

**RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND
RESPONSIBILITY**

College of Forestry
Oregon State University
July 25, 2006

K. Norman Johnson, Chair

Jo Albers

John Bliss

Barbara Bond

Cristina Eisenberg

Fred Kamke

Loren Kellogg

Denise Lach

Doug Maguire

Jeff McDonnell

Jeff Morrell

Richard Waring

Penny Wright

Executive Summary

Last February, Dean Hal Salwasser created the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility to engage the College of Forestry in a discussion about the atmosphere and culture of the College relative to achieving our core values of academic freedom and academic responsibility. Toward that end, we

- held a number of open meetings to discuss our mission and our recommendations,
- conducted a survey on problems with academic freedom and responsibility in the College,
- produced a draft report on which we sought comments from members of the College, and
- conducted a survey on confidence in the Dean's leadership into the future and on support for our draft recommendations and the Dean's initial attempts to implement them.

Our discussions with the members of the College went much deeper than the immediate cause of our work (response to the Donato et al. paper). Thus, we have tried to look beyond the specifics of this particular case to underlying problems that enabled it to happen. In this work, we have focused on the institutional and cultural context that enabled the problems of the last few months to occur. We have developed a set of recommendations that, we believe, address the problems and issues we found.

In developing our recommendations, we were guided by a number of principles:

- Diversity of perspective, ethnicity, gender, age, background, and training strengthens the College.
- Transparency in decision-making leads to better decisions and fosters confidence in those decisions.
- Participation by the College community in its governance builds ownership of College policies and programs.
- Active participation by faculty, staff, and students in College governance should be rewarded and must be accomplished within the constraints of other demands on their time.
- Collegiality is a cornerstone of a rigorous, dynamic, and open learning environment.
- Leaders must be accountable to those they lead.
- Achieving excellence in the academy requires attention to each of the above principles.

We have organized our recommendations into five topics: (1) ensuring effective leadership; (2) cultivating professional behavior; (3) fostering collegiality, rigorous inquiry, and debate; (4) assessing future progress; and (5) reviewing our report. We have developed twenty-five recommendations to address these issues:

Ensuring effective leadership and governance

REC #1: Reconstitute the governance bodies of the College to reflect the diversity within the College.

REC #2: Develop transparent deliberation and decision processes for College governance bodies.

REC #3 Ensure broad faculty, staff, and student participation to provide new ideas, as well as checks and balances.

REC #4: Build systems of accountability so that all decision makers are responsible to the College for decisions they make.

REC #5: Seek advice from a wide range of perspectives, reflective of the issues and values important to Oregonians in the management of forests and of the questions that are the focus of our teaching and research.

REC #6: Build and maintain relationships with the wide variety of professional groups interested in the management of forests and the goods and services that forests provide.

REC #7: Advocate the academic enterprise.

REC #8: Follow existing policy on participation in public policy development (Administrative Memo #31).

REC #9: Provide proposed testimony in draft form for comment by members of the College.

REC #10: Maintain independence of College research, regardless of funding source.

REC #11: Publicize increasingly diverse sources of research funding in the College and begin to evaluate the meaning of this diversity for the future of the College.

REC # 12: Utilize competitive processes within the College that are open and transparent for discretionary research fund disbursement.

REC #13: Form a college-wide committee to examine the desirability of reorganizing the College.

Cultivating professional behavior

REC #14: Develop a general Code of Conduct for the entire College community, similar to the code currently applied to students in the College of Forestry.

REC #15: Utilize an ombudsperson to mediate situations in which people feel the Code has been violated, and empower the ombudsperson to take matters to the Dean of the College (or the Provost if the Dean is involved), if the situation cannot be satisfactorily resolved.

REC #16: Designate people in the College who can act as ombudspersons to work both informally and formally with faculty, staff, and students in resolving conflicts related to the Code of Conduct.

REC #17: Immediately appoint someone of national stature from outside the College as an ombudsperson to help work through the dispute associated with the publication of the Donato et al. article in *Science* and letter asking that its publication be delayed.

REC #18: Elevate mentoring to a high priority in the College.

Fostering collegiality, rigorous inquiry, and debate

REC #19: Work with the new Graduate Student Council to develop graduate course offerings on academic freedom, academic responsibility, and scientific ethics.

REC #20: Develop a variety of mechanisms to encourage a respectful exchange of views across the College on controversial issues and studies.

REC #21: Encourage challenge and dissent in discussions of controversial issues and studies and develop a seminar to prepare students for these types of discussions.

REC #22: Continue to utilize peer review in the scientific literature as a primary means for evaluating the scientific rigor of studies done in the College.

REC #23: Use the *Annual Reports* and *Focus on Forestry* to discuss scientific controversies and our work on them.

Assessing future progress

REC #24: Convene a successor to the Academic Freedom and Responsibility Committee to assess the College's pursuit of the above recommendations and to review evidence of tangible progress.

Reviewing this report

REC #25: Solicit independent outside review of the recommendations and any subsequent implementation plan.

We are available for further discussions of these recommendations as needed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people assisted us in our efforts. Hundreds of people took the time to respond to our surveys and votes, and scores wrote us detailed reactions to our proposals.

A few people should be singled out for their efforts. Caryn Davis helped edit our report. Susan Morre helped us create and administer our survey. Kathy Howell and Terralyn Vandetta developed an approach to web-based voting that enabled us to take the “confidence” vote---a difficult task that they accomplished in very little time.

Thank you all very much.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction

- A. The Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility
- B. The College Survey on Academic Freedom and Responsibility
- C. A Vote of Confidence in Dean Salwasser and Support for the Recommendations and the Dean's Initial Implementation of Them.
- D. Addressing Underlying Problems: The Committee's Approach

II. Recommendations

- A. Ensuring Effective Leadership and Governance
 - 1. Governance structures and processes
 - 2. External advisors
 - 3. Advocacy
 - 4. Sources of funding
 - 5. College organization
- B. Cultivating Professional Behavior
 - 1. Code of conduct/Addressing unprofessional behavior
 - 2. College Faculty/Staff/Student ombudsperson
 - 3. Mentoring
- C. Fostering Collegiality, Rigorous Inquiry, and Debate
 - 1. Collegiality
 - 2. Learning about scientific ethics, academic freedom, and academic duty
 - 3. Encouraging dialogue on controversial issues
 - 4. Encouraging challenge and dissent
 - 5. Ensuring scientific rigor
 - 6. Telling our stories
- D. Assessing Future Progress
- E. Reviewing This Report

Appendix A. Background—The Donato, et al. Paper and Reaction to it in the College of Forestry and Elsewhere

Appendix B. Statement of Academic Freedom and Faculty Responsibility from the Faculty Handbook

Appendix C. The Confidence/No Confidence Vote

Appendix D. Administrative Memo #31

I. INTRODUCTION

The College of Forestry at Oregon State University aspires to be the world's premier forest resources education, research, and service institution. The mission of the College of Forestry, as part of Oregon's Land, Sea, and Space Grant University, is to educate and engage the next generation of scholars, practitioners, and users of the world's forest resources, to conduct distinctive problem-solving and fundamental research on the nature and use of forests and related resources, and to share our discoveries and knowledge with others.

Events in the College following the publication, in January 2006, of a one-page article in the journal *Science* have raised a range of issues concerning academic freedom, academic responsibility, professional conduct, and the very culture of the College. (See Appendix A for a summary of the events following the article's on-line publication and Appendix B for statements from the Oregon State University Faculty Handbook on academic freedom and faculty responsibility). The following report makes a series of recommendations that the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility considers important in addressing concerns raised by those within and outside of the College in recent months. Although the response to publication of the article by College leadership and faculty was the precipitating event for these debates, many issues raised go beyond those stemming directly from the article's publication and the aftermath. In what follows, the Committee takes a forward-looking perspective and recommends actions aimed at reducing the likelihood of similar situations arising in the future and at strengthening the College.

A. THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY

In late January, in a message to the entire College of Forestry, Dean Salwasser expressed the need for the College to

“examine how and why things unfolded the way they did after the *Science* article, reaffirm the core values and principles that we hold as guidance for our scholarly work, and reinvigorate a culture of trust and openness in the College. . . . Our aim now is to learn from this experience, look deeply within ourselves, and take the steps needed to maintain a free and open environment for scientific inquiry.”

Soon thereafter, the Dean formed this Committee to engage the College of Forestry in a discussion about the atmosphere and culture of the College relative to achieving our core values of academic freedom and academic responsibility. He asked all Endowed Chairs and Distinguished Professors of the College to be on the Committee, but it soon became clear that such a committee would not adequately represent the College. Over the first month of existence, some original members left the Committee and four were added. Those added were a junior faculty member, a staff member, a graduate student, and a member from the Department of Sociology. In the process the Committee went from a composition of eleven men and one woman to eight men and five women.

The Committee did not begin to function until mid-March, largely because the Chair wanted emotions in the College to settle enough that we could have a reasoned discussion about what had happened and what to do about it. The first meeting, at which Dean Salwasser explained his actions (at the suggestion of some members of the Committee), highlighted the need to assure students that their education and protection was a top priority for the College. Toward that end, the Committee developed a statement of student support, subsequently signed by over eighty faculty and staff, which became well known in the College and was published in *The Daily Barometer* on May 8. Also, members of the Committee signed a letter of support for the two students involved in the Donato et al. paper, committing to encourage a more welcoming, supportive environment in the College.

One of our difficulties in engaging the College in a discussion of academic freedom and responsibility related to creating an environment in which everyone felt free to speak. We heard repeatedly that some people (especially junior faculty and graduate students) felt reluctant to speak up. Then how do we obtain their views? To ensure representation of their views, we first settled on an anonymous survey administered by the business school. We then took comments from the College through a variety of methods: open meetings, comments submitted to the committee through e-mail and verbal communication, and finally through the vote requested by the Dean on our draft report. The problems and recommendations identified through these sources and our own review are summarized below.

Using the survey results as a starting point, we convened a series of two- to three-hour meetings over a four-week period to develop recommendations. These meetings were in a public setting. Everyone in the College was invited to them, and we occasionally stopped to allow members of the audience to participate. Members of the press attended some of the meetings.

B. THE COLLEGE SURVEY ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY

In April, we distributed a survey to the faculty, graduate students, and staff of the College of Forestry to assess opinions within the College on academic freedom and academic responsibility. Approximately 2/5 of the faculty and 1/3 of the graduate students completed the survey; few staff participated.

The survey first asked four summary questions about the state of academic freedom and academic responsibility in the College, and then we asked open-ended questions about problems and recommendations for solving them. A summary of these results follows:

- Most people agreed or strongly agreed that their academic freedom is protected in the College.
- Most agreed or strongly agreed that some problems exist in protection of academic freedom in the College.

- Most agreed or strongly agreed that members of the College adequately discharge their academic responsibilities, but they did see some problems in the College with the discharge of these responsibilities.
- Organizational problems highlighted included perceived conflict of interest (due to industry funding), lack of tolerance of divergent viewpoints, leadership problems, lack of diversity, and lack of a mentoring program.
- Organizational recommendations highlighted included development of a code of ethics with sanctions, structural change in governance, education on the meaning of academic freedom, reorganization of the College, improved protection for independence of research, increased cross-disciplinary sharing of ideas, and improved internal review mechanisms.
- Individual issues highlighted included unprofessional behavior, the Dean's relationship to the timber industry, difference in interpersonal styles, and lack of communication skills.
- Recommendations for solving individual problems included making public statements about and implementing sanctions for unprofessional behavior, clarifying the policy roles for the College leadership, and developing a culture of mutual respect.

C. A VOTE ON CONFIDENCE IN DEAN SALWASSER AND SUPPORT FOR OUR RECOMMENDATIONS AND THE DEAN'S INITIAL IMPLEMENTATION OF THEM

In early June, the College of Forestry participated in a “confidence/no confidence” vote about Dean Salwasser’s ability to lead the College into the future. The vote was called by this Committee to address questions about the Dean’s ability to lead the College after the tumultuous events of the winter months. The wording of the anonymous vote was as follows:

Choose 1:

- (1) I have confidence in Dean Salwasser's ability to lead the College into the future.
- (2) I do not have confidence in Dean Salwasser's ability to lead the College into the future.
- (3) Abstain.

Five categories of voters were recognized: (1) Faculty (assistant professors, associate professors, and professors with at least a half-time appointment); (2) All other employees of the college (professional faculty, classified staff, research assistants, research associates); (3) Undergraduate students; (4) Graduate students; and (5) Emeritus faculty.

Highlights of the confidence/no confidence vote:

- A high proportion of the College (except undergraduate students) participated in the vote: 330 members of the College community voted.

- Overall, 66% of voters expressed confidence in the Dean’s ability to lead the College, while 24% voted “no confidence” and 10% abstained.
- Many voters on either side of the “confidence/no confidence” question commented that their decision was difficult, reflecting the complexity of the issues involved. These comments (125 were received) provide a rich, nuanced view of the issues, and have been forwarded to the Dean for his consideration.

At the request of the Dean, voters were also asked to indicate whether or not they support the Committee’s draft report and the Dean’s proposed action plan. The wording of the anonymous vote was as follows:

Choose 1:

(1) I support the committee's recommended changes and Dean Salwasser's proposed action plan.

(2) I do not support the committee's recommended changes and/or Dean Salwasser's proposed action plan.

(3) Abstain.

Highlights of the support vote:

- Overall, 63% of voters expressed “support,” 17% expressed “no support,” and 20% abstained.
- Many thoughtful comments and suggestions were offered on the Committee’s report and the Dean’s proposed action plan. Results of the vote on the Committee’s report and the Dean’s proposed action plan are difficult to interpret. The vote did not provide an adequate mechanism to assess the individual merits of the report or the action plan. Several comments from the respondents indicated that parts of the report were acceptable, while other parts were not. The Committee has taken the comments provided with the vote, as well as previous comments, into consideration in preparation of the recommendations described below.

More details on the two votes are provided in Appendix C.

D. ADDRESSING UNDERLYING PROBLEMS: THE COMMITTEE'S APPROACH

Our discussions with members of the College went much deeper than the immediate cause of our work (response to the Donato et al. paper). Thus, we have tried to look beyond the specifics of this particular case to the underlying problems and the institutional and cultural context that enabled it to occur.

As the Committee sought to understand how the events of the past months could have occurred, how the environment within the College could have become so uncomfortable for many of its members, and how we might chart our way into a brighter future, several funda-

mental principles emerged. We offer the following principles to guide the College as it seeks to renew and reinvigorate itself:

- Diversity of perspective, ethnicity, gender, age, background, and training strengthens the College.
- Transparency in decision-making leads to better decisions and fosters confidence in those decisions.
- Participation by the College community in its governance builds ownership of College policies and programs.
- Active participation by faculty, staff, and students in College governance must be rewarded and be accomplished within the constraints of other demands on their time.
- Collegiality is a cornerstone of a rigorous, dynamic, and open learning environment.
- Leaders must be accountable to those they lead.
- Achieving excellence in the academy requires attention to each of the above principles.

Most generally, we have tried to make recommendations that will allow academic freedom to flourish in the College and enable people to fulfill their academic responsibilities (academic duty) to the fullest extent possible. Thus, we have addressed the following issues in our recommendations:

- Ensuring effective leadership and governance
 - Governance structures and processes
 - External advisors
 - Advocacy
 - Sources of funding
 - College organization
- Cultivating professional conduct
 - Code of conduct/Addressing unprofessional behavior
 - College advocate/ombudsperson
 - Mentoring
- Fostering collegiality, rigorous inquiry, and debate
 - Collegiality
 - Scientific ethics and academic freedom and responsibility
 - Dialogue on controversial issues
 - Challenge and dissent
 - Scientific rigor
 - Telling our stories

We make recommendations below to address each issue and offer examples of how each recommendation might be implemented. We also recognize, however, that more thought and experience may lead to other ways to accomplish these goals. The key guidance we offer comes from the recommendations themselves along with the principles listed above.

II. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. ENSURING EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE

Our survey results and discussions with colleagues have identified a significant concern that decision making in the College often does not consider the wide variety of perspectives in the College, and in forestry in general. Furthermore, these concerns center on the makeup and decision process of the Forestry Executive Committee (FEC)—the body that makes the major policy and budgetary decisions of the College.

Despite the College’s stated commitment to diversity, the FEC lacks diversity in gender, rank, ethnicity, and disciplinary perspective.

The difficulty that some members of the leadership had with recognizing the academic freedom issues involved in their participation in the letter to *Science* calling for delay of the Donato et al. paper, and the encouragement of groups interested in challenging the Donato et al. paper, stand out as failures of leadership.

If the College leadership were more representative of the diverse perspectives and expertise resident in the College, we believe that it would have been less likely to march into the quagmire that followed publication of the Donato et al. paper.

Comments from many sources identified a lack of transparency in the College governance as a distinct problem. The Dean and the FEC operate in a hierarchical fashion with little opportunity for input from faculty or students, even in decisions that affect them, and little accountability for decisions that have been made. It is not clear to many members of the College how the Dean and/or the FEC deliberate, make decisions, or communicate to the College and others about important issues.

1. Leadership: Governance structures and processes.

The Committee recommends rethinking the governance structures and processes of the College to ensure that governance represents a wide range of perspectives and is transparent to those affected by its decisions. To do this, we make the following recommendations to guide governance, with bullet points listing examples of how to implement each recommendation:

REC #1: Reconstitute the governance bodies of the College to reflect the diversity within the College.

- Reorganize the College decision-making structure (currently the FEC) to provide for diversity of disciplinary perspectives, values, rank, gender, and ethnicity.
- Provide incentives for participation by the College community in decision-making (recognizing the tendency of women and members of minority groups to become overloaded with committee assignments).
- Develop mechanisms for the Dean and other members of the FEC to interact more, and more proactively, with the College community. Ensure that both internal and external matters receive the attention they require from the Dean.
- Create a welcoming environment for all perspectives.
- Ensure that groups that cross departmental boundaries are represented, like “computing” and “publications.”

REC# 2: Develop transparent deliberation and decision processes for College governance bodies.

- Utilize an open decision-making process: publicize agendas, solicit agenda items, allow the College community to attend meetings, and report and discuss decisions promptly.

REC #3 Ensure broad faculty, staff, and student participation to provide new ideas as well as checks and balances.

- Create multiple opportunities and methods for the College community to offer ideas, opinions, and statements of concern, such as frequent briefing meetings, time for the College community to speak at meetings before decisions are made, and discussion boards on websites.
- Ensure efficiency so that administrators, faculty, staff, and students all feel that participation in governance activities is a good use of their time
- Ensure the College community knows when items of interest will be discussed.

REC #4: Build systems of accountability so that all decision makers are responsible to the College for decisions they make.

- Increase the voice of the College community in reviews of the leadership by eliciting regular (annual) feedback regarding performance.
- Develop a mechanism whereby the leadership regularly reports to and discusses their decisions with interested faculty, staff, and students.

2. Leadership: External advisors

To maintain its leadership in forestry, the College of Forestry must understand the wide range of perspectives and values held about forest resources. Therefore, the College should seek input and advice from a wider range of perspectives than it has in the past.

Historically, research in the College was dominated by the Forest Research Lab (FRL), which was created by the State of Oregon in the 1930s to support reforestation of the Tillamook Forest burn and transferred to the College in 1941. The FRL Advisory Board, set up in 1941 to oversee research in the FRL, is to “render practical counsel in the fields of forest management and use and forest harvest and utilization as they relate to the economic and social well-being of the people of Oregon. Nine members shall be individuals who are actively and principally engaged in timber management of forest lands, harvesting, or the processing of forest products, one of whom shall be from a small woodland owner’s association, three members shall be individuals who are the heads of state and federal public forestry agencies, and three members shall be individuals from the public at large.”

From the 1940s to the early 1970s, almost all research funds came through a legislative appropriation and were augmented by harvest tax funds. It was expected that this research would be focused on increasing the productivity of Oregon’s forests and the contribution of these forests to the industries of Oregon. Research results were largely published through FRL papers and notes.

In the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s, major changes occurred in our approach to research as the College became a major force in forest science and policy in the United States and the world. Scientists in the College are now involved in a wide array of topics, only some of which are directly related to “forest harvest and utilization.” Also, College researchers now receive most of their funds from outside contracts and grants and publish mainly in scientific journals, most of which did not exist when the FRL was established. Today, the role of the FRL committee as an advisory board to the College needs to be reassessed to insure that it remains an effective advisory organization.

We expect our leadership to seek advice from people interested in the use of forests for wood production. This output and value from forests will always be an important part of our teaching and research program, and is part of our Land Grant mission. Today, however, the mission of the College extends beyond commodity-based forest practices to address watershed, recreation, fish and wildlife, spiritual, and other values. We need advice representing these perspectives as well.

REC # 5: Seek advice from a wide range of perspectives, reflective of the issues and values important to Oregonians in the management of forests and of the questions that are the focus of our teaching and research.

- Seek a diversity of perspectives from individuals and groups outside the College to offer advice and/or counsel on both a regular and *ad hoc* basis as issues arise.
- Create a College-wide external Advisory Board with a diversity of perspectives that add to those on the FRL Advisory Board. As an example, useful counsel could come from conservation groups such as The Nature Conservancy, Defenders of Wildlife, Sustainable Northwest, Audubon Society, and the Corvallis Environmental Center.
- Consider seeking an amendment to state law to diversify membership of the FRL.
- Identify the full range of College research supporters and funding organizations and involve them (or the perspective they represent) in advisory activities. Include important federal sources of funds, such as NASA and NSF, in addition to the Forest Service and other traditional sources of support.

REC #6: Build and maintain relationships with the wide variety of professional groups interested in the management of forests and the goods and services that forests provide.

- Actively participate in the activities of a wide variety of professional groups that represent the professional activities of the entire faculty, for example Society of American Foresters, Ecological Society of America, Wildlife Society, and the Society for Wood Science and Technology.

3. Leadership: Advocacy

The initial reaction of the Dean and some members of the FEC to the Donato et al. article appeared to take sides in the scientific controversy about post-fire salvage and recovery. The Dean's initial statements and his e-mail correspondence reflect a high level of interaction with individuals from, and support of, the side of the argument favoring salvage logging. A later memo from the Dean acknowledges these issues. In addition, the Dean has advocated for specific legislation on federal forest management while speaking for the College.

The Committee believes that these actions were inappropriate and in conflict with Administrative Memo #31 (August 1993) concerning "Participation in Public Policy Development" (see Appendix D for Administrative Memo #31). This memo reiterates University policy regarding an "obligation to avoid any action which purports to commit the institution to a position on any issue without appropriate approval," with the addition of a College-specific interpretation that "faculty must actively avoid actions that might logically be construed as institutional representation and approval." The College-specific additions to the University policy require faculty to "specifically note for the record that OSU and the College or FRL do not take positions in public policy matters." We believe that the Dean's actions in response to the Donato et al. article and his testimony about specific policy are in conflict with this memo's policy statement against taking sides in policy debates.

The College-specific additions to the University policy also require faculty to inform “their department head or comparable supervisor” about policy-related activities. In this case, the Dean notified the FEC—which contains his department head—about his involvement with statements/letters with an opposing view to that taken by Donato et al. While not privy to conversations between the FEC and the Dean regarding his involvement, College policy regarding policy-related activities by College members was not enforced. The actions of the Dean and some FEC members, and the inaction of other FEC members, may have contributed to the divisive conversations in the months following the publication of the Donato et al. paper.

We expect College leaders to be just that — leaders in the science of forestry, forest resources, wood science, and forest ecosystems. We expect them to be advocates for the College and for science in general. However, it is the policy of the College and a professional responsibility of researchers (including leaders) to always note that the College and the FRL do not take positions in public policy matters.

REC #7: Advocate the academic enterprise

- An example of this approach is the testimony that Dean Salwasser and others gave on research needs at a Medford Congressional hearing.

REC # 8: Follow existing policy on participation in public policy development (Administrative Memo #31)

- Follow Administrative Memo #31 (August 1993) which clearly lays out the College expectation for all faculty (including leaders) with respect to their interaction with policy organizations (Appendix D).

REC #9: Provide proposed testimony in draft form for comment by members of the College.

- Utilize a process similar to that used by Dean Salwasser in developing his testimony for the Medford Congressional hearing in which he drew on the expertise of College members.

4. Leadership: Sources of funding

Our survey results suggest that a number of people felt that our funding sources create a conflict of interest in our work and contributed to some of the reactions in the College to the Donato et al. paper. Also, the College has received substantial press coverage on this point. The press commonly states that the harvest tax money, combined with the makeup of the FRL Advisory Committee, create inevitable bias in our research.

The College now receives most of its research funding from grants and contracts rather than from legislative funding or the harvest tax. In total, most College research monies come from federal and state sources unconnected to the forest industry.

An increasing source of our research funding comes from competitive grants; some scientists have all, or almost all, their research money coming from these grants and spend almost all their time working on them. They are faculty entrepreneurs working in a very competitive environment. These grants also produce a disproportionate share of the overhead that funds essential university services.

We make the following recommendations to guide our sources of research funding:

REC #10: Maintain independence of College research, regardless of funding source.

- Maintain a protective environment within the College to ensure that individuals or institutions that fund scientific research do not influence the outcome of the funded research.

REC #11: Publicize the increasingly diverse sources of research funding in the College and begin to evaluate the meaning of this diversity for the future of the College

REC # 12: Utilize competitive processes within the College that are open and transparent for discretionary research fund disbursement.

5. College organization

There is considerable debate over whether the current structure of the College is adequate to effectively address forestry issues of the twenty-first century. The current structure likely resulted from past problems and issues. The division of the College into four, somewhat, but not totally distinct, departments may also contribute to perceived and actual epistemological divisions among College members.

Should the College reorganize internally? Should it absorb other departments or disciplines? Should it merge with other Colleges? These are all questions that can be usefully studied. Comments the Committee received show there is both enthusiasm for and great reluctance to reorganize the College.

All organizations benefit from periodic examination of their organization. In fact, many forestry institutions around the country have reorganized over the last few decades. Examples include Colleges of Natural Resources (e.g., Colorado State, University of Arizona, UC-Berkeley, University of Wisconsin, University of Idaho, Utah State, Humboldt State, Virginia Tech, etc.); Renewable Natural Resources (Louisiana State University); Environment and Natural Resources (Ohio State); Natural Resources and Environment (University of Illinois, University of Michigan); and Forest Resources and Conservation (University of Florida and University of Montana). While none of these reorganizations may be exactly right for OSU, and in some cases they may have undergone more of a name change than a fundamental reorganization, the changes suggest that others have found the need to adapt.

The Committee recommends that the College begin by implementing our other recommendations, all of which are designed to provide opportunities for College members to work together on activities that improve the atmosphere and culture of the College of

Forestry. As we gain experience in working together to solve College problems, we will build the capacity necessary to consider College reorganization.

REC #13: Form a College-wide committee to examine the desirability of reorganizing the College of Forestry.

- Engage the full spectrum of internal and external constituents for the College in all discussions about the future of the College.
- Examine past and current structures of other colleges with similar objectives across the country
- Attempt to increase possibilities for world-class education, research, and outreach about forests and forest systems at OSU, while decreasing administrative costs.
- Provide faculty units that reflect the current and future nature of the forestry enterprise.
- Consider alternative forms of departmental leadership, including rotating department chairs.

B. CULTIVATING PROFESSIONAL BEHAVIOR

1. Code of conduct/Addressing unprofessional behavior.

Recent events have raised questions about the need for a code of ethics (or conduct), with associated enforcement mechanisms to guide our behavior in the College. These events suggest that we may need some guidance in setting limits on how we act toward each other. In the survey the development of a code of ethics with “teeth” was the most common recommendation for change in the College. Some comments on the draft recommendations suggested that our recommendations also need more “teeth”; however, others said that the College does not need a code of ethics at all. We recognize that there are people on both sides of this issue.

There is currently a Code of Conduct in the College for students, but not for faculty. The student Code includes enforcement mechanisms through an honor court. OSU has a statement of faculty responsibilities in the Faculty Handbook, but does not have specific enforcement mechanisms to address violations.

The Committee recommends that the College develop a Code of Conduct for the College community as follows:

REC# 14: Develop a general Code of Conduct for the entire College community similar to the code currently applied to students in the College of Forestry.

- Make every member of the College community responsible for conduct that creates, promotes, and maintains learning and working environments that are open and welcoming to all persons.
- Foster a learning environment in which everyone feels safe to state his or her opinion and that ensures behavior that is acceptable in the professional workplace. This conduct can be described simply as honest, civil, courteous, and responsible.
- Develop a plan to encourage and enhance professional behavior for all College personnel.
- Ensure that supervisors at all levels are proactive in promoting professional conduct.

REC #15: Utilize an ombudsperson (see below) to mediate situations in which people feel the Code has been violated, and empower the ombudsperson to take matters to the Dean of the College (or the Provost if the Dean is involved) if the situation cannot be satisfactorily resolved.

2. College Faculty/Staff/Student Ombudspersons

One of the consequences of recent events has been the creation of an environment in which some people felt uncomfortable or even unsafe in talking with certain members of the College. Ideally, Advisors and Department Heads provide assistance when we have academic or professional problems, or when we have problems with the way we are treated by colleagues, teachers, clients, and funding institutions. Individuals who do not feel comfortable with these traditional advocates have nowhere else to turn in the College and may feel that taking problems to advocates in the university outside the College would be difficult or even fruitless.

REC #16: Designate people in the College who can act as ombudspersons to work both informally and formally with faculty, staff, and students in resolving conflicts related to the Code of Conduct.

- Ensure that faculty, staff, and students trust selected advocates.
- Seek nominations from faculty, staff, and students for potential advocates in each department.
- Develop skills and knowledge of advocates so they can be effective in assisting faculty, staff, and students in resolving conflicts.
- Develop or provide training for individuals and departments to address the Code of Conduct and individual skills for resolving conflicts
- Utilize trained advocates in managing the Code of Conduct.

We believe a gulf remains between those who wrote the one-page *Science* article on post-fire salvage and recovery and those who wrote the letter to *Science* asking that publication of the article be delayed. To address this remaining problem, we ask for the appointment of an ombudsperson. We feel that it would be wise to appoint someone of significant national stature from outside the College, such as one of the people we recommend below, as a reviewer of our recommendations and initial implementation.

REC #17: Immediately appoint someone of national stature from outside the College as an ombudsperson to help work through the dispute associated with publication of the article in *Science* and letter asking that its publication be delayed.

3. Mentoring

The adequacy of the College community mentoring has been raised in our survey and in discussions. Part of developing an academic career at all stages involves becoming a mentor and also finding mentors; the College community should be inculcated with the importance of mentoring because success in academia depends, in part, on creating a set of mentors. We could do more to encourage a climate of mentorship in our college. We believe that mentorship quality varies in the College, as does the knowledge of faculty, staff, and students about how to find and utilize mentors. Currently, the College allocates very few resources to mentoring.

REC #18: Elevate mentoring to a high priority in the College.

- Provide mentorship training and also advice on finding and utilizing mentors for all who seek it. (The draft report of the Building Community Committee proposes that mentorship training be required for all supervisors in the College.)
- Provide expectations and incentives for faculty in mentoring.

C. FOSTERING COLLEGIALITY, RIGOROUS INQUIRY, AND DEBATE

1. Collegiality

Collegiality is a cornerstone of a rigorous, dynamic, and open learning environment. Collegiality must be built by the entire College community and can not be regulated by the administration. Nevertheless, every supervisor has the responsibility to foster collegiality.

2. Learning about scientific ethics, academic freedom, academic duty, and peer review/publication in the scientific literature

Students, staff, and faculty have expressed interest in learning more about these topics as a result of issues raised by the events of the last few months such as scientific ethics, publishing, academic freedom, and academic duty. Students are especially interested in a course/seminar that could serve as a discussion forum in which a number of scholars would participate. Currently, little is offered in the College on these topics, although, a course on scientific ethics has occasionally been offered in the College and a course on scientific ethics may be offered in the Philosophy Department. The Forestry Communications Group (FCG) has offered short workshops specifically on the peer review/scientific publishing process for the past 10 years. The workshops have also touched on issues of ethics in academic publishing, although the approach has been more practical (how to avoid common pitfalls) than philosophical. FCG has offered to develop and teach a course on scientific publishing that would walk students through the entire process, using the students' own papers and in-class peer review as part of teaching process, but there has been little interest/available resources for such a course.

REC #19: Work with the new Graduate Student Council to develop graduate course offerings on academic freedom, academic responsibility, and scientific ethics.

3. Encouraging dialogue on controversial issues

As was pointed out in the survey, we do not have many forums at the College level for discussing controversial scientific issues, yet many of these issues transcend Departmental boundaries. Rather, we emphasize departmental seminars, thesis defenses, and topic seminars, especially by visiting scholars. Occasionally, we have College-wide seminars

on controversial issues, but only rarely do we have a forum in which views can be presented and critiqued.

Science simply does not progress unless new and old ideas are challenged. The College needs to encourage the College community to participate fully in rigorous scientific debate and to dissent when the available information suggests alternative interpretations. Vigorous debate, however, can and should be done in a respectful and professional manner.

REC #20: Develop a variety of mechanisms to encourage a respectful exchange of views across the College on controversial issues and studies

- Institute College-wide seminars and workshops each year on controversial issues and relevant current research.
- Implement
 - a College-wide seminar series on controversial issues of the day run by faculty/graduate students of the four departments.
 - an annual public workshop on some controversial issue in which College members present their ideas and research and discuss/critique them.
 - an annual College workshop at which graduate students present their work (organized by the Graduate Student Council).
 - a joint, all-College new graduate student orientation, involving faculty from each department, perhaps conducted at the H. J. Andrews Forest

4. Encouraging challenge and dissent as an essential ingredient of the scientific process

Science simply does not progress unless new and old ideas are challenged. The College needs to encourage faculty and graduate students to participate fully in rigorous scientific debate and to dissent when the available information suggests alternative interpretations. Vigorous debate, however, can and should be done in a respectful and professional manner.

Beginning scientists can be taken aback by these debates and the sharpness of the remarks in them. A course or seminar on how to participate in the discussions and what to expect would be useful.

REC # 21: Encourage challenge and dissent in discussions of controversial issues and studies and develop a seminar to prepare students for these types of discussions

- Ensure that the discussion remains respectful and professional

- Develop a class for graduate students on how to debate, what to expect, and how to identify and separate academic vs. personal attacks.

5. Ensuring scientific rigor

At one time, we had an internal review process in the College of Forestry, but that process has largely disappeared. Instead, scientists in the College send their work directly to journals and other peer-reviewed outlets, often after receiving informal review by their colleagues, and then rely on the peer review process and open debate in the scientific literature to deal with bias of all kinds.

REC # 22: Continue to utilize peer review in the scientific literature as a primary means for evaluating the scientific rigor of studies done in the College.

6. Telling our many different stories

Our alumni and supporters, faculty, staff, and students in the university, and Oregonians in general may not understand the diversity of research projects, perspectives, and values held by the faculty and students working on the major policy issues of the day. In addition, many do not understand how these differences informed and inflamed the recent controversy following publication of the Donato et al. paper.

Currently the College tells its story through an *Annual Report* and *Focus on Forestry*—neither outlet contributes much toward solving this problem. The May 2006 edition of *Focus on Forestry* is spectacular in design and covers a multitude of important projects. Still, it has only one paragraph (in the Dean’s message) on the most famous controversy in a forestry school in decades. To tell our story, we recommend the following:

REC #23: Use the *Annual Reports* and *Focus on Forestry* to discuss scientific controversies and our work on them.

- Take a few controversies and get an outsider to weave a story about them and our research/teaching/outreach on them. Do this in a candid, engaging fashion while pointing out our different perspectives and the scientific process for vetting these ideas.
- Use *Focus on Forestry* to explore fundamental issues about our College and its future, including the meaning of academic freedom and duty.
- Utilize OSU News and Communications and University Advancement to assist with rebuilding of the College’s reputation.

D. ASSESSING FUTURE PROGRESS

- Some of the recommendations listed above can be addressed almost immediately (within six months), but others will require a much longer period (one to three years).

The committee believes that, in the spirit of active engagement of the entire College community, periodic evaluation of our progress will be essential to ensure that the desired outcomes are achieved.

REC #24. Convene a successor to the Academic Freedom and Responsibility Committee to assess the College’s pursuit of the above recommendations and to review evidence of tangible progress.

- In recognition that many of the problems our recommendations address could be resolved with actions other than those suggested, we propose that the evaluation focus on outcomes, as well as on the pursuit of suggested actions. To start the assessment process, we suggest the following:

September 2006	Dean appoints Academic Freedom and Responsibility Oversight Committee
November 2006	The College leadership provides Committee with a six-month progress report on responses to the recommendations listed above.
December 2006	The Committee meets to discuss a draft assessment of progress on improving the culture of the College, then solicits and incorporates feedback from faculty, staff, and students.
January 2007	Final draft of Progress Report is posted on the College website.
May 2007	The College Leadership provides Committee with a one-year progress report on responses to the recommendations listed above.
June 2007	The Committee meets to discuss a draft assessment of progress on improving the culture of the College, then solicits and incorporates feedback, from faculty, staff, and students; a schedule for future assessments is established.
July 2007	Final draft of Progress Report is posted on the College website.

E. EVALUATING THIS REPORT

We believe that some of our peers should review this report and evaluate whether our recommendations will help address the problems that have surfaced in the College over the last six months. Also, that review should examine the adequacy of any plan to implement these recommendations.

REC #25: Solicit independent outside review of our recommendations and any subsequent implementation plan.

- Suggested reviewers: Susan Stafford, Ross Whaley, John Gordon, and Pamela Matson.

Appendix A. Background---The Donato, et al. Paper and Reaction to It in the College of Forestry and Elsewhere

Fall, 2005

Six scientists (graduate students D. C. Donato and J. B. Fontaine; post-doctoral research associate J. L. Campbell; Forest Service researcher J. B. Kauffman; and OSU professors W. D. Robinson and B. E. Law, hereafter referred to as Donato et al.) submitted a short paper to the journal *Science* on some early results from work on post-fire recovery of the Biscuit fire in southern Oregon—work sponsored by the Joint Fire Sciences Program. Their paper focused on post-fire tree regeneration and fuel loadings with and without salvage logging. It contained some scientific results that had potential policy relevance to a bill on post-fire salvage and recovery that was working its way through the House of Representatives.

January 1-20, 2006

After peer review, the Donato et al. paper, ‘Post-wildfire logging hinders regeneration and increases fire risk,’ was accepted for publication in *Science* (vol. 311, no. 5759, p. 352). Before it appeared in the print version of the journal on January 20, 2006, however, the paper was first published in *ScienceXpress* on January 5, 2006. *ScienceXpress* is a preliminary, online version of *Science* that provides ‘publication ahead of print’ for selected papers. The article was made available to the press and promptly made front-page headlines across the West, in part because reporters saw it as questioning the need for, and basis of, proposed legislation.

The authors of the paper notified the Dean that it would soon appear in the regular print version of *Science* and the Dean and authors began a discussion about the paper and the underlying research. Once the online version appeared in *ScienceXpress* and the media made their interpretations, the College leadership received a torrent of criticism of the paper from alumni, supporters, and legislators. The Dean began to work with members of the forest industry and the Society of American Foresters to find ways to challenge the conclusions (inferences) in the paper. Among the suggestions discussed was to organize a group of scientists to make a public statement about the paper. At the same time, the Dean attempted to keep people with critical comments focused on the merits of the work rather than on the scientists involved.

Release of the Donato et al. paper also created a furor within the College, as people argued the soundness of the analysis in the paper and the degree to which the conclusions were justified by the findings. People also questioned the prominent role of the graduate students in the paper compared with that of the more senior faculty authors. To bring things to a head, the Chair of this committee convened a seminar at which the authors presented their work, answered questions about it, and responded to numerous criticisms.

Just before the seminar began, the Dean released a statement about the context of the work that was sent out to news outlets and supporters. This memo, constructed with participation of some members of the leadership, was critical of inferences in the Donato et al. paper and neglected to

recognize the significant achievement of a graduate student publishing in *Science*. Some faculty, such as the Chair of this committee, did not fully recognize how that statement would be received within the College and university.

During this same period, the Dean wrote an e-mail to a member of the forest industry characterizing some environmental activists on the Biscuit fire controversy as acting like “goons.” This message was later publicized in an April issue of *Willamette Week*.

Approximately one week after the seminar, six senior scientists of the College (P. Adams, Forest Engineering; S. Fitzgerald, Forest Resources; M. Newton, Forest Science; R. Rose, Forest Science; J. Sessions, Forest Engineering; S. Tesch, Forest Engineering), along with three Forest Service scientists (T. Atzet, National Forest System; R. Powers, PSW Research Station; C. Skinner, PSW Research Station), sent a letter to *Science* asking that publication of the Donato et al. paper (in the print version of *Science*) be delayed until certain criticisms of the paper were addressed or that the criticisms be published alongside the Donato et al. paper. One member of the College leadership, Forest Engineering Department Head Steven Tesch, signed the letter. The Dean discussed the proposed letter with the letter writers and suggested that they keep their focus on the substance of the paper. Among other things, the letter claimed that *Science's* peer-review process had failed.

The letter was sent a few days before the issue of *Science* was to appear in print. The editor of *Science* responded that the letter appeared to be an attempt to censor the paper and that the letter writers should take the usual scientific approach of submitting a comment. The letter, combined with the *Science* editor's characterization of it and the Dean's statement on the Donato et al. paper, created another wave of press coverage, this time on a national and international scale.

Numerous daily newspapers published articles on the events. Topics in these articles included the “battle” within the College and whether the letter constituted an attempt at censorship. Other consistent themes were that the College got a portion of its funding from the industry, that its advisory board was dominated by industry, and that these relationships influenced, or appeared to influence, the attitude of the College and College leadership toward research results challenging industry's point of view.

January 21-30, 2006

A group of graduate students wrote directly to the Dean to express concerns raised by his initial statement, including its failure to congratulate the authors for having their paper published in *Science*, public perceptions of bias toward the timber industry and federal agencies, lack of support for graduate students conducting research on controversial or policy-relevant topics, abuse of power, and the politicization of science. In response, the Dean expressed regret for his actions to the students and began meeting regularly with them to work together to address these issues.

Soon thereafter, the Dean met with a broadened group of advisors and then issued another statement in which he congratulated Donato et al. for publishing in *Science* and apologized for the one-sidedness in his previous memo. This development also generated considerable press cover-

age. At about the same time, the Dean announced the formation of a committee on academic freedom and academic responsibility (discussed below).

A large group of faculty in the College of Forestry endorsed a statement of academic freedom that included the statement that “Academic freedom requires that we . . . reject censorship or actions that promote the appearance of censorship,” and the Provost and the Head of the Faculty Senate sent out a letter to the university community that stated (in part): “It is inappropriate that a request to delay publication of other scholars’ work was used as the vehicle to express these concerns. Differences of perspectives drive the scientific inquiry process. These should not only be encouraged, but fostered in our academic community.”

Individual faculty, such as John Hayes, who was a member of the College leadership, began meeting with graduate students to discuss the events and how to move forward.

Early February, 2006

With little advance warning, the Bureau of Land Management (the government overseer of the research grant that led to the Donato et al. article) announced that they were suspending the grant until they could satisfactorily resolve issues related to the use of federal funds to advocate positions on pending Congressional legislation and publication of results funded by the federal government without the expected consultation with the funder prior to publication. After a response from OSU, the grant was reinstated.

The publicity around the paper led to a Congressional hearing in Medford, which included sponsors of the salvage legislation, HR4200. Donato was called as a witness and was subjected to intense, sometimes hostile questioning about the *Science* article, the statistical analysis underlying the conclusions, and implications of the paper for pending legislation. Again, considerable press coverage followed the hearing.

Mid February-mid March, 2006

During February and early March, ferment about these events continued to roil the College. Graduate students met with a number of the senior scientists who wrote the letter to *Science* requesting delay of publication. Some of those who wrote the letter expressed that they had a professional responsibility to take such action; others were less certain whether they would take the same approach again. Copies of selected e-mails written to and from the Dean appeared in mailboxes of several College faculty members and students, prompting the Dean to share a set of copies of his e-mail with graduate students who had been meeting with him. Memos from people critical of the Donato et al. article, some quite personal in their attacks, were posted around the building. Actions of senior faculty were perceived as intimidating by a number of graduate students.

At the request of some members of this committee, the Dean held a meeting in March to explain his actions and e-mails and to express his regret. That meeting broadened into related issues, such as the treatment of Donato and the other authors of the *Science* paper and the fact that the authors no longer felt welcome in the College of Forestry because of the actions of some senior

faculty. That discussion triggered statements of support for students from the Dean and from this committee, along with a petition of support signed by 80 faculty and staff. Also, the actions that the students found intimidating generally decreased.

April 2006

Early in these events, a state senator had asked for the Dean's e-mail correspondence about publication of the Donato et al. paper and its aftermath. In early April, the State Senate Natural Resource Committee held a hearing in Salem to review College reactions to the Donato et al. paper. Many from the College testified, and the Dean's actions were a major focus of the hearing.

Weekly and monthly magazines such as the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *Willamette Week*, and *Eugene Weekly* published analyses of the events.

May 2006

All but two (B. Powers and C. Skinner) of the scientists who wrote the letter to *Science* asking for the delay in publishing the Donato et al. paper submitted a comment to *Science* that will be published soon, along with a rebuttal by Donato et al.

From late January onward, the Dean, realizing the magnitude of the problems created by his initial responses to the Donato et al. paper, worked with students, staff, faculty, and administrators to create a more collegial atmosphere in the College of Forestry. He made himself available to students, listened to their concerns, and showed receptivity to their ideas. As the weeks and months passed, the Dean publicly acknowledged his poor judgment in his initial response to the Donato et al. paper, and intensified his efforts to resolve the conflict within the College.

Appendix B. Statement of Academic Freedom and Faculty Responsibility from the Oregon State University Faculty Handbook

(www.oregonstate.edu/facultystaff/handbook/acafree/head.htm)

ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND FACULTY APPOINTMENTS

Academic freedom is the intellectual and creative foundation of the University. Academic freedom is protected by the Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR 580-22-005) and by Oregon State University.

In 1971, the Oregon State Board of Higher Education requested that each State Oregon University System college and university develop a specialized code of conduct, or statement of faculty responsibility. The OSU Faculty Senate adopted a **Statement of Faculty Responsibilities**, but emphasized that it should appear in the *Faculty Handbook* only in conjunction with its **Statement on Academic Freedom**.

Statement on Academic Freedom

The faculty and administration of Oregon State University jointly accept the responsibility for maintaining an atmosphere in which scholars may freely teach, conduct research, publish, and engage in other scholarly activities. This responsibility includes maintaining the freedom for the examination of controversial issues throughout the University, including classroom discussion when such issues are germane to the subject matter of the course.

The University does not attempt to control the personal opinion, nor the public expression of that opinion, of any member of the faculty or staff of the institution. Indeed, the faculty and administration of Oregon State University feel a responsibility to protect the right of each employee to express his or her personal opinion, but in doing so, employees have an obligation to avoid any action which purports to commit the institution to a position on any issue without appropriate approval.

Statement of Faculty Responsibilities

The faculty of Oregon State University recognizes and accepts the special responsibilities incumbent on each of its members.

As a scholar in an academic discipline, each faculty member is expected to:

- seek and state the truth as he or she sees it
- develop and improve his or her scholarly competence
- exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge to diverse audiences on-and off-campus
- contribute to the development of the discipline
- practice intellectual honesty.

As a teacher, each faculty member is expected to:

- encourage free pursuit of learning and free inquiry in students
- exemplify high scholarly standards
- improve his or her instructional methods while ensuring that the primacy of the instructional function of the academic area is upheld
- respect students as individuals while adhering to the proper role as intellectual guide
- foster honest academic conduct and fair evaluation of students
- protect the academic freedom of students and their rights of access to the University.

As a member of the University community, each faculty member is expected to:

- respect and defend the right of free inquiry of fellow faculty members
- show due respect for the rights of others to hold and express their opinions
- accept a share of the governance tasks of the University
- be objective in the judgment of the professional capabilities and performance of colleagues.

Appendix C. The Confidence/No Confidence Vote

Report of the Confidence/No Confidence Vote in the College of Forestry
Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility
6/12/06

Last week, the College of Forestry participated in a “confidence/no confidence” vote about Dean Salwasser’s ability to lead the College into the future. The vote was called by the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility. The Committee felt compelled to send a strong signal to College leadership, the College community, and colleagues around the world that this institution understands, cherishes, and defends the fundamental principles of academic freedom and responsibility.

The wording of the anonymous vote was (choose 1): 1) I have confidence in Dean Salwasser's ability to lead the College into the future 2) I do not have confidence in Dean Salwasser's ability to lead the College into the future and 3) Abstain.

The Committee, with the encouragement of the College, wanted to enable the widest possible participation of the College community. Therefore, five categories of voters were recognized: 1) Faculty (Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors with at least a half-time appointment) 2) All other employees of the college (Professional faculty, classified staff, Research Assistants, Research Associates) 3) Undergraduate students 4) Graduate students and 5) Emeritus faculty.

Results of the confidence/no confidence vote

- A high proportion of the College (excepting undergraduate students) participated in the vote: 330 members of the College community voted.
- Overall 66% of voters expressed confidence in the Dean’s ability to lead the College, while 24% voted “no confidence” and 10% abstained (Table 1).
- Many voters on either side of the “confidence/no confidence” question commented that their decision was difficult, reflecting the complexity of the issues involved. These comments (125 were received) provide a rich, nuanced view of the issues, and have been forwarded to the Dean for his consideration.

Table 1. Results of the confidence vote.

Category	% Eligible Voters	# of Voters	-----Percent of Votes-----		
			Confidence	No Confidence	Abstain
Faculty	82	61	70	16	13
All Other Employees	65	114	57	32	11
Undergraduate Students	14	63	78	13	10
Graduate Students	52	77	66	25	9
Emeritus Faculty	79	15	73	27	0
All Voters			66	24	10

Results of the vote on the Committee’s Report/Dean’s proposed action plan

At the request of the Dean, voters were also asked to indicate whether or not they support the Committee’s draft report and the Dean’s proposed action plan. The wording of the anonymous vote was (choose 1): 1) I support the committee's recommended changes and Dean Salwasser's proposed action plan 2) I do not support the committee's recommended changes and/or Dean Salwasser's proposed action plan 3) Abstain.

- Overall, 63% of voters expressed “support”, 17% expressed “no support,” and 20% abstained (Table 2).
- Many thoughtful comments and suggestions were offered on the Committee’s Report and the Dean’s proposed action plan. Results of the vote on the Committee’s report and the Dean’s proposed action plan are difficult to interpret. The vote did not provide an adequate mechanism to assess the individual merits of the report or the action plan. Several comments from the respondents indicated that parts of the report were acceptable, while other parts were not. The Committee will take into consideration all the comments provided with the vote, as well as previous comments, when the final report is prepared.

Table 2. Results of the vote on the Committee’s Recommendations and the Dean’s Proposed Action Plan

Category	% of Eligible Voters	# of Voters	-----Percent of Votes-----		
			Support	No Support	Abstain
Faculty	82	61	54	28	18
All Other Employees	65	113	68	11	21
Undergraduate Students	10	46	46	24	30
Graduate Students	52	76	74	11	16
Emeritus Faculty	74	14	57	36	7
All Voters			63	17	20

The high participation rate in these votes and the thoughtfulness of the comments provided, are evidence of how deeply the College community cares about this institution. It is the hope of the Academic Freedom and Responsibility Committee that this thoughtfulness and caring will provide a solid foundation upon which to build the College’s future. Our thanks to all who participated.

Appendix D. Administrative Memo #31

Admin Memo #31
August, 1993

I. Participation in Public Policy Development

A. General

Faculty in the College of Forestry have an obligation as both public servants and citizens to contribute their knowledge as part of the process of developing public policy about forests and related resources and forest products. The college encourages such participation. It is important that faculty participation be appropriately conducted, especially the acknowledgement of the role being played either as a representative of OSU or the College of Forestry, as an individual speaking personally, or as a member of a professional or scientific society.

The purpose of this administrative memo is to clearly identify policies and guidelines for faculty participation in the public policy development process. Following these policies and guidelines will help ensure legal protection for faculty members and the university and will help preserve and enhance the integrity of those involved.

B. University Policy

University policy on public participation is contained in the OSU Faculty Handbook in the sections on academic freedom and outside activities.

The university does not attempt to control the personal opinion, nor the public expression of that opinion, of any member of the faculty or staff of the institution. Indeed, the faculty and administration of Oregon State University feel a responsibility to protect the right of each employee to express his or her person opinion, but in doing so, employees have an obligation to avoid any action which purports to commit the institution to a position on any issue without appropriate approval. (The college interprets this last phrase as meaning faculty must actively avoid actions which might logically be construed as institutional representation or approval).

Further, in a statement of faculty responsibilities:

The faculty of Oregon State University recognizes and accepts the special responsibilities incumbent on each of its members.

As a scholar in an academic discipline, each faculty member is expected to:

- *Seek and state the truth as he or she sees it.*
- *Exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending and transmitting knowledge to diverse audiences on and off campus.*
- *Practice intellectual honesty.*

In some cases, participation by the faculty member may be at the request of another organization with financial remuneration. If so, the faculty member is required to:

- Use the Request for Approval of Outside Employment form, obtaining all required signatures and filing with the Office of Academic Affairs before the activity begins.
- Make it clear to the outside employer and others that he or she is acting in an individual capacity and does not speak, write or act in the name of the university or directly represent it.
- Not list his or her university telephone number or address in commercial listings or other public documents, the purpose of which is to draw attention to the individual's availability for compensatory service.
- Not use the university name, logo, stationary, or facilities.

College Policy and Guidelines

In addition to the university policies stated above, the College of Forestry policies include the following:

- Faculty will keep their department head or comparable supervisor informed about their participation in policy-related activities including statements to, and work with, legislative bodies, boards, agencies, and statements in the public media. Our purpose here is not to restrict participation, but rather to help us all do our jobs more effectively by keeping everyone informed.
- Faculty will, when speaking, testifying or writing as a member of the university faculty, specifically note for the record that Oregon State University and the College of Forestry or Forest Research Laboratory do not take positions in public policy matters.

Some useful guidelines to keep in mind when participating in public policy activities include the following:

- Help your audience understand your role by stating it clearly. Are you providing scientific information as a representative of the college or FRL responding to an official request by a policy-maker or government body or

are you participating as an individual expressing your personal or professional views and values?

- If you are expressing personal views and values or are appearing in a consultative capacity as a professional, either as an individual or part of a group, make sure you do not give the impression of representing the university by using OSU stationary or business cards. If you use your academic title and rank, make sure your audience that it is for identification purposes only, not as a representative of the college/FRL.
- If you are serving first as a representative of the college/FRL and wish to change roles and provide personal/professional opinion or views, preface your remarks with a statement that clearly indicates such a shift in role.
- When providing information to policy-makers, clearly identify what is known, what is unknown and what is contentious or uncertain. When synthesizing information or providing personal/professional judgment or opinion, let audiences know that you are doing so. Our purpose is to avoid misleading.
- Confine your scientific and professional participation to areas where you have qualifications and expertise.