

Visiting Committee Meeting

January 9, 2003

Present: Board members Brian Boyle, Bob Alverts, Dale Cole, Roger Hoesterey, Dana Rasmussen, Curt Smitch, R. McLachlan, and Phil Woolwine. College faculty Dean Bruce Bare, Don Hanley, Linda Brubaker, Rick Gustafson. College Director of Development Tom Mentele

Welcome and Introductions

Don Hanley, WSU Extension Forester gave a briefing on the Private Forest Forum to be held in May 2003. Invited committee to comment on the agenda.

Tom Hinckley gave a briefing on the Merrill Hall reconstruction and the Center for Urban Horticulture.

Alverts: I'm impressed with your list of supporters

Woolwine: Asked if the Environmental Forum will be included at the site.

Hinckley responded: It wasn't included in the plans, but the Environmental Forum is included in the Campus Master Plan, and its inclusion is intended.

Cole asked: Is CUH closely connected to CFR, or is there still tension between CUH and CFR?

Hinckley responded: There is still some tension, but he has told faculty he will not support such divisions. The weakness at CFR must be overcome by improving all the metrics, including CUH.

Bare: The sustainability focus of CFR is shown in a variety of areas, and CUH has a critical role in the intertwined urban spectrum. The CUH/WPA director position is being advertised and is for a tenure-track faculty. However, it is to have mainly management and research responsibilities.

Smitch: The urban components are captured in CUH and it's possible that success at urban forestry exacerbates the need for CFR to deal with rural issues.

Hoesterey: Urban issues are critical for CFR, and many jobs emerge from urban/suburban forest.

Brubaker: Students are challenged by the urban/rural/wildlands issues. They need to be educated to not be polarized.

Alverts: The triple-bottom line emphasis of CFR will help gain what Brubaker observes.

Smitch had an anecdote: My next door neighbor is a retired forester – he thinks CFR should be in Forks, but I tell him CFR needs to be here, as this is where the political power exists.

Professor Rick Gustafson – Advanced Technology Initiative

Gustafson: Discussed draft of Precision Forestry/ATI proposal and the need to search for a permanent director.

Precision Forestry could be very important to the college, applied to timber harvest, ecosystem health, and urban/wild interface. Craig Hogan, Vice Provost of Research, needs to be convinced to approve new hire.

Bare gave the history of the October meeting with the Provost. It didn't go favorably. His request for new ATI director hire was denied. Rick's draft is a response to the denial. It is unfair for upper campus to think we haven't done enough when our hands are tied with respect to hiring. Some possibilities:

1) Two USGS scientist were once housed in the college. In FY03, USGS wants to fill one of those positions --a geospatial technology specialist is one possibility. A collaborative effort is also happening with Battelle in regard to a NW Geospatial Collaborative.

2) Technological component is there and we can capitalize on this. We should increase collaboration with other partners, Ex. RTI's GIS program. We must get a buy-in from upper campus to get the support to hire the director for ATI. The money is there.

Woolwine: What can we do? Do we stand to lose the money for ATI?

Bare: It is possible, but not likely that ATI will be placed with another unit on campus. The money allocated in the state budget for ATI has not been subject to cuts in the past and will likely not occur this time.

Woolwine: Where is CFR going? Need to develop how it will grow before a commitment can be expected.

Boyle: The university perceives that CFR's vision is unclear about ATI. We may have done the work, but not made it clear.

Bare: ATI could play a role in regional NASA-funded program. (wood utilization, environmental issues, watershed management) Some of these issues were at odds with the internal vision/purpose of ATI. Propose that the Advisory Board push for support for ATI.

Hinckley: The urban to wildlife theme has much support. It seems ATI should reflect that theme. Examples of research: Woody debris, counting trees for carbon sequestering.

Brubaker observed that she sees lots of educational value coming from ATI.

Mentele: Earth and Space Department has an excellent remote sensing lab that is well-funded and is developing applications for Defense Dept. We should try to collaborate with them and bring our own money to the table.

Boyle: UW wants transformational work; it needs to see that CFR is doing just that.

Alverts: CFR should come to the table as a partner and not so much as "the" place to go for research. We need to be collaborative.

Woolwine: What are we doing to get real pay-offs that benefits flow from this. We need a compelling case.

Alverts: Yes, for example, we can provide Metro/King County with technical assistance and information with lots of natural resource issues, like wildlife, watershed, drainage, etc.

Smitch: (Referring to page 3 in the ATI draft document)

We have the technology to monitor on a landscape level. How do we manage forests in real-time? Will the technology allow this? The old technology won't. Our ability to monitor landscapes at the forest level could drive policy.

Smitch questioned: From a forest management perspective, we have to go in the direction of monitoring on a landscape level. The technology exists and is needed if we're monitoring that precisely. The new buffer screens can be more finely-tuned and keep more forest in production.

Boyle: We need to be interpreting and presenting technology such that it can take in all perspectives. He asked Bare – How do you pick a direction for ATI that can encompass all those interest and issues?

Smitch: Need to say to the legislature that a \$1 million investment represents \$10 million in resources.

Brubaker cautioned about research that becomes tool-focused and results in little or no real value. CFR should continue to have collaborations with those who can gain real-world applications. A grant should start with what the problems are and how you can solve them.

Hinckley: ATI draft doesn't emphasize how ATI can bring solutions to the table. It needs to emphasize solutions and not address why things haven't worked.

Alverts: Identify issues and needs where CFR can serve in a collaborative role. ATI is a good start, but we need to have talked with other campus units before going to Vice Provost.

Hoesterey: What can this Advisory Board do?

Boyle: Help CFR get its ducks in a row, and connect with other technology players and win approval of ATI.

Smitch: See 2nd to last page of ATI draft. Be sure to explain benefits of ATI before asking for money or the hire. Then ask the Board to sell the plan.

Bare: We need to revisit and revise the draft.

Boyle: We need to show other campus units that they will benefit from collaborating with CFR.

Gustafson: I'll get back to work on the draft with all the feedback in mind. I want to tailor the ATI proposal to suit the vice-provost of research.

Smitch: We have the money but the university doesn't think CFR would do much good with it and we need to convince them we can do it and let us hire a director.

Professor Linda Brubaker - Presentation Of Curriculum Change

Undergraduate curriculum changes

- 1) CFR niche is the broad study of functionality of biotic and human systems focused on the PNW.
- 2) Interdisciplinary approach and very hands on. There are connections to the field and a requirement to make knowledge tangible. This requires a high number of teaching hours. This is good, but problematic

Number of graduates per major at CFR is currently 15. We are well below the average, especially with respect to the natural sciences. Geology and botany, for example, both have low graduates numbers and have been collapsed into other units on campus.

Compared to smaller colleges, we have too few graduates with lots of majors. This indicates too much specialization and has led to polarization of students. This is the view the administration has of CFR. They don't see our collective value. The solution to collapse seven majors to only two majors makes CFR resemble other small colleges on campus.

Rasmussen: How do we compare to other colleges?

Brubaker: No real data, but enrollments have declined in other schools.

Bare: Comparison to peer institutions is difficult as other schools have changed/morphed. Forest Management has clearly been on the decline, while some other majors have increased, such as recreation and natural resource management.

Brubaker: Predicts increased job opportunities for graduates in the future as many organizations will have much turnover in the next 10 years.

Smitch: Want a sense of management philosophy of large land managers. Will they hire new forest managers or will they just promote biologists, etc. they already have in place?

Brubaker: Faculty wants to move from multi-disciplinary to interdisciplinary. This is essential but challenging. We need to formulate processes that cross-cut natural resources problems. The curriculum needs to stress fundamental issues that are common across disciplines. Professional specializations are shifting to graduate level work.

Changes:

2 curricula (Paper Science and Engineering and a yet-to-be-named curriculum)

The unnamed curriculum would be broadly structured and core coursework would be interdisciplinary.

Rationale: resource issues are interdisciplinary by nature.

We need to switch from getting students wedded to a major and get them a broad-based education to prevent polarization and increase awareness that all majors are part of an interdisciplinary discipline.

Undergraduate curriculum core:

A case study approach. Example: Union Bay Natural Area; history, function, community interaction. Class would present a problem and use it as a vehicle on nutrient cycling, community impact, measurements, etc. It is a challenge to teach this way, but it uses real-world problems. At the senior level, there would be specialization in hydrology, wildlife, etc.

There is an urgency: The USDA Higher Education Challenge Grant for the improvement of curriculum is a timely and great opportunity and we need to apply for it. We need to make the curriculum reflect practical knowl-

edge students can readily apply. There is a great potential to train students and this is very exciting to faculty.

Boyle: Is faculty able to get behind this? There needs to be institutional support and positive reinforcement to get faculty to buy in to the changes.

Brubaker: We have the knowledge and ability. We need the buy-in and the enthusiasm of the faculty. We need positive enforcement, not just negative. Incidentally, she mentioned, for the grant, we need letters of support and will be asking for those soon.

Hinckley: We need to get the external community to show support.

Brubaker: There is no name for the new curriculum and that is up for debate.

Cole: There seems to be a lack of balance of economic/social parts of curriculum. What do we do?

Brubaker: There was a faculty motion suggesting four core courses, which was amended to have all those major areas handled in a single course. Although not represented well here, those economic/social issues are considered important and are part of the new curriculum. We do not want a "mile wide and inch deep" form of interdisciplinary teaching. The challenge is how to keep from falling back into specialties. Traditionally, there has been a bottom-up education system, but case studies teach holistically and then address the details.

Bare: What happens to in-depth professional education we currently offer? This will be addressed at the Master's level. We don't want these programs to be separate from our undergraduate curriculum, so students can switch into masters in year three and can finish in 5 years with two degrees, rather than just one.

Boyle: What of the issue of community college (transfer) students?

Brubaker: We have taken that into consideration, which is why the core curriculum starts at the junior or 300 level.

Brubaker: The middle tier faculty (those under 55) think curricula are heading in the right direction and are most on board.

Woolwine: How many were on the committee?

Brubaker: 8 – 9 representing 7 curricula. It was heavy on senior faculty, but 2 are assistant professors.

Brubaker: There are two committees: One for graduate level and one for undergrad. There is overlap, but they are different groups of people.

Bare: The Provost has set a spring deadline for our proposal, so graduate curricula will not be done yet. But consolidation is coming and will be included in the report to the provost.

Alverts: I do not see anything in the curriculum changes as abandoning the rich history of the college. It's a credit to Bruce in moving from where CFR was. I am very supportive. I feel very strongly about the success of the college. Who do you share this draft with? We need to secure constituent and political support, not just faculty support.

Bare: We need to know if the direction given by board last August is still effective? How do we report that to the university and state that this curriculum change is consistent with your previous direction? And what if

they say it is not enough?

Brubaker: The University wants degrees that students like and are important. Professional support isn't enough if the majors we offer are unpopular. Majors are to be consolidated but revitalization is the key. We still need to artfully integrate a hands-on approach, but with larger classes.

Woolwine: I really like the balance you show in the curriculum.

Bare: There is a problem now that state funding is down and enrollment is up at UW. Re-allocation of resources will occur. The solution is to show our importance to UW and our contribution, e.g. service-teaching. We also need to increase faculty research.

Alverts: Sustainability is a good philosophy and although hard at first, it is a good position to move into.

Cole: The metric UW uses for success changes. Don't just focus on the curriculum.

Boyle: Communication with students is important. He said that the Advisory Board, while not involved in curriculum changes, should show support for those efforts and buy into those changes.

Rasmussen: Students have an interest in natural resources and environmental work. CFR must figure out a way to capitalize on that interest.

Brubaker: It is good to know the support is there for the efforts the faculty is making.

Environmental Forum

Boyle: Discussed a Saturday seminar Craig Hogan (vice-provost of research) held on research at UW that focused on climate change, wildlife impacts, urban ecological change and other issues, which were never really connected at the seminar. Boyle conducted a later seminar on the Forum which Hogan attended. Bare and Boyle later met with Hogan, who stated he was impressed by the idea of an Environmental Forum and gave good feedback. It ties into how CFR can present itself as core of expertise that connects to other critical research centers of UW.

Bare: Initially Boyle's job was to get support for a new facility. Now most of his work and success is on the program side of the forum concept. Everything changed when McCormick left. The Provost hasn't said yes or no to our request for support for the Forum and there is much talk of collaborating with other units.

Woolwine: Any reason why we can't start rolling without the facility?

Bare: It shouldn't be a problem.

Alverts: We should get with industry/retail businesses and educate them on the impact forestry has on their bottom line/interest. He stated he would like to see CFR work with OSU on this.

Boyle: Would the high-tech industry attend a meeting like this?

Alverts: Many businesses have donated to causes and we need to show how extremists have affected their bottom line.

Bare: Another example is that the Forum could help CMER navigate their research needs and resulting policy changes.

Mentele: Growth of Washington is high. Urbanization issues will only increase. There is great potential for the Forum to help bring solutions to these issues.

Tom Mentele - DEVELOPMENT CAMPAIGN

[handed out a packet of information on development campaign]

Mentele: We have much support and the design phase is on for campaign. There is a broad base of alumni support. Development doesn't ask for money, but helps donors realize their goals. If you just ask for money you won't be successful. It is development's job to help a donor give according to his or her wishes.

Cole: Historically, contacts to alumni have had negative results and we need a more positive way of contacting for donations. As example, phone solicitations at dinner time are bad. Alumni of CFR are much more excited giving directly through the college and little or no enthusiasm for giving through the central alumni association.

General discussion of campaign for CFR ensued.

Meeting adjourned at 2:05pm