

Visiting Committee Meeting

Meeting of 15 October 2004

Anderson Hall, University of Washington

Welcome

The meeting convened at 1:30 pm by introducing the new Visiting Committee members, Janet Wainwright, Cassie Phillips, and James Dooley, and having each of the existing members introduce themselves. Members present were: Chair Brian Boyle, Dale Cole, Duane Kelley, Maureen Frisch, Phil Woolwine, Bob Alverts, Tom Quigley, Jim Anderson, Dana Rasmussen, Dean Bruce Bare, staff members Tom Mentele and Sarah Westbrook, and Professor Ivan Eastin.

Research Agenda

Dean Bruce Bare then began the official discussion by speaking about the College's research agenda. There was a focus on the current state of the College, and a need to collectively identify the research agenda. In the past couple of months there have been two important items; a faculty report, and a faculty retreat. Both of these concluded there is a need to go outside of the College to meet with different groups, individuals, and departments to get a further insight on where the College should be going and what the research agenda shall be.

There are some issues involved with this. For example, who are these groups and individuals? Also, the faculty is not always interested in following a collective research agenda. Further, the direction in which the research agenda goes is largely determined by funding. Bruce then pointed out that the current intents of the College research agenda emphasize:

- 1) coupling human and bio-physical systems
- 2) support for the development of the science of sustainability to integrate ecological and economic approaches in a socially acceptable manner
- 3) development of technology, discovery of new scientific knowledge and transfers of knowledge to user communities.

He then further emphasized that we need to integrate across the sciences and recognize that we are an interdisciplinary college. This was further illustrated in reference to slide number 11 on page 3 of the handout (attached), which emphasizes assumptions relevant to the research mission. These are:

- 1) build strong partnerships with external collaborators
- 2) align the research agenda with priorities and expectations of both society and government funders
- 3) proactively seek research funds to support the agenda

The Dean then transitioned into suggested broad research themes which can be found on slides 18, 19 and 20 on page 5. These themes could be summed up as: Ecosystem Structure and Function, Social and Human Systems and Technology. In reference to this Jim Dooley then suggested a theme around the idea of integration and concepts of community, and the question of rather there should perhaps be a fourth research theme, or rather different themes all together.

This was a highly crucial aspect of the discussion because not only will the research themes represent the research agenda, but they will also determine what kind of faculty to hire in the future. The Dean then touched on this and acknowledged the path of least resistance, that is, if a scientist of one area retires, to rehire another scientist of the same area. However, he stated that in order to implement the new research agenda he wanted to steer slightly away from this method. Two positions he now suggested are an Environmental Econo-

mist and a Landscape Analyst. In response to this Dale Cole asked if the theme of Reuse and Recycling would continue to play a role in the College in the future. The Dean then noted that he didn't remember anyone talking about recycling, and Tom Mentele further clarified by saying that in the retreat, the faculty had discussed a Life Cycle Analyst, but nothing directly related to recycling.

The discussion then was picked up by Phil Woolwine who complemented Bruce on the amount of progress he has made thus far, and suggested using a matrix to find intersections and then draw the focus areas from there. Phil stated that he would consider attempting to apply such a matrix himself.

New Faculty (discussion continued by Maureen Frisch, Tom Quigley, Janet Wainwright, Brian Boyle, Bob Alverts and Jim Anderson)

Continuing the train of thought from research themes to new faculty Maureen Frisch posed a question to Bruce Bare, asking him "...with such a potential for change in faculty, where does he think he will find them...?" In response Bruce stated that there is not a lot of hope within the campus as far as interdisciplinary professors, and then Janet Wainwright suggested that he is going to have to look out in the broader community.

Maureen Frisch then posed another question to Bruce about the fact that the forest industry is facing the issue of an aging workforce, and therefore we will all be competing for the same talent at the same time. Tom Quigley then spoke to this issue in reference to the Forest Service and the PNW Station, and the potential for a lot of turnover, and said that he has an ongoing process of looking to the future. He further deliberated that there are two ways of approaching the research agenda and new faculty; either you could approach from an all-embracing way where everyone has a home, or target going after focused and specialized areas. The issue of tenure was then brought up by Bruce Bare, who said that there is a risk of alienating tenured staff if their research doesn't fall under any proposed umbrella. The discussion then continued around the idea of turnover and research and budget shifts.

Center for International Trade in Forest Products -- CINTRAFOR

Professor Ivan Eastin, interim director of CINTRAFOR, discussed that CINTRAFOR is a 20 year old Center of Excellence, but that the University has never really funded it. In addition CINTRAFOR is now developing a strategic plan and needs to grow the funding base by about 40 percent by developing new programs and collaborative projects with impact. He further emphasized that CINTRAFOR needs to go back to the legislature for more funding, get more aggressive with grants and contracts, and get new postdoctoral candidates to do research and write grants for such research.

Phil Woolwine then asked Ivan in what form and how much industry support CINTRAFOR has. Ivan responded that they have contributed about seven percent, but that they are trying to get consortium project funding. Cassie Phillips then suggested that they try to be specific when asking for support, because from a company standpoint general support doesn't always make sense, whereas project support does. Bruce Bare then concluded the discussion on CINTRAFOR by observing that the UW sees Centers as magnets for money to come into the University.

Center for Sustainable Forestry at Pack Forest

This was briefly touched on, as an update of the discussion in the last meeting, which was at Pack Forest. Bruce Bare updated that we are almost done with certification of Pack Forest, and that he wants to look at both standards of certification. Architects are now in beginning phases of design for a lodge at Pack Forest, which would cost roughly \$3.5 million to build. The Lodge would update Pack's facilities and be attractive to a wider public, and would contain about 20 rooms, with a central meeting hall. The financing is being evaluated now.

Center for Water and Watershed Studies

New faculty member Anne Steinemann was introduced and she described the Center, which is not part of the College but has many interactions. Anne is a joint appointment of the College of Engineering and the School of Public Affairs and she was welcomed and questioned by the Committee.

Working Forest Forum

Brian Boyle then presented an update about the Working Forest Forum, to be held at Alderbrook Resort November 22-23. A small working committee has been planning the event, and the agenda and background materials are available on the College web site (see <http://www.nwenvironmentalforum.org/index.htm>). He then addressed Phil Woolwine who asked if the forum was an annual event by saying that had not been determined. However, a College faculty group has suggested that the Alder Forum planned for March 2005 be conducted with similar dialogue objectives as the Forest Forum. The meeting concluded at 3:30 pm and Phil Woolwine thanked the dean and fellow members for all of their great work.