

**Visiting Committee Meeting
Forest Club Room, Anderson Hall
October 10, 2007**

Attendees:

Committee Members: Brian Boyle, Tom Wolford, Bov Eav, Janet Wainwright, Phil Woolwine, Doug Sutherland, Roger Hoesterey, Neal Lessenger, Bob Dick, Maureen Frisch
Faculty: Steve West, Dean Bruce Bare, Gordon Bradley
Staff: Tom Mentele, Ramona Hickey

Chairman Boyle opened the meeting with introduction of new member Tom Wolford, and introductions of all present.

Dean Bruce Bare thanked members, commenting that his goal is to make the visiting committee representative of the College's programs. Tom Wolford is new, representing the Washington Pulp and Paper Association. We can't have every agency or company or NGO, but we try to be as inclusive as we can. Brian invited members to suggest people who could be useful and active members of the committee.

Dean's Report

Enrollment

Bruce Bare reported that this autumn, the undergraduate programs increased by 19% as measured from autumn 2006 – up thirty percent in the ESRM curriculum and up 5% in the PSE curriculum. There are 216 undergraduates, 149 in ESRM, 59 in PSE, with the remainder scattered in programs being phased out. Graduate enrollment in the College is 146, about the same as last year.

Steve West: Our classes are full of students, and we've moved to larger venues in some classes, so our courses have been "found" by people in other majors. Across the board, classes have expanded.

Research

Our research productivity is measured in many ways - number of grants submitted, number of grants funded, and the expenditure of funds on grants. This year, with our faculty retirements and new hires, we dropped 30% in research expenditures from last year. Over the past two years we have experienced a faculty turnover of about 30%. We expect this to be a temporary drop as the new faculty gain success in grant funding.

Development

The capital campaign will end June 30, 2008. The University reached its \$2 billion goal earlier and raised it to \$2.5 billion. The College goal of \$17.7 million is achieved as we have raised just under \$18 million with about 8.5 months remaining in the Campaign.

Roger Hoesterey: What about planned giving programs?

Tom: Planned giving is a huge part. Our constituents are very open to planned giving, big gifts over long periods of time. We've had some outstanding gifts.

Bob Dick: Please note that the Development staff has done an incredible job.

Bruce Bare: Tomorrow we are going to celebrate an important milestone with a celebration of the completion of Phase I of the Pacific Connections Garden in the Washington Park Arboretum. This is the first privately funded plant collection renovation project from the Arboretum Master Plan approved in 2001.

Asked about the proposed highway 520 bridge impact, Neal Lessenger reported that the UW, City of Seattle, and Arboretum Botanical Garden Committee have taken the lead to make the Arboretum's case regarding the new 520 bridge. The major concern is the Pacific interchange and the interchange at the north end of the Arboretum.

Washington Forest Futures studies, Legislative funding, and the NW Environmental Forum

Bruce Bare: The College submitted The Future of Washington's Forests report this summer. We recently testified to the State Senate Committee on Natural Resources, Forests and Recreation where we summarized our research findings. The 2007 Legislature provided \$500,000 to continue work on bio-fuels and a forest land retention model to keep working forests. CINTRAFOR funding was restored at \$100,000/year for the next biennium. In addition, we received \$200,000 from CTED to work on identifying barriers to bio-energy use, \$150,000 to study log truck safety, and \$50,000 for ONRC to study marine issues.

Brian Boyle: In September, the NW Environmental Forum met again to continue discussions related to ways to retain working forests. Eighty-eight people attended the Forum. Forum participants assessed information on land use in Washington and looked at strategies and incentives, especially for small land owners -- the people most likely to be in the path of development. The Forum report is at: www.nwenvironmentalforum.org

Roger Hoesterey: There was some consensus among Forum participants, or at least an acknowledgement, that on federal lands, there is little forest management going on, and that has resulted in fire and insect problems. The UW is one of the few institutions that's seen as neutral and can have faculty and students do research and show the issues.

Doug Sutherland: Several in the Legislature want to do something now; and are growing impatient. We have \$70 million to buy forests at risk of conversion. I have to be in a position to justify every acquisition to the Legislature. What do we do with small diameter wood? What are we really going to do in terms of forest health? We need new ways to bring processing into the forest. How are we going to work the federal land issue with forest health and stewardship? That's where I think we should be talking to the Legislature in 2008 so we can move forward in 2009.

Maureen Frisch: The regulatory burdens add a lot of costs, not a significant benefit to keep the lands in forestry. There are some nice messages that have come out of this, such as forest health on federal lands, but there is not much that the legislature can do other than urge the feds to act. We can build on that, to challenge those that are really going to make a difference. This is important.

New Faculty

Bruce Bare: We have brought 11 new faculty members into the College since the autumn of 2006. Our faculty really had to work hard on the searches and we've hired some great people as a result. Three are non-tenure track and the other eight are state-funded. They replace those who retired -- we have not received any new funds from the University. The three most recent hires are Josh Lawler, Sandor Toth, and en route, Sergei Rabotyagov. This year five faculty will retire and we need to initiate another round of faculty hiring soon. Bruce introduced Joshua Lawler and Sandor Toth.

Joshua Lawler: See <http://www.cfr.washington.edu/People/faculty.asp?ID=598> is Assistant Professor of Landscape Ecology and Conservation Biology. He reported his work with conservation planning tools to minimize threats to conservation, on climate changes affecting South America, and on cumulative effects of military activities on endangered species. He has two postdocs and two graduate students working, teaches a seminar on ecological effects of climate change and introduction to GIS for natural resource and forestry students.

Sandor Toth: See <http://www.cfr.washington.edu/People/faculty.asp?ID=618> is Assistant Professor of Natural Resources Informatics and has worked for five years in private and public sectors in Europe, Japan and the U.S. His work on mathematical models can quantify and visualize the resource trade-offs and production possibilities between conflicting management objectives. His current research is also focusing on an auctioning platform to see if better resources decisions will ensue in the market.

Roger Hoesterey: It's a math problem - what is the value of the forest, what's the market, what's the value of the finished product. We can point to the values. I need to translate your model to reality. What's it mean to me today?

Sandor: We try to translate what you want, what stakeholders want, what are their management goals, then try to quantify what's quantifiable and build these mathematical models together.

College of the Environment:

Bruce Bare: The Provost held a charette in June. I attended, along with faculty Clare Ryan and Rick Gustafson and five other deans and faculty from other colleges. Outside attendees included Sally Jewel, Bill Ruckelshaus, Miles Drake and Denis Hayes. There was no consensus about the college, but the Provost wanted to do something "big."

In July, the Provost announced that she would like to consider forming a new College of the Environment and began meeting with small groups of faculty and administrators.

On Sept 5, she convened a work planning meeting with some of the same folks, trying to move it along a little further. She reaffirmed why she thought this was the proper time to take this action. On September 27, the Provost met with a group of CFR faculty and administrators who had attended one of the above-referenced meetings to further discuss this topic.

Dean Bare stated that the College wished to proactively pursue this issue to better inform the discussion and to influence the outcome to the benefit of the College. When the Provost visited, we explained that we sought a win-win situation. Our goals are to: 1) retain the momentum of the past six years in transforming our College's educational programs so that they emphasize the sustainability of natural resources and environmental services, 2) maintain the organizational integrity of the College; 3) build on the professional orientation of the College so we can continue to engage a broad constituency base, and 4) promote our science-based academic programs in environmental and natural resource sciences including our new ESRM and PSE undergraduate curricula. The four strategic themes espoused by the Provost are climate, energy and water; urbanization and conservation; global ecosystems and environmental health; and human dimensions of the environment. These correlate closely with the themes of our College. The Provost said she developed her themes by looking at those of our College.

Roger Hoesterey: what is she really trying to accomplish here?

Bruce Bare: It's hard to connect lines between the dots. She wants to go to the regents in November; probably to see if this idea is worth pursuing.

Janet Wainwright: There's a lot of money in this area that will go to this.

Roger Hoesterey: This wasn't part of the capital campaign. It was never a role of existing fundraising. If there is going to be a bigger college, it should be around us and around environmental and earth science. How do you define a structure or work plan without knowing?

Members of the Visiting Committee observed that much remains to be defined. Before they could endorse such a new college they need to see a strategic vision statement and plan, a financing plan, an academic program definition, a facilities plan, and a needs assessment for the State of Washington. The point was made, we're not supporting or fighting the college, but we need to know more. Now could we identify some strengths and weaknesses to this college?

Brian Boyle: The visiting committee previously was very heavily involved with the President's office on articulating standards for the college and for President McCormick's charting directions committee. Do we want to weigh in as a visiting committee and if so, what are the important things to communicate? If we're going to have an opinion amongst ourselves, do we want to let others know? What do the faculty, particularly the new faculty think about this?

Bov Eav: Nothing concrete is yet on paper, but intellectually it makes some sense.

Phil Woolwine: What's missing is a core concept to crystallize this discussion. Then we can explore the idea more fully. It's a creative process so don't take positions too early. It takes someone who can march forward with a collaborative sense of what steps need to be taken. We need to have these conversations, loose in the beginning but collaborative, and then something will start to gel; we all have to cook on these kinds of things.

Doug Sutherland: Every once in a while, you have an opportunity to redefine yourself. See if there isn't some kind of strategy we can form here, not just within your faculty but within this group as well. If they're really serious about doing this, see if you can take the leadership on what the shape of this is going to be -- so it's in your best interest. Don't wait if it's serious. You can take a leadership role.

Bruce Bare: One marker may be the president's annual address to the campus that takes place next week. (Later note: President Emmert in his address did discuss the issue, although did not say "College of the Environment" and stated that other universities have tried and failed and UW needs to "get it right.")

Janet Wainwright: Think in terms of the whole university. This College should definitely be in a leadership role. Has there been any outreach by you with other affected colleges?

Bruce Bare: The Provost has discussed this topic with the Board of Deans and Council of Environmental Deans. The discussion has been at the 35,000 foot level so far. Details have not been developed.

Maureen Frisch: What everyone is saying is that we want you to be apart of the game. If there's a communication that would come from this group we should do it. But there's a big missing link. This is going to cost a fortune, and if financial resources – private or public – are not already identified this effort will likely fail.

Bruce Bare: This is viewed as a three-campus program, not just in Seattle. We do have environmental programs at Bothell and Tacoma.

Bob Dick: I speak on behalf of other alumni, but I do think there needs to be a perspective that needs to be brought into play. My association begins in 1939 when my dad graduated. I graduated from here in 1974,

which is other than just interesting history. This was a school on how to cut down big trees and cut them into boards. In 1974, DDT was still used, so we've watched the college change over the years. I don't see this college being static. I hark back to a few years ago, and the college was broken in a lot of ways and it was being considered for the chopping block. Disruptions occurred in faculty, students, and I think we've worked and changed with the times. Though it's politically correct to talk about the environment, but looking at the demands on our forests from amenities to forest products, that is a very important part of this state. I'll argue that this college deserves to be here as a College of Forest Resources. There's no reason why we cannot be in charge. This college needs to survive as a college. When I think of what we've gone through, our college deserves to be here. I will argue equally as strenuously that we need to collaborate with other natural resource schools.

Brian Boyle: Do you believe it is best to oppose the College of the Environment?

Bob Dick: I don't think we know enough about it. I think we should be very wary about anything as nebulous as what's being put forth. We've worked very hard to raise \$18 million, and private support will be severely impacted with the demise of this college.

Tom Mentele: Most of our funding has come from our traditional sources. We were told not to go to environmental donors because UW Earth Initiative was focused on that donor base.

Brian Boyle: I attended meetings regarding the UWEI. We talked about the UWEI for one day at the HUB, and that's the last we heard of it, except for a web site.

Roger Hoesterey: I would be absolutely shocked if Ocean and Fish were not having the same conversation. I assume that the goal they want is for the University of Washington to be a leader.

Bruce Bare: We already are, but we aren't recognized.

Roger Hoesterey: I would love to see the UW be a leader, but it's not just with an environmental science curriculum. Maybe we can help the Provost figure this out. Environmental leadership, environmental sustainability of this University, where's our green initiative? There are lots of other ways that we can make a difference without starting a new college.

Brian Boyle: I don't think it's anyone's perception that we fight this, but that we be constructive. Given that there are a variety of viewpoints, it may be best that we write individual letters according to our inclination.

Bruce Bare: Provost Wise asked if we wanted her to attend the Visiting Committee meeting.

Brian Boyle: Maybe the Visiting Committee should meet with her. Former President McCormick asked me once why is it necessary for the University of Washington to have a program on forestry, and I was just dumbfounded. Why would the UW not want to teach about forests, since 50% of the state's surface is covered with forests? It made me think he had a skewed concept of how forests contribute to the quality of life in Washington. I think meeting with her would be worthwhile.

Phil Woolwine: We met several times with President McCormick in the past and were confronted with the same questions and we were just dumbfounded by this. We would answer the same questions over and over.

Tom Mentele: I feel like the UW has been influenced by voices from the new, wealthy generation who want to do something about the environment, but they don't know what it is. It may be that we can help

develop some alternative ways depending on what turns out.

Gordon Bradley: This idea could emerge out of this committee. The question came up as to why we need a new college; what are we trying to create, what isn't happening in this university today, with all the centers, the interdisciplinary efforts. What was it about our current functioning, what wasn't being accomplished by this organization that could be accomplished by a reorganization? Maybe a change is quite appropriate, if you look at what it is, and you look at the process by which things develop. You don't currently have any detailed image of this new college. People want, and need, to know how they will be impacted. When you come up with a concept of the environment, people want to know, am I in, am I out, how am I going to be impacted. Without a clear transparent process it fails. When we were putting together our new curricula, we had structure and function advisory committees. These are not independent activities, not mutually exclusive, and together they produce an image of what we've done and also where we're going.

Roger Hoesterey: In terms of finding another solution, that's great.

Steve West: Right now, there are consolidated colleges and then there's a virtual college where we figure out some collaborative method where you can respond in a very flexible way, with joint appointments or shared FTE's. Right now, the faculty is excited about the virtual college, but there's a huge leap from that to this concept.

Maureen Frisch: You'll have some legislative interest in this.

Bov Eav: We need some options for us to look at the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 pm.