

NAUFRP Executive Committee
November 1, 2016
Madison, WI

NAUFRP Executive Committee: Jim Allen, President (Northern Arizona University); Keith Belli, President-Elect (University of Tennessee); David Newman, Secretary-Treasurer, (SUNY-ESF); Phil Tappe, Southern Regional Chair (University of Arkansas); Alton Thompson, 1890s Representative (1890 Research Directors-Land Grant Universities); John Hayes, International Chair (Colorado State University); Mike Messina, Northeast Regional Chair (Pennsylvania State University); Janaki Alavalapati, Policy Chair (Auburn University); Terry Sharik, Education Chair (Michigan Tech University); Red Baker, Research Chair (University of Kentucky); Andrew Ezell, Extension Chair (Mississippi State University); Kurt Pregitzer, Western Regional Chair (University of Idaho); Mark Rickenbach, North Central Regional Chair (University of Wisconsin-Madison); Bob Wagner, At-Large Member (Purdue University); Steve Shaler, International Chair (University of Maine); Mary Watzin, At-Large Member (North Carolina State University); Randy Nuckolls, NAUFRP General Counsel; Terri Bates, NAUFRP Executive Liaison

NAUFRP Members: Jim Johnson, Oregon State University; Katy Kavanagh, Texas A&M University; Keith Blatner, Washington State University; Dale Greene, University of Georgia; Paul Winistorfer, Virginia Tech; Gordon Holley, Louisiana Tech University; Allen Rutherford, Louisiana State University; Tom DeLuca, University of Washington; Adrian Leighton, Salish Kootenai College

NAUFRP Guests: Bob Alverts, Society of American Foresters; Catalino Blanche, USDA National Institute for Food and Agriculture (NIFA); Ali Mohamad, NIFA

Clark Seely, President, Society of American Foresters (SAF) welcomed NAUFRP. He said there are 1,600 registered for the convention and they expect more walk-ins. Over 460 students are registered.

A motion to accept the agenda was made and approved.

A motion to accept the minutes from the March 7-8, 2016 Executive Committee meeting was made by Kurt Pregitzer and seconded by Andy Ezell. The minutes were unanimously adopted.

Jim Allen noted changes in the Executive Committee. Steve Shaler has become the International Chair, John Hayes is the BAC Representative, Alton Thompson has taken the place of Carolyn Brooks who retired during the summer, Bob Wagner has returned to the Executive Committee as an At-Large Member. Dale Greene will become Southern Chair and Phil Tappe will become an At-Large Member; Katy Kavanagh has agreed to take over the Treasurer/Secretary position in the new year.

Financial Report: David Newman, Treasurer: Revenue is up as a result of dues income and McIntire-Stennis (McStennis) grant funds that reimbursed NAUFRP for Terri's time and expenses. Last year the Executive Committee approved funding for a Bench Marking study by Rob Swihart at Purdue University; it is in progress although we may not be invoiced until next year. The only surprise is how much expenses have increased for the annual meeting and reception over the last several years. An unplanned expense is a monthly transamour fee that provides protection for those using credit cards to pay dues. There was discussion about members who don't pay dues: David said 57 out of 69 institutions do pay. It is hard when there is no real forestry in some regions/states. Randy suggested that the regional chairs, Keith, Terri and himself develop a list of those schools that do not pay and plan

to discuss at the next meeting. Terry said there is value in having more institutions involved in NAUFRP. Randy said we need to reach out in ways other than dues – for example, invite those institutions to participate in meetings and special projects such as McStennis Strategic Planning. Terry suggested developing a one-page document that lists the benefits of membership. Randy said the PowerPoint on NAUFRP accomplishments would be useful for this purpose. A question was whether NAUFRP has a formal communications plan? Jim said we do not have one, but all NAUFRP institutions have the McStennis program in common. David continued with the budget proposed for 2017. It is similar to the 2016 budget. He is hoping income will stay the same. A small deficit is projected for the next several years. The Executive Committee voted unanimously to accept the budget proposed for 2017.

Washington Report, Randy Nuckolls: Randy discussed next week's presidential election and seats in play in the Senate that may shift power back to the Democrats. The Continuing Resolution is in effect until mid-December when there will likely be a deal for multi mini-bills or an omnibus appropriations bill. McStennis and RREA will probably stay the same. Some of the competitive grant programs have increases in both the House and Senate and these may carry over. A big issue continues to be Wildfire Funding. Kurt asked about the funding cut proposed for the Joint Fire Science Program (JFSP) that was a concern at the March Executive Committee meeting – where did that come from? Randy said it was DOA but he never understood where the proposed cut came from. Janaki urged that NAUFRP be vigilant in monitoring this program. John Hayes said JFSP was caught up in the large, unresolved issue of fire funding. Terry believes FIA funding may also have been a factor. Randy said we need to be more vigilant about these kinds of budget maneuvers. Randy continued with an analysis of the upcoming election. In the House, the Democrats may pick up 10-20 seats, but they need 30 to become the majority. A final question was what happens if the Senate splits 50-50 after the election, how will the committee chairs be determined? Randy said it all goes to the party of the sitting President.

Research Committee, Red Baker: Red said there has been an on-going team effort on behalf of the research committee. Keith Belli went and presented the new McStennis Strategic Plan to FRAC in October. John Hayes met with the NASF Science/Research Committee in April. In July, Red met with the National Council of Forestry Association Executives (NCFAE). They were very receptive and interested in the Strategic Plan. Buck Vandersteen (Louisiana Forestry Association) is to liaison with NAUFRP. Red distributed the new McStennis Strategic Plan and brochures and reviewed the process for developing it. When they reached out to partners they found very few understood or knew anything about the McStennis program. A Steering Committee was formed and met first in Baton Rouge followed by a two-day meeting last March in Washington, D.C. Everything was distilled into three goals: graduate education, partnerships and communications. Two of these correspond with NAUFRP committees. The third goal is more of a challenge; NAUFRP does not have a communications committee or strategy. A breakout session is planned for the General Assembly tomorrow to work on these. John Hayes said he is surprised not to see a goal for research. Red said the group did not focus on research because they felt so much other work has been done in recent times (i.e., BNR Science, Education and Outreach Roadmap for Natural Resources) and given McStennis is driven at the state level by stakeholders. Keith noted the 2007 McStennis Strategic Plan was very specific and in 2010, realizing that our research terms were not in sync, revised it to reflect more contemporary terminology. Keith asked John if there a willingness by the BNR to continue to evolve the BNR Roadmap? John said this has not been discussed yet but would guess yes. Keith wants to ensure we stay connected with the BNR. Mary believes a fundamental problem is understanding what the capacity programs are – she is very concerned that all the focus is given to the competitive programs; maybe this should be part of the messaging/communications. Kurt added that people do not differentiate between programs – they just want the research. A McStennis strength is the connection at the state level. Kurt is also hearing concerns about graduate capacity;

there is support is out there for capacity building; it is just a matter of communications. Both documents are on the NAUFRP webpage; Red would like feedback and as many as possible to participate in the process. He said they were stunned at the lack of knowledge the State Foresters had about the McStennis program. Mark Rickenbach said his State Forester asked him to fill out the survey. Red is interested in following-up with McStennis alumni. Janaki said he has faculty who receive McStennis dollars but do not understand the program. Tim Martin has his faculty who get or propose McStennis projects read Steve Bullard's article on the history of the program. Randy asked if anyone has put together a one-pager on how McStennis is used in the state? It was noted that one-pagers were prepared in the past at Catalino's request. David asked if there have been any recent visits with NIFA? Red says not this year; the Strategic Plan took over but they plan to resume in March.

Policy Report, Janaki Alavalapati: Janaki distributed a written report. NAUFRP participates in the Forest Carbon Working Group (FCWG); we provide our insights and have had faculty involved. He discussed NAUFRP's process for policy issues and provided an updates on: the Environmental Protection Agency's Science Advisory Board letter on Forest Carbon Science fundamentals; FCWG FY 2017 budget; work with the Green Building Coalition to reorganize; letters that NAUFRP has co-signed. The 2018 Farm Bill process has begun through APLU; NAUFRP has submitted a 'wish' list to them. Randy and John will represent NAUFRP at the upcoming annual APLU meeting. Randy noted that Farm Bill hearings will begin early next year. McStennis is permanently authorized; however, RREA re-authorization is necessary. We have talked previously about the possibility of changes regarding tuition and federal grants; legislative language may be needed. In the last Farm Bill, Janaki worked to have wood/forestry included specifically in the Specialty Crops Program; this was included again in the wish list provided to APLU. It also makes sense to include 'tree farmers' in the Beginner Farmer/Rancher Program. We have been told that the eligibility is there, just not spelled out. Adrian said it is likely the 1994s will seek eligibility for McStennis funding through the Farm Bill; he would like to discuss how to talk about that – he wants NAUFRP input on what the legislative language might look like. Jim Allen noted we work closely with APLU and anticipates we will advance a Forest Health Initiative. Randy assumes we will also work through the Forests in the Farm Bill Coalition. Janaki feels APLU is the stronger partner for our interests in the Farm Bill and Randy agrees. Janaki noted the Forest Health Initiative is going to be our 'one big idea' for the 2018 Farm Bill. Randy says we need to determine if Forest Health needs specific statutory language or if it could be implemented through an existing program.

Education Report, Terry Sharik: Terry reviewed his written report. He continues to explore the possibility of NAUFRP becoming a member of the International Forestry Student Association (IFSA). Item 2 relates to the student surveys he developed for the 2014 IUFRO World Congress and 2014 SAF National Convention, followed by one administered to all NAUFRP institutions. He plans to share the data from the latter survey with all participating institutions. He referenced that this was an action item in the NAUFRP Undergraduate Strategic Plan. Terry is working with the FAEIS administrators on data management issues related to NAUFRP institutions. With Keith Belli, Terry is serving on the U.S. Endowment's Blue Ribbon Commission on Forest and Forest Products Research and Development in the 21st Century; his part is the pipeline issue. Terry participated in the joint SAF-Intertribal Timber Conference recently held in Spokane. His final note was that NAUFRP has the best data base on enrollments in the world.

NAUFRP Webpage, Hannah Abbotts: Hannah reviewed the new website design on screen. The primary goal is to make the site easy to use by multiple users. It will look like Microsoft Word with no coding to deal with. The code will be on the MI Tech servers but it will be masked. David Newman suggested that

we forward job positions with a link back to the NAUFRP webpage – that might bring more people, particularly faculty, to it. The intent is for individual committee chairs to develop content but we will probably need an internal structure/model. Randy suggested setting up a working committee on this; perhaps Terry, David, Keith, Jim. Hannah will stack the committees. For now, view it at Naufrpforest.mtu.edu.

International Report, Steve Shaler: Steve has taken over this chair from John Hayes. He plans to work on expanding international strategic relationships.

Extension Report, Andy Ezell: There were seven nominations submitted for the NAUFRP/NWOA Family Forests Education Award this year. The awards will be presented tomorrow at the General Assembly. The award for comprehensive program will go to Pennsylvania State University; the award for an individual program will go to the University of Tennessee's Healthy Hardwoods Program. Andy is working with Eric Norland to gain a better understanding of the RREA program and its funding.

Terry gave an example of agriculture research in Michigan, where the agriculture industry provides over \$10 million in funding annually to universities. In contrast, the forest industry provides very little for university research and development. There is clearly a dichotomy here. Why is this and what can be done about it? Randy said we began building a relationship with NAFO (reference to Tim White's work and NAFO research survey) NAUFRP needs to continue that conversation with NAFO and others about the value of research to them. This is a critical topic.

Western NAUFRP Report, Kurt Pregitzer: At the March meeting Department of Energy representatives, Zia Haq and Bryce Stokes, briefed the Executive Committee on the Bioenergy Technologies Office. Bryce invited NAUFRP members to visit the Idaho National Lab which has the biomass lead for the country. Kurt has followed up on this and contacted Rich Hess, Nation Leader, about hosting NAUFRP representatives for a day or two to show what they are doing in Idaho. Kurt will organize but would like to gauge the interest in moving forward on this. The Executive Committee indicated they wanted to do this and liked the engagement with DOE. Kurt will look at dates in March or April.

NIFA Capacity Program, Karl Maxwell, NIFA, and Simon Tripp, TEconomy (by conference phone): Karl is with the NIFA office for central evaluations and strategic planning. He referenced the recent evaluation of the AFRI program. NIFA is doing the same kind of evaluation for the capacity programs. The purpose is to 1) enable them to be a better champion and sustain funding; 2) demonstrate accomplishments; and, 3) demystify, articulate the complexities and distinguish the capacity programs. NIFA contracted with TEconomy last February. The contract runs through the end of next January (2017). They are looking at the value of the programs; identifying research gaps and areas for improvement and opportunities to leverage visibility. The survey is one piece of the evaluation; they will also use data from impact statements. They are not trying to compare competitive versus capacity programs. The survey data collection has wrapped up and they are working towards draft findings for the end of November and a draft report by end of December. The final report is due in January. They feel they have had a strong response. Jim asked about consistency. NAUFRP concerns (Mary, John) were expressed that forestry was not appropriately covered by the survey. There were questions about distribution plans for the final report. Karl said Sonny will let the world know about it. Another question was whether natural resources would be addressed as an entity or lumped in with agriculture. That is something they are still grappling with and said this is a good time for this call. There was concern that although research and extension are separate structures there is no breakout between natural resources and agriculture. There was a question whether there will be an external review. The thinking

is, even given the time crunch, there will be some type of review but that will need to be cleared with Karl and Sonny. Randy offered NAUFRP's assistance with a review of forestry. Ali and Catalino are not familiar with this review; Catalino gathers data annually.

1890 Institutions Report, Alton Thompson: Alton noted that Carolyn Brooks retired last summer. This is his first meeting with the NAUFRP Executive Committee as the representative of the 1890 institutions with forestry programs. He provided background on himself. He has served as Provost at Delaware State University and Dean and Provost at North Carolina A&T State University. He has worked with the 1890 Agroforestry Consortium. Alton will send a written report to Terri. He noted that there is an ARD Research Symposium that occurs every two years coming up next April in Atlanta that would be good for prospective graduate students. This event will be good to post on the NAUFRP webpage. Alton will send Terry's survey to the 1890s to see if more of them will participate. Terry asked about the forestry focus for the 1890s: is it more agroforestry, urban, outdoor recreation/economics, ...? Jim Allen said he will encourage more NAUFRP institutions to exhibit/participate and encourage the 1890s to attend our meetings. Fourteen 1890 institutions receive McStennis funding; the latest is Central State University in Ohio.

Budget and Advocacy Committee (APLU), John Hayes: John reviewed the BAC structure and NAUFRP's participation on it. Tim White represented NAUFRP/forestry until his retirement last summer. BAC receives regular reports from Cornerstone. The Board of Natural Resources (BNR) is made up of five sections; the forestry section is represented by NAUFRP. The BNR has not been effective in leveraging APLU's strength behind their interests and initiatives. APLU has developed a new internal process and structure for advancing initiatives (example: APLU water initiative was a two-year process). John has begun to lay the groundwork for a Forest Health Initiative; a small group will be created to form a problem statement which will be presented to APLU. After that, he expects a request from APLU to develop a white paper. John has met with the State Foresters and chatted with Sonny Ramaswamy about this. Forest health impacts every state and links to many issues. John anticipates developing a white paper over the next three to four months.

Northeastern NAUFRP Report, Mike Messina: Mike discussed the issue of inactive schools in his region. They have 16 universities in 12 states but only five are active in NAUFRP. He has tried reaching out. And he has tried to engage with Forest Service R&D Northern Research Station. Since then Mike has been invited to participate in FS listening sessions and other forums.

North Central NAUFRP Report, Mark Rickenbach: Mark has taken over this role from Jim Zaczek. He attended the March Executive Committee meeting. He has an active list of contacts in his region and intends reaching out to those who are inactive.

Matt Menashes, CEO, Society of American Foresters: Matt appreciates NAUFRP meeting at the SAF convention every year. Five hundred students are registered for the convention; the Forest Service plans to hire 150 while here this week. There appears to be an uptick in university graduates. SAF's 'Evolving Forests' represents resetting the thinking of what the profession of forestry is going to look like in 25-30 years; it will also look at how to attract talent and talk to the public. SAF also has participated in the new North American Forest Partnership that was launched in September with an internal focus on forestry professionals telling their story. A year from now, NAFP will go public with this and talk to the community about forestry. Matt asked how SAF and NAUFRP can focus on policy together and how SAF can support NAUFRP positions? John and Danielle are important to that end. 'Issues and Advocacy' is one year old. Advocacy is a tight rope for them. They appreciate the support of our SAF faculty advisors

and student support. This year's database is providing better information on students and advisors. They plan to tie student membership to the student academic year versus the calendar year. Matt says SAF has to figure out how to help with student recruitment. Terry suggested expanding the career fair at the convention. Resource Management has set up two full scholarships for minority scholarships. Molpus Timberlands has done something similar. Overall SAF membership has increased three percent in 2015 to 11,800; Matt believes there will be an additional increase in 2016 of one-to two percent.

Blue Ribbon Commission on Forest and Forest Products Research and Development, Rich Guldin, Project Leader, U.S. Endowment for Forestry and Communities Rich discussed the National Science Foundation 2002 Forest Research Capacity Report. The Commission's plans to update the data in that report – they are having a hard time interpreting the data for students and faculty in the pipeline. The data shows an increase in research dollars in some areas (NSF, NIFA competitive programs) but decreases in research dollars in other areas (industry, FS R&D). Other countries (Canada, New Zealand, Europe...) have new organizational models. The Commission is scheduled to meet December 13. They will receive 12 options and select 5 to 7 for which papers will be needed. The report is to be written in January and finalized with recommendations in February. Rich identified emerging attributes for future success: flourishing partnerships/networks; emphasis on development beyond research; increased integration of social and economic research with ecological research. Dale agrees this is where we need to go: industry left us because we left; we need to engage with the agency and industry.

1994 Executive Committee Representative Discussion: Currently there is discussion on the possibility of the 1994 institutions becoming eligible for McStennis funding. There are thirty-seven 1994 institutions; 6-7 of them have BS's in natural resources or environmental science. An issue for them is recruitment; most are only two-year institutions. We recruit them into four-year programs. There is value in having a 1994 representative at the NAUFRP table. They can act as an umbrella bringing the other programs in. A concern is diluting the McStennis dollars. FRAC has recommended making 1994 institutions eligible for McStennis funding and increasing McStennis funding to \$50 million. Randy says that current Farm Bill language is prescriptive; it requires a four-year program (the 1890s don't have this?).

Update on SAF stakeholder engagement about the future of forest research and development, John Barnwell and Rich Guldin: The Forest Service leadership has spent effort in understanding what people inside and outside the agency are thinking. They contracted for an external stakeholder dialogue. SAF embarked on a similar project for FS R&D. Forest Service Associate Chief Mary Wagner wanted them to work together; 4-5 months have been spent co-developing an approach and questions to accomplish this. Plans are to hold four dialogue sessions. The Forest Service will be both host and participant. The same approach will be used to explore the needs of people and place and the needs identified for the nation. Rich thinks the objective is good. A template is being designed that can be used by any organization. The morning sessions will focus on science needs; the afternoon sessions on the science community. Four more sessions will happen to review the data and determine if more is needed. SAF will look at training state and society leaders to host similar dialogues. John Hayes noted The Wildlife Society is moving towards having all their journals available to members for free. Allen Rutherford said they (LSU) are giving the agency full access to their library. David noted the carbon debate is a good example of how data/information are not being very accessible. Non-peer review NGO's get a lot of attention because they are good at marketing science. Rich believes the Station Directors see identifying forest research needs as a way to better connect with stakeholders. They recognize that FS R&D has lost one-third of their scientists and a string of Acting Deputy Chiefs have not been able to maintain (institutional) connections with the broader community. Red said one of the McStennis

Strategic Planning themes is the need for better communications to convey what is done at our institutions and the value that it has.

FAEIS Update, Pete Ziegler, Project Leader, Andrew Meeks, Data Analyst and Terry Sharik: Terry introduced Andrew and Pete, providing background on FAEIS and the forestry data it houses. NAUFRP tracked enrollment data from 1980 to 2009 but began to transition this to FAEIS in 2012. There was a problem with compatibility. FAEIS classified programs using the federal government classification system; data on shifting degree programs was lost. In the process of transiting this, Bill Richardson who was handling this from the FAEIS end died and there was a time lapse before Pete and Andrew joined FAEIS. Terry visited them at Virginia Tech last summer. In 2012, FAEIS had data from 64 NAUFRP institutions. Since then, our institutions are not submitting data consistently. We cannot portray this data with so many missing. Pete said that even though he has been there two years now, Bill Richardson was the institutional memory. IPEDS (Dept of Education) cannot be disaggregated. Keith said that data exists (SAF accreditation process; self-study enrollment figures exist). The survey goes out about this time of year; the key question is who is it going to? Pete said they are trying to send the survey to the deans of the natural resources programs and their data contacts. This is only for student enrollment. The faculty data is a different fish; the survey 'stinks'. Of the 77 institutions that participate, eight are NAUFRP. Dr. Thompson will confirm 1890 contacts. Pete asked if anyone would be available to be a beta tester.

Southern NAUFRP Report, Phil Tappe: Southern NAUFRP met in conjunction with the SFI conference in September in Florida. Five institutions were represented and provided updates on their programs. Their comparative data survey is going to track graduate students. Enrollments appear up. They discussed continuing with two meetings a year.

Western NAUFRP, Jim Allen: Plans were to meet at OSU last summer but because of Tom Maness' illness, the meeting was canceled. Kurt will help on arrangements with the DOE meeting if that goes forward.

Continuation of the 1994 Representative discussion. It was decided to defer this discussion to a later date.

USDA Forestry Advisory Research Council (FRAC), Keith Belli: Keith met with FRAC at their last meeting in October and presented the McStennis Strategic Plan. Also discussed were grantees perspectives on McStennis, program modernization, flexibility and possible changes (i.e., funds above current level go to applied research).

Meeting Adjourned.

*Minutes Approved March 6, 2017
Washington, D.C.*