



NAPFSC



March 1999

R E P O R T

A report to the members of the National Association of Professional Forestry Schools and Colleges

President's Message

Albert R. Vogt

Welcome to the many who participate in forest resource education, research, extension and outreach. This spring NAPFSC finds itself heavily engaged in activities directed toward strengthening the Association's effort to provide society with education, research and outreach in support of healthy, productive and sustainable forests. As I prepare this article, several key activities have been initiated:

Educational Summit

We are in the process of preparing for an educational "Summit" February 21-23, 1999 in Washington, DC, at the Ronald Reagan Building International Trade Center. The purpose of the workshop will be to engage discussions with multiple stakeholders (a) to coalesce in the development of shared visions, strategies and proposed joint actions to be carried to Congress for funding over the next five years, and (b) to advocate increased federal support for coordinated efforts by NAPFSC universities, key public agencies and cooperative forest industry programs. A planning group has met twice in Washington, DC. People on that committee include representatives from CSREES, NAPFSC, NAUFWP, NASULGC, National Association of State Foresters (NASF), the Pinchot Institute, the forest industry (AF&PA), forest landowner associations, consulting foresters and federal agencies including the Forest Service and the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). The invitation list of 103 individuals includes the spectrum of stakeholders the steering committee represents, as well as congressional staffers and representatives from the Executive Branch. CSREES, the Forest Service, NRCS, NASF and AF&PA are providing financial assistance. I anticipate a full report on the summit to be included in the fall NAPFSC newsletter in advance of the annual meeting in Portland.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 2

Feature Article

Pinchot Institute Completes Forestry Survey

Paul C. Ringgold, Research Associate



Ringgold

The Pinchot Institute for Conservation has recently completed an extensive nationwide survey of forestry employers and recent graduates of forestry programs at US colleges and universities to assess how well these programs are preparing new forestry professionals to practice forestry consistent with today's needs. The study also sought information from the leaders of every professional forestry degree-granting program in the country, in an attempt to characterize the strengths and areas of emphasis in each program and the variety of strategies being used to address the changing needs of the forestry profession.

The Institute embarked on this study based on the findings of its 1996 assessment of change in US forestry organizations. Among these findings were numerous indications that the practice of forestry, and the public and private organizations that manage forests, have undergone significant change in recent years, reflecting changing public perceptions about what constitutes sustainable forestry and sound land stewardship. The education study seeks to determine whether the skills and competencies sought by these organizations when hiring graduates of professional forestry programs have evolved as well, and if so, the steps that have been taken by forestry schools in adapting their curricula to meet these evolving demands.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 5



NAPFSC

REPORT

Bi-Annual Newsletter of the
National Association of Professional
Forestry Schools and Colleges

Executive Committee:

Albert R. Vogt. . . .President
Perry J. Brown. . . .President-Elect
Gregory N. Brown. . . .Past President
G. H. Weaver. . . .Secretary-Treasurer
Terri Bates. . . .Executive Liaison
F. E. Busby. . . .Chair, Extension
Daniel E. Keathley. . . .Chair, Education
William R. Bentley. . . .Chair, International
G. Bruce Wiersma. . . .Chair, Legislative
C. P. Pat Reid. . . .Chair, Policy
James P. Lassoie. . . .Chair, Research
Carl Settergren. . . .Chair, North Central Region
Donald H. DeHayes. . . .Chair, Northeast Region
Frederick W. Cabbage. . . .Chair, Southern Region
Charles R. Hatch. . . .Chair, Western Region

Staff:

Cindy Harper. . . .Administrative Assistant
Arlice K. Banks. . . .NAPFSC Report
Designer and Editor

Letters, news items, stories,
and photographs
for the
NAPFSC REPORT
may be sent to:

Terri Bates
NAPFSC Executive Liaison
3325 Rose Lane
Falls Church, VA 22042
Telephone: (703) 538-1134
E-mail: Bates-Stasny@erols.com

President's Message

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 1

The Silver Bullet 2

NAPFSC's Executive Committee has decided to update and reprint the 1986 publication "A Quarter Century of Progress: The McIntire Stennis Cooperative Forestry Research Program 1962-1987." This is also more familiarly known as "The Silver Bullet." In the course of updating this document, we will broaden its scope beyond the original focus on forestry research to include extension and education at both national and international levels. At this time the document is being called "Sustaining America's Forest Resources - The Role of Education and Research." The project has been implemented at SUNY/ESF (Syracuse) under a Cooperative Agreement with CSREES. Two professional writers/editors will develop the document with oversight provided by Bill Bentley. Terri Bates (NAPFSC) and Boyd Post (CSREES) are acting as point persons in coordinating at the national level. The assistance of the National Education, Research, Extension and International Chairs is critical to the completeness of the document produced. CSREES is providing financial backing for the publication.

The purpose of this project is to develop a current and contemporary document that portrays the key role that universities' research, teaching and extension have and should continue to play in assuring sustainable, healthy forests well into the next century. The university role will be clearly and uniquely defined. The document will highlight the valuable accomplishments of forest research, extension and education programs at both the national and international level as a result of university-federal funding. To do this, tangible examples and success stories will be documented that depict results and benefits of importance to the audience. Silver Bullet 2 will identify future university driven thrusts related to priority forest resource needs linked to national priorities such as water quality, watershed management, sustaining (rural) communities and global warming.

The anticipated audience in line with the anticipated use of the document is broad: the US Congress, Administration, stakeholder and partner organizations and environmental groups. NAPFSC members' institutions are also an important audience. The production time frame is

CONTINUED ON PAGE 10



NAPFSC Regional Officers, 1998-99

North Central Region

Chair	Carl Settergren settergrenc@missouri.edu
Education	Dan Keathley
Extension	Tom Warner
International	Pete Schaefer
Legislative	John E. Phelps
Policy	Dennis C. LeMaster
Research	Alan Ek

Western Region

Chair	Charles R. Hatch crhatch@uidaho.edu
Education	Don Arganbright
Extension	Ed DePuit
International	Jerry Allen
Legislative	Terry Sharik
Policy	Norm Pillsbury
Research	George Brown

Northeast Region

Chair	Donald H. DeHayes ddehayes@nature.snr.uvm.edu
Education	Larry Nielsen
Extension	Bill McComb
International	Dave Schoeder
Research	Bruce Wiersma

Southern Region

Chair	Fred W. Cabbage fred_cabbage@ncsu.edu
Education	Bruce Bongarten
Extension	George Hopper
International	Wayne Smith
Research	Arnett Mace

Committee Reports

National Research Committee

James P. Lassoie, Chair

FRAC Report

The Forestry Research Advisory Committee (FRAC) was authorized by the 1995 Farm Bill to provide the USDA Secretary with recommendations and advice on forestry research. Al Ek (U. of Minn.) is the current chair; other members from NAPFSC schools included Mary Duryea (U. of FL), Jo Ellen Force (U. of Idaho) and Bruce Wiersma (U. of Maine).

In recognition of their importance and the disproportionate investment in nonindustrial private forests (NIPFs) compared to federal lands, FRAC's June 1998 report provided four recommendations focused on improving the productivity and environmental quality of these lands: (1) increase science-based information for the public, landowners, natural resource professionals, and policymakers by increasing funding levels for CSREES/McIntire-Stennis and USFS Research programs; (2) improve the timeliness and precision of forest inventory and analysis (FIA) information for all forestlands by convening a conference to unite support for FIA, and develop a budget initiative to provide sufficient funding for it; (3) increase the flow of forest management options and research results to NIPF land-

owners by convening a meeting of stakeholders to articulate the needs and issues, and develop a strategy to respond to them; and (4) use the FRAC to keep the USDA abreast of emerging issues for forestry research by providing sufficient funding to hold three-day annual meetings for FRAC members who hold rotating assignments.

Section on Ecology

The National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC) recently established a new section to address "ecology" within its relatively new Board on Natural Resources. Presidents of NASULGC institutions were asked to appoint a member and alternate to this section. NAPFSC, of course, is essentially the same as the Board's Section on Forestry, and many of our members are also representatives on the Section on Fish and Wildlife, which is different from the National Association of University Fish and Wildlife Programs (NAUFWP). Since the Section on Ecology is also of importance to NAPFSC members, you should establish contact with your institution's delegates if they are not in your particular unit. ■



Committee Reports

National Education Committee

Daniel E. Keathley, Chair

The sessions on accreditation at the National SAF meeting in Traverse City were well attended and brought focus to the issues that need to be resolved in redefining the accreditation process and standards. A special thank you to Dennis LeMaster and Greg Smith for their outstanding presentations and the thoughtful way in which they responded to questions and guided the discussion. The major issues that were repeated throughout the sessions involved the following:

Placing more emphasis on outcomes assessment. This change was viewed as essential if the accreditation process is to retain its credibility with university higher administrations. Along with this, the need to identify acceptable patterns of outcomes assessment, while allowing individuality in developing new models, was stressed.

Intertwined with discussion of outcomes assessment were issues of bringing greater clarity to what is actually required for accreditation. There is a need to more clearly identify essential elements for either outcomes assessment or program inputs by reducing the use of "should." Specifically identified single items, such as math or statistics, which are not regionally variable but rather are the general foundation on which the curriculum rests, must either be clearly required or omitted from the standards.

The need to examine the development of standards for specializations within forestry using either a model of a common core to which specializations are added or the development of individual standards for each area.

The need for this was expressed in all sessions, but there was no consensus on the best model. Concern was expressed that the current process accredits specializations (urban forestry, forest engineering, etc.) as sound forest management curricula, but that the standards do not deal with the actual area of specialization. Defining which disciplines to include was also problematic.

The need to define and incorporate standards for distance education into the process. Finally, once again there were process issues, with continued questioning of the need for and value of the Interim Status Report. Recent changes have clearly lessened the outcry, but the consensus seemed to be that unless there are problems to be resolved following a site visit, the Interim Status Report is not needed, particularly given that programs prepare Substantive Change Reports as major changes occur.

Again I want to express my appreciation to the participants and speakers. The input from these sessions was relayed to the SAF Task Force on Forestry Education Accreditation during our meeting in November. The second meeting of the Task Force is scheduled for January 15-16, 1999. ■



International Committee

William R. Bentley, Chair

NAPFSC, in collaboration with CSREES, is developing a short brochure entitled "The Role of Research, Education and Extension in Sustaining America's Forest Resources – Why You Should Care." The 16-page brochure, which focuses on the constituency that benefits from forestry programs at public universities, will cover the following points:

Who Cares about America's Forests and Why. An introduction that grabs the reader and helps her understand why she cares.

America's Forest Resources. A report on the many pressures on forests and the changing uses, but especially the many shifts of pressure onto the private forestlands owned by 10 million Americans. This places more stress on the public universities to listen better to these owners and to deliver the research, education and extension services the owners need to serve America well.

Roles of Research, Education and Extension as Base for Sustainability. The unique role of universities in providing this base, a brief background on funding for forestry research, education and extension, and the continuum among stakeholders. The role of asking better questions and transfer of better answers to appropriate stakeholders is especially important. Sustaining the base and the purposes of different kinds of funding and the critical priorities for the 21st century is explored.



Feature Article

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 1

With the assistance of an independent survey research firm, forestry employers and recent forestry graduates were surveyed during the summer of 1998. The purpose of these surveys was to: (1) identify the skills and competencies that employers rate as being most important, and that new practicing professionals find they most need, and (2) measure the perceptions of employers and recent graduates as to how well forestry programs at US colleges and universities are imparting these skills and competencies. Over 250 telephone interviews were completed with employers from consulting firms, industry, state and federal government agencies, non-profit groups and associations. Of the more than 1,500 written surveys mailed to recent forestry school graduates, a total of 330 were completed and returned.

Another segment of the education study involved gathering responses from the heads of forestry programs at universities in the US that offer either a bachelor's degree or master's degree in forestry. The goal was to gain information not contained in catalogues or brochures, such as the school's vision for the future, the process for curriculum changes and changes that have been instituted in the last few years based on evolving forest management concepts. Forty-two schools responded out of a total of 53 schools that were identified.

The results of the survey identify a number of important gaps between the skills and competencies forestry employers rate most highly in terms of their importance to the practice of forestry today, and the skills and competencies provided by forestry education programs on the whole. Although employers continue to rate technical skills very highly, there is an equally high demand for graduates who have the communications and organizational skills necessary to function solidly as resource professionals and not merely as technicians. There was a demonstrated need for higher proficiency in these areas. However, employers do not expect all of these skills to be acquired at the undergraduate level. Employers are looking to graduate education to provide and reinforce many of these competencies, and many are increasingly looking to extension and adult continuing education to help practicing professionals build these skills throughout their careers.

“The results of the survey identify a number of important gaps between the skills and competencies forestry employers rate most highly. . .and the skills and competencies provided by forestry education programs on the whole.”

Although forestry program administrators are certainly aware of the full range of needed skills, there has been varying success in the development of curricula that can provide these skills adequately within the constraints of a four-year program and without conflicting with basic undergraduate core requirements. In the course of this study, several examples were found of innovative approaches that

have been taken by various schools to address this problem (such as integrated programs that teach core elements across the curriculum). The administrative heads at most of the forestry programs at US colleges and universities indicated that they have instituted changes of some kind to their programs in response to changing demands in the practice of forestry. Most

have made changes in response to technical advances by adding new courses in areas such as geographic information systems. Several programs have added new courses that address social and environmental concerns, while others have broadened existing courses to incorporate these concepts.

A key issue that surfaced during the course of this study was the shared responsibility that educators and employers have for maintaining communications between academia and the employment sector, as well as for ensuring the success of those curricula which best meet the needs of both students and employers. With these issues in mind, the Pinchot Institute will be hosting a symposium on March 15-16 that will convene a group of leading forestry educators and employers (representing both traditional and non-traditional sectors) to review the findings of our study and to engage in a discussion of two critical topics. These are:

-  the role of forestry educators in striking an appropriate balance between responding to current needs of forestry employers and providing independent academic leadership in areas of knowledge critical to the future of forestry practice, and
-  the role of forestry employers in enabling forestry schools to maintain educational programs that excel in giving students the skills and competencies they need to succeed as forestry professionals and to assist in attracting top-quality students.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 10



President-Elect's Message

Perry J. Brown

The NAPFSC strategic plan identifies NAPFSC as “a catalyst in increasing cultural diversity in forest resource schools and workforce.” Strategy D-1 identifies actions to increase cultural diversity within NAPFSC membership, Strategy D-2 lists several actions to recruit college-bound high school minority students into NAPFSC institutions and Strategy D-3 identifies actions to increase the enrollment of women. To begin the process of fulfilling the vision and tackling strategies D-1 and D-2, two workshops were arranged for the NAPFSC annual meeting in Traverse City, Michigan.

The NAPFSC Executive Committee held the first workshop, while the second involved the NAPFSC membership attending the annual meeting. President Verna Fowler of the College of Minominee Nations, Judith Li of the Fisheries and Wildlife Department of Oregon State University, Myron Floyd of the Recreation, Parks and Tourism Department of Texas A&M University, and Ralph Crawford, USDA Liaison Officer at Delaware State University, were resource persons for both workshops. These workshops were wide-ranging in their scope. Many issues surfaced that need to be addressed as NAPFSC moves along the path of increasing cultural diversity within the organization and in helping member institutions enhance their activities targeted toward cultural diversity.

While the following list is not exhaustive, some of the issues identified during the discussions were the following:



CULTURAL DIVERSITY AND NAPFSC

What is meant by cultural diversity?

New pathways for participation of minorities are needed to break the current mold in dealing with this issue. In partnerships with minority institutions, reciprocity is important; parity is an issue. In working with minority institutions, are there things we can offer that they need, such as having graduate students teach a course at Tribal Colleges, participating in curriculum development activities or incorporating their undergraduates in research projects? Are there ways to participate with minority institutions without raiding them for students, such as working out summer and one-semester programs for student exchanges? Is forestry (and natural resources) recognized as relevant to minority populations? To what extent might diversity be reflected in the curriculum? To what extent does moving toward cultural diversity mean changing the campus culture in contrast to simply adding a variety of people? How might students be kept in school when the employers draft them into jobs before they earn a degree? What possibilities are there to encourage minority students to pursue graduate education?

Some of the conclusions that resulted from the wide-ranging discussion are the following:

1. Cultural diversity is a highly complex issue.
2. Collaborative efforts in enhancing cultural diversity are necessary.
3. Personal actions, especially faculty oriented, are critical.
4. Human dimensions issues need to be incorporated into many natural resource courses since one of the strong values of cultural diversity is the addition of many perceptions and voices.
5. Changing cultures, not just adding variety, in our institutions will be necessary.
6. Reciprocity leads to mutually beneficial outcomes.
7. Advice and help as we proceed down the cultural diversity path can come from others.
8. Sharing as a family, rather than just contractual arrangements as partners, is the way to go.

How might we proceed given the ideas that have been generated?

The President and President-elect need to visit HBCUs and Native American Tribal Colleges with bachelor's degrees in forestry or natural resources, or that conduct research or extension in forest resources, to begin a discussion about their participation in NAPFSC. The Executive Committee needs to examine the criteria and procedures for admitting



Washington, DC Update

Randy Nuckolls

Clinton Proposes FY 2000 Budget

President Clinton released his FY 2000 budget in early February. Formula funds once again took a hit at USDA as priority is increasingly given to competitive grant programs. Large sweeping cross-agency initiatives such as the Lands Legacy Initiative (see following article), the Food Safety Initiative and the Clean Water Action Plan received major increases. NAPFSC's Executive Committee convened in Washington in late February to discuss the FY 2000 budget and to meet with Members of Congress on NAPFSC's budget recommendations.

The FY 2000 requested funding levels are as follows:

McIntire-Stennis - \$19,882,000, same as the President's request last year, but down from the \$21,832,000 approved by Congress for FY99.

RREA - \$3,192,000, same as the President's request last year, and the same as Congress appropriated for FY 99.

NRI Competitive Grants - Congress appropriated \$119.3 million in FY99. The President's budget includes a large increase for NRI to a level of \$200 million for FY 2000. Language included in the USDA budget briefing book states, "the proposed increase will address the key concerns through additional investments in biotechnology and animal and plant genetics, global climate change, food safety and human nutrition research, animal waste management, and value added agricultural commodities."

Initiative for Future Agriculture and Food Systems - A mandatory \$120 million/year for the next five years. Competitive grants of up to 5 years will be rewarded to address pressing agricultural needs. Language is included that states, "special emphasis will be placed on awarding grants to small and mid-sized institutions who have not previously been successful in obtaining NRI competitive grants. Priority will be given to multi-institutional and multi-state projects that integrate agricultural research, extension and education activities." This is the program that was included in last year's reauthorization of the Research Title, but was not funded in the final appropriations bill.

Forest Service Forest and Rangeland Research - \$235 million, a \$38 million increase over FY 99. The increase includes \$5 million for Global Climate Change, \$6 million

for Climate Change Technology Initiative, \$5 million for optimization research related to decision support systems such as land management planning, and \$14 million for the Integrated Science for Ecosystem Challenges (ISEC).

State and Private Forestry - State and private forestry programs received a substantial increase in funding for FY 2000. Forest Health/Fire Protection programs received an increase of \$17 million to \$95 million for FY 2000. Cooperative Forestry programs were recommended for an increase of \$64 million. Most of the increases are for programs included in the Lands Legacy Initiative.

Budget Breakdown			
Enacted FY 1998		Enacted FY 1999	
McIntire-Stennis	\$20,497,000	McIntire-Stennis	\$21,932,000
RREA	\$3,192,000	RREA	\$3,192,000
NRI	\$97,200,000	NRI	\$119,300,000
Administration Proposal FY 2000		NAPFSC Recommendation	
McIntire-Stennis	\$19,882,000	McIntire-Stennis	\$23,332,000
RREA	\$3,192,000	RREA	\$4,000,000
NRI	\$200,000,000	NRI	\$200,000,000

Clinton Announces New Plan to Set Aside Federal Wilderness and Urban Parks

President Clinton announced a new budget proposal, the "Lands Legacy Initiative," in mid-January that would spend over \$1 billion during the next fiscal year to expand federal wildernesses and urban parks. The bulk of the money for land purchases would come from the federal government's Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF), a pool of royalty money from offshore petroleum and natural gas leases. This proposal, if approved by Congress, could further increase the pressures on private timberland owners as the federal government purchases more land and limits are

CONTINUED ON PAGE 14



Regional Reports



Northeast Region

Donald H. DeHayes

The Northeast region of NAPFSC has affirmed its interest in functioning as a body that jointly represents regional issues of interest and important to both NAPFSC and the National Association of University Fish and Wildlife Programs (NAUFWP). To that end, we have agreed to hold our spring meeting each year in conjunction with the Northeast Wildlife meetings. We have been planning a cosponsored, graduate level seminar course on “Ecosystem Health and Sustainability” to be delivered via interactive compressed video TV for a couple of years. Numerous challenges, such as room access on campuses, varying academic year calendar’s across institutions, and other management complexities, have thwarted our efforts. We are pleased that the Presidents and Council of Presidents of the New England land grant institutions are now financially supporting the effort, and we expect to deliver this prototype course among the New England schools during spring semester 1999.

Most of our recent efforts have focused on establishing a regional natural resources research agenda for the region in partnership with several federal natural resource agencies (USFS Northeast Research Station, US Fish and Wildlife Service, US National Park Service, USDA CSREES). We have developed and are now revising draft “white papers” in three priority areas identified by both the universities and the agencies. These are “Landscape Change,” which is broadly construed to include a diverse array of biological and social components, such as forest fragmentation, sprawl impacts, watershed issues, and perhaps certain aspects of “precision agriculture;”

“Contaminants in Air, Land, and Water,” which may include the fate, transport, transformation, and potential impacts of pollutants and actions to prevent or mitigate such impacts, and “Inventory, Monitoring and Information Management,” which may actually represent more of an outreach than a research function and an excellent needed arena for partnering between research agencies and universities. These priority areas for the Northeast region were discussed in the context of the evolving Initiative for Future Agriculture and Food Systems, the NRI and other agency research funding programs. We noted, with some dismay, that these areas of high priority in the densely populated northeast are only remotely evident on the agenda’s of national funding programs, especially within USDA. We seek help from NAPFSC to elevate the importance and visibility of these research issues, which likely transcend the northeast region.

We have begun an effort of joint position planning among the universities and agencies throughout the region. This is, in part, a response to a concern that downsizing and early retirement programs coupled with the hiring programs aimed at course needs could lead to the loss of certain types of expertise regionally or nationally. We also perceive a benefit in identifying unique strengths of individual institutions that might be more broadly and efficiently shared through distance course offerings and collaborative projects. With this in mind, we have started compiling information on faculty and scientist positions, institutional strengths, and program strategic

CONTINUED ON PAGE 10

Western Region

Charles R. Hatch, Chair

The western region held its fall meeting at Traverse City, MI, in conjunction with the NAPFSC General Assembly meeting. Actions taken at the meeting included the following.

RREA Summary

The final draft of a brochure summarizing RREA activities in the western region was distributed and modifications to it were discussed. Copies of that brochure now have been distributed to each of the western region members, the NAPFSC national office, and to Larry Biles in CSREES. A limited number of additional copies also are available from the Western Region Chair. It attractively articulates key issues in the western region and notes RREA’s response to them on a state by state basis.

Comparative Data Survey

The Western Region, for a second consecutive year, is conducting a “Western Forestry Schools Comparative Data Survey” of its members. Statistics on enrollment, credit hour production, funding levels, and personnel and salaries are being collected. A complete set of data is provided to all participating members.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 12



Executive Liaison's Message

Terri Bates



Bates

In the new position of Executive Liaison I have had a warm reception from both NAPFSC members and the forestry/natural resource community. I hope my position increasingly provides a central point of contact for and on behalf of NAPFSC for information, coordination and general staffing assistance. Al Vogt has

provided direct guidance, and through regularly scheduled conference calls that have included Al, Perry Brown, Greg Brown and Randy Nuckolls, I have gradually caught up with much of NAPFSC's on-goings and business.

From the start much of my work has been geared towards the planning and preparation for the February Summit on "Sustaining America's Forests: The Role of Research, Education and Extension" that NAPFSC and CSREES are cosponsoring. I have also been working with Bill Bentley and Boyd Post of CSREES to help get a new NAPFSC publication underway which will depict the crucial role of university research, education and extension. Both Al Vogt and Bill discuss these in more detail in their newsletter reports. The newsletter is another area I have become involved with in terms of facilitating its production and content, however, Arlice Banks at Virginia Tech retains all the credit for really making it happen.

Roundtable on Sustainable Forests

As NAPFSC's representative, I have participated in several sessions of a group that has become known as the Roundtable on Sustainable Forests. This is the outgrowth of a meeting of senior federal agency officials last summer led by Forest Service Chief Mike Dombeck to discuss a commitment to implementing the Montreal Process Criteria and Indicators (C&I). Follow-up sessions have broadened the group to nonfederal organizations including NAPFSC.

Given the nature of the subject, progress and process have been relatively slow going. Discussions by the group have explored questions such as the role of the

CONTINUED ON PAGE 12

Past President's Message

Gregory N. Brown

In the August 1998 NAPFSC newsletter past president's message, I identified two priority areas being considered by the FY 2000 Board on Agriculture (NASULGC) Budget Committee for increased funding, i.e., Food Safety and Agroecosystem Management. Those two areas have now been modified to five targeted activities within the mission focus areas which are: (1) an agricultural system that is highly competitive in the global economy, (2) greater harmony between agriculture and the environment, (3) a safe and secure food and fiber system, (4) healthy, well-nourished children, youth, and families, and (5) enhanced economic opportunity and quality of life for citizens and communities.

Each of these targeted activities has several subsets. I have been representing forestry's interests and attempting to modify the wording under each of these targeted activity areas and subset areas to be more representative of forestry, forest-land owners, and forest-land management to make them more visible. Currently the plan is to request an increase for formula and competitive funding across the five targeted activity areas. I am attempting to have the Renewable Resources Extension Act (RREA) allocation increased under an appropriate targeted activity area. I think the case being made is rather compelling for RREA funding increase because of the need to provide nonindustrial private forest (NIPF) landowners increased educational programs in order to meet the future demand for forest resources and products. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) uses the previous fiscal years OMB base upon which to build, not the final budget passed by the Congress. As you recall, in FY 99 research formula funding received a seven percent increase and Extension formula funding received a three percent increase from the Congress. OMB has recommended a decrease in formula funding, an increase in the Natural Research Initiative (NRI) funding, the addition of the \$120 million new initiative and a reinstatement of the Fund for Rural America. It is felt, however, that the Congress will not support the new initiative or the Fund for Rural America because, particularly on the House side Appropriations Committee, there is sentiment opposed to mandatory budget initiatives and the loose wording which would provide the executive branch with too much flexibility in providing funding for specific interests. In reality we may have to work with the

CONTINUED ON PAGE 12



President's Message

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 2

to complete and deliver the report by mid-summer 1999. A draft outline will be ready to use as background material for NAPFSC's Summit planned for February 1999. In addition, we would like to obtain some form of support statements from key congressional advocates as well as stakeholder groups.

Cultural Diversity

Perry Brown and I have been discussing the future plans for the Minorities in Natural Resources (MINFORS) conferences with Robert Lewis, Deputy Chief for Research, USFS and with people in the National Society of Minorities Agriculture, Natural Resources and Related Sciences (MANNRS). We are planning to associate the next MINFORS conference with the annual meeting of MANNRS in April 1999 at Virginia

Tech. This should improve both groups' efforts and provide more exposure of minorities to the fields of study and careers in natural resources. Perry's report from the annual meeting details recommendations for actions within NAPFSC to include cultural diversity in NAPFSC. In summary, I continue to believe we are making important progress in pursuit of our purpose as an association and are gaining opportunities as we do. Thanks to all of you for your contributions to the effort.

Executive Liaison

The assistance of Terri Bates, NAPFSC's Executive Liaison, has been essential to our progress on the Summit, the Silver Bullet and the Newsletter. She has also well represented NAPFSC at several important meetings in the DC area. ■

Regional Reports

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 8

directions from throughout the region. We hope to share this information among institutions at our spring meeting.

We discussed USDA CSREES reviews in an effort to offer input that might further enhance the utility of the reviews. There was a generally positive assessment of the utility and value of these reviews. Both the CSREES representative and the institutions agreed that the reviews were most helpful when the programs clearly defined the objective for the review at that institution and followed with proposed action steps to address important issues.

Finally, there was general satisfaction expressed about the importance and value of the regional meetings and actions and further recognition that time is the chief limiting factor in our accomplishing more at the regional level. With that in mind, there was some discussion of creating a small fund (perhaps \$150-\$200 per institution) that the regional chair may use to expedite information gathering and dissemination. This concept was generally endorsed, although no formal action was taken on this matter. ■

Committee Reports

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 4

Success Stories. This section includes several stories of successful mixes of research, education and extension serving clients. The section concludes with understanding the future in terms of partnerships and alliances to target specific problems and desired results.

Summary of Argument and Opportunities.

Actions to Improve Reader Support to Serve their Interests.

NAPFSC members who wish to contribute success stories should contact me at (wbentley@esf.edu). ■

Feature Article

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 5

The goal of this symposium is to identify specific actions that can be taken by both forestry educators and employers to help close the education gaps identified in the nationwide survey. The expected outcome is a detailed strategy for closer cooperation among educators, employers, federal and state governments, and other interested stakeholders to ensure that tomorrow's forestry professionals are fully equipped to address the growing challenges of practicing sustainable forestry.

The information collected in the study, as well as the symposium summary, will be contained in a final project report expected in late spring of 1999. The results of the study will also be published in the May 1999 issue of the *SAF Journal of Forestry*. For further information about the report or the symposium, please contact Nadine Block, Research Fellow, by email at neblock@pinchot.org or by phone at (202) 797-6585. ■



NASF and the National Research Council Study: A Perspective

*Gary L. Hergenrader, President
National Association of State Foresters*

With the publication of the 1998 National Research Council's study "Forested Landscapes in Perspective: Prospects and Opportunities for Sustainable Management of America's Nonfederal Forests" a strategic objective of NASF was finally fulfilled: to see published a national study of the opportunities provided by nonindustrial private forestlands to help meet society's needs for the goods and services provided by forestlands. It was a long time in coming, having had its genesis in discussions leading up to the 1990 Farm Bill. For the first time ever there was a Forestry title in the Bill and within that title was a section calling for the establishment of a national commission on private forestlands. That language ultimately resulted in the study recently completed by the National Research Council. The state foresters' view this study as a landmark in modern forestry and an opportunity to make strategic investments in forest sustainability.

The study confirms what state foresters have been contending all along—that private and public investments in nonfederal forests, while notable, are far below the investment opportunities and potential gains these lands represent. Currently in the United States, the value of timber delivered to mills is higher than the annual value of corn, of soybeans or of hay. The forest products industry employs about 1.6 million people and pays annual wages over \$45 billion. More than 60 percent of the harvest that supports this important sector of the economy comes from nonindustrial private forestlands. But, these lands have the potential to do much more, not only in terms of providing forest products but also in providing public benefits like long-term watershed health, wildlife and fish resources and stabilization of rural economies. NIPF lands could benefit most from targeted federal investments that would help educate the more than 9.9 million NIPF landowners about the multiple benefits their lands can produce through forest management and provide the technical assistance they need to help realize the objectives they have for their forestlands.



“The study confirms what state foresters have been contending all along—that private and public investments in nonfederal forests, while notable, are far below the investment opportunities and potential gains these lands represent.”

The reality is, however, that fewer than 20 percent of NIPF owners have written management plans for their land. Before these owners are likely to take some management action on their lands, they must be made aware of the diversity of opportunities that can become reality through forest management. When landowner's decide to actually do something with their land to achieve whatever objectives they desire, foresters must be available to provide the technical assistance that will help guide their management actions.

NAPFSC clearly has a role to play in the arena related to educational outreach and research. Funding for landowner educational programs (extension) has been far below what is needed. For example, the Renewable Resources Extension Act has been funded at around \$3 million per year for

the past several years. In NASF's opinion, this level is far below the actual need. The NRC study provides a basis and justification for increasing that level substantially. NASF looks forward to participating in the upcoming Forestry Summit with the anticipation and expectation that there will be an initiative developed to address the educational and research needs identified in the NRC report. Moreover, we will continue, in the future as we have in the past, to join our NAPFSC partners in emphasizing the important role forestry education and research plays and to work hard to obtain budgets that reflect the real need.

NASF will be using the NRC study to support a major budget increase request for state and private forestry for FY 2000. While the final budget position will be determined after the President's budget is delivered, a program of over \$250 million would just begin to address the study recommendations of the NRC report. ■



President-Elect's Message

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 6

new members to NAPFSC and to determine the organizational and financial consequences of admitting new members. The Executive Committee needs to determine the consequences associated with implementing action D-1 and D-2 of the strategic plan which calls for an Executive Committee appointment of a "Cultural Diversity National Committee" with regional representation. To the extent that the consequences of adding minority members and establishing a Cultural Diversity National Committee chaired by an Executive Committee member are positive and that there are interested minority institutions, the Executive Committee needs to prepare recommendations to the membership to add minority institution members to

NAPFSC and to establish an Executive Committee position for Cultural Diversity, with appropriate changes in the Articles of Organization.

Individual member institutions will need to develop appropriate activities for them to attract and retain minority faculty and students. However, NAPFSC can be a facilitator in helping members learn ideas and techniques that might be effective in cultural diversification. The National Cultural Diversity Committee would be the locus of such facilitation. In addition, it would be the committee that would lead NAPFSC's participation in activities such as MINFORS, cultural diversity training workshops, and other national and regional events. ■

Executive Liaison's Message

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 9

Roundtable, federal and nonfederal participation, whether the scope should be limited to only C&I implementation, the inclusion of rangelands, etc. A draft charter has yet to be finally agreed upon.

Tangible activities to date include a federal agency Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), a Forest Service commitment to implementing C&I with particular focus on using them as performance based success measures, a draft Charter, documentation of what federal agencies are doing in terms of C&I Implementation and completion of a "data gap analysis." Nonfederal participants are exploring a "symbolic" equivalent to the federal MOU and documenting "who is doing what" outside the federal sphere. Other efforts include: determining what

similar activities may be occurring for other ecosystems/sectors; a compilation of US agreements/commitments related to C&I and sustainable forest management, and development of a communication and outreach strategy for the Roundtable process. The Forest Service has contracted with the Meridian Institute of Dillon, CO, to facilitate the Roundtable; the next meeting is planned for February 24 in Washington, DC. I have thoroughly enjoyed working with NAPFSC and encourage folks to contact me whenever I can be of assistance. You can reach me at (703) 538-1134 or via e-mail at (Bates-Stasny@erols.com). ■



Regional Reports

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 8

Participation of External Research Organizations at WNAFSC Meetings

Historically, members from USDA, Forest Service research stations geographically located near the site of the Western Region NAPFSC meeting were invited to attend the meeting. The Western Region decided at its fall meeting to formally arrange to have a USDA, Forest Service research station member represent that organization at Western Region NAPFSC meetings regardless of its location to formalize and institutionalize ties between the two organizations. This new partnership model is expected to be in place by the spring meeting 1999.

Spring Meeting

The spring meeting of WNAFSC is being scheduled at Moscow, Idaho, in April 1999. ■

Past President's Message

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 9

Congressional Appropriations committees this coming year to get back to the FY 99 baseline funding.

Stay tuned. I will try to keep you informed of the progress. I also will be serving on the Board on Agriculture (NASULGC) FY 2001 Budget Committee, which will be cranking up its operations early in 1999. ■



NAPFSC News Briefs

1999 NAPFSC Annual Meeting

Mark your calendars for September 9-11 in Portland, Oregon, for NAPFSC's 1999 Annual Meeting! We plan to begin mid-afternoon on the 9th. As last year, we will collect all written reports to print in the summer newsletter in advance of the meeting. Please be on the lookout for information requesting submission of your reports. ■

Virginia Tech Signs MOU with Turkish Forest Service

Lynn Davis, Public Relations Specialist, Virginia Tech

Virginia Tech's College of Forestry and Wildlife Resources has initiated a partnership with the Turkish Forest Service. Forestry professor and coordinator of the program, Shep Zedaker, hosted a delegation from the Turkish Forest Service's silviculture department. The group toured Virginia Tech's facilities and southwestern Virginia with the week culminating in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for a reciprocal exchange visit. During the Blacksburg visit, Burhanettin Seckin, head of the Turkish Forest Service Department of Silviculture, gave a lecture on forestry in his country to the college. The MOU, signed by College Dean Greg Brown and the Director General of the Turkish Forest Service, Hasan Basri Canli, calls for the development of a cooperative project between the college and the Turkish Forest Service to provide training and technology transfer to Turkey. ■

New National Research Council Study

Terri Bates, NAPFSC Executive Liaison

A new NRC study on National Research Capacity in Forestry is underway at the instigation of the US Forest Service. In preparation, a workshop will be held in Washington, DC, on July 15-16 to assess the educational and technical needs of forest researchers and land managers and the capacity of existing university curricula, particularly at the graduate level, for the training of those professionals. This workshop will provide basic information for use in a major follow-on study that will address the specific research capacity of the Forest Service and universities. A "Consensus Committee" is expected to be established with the specific charge to summarize the workshop results and make recommendations in the final report. NAPFSC has agreed to provide a limited amount of financial support for the workshop. ■

National Research Council Nonfederal Forests Study Implementation

Terri Bates, NAPFSC Executive Liaison

George Moeller, recently Deputy Director of the Pacific Northwest Experiment Station, has been assigned for the next year to the Forest Service Washington Office to begin the work of implementing the 1998 National Research Council's (NRC) Report "Forest Landscapes in Perspective: Prospects and Opportunities for Sustainable Management of America's Nonfederal Forests." Based with the Cooperative Forestry Assistance staff, he is charged with establishing a consensus among groups and organizations on how and where to begin implementation. His role will entail both coordinating within Forest Service and with partner agencies and organizations. All input is welcome. George can be reached at (202) 205-1389. ■

Teaming with Wildlife

Terri Bates, NAPFSC Executive Liaison

Legislation (S. 25) that would direct revenues from outer continental shelf (OCS) oil and gas drilling to affected communities was introduced in the Senate January 19. The Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 1999 would also provide major funding for state recreation and wildlife conservation programs. The bill provides one half of outer continental shelf revenues to coastal state communities, state park, recreation, and wildlife conservation programs and federal land acquisition. Funds would be distributed to 34 coastal states, including the states that border the Great Lakes based on coastline miles and population. For land and water conservation, the bill would direct money from oil and gas drilling to all 50 states. States would be allowed to use funds for wildlife conservation programs, namely to increase fish and wildlife populations and improve fish and wildlife habitat.

An estimated \$4.1 billion from OCS drilling goes into the federal treasury annually. Only a portion of the funds authorized for the Land Water Conservation Fund are appropriated each year and these used only for land acquisition; the state-side portion has been zeroed out. Senate cosponsors include Frank Murkowski (R-AK), Mary Landrieu (D-LA), Trent Lott (R-MS), John Breaux (D-LA), Tad Cochran (R-MS), Tim Johnson (D-SD), Barbara Mikulski (D-MD), Jeff Sessions (R-AL), Max Cleland (D-GA) and Judd Gregg (R-NH). The House version is expected to be reintroduced shortly. Both bills were first introduced in October 1998. Hearings are expected at later dates. ■



Washington, DC Update

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 7

placed on how those lands can be used.

Clinton's proposal would add hundreds of thousands of acres to America's protected lands and would release hundreds of millions of dollars to state and local governments to set aside farmland and wetlands and expand city parks. Clinton is also expected to call on Congress to extend permanent wilderness protection for five million acres of federal lands that already are incorporated in national parks and refuges.

Bipartisan legislation has been introduced in both the House and Senate to provide increased funding for national conservation and recreation programs, similar to President Clinton's proposal. The House legislation, introduced by Congressmen Don Young (R-AK) and John Dingell (D-MI), will use funds from the Federal Outer Continental Shelf revenues to provide substantial increases in wildlife and land conservation funds.

New Committee Assignments

The House and Senate Appropriations Committees have organized for the 106th Congress. Listed at right are the members of the Agriculture and Interior appropriations subcommittees that deal with most of the federal forestry funding. ■



Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee

House

Republicans

Joe Skeen (NM), Chairman
James Walsh (NY)
Jay Dickey (AR)
Jack Kingston (GA)
George Nethercutt (WA)
Henry Bonilla (TX)
Tom Latham (IA)
Jo Ann Emerson (MO)

Democrats

Marcy Kaptur (OH), Ranking Member
Rosa DeLauro (CT)
Maurice Hinchey (NY)
Sam Farr (CA)
Allen Boyd (FL)

Senate

Republicans

Thad Cochran (MS), Chairman
Arlen Specter (PA)
Christopher Bond (MO)
Slade Gorton (WA)
Mitch McConnell (KY)
Conrad Burns (MT)

Democrats

Herb Kohl (WI), Ranking Member
Tom Harkin (IA)
Byron Dorgan (ND)
Dianne Feinstein (CA)
Richard Durbin (IL)

Interior Appropriations Subcommittee

House

Republicans

Ralph Regula (OH), Chairman
Jim Kolbe (AZ)
Joe Skeen (NM)
Charles Taylor (NC)
George Nethercutt (WA)
Zach Wamp (TN)
Jack Kingston (GA)
John Peterson (PA)

Democrats

Norm Dicks (OR), Ranking Member
John Murtha (PA)
Jim Moran (VA)
Bud Cramer (AL)
Maurice Hinchey (NY)

Senate

Republicans

Slade Gorton (WA), Chairman
Ted Stevens (AK)
Thad Cochran (MS)
Pete Domenici (NM)
Conrad Burns (MT)
Robert Bennett (UT)
Judd Gregg (NH)
Ben Nighthorse Campbell (CO)

Democrats

Robert C. Byrd (WV), Ranking Member
Patrick Leahy (VT)
Fritz Hollings (SC)
Harry Reid (NV)
Herb Kohl (WI)
Patty Murray (WA)
Dianne Feinstein (CA)



Enhancing Federal Funding Opportunities A Report from the Annual Meeting

Randy Nuckolls

NAPFSC members participated in three informative sessions at the annual meeting in Traverse City, Michigan on ways to expand federal funding sources for university-based research and extension activities for forestry. NAPFSC Washington Counsel, Randy Nuckolls, moderated these sessions. Panel participants included USDA official and RREA program manager Larry Biles, Dean Al Ek of the University of Minnesota and Scott Berg of the American Forest and Paper Association.

Randy Nuckolls opened each session with a review of the status of the federal budget process and the trends for federally funded research at USDA and other federal agencies. He also gave an update to participants on funding levels for programs including the McIntire-Stennis Cooperative Forestry Research program, the Renewable Resources Extension Act program, NRI and other specific USDA sources of funding for NAPFSC programs.

Larry Biles then provided an excellent overview of the federal budget process and yearly timetable. Larry's presentation emphasized for participants how critical it is for NAPFSC to progress in its involvement with USDA and OMB on budget and issues since the executive branch budgeting process begins at the agency level a full calendar year before the final president's budget is released to Congress for any particular fiscal year. Larry also outlined the various pressure points inside USDA as the yearly budget is developed and encouraged NAPFSC members to be more active at all levels of USDA and at OMB in pushing for significant increases that are long overdue in our base programs (McIntire-Stennis and RREA).

Al Ek was next on the panel with a discussion of "do's and don'ts" for NAPFSC members in promoting our programs on individual campuses and with each NAPFSC members Congressional delegation. Ek encouraged all participants to allocate time to travel to Washington, DC, to visit with congressional offices, to contact Congressional representatives by telephone, e-mail or letter and to work with university governmental affairs officers on issues of importance to forestry research and extension. Al Ek also described his activities as the Chairman of USDA's Forest Research Advisory Committee.

The final panelist was Scott Berg of AF&PA who challenged NAPFSC members to not only continue to work hard for enhanced federal funding for forestry activities but to also work smarter. Berg described the priority setting process that AF&PA's research committee had undertaken. This priority setting led to the industry's Project 2020 which has identified four critical areas of focus for keeping the US forest products industry competitive. Berg identified these "critical pathways" where greater research is needed as (1) biotechnology, (2) soil productivity, (3) remote sensing and (4) forest physiology. Scott then informed the participants about the successes of Project 2020 in obtaining funds from the Office of Industrial Technology at the Department of Energy and in identifying new programs within the research program of the Forest Service. Scott encouraged NAPFSC to expand its horizons in looking for funding outside of USDA's traditional programs. He was candid, however, in stating that AF&PA believes it is very important for university-based forestry research programs to more closely match its future research agendas with the needs of the industry and nonindustrial landowners. Scott's presentation led to a discussion of new sources for federal funding opportunities at EPA, DOE, NASA and within major Presidential initiatives like global warming research and the Clean Water Action plan.

All three sessions provided lively discussions of the need for greater understanding within the federal bureaucracy about the growing challenges facing nonfederal forest lands. Everyone recognized that too little in federal resources has been applied to nonfederal land issues and that with less timber cutting occurring on the public lands, more research and landowner technical assistance will be imperative in the years ahead if the nonfederal lands are to remain economically and environmentally sustainable. These sessions were an excellent conclusion to the NAPFSC meeting in Traverse City and underscored the importance of the Summit meeting "Sustaining America's Forests: The Role of Research, Education and Extension" being sponsored by NAPFSC and USDA's Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service in February 1999. Participants left the Traverse City sessions with much food for thought for the upcoming Summit. ■



NAPFSC

R E P O R T

A report to the members of the National Association of Professional Forestry Schools and Colleges



National Association of Professional
Forestry Schools and Colleges
Arlice K. Banks, NAPFSC Report Designer and Editor
College of Forestry and Wildlife Resources
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
324 Cheatham Hall, Mail Code 0324
Blacksburg, VA 24061