

NAUFRP Executive Committee

November 14, 2017

Albuquerque, NM

NAUFRP Executive Committee: Keith Belli, President (University of Tennessee); Jim Allen, Past President (Northern Arizona University); David Newman, President-Elect (SUNY-ESF); Katy Kavanagh, Texas A&M University (Secretary-Treasurer); Dale Greene, Southern Regional Chair (University of Georgia); John Hayes, BAC Representative (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 Florida); Andrew Ezell, Extension Chair (Mississippi State University); Linda Nagel, Western Regional Chair (Colorado State University); Mark Rickenbach, North Central Regional Chair (University of Wisconsin-Madison); Bob Wagner, At-Large Member (Purdue University); Kamran Abdollahi, Diversity Chair (Southern University); Stephen 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: Ching-Hsun Huang (Northern Arizona University); Keith Blatner (Washington State University); Matt McBroom (Stephen F Austin University), Adrian Leighton (Salish Kootenai); Greg Yarrow (Clemson University); Ted Howard (University of New Hampshire)

NAUFRP Guests: Buck Vandersteen (CARET Liaison); Larry Biles, Kansas State Forester and NASF Liaison

A motion was made by Jim Allen and seconded by Mary Watzin to approve the minutes from the March 6-7, 2017 Executive Committee meeting in Washington, D.C. Terry Sharik requested a revision on page 2. The minutes were unanimously approved subject to the correction noted.

Keith reviewed the agenda. There are several additional items to discuss. Dan Robison (West Virginia University) is currently attending the Association of Public Land-grant Universities (APLU) annual meeting in Washington, D.C. Their Board of Agriculture is proceeding with a new approach intended to simplify messaging on appropriations on the Hill. This was discussed at the March NAUFRP meeting. John Hayes said the functionality is the same; the difference is it will all be bundled differently. Wendy Fink of APLU has mentioned to Keith that the University of the District of Columbia (UDC) is interested in McIntire-Stennis (McS) funding; they have an urban forestry program. NAUFRP is supportive of McS funding to new programs so long as the institution meets McS requirements and there is a corresponding appropriations increase. This applies to the tribal colleges. Adrian said it will take a while for the tribal schools to build capacity; as tribal programs evolve, McS allocations in four states may be affected. Eric Norland pointed out that UDC is not in a state and the McS formula is based on land base and forest cover. Dale questioned whether NAUFRP should seek changes in the McS legislation to demonstrate what is being done. Red agreed; this would provide an opportunity for a substantive conversation to describe the value of the McS program. Dale thought it could be an incentive for strong programs to build capacity with smaller programs. Terry agrees with partnering; we are touching only a narrow base of natural resources and there is potential to do much more. John agreed it may be time to look at the McS legislation and formula. It may be time to take into account how the nature of forestry on public and private lands has changed so drastically over the last 50 years and the decline in the Forest Service Research and Development (R&D) program. Mary was cautious about doing anything in the current political environment. Randy noted that a revision of the McS Strategic Plan was just completed and changing the formula was not discussed. He also noted that the Forests in the Farm Bill (FIFB) Coalition was initially not going to include research language in their platform but that changed due to the NAUFRP reaction. The platform also includes making tribal colleges eligible for McS. Because the McS program is permanently authorized, we don't have to worry about anything else in the 2018 Farm Bill. Randy does not think McS should be tinkered with in the current Farm Bill reauthorization process; it would be better to look at the next one in five years. It would be best to put the energy into McS branding, working closely with NIFA, and identifying future issues NAUFRP needs to look beyond McS -- water and sustainability need to be part of the conversation.

Adrian said the tribal colleges are land grant institutions; they can tell a significant story about McS. Randy noted that a number of NAUFRP representatives have had the opportunity to talk to the new USDA Secretary Sonny Perdue. The USDA Forestry Research Advisory Committee (FRAC) has not met this year. They were waiting for new appointments but it has also gotten caught up in reviews by the new Administration. Another issue for discussion is institutions not spending all their McS funds.

Treasurer's Report, Katy Kavanagh: The final 2016 financial report was reviewed (handout) noting that income was \$17,000 above what had been anticipated in the 2016 budget. It appears that the 2017 expenditures and income are in line with what was anticipated in the budget. It is expected that \$115,000 will be carried into next year. There was a question whether that balance is where we want it to be. Randy said a 'best practice' for non-profits is to retain 35 to 50 percent of their yearly (9-12 months) operations as a reserve. Regional chairs were asked to follow-up with institutions who are not paying dues. A good opportunity is to touch base with new program leaders early in their tenure. A motion was made by Janaki Alavapati, seconded by Andy Ezell, to adopt the budget proposed for 2018. The motion passed unanimously.

Bibliometric Benchmarking Project, Rob Swihart: Rob linked in remotely and used a PowerPoint presentation to report on the study he had undertaken to benchmark faculty citation metrics at NAUFRP institutions. He has previously done this for the fish and wildlife institutions. NAUFRP contributed \$5,000 towards the project. Rob is close to finalizing and publishing the results which will be shared with NAUFRP.

Society of American Foresters (SAF): Fred Cabbage (President), Carol Redelsheimer (Science and Education Director) and John Barnwell (Policy Director): Fred discussed Matt Menashes' position. He is on leave until his contract expires in December; it will not be renewed. Fred reported on some of SAF's financial issues. Annual expenditures are about \$4 million and income is approximately \$3 million. The goal is to reach a stable financial platform. They want accreditation to pay for itself meaning an increase in the annual accreditation dues that academic institutions pay. This was discussed with the NAUFRP Executive Committee in March. The goal is to make the program sustainable. Dale feels another \$200-\$300 annually would be okay; others indicated the same. NAUFRP encouraged SAF to factor in inflation every year. Keith suggested it might be acceptable for the first increase to be a little more at first to catch up and asked what it would take to break even? Carol is uncertain but will determine that and bring it back to NAUFRP. Dale suggested changing the billing format: apply an increase every 2-3 years. Keith said he would like to have a breakdown of what it would take to break even. Accreditation fees are bringing in about \$60,000 annually; this is small in the scheme of \$1 million annual losses. Keith asked SAF to bring these numbers back to NAUFRP with a five year plan. Carol noted all committee (accreditation) members are volunteers and this is appreciated. Keith said NAUFRP wants to work with SAF more closely on advocacy and policy issues. SAF is already doing this for FS R&D; NAUFRP wants to be included. There was discussion about a member of the NAUFRP Executive Committee serving in some capacity (i.e., ex-officio) on the SAF Policy Committee. It doesn't have to be formal; the object would be to have a representative. Carol said the Logic Model has not been lost. Last year at the Madison Convention they focused on Oral History. Keith asked if there have been further conversations with FS about future commitments? John says yes and it appears positive but there is nothing formal. John Hayes asked about progress on the D&I front? How can NAUFRP be involved? Carol said they have formed a working group and are trying to incorporate measures through the Convention to develop leadership skills. They have a new student chapter at Southern University. Jim Allen asked about the status of CHEA and third party accreditation/certification. SAF has not done anything on this. Carol is trying to get funds into her budget to pursue this. Keith asked what are the significant costs? Fred said personnel are the bulk of the budget, followed by the convention deficits. Dale asked if the Certified Forester Program is a big loss. Fred said it not a big drag; it is more of a loss leader. Buck asked about the building and maintenance costs? They run \$50,000 to \$80,000 a year. It is an 80-year old building, with no ADA and with historic restrictions.

Rich Guldin, U.S. Endowment for Forestry and Communities: Rich described the several roles he is serving in for his post-Forest Service retirement. He is here today as a consultant to the Endowment to report on the finding of the Blue Ribbon Commission on Forests and Forest Products Research and Development in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century which was recently released. (Powerpoint presentation; later circulated to Executive Committee) The report was distributed to the NAUFRP membership. The core message is that major changes are needed in the forest research and development

sector to secure the future of forests in the US. Findings include: innovation has slowed, basic research has strong support and applied research has withered. The federal investment in forest research (FS R&D) has declined 36 percent in the last 50 years. By comparison, it has increased 18 percent in Canada. Federal funding for forest research comes through the Forest Service, NIFA, universities, NSF, DOE and SFI. Rich estimates that 20 percent of NSF grants involve forests. The university sector invests roughly \$150 million; this is a very soft number Rich says. Rich was asked what portion is research versus extension and teaching. Rich said they did not look at that question. Annually, an estimated \$700 million in funding goes into the forest research sector; it was more than \$1 billion in 1962 dollars. There were several questions for Rich: who are/were the Commissioners? How does it relate to FRAC? Is there a suggestion of refocusing university dollars? Local vs. regional vs. national priorities? Rich noted there are also a lot of state, local and regional impediments; Randy asked if these impediments were identified? Rich said the Endowment will push hard on a couple of recommendations. Keith proposes follow-up. Ali suggested NAUFRP seek a conference grant making it possible to look at some of these issues in more depth.

Washington Report, Randy Nuckolls: Congress is desperate to pass a tax bill and he thinks they will despite some negative (potential) impacts to higher education. Representatives of the higher education community are in DC now expressing strong concerns about certain provisions. With a number of announced Congressional retirements pending, the historical memory is being depleted. USDA still has many vacant positions. Fire legislation is still a big gorilla issue but is on a back burner because of all the fight over health care. The real push now is on taxes. The Continuing Resolution expires on December 8<sup>th</sup> and Randy believes it will be extended again through January. This means McS and similar programs are funded at current levels and funds are being depleted subject to the sequestration process. Another fight on the debt limit is looming. There is pressure to increase defense funding but the deficit will likely go to \$1.5 trillion because of the tax bill. APLU's Council for Government Affairs (and Cornerstone) has a group to focus on USDA appropriations. Randy encouraged everyone to visit with their government affairs reps on campus and give them information on NAUFRP priorities; the agriculture research community is certainly doing it. There was a question about taxing graduate student stipends; Randy said the university presidents are addressing this. We should keep the focus on our priorities.

Diversity Chair Report, Kamran Abdollahi: Kamran distributed a written report. The Diversity Logic Model was developed in partnership with SAF, US Forest Service and NAUFRP. Several actions have taken place as a result including the adoption of a SAF national Diversity and Inclusion (D&I) Policy, the creation of a Diversity and Inclusion Working Group, the establishment of a Diversity Leadership Award and several programs at the 2016 and 2017 SAF conventions. It was noted that the D&I Working Group has not been active.

Research Chair Report, Red Baker: Red distributed a written report. He and several from the Executive Committee visited NIFA in March 2017 and have plans to do so again in 2018. Currently, Red is working on wrapping up the McStennis Strategic Plan. The Goals that grew out of the Strategic Plan process correspond with NAUFRP's committee structure with the exception of communications. An Ad Hoc Committee on Communications was founded and is being led by Mary Watzin. A new issue that Red has come across deals with the STEM classification system and the US Department of Homeland Security (DHS). DHS does not recognize general forestry programs as STEM, however, they do consider Forest Science and Biology (and Urban Forestry) as STEM programs. This creates challenges for graduate students in pursuing additional schooling and employment. Red provided a listing of CIP Codes highlighting DHS recognized STEM majors and asked whether NAUFRP should approach DHS about revising this? Mark said they handled this with name changes. Keith asked how wide this issue is beyond DHS? Red is in favor of pursuing it. Janaki suggested writing DHS on NAUFRP letterhead. Keith thinks DHS is a good place to start and NAUFRP should follow-up. Red discussed plans for future agency visits. He is concerned with how to get faculty to connect with NIFA's national program leaders. Eric Norland encouraged continuing conversations with them and noted NIFA has state liaisons. They should be visited and engaged with regularly. Eric encouraged NAUFRP to stay on Sonny's radar. (Eric to provide the list of NIFA State Liaisons to Terri – it can be found on the NIFA website).

<https://nifa.usda.gov/sites/default/files/resource/POW-NPL-State-Liaison-Assignments-FY18-FINAL.pdf>

Discussion of winter 2018 dates: to be determined. Note CARET meets March 3-7. Randy encouraged NAUFRP members to host Congressional staff for campus tours. They are more free to do this if invited by the university. Dale recommended making these tours exclusive to forestry and involving state forestry and forestry associations. There was discussion about hosting a Congressional breakfast in March.

Policy Chair Report, Janaki Alavalapati: Janaki reviewed a written report. He noted that NAUFRP has worked with the Forests in the Farm Bill Coalition (FIFB) and the Forest Carbon Working Group (FCWG). The former has developed a platform for the 2018 Farm Bill legislative process. Five themes have been agreed upon to focus on: fire and forest health, forest dependent wildlife, keeping forests as forests, growing jobs and economies through forestry and improving and streamlining forest conservation programs. In March 2017, the FCWG finalized the "Roadmap for Forest Sector Carbon Resilience and Productivity". Links to both documents can be found on the NAUFRP website. Janaki also noted the joint letters NAUFRP has signed on various issues. These can also be found on the webpage. Janaki is interested in working with Red on the DHS STEM issue. Perhaps this is an area where APLU can also help.

Education Chair Report, Terry Sharik: Terry reviewed his written report which was distributed. He is still working on becoming a 'professional partner' with the International Forestry Student Association (IFSA). He has continued to build on the survey first administered to students attending the 2014 IUFRO World Congress. The findings have been presented and published in several venues. The results of an analysis of NAUFRP-member institutions to determine if there is a relationship between the proportion of women and minorities in the natural resources student body and the content of their respective websites was presented at the 2016 SAF. Terry has served on a SAF ad hoc steering committee that organized a diversity and inclusion session at the 2016 Convention. They recommended that a new SAF Working Group on Diversity and Inclusion be formed, which was recently approved by the SAF leadership. Terry was closely involved in the redesign of the NAUFRP website which is now operational. Terry continues to work with FAEIS administrators to increase participation from NAUFRP institutions in data collection. He served on an Advisory Committee for the Global Outlook on Forestry Education project jointly sponsored by IUFRO and IFSA.

International Report, Stephen Shaler: Steve has nothing strategic to report for the last six months. At the March meeting he discussed his meeting with the Canadian schools. He asked what APLU may be doing on the international level; he has not connected with them. Jim pointed out that we used to have an IUFRO liaison: it was Jim Johnson and then John Hayes. Steve should be appointed to this role.

Extension Report, Andy Ezell: Andy provided a written report. The Family Forests Education Award did not have as many nominations this year as he expected. Only one award is being made and that is in the comprehensive category; it will be presented to Oregon State University. He has provided feedback to the other award nominees. Andy attended a meeting of the Western Extension Foresters in Fort Collins and again found few familiar with the McS program. He will meet with the northeast extension area foresters in December.

### Regional Reports

Northeast, Mike Messina: The northeast area has 15-17 programs but only about six are active. Five of these will combine to host an Alumni Reunion here in Albuquerque. (They are Penn State, Maine, SUNY, NH and VT).

North Central, Mark Rickenbach: The Forest Service Northern Research Center has transitioned its headquarters to Madison. The Director position will be unified; the program leaders will not move.

Western, Linda Nagel: Western NAUFRP has about 20 programs; 10 will meet for lunch tomorrow and discuss ways to better engage the western schools. Their mid-June meeting was in Montana at Salish Kooteani. A discussion point then was the Western Coalition of State Foresters. They are housed in Denver and the current chair is Mike Lester (who reports to John Hayes). Jim Allen met with the Coalition some years ago; at that time they were not interested in including the universities.

Southern, Dale Greene: Southern NAUFRP met with the Southern Group of State Foresters (SGSF) in Arkansas last June; 6-8 schools participated. Keith and Dale wrote a letter to the USDA Secretary about McS funding. Dale saw Secretary Sonny Purdue in July and had a couple of opportunities to talk with him. Dale is pleased that Tony Tooke is the new Forest Service Chief: he understands private land forestry issues. Also discussed at the June meeting were the SGSF hiring needs and growth of intern programs. Southern NAUFRP plans to meet in 2018 in conjunction with the Forest Landowners Association in Lake Oconee, GA on June 27-29. Dale added that he attended one of the USDA Listening Sessions; he was introduced as the UGA Dean but also as a member of NAUFRP. He talked about forest health and big data issues. Dale recommended staying in contact with FRA, NASF, and the National Council of Forestry Association Executives.

Budget and Advocacy Committee, John Hayes: John participates in monthly BAC calls. There has not been much to engage on recently. They are going to the 'one ask' as discussed earlier. John is not knowledgeable about what will happen with the budget in the new Administration.

Board of Natural Resources, John Hayes: John reported that the APLU Board of Agriculture plans a survey of what skills employers want from new college graduate. Wendy Fink (APLU) is not confident she has a good list of employers to reach out to and needs NAUFRP's help if it is to be of value to us. Terry said the Pinchot Survey developed such a list; it would be useful to obtain it for Wendy from Will Price at the Pinchot Institute. Other areas we can help with are the non-land grant universities engaged in forestry.

Forest Health Initiative, John Hayes: John has been working NAUFRP's draft Forest Health Initiative through the APLU process. He distributed a handout which covered the outline, writing needs and steering committee. The Steering Committee reflects the APLU structure, process, and diversity of representatives needed to help see the Initiative through. There was some discussion about broadening the Initiative to Canada. For now, people have been identified to flesh out and serve on the writing team. There will be 3-4 pages for each section; the key has been to get the right people -- high level of expertise with comprehensive overview. Keith suggested the USDA Listening Session may be a means to highlight forest health issues. Mary, Keith and Dale have testified. Written comments may be submitted. Keith will send out a reminder on the Listening Sessions again. There was discussion about broadening the Steering Committee to include the USFS; their input would be of value. A Steering Committee might also include a review component and gather stakeholder input (FS, regions, industry,...).

McStennis Branding Strategy, Mary Watzin: Mary volunteered to lead on this. She worked with Will Novy-Hildesley of the North American Forest Partnership (NAFP) on how to identify the essence of branding and how to use it. A workshop is planned for the General Assembly tomorrow and Will is going to link in. Red believes SAF needs to better understand that the future forestry generation will come from the universities and SAF should acknowledge and support our priorities. Mary said we have to make the case for capacity and continuity in our research programs. Eric pointed out that McStennis funds can be used for administration projects: 'you can write your own stories'. Randy said the agriculture schools are doing a very good job with leave behind materials for the Hill. He asked everyone to prepare a paragraph on how McStennis has improved one thing in your state and/or what has changed in your state's forestry landscape for the better that can be traced to a faculty member or graduate student as a result of McStennis (ie BMPs). Ali really needs this kind of information. NAUFRP would like to see Catalino's notebook; a lot of valuable material was pulled together for the McStennis review. The NIFA Data Gateway can also provide quite a bit of information going back to 2002.

Louie Tupas, Deputy Director for Bioenergy, Climate and Environment, USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture: "Share Your Science" is a NIFA program intended to highlight research outcomes and accomplishments by agency partners. Please send Eric, Daniel and Catalino information on your key achievements. The physical USDA Listening Sessions have been completed. December 1 is the deadline for submitting written comments to the NIFA website; Keith will send a reminder to NAUFRP institutions. Louie assures that NIFA listens to this input. They are seeking ideas on how to manage big data. Ideas on this are welcome. The Secretary has an important new 'blogging' element to the USDA website; check it out. Louie will send way to share ideas on it. The Secretary also has a Task Force under way addressing rural issues. Louie talked about Forest Research Advisory Committee (FRAC) and the National Agricultural

Research, Extension, Education and Economics Advisory Board. Nominations to both have been held up due to the new Administration's review process. Louie pointed out under Farm Bill Section 310 that Forest Products Research is authorized at \$7 million but has never been funded. It is an opportunity for partnerships and relates to the Forest Products Lab (FPL). NIFA has a MOU with FS R&D and a good relationship with the FPL. There are opportunities for partnerships with the Commodity Boards and AFRI can work with them. They have started discussions with the Softwood Lumber Board and have the ability to share funding for specific projects. The last time the National Needs Fellowship focused on forestry was seven years ago. Louie thinks it is time to do so again. He will work with his education counterpart to help facilitate this. There is a program for a research-extension experience for undergraduates; funding is available for summer programs that cover areas like genetics, business, silviculture. This is again in the education area but Louie can help facilitate connecting forestry to it. NIFA is looking at ways to encourage positive youth development -- how to engage them in forestry working with extension. Sixty percent of NIFA funds go to applied science. Private landowners want tools (i.e., apps, models) that will help them manage their lands. They trust the science and want the tools. This all relates to small business innovation which comes under Louie (i.e., patents). Randy asked if Louie had any sense when the President's budget will be released; Louie did not. He was asked when the next request for AFRI applications would be? The target date is January 2018.

McStennis Carryover Funds: Keith was made aware by NIFA back in July that 31 institutions had 78% (\$4 million) in unspent McStennis carryover funds. There is concern when funds of this amount are left on the table and would have to be given back. Ali followed up with these institutions. Keith feels we cannot ask for more McS dollars when there is significant unspent money. Keith would like a heads-up earlier to ensure these funds are utilized and the schools have a chance to share/transfer them if needed. David thinks this might just be oversight. The report goes to Ali and he worked to get the funds encumbered (only 3 schools returned funds) and a three month extension. Keith asked Louie to provide timely notice on this issue and he committed to doing so. John believes this is a cash flow problem given the dollar amount so late in the year; institutions need to manage the carryover.

Buck Vandersteen, CARET Liaison and National Council of Forestry Association Executives: CARET stands for the Council for Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching. Buck has been a member for some years and it was agreed back in March that he serve in a liaison role with NAUFRP. The role of CARET is to provide the land-grant universities with true stakeholder support. He encouraged NAUFRP to get to know who CARET is. There are 250 stakeholders that go to the House and Senate to specifically talk about agriculture/forestry research and extension programs. Buck discussed the Congressional Working Forest Caucus pointing out that forestry does have champions in Congress. The HEARD (Hunting, Education and Recreational Development) Act is proposed legislation that would direct federal agencies to identify excess property to sell. Resulting revenue would be distributed back to the states where the property is for educational and recreational purposes. CARET is very supportive. Most of this land is in the west. The funds would be split along the following lines: 15% state, 15 % land grants, 10% counties.

John Hall, Joint Fire Science Program (JFSP): John distributed a handout. The JFSP is a competitive, extramural, interdisciplinary research program with a visibility and branding problem. It hasn't shown how value is added to science. It is a mix of applied science that solves real problems. Their clientele are viewed too narrowly (i.e., federal fire managers). The challenge is to message why fire science is needed. Processes are changing as well as funding. There are implications with the Forest Service going to no year funding. They fund front-end; are subject to carryover. Last year, USDI instituted a new process for this year through executive cooperative agreements USDA gets \$8 million and USDI \$8 million; \$16 million is authorized. Prior to FY17, there was \$13 million of which \$8 was for research. In FY 17, the program was reduced to \$9 million. John Hayes would like this to be on the agenda in March.

Pete Ziegler, Project Leader, Food and Agriculture Education Information System (FAEIS): Communication is key between NAUFRP institutions and FAEIS. Pete is working with APLU. He wants to talk to the NAUFRP regions about those institutions not responding. Terry said in the past we have dealt with the forestry academic units but not with the natural resources programs in other parts of the institution (i.e., wildlife). FAEIS may now be in a position to broaden their reach to the university level with our help. They are able to filter out areas like geology and geography.

*Approved March 5, 2018 – Washington, D.C.*