



**College of Forestry Dean's Office**

Oregon State University  
109 Richardson Hall  
Corvallis, Oregon 97331

**P** 541-737-1585  
forestry.oregonstate.edu

**Forestry Executive Committee (FEC) Meeting**

**Agenda for Wednesday, November 1, 2017**

9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.

Richardson Hall 115

9:00 a.m.      **Opening Remarks** – Anthony S. Davis

9:02 a.m.      **Update from the Dean** – Thomas Maness

9:10 a.m.      **Pressing Issues/Important Updates:**  
**Research Forests** – Steve Fitzgerald  
**Marketing and Communications** – Michael Collins  
**\*Strategic Initiatives** – Geoff Huntington  
**Research Support Faculty** – Keith Olsen, Michelle Day  
**Research Office**– Melora Park  
**FES Department** – Troy Hall, Steve Strauss (Interim Faculty Rep.)  
**Computing Resources** – Terralyn Vandetta  
**International Programs** – Michele Justice  
**FERM Department** – Claire Montgomery, Jeff Hatten  
**FOBC** – Roger Admiral, Penny Wright  
**Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion** – Heather Roberts  
**WSE Department** – Eric Hansen, Rakesh Gupta  
**Foundation Development** – Zak Hansen, Marlys Amundson  
**Staff Affairs** – TBD  
**Student Services** – Randy Rosenberger  
**\*TallWood Design Institute** – Iain Macdonald  
**Forestry Extension** – Jim Johnson

10:00 a.m.      **Open Discussion after Updates**

- **\*Suggested Revisions to Administrative Memo 31: Participation and Recognition of Faculty Activity in Policy Development**

10:20 a.m.      **\*Topic of the Month: Positioning the College for Success** – Thomas Maness, Anthony S. Davis  
Our ranking as #2 in the world is getting a lot of great attention and also leads to the important question: How do we make sure that we succeed in all the facets of our College? That ranking is based on our research productivity – we also aspire to be recognized at that level in teaching, extension, and engagement. What attributes does it take to be the best, and where are we exceeding vs. failing?

10:55 a.m.      **Wrap-up**

11:00 a.m.      **Adjourn**

***\* Attachments Included***

<b>ACTION ITEM TRACKING</b>	
10/06/17	RSF Faculty Professional Development Funding Change Proposal - Approved
10/06/17	Request for Space Committee to be Re-activated
10/06/17	Blodgett Forest Options Discussion – Special Meeting held 10/17/17

<b>IMPORTANT DATES</b>			
<b>Date</b>	<b>Event</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Location</b>
11/1/17	The Restoration of the Heart of Recreation Leadership - Francisco Valenzuela	1:30 – 3 p.m.	RH 107
11/3/17	IWFL Advisory Board Meeting	10 a.m. – 2 p.m.	OSU Foundation Portland
11/4/17	Beaver Open House	10:15 a.m. & 1:00 p.m.	107 Richardson Hall
11/9/17	SAF Student Chapter Job Fair	10 a.m. – 2 p.m.	CH2M Hill Alumni Center
11/16/17	SAF Nat'l Convention Alumni Reception	6:30 – 8:30 p.m.	Albuquerque, NW TBD
11/28/17	FWHMF Research Program Progress Report Meeting	TBD	CH2M Hill Alumni Center
11/29-30/17 12/7-8/17 1/18-19/18 2/5/18	Dean's Forestry Leadership Series	TBD	107 Richardson Hall
12/5/17	Holiday Social	5 -9 p.m.	The Vue
12/6/17	FEC Meeting	9 – 11 a.m.	107 Richardson Hall
1/17/18	Starker Lecture Series	TBD	TBD
February 2018 TBD	Fire Summit	TBD	TBD



**From:** Huntington, Geoffrey  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 24, 2017 4:37 PM  
**To:** CoF\_All  
**Subject:** Construction Schedule & Budget Update

Now that we are well under way with construction, I want to offer an update on the schedule and budget for our new Forest Science Complex project which includes New Peavy Hall, the Advanced Wood Products Laboratory, and a new Field Instrument Room. Lots of progress on the basement and foundation is happening every week, with even more to come as the structure starts to go up in mid-November.

If you are interested, you can see what's happening live by clicking on one of the following links to two web cameras that show the project site live every day: <http://webcam.oregonstate.edu/fsc2> or <http://webcam.oregonstate.edu/fsc1>

### **New Peavy Hall**

- We continue to be on a schedule that calls (by contract) for completion in December 2018. That timeline is for faculty and staff move in to labs and offices at the conclusion of fall term. Classes will not be scheduled in the building until Spring 2019, so that I.T. has time to make sure classroom technology is fully operational. However, there may be opportunities to shift COF classes from other locations on campus to New Peavy in winter term if the new classrooms open up early.
- We expect to have New Peavy foundations completed by the end of this month. CLT sheer walls will go up first beginning the week of November 13th, with CLT panels and glue lam beams going up in December and January. The plan is for the wood structure of the academic bar (along Jefferson Way) to be complete by the end of the year, and the wood structure for the atrium completed in January 2018.
- Snow, not rain is what we fear for our scheduled installation to keep on track.
- The contract signed with Andersen Construction for construction of New Peavy is at a fixed price with a fixed timeline. We could not be more pleased with their performance and approach to meeting the goals of the College.
- As you no doubt heard, bids received on the entire project came in substantially over the independent estimates we had received for the cost of construction. In response, we worked with Andersen, the architects, and the subcontractors to find cost savings in the design details to bring the project back to something closer to our anticipated budget. We could not get all the way back to budget, however, unless we sacrificed program space. Faced with that choice, we decided to NOT change any of the program space everyone in the college worked so hard to set during the design phase, and limited all contemplated design changes in New Peavy to places where we could save money without impacting program, or long-term performance of the building (i.e. we haven't gone cheap on roofing and windows, etc.).

- Things like the roof line and design of the third floor of the atrium have been adjusted, and some of the upscale features we had hoped to include have been reduced in scope. All that said, there is no question that the building will be a very special place that fulfills the original vision that so many of you articulated during those long “visioning” sessions in the basement of old Peavy Hall some two and three years ago.
- The Advanced Wood Product Lab and Instrument Room structures also went out to bid with New Peavy, and they too came in substantially higher than the independent cost estimates that were completed at the end of the design phase.

### **The Advanced Wood Products Lab**

- In order to proceed without delay on building New Peavy, we chose to move forward and contract construction of New Peavy separately from the other two structures. As a result, New Peavy is headed forward at a \$69 million price, and we are going through the cost-savings redesign phase of the Advance Wood Products Lab now to bring it in at \$10 million (before equipment). We have set the budget for the entire complex at just over \$79 million. With the New Peavy construction price now fixed, we are on track to meet that total cost figure of \$79 million by implementing a pretty substantial redesign of the Advance Wood Products Lab. Given the extent of redesign, we don’t expect to break ground and begin construction of the lab until March 2018. That start date means the building will be completed around February or March 2019.
- We are making no program reductions to the working lab space in AWP, but are re-working the building design and administrative wing to be much simpler and more streamlined in its demonstration of wood products. No CLT panels are in the current design, no state-of-the-art connection systems, and there is a heavy emphasis on wood products that our partners can donate like glue lam beams, LVL, LSL, and dimensional lumber.

### **Field Instrument Room**

- Since there is a relatively short time required to construct the Field Instrument Room (“FIR”), we have held re-design of this portion of the project for last. We began working with Jim Kiser this month and are getting close to a couple of options for moving forward with FIR, so that it fits within the total project budget, and will be completed on the same schedule as New Peavy.
- While we will have more information in a couple of weeks, we continue to plan on the FIR building to be located in the Hatfield Courtyard which will be spruced up a bit so that it is an inviting place for all of us to use during three seasons of the year. This space and the arboretum are being held as important program spaces for the project to deliver, and we will not leave either one behind as an afterthought.

### **General Comments on the Project Budget**

- The cost overruns in the budget for the entire project are the result of cost escalation in the construction market that is impacting every private and public commercial project from Seattle to San Francisco. Neither the scope nor the square footage of the buildings were increased at any point during the design process. Several independent cost estimates run on the project at various times leading up to the bid solicitation confirmed this, as well as a recently completed independent audit of the entire design process of the project commissioned by the University. We simply ran into a hot construction market that is experiencing a significant workforce shortage and a lot of projects to bid on. Interestingly,

it was not the wood structure components that drove the cost increases beyond estimates. Rather, the greatest increases in market rates for our project are generally related to typical components of all new construction projects like concrete, roofing, drywall, glazing.

- Finally, the construction budget for the Forest Science Complex (including the extra \$10 million) will be met without relying on payments from current or future operational budgets of the college. We are identifying one-time sources of funding and material donations that will not impact operational accounts.

Thanks to all of you for remaining patient and enthusiastic. There is no question this has been a frustrating experience that has tested us. That said, there is also no question in my mind that these facilities will transform our College in ways we haven't quite yet imagined. Please don't hesitate to reach out with whatever questions you have and I will absolutely do my best to answer them. We will also start providing you with notice a week or a few days in advance when the mass timber beams and panels start to fly!

My best,

Geoff

--

Geoff Huntington

Director of Strategic Initiatives

OSU College of Forestry

O.: 541.737.9103

C.: 503.881.6225

TDI Update – Iain MacDonald

FY18 ARS Call for Proposals Released

3 areas of special emphasis – durability, modular construction and environmental concerns

10 industry representatives confirmed for external review committee

Brad Nile, Andersen Construction

Mikhail Gershfeld, Cal Poly Pomona

Hans-Erik Blomgren, Katerra

Emily Dawson, SRG Partnership

Sebastian Popp, KLH USA

Ben Kaiser, PATH Architecture

Sam Zelinka, Forest Products Laboratory

David Cohen, University of British Columbia (Emeritus)

David Barber, ARUP

Noel Johnson, Cairn Pacific

TDI's first "Critical Mass (Timber) Meet-up

Well attended

Broad range of industry representatives

Possible themes already selected for future meet-ups

TDI's Outreach Coordinator position

Looking for more applications

## **BACKGROUND SUMMARY RE: ADMIN MEMO #31 REVISIONS**

Back in 2014, Steve Strauss led an effort to develop policy for FES that would encourage and reward faculty who engaged in science advocacy. Others making significant contributions to the proposed college policy included Michael Nelson, Troy Hall, Mark Needham, and Norm Johnson. The work was motivated by the growing recognition that in the online world that we have entered bad or incomplete science is having a growing impact on decisions, and academia seems to be doing little to counter this. The situation has of course since ballooned given the current federal administration, Facebook errors, internet marketing, and many other factors. In addition, the reward structure still emphasizes standard measures of scholarship such as peer-review scientific papers and standard extended education, and has little to no emphasis on science advocacy. Training programs, such as the Leopold Leadership Program developed by Distinguished Professor Jane Lubchenco at OSU in 1998 (COF faculty Strauss and Bev Law are Fellows), has emphasized the critical importance of science advocacy and communications training for nearly two decades.

We therefore developed a policy statement about what science advocacy is and is not, and how it might be measured for use in promotion and tenure decisions in FES. After a discussion with Dean Maness the policy was reduced in scope and strength (e.g., the word advocacy was at one time removed) given his expression of serious concerns about how faculty might misuse it and create (even greater) public relations problems for the College and OSU.

In 2015, as the College was beginning the process of review of administrative memos, we made the decision to fold the contents of our policy into a revised Dean's Memo #31 on "Participation in Public Policy Engagement." We updated all of that memo and folded into it our recommendations for how to recognize science advocacy that is not simply a citizen acting on his on, but a faculty member doing their job to inform and improve the science basis of policy decisions. The policy proposal therefore became a COF-wide proposal.

In April 2017, Dean Maness reviewed and helped to edit the Memo, and expressed general support for the concept in a lengthy phone call with Strauss. Dean Maness provided further edits in September 2017, and in October 2017 he and Strauss have modified it further.

The Dean has said he endorses the current Memo, and is ready to sign it. The question before the FEC is whether it supports the Memo or not, or supports it but wishes to see changes in language to weaken, strengthen, or extend some of its provisions.

Steve Strauss

October 17, 2017

## **Administrative Memo 31**

### **Participation and Recognition**

### **of Faculty Activity in Policy Development**

November 1, 2017 (rev. 1993, 2007)

Faculty in the College of Forestry have an obligation to contribute their knowledge and scientific expertise to support the development of policy about natural resources and related products and ecological services. Many forestry and natural resource problems are extraordinarily complex, consequential, and controversial. As such there is often wide disagreement among stakeholders with respect to the underlying values, desired outcomes, appropriate frames for understanding, and scientific facts and knowledge within a natural resource problem. The public is often asked to state their preferences based on contradictory allegations of fact and context, and often struggles to separate fact from fiction, or half-truth from artful distortion. The scientific record, even when long and broadly accepted, is often inappropriately manipulated in favor of one outcome or another. Outside of academia, few in society have the expertise, broad understanding, limited conflicts of interest, and freedom to speak authoritatively on these complex natural resource issues.

It is not the role of the College to take positions on specific natural resources policies, nor to advocate for specific policies. However, the College believes that it is appropriate, under Oregon State University guidelines for academic freedom, for College scholars to educate, and in some cases directly advocate about the science that influences policy development or major management decisions.

The college encourages such participation, which will vary widely in scope and extent among faculty. However, it is important that faculty participation be appropriately conducted, including clear differentiation and identification of their roles—which can include being a representative of OSU or the College of Forestry, a member of a professional or scientific society, an independent scholar from OSU with knowledge of the subject area, and as an individual citizen speaking personally.

The purpose of this administrative memo is to clearly identify College policies and guidelines for appropriate faculty participation in the policy development process, and their connection to larger OSU policies on such engagement. Following these policies and guidelines will help ensure legal protection for faculty members and the university, help preserve and enhance the integrity of those involved, and improve the quality and value of their contributions for to society. In addition, the memo provides guidelines for how faculty are to be recognized for such activities in their annual review, promotion, and tenure evaluations.

## University Policy

The University [Strategic Plan for 2014-2018](#) recognizes the importance of public engagement, stating that “Oregon State will be a leader in solving society’s most pressing challenges through innovative, integrated, data-enabled research, outreach and creative activity.”

University policy describing rights and recommendations for public participation is contained in the OSU Faculty Handbook in the sections on [academic freedom and outside activities](#). It states:

“The faculty and administration of Oregon State University jointly accept the responsibility for maintaining an atmosphere in which scholars may freely teach, conduct research, publish, and engage in other scholarly activities. This responsibility includes maintaining the freedom for the examination of controversial issues throughout the University...

The University does not attempt to control the personal opinion, nor the public expression of that opinion, of any member of the faculty or staff of the institution. Indeed, the faculty and administration of Oregon State University feel a responsibility to protect the right of each employee to express his or her personal opinion, but in doing so, employees have an obligation to avoid any action which purports to commit the institution to a position on any issue without appropriate approval.

As a scholar in an academic discipline, each faculty member is expected to:

- seek and state the truth as he or she sees it
- develop and improve his or her scholarly competence
- exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge to diverse audiences on-and off-campus
- contribute to the development of the discipline
- practice intellectual honesty.”

In some cases, participation by the faculty member may be at the request of another organization with financial remuneration. If so, the faculty member is required to:

- Use the Request for Approval of Outside Employment [form](#), obtaining all required signatures and filing with the Office of Academic Affairs before the activity begins.
- Make it clear to the outside employer and others that he or she is acting in an individual capacity and does not speak, write or act in the name of the university or directly represent it.
- Not list his or her university telephone number or address in commercial listings or other public documents, the purpose of which is to draw attention to the individual’s availability for compensatory service.
- Follow university [policy](#) pertaining to use of online services at OSU. It states that “Personal use of computing resources may be permitted if it does not interfere with the University's or the employee's ability to carry out University business, and does not violate the terms of this policy.”

## College Policy and Guidelines

In addition to the university policies stated above, the College of Forestry policies include the following:

- Faculty will keep their department head or comparable supervisor informed about their significant participation in policy-related activities including statements to, and work with, legislative bodies, boards, agencies, and statements in the public media. This will help keep everyone informed on matters of potential public relations importance to the College. The appropriate frequency and level of detail of communications will be agreed upon between the faculty member and department head.
- When potentially ambiguous, faculty will specifically note that their views do not reflect those of Oregon State University (or the College of Forestry or the Forest Research Laboratory). This is most important when they are identified as a member of the university faculty when speaking, testifying, or writing.
- When acting as a private citizen or are receiving remuneration for services, the use of university email addresses should be avoided or minimized. Faculty should also avoid all use of OSU logos and stationary, and not list their OSU facilities (laboratories, affiliated institutes, etc) on private web sites, communications or reports.
- Faculty should be cognizant of the Freedom of Information Act and Oregon public records laws in their scholarship, teaching, outreach, and policy engagement communications. All emails, notes, documents (drafts or final), pictures, or other tangible records are documents to which public members (including the media) are likely to be entitled. Further information and communications may be discoverable through litigation. Consult OSU legal [counsel](#) to understand your rights and obligations, including possible legal support.

Some useful guidelines to keep in mind when participating in policy activities include the following:

- Help your audience understand your role and the capacity in which you are acting by stating it clearly. Make clear whether you providing information as a representative of the college or FRL responding to an official request by a policy-maker or government body, or if are you participating as an individual expressing your personal or professional views and values.
- If you are appearing in a consultative capacity as a professional, either as an individual or part of a group, make sure you do not give the impression of representing the university by using OSU stationary or business cards. If you use your academic title and rank, make sure your audience knows that it is for identification purposes only, not as a representative of the college/FRL.
- If you are serving first as a representative of the college/FRL and wish to change roles and provide personal/professional opinion or views, preface your remarks with a statement that clearly indicates such a shift in role.
- When providing information to policy-makers, clearly identify what is known, what is unknown and what is contentious or uncertain. When synthesizing information or providing personal/professional judgment or opinion, let audiences know that you are doing so. Our purpose is to avoid being misleading.
- When acting as a university faculty member or representative, confine your participation to areas where you have qualifications and expertise.

## **Consideration of Science Policy Engagement during Annual Performance and Promotion/Tenure Reviews**

The College will recognize engagement during annual performance and promotion/tenure reviews. Such engagement may take many forms, such as organizing scientific responses to policy proposals from experts; writing op-eds or articles for peer review journals that analyze policy solutions; and helping corporations, NGOs, and government entities to fully understand the science to help develop sound policies for managing natural resources or derived products. This should result in an improvement of performance and impact, stimulate faculty to search for new sources of funding to support engagement efforts, and attract new and highly motivated students.

The [OSU faculty handbook states](#) that “Many faculty make important service contributions to university relations or to the community that are not directly related to their appointments. Though valuable in their own right, and ideally a responsibility of all citizens, these efforts are considered in promotion and tenure decisions only to the extent that they contribute to the mission of the University.” Thus, to ensure that engagement qualifies for consideration as service during promotion and tenure it is important that faculty position clearly delineates that such engagement is a significant dimension of their work. The following guidelines apply:

- Only engagement activities that are directly related to the faculty members’ areas of scholarly expertise will be considered for performance review purposes. The linkages must be reflected both in their position description and publication record. The expression of personal opinions about desired policies will not, however, not be considered. Only statements that address the relevant science surrounding policy options may qualify as engagement.
- It is recommended that faculty receive some form of explicit training in methods and approaches for public engagement as part of their professional training. The form and source will be geared to individual faculty member needs and activities, and discussed during performance reviews.
- Engagement activities may use any of the traditional and emerging forms of online and social media.
- Many forms of policy engagement are possible. Examples of the kinds of efforts and impacts that could be considered in performance reviews include:
  - a. Evidence of impact of the faculty member’s scientific contributions to policy actions, or as stimulus for policy analysis and organized action.
  - b. Scholarly quality of engagement forums they take part in.
  - c. The level of decision making affected (e.g., international, national, regional, and state vs. local levels of political and business influence).
  - d. The extent of readership/viewership, including measurements such as web site views, downloads, likes, and retweets (and other new and developing social media indicators).
  - e. The ability to raise funding for science and research related to policy, such as from foundations and crowdfunding campaigns that are dedicated to policy-relevant research and engagement.
  - f. The degree of innovation in activities and products.



**Topic of the Month: Positioning the College for Success – Thomas Maness, Anthony S. Davis**

*Our ranking as #2 in the world is getting a lot of great attention and also leads to the important question: How do we make sure that we succeed in all the facets of our College? That ranking is based on our research productivity – we also aspire to be recognized at that level in teaching, extension, and engagement. What attributes does it take to be the best, and where are we exceeding vs. failing?*

Heading into our focused discussion at FEC on 1 November, please consider the following thoughts and questions and be prepared to share your ideas with the rest of the committee.

While recognizing the limits that the college has to accomplish the myriad tasks needed to be “excellent” – it is important to step back every now and again and see if we are deploying our resources where needed. At a recent FEC meeting, a question arose about how should the College view its role in national organizations (e.g. NAUFRP); that question cannot be answered without also asking what the College’s role should be within a number of professional and scientific associations. What are the core organizations with which the College of Forestry has, or should have, affiliations (either through individuals or departments)? What are the ways we engage with those groups?

Beyond just being part of the right organizations, how are we helping College employees, units, and programs demonstrate leadership or develop professionally? Are there core competencies that we need to grow (e.g. social media training or engaging with the press)? What are some of the ways that we are providing outstanding service to people, whether they are students, external stakeholders, or partners? Is there something we need to do to ensure that University leaders understand key accomplishments, goals, and messages?

Our space (including both physical and digital) is obviously an important part of our image. How can we create a culture of shared maintenance, improvement, and feedback that provides a rewarding work environment within the College? Beyond just having a new, state-of-the-art building, what can we do across all spaces to demonstrate pride in our work and an expectation of professionalism from those who visit us?

Finally, a simple punch list to consider:

- What makes you proud to be a part of the College of Forestry? (Or, what makes us awesome?!)
- What makes you cringe?
- If there is one thing that a world-leading program should do, what is it (whether we are doing it or not doesn’t matter)?
- If there is one thing that a world-leading program shouldn’t do, what is it (whether we are doing it or not doesn’t matter)?