



# NAPFSC

## R E P O R T

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

### What's Inside

President's Message .....	1
President-Elect's Message .....	2
Feature Article	
SAF Accreditation .....	3
People Profiles .....	4
Appropriations Update .....	5
Committee Reports .....	7
Regional Reports .....	8
NAPFSC News Briefs .....	13
Financial Summary .....	19

### President's Message

*Perry J. Brown*



**N**APFSC has been active over the past several months, and Executive Committee members have devoted a lot of time and energy to important issues for our membership.

We continue to work with the Society of American Foresters (SAF) on accreditation issues. Our national and regional education chairs served on a special joint task force to examine accreditation finance issues. The results of their work, and our thoughts about accreditation, will be a major topic for us during our General Assembly in September.

Additionally, we continue to focus on workforce planning issues with the US Forest Service and other agencies. One small success was the inclusion of all NAPFSC institutions in the Forest Service's list of workforce partner universities.

National legislative activity has been a major focus as we build on the work of the National Coalition on Sustaining America's Nonfederal Forests, and as we look toward having a new Farm Bill drafted and ratified. As of this writing, it looks like we will be able to hold steady on McIntire-Stennis, possibly getting a two-thirds increase in RREA, and obtaining a substantial increase in NRI. We also have been working to get favorable language into the 2002 Farm Bill.



# NAPFSC

## REPORT

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

### Executive Committee:

Perry J. Brown. . . .President  
C. P. Patrick Reid. . . .President-Elect  
Albert R. Vogt. . . .Past President  
G. H. Weaver. . . .Secretary-Treasurer  
Terri Bates. . . .Executive Liaison  
George Hopper. . . .Chair, Extension  
Donald H. DeHayes. . . .Chair, Education  
Daniel E. Keathley. . . .Chair, International  
Arnett C. Mace, Jr. . . .Chair, Policy/Legislative  
Alan R. Ek. . . .Chair, Research  
J. Michael Kelly. . . .Chair, North Central Region  
William C. McComb. . . .Chair, Northeast Region  
B. Allen Dunn. . . .Chair, Southern Region  
Terry L. Sharik. . . .Chair, Western Region  
Susan G. Stafford. . . .Diversity

### Staff:

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: [mtbates@erols.com](mailto:mtbates@erols.com)

VT/0801/250/220598

## President-Elect's Message

*C. P. Patrick Reid, Coalition Chair*

The 2000 report by the National Coalition on Sustaining America's Nonfederal Forests appears to have some impact as discussion continues on a new Farm Bill in 2002. Earlier this year, NAPFSC used the report as a basis for making recommendations for McIntire-Stennis, RREA, and NRI appropriations in FY2002. Now the report is being used as a starting point for the forestry community to develop a consistent and coordinated message on the needs in a 2002 Farm Bill. As the House moves rapidly towards drafting a Farm Bill, NAPFSC had the opportunity to testify before the House Agriculture Subcommittee on Department Operations, Oversight, Nutrition and Forestry regarding forestry education, research, and Extension programs in the new Farm Bill. Both NAPFSC and the coalition are recommending that there be a forestry title in the new Farm Bill with emphasis on nonfederal forestlands. Several groups are preparing, or have prepared, issue papers concerning Farm Bill needs, including SAF, NASF, US Forest Service, NRCS, National Council on Private Forests (NCPF), AF&PA, and both the Board of Agriculture and the Board on Natural Resources of NASULGC. NAPFSC, in concert with the coalition, submitted a Farm Bill issue paper to the Board of Natural Resources, a report later shared with the Board of Agriculture. Certainly SAF, NCPF, and AF&PA issue papers reflect many of the recommendations in the coalition report. Both NASF and the Forest Service are well aware of the report as they have prepared their Farm Bill recommendations.

The full coalition membership met in Washington, DC, on June 27, 2001, to develop long-term strategy for the nonfederal forestlands initiative. The coalition has offered to testify before the Senate Agriculture Committee as that committee moves forward on the 2002 Farm Bill. It is now very important for grassroots stakeholders in each state to embrace the recommendations and have their voices heard by Congress. The coalition will emphasize educating Congress, the administration, and the general public on the need for attention to nonfederal forestlands.



## Feature Article - SAF Accreditation

### Assessing the Value and Costs of SAF Accreditation

*Donald H. DeHayes, Chair, Education Committee*

A SAF/NAPFSC Work Group was formed following our fall 2000 meeting and NAPFSC's unanimous support of a resolution to place a moratorium on accreditation activities and to not participate in SAF's new accreditation fee structure. The moratorium and enhanced interest in the cost/benefit ratio associated with SAF accreditation was stimulated by an unexpected increase in SAF's annual accreditation fee from \$100 to \$2000. The work group agreed to pursue two objectives: an assessment of the costs and benefits of SAF's forestry accreditation program, and revision and update of the *SAF Accreditation Handbook*, as appropriate and necessary. The work group included me as NAPFSC's education chair and the NAPFSC regional education chairs, including Don Arganbright (West), Dave Field (Northeast), Dan Keathley (North Central), and Wayne Smith (South). Other committee members were Scott Beasley, Emily Schultz, Mary (Sam) Matthews, and Michelle Harvey. The work group met on May 8-9, 2001, in Washington, DC, and focused primarily on the first objective, although a desire to streamline accreditation procedures was discussed.

After listing the perceived benefits associated with SAF accreditation, the work group suggested compiling this information in a joint SAF/NAPFSC statement of accreditation benefits to share with the SAF membership. It was emphasized that SAF accreditation, and the benefits derived from it, reflect the core mission of SAF. It became evident that the values of accreditation are broadly distributed across both SAF and society as a whole. The values of SAF accreditation are to the profession and SAF membership rather than only, or even primarily, to universities. There also was consensus that SAF accreditation standards define the profession of forestry. As such, it is imperative that the standards are progressive and forward-looking if the profession is to remain vital and dynamic. The apparent broad-based value of accreditation to the profession indicates that SAF should support the accreditation process more fully.

With respect to costs, Michelle Harvey explained that, like many of us in universities, SAF has faced some financial challenges and has had to trim positions, leave anticipated new positions unfilled, and reduce expenses associated with consultants.

With respect to the accreditation program, Michelle reported that the only revenues credited to the accreditation program have been fees paid by the schools, and that the program has experienced deficits each of the past several years. The increased accreditation fee structure announced to the schools abruptly in fall 2000 was an attempt to stabilize revenue and costs associated with the accreditation program.

Michelle Harvey kindly shared detailed expenses and revenues associated specifically with SAF's accreditation program. The total expenses have varied widely over the past four years, ranging from a low of about \$68,000 to a high of about \$182,000. The latter was thought to be an anomaly associated with Michelle's first year as Director. Costs are associated primarily with personnel, program operating expenses, and indirect costs; the latter is calculated as about 80 to 90 percent of total personnel expenses. Personnel costs represent about a 30 percent and 20 percent commitment of the director's and coordinator's time, respectively. Revenue associated with the various fees from the schools ranged from about \$17,000 to \$29,000, leaving a substantial shortfall for SAF each year. Although it is clear that existing expenses exceed existing revenue sources in the current SAF accreditation program, it is also clear that the total expense of accreditation (e.g., even the \$182,000 in expenses for the anomalous very expensive year) represents only a minuscule portion of SAF's total annual revenues (about \$4.3 million in 1999). In fact, in relative terms, the SAF accreditation process is not a hugely expensive program, especially for a program that is at the core of SAF's mission.

Many of us noted that the schools also make a substantial investment in the accreditation process beyond the annual accreditation fee. Two schools that recently underwent accreditation reviews estimated direct costs in the \$8,000 to \$10,000 range, not including the direct, indirect, and opportunity costs of faculty and staff time in preparation of the self-evaluation critical to the process. While the schools understand and appreciate that indirect costs are real, we also noted that there is no way for us to recover our indirect costs associated with the accreditation process.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 18



## People Profiles

### Dombeck Joins UWSP College of Natural Resources

*Steve Menzel, Development and Public Relations Coordinator  
College of Natural Resources, University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point*



Former USDA Forest Service Chief Michael Dombeck has accepted a new position with the College of Natural Resources at his alma mater, the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point (UWSP).

Dombeck, who led the Forest Service from 1997 until April 2001, has been named Global Environmental Management (GEM) Pioneer Professor and UW System Fellow of Global Conservation. In his new full-time role, he will help lead the planning and development of the GEM Education Center, a unifying theme and vision for UWSP's College of Natural Resources, according to Dean Victor Phillips.

A native of Stevens Point and recipient of the UWSP 1997 Distinguished Alumnus award, Dombeck has professional expertise in watershed restoration, fisheries, and ecosystem management, in addition to his obvious connections to forestry. This experience and expertise makes him ideally suited to spearhead the GEM Education Center's early program themes of watersheds and land use, according to Dean Phillips.

As a member of the college's advisory board for several years, Dombeck is no stranger to GEM. As envisioned by Phillips, the GEM Education Center is being developed as the college's integrating theme, program focus, and world-class facility that will serve as an international model for training leaders in natural resources and environmental management. A 10-year, \$70 million development timeline calls for additional staffing and a 100,000 square foot facility equipped with leading-edge telecommunications and digital technology. The center will utilize these emerging technological tools to bring the classroom to the field and the field to the classroom, locally and globally.

As Forest Service Chief, Dombeck was responsible for the management of 191 million acres of land, over 33,000 employees, and a \$4 billion budget. He focused on promoting partnerships, collaborative stewardship, accountability, and financial health. His tenure is perhaps best noted for work in watershed health and restoration, sustainable forest management, sound forest roads, and roadless area protection. Dombeck led reform of the Forest Service's 386,000-mile road system, protection of national treasures such as the Rocky Mountain Front, and development of a national fire plan based on protecting communities and restoring the health of fire-dependent land.

After leaving the Forest Service in March 2001, Dombeck was named a Senior Fellow to the National Wildlife Federation, the nation's largest conservation organization. In May, the US Secretary of Agriculture recognized Dombeck's contributions to conservation by naming him to the honorary position of Chief Emeritus of the USDA Forest Service.

### Bosworth Selected as USDA's New Forest Service Chief

Agriculture Secretary Ann M. Veneman announced the selection of Dale N. Bosworth as the new Chief of the Forest Service. Bosworth succeeds former chief Mike Dombeck, who retired from federal service March 31.

"Dale Bosworth is a veteran forester who has devoted his career to the Forest Service," said Veneman. "His background and experience will make him a great addition to our team. I am pleased to announce his selection as the 15<sup>th</sup> chief of USDA's Forest Service."

Bosworth currently serves as Regional Forester for the Forest Service's Northern Region, which includes northern Idaho, Montana, North Dakota, and northwestern South Dakota. As Forest Service Chief, Bosworth will oversee more than 30,000 employees and a \$4.6 billion budget.

Prior to his current assignment, Bosworth was the Regional Forester in the Intermountain Region and Deputy Regional Forester in the Pacific Southwest Region of the Forest Service. He also has worked as a forest supervisor and district ranger.

Bosworth is a native of California and second-generation forester and Forest Service employee. He graduated from the University of Idaho in 1966 with a BS in Forestry.



## Appropriations Update

*C. Randall Nuckolls and Patrick Turner, Long Aldridge and Norman*

Prior to the August recess, the House and Senate Appropriations Committees completed work on the FY2002 Agriculture and Interior Appropriations bills. Thanks to the hard work by individual NAPFSC members, as well as the Executive Committee leadership, the committees provided increases in funding levels to several NAPFSC-supported programs. Much remains to be done by NAPFSC schools during September, since these bills still must go to a conference committee to have their differences resolved, be voted on again by the full House and Senate, and finally be sent to the President for his signature.

The change of control in the Senate has complicated and delayed the legislative process, and made it likely that many of the 13 appropriations bills will not be completed prior to the beginning of the new fiscal year on October 1. In past years, the Agriculture and Interior appropriations bills have been relatively noncontroversial and should be completed before the end of the fiscal year.

### Agriculture Appropriations

The House of Representatives approved a \$15.7 billion FY2002 agriculture spending bill, while the Senate Appropriations Committee increased that amount to \$16.1 billion. As outlined in the table below, the funding levels stayed the same in the House for our various programs, while the Senate provided much-needed increases to the Renewable Research Extension Act (RREA) program, as well as to the National Research Initiative (NRI).

The news about the increases in RREA and NRI is welcome, and we will need to work hard to ensure that the conference committee funds the programs at the Senate-passed level.

We can take credit for helping increase RREA from \$3.1 to \$5 million—the first significant RREA increase in several years. Special mention goes to Pat Reid, Arnett Mace, Terri Bates, and others who diligently worked on the National Coalition for Sustaining America’s Nonfederal Forests. The coalition’s recommendations were circulated throughout the Hill and helped lay the groundwork for many of our personal meetings. Other NAPFSC Executive Committee members, led by President Perry Brown and Research Chair Al Ek, have walked the halls of Congress this year to educate members of the Senate and House appropriations committees about the need for more forestry research and RREA funding. It is nice to see this modest victory. We will need to do our utmost to hold the Senate figure in conference.

The \$137 million for NRI in the Senate is the highest ever provided for that program, and we will attempt to encourage the conferees to adhere to that figure in conference.

The agriculture commodity groups continue to strongly favor NRI increases over formula-based funding. The Senate had a somewhat better allocation for agriculture than the House Subcommittee and, therefore, decided to put some of the additional funding in NRI. As various groups push to increase research funding at agencies beyond NIH and NSF—such as USDA, Energy, and Commerce—it will be easier to justify if the funds are competitive grants. The USDA is becoming the last bastion of formula-based funding in the federal research complex. As we can see, and as we have been told for the last several years, USDA is also under increasing pressure to move toward competitive programs.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 13

Program	FY2001 Funding	FY2002 Request	FY2001 House	FY2002 Senate	FY2002 Conference
McIntire-Stennis	\$21,884,000	\$21,884,000	\$21,884,000	\$21,884,000	
RREA	\$3,185,000	\$3,185,000	\$3,185,000	\$5,000,000	
National Research Initiative	\$105,767,000	\$105,767,000	\$105,767,000	\$137,000,000	



PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE CONTINUED  
FROM PAGE 1

While there is a long way to go on the Farm Bill, the forestry community has been able to get into the House version a forestry title that includes reauthorization, an increased dollar authorization for RREA, and a favorable note of the importance of the McIntire-Stennis program.

Other important agenda items have been continued support of the National Coalition on Sustaining America's Nonfederal Forests, under the leadership of President-elect Pat Reid, and visits to 1890 Historical Black Institutions Alabama A&M and Southern University. These schools, both having four-year forestry degree programs, will make presentations to the NAPFSC Executive Committee in September. Talks are underway relative to their joining NAPFSC.

While our work is never done, NAPFSC has made significant progress on several fronts. Terri Bates, Washington Executive Liaison, Randy Nuckolls, Washington Counsel, Executive Committee members, and several leaders across our membership have been effective in placing NAPFSC's ideas before those who need to hear them. Please join us at the General Assembly in Denver in September to talk about these and other issues.

## Remember...

The NAPFSC REPORT is on line!

Visit the web site at

[www.napfsc.org](http://www.napfsc.org)



## Meeting Dates

### NAPFSC 2001 Annual Meeting Denver, CO

#### Executive Committee Holiday Inn Denver Downtown

Tuesday, September 11  
Black Hawk/Idaho Springs Room  
1:00 - 5:00

Wednesday, September 12  
Black Hawk/Idaho Springs Room  
8:00 - 12:00

#### Reception Adam's Mark Hotel

Wednesday, September 12  
Governor's Square Room 15  
Plaza Bldg.  
6:00 - 7:30 p.m.

#### General Assembly Adam's Mark Hotel

Wednesday, September 12  
Governor's Square Room 14  
Plaza Bldg.  
1:00 - 5:00


Thursday, September 13  
Governor's Square Room 14  
Plaza Bldg.  
8:00 - 12:00

### Extension Foresters/ ANREP Meeting

Adam's Mark Hotel, Denver  
Thursday, September 13  
12:30 - 4:30 p.m.

### 2001 SAF National Convention

Forestry at the Great Divide  
September 13-17, 2001  
Adam's Mark Hotel, Denver



### Southern Forest Science Conference Update

Registration materials for the Southern Forest Science Conference to be held in Atlanta, GA, November 26-28, 2001, have been placed on the web at [www.southernforestsience.net](http://www.southernforestsience.net). An updated program agenda is also on-line and includes over 80 presentations and posters on a variety of subjects arranged around the conference themes. The conference objective is to celebrate the past century of success and develop strategic alliances for future scientific research and development. A limited number of hard copy registration brochures will be mailed out in July and August. The registration fee is \$195.00 until October 5, 2001, after which the registration fee increases to \$235.00. Be sure to register by October 5, 2001 to save \$40.00!



## Committee Reports

### Extension Committee

*George Hopper, Chair*

The Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (ECOP) established the ECOP Forestry Team in fall of 1999. This team has been active over the last two years to increase federal funding for Extension forestry and natural resources programs. The team is chaired by Nancy Bull, Extension Director for Connecticut. Other members of the team include: Jack Bagent, LA; Steve Jones, AL; Tony Nakazawa, AK; Michael Heard, MO; Carl O'Connor, WI; Bill Harris, TX; Scott Reed, OR; Warren Archey, NASF; George Hopper, NAPFSC; Eric Norland, CSREES; and Larry Biles, CSREES.

The major charge of the Forestry Liaison Committee was to secure increased funding for Extension forestry and natural resources programs, with primary focus on increasing RREA to full authorization of \$15 million. We were pleased that the NASULGC Board on Agriculture supported this recommendation. We have also networked with various partners to assist in forestry education activities. These partners include the National Association of State Foresters, US Forest Service, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Forest Landowners Association, American Forest and Paper Association, and CSREES. The Forestry Team has made several visits to the Washington offices of the leaders of these agencies. Additionally, they have met with their congressional delegations, written letters, and hosted on-campus visits for these leaders.

On June 12, Extension forestry was represented at a House and Senate hearing on private forestry landowners issues. The National Council on Private Forests, a consortia of organizations with interests in private forestry issues, supported a major national initiative for private forest land education, research, and technical assistance. The council requested a \$48 million package. On June 28, a similar hearing was held for governmental agencies to testify regarding private forest lands education and research assistance. Extension forestry was represented by Eric Bendfeldt, Extension Agent, Environmental Sciences, Virginia Cooperative Extension, Rockingham County. Rockingham County is in the district of Congressman Bob Goodlatte, chair of the subcommittee. Mr. Bendfeldt did an excellent job for Extension in his testimony.

The Forestry Team wrote to USDA-CSREES Administrator Colien Hefferan, soliciting her support for increased RREA funding. The team has strongly supported the need for increased formula funds for RREA. At the request of

the administration, the team also provided strategies for a competitive program and increased participation of the 1890 programs. Additionally, the ECOP Forestry Team actively solicited support from OMB financial officer Noah Engleberg, who has oversight on the CSREES budget. Mr. Engleberg is sincerely interested in RREA and natural resources funding. The team provided him with materials on successful forestry Extension programs throughout the country, indicating the results and impacts of these programs. Mr. Engleberg emphasized the importance of providing solicitors details on program results in terms of immediate as well as long-term impact.

The ECOP Forestry Team worked closely with CSREES forestry program leader Larry Biles, and with Eric Norland, who is working in Washington, DC, on a short-term IPA assignment. Their leadership in this effort was invaluable and greatly appreciated.

The team will continue to solicit support from administration offices, including CSREES, OMB, NRCS, and US Forest Service. We will continue to provide information and testimony to the House and Senate appropriation committees, with special interest in the forthcoming Farm Bill legislation. The ECOP has developed a plan to formalize a CSREES relationship with the US Forest Service national office. Michael Raines, Deputy Chief of State and Private Forestry, would like to strengthen the Extension and Forest Service connections in this regard.

---

### International Committee

*Daniel E. Keathley, Chair*

The US Agency for International Development (US AID) is interested in meeting with NAPFSC representatives to discuss forestry and natural resource issues and programs in Africa. Jon Anderson, the Natural Resources and Environment Team Leader within the Office of Sustainable Development in US AID's Africa Bureau, has proposed a meeting to discuss interests between the two organizations with respect to Africa. The meeting will focus on identifying key issues and obstacles to be addressed at the forum in 2002, and to improving collective development efforts in Africa.

I am currently working with Dr. James Johnson from Virginia Tech, US AID's main contact on this project, to establish dates for the pre-forum meeting this September.



## Regional Reports

### Southern Region

*B. Allen Dunn, Chair*

The Southern Region held its annual meeting in Alexandria, VA, on April 18, 2001, in conjunction with the Forest Landowners Association's annual meeting. Discussion topics included the Southern Forest Science Conference, the federal budget, Southern Forest Resource Assessment, SAF's accreditation program, Forest Service recruitment strategy, and initiatives of USFS' State and Private Forestry. The completed southern forestry schools comparative data survey results for fiscal year 2000-2001 were distributed, along with the comparative survey guidelines. The comparative data showed forestry schools in the south averaged 139 undergraduate majors in forestry and 96 in wildlife management. At the graduate level, the averages were 49 for forestry and 38 for wildlife management. Credit-hour production, in semester hours, averaged 3,839 for undergraduate and 1,075 for graduate programs. Average faculty FTE's for southern schools were 11.86 in teaching, 14.75 in research, and 5.75 in Extension.

The Southern Forest Science Conference will be held in Atlanta, GA, on November 26-28, 2001. The collaborative conference will highlight the history and future role of science in southern forestry. One goal of the conference is to understand the contributions science makes to the management of forest ecosystems and the resulting social and economic benefits. The Southern Region is a sponsor of the conference.

Federal appropriations for forestry research and education were reviewed and discussed. Funding levels for McIntire-Stennis and RREA are below those required to meet research and landowner assistance needs in the Southern Region. Letters were written to key congressmen and committee chairmen, and we will continue efforts to influence members of Congress to support increases in these programs.

A draft of the Southern Forest Resource Assessment will be released this summer. The final report will be available this November. The survey, resulting from concerns over chip mill construction in southern states, addresses productivity, ecosystem diversity, biodiversity, and water quality issues. Southern schools are preparing to address questions about this controversial report.

Michelle Harvey, SAF Director of Science and Education, summarized discussions between NAPFSC and SAF regarding accreditation. An Accreditation Task Force has been organized and will work on issues of disagreement. SAF will account for funds paid by forestry schools for accrediting services. Procedures for conducting reviews, reporting, etc., have been revised and no changes in this area are expected. The Southern Region strongly supports NAPFSC's position and will work to help resolve issues.

Southern schools are constantly assessing educational programs to ensure that they meet society's needs. This is extremely critical in working with the USDA Forest Service

### Northeast Region

*William C. McComb, Chair*

During Northeast NAPFSC's annual meeting in January 2001, we discussed planning a regional conference on Invasive Plant Species in conjunction with the USFS Northeast Station and USGS. Now that several regional universities are interested, we will try to organize the conference over the next year. Invasive species management is a high priority topic for many cooperating federal agencies, as well as an agenda item for many state agencies. This topic is particularly important in the northeast region. The intent of the conference will be to highlight what is known about invasive plant species in the region, identify current management strategies, and develop research priorities for the northeastern United States. Conference proceedings will be prepared and used to generate attention to this issue in the northeast. We are hopeful that this strategy will lead to enhanced collaborative opportunities among agencies and universities.

Additionally, we plan to submit a USDA Higher Education Challenge Grant this year to further our distance education efforts. Five northeast universities participated in an interactive graduate seminar series entitled "The Human Dimensions of Ecosystem Health." This is the second seminar series to use real-time, compressed video



## Regional Reports

### Western Region

*Terry L. Sharik, Chair*

Western NAPFSC held its summer meeting at Oregon State University in Corvallis on July 12-13, 2001, hosted by Hal Salwasser and Bart Thielges. The following is a summary of that meeting.

#### **Relationship among Western NAPFSC, USFS-S&PF, and State Forestry**

We met with Steve Ambrose, Assistant Regional Forester for Western State and Private Forestry (USFS), and Jim Lawrence, Executive Director of the Council of Western State Foresters. Steve and Jim co-direct the Western Forestry Leadership Coalition (WFLC) out of the Western Forestry Coordination Center (WFCC) in Lakewood, CO. Staffed by both state and federal employees, the center is designed to “help federal, state, and private managers better understand and manage the natural resources of the west.” WNAPFSC agreed to affiliate with WFLC in a mutually agreeable manner. The affiliation process is underway.

#### **Regional Coordination of WNAPFSC Research**

We discussed ways to assist in coordinating university research in forest and related natural resources west-wide, starting with the model used by agricultural programs in their regional research projects. We will correspond with established, specialty research groups in the west, surveying them regarding critical issues, and advocating for them regarding regional collaboration on research projects and proposals in the critical areas identified. State and federal research groups will be involved in this effort.

#### **Possible Subdivision of WNAPFSC**

As a follow-up to an e-mail survey, we discussed the possibility of subdividing the 18-member Western NAPFSC into “interior” and “coastal” regions, thereby adding a region to NAPFSC at the national level. After considerable discussion, we unanimously decided not to recommend a split, so that we could continue to capture the diversity of ecosystems, ownerships, institutions, and political philosophies that would be diminished otherwise. Moreover, we decided to explore the possibility of expanding the geographic region of WNAPFSC to bring it more in line with the areas represented by the Association of Western Governors and the Western Forestry Leadership Coalition.

#### **Possible Name Change for NAPFSC**

In a follow-up to an e-mail survey of members, we discussed the possibility of changing the name of NAPFSC to better reflect the breadth of forest resource issues and disciplines that we represent. It was decided that we will propose to the NAPFSC membership that the name be changed to the “National Association of University Forest Resources Programs” (NAUFRP). This change was also seen as conducive to closer alignment with similar associations, such as the National Association of University Fisheries and Wildlife Programs (NAUFWP), with whom we already interact considerably.

#### **SAF Accreditation**

We reviewed the status of SAF accreditation based on the recent efforts of the SAF/NAPFSC Work Group (WG) on Forestry Accreditation. The WG met on May 8-9, 2001, and prepared a report (including recommendations for a revised fee structure) that was sent to SAF Council on May 25, 2001, by Michelle Harvey, SAF Director of Science and Education. In an e-mail message to WG members on June 13, 2001, Michelle announced that the council had accepted the ten recommendations in the WG’s report. Thus, SAF would send out a letter to all forestry program heads announcing the outcome of the WG and council meetings and revisions to the fee structure. Accreditation invoices were to be mailed on July 1, 2001. We noted that the WG report had not been sent to the NAPFSC Executive Committee for review and discussion with its member institutions.

In reviewing the WG report, obtained from Don Arganbright, WNAPFSC Education Chair and our representative on the WG, we concluded that it does not address the major request that “SAF provide[s] detailed information about accreditation finances and the specific program services they are designed to support,” as stated in the NAPFSC resolution of November 15, 2001. We will inform the NAPFSC Executive Committee of our viewpoint, and will continue to honor the moratorium on paying SAF accreditation fees until the matter is resolved to our satisfaction.



## Regional Reports

### North Central Region

*J. Michael Kelly, Chair*

A joint North Central NAPFSC/NAUFWP meeting was held in Kansas City, MO, with 11 NAPFSC administrators, 9 NAUFWP administrators, 2 administrative advisors, and 2 guests present. The morning session focused on issues of common interest to both groups.

Larry Biles briefed the group on activities underway at CSREES. He mentioned that there had been a “partnership meeting” at which the university partners had conveyed their unhappiness with CSREES over several issues, including:

- assurance of CSREES’ support to push for formula funding increases;
- the need for a marketing plan for the food and agricultural system;
- more equitable treatment sought by 1890 schools;
- more congressional outreach;
- a simpler, single reporting system so that paperwork is proportional to the money or issues involved;
- the need to develop a shared vision for the system, and
- establishing a priority-setting process.

Larry indicated that the universities’ unhappiness with CSREES came as a surprise to him.

RREA has been placed in the budget at the full \$15 million level. While that might not make it through the final stages of the budget process, it has established a target that might

be useful in subsequent budget cycles. We have since learned that this level of funding has not survived the budget process and that level funding is the likely prospect.

Larry also pointed out a source of potential funds that may be overlooked in some states. He indicated that counties with more than \$100,000 in federal timber sale receipts are required to spend the equivalent of 15 percent of the proceeds on forestry education and that these funds might be an opportunity for some universities.

Jim Perry reported that the NC-230 project (Integrating Biophysical Functions of Riparian Systems with Management Practices and Policies) was approved by the North Central Directors. However, only one university has provided any direct funding to support the project. The group is gearing up to seek funding from other sources in the coming year. Officers have been named for the project: Jim Perry, Chair; Pete Schaefer, Vice Chair; and Charles Nyland, Secretary. The participants will meet annually and are looking for funding to cover the three emphasis areas of the project, which are 1) biophysical approaches to looking at the functions of riparian areas, 2) socio-economics and benefits and costs, and 3) integration to develop educational and outreach materials.

Linda Donoghue, Director of the North Central Forest Experiment Station, reported that there is little direction yet from the administration for the Forest Service, although a budget cut is anticipated in FY 2002. They are currently focusing on global

climate change, urban sprawl, state and private lands, and bio-based products. They are also emphasizing forest productivity, but in a broad sense that includes more than timber or water. Fire research is also a big area in the agency and funds are available in the current year to support cooperative activities. Several new fire-related research positions have been identified but there is some uncertainty about long-term funding for the positions. Forest Service State & Private is adding a division to cover urban forestry and conservation education, although they might not be quite equal administratively to existing divisions.

The meeting shifted to a discussion of capstone courses led by Mike Kelly. Mike provided a definition of capstone courses and listed expected outcomes and objectives. He then reviewed information he had gathered on capstone courses from several schools. A general discussion ensued about the mechanisms used to foster student participation, faculty involvement, and inclusion of outside “clients” in these courses. There was also discussion of whether schools were trying to develop leadership skills in these courses, and there seemed to be general agreement that such skills were fostered through curricular and extracurricular activities rather than being taught in a single course. Most schools recognized as well that students needed to be prepared for the capstone course in advance by including aspects of teamwork in other courses to develop their skills. It was also emphasized that the main benefit of capstone



## Preliminary Observations on Survey of Ethics Courses at NAPFSC Schools

Sharon Friedman, *Forest Genetics Research National Program Leader*  
USDA Forest Service

This survey was intended to compare the ethics coursework and approach to the teaching of ethics at the NAPFSC schools. Without delving deeply into the coursework, topics covered included professional ethics, environmental ethics, research ethics, religious ethics, and general personal ethics. The following are the preliminary findings based on the responses from 22 schools. The complete tables of information will be sent out to the NAPFSC mailing list.

### Observation 1

There is a broad range of topics covered by coursework at these schools. There are standard environmental ethics courses taught by philosophy departments. There are professional ethics for forestry, wildlife and fisheries, and environmental professionals. There are general ethical principles such as general plagiarism covered in a freshman survey course, and research ethics. Unique courses are taught in Religion, Ethics and the Environment, and Ethics and the Management of Public Lands.

### Observation 2

University requirements can affect the development of specific ethics courses. When there are general education requirements in ethics, schools may develop their own ethics courses that focus on issues related to natural resources and the environment.

Cornell requires a normative ethics course, and two courses in natural resources have been developed to satisfy that requirement (Seminar in Environmental Ethics and Religion, Ethics, and the Environment). A 100-level course on ethics is required for the general, natural resource ecology, and conservation biology majors at the University of Idaho. At the University of Maine, a 3-credit course on ethics is a general education requirement. Students in Ecology and Environmental Science (formerly Natural Resources) must take either Principles of Sustainable Development or Environmental Ethics from the philosophy department. University of Montana's course on Ethics and Management of Public Lands is optional, but also taken by 90 percent of forestry majors (as well as non-majors) because it meets a university upper division general education requirement. The University of Wisconsin-

Stevens Point requires forestry majors to take a course in Environmental Ethics (from the philosophy department), which also meets 3 credits of the general education requirement.

### Observation 3

Of the 11 schools that teach ethics throughout the curriculum, four replied with specific comments on their forest policy or administration courses. In some cases, content focused on professional ethics; in others the treatment of others and treatment of the environment was highlighted. At Oklahoma State, 15 percent of the course in Administration and Policy was estimated to be ethics.

### Questions

- Beyond the required professional ethics, what kinds of ethics topics are most valuable to students and their future employers and colleagues?
- Could or should professional ethics be covered more broadly; e.g., all environmental professionals, including conservation biologists, fish and wildlife, and forestry students?
- Could or should ethics courses (perhaps including professional, environmental, and social ethics) provide a foundation for valuing and working with philosophical differences? If they should, do they? For example, at some schools, there appear to be philosophical differences between students and faculty relative to "conservation" disciplines and "management" disciplines. Would it be possible to use jointly conducted ethics courses to develop a better, mutual understanding of individuals with these differences?

### Next Steps

I plan to acquire information from those schools who have not responded and to send out the complete table of data. Additionally, I would like to compare the topics and approaches of different courses—however, this task would require some assistance. Any interested graduate students out there?



## People Profiles

### **Tombaugh Retires, Nielsen Appointed at NC State**

*Terri Bates, Executive Liaison*

Larry W. Tombaugh retired as Dean of the College of Natural Resources at North Carolina State University at the end of June 2001. Tombaugh was a founder of the National Association of Professional Forestry School and Colleges in 1981 and served as President in 1990 and 1991.

Dean of the college at NC State since 1989, Tombaugh oversaw major growth in private financial support for scholarships and an increase in the amount of research funding from sources outside the university. Also, during his tenure, the college—formerly the College of Forest Resources—was renamed to reflect its growing emphasis on the sustainable use and stewardship of natural resources.

Before coming to NC State, Tombaugh served as chairman and professor in the Department of Forestry at Michigan State University from 1978 to 1989. He served in several senior research management capacities at the National Science Foundation in Washington, DC, from 1971 to 1978, and was an economist with the US Forest Service's Southeastern and North Central research stations.

Tombaugh is a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and the Society of American Foresters, and has earned the silver medal for meritorious achievement from the National Science Foundation. He earned his BS in Forestry from The Pennsylvania State University, his MS in Forestry from Colorado State University, and his Ph.D. in Resource Economics from the University of Michigan.



Effective August 1, 2001, Larry A. Nielsen was named Dean of the College of Natural Resources at North Carolina State University. Nielsen comes from The Pennsylvania State University's School of Forest Resources, where he has served as Director since 1994.

During his time at Penn State, he raised over \$12 million in funds, established student and faculty exchange programs, received authorization for the construction of a new building, and co-created a Center for Watershed Stewardship.

Nielsen earned his BS in Biology from the University of Illinois, his MS in Fisheries Biology from the University of Missouri, and his Ph.D. in Fisheries Biology from Cornell University. He is a fellow of the American Institute of Natural Fisheries Biologists, an honorary member of the American Fisheries Society, and a certified fisheries scientist. From 1977 to 1994, Nielsen was a faculty member at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

### **Changes at the University of Idaho**

*Sue McMurray  
Communications Specialist  
College of Natural Resources  
University of Idaho*

Charles R. Hatch is the University of Idaho's new Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies, after serving in that role on an interim basis since December 1999. He has left his position as Dean of the University of Idaho's College of Natural Resources. He became Dean of what was then the College of Forestry, Wildlife and Range Sciences in 1995. Hatch joined the UI faculty in 1973 after serving as a forester and research forester with the US Forest Service, and as an assistant professor at Southern Illinois University-Carbondale. He earned his BS degree in Forest Management at the University of Montana, an MS in Forest Mensuration at Oregon State University, and a Ph.D. in Forest Mensuration/Statistics from the University of Minnesota.

Leonard R. Johnson, Associate Provost at the University of Idaho and Associate Dean of the College of Natural Resources (CNR), was named, for the second time, as Interim Dean of the college.

Johnson, who served as Interim Dean from July 1994 to June 1995, began his new duties June 24, 2001. Johnson joined the UI faculty in 1974, served as Associate Dean for Academics in the College of Natural Resources in 1989 and 1990, and was head of the UI Forest Products Department from 1990 to 1999. He also served as Interim Executive Director for Institutional Planning and Budget at the university.



## Interior Appropriations

Both the Senate and House have passed the FY2002 Interior spending bill, and conferees must now work out a \$380 million funding difference between the House and Senate spending levels. The bill provides about \$18.5 billion in the Senate version and \$18.9 billion in the House for Interior and related agencies and programs. Both bills show increases over the administration's budget request, which is about \$18.1 billion.

The House Interior Appropriations bill includes a total of \$237 million for Forest and Rangeland Research programs, an increase of \$7.8 million from what was enacted last year. The Senate Interior Appropriations bill provides nearly \$243 million for Forest and Rangeland Research programs, which is nearly \$8 million more than requested by President Bush.

The House version did include report language strongly supported by NAPFSC that states: "The committee is aware that reduced timber harvesting from public forests has greatly increased the demands on the nation's private forestlands as a source of wood and fiber. These same nonfederal lands are also under increasing pressures for recreation, wildlife, and environmental quality. The committee encourages the Forest Service to focus its research on private land issues as well as public lands, including forest productivity, water quality, and sustained management, and to expand its collaborative efforts with the nation's forestry schools."

The House included \$277.8 million for State and Private Forestry Programs. The Senate provided \$287.3 million for State and Private Forestry Programs. The Senate level is an increase of nearly \$16 million over FY2001, and an increase of nearly \$50 million over President Bush's request.

A conference committee will meet to resolve the differences between the House and Senate FY2002 Interior Appropriations bill in September. It is very important for NAPFSC members to express their appreciation and support for the various forestry funding increases to their Members of Congress, especially if they are on the appropriations committee. Further updates on both of these bills will be provided at the NAPFSC annual meeting in Denver in September.

## NAPFSC News Briefs

### Workforce Planning: Helping Federal Agencies Meet Future Needs

*Kerry Bolognese, Assistant Director, Federal Relations  
NASULGC*

NAPFSC is represented in the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC) by the Forestry Section. The Forestry Section is one of five sections on the Board on Natural Resources. On July 12, 2001, the board met with leaders of the US Geological Survey (USGS) to review USGS' workforce planning processes and to discuss strategies to address future needs. The USGS, like many other federal agencies, has an aging workforce. Over 50 percent of its scientific workforce will be eligible to retire within ten years. In the geological sciences, retirement eligibility is approaching 75 percent.

The board was comprised of two or three leaders from each section. The Forestry Section included Greg Brown, Bill McComb, and Al Sullivan. USGS was represented by Chip Groat, Director; Jeff Armbruster, Senior Policy Analyst for Workforce Planning; Karen Siderelis, Geographic Information Officer; Denny Fenn, Associate Director for Biology; Barbara Ryn, Associate Director for Geography; Pat Leahy, Associate Director for Geology; Mary Jo Baedecker, Hydrology Chief Scientist; and Stan Ponce, Senior Liaison for Interagency Programs.

Each USGS division leader gave an overview of his or her vision of future science activities and of the workforce needed to achieve it; i.e., what kind of skills, technological capabilities, and scientific knowledge will future USGS employees be expected to have? The board will share this information with NASULGC institutions and provide feedback to USGS regarding the demographics and disciplinary interests of students coming through the system. Then the board will attempt to compare the university situation with USGS's needs, help identify gaps in the current and future workforce, and recommend strategies for addressing these needs and actions that the agency can take to help recruit the "best and the brightest" graduates. This strategy will also help NASULGC universities ensure that they are meeting the needs of society and policymakers by producing students (and skills) who will be in demand. The board will use this model for other environment and natural resource agencies facing similar workforce issues, including the US Forest Service, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency, and the Environmental Protection Agency. Future meetings will be scheduled with leaders in these agencies.



## People Profiles

### CSREES News

*Terri Bates, Executive Liaison*

Gary L. Cunningham of New Mexico State University (NMSU) has accepted the position of CSREES Associate Administrator. He will assume his duties at the end of the summer. Cunningham has been at NMSU since 1968, starting as an Assistant Professor in the Department of Biology. In 1984, he was named Associate Dean of the College of Agriculture and Home Economics and Director of the Agricultural Experiment Station. He currently serves as Vice President for Research at NMSU. Cunningham has served the university system in a number of western regional and national roles, including membership on the Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy (ESCOP), the ESCOP liaison to the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy, the Hispanic Colleges and Universities Research Association, and other professional associations and societies. He earned a BS in Secondary Education in Biology, an MS in Botany from the University of Arizona, and a Ph.D. in Botany from the University of California, Los Angeles.

### USDA Personnel Updates

*Terri Bates, Executive Liaison*

Joseph J. Jen was sworn in as USDA Undersecretary for Research, Education and Economics in late July after US Senate confirmation. Since 1992, Jen has served as the Dean of the College of Agriculture at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, where he oversaw 11 departments and a \$30 million budget. He was also on the faculty of three land-grant institutions. In 2000, he was appointed by the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy and served as a member of the United States delegation to the United States-Japan Millennium Study. Jen received a BS in Agricultural Chemistry from National Taiwan University, an MS in Food Science from Washington State University, and a Ph.D. in Comparative Biochemistry from the University of California at California at Berkeley. He also has an MA in Business from Southern Illinois University.

Mark E. Rey has been nominated to be Undersecretary of Agriculture for Natural Resources and Environment. Upon confirmation by the US

Senate, Rey will assume responsibilities for the US Department of Agriculture's Forest Service and Natural Resource Conservation Service. Rey has served as professional staff on the US Senate Energy and Natural Resources Subcommittee on Forests and Public and Land Management since 1995. During his tenure there, Rey worked on legislation designed to bring collaborative management to national forests. Prior to his work for the Senate, Rey worked as Vice President of Forest Resources for the American Forest and Paper Association from 1992 through 1994. Before that, he was Executive Director of the American Forest Resource Alliance from 1989 to 1992 and Vice President of the National Forestry Products Association from 1994 to 1989. Rey holds a BS in Wildlife Management, a FS in Forestry, and a MS in Natural Resources Policy and Administration from the University of Michigan School of Natural Resources. He was elected a Fellow of the Society of American Foresters in 1987.

### Day Heads New Urban Forestry Program at Virginia Tech

*Lynn Davis, Public Relations Specialist, Virginia Tech*

A new Urban Forestry program in Virginia Tech's Forestry Department has been started to offer forestry majors an option in that discipline. Only begun recently, the option is already accredited by the Society of American Foresters. In addition to the core classes for the forestry major, students in the new option take urban forestry classes that include arboriculture and a hands-on, project-driven class for seniors that encompasses urban forestry policy and management. The option also includes classes in landscape horticulture, pest management, and urban planning. Graduates from the new program will be foresters who will be well prepared to pursue a career in any area of urban forestry. The Forestry Department, one of three departments in

the College of Natural Resources, had been teaching a popular junior/senior level urban forestry class for over 20 years, and an interdepartmental urban forestry curriculum had been available to students for the last five years. "The new program builds on these strengths," says Forestry Department Head Harold Burkhart, "by adding more core urban forestry classes and creating an option within the forestry major." The department will add an urban forestry faculty position this year. Currently the program is headed by Susan D. Day, who specializes in soil compaction and construction damage to trees. She has been teaching urban forestry at Virginia Tech since 1997.



## NAPFSC News Briefs

### Historically Black Institutions and NAPFSC

*Susan G. Stafford, Diversity Chair*

On April 24-26, NAPFSC President Perry Brown and I visited Alabama A&M University and Southern University, two of the 1890 Historically Black Institutions. Our focus was to learn more about their programs and to inquire about their interest in joining NAPFSC.

Alabama A&M (AAMU) offers a BS in Forestry with concentrations in Forest Science and Forest Management. The forestry program, headed by Dr. George Brown, has carved a niche for itself in the timber management and harvesting operations areas. AAMU is the only 1890 Historically Black Institution to offer a four-year forestry degree. Additionally, it is the only Historically Black Institution to offer both MS and Ph.D. programs in Plant and Soil Science under the umbrella of Natural Resource Sciences. The university shares a strong and productive relationship with the USFS, with its forestry program being designated as a USDA Center of Excellence. AAMU has an active outreach program led by Louise Wyche, who is committed to the internship program and has been successful in securing funding (\$5K/student) and placing interns (40 students). The AAMU program will be evaluated for SAF accreditation this fall with a site visit in October 2001. Securing SAF accreditation is important to AAMU, as it is viewed as a key component of “validating” the integrity and long-term success of the forestry program.

Southern University is the largest of the Historically Black Institutions. Southern has the first four-year BS degree program in urban forestry in the nation, established in 1992. The program also offers an MS in urban forestry, and is in the process of obtaining approval for an urban forestry Ph.D. program. Dr. Daniel Collins, head of the forestry program, is an Alabama A&M graduate. Southern University also has a strong relationship with the USFS, having received seed money and a five-year grant to help build their program. They also have an active outreach program, under the direction of Rodney Stone, who has successfully placed 270 students in the last four years. Two programs, “City as a Park” and “Urban Forestry on the Road,” have been very successful. The visit included some student presentations. The students were articulate, spoke highly of their internships, and were excellent ambassadors of the program. Southern University is in a position to redefine urban forestry for the rest of the nation.

Both institutions are keenly interested in joining NAPFSC and accepted Dr. Brown’s invitation to make a presentation and share information about their programs to the general NAPFSC membership at the annual meeting in Denver. In addition, both institutions are interested in strategizing with the NAPFSC leadership to find ways to increase the total McIntire-Stennis funding so additional resources will be available for appropriate programs.

---

NORTH CENTRAL REPORT CONTINUED FROM PAGE 10

courses is in teaching students the process of problem solving and planning rather than in the end product.

The two groups reconvened in the afternoon in separate sessions. During the NAPFSC afternoon session, each member present provided a spreadsheet summarizing important institutional parameters and then briefly discussed program activities at their home institutions. One important point noted by all institutions present was either flat or declining enrollment, with traditional forest management programs being the most impacted. The University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point was the only institution present to report substantial growth in enrollment.

Al Sullivan reported that, by virtue of his position on the Board on Agriculture, the Food and Society Initiative has an advocate for a forestry element for the first time. Al reported that the board is trying to increase its influence and is seeking a stronger relationship with USGS. He also predicted that we will see a lot of competition among universities, government agencies, and private industry within the next few years for people with advanced degrees to replace those retiring. This may force us to look seriously at new partnerships and delivery options as our programs broaden and the pool of qualified professors declines.

The meeting ended with brief reports from the research, legislation, Extension, and international committees, given by Al Ek, John Phelps, Tom Warner, and Pete Schaefer, respectively, about the future of federal funding for McIntire-Stennis and RREA. Ek noted that nominations for FRAC would be needed soon. He also reported that many 1994 land-grant institutions needed research and teaching partners and that these institutions have access to funds that are not directly available to 1860 institutions.



## Regional Reports

### Southern Region - Extension

*William G. Hubbard*

*Southern Regional Extension Forester*

**Forest Certification Landowner Awareness Satellite Video Conference Scheduled for December 4, 2001.** A multi-agency planning committee has been formed to organize a three-hour satellite video conference for forest landowners who want more information on forest certification. A contentious issue in much of the country right now, the program will discuss definitions, history, current programs, implications for forest landowners, and sources of additional information. The videoconference will be uplinked from Auburn University and while the focus audience is currently scheduled to be southern forest landowners, much of the information will be relevant to national audiences as well. For more information, contact Bill Hubbard, [whubbard@uga.edu](mailto:whubbard@uga.edu) or visit [www.soforext.net/certification](http://www.soforext.net/certification) on the web.

**Urban and Community Forestry Update.** USDA Forest Service, Southern Group of State Foresters, Extension, universities, and others are planning a satellite video series this fall (October 2, 9, 23) at select locations around the south. The three-session, nine-hour program will offer participants the opportunity to learn more about the changing role of public servants (state forestry agency, Extension, city/county administrators, etc.) and private individuals and groups in an ever-changing urbanizing south. For more information on the program, contact Bill Hubbard, [whubbard@uga.edu](mailto:whubbard@uga.edu) or visit [www.forestrysatellite.net](http://www.forestrysatellite.net) on the web.

**Master Tree Farmer Series.** Due to an overwhelming response in 14 participating southern states, the Master Tree Farmer satellite program will be offered as a taped series this fall beginning October 2, 2001, and continuing for six weeks. The sessions will be planned for Tuesday evenings at Extension and other downlink sites throughout the South. States interested in participating may elect to participate in the Tuesday night sessions, having the benefit of communicating with the speakers via phone, or they can obtain the taped sessions for viewing at their convenience. To obtain a copy of the tapes, contact Dr. George Kessler at [gkessler@clmson.edu](mailto:gkessler@clmson.edu).

**Virginia Assistance Finder Debuts.** Dylan Jenkins at Virginia Tech provides the following report on a service now available on their website.

Extension agents and natural resource managers receive numerous questions from landowners regarding who to contact for different types of management assistance. The Virginia Tech Department of Forestry, in cooperation with the Virginia Department of Forestry, has developed an on-line "assistance finder" for forest landowners and others seeking contact information for natural resource agencies for all counties in Virginia. Landowners simply click on their county from either a dropdown menu or Virginia map. Contact information, i.e., agent name, address, phone, fax, email, and website, for major state, federal, and private natural resource management agencies, is then listed for the desired county.

Links are also provided to the state private forest consultant list (maintained by the Virginia Department of Forestry) and the Virginia SFI-trained logger list (maintained by the Virginia Forestry Association). In addition, an extensive list of assistance services is provided for each agency. A printer-friendly listing is also available for each county. Other private organizations, such as land trusts and conservation organizations, are being added constantly.

The assistance finder was developed as part of the new web-based Woodland Options for Landowners course that will begin January 15, 2002. The Virginia assistance finder is located on the Virginia Forest Landowner Update webpage at [www.cnr.vt.edu/forestupdate](http://www.cnr.vt.edu/forestupdate). For more information on the assistance finder or the Woodland Options web-based course, contact Dylan Jenkins, Extension Forester, at 540-231-6391, [dylan@vt.edu](mailto:dylan@vt.edu).

**ANREP Awards.** The Association of Natural Resource Extension Professionals (ANREP) recently announced their award recipients. ANREP seeks to develop multistate, regional, and national relationships in the natural resources and environmental management arena. The association began in 1995 and today consists of approximately 250 wildlife, environmental education, watershed, forestry, wood products, community development, and other related professionals. The 3<sup>rd</sup> National Natural Resources Extension Conference, sponsored in part by ANREP, will be held in Naples, FL, on June 2-5, 2002. For more information about ANREP, the awards program, or the biannual conference, see [www.anrep.org](http://www.anrep.org).



## Regional Reports

### SOUTHERN REGION REPORT CONTINUED FROM PAGE 8

because of the high number of retirements expected in the next few years. Forestry schools will play a major role in filling many of these vacant positions. Concerns were expressed over the original list of targeted schools, which would be used for recruitment, and aspects of the agency's recruitment strategy. The Southern Region has expressed its concern about the targeted school list, and changes in the list have been made. Now all accredited forestry schools will be included. In addition, the Southern Region has proposed a partnership with the Forest Service to enhance and expand recruitment activities.

Bruce Jewell, Southern Region Deputy Regional Forester, discussed USFS' State and Private Forestry programs. He noted that the goals of State and Private Forestry include customer service, congressional relations, and reaching diverse landowners. Two primary initiatives, for which funding has been allocated, are prescribed fire and community development. Ideas for future cooperative efforts between the Southern Region and State and Private Forestry were hosting a "Dean's Tour" and creating a cooperative agreement among the Forest Service, state foresters, and southern forestry schools.

Discussions were held with the following cooperators: Steve Newton, Forest Landowners Association; Bill Hubbard, Regional Extension Forester; Pete Roussopoulos, Southern Forest Experimental Station; and Larry Biles, USDA-CSREES. Our talks were informative and included discussions on federal funding, opportunities for cooperation, the Canadian softwood agreement, 2002 Farm Bill, the Master Tree Farmer Program, the National Fire Plan, and personnel changes.

### NORTHEAST REPORT CONTINUED FROM PAGE 8

technology to allow students from the various campuses to interact with the seminar speaker, as well as discuss issues among campuses. The series has been successful and the intent of the grant proposal will be to examine opportunities for coordinating distance education offerings among campuses so that everyone can benefit from expertise on the collection of northeast campuses.

Finally, Greg Brown and I participated as NAPFSC representatives at a NASULGC Board on Natural Resources meeting in July 2001. The meeting was held with

USGS administrators to discuss Workforce Planning—a popular topic among federal natural resources agencies these days. In what is becoming a familiar story, USGS (like many other federal agencies) predicts a huge turnover in personnel in the next five to ten years. The board agreed to initiate a survey of member universities to assess the potential to meet workforce demands for this and other agencies. It is clear that joint agency-university leadership is needed to ensure that high school students and their parents are aware of what is likely an impending crisis in natural resources employment at all levels of training. This is good news for placing the students that we have in our programs now, but it will mean that we should ensure that enough adequately trained students are in the pipeline to meet agency (state and federal), NGO, and industry expectations over the next ten years.

### WESTERN REGION REPORT CONTINUED FROM PAGE 9

#### **“Terrorism” of WNAPFSC Programs and Initiatives**

We discussed the recent experiences of terrorism of WNAPFSC programs and initiatives, with the major incidents, related to biotechnology advances, occurring at the University of Washington and Oregon State University (OSU). It was announced that OSU will co-sponsor an international conference on forest biotechnology, including presentations on social and ethical concerns, in late July 2001. The university will take security precautions for the conference and the various participating organizations and institutions. “Talking points” and other OSU guidelines for working with the media and law enforcement agencies in conjunction with this conference, along with other experiences in the west, will be shared with the NAPFSC membership regionally and nationally.

#### **WNAPFSC Annual Survey**

We reviewed our annual survey of WNAPFSC members and decided to continue using it in the future with modest revisions. Accordingly, we will continue to gather information on student enrollments, credit-hour production, budgets (for teaching, research, and Extension), graduate student stipends, FTEs (for teaching, research, and Extension), and salaries (by rank) of faculty and administrators.



FEATURE ARTICLE CONTINUED FROM PAGE 3

Michelle informed the work group that the increase in annual fee to \$2000 functions as an all-inclusive flat fee, in contrast to the current variable fee in years of interim status and on-site reviews. There were mixed reactions to a flat fee model. On the one hand, it was reviewed as predictable and convenient. However, it also drives the annual fee upwards. Some felt it would be easier to justify an elevated fee during an on-site accreditation review year rather than imposing a higher annual fee. Finally, an annual flat fee that builds in the elevated costs associated with the year of review effectively represents prepaying the cost of review for nine years prior to review in the tenth year. From a financial management perspective, this might not be a desirable approach for some schools. Similarly, it also makes sense for the schools to cover the costs of the on-site review team directly rather than routing funds through SAF to cover such costs.

After substantial discussion and analysis, it was evident that SAF accreditation needs to be viewed as a partnership between the schools and SAF. Clearly, the schools need to bear some of the cost, but SAF and the membership of SAF should also absorb some of the cost for this core program that benefits the profession broadly. A generalized model for how costs might be computed and covered began to emerge. Because schools contribute both their direct and indirect costs of accreditation and substantial faculty and staff time, it was felt that SAF should not charge an overhead cost associated with accreditation. This alone would substantially reduce expenses. For example, in 2000, SAF's indirect cost of accreditation was about \$76,000 on top of personnel costs of about \$84,000. Furthermore, it was proposed that a small percentage (perhaps 3 to 5 percent) of SAF dues should be allocated to accreditation. This would provide between about \$42,000 (3 percent) and \$70,000 (5 percent) in revenue. It was also recognized that the fee to the schools associated with the year of a review and on-site visit should probably be increased above the current \$1200 level. Given the expectation of six to seven accreditation visits per year over the next several years, an elevated fee (perhaps \$2500) associated with on-site reviews would serve as a significant annual source of revenue. These potential sources of revenue investment in accreditation, coupled with the justified waiver of indirect costs for accreditation, would certainly appear to make SAF accreditation a more affordable process that could be supported with only a modest increase in annual fees.

I believe that an unresolved issue is defining exactly what the necessary expenses and services associated with

SAF accreditation ought to be. Clearly, the annual SAF expenses have varied considerably over the past several years. Considering new initiatives, such as training programs for visiting team members, development of a handbook for member programs, and electronic databases, etc., will only add to the expense. Ultimately, SAF and partnership schools must decide what is needed, valued, and affordable.

We are all sensitive to the challenges of overcoming budget shortfalls and keeping costs in line with the benefits accrued. As such, our recommendations to drop indirect costs or tap into dues (or other sources of SAF revenue) to support accreditation were not made lightly. We recognize that these investments may mean some other dimension of SAF might be compromised or eliminated or that the accreditation process might need to become much more streamlined. Certainly, there has been a strong push for the latter among many of the schools. However, if accreditation is as valuable to the society, employers, schools, and the broad membership as stated in our opening discussions, then it would seem to warrant a greater investment from SAF's base funding. Perhaps the real test of value is the extent to which any of us are willing to invest.

### **Forestry and Natural Resources Management in IFAFS 2001**

*Rodney Foil, USDA-CSREES*

Of the 758 proposals submitted for consideration for funding as part of the 2001 Initiative for Future Agricultural and Food Systems, 35 were devoted to forests, wildland management, and related issues. Seven such proposals were submitted to the plant genome program, 8 to the new uses for agricultural crops program, 15 to the program in alternative management of natural resources, 3 to the invasive species program, and 2 to the program on farm efficiency and productivity.

The awards process has not been completed, and no decisions are final at the present. However, review panels and program management have made initial recommendations to fund four of these proposals, two in natural resources management and one each in the plant genome and new uses areas.



**NAPFSC**  
**Year-to-date 2001 Financial Summary**  
**(August 1, 2001)**



**INCOME**

Dues Paid.....			\$ 84,363.00
Other Deposits			
USFS	\$15,000.00		
AF&PA	\$ 5,000.00		
		\$ 20,000.00	
Dues Outstanding (\$16,389.00)			


**TOTAL INCOME** **\$104,363.00**

**EXPENSES**

Operating Expenses.....			\$ 54,695.72
Executive Committee.....			\$ 9,742.44
Coalition.....			\$ 12,691.09

**TOTAL EXPENSES** **\$ 77,129.25**

Submitted by G. H. Weaver  
Secretary/Treasurer



# 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 Natural Resources  
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University  
324 Cheatham Hall, Mail Code 0324  
Blacksburg, VA 24061