18 April, 2014

External Review Team
Tourism and Outdoor Leadership Program

Dear Review Team,

I have read the self-study report submitted by the Tourism and Outdoor Leadership (TOL) Program in support of their 10-year review. The self-study report highlights many of their accolades and issues that they face as they plan for the future. It also includes several questions for you to reflect on pertaining to their future. I am sharing my perspective as an administrator in the College of Forestry (COF), former faculty member in the Forest Ecosystems & Society (FES) department, and as a former member of the Recreation Resources Management (RRM) program in Corvallis.

The creation of the Cascades campus, politically, financially, and administratively, shades much of the context within which the TOL program is attempting to operate. I do not believe this context is clearly laid out in the self-study. I believe Stefani will be providing you with some background information on the Cascades campus that you might find interesting. However, let me succinctly outline what I believe are some issues to consider as you think about the future of TOL and respond to the self-study’s questions asked of you.

Cascades campus is funded directly from the state legislature, and separately from the Corvallis campus. This means that faculty, instructor and advisor salaries, among others, at Cascades are funded separately from Corvallis. Yet, the TOL program resides in the COF/FES in Corvallis. Promotion & Tenure (P&T) for TOL tenure-track faculty flows through the COF/FES in Corvallis with input from the Cascades administration. Thus, on paper, the TOL program is managed through the COF/FES in Corvallis with no real financial obligations to it. The defined structure that created the Cascades campus, and TOL as a unique program offered only at Cascades, is resulting in many points of confusing, contradicting, and conflicting issues (P&T, course delivery, access to funding, etc.).

This disconnect is evident in the administrative organizational chart in Figure 1 of the self-study report, which shows TOL’s organizational relationship with Cascades, but not with the COF/FES. The self-study does refer to some connections with the COF/FES, and asks you all to consider some solutions around growing TOL, either independently within the Cascades campus or in partnership with the COF. In order for you all to provide informed feedback, I feel
it is necessary to provide you with some additional information about the COF, and possible solutions that the COF is willing to consider.

Please note that these solutions (in bullets below) are presented in the spirit of collaboration and support of TOL. They may or may not be the direction TOL chooses in this time of significant transition. But, this program review is the perfect opportunity to invite such conversations and to obtain input from experts who can provide independent perspectives. I feel that to maximize the benefit of this review, it is important you have some additional information.

- It may be helpful to find ways to leverage the (on paper) relationship between the COF/FES and TOL, that may result in mutually beneficial outcomes. For example, I could propose a model in which COF/FES develops a "Recreation and Tourism" program where variants of RRM are offered on the Corvallis campus and variants of TOL are offered on the Cascades campus. This may increase the interests of FES in supporting the TOL offerings (administratively and financially), create more effective learning opportunities for our students through shared educational deliveries, and in general be beneficial to both.

- As it currently stands, the Adventure Leadership Institute (ALI) in Corvallis may be seen as “competition” or, at the very least, can be a point of confusion for students (i.e. What is the difference between TOL and ALI?). I can see a scenario where we could focus on bridging with Corvallis campus and accept credits through ALI. This may enable Corvallis to offer the first 2 in a 2+2 model for TOL. The pathway may be defined through NR or jointly with RRM in a new model.

- Student advising - One possible resolution is if COF/FES provided and had oversight in professional advising "for its programs" offered at Cascades. The COF/FES would assume responsibility for providing professional advising services "to its students" at Cascades, focusing these efforts on TOL/NR and not on other Cascades programs.

- International students - If a pathway is defined in which TOL students could do their first 2 years in Corvallis, then access to international recruitment through INTO would be one possibility, and would help overcome the VISA restrictions to COCC and E-campus course delivery.

- Assessment – The COF/FES program may be able to support assessment if there are stronger ties between the programs.

While I appreciate the desire of the TOL program to be stand-alone as Cascades moves to a 4-year campus, I also do not want to lose sight of potential, mutually beneficial, relationships with the Corvallis campus in general and the COF/FES in particular. This leads me to some questions I would like you to consider.

- What does it mean to be “stand alone” and what is the role of the COF/FES in desired future for the TOL program?

- What models do other colleges use when similar degree programs are offered on separate campuses?
• Is there a different program structure that captures the benefits of an integrated, synergistic relationship with the Corvallis campus while maintaining the integrity and essential attributes of TOL?
• And what relationship between the two campuses and programs would best serve our students and the long-term success of our faculty at Cascades?

These are the issues I look forward to discussing with you when you are here for your review.

Sincerely yours,

Randall S. Rosenberger, PhD