

Overwhelming response to NZIF Membership Survey

Kathrine Fraser, Kinetics Organisation Development Consultancy

When the NZ Institute of Forestry approached its members, early in 1994, the response was overwhelming. Over 80 per cent responded to the census addressing the mission and objectives of NZIF for the future; NZIF services currently used and other potential services; involvement in and preferences for continuing professional development (CPD); the role of NZIF in CPD; the current recognition scheme for forestry consultants; formalising a registration scheme for consultants and possibly other full members; and the demographics of the membership.

A very noteworthy feature of the NZIF survey was the high quality of the responses, with many respondents not only completing the defined opinion scales in the survey, but also adding a wealth of comments which aided in the interpretation of the results. The survey results provide an invaluable resource for NZIF as it plans its development for the next five to ten years.

Extensive consultation with NZIF Task Forces and other members was used to identify key issues and draft survey questions. The questionnaire was distributed to all current NZIF members along with a covering letter and reply-paid envelope.

The results indicate endorsement for the development of a more formal recognition/registration scheme for forestry consultants. The study recommends that following exploration of the options, a discussion paper addressing the purpose, eli-

gibility, standards, assessment procedures and monitoring, be circulated to the wider membership for consultation. The CPD Task Force was also given a mandate to further investigate CPD provision, policy, promotion and associated issues. These two important areas of investigation need to contribute to the Institute's overall strategic plan, which will also address the mission, objectives, structure, and services of the overall organisation.

Who are the members of NZIF?

The geographic locations of members are presented in Table 1. Geographical spread is a difficulty facing all professional organisations, but may be particularly acute for NZIF since some forest areas are in remote locations. The organisation needs to find creative ways to include people who would otherwise be isolated from professional interaction.

It probably comes as no surprise to discover that NZIF is an organisation with a largely male (95.8%) membership. 56.5% of all respondents were full members, the next largest group being the 28.7% who were associate members. Other categories were represented in fairly small numbers. A "retired" membership category could be useful in allowing an ongoing association with members who have been in the industry and may still wish to make a contribution.

Table 2 shows the current employment situations of the respondents. The proportion of members who are employed as consultants is 20.2%, with employees of large forest-related companies constituting the single largest group within the Institute. The majority of members (65.6%) work in exotic forest, and 28.8% have at least some involvement with indigenous forest. About a quarter of NZIF members also belong to the NZ Farm Forestry Association.

Whilst most members (74.3%) have forestry as their main source of income, this is not the case for 25.8%. When considering formal education background it is clear that NZIF attracts a high proportion of university trained members (356 respondents indicated that they hold a university degree or diploma). This is perhaps not unexpected, given the degree structure for forestry. The membership includes a high proportion of people (54.6%) with over 20 years in the industry. 13.0% have under five years' experience and 16.6% ten years' experience or less. Most members belong to NZIF by choice, with only 7.6% of respondents being required by their employers to have membership.

In terms of contributions to the NZIF organisation, there is quite a high level of participation with 44.3% of respondents having been involved in some official capacity.

TABLE 1: Membership by Region

Region	No. of Members
Auckland	41
Rotorua/BOP	125
Canterbury	57
Gisborne	3
Hawkes Bay	21
Manawatu	2
Nelson/Marlborough	32
Northland	17
Otago/Southland	19
Taranaki	1
Wanganui	2
Wellington	68
Westland	15
Expatriate	1
None/Unaware	19

TABLE 2: Employment Situations of Respondents

Employment Situation	No.	%
Employee in large forestry company (>50 staff)	114	22.8
Consultant: non-NZIF recognised	62	12.4
Retired	55	11.0
Employee of Research Institution	43	8.6
Consultant: NZIF-recognised	39	7.8
Employee in small forestry company (<50 staff)	36	7.2
Employee of MOF	31	6.2
Other forestry-related employment	27	5.4
Employee of other Government agency	19	3.8
Employed outside forestry	19	3.8
University/Polytech employee	15	3.0
Farm Forester	11	2.2
District/Regional Council employee	10	2.0
Not in paid employment	7	1.4
Not stated	7	1.4
Student	6	1.2

NZIF MISSION AND SERVICES Why belong to NZIF?

The following trends were found in members' ratings of the importance of various reasons for their belonging to NZIF.

- Keeping in touch with trends in forestry rated the most highly, followed by the opportunity to exchange ideas/networking.
- Professional image associated with membership does seem to be important, with nearly 50% of members rating this as very or extremely important, although 12.3% of respondents rated this as not at all important as a reason for membership. This could reflect how closely members relate to the concept of having a professional image.
- Receiving *New Zealand Forestry* journal was rated overall as important, but less extremely as a reason for membership. Given that the journal is available on a subscription basis, this could be interpreted as indicating that the journal is a highly valued service (important), but is less of a reason for joining, since it could be obtained from other sources if one was not a member.
- The Consultants Recognition Scheme was rated as not important at all as a reason to join by quite a high proportion of respondents (32.6%). This is understandable, given that the scheme is directly applicable only to those who practise as consultants, and only 20.2% of respondents indicated this as describing their current employment situation. The scheme does have some relevance to other members, to the degree that consultants present the public with a view of foresters which may be generalised to the wider membership.

What is the purpose of NZIF?

The four most highly rated purposes were:

- To be an independent authority on forestry issues and practice.
- To establish and maintain an ethical code for the forestry profession.
- To encourage excellence in the practice of forestry.
- To provide a forum for the exchange of ideas and information between members.

To provide or advise on professional development and education, to promote principles of environmentally and socially sustainable forest development, and to establish professional standards for forestry consultants and promote public recognition, were all also endorsed as appropriate purposes for NZIF. Several people noted the desire to influence or

lobby, and the opportunity to network was further endorsed.

What activities should NZIF be involved in?

The activities that were rated most highly were:

- Provide independent comment on forestry issues.
- Provide and reinforce an ethical code for professionals in the industry.
- Publish *NZ Forestry* journal.
- Organise meetings for exchange of ideas/information between professional foresters.

Also highly rated were:

- Promote the image of professional foresters.
- Develop and administer a system of recognition for approved forestry consultants.
- Provide advocacy for the profession.
- Further the science of forestry and forest resource management.
- Provide a source of forestry information, e.g. handbook and guidelines.

The activities that were viewed as least important were:

- Sponsor touring "experts".
- Sponsor awards for excellence in forestry.
- Advise on or provide professional development courses.

Which NZIF services are used by members?

The *NZ Forestry* journal was 'used' by the vast majority of members and is highly valued. The handbook and local section meetings are also well supported. It appears that in local sections that organise events, nearly two-thirds of members have supported these at some time in the past two years. This is a very positive aspect of NZIF activity. Also, given the size of the membership, interest in attendance at the Conference is strong. The most commonly cited additional service was the Consultants Recognition Scheme.

How well known is the Code of Ethics?

10.8% of respondents did not know that NZIF has a Code of Ethics. Of those who did know of its existence, almost as many were unaware of its requirements as were aware of its requirements (53.8% aware versus 46.2% not aware).

The level of awareness of the Code of Ethics among non-recognised consultants was similar to the total population. However, all NZIF-recognised consultants were aware that the Code of Ethics existed and 97.4% were aware of its require-

ments. This indicates a relationship to the recognition process, which involves active consideration of the Code of Ethics. Thus a system of recognition/registration which formally includes the Code of Ethics, is clearly effective in raising awareness of and understanding of the requirements of such a Code. This discussion in no way implies that non NZIF-recognised consultants or the membership at large are less ethical in their actual work behaviour. It simply highlights that the current recognition scheme has enabled the professional guidelines contained within the Code of Ethics to be promoted.

What local section activities are available?

71.9% of respondents indicated that they were in sections that organise activities for members. 13.7% indicated that their local sections did not have organised activities. It seems likely that the form and frequency of activities will vary widely from region to region. The most active sections appeared to be Rotorua/BOP, Hawkes Bay, Nelson/Marlborough, Canterbury, Westland, Wellington and Otago, with some activity in Auckland and Northland. Support and assistance for organisers at the local level is essential if NZIF is to enhance its services to members and market itself more effectively.

15.2% of respondents have a list of other members in their local section, compared with 75.8% who do not. Of this latter group, 77.4% would find such a list helpful.

CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (CPD)

This section focused on the ways in which members can maintain and develop their levels of professional knowledge, skill and attitude through CPD. Its aim was to gain an understanding of what members currently undertake as CPD, as well as their preferences with respect to delivery.

What level of participation do members have in CPD?

The results showed that members are active in the area of CPD. The most popular activities are local meetings including:

- NZIF Local Section meetings/field trips;
- seminars and conferences organised by other professional societies;
- farm-forestry meetings/field trips.

Many members also indicated involvement in writing articles and presenting seminars, although the nature of these varied widely. 21.6% recorded that they

attended the 1993 NZIF Conference in Napier.

Approximately 12% of members claim no involvement in any CPD activities. These members come from a range of employment categories including forestry company employees, consultants, and Government employees. 27.9% of those stating no involvement in CPD are non-active in forestry, e.g. retired, employed outside forestry or not in paid employment. In considering this information, it is important to note that some people may have undertaken CPD but not recognised it by that name. Overall, the proportion of active members who do not undertake any CPD is small. The data suggest that members generally have an appreciation of the need to update skills and develop their abilities.

The time committed to CPD was, on average, about 40 hours per participating member in the past 12 months. This excludes estimates of hours spent in formal university papers which, whilst qualifying as CPD, would have unduly inflated the figure. The requirements typically specified by other New Zealand professional associations, which have recommended or compulsory CPD schemes in place, are in the range of 15-30 hours per year.

What types of CPD activities appeal?

Predictably, the highest level of interest was shown in Local Section meetings/seminars (70.1%) and field trips (66.7%). Other CPD activities to score highly for interest were attendance at lectures/seminars by visiting "experts", NZIF Annual Conference, conferences and seminars run by other professional groups and regional seminars. These are the traditional methods of training and education for professionals, so to an extent the results reflect familiarity with the media. The interest expressed in attending seminars given by visiting "experts" is noteworthy, since sponsorship of touring "experts" was rated less highly as an activity for NZIF. Perhaps members enjoy having the opportunity to attend such specialist seminars, but would prefer them to be sponsored by other organisations!

Relatively few members indicated an interest in either video or audio tape instruction (10.5%) or audio-conferencing seminars (9.7%). These are less traditional forms of delivery, but offer particular advantages to people located in smaller centres around the country.

Why do members participate in CPD?

Respondents marked their ratings of importance for listed reasons for partici-

pating in CPD. The aspects that received the highest importance ratings were:

- to gather new information (97.2% important, very or extremely important rating);
- to enhance personal standards (89.8% important, very or extremely important rating).

To improve service to clients also rated highly. The least important of the reasons listed was to get a promotion or better job, with only 40.6% of respondents rating this as an important, very or extremely important reason, and 36.3% indicating it as not at all important.

Professional development activities need to be relevant to organisational and personal needs to be of real benefit to participants. Members generally desire to be able to gather new knowledge and raise their awareness of current professional issues through involvement in CPD. CPD is a joint responsibility of professionals, their associations and employers in the industry. Some respondents raised the issue of who pays for educational programmes. Any marketing of CPD needs to target both individuals and employers.

How involved should NZIF be in CPD?

This question gauged respondents' level of agreement with NZIF becoming more involved in CPD. 67.6% of respondents agreed to some extent with further involvement. 23.8% neither agreed nor disagreed and 8.6% disagreed with more involvement.

The need for CPD is increasingly being recognised in many spheres as the pace of change and technological development rapidly makes existing knowledge obsolete. Professional institutes are also recognised as being in a good position to serve their members in this regard. This does not mean they must actually provide all the education for their members. They may coordinate, advise, and provide in certain specialist areas where, without their involvement, needs could not be satisfied by the open education market. Considering the low level of disagreement accorded further involvement of NZIF with CPD, it can be concluded that the membership is supportive of some involvement, and initiatives will need to be developed in consultation with the membership.

How much will members pay for educational programmes?

This question aimed to assess the price sensitivity of members to education programmes. People can endorse the concept of specialist seminars, etc, but resources need to be available to fund them.

55.1% of respondents indicated a will-

ingness to pay over \$200 per day and 83.5% to pay over \$100 per day. 16.5% indicated that they would be prepared to pay less than \$100 per day.

The level of cost which members indicated as acceptable seems fairly realistic, and could allow some payment to be made to presenters and/or organisers. Professional associations often call upon their members to organise and/or present seminars as a contribution to the profession (i.e. on an unpaid basis) and this markedly lowers the cost of conducting a seminar. However, given the demands on already busy professionals, there is a limit to which this practice can be applied. In considering its involvement with CPD, NZIF will need to reflect on how the programme will be managed. There is a ceiling above which it becomes dysfunctional to expect volunteers to totally manage the process. Notwithstanding this, volunteers will still always have a vital role within this function.

When is the best times for meetings?

For shorter seminars (1-3hr duration), a clear preference was indicated for holding them either early in the morning (an 8 or 9am start) or in the evening (starting between 5 and 8pm). Respondents seem to prefer the bulk of their work day (mid morning to late afternoon) to be uninterrupted. This information is perhaps particularly useful for Local Sections planning their meetings and seminars, although there may be some differences between areas.

How far do members travel to local section meetings?

The distances people need to travel to attend local section meetings are likely to be related to their attendance. This question also reflects the commitment required of members to maintain direct contact with others in their local Institute.

63.6% of respondents travel up to 30 km, with 36.4% travelling over this distance. This includes 27.2% who have to travel more than 50km. No assessment was made within this survey of how acceptable respondents find the distances they travel. This could be an issue for local sections to further explore. Whilst the benefit of direct contact cannot be underestimated, these figures reinforce the need for a mixture of ways for involving members in CPD.

What makes a "good" CPD event?

People do look for different benefits from involvement in CPD. This question aimed to gauge the relative importance of several attributes of CPD programmes. In actual fact all rated highly, with slightly less

importance being placed on receiving written background papers. The interactive and practical aspects were strongly endorsed:

- opportunities for discussion/debate;
- practical examples/case studies;
- opportunity to network with other members.

This message has implications in the planning of activities. It appears that members like active involvement in their educational activities, so the appropriateness of lecturing alone, as a presentation format, is questionable.

Should NZIF require consultants to undertake CPD?

There was a positive response to the concept of NZIF requiring consultants to have ongoing involvement in CPD. 62.2% of respondents agreed with the concept compared with 16.6% who did not. The details of a mandatory CPD scheme need to be worked through carefully and in consultation with the members affected.

Should NZIF require all full members to undertake CPD?

This question paralleled that concerning consultants. Whilst the application of a compulsory CPD requirement received less support when applied to full members, it still attracted a positive response.

41.1% of respondents indicated their support for a requirement for full members to undertake CPD, compared with 27.5% who disagreed. Nearly one-third (31.4%) of respondents neither agreed nor disagreed, which is understandable given that no details of how such a requirement would be established or monitored were given.

PROFESSIONAL RECOGNITION AND REGISTRATION

This section of the survey was designed to assess the extent to which the concept of the current recognition system for forestry consultants was endorsed by members and then to further explore the appropriateness of formalising the scheme to one of registration. The opportunity was also given for members to indicate whether a more formal registration option should be available to other full members of the Institute, rather than only to forestry consultants.

How useful is the current NZIF recognition system for consultants?

Respondents rated the extent of their agreement with the statement that "the recognition system serves a useful pur-

TABLE 3: Responses to the Statement "The (current) recognition scheme serves a useful purpose for consultants"

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
All respondents – No.	128	248	83	20	7	486
– %	26.3	51.0	17.1	4.1	1.4	
Consultants: non-recognised						
– No.	14	30	14	2	2	62
– %	22.6	48.4	22.6	3.2	3.2	
Consultants: NZIF recognised						
– No.	14	22	1	2	0	39
– %	35.9	56.4	2.6	5.1	0.0	

pose for consultants". Very strong agreement was reflected, with 77.3% of respondents rating agreement or strong agreement. 17.2% indicated that they neither agreed nor disagreed and 5.5% indicated some level of disagreement. Table 3 compares the replies of the total respondents against a break down for consultants (recognised and non-recognised).

Should a registration system be established for consultants?

When asked to indicate the extent of agreement with a registration system being established for forestry consultants, the level of agreement was once again high. 77.5% of all respondents to this question were in agreement with such a scheme. When considering the response from consultants, the group most directly affected by this, support for the concept was equally high (76.2%). Whilst percentage responses of agreement from currently recognised consultants were higher than for those who are not currently recognised, what is most apparent is that the level of disagreement with a registration scheme is generally low. See Table 4.

In phrasing this question, a brief explanation was given of some differences between the current recognition system and a more formal registration system. However, the survey did not assess the perception that members have of what such a scheme would require, or exactly how it would differ from recognition as it is currently. Overall, it seems that the need for a more formalised system is accepted by the membership at large, as well as by members currently working in consulting capacities.

Many respondents took the opportunity to comment on the recognition/registration question and some clear themes were evident. These are summarised below:

- A recognition or registration scheme is potentially useful in indicating professional standards and levels of competency have been met and in protecting the public from 'fly-by-nights'.
- Forestry consultants influence the public perception of foresters in general, and as such act as a window to the wider profession.
- The current recognition system has

TABLE 4: Agreement with the Establishment of a Registration Scheme for Forestry Consultants

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
All respondents – No.	161	214	69	32	8	484
– %	33.3	44.2	14.3	6.6	1.7	
Consultants: non-recognised						
– No.	17	26	13	4	2	62
– %	27.4	41.9	21.0	6.5	3.2	
Consultants: NZIF recognised						
– No.	21	13	4	1	0	39
– %	53.9	33.3	10.3	2.6	0.0	

been of limited benefit because of its low profile (amongst the industry and more particularly clients), the variable support it has received from respected consultants in the industry, and the lack of clarity over the criteria involved (and perhaps suspected elitism).

- There is support for the development of a more formal system. This could take the form of a registration scheme or involve a strengthening of the current recognition system. The advantage of the former option is the public understanding of the standing of registration. The exact form of any scheme will need to be worked through.
- If the key target group are consultants who provide advice to the public, care must be taken to ensure that the scheme is not viewed as detracting from the status and expertise of forestry professionals who work under other employment arrangements. Other specialists could be recognised through alternative mechanisms such as differentiated membership categories.
- The standards that are currently applied to obtaining recognition are not well known to members. The recognition/registration scheme needs to have a clearly stated purpose, which is accepted by members and understood by clients. Standards need to be clearly defined, along with a method for assessing their attainment.
- The system needs to be focused on the competence of the consultants and must avoid simply being elitist.
- Any system that is established needs to be administered and involve careful and ongoing monitoring (i.e. recognition or registration is for a defined period). There needs to be provision made for management of the system (which may not be able to be undertaken purely by volunteers).
- To be of benefit to consultants, the system has to be promoted (along with NZIF and its function) to clients, e.g. banks, farmers, investors. One respondent did note some banks now requiring recognition.
- Real recognition for a consultant comes from having satisfied clients. Some high-profile members of NZIF are not recognised consultants, which reduces the credibility of the current system. The system needs to be supported by more consultants.
- Interest in forestry investment is currently high, making it an appropriate time to be providing some assurance to the public over the credentials of advisers.
- Other professions have recognition/registration schemes.

- Suggestions for standards and system included: importance of ethics, the possibility of including an exam, provision for stating the area of specialist expertise which is being recognised/registered, review periods, inclusion of company foresters who act as internal consultants, inclusion for part-time consultants.
- There will be cost implications in the development and administration of the scheme and these need to be identified and articulated.
- The Institute of Forestry needs to progress any development of the recognition/registration system in collaboration with the membership. A discussion paper needs to be prepared once further investigation of the parameters, draft standards, etc. has been undertaken. This can be the basis for a consultation phase.

Should the proposed registration system be available to all full members?

Respondents rated their level of agreement with the proposed registration process being also available to other full members of NZIF, as a means to highlighting their special expertise. 64.8% agreed with the option of registration being more widely available, with 21.9% neither agreeing nor disagreeing, and 13.4% disagreeing. See Table 5. Whilst the responses indicated considerable support for this concept, the comments given in expansion of the rating indicated some confusion between registration and membership of the Institute. This highlights how vitally important it is for NZIF to make a clear statement about the purpose of any registration scheme it may consider developing.

There was much comment on the assessment for registration, some of which is reflected in the above discussion on recognition. There are some difficulties

associated with specifying and assessing standards. It was noted that forestry is in part an art rather than a pure science, so any registration system must not strait-jacket the profession by not allowing creative approaches to forestry. Further concerns raised, which would need to be addressed in the registration system, were the need for a complaints procedure, arbitration of disputes, the capacity of NZIF to assess competence in very specialised areas of expertise, and culpability of the registering authority.

The Institute needs to be aware of and responsive to the needs of the industry and the profession. In developing the registration system, there needs to be ongoing consultation with the membership to avoid fragmentation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A number of recommendations emerged from the survey for NZIF to explore. These included that:

- NZIF disseminate the results of the membership census/survey widely to its members, in recognition of the contribution they made to its success.
- NZIF develop a strategic plan with regard to the views expressed on the mission and objectives, services, policy formation, management systems and support mechanisms at national and local levels, marketing and promotion of NZIF both internally and externally, and CPD. NZIF needs to re-examine its structure with respect to the services it wishes to offer and consequently, the support and assistance available to local representatives. The process needs to allow for consultation with the membership.
- NZIF officially endorse the desirability of all active members undertaking CPD and market the benefits and opportunities to individuals and employing organisations.

TABLE 5: Agreement with registration being available to all full members

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
All respondents – No.	89	215	103	49	12	468
– %	19.0	45.9	22.0	10.5	2.6	
Consultants: non-recognised						
– No.	10	26	13	6	3	58
– %	17.2	44.8	22.4	10.3	5.2	
Consultants: NZIF recognised						
– No.	5	14	9	8	3	39
– %	12.8	35.9	23.1	20.5	7.7	

- NZIF review its Code of Ethics and in so doing consider the addition of a requirement that members undertake CPD as a part of their professional responsibilities.
- NZIF review the demographics of its members, membership categories, locations and take further actions as appropriate.
- NZIF explore the feasibility of publishing membership lists by region and action as appropriate.
- The CPD Task Force develop a plan outlining CPD policy, and the how, when and by whom details of CPD initiatives, with such a plan contributing to the overall strategic plan. The process needs to allow for consultation with the membership and take into account the trends in training and development in other professions in New Zealand.
- A more formal recognition or registration scheme be explored and progressed for forestry consultants. Following review of the options, a discussion paper be prepared for consultation with the wider membership. This needs to cover: the purpose of the scheme, eligibility, standards (including Code of Ethics, CPD requirements, etc), assessment methods for achieving recognition/registration, the monitoring or review process which will be established, how the scheme will be marketed and any implications for the accrediting body.
- NZIF explore ways of endorsing the specialist expertise of individual members, e.g. specialist register, endorsement of membership category, or incorporation into the proposed registration system.

The census has revealed many areas for NZIF to explore and action. The effort that was directed into the formulation of this study and the whole-hearted response from the membership bode well for the evolution of the Institute as it develops and responds to the needs of its members into the 21st century.

Schlich Medal

The Institute has made two Schlich awards to Canterbury School of Forestry students finishing in 1993. Angus Malcolm, who received his award at the AGM in Nelson, was the top academic student in 1993. He also received the University Faculty of Forestry Prize. Catherine Aiken was awarded hers for excellent all-round performance in academic results and cultural contributions. Both were very worthy recipients of the medal.

Graham Whyte

Membership Changes

In the nine months between October 1, 1993 and June 30, 1994 the Institute Council has processed 77 applications for membership from new and returning members and 12 resignations. These names are listed below.

APPLICATIONS

Beath, P.	Gilbert, P.G.	Ogle, R.M.
Bertram, M.	Gillett, P.	Orchard, R.
Bishop, D.M.	Gray, J.	Parker, A.F.
Boyer, I.C.	Gresham, S.	Perry, B.
Brophy, J.	Guard, H.	Reid, A.D.
Bryan, D.G.	Hall, M.	Richards, A.S.
Bullivant, G.B.	Hall, P.W.	Riddell, N.A.
Cadman, A.L.	Hornby, J.V.	Robinson, P.A.
Cannon, L.	Jayasuriya, A.W.A.	Scott, E.
Carlisle, S.	Keer-Keer, A.	Shirley, R.E.
Cherry, R.G.	Kirk, P.M.	Sloggett, J.
Clark, P.A.	Lawrence, R.R.	Smart, P.
Clarke, M.	Lee, S.W.	Smith, C.
Cochrane, J.	Lovelock, B.	Stafford, J.
Crang, J.	Lyon, C.	Syme, J.
Cutfield, A.	Macdonald, R.	Taylor, R.S.
Davies-Colley, P.	MacKenzie, M.J.	Thomson, J.W.
Denton, B.	Marshall, P.	Thorneycroft, J.H.
Dickson, R.	Martin, H.	Van der Leden, M.
Eyre, J.R.	Mauder, C.	Wallace, I.M.
Feast, G.	May, R.	Watson, M.K.
Fielder, M.	McCracken, I.J.	Watt, P.
Fox, I.H.	McKercher, M.	Weterings, R.
Fulton, J.	Meine, S.	Weytmans, K.
Fung, L.	Nash, K.	Yeoman, S.
Garden, E.R.H.	Nicholls, S.	

RESIGNATIONS

Clemett, N.L.	Gilbert, E.D.	Moore, T.
Cowan, M.A.	Hayward, W.J.	Nicholls, M.C.P.
Depta, D.J.	Hodgkinson, P.J.	Poole, D.J.
Forsell, J.	McKeesick, H.A.	Skipworth, M.

TREES AND SOILS

The effect of monocultures of trees on soils has been argued for many years. It is an issue that is likely to grow as people continue to question plantation sustainability.

A workshop was held at Lincoln University late last February to review our knowledge on the effects of trees on soil properties, and to look at how experiments should be designed to investigate this question. The workshop was organised by Dr Don Mead and Professor Ian Cornforth and was attended by delegates from Sweden, Canada, United States, Britain and Australia, as well as from New Zealand.

Although it was apparent there have

been many studies, there have been very few definitive trials. A clear conclusion of the workshop was the need to carefully plan and execute a few very well designed, long-term field trials. A workshop proceedings will be published.

Since the meeting Don Mead and Ian Cornforth have begun preliminary studies on litter quality for a range of tree species. These studies will provide a basis for selecting tree species to include in trials. A trial close to Lincoln University trial is expected to be planted in the winter of 1996. It is anticipated that the trial will become the focus of detailed process studies, so leading to a deeper understanding of the problem.