



UNIVERSITY of CALIFORNIA  
Division of Agriculture & Natural Resources



University of California Agriculture and Natural Resources

Academic Assembly Council

MINUTES

March 31st and April 1st, 2009  
UCCE San Joaquin County office, Stockton, CA

Members attending:

Paul Vossen, President  
Leigh Johnson, President Elect  
Brenna Aegerter, Secretary  
Jeannette Sutherlin, Program Committee chair  
Chris Greer, Welfare and Benefits Committee chair  
Jennifer Hashim-Buckey, Rules and Elections Committee chair  
Steve Wright, CVR Committee chair  
Sheila Barry, CCSR Committee chair  
Rachel Elkins, NCMR Committee chair  
Joyce Strand, Academic Coordinators Committee chair  
Max Moritz, UCB Committee chair  
Frank Mitloehner, UCD Committee chair

Motions:

**Motion Approved:** We shall recommend to the administration that the proposed revision to policy 315 be removed from consideration.

**Motion Approved:** We appoint an ad-hoc committee charged with determining the need for a revision to administrative handbook section 315 concerning performance expectations for advisors, if so, to draft a revision. Committee should report back to AAC by June 1<sup>st</sup> 2009.

**Motion Approved:** We shall update the AAC brochure and pay to have it professionally designed and printed.

**Motion Approved:** Approval of the Minutes of October 2008 and February 2009 Meetings

**Motion Approved:** We charge the Welfare & Benefits committee with preparing a statement to Rick Standiford and Dan Dooley about Academic Assembly Council support of mentoring and internship programs.

Action items:

**Action item:** Brenna Aegerter will send Leigh Johnson word version of by-laws, change ratification date on cover page of new by-laws, Check with Fe Moncloa about her changes to October minutes, Update committee list – Steve Wright is now chair of CVR rep committee

**Action item:** Paul Vossen will remind standing committee chairs that their charges come from assembly council and any request from outside should be brought to AAC before they are acted upon.

**Action item:** Paul Vossen will send Rick Standiford a document with AAC's input into the strategic vision by April 3<sup>rd</sup>.

**Action item:** Chris Greer will develop a survey on consulting policy in the next 2 weeks, have Paul Vossen and Rachel Elkins look at it, Rachel Elkins also suggested having a county director look at it.

**Action item:** Chris Greer will develop a list of possible trainings. Leigh Johnson will let Rick Standiford know that we don't need carry-forward funds as previously requested.

**Action item:** Chris Greer will ask Dan Dooley to respond to Western Farm Press quote from November 2008.

**Action item:** Paul Vossen will make a statement to Rick Standiford and Fe Moncloa about reducing size of Program Review documents, and implementing the recommendations of the special committee on merit and promotion process.

**Action item:** Paul Vossen asked Personnel Committee for the table of percentage of salary actions that were granted/rejected in the last round (2008)

Next meeting June 2-3 in Davis

---

### **Academic Coordinators Committee Report**

Chair Joyce Strand reported that her committee held a meeting Feb 26<sup>th</sup> to discuss Academic Coordinator issues

Feedback from Academic Coordinators is that they are very happy that AAC is representing them

Next big issue- gathering feedback on new merit and promotions process

E-book now contains everything the admin knows about Academic Coordinators; there is no other source of information.

**Discussion about the draft revision to policy 315 (regarding performance expectations for Advisors)**

The draft revision will hereafter referred to as the “matrix” based on the “at a glance” tables of performance expectations that accompanied the draft revision.

What was the process to arrive at this revision? Although neither Shelley Murdock nor Fe Moncloa are present to explain, there was some discussion about what people thought the process was. Shelley Murdock (Personnel Committee chair) took the information from the E-book and put it into a matrix form. The matrix had several blanks in it. Members of the personnel committee and Fe Moncloa made suggestions to fill in the blank boxes. The goal was to help advisors know what the expectations are for each step. The development and wording of performance expectations at each step was never discussed by the Academic Assembly Council prior to Rick Standiford’s request for input from CE Advisors.

There was discussion about whether development of this matrix was a charge given to the Personnel Committee, and if so then PC should have brought it back to the Council per policy.

Regional representative committees collected comments on the matrix. Many comments were sent directly to Paul Vossen, AAC president.

Discussion of some of the concerns: Is a revision of performance expectations (policy 315) even necessary? Are some of these expectations unreachable? Would they require rewriting our job descriptions? First author issue creates problems as the issues we are working on are complex and require interdisciplinary teams; it removes incentives for senior advisors to convene, foster and mentor such teams that will lead to shared publications and may not provide first authorship; it creates incentives to select narrow and simple research that can generate many publications of which the advisor can be first or sole author. Further, there is not enough emphasis on the real county advisor job of affecting change among local clientele who do not read scholarly journals. These expectations reflect a lack of understanding by administrators of the county advisor’s job.

In general, the matrix is good idea. However, there are significant problems with the language in the matrix and expanded discussions of criteria for evaluating performance in the various ranks. Some particular concerns, for example, are the requirements for first authorship at higher ranks and for statewide, multi-state, national, and international recognition. The narrowness of the examples and linear characterization of program “growth” are overly restrictive and will limit flexibility and creativity. Also, need to change language to include recognition for publications for lay audiences, mentoring new advisors, and one-on-one work with clientele.

Motion Approved: We shall recommend to the administration that the proposed revision to policy 315 be removed from consideration.

Motion Approved: We shall appoint an ad-hoc committee charged with determining the need for a revision to administrative handbook section 315 concerning performance expectations for advisors, if so, to draft a revision. Committee should report back to AAC by June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2009.

Suggested committee members:

Rachel Elkins (NCRM, Ag) – chair

Eric Natwick (CCSR, Ag) or Daren Haver (CCSR, Natural Resources)

Leigh Johnson (CCSR, Natural Resources)

Jeannette Sutherland (CVR, CD)

Steve Wright (CVR, Ag)

Shelley Murdock (CCSR, Human Resources; PC chair) or Dorothy Smith (CVR Human Resources; PC chair elect)

*Action item:* Paul Vossen will remind standing committee chairs that their charges come from assembly council and any request from outside should be brought to AAC before they are acted upon.

### **Discussion about Strategic Plan**

Jeanette Sutherlin is on the Steering Committee, and she reported that a huge amount of work went into producing the white papers.

There was a “Top-down” appointment of committees (chairs didn’t select committees)

The document we are looking at is the 12<sup>th</sup> or so iteration

Comments/concerns:

Description of role of advisors is outdated (Who we are first paragraph, last sentence)

In mentions of pest issues/invasive species, it should include not just invasive species directly attacking crops, but also those attacking ecosystems, waterways, and infrastructure.

Urban landscape water use – role of ANR in developing landscape materials to reduce urban water use – in the future urban water use will be competing significantly with agricultural use

Coastal and marine resources – only mentioned once; needs to be included in most sections

Air quality ignored

Rangeland not mentioned once

Ag personnel availability, health and safety

Ag land preservation

Lack of natural resources mention in innovations in food & NR systems

When you say food and natural resources it excludes other ag (non-food crops such as nursery/env. hort)

Document needs a better name than strategic vision, suggestion was “sustainability/environmental and economic viability” – Jeannette Sutherland mentioned that PR people will be involved in final product before it goes to Regents.

Put emphasis on our continuum – our teams – that is what is unique about us.

We need to incentivize collaboration

Chris/Rachel: campus-based people are not evaluated based on working with county advisors.

Some comments from constituents were already sent to admin, some coming only to us

What is our role? There are lots of others players now, what can we do that consultants do not? Frank suggested rather than working on current problems (analogy of car mechanics), we should look ahead to 2025 and develop new systems (develop new car designs)

There should be a statement that “We are ill-prepared to meet the demands of California in 2025 because we lack sufficient staff, operating resources and other funds”

Discussion continued into the next day (looking at Paul’s draft of our responses to strategic vision)

More comments/concerns:

Failure to mention extending information (emphasis is on development of information)

Page 7 who we are first paragraph last sentence is old model of CE

Incorporate social science into our work, for example on GMO issues

Comment about advisors “going native” – are all advisors providing the latest science-based information? Or are they extending their opinion?

It was decided this was an internal issue, not something that should be in the strategic vision. Comment on need for issue-based training for county-based staff.

Action item: Paul Vossen will make changes to the draft and send it to Rick Standiford by April 3<sup>rd</sup>. (See attached document, APPENDIX I, at the end of these minutes)

### **President’s Report**

President Paul Vossen reported that the AAC executive committee met with Dan Dooley Feb 12<sup>th</sup> – see minutes of that meeting on the AAC website.

Paul Vossen and Rick Standiford have talked about meeting on a monthly basis with the Executive committee) – via one-hour conference calls

There was some discussion about a request from an advisor (not on Executive Committee) to attend these meetings. It was decided that this was not appropriate as per the By-Laws.

Internship and mentoring programs

Frank Mitloehner mentioned that UCD Specialists have new mentoring handbook

System-wide Academic Senate currently has a task force to address question of whether CE academics should be included in the Senate.

### **President Elect’s Report**

President Elect Leigh Johnson reported that the budget request for next year is the same as this year, minus Distinguished Service Award funds, plus asked to carry forward \$3,500 funds for new-advisor training program. Discussion: carry forward request will be withdrawn and the project handled with anticipated Welfare and Benefits Committee funds for next year.

Discussion about need for a new AAC brochure that would be distributed at the Statewide Conference.

Motion Approved: We shall update AAC brochure and pay to have it designed and printed.

### **Program Committee Report**

Chair Jeannette Sutherlin reported on plans to present Distinguished Service Awards at the Tuesday morning breakfast meeting at statewide conference (April 28<sup>th</sup>)

We have 45 min to 1 hour (we might not use all this time- so perhaps not start at 7am?)

President Vossen will give introduction to AAC and introduce committee chairs, tell audience to contact chairs with any questions/concerns.

Awards presentation: Jeannette Sutherlin will present brief piece about why each person won the award and awardees will shake hands with Rick Standiford. Awardees should be notified in advance to be sure they are present.

### **DANRIS-X Improvement Committee Report**

Chair Sheila Barry reported that she obtained information from Pat Day about what information is needed for Federal reporting. The committee has started working on a simplified template, trying to inform programming changes that are already underway with DANRIS-X.

In parallel, the programmer is trying to design a new version for this year - for example, dates associated with items will be going away.

Most of the content cannot be changed, but format can.

Members of this special committee are: Steve Koike, Sabrina Drill, Steve Quarles, Alan Fulton, Sue Manglallan.

### **Rules and Elections Committee Report**

Chair Jennifer Hashim-Buckey reported that the election for AAC president-elect and Rules & Elections seat ends tomorrow.

Jim Downer had volunteered to be the new chair of committee (starts July 1)

Major gap in committee membership is UCR committee

Motion Approved: Approval of the Minutes of October 2008 and February 2009 Meetings

### **Welfare and Benefits Committee Report**

Chair Chris Greer reported that his committee will be meeting via conference call next week

Chuck Ingels has provisionally agreed to be new chair

Consulting policy – maybe AAC could do training on consulting policy or other similar topic (Breeze)?

Different regional directors seem to interpret consulting policy differently, CDs seem to approve or disapprove based on varying levels of scrutiny

Concern was voiced that this was not an issue for us to concern ourselves with. But it was decided that consulting is a job benefit, so it does come under Welfare and Benefits.

Question: Can advisors in a statewide program consult within California?

Chris will talk to Linda Manton on Friday about providing information on how many people are consulting

Rachel: suggested survey of assembly to see if there are issues people are concerned about

Action item: Chris Greer will develop a survey on consulting policy in the next 2 weeks, have Paul Vossen and Rachel Elkins look at it, Rachel Elkins also suggested having a CD look at it.

Chris Greer: Shelley Murdock has suggested in-service trainings we could do – “academics helping academics”. For example: Consulting, navigating IRB process, tips on collecting PR materials for new advisors, and developing AA program and documentation system

Action item: Chris Greer will develop a list of possible trainings. Leigh Johnson will let Rick Standiford know that we don't need carry-forward funds as previously requested.

### **Discussion about internship program**

With upcoming waves of retirement, we recommend that administration and leadership group develop internship programs for disciplines/geographic areas where needed. Possible collaboration between UC and CSU.

Motion approved: We charge the Welfare & Benefits committee with preparing a statement to Rick Standiford and Dan Dooley about Academic Assembly Council support of mentoring and internship programs.

Discussion about exit surveys- the surveys used differ, they are conducted, but is anything done with the information? One problem is the confidentiality of the exit surveys. No action taken.

### **Personnel Committee Report**

Committee member Joyce Strand reported on activities of the committee  
Annual evaluations are not handled by Personnel Committee – except reviewing documents produced by Human Resources admin  
M&P: E-book revisions, trainings for advisors and for ad-hoc chairs and SAC  
They'll be looking at the ad-hoc reports, and review materials for trainings for next year  
Jeannette Sutherland mentioned that streamlined merit system is not working well. From a CD perspective, annual evaluations must now be taken much more seriously, because if there are any issues they cannot wait until 3 years. Advisors must also take them much more seriously than before. Goal was to reduce time for the merit process, but in fact writing an Annual Evaluation is as much work as a Program Review, then the opposite has happened.  
Paul asked about outcome of special committee that looked at the Merit & Promotions process, Joyce said that one recommendation has been implemented (Regional Director does not vote on PRs in their region since they have written a letter), implementation of other recommendations are delayed or still being discussed.

Action items: We ask that Personnel Committee evaluate the current marriage of the Annual Evaluation and Merit & Promotions processes, and find out about the outcome of the special Merit and Promotions committee (what the findings were) and bring it back to the Council. Joyce Strand will communicate this to the Personnel Committee.

Discussion about quote from Dan Dooley in Western Farm Press (Nov 2008) – “morale buster” for advisors

Action item: Chris Greer will ask Dan Dooley to respond to Western Farm Press quote from November 2008.

### **CVR committee Report**

Chair Steve Wright reported about the concerns of his constituents:  
Advisor performance expectations (draft revision to policy 315)  
Reducing PR process to shorter process (i.e. 8 pages)  
Keeping positions refilled

Action item: Paul Vossen will make a statement to Rick Standiford and Fe Moncloa about reducing size of Program Review documents, and implementing the recommendations of the special committee on merit and promotion process.

### **NCMR Committee Report**

Chair Rachel Elkins also submitted a written report  
Collaborative tools site developed and used to communicate with constituents  
Survey (developed by and results summarized by Margaret Collins)  
Will send survey results back out to constituents after AAC has looked at it.  
Rachel recommends that other regions do same or similar survey, she offered to forward survey structure if others want to use it.

### **Berkeley Committee Report**

Committee member Max Moritz reported that they put forward 3 positions, admin whittled down to a single position – climate change specialist, but now there is hiring freeze  
There are several retirements of Specialists upcoming

Consolidation and reorganization – Center for Forestry, IHRMP, and CFRO now combined for certain administrative purposes (e.g. affects how grants are submitted)

### **UCD Committee Report**

Chair Frank Mitloehner reported on the discussions of his committee (which is also the UCD Specialists advisory committee, meets often with the Dean)

80 specialists surveyed – 90% response rate

1. Mentoring handbook for new specialists – currently being finalized by Deans office, not yet printed
2. Should new CE positions be split appointments? Clusters to focus on certain areas both specialists and advisors to work in a particular area? What positions do we want?

Farm advisors are included on search committees for new Specialists.

Currently Specialists cannot vote on packages of AES and I&R faculty nor on candidates for new positions

They have talked to UCD Provost and system-wide Academic Senate – both working towards a senate vote for specialists, clinical professors, advisors

50% of specialists will RETIRE IN THE next 5 yrs, none will be hired this year, to keep pace with retirements, eight specialists need to be hired each year

Dean says: “How do we do less with less?”

Next meeting June 2-3 in Davis, Rick Standiford to be invited

## APPENDIX I

### Academic Assembly Council April 2, 2009

#### Input into the ANR Strategic Vision

*Sent to Rick Standiford on April 3, 2009*

1. Make the "University of California" as the identifiable brand of ANR and CE
2. Lack of sufficient staff, in many cases below critical mass, leaves Cooperative Extension ill prepared to meet the challenges listed in the strategic vision (who we are page 7)
3. The strategic vision must go beyond solving current problems to developing new sustainable systems that integrate all of our resources (human, Agriculture, natural) (California depends on UC and ANR mission page 7)
4. The role of Cooperative Extension research in the counties is equally important as campus based work in solving the state's problems (ANR mission – who we are – end of 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph on page 7 should say: "Cooperative Extension advisors are the bridge between communities and the campus solving problems often in collaboration with campus-based CE specialists and AES scientists to study and extend solutions back to the people in communities throughout the state")
5. Campus and experiment station researchers and educators must work more closely with Cooperative Extension in solving the strategic vision challenges (ANR mission page 7)
6. Specific issues/challenges to be added to, or emphasized in the strategic vision:
  - Food Production (page 9 - Trends): Greater production efficiencies are needed to feed a growing population on less land (page 17 – science innovation)
  - Ag production is more than just food and should include floriculture and landscape (page 9 – Trends and page 17 – science innovation)
  - Urban landscapes use significant quantities of California's water (land use trends page 9, water trends page 10, and ANR's role page 16)
  - Aquatic pest species in our waterways and ocean are huge problems (invasive pests trends page 13)
  - Air quality (particulates, greenhouse gasses) is a major issue (Trends - resources page 10 – climate change page 12 and ANR's role page 16)
  - Emphasize natural resource management (land use trends page 9, ANR's role page 17)
  - Coastal and marine resource management requires more emphasis (land use trends page 9, trends governance and policy page 12, ANR's role - water page 16, and throughout the document)
  - Urbanization challenges - land preservation for agriculture and as a natural resource (ANR's role needs to be added)
  - Obesity, diabetes, and heart disease are major health issues (ANR's role - add nutrition research and education section)
  - New agricultural crop development to improve global competitiveness (food production trends page 9, ANR's role page science innovation page 17)
  - Ag personnel (labor) management (alternatives to manual labor and worker education, health, and safety) (ANR's role – science innovation page 17, science literacy page 19)
  - Social science research and education will be important components in support of all programs