



UNIVERSITY of CALIFORNIA
Agriculture & Natural Resources
Academic Assembly Council Minutes
April 26 & 27
UC Davis - Buehler Alumni Center

ITEM	TASKS	DATE	WHO
AAC Secretary for 05-05	Leigh Taylor Johnson has volunteered to serve as AAC secretary	ASAP	President-elect Steve Vasquez will contact Leigh or others interested
AAC Election	Email ballot	ASAP	Doug Gubler

April 26

Welcome and Introductions

Attending: Tuesday, April 26th: Gloria Barrett, Mary Blackburn, Jodi Cassell, Art Craigmill, Chris Greer, Doug Gubler, Juan Guerrero, Maggi Kelly, Diane Metz, Re Moncloa, Dorothy Smith, Steve Vasquez, Paul Vossen, Lynn Wunderlich

Approval of last minutes—Minutes of the October 2004 meeting were approved. MSC

President's Report-Gloria Barrett

- Received budget allocation for FY 2004-2005 (\$68,963)
- Reported AAC October meeting for publication in ANR Report
- Communication with VP Lund – Consulting Policy
- Executive Committee met with VP Gomes and A-VP Standiford on March 18, 2005
- Continue to communicate Council's work throughout the organization
- Facilitate greater collaboration among campus and county
- Transition Plan in place for incoming President Steve Vasquez

Committee Reports

Rules and Elections Committee—Doug Gubler reported

- Election process was initiated two weeks ago but it did not go through
- Doug tried to go through person to allow the person to work on the ANR listserve but Andrea Strand has not responded.
- President-elect position has a good candidate—Chris Greer volunteered

- Many vacancies on the various committees so the Rules and Elections committee is working on this
- Several people have volunteered for the AAC secretary position; no one was named—Steve Vasquez will select and discuss with the individual
- Committee Needs are on Website and ANR Report and through the email
- MSC Report Accepted

Personnel Committee—Fe Moncloa

- Ad hoc Committee Training was held in January and the emphasis was on constructive comment. Training was well received and people commented that mentoring up to now was not perceived as a goal
- Concerns were stated regarding the nature of the training if we change to electronic submission. Fe acknowledged that this process will be assessed and addressed by the committee
- Electronic submission was completed by 10 people this year and this was evaluated.
- There were problems however. County Directors did not understand the deadlines;
- All people who completed PR's were surveyed about the process as it exists and how it might exist with electronic submission
- Streamlining Merit Advancement—AVP Standiford supports the process so this is in ongoing development
- Issues about streamlining related to additional reports—CASA, CREES
- Fe Moncloa will serve as chair in 2005-2006 and Michael Delasaux will be the chair in 2006-2007
- Electronic submission is clearly favored and training for all will proceed
- Dr. Standiford praised Personnel Committee's efforts
- MSC Report Accepted

Program Committee—Cindy Fake, Chr.—report follows:

Professional Society Travel Funds

- The Professional Society Travel Fund reimbursement program is still on a quarterly system, despite our stated intention to change it. In recent quarters, only 50% have been funded. So far this year there have been 164 applications and 76 of these were funded (46%).

Distinguished Service Awards

- In 2004, awards were given for outstanding research, extension, and teamwork; and for the first time, the Outstanding New Professional award was also given. Distinguished Service Awards given in 2004 were: **Outstanding Research:** Sheri Zidenberg-Cherr of the UC Davis Dept. of Nutrition; **Outstanding Extension:** Steve Tjosvold, Farm Advisor,

Environmental Horticulture, UCCE Santa Cruz County; **Outstanding Team Work:** Ann King, Environmental Horticulture Advisor, UCCE San Mateo County Julie Newman, Environmental Horticulture Advisor, UCCE Ventura County, Karen Robb, Environmental Horticulture Advisor, UCCE San Diego County, Steve Tjosvold, Farm Advisor, Environmental Horticulture, UCCE Santa Cruz County

Outstanding New Professional:

- Juan Nunez, UCCE Kern County Farm Advisor, Veg Crops and Plant Path
The office of the Vice President funded the awards at \$5,000 each for the outstanding extension, research, and new professional awards; and \$10,000 for team work.

CE Training --No training was organized during this period due to the lack of funding.

Program Committee Report was accepted as presented. MSC

Welfare and Benefits Committee—Dorothy Smith (still need a chair for 2005-06

- Exit Interview process is still their project for the year
- Presented to VP Gomes and AVP Standiford
- Reason behind this was that organization was losing good people so gathering a data base was what reason behind this data gathering
- Dr. Gomes wants such data but feels it should be gathered via the Personnel Office in Oakland
- MSC Report Accepted

Consulting Sub-committee Report—Juan Guerrero

- Gerald Higginbotham checked with 30 states and they found that at least 15 states supported
- The report was submitted to Elizabeth Gomez's office on request
- Report from AAC stated that the inequality between Specialist and Advisors
- Chris Greer raised the consulting issue discussed with Dr. Gomes at the Executive Committee. Dr. Gomes says the lawyers are now looking into the definition of a workday.
- Consulting Policy was close to being done and had been referred to Program Council
- Rick Standiford praised the AAC's Consulting Committee's report
- Subsequent news since the meeting--Consulting Policy becomes official July 2005

Fee for Service Guidelines Have Been Released:

- This has been released
- Check the Academic Administrative Handbook (web version 2/2005) for details

Sub-Region and Campus Reports

Sub-Region 1 – North Coast and Mountain Region—Paul Vossen

- Submitted written report-read written report in appendix for details
- No support for Ph. D requirement

- Concern about cost of living
- Eleven new positions were good but too few

Sub-Region 2 North Coast and Mountain Region – Dorothy Smith & Lynn Wunderlich

- Written report submitted—see appendix
- FSNEP indirect charges was a concern—no basis for continued rising cost
- Lack of support in counties
- Re-filling of vacancies—no strategic planning evident
- Lack of peer review publishing
- Discrepancies between regions for professional training funds; some regions get \$1,000 per person and others got \$4,000 for professional training.
- Salary range is a key issue with housing is so high in CA
- Salaries as related to people in lower ranks a major concern
- Lack of specialists support for many program areas—Pomology, water quality, youth were mentioned
- Concern over filling ‘vacant’ positions with advisors with ‘issues – based advisors’ rather than ‘commodities advisors’.
- PECC -- tried to get feedback from advisors; it was not successful but will be revisited. Currently PECC is polling County Directors
- NCMR Human Resources group meets quarterly; they have been able to advocate positions
- Lack of focus on extension efforts in lieu of research efforts.
- Split over requirement of Ph. D; will this requirement help organization?
- Support for regular cost of living increase recommended; new consulting guidelines (and supervisor’s allowance of such) will be a boost.

Sub-Region 1 – Central Valley Region—Dorothy Smith reported for Anna Martin

- Low morale, lack of faith in CE administration, concern over fewer and fewer positions being filled and more and more retirements occurring. How can counties continue supporting CE at the county level as advisors are asked to cover more and more topics and territory to cover? Service levels have fallen dramatically
- No support for requiring a PhD for advisors
- Written report in the appendix

Sub-Region 2 – Central Valley Region – Chris Greer

- Written report—see report in the appendix Discussion regarding Dean Neal Van Alfen reports on the college done by a consulting company. This was done in regards to further developing outreach programs.
- Ph. D Advisors – will this change the salary scale?

- Consulting policy—several suggested that it not be allowed
- Primary job is to local clientele and suggested that the 45 days of consulting time be bought out. Vet. School does this now—11 month appointment with 20% more salary.
- Streamlining Merits—is strongly supported. Lists are supported—shortening PR.
- New Positions—the issue of lack of strategic planning of positions is evident
- Relationship with Dynes is good for the organization
- Air Quality Advisor—5 year appointment—this kind of an arrangement was not felt to yield the best pool because of position insecurity. Strongly felt that air quality problem will not be solved in 5 years. Advisors need to feel positions are sufficiently important to warrant long-term support.
- Full-time advisors dedicated to an area are needed to be
- Bio-metrician support is still strongly needed: Carol Adams, Schneider—people who formerly did this job. There was a whole office that offered this kind of support—how is this applied to the whole of UCCE to get the support
- Salary inequality still remains an issue

Sub-Region 1 – Central Coast and Southern Region – Jodi Cassell filling in for Charles Go

- Written report in appendix prepared by representative Charles Go
- Cost of Living prohibits living in counties where people work. People live in Sacramento and work in South Bay Area
- Low morale is very evident
- Specialists becoming advisors and finding the job is the same in the counties as on campus
- Optimism regarding President Dynes
- Losing Advisors right and left; few positions being filled. Program reps take over advisors jobs
- Ph. D == 25% positive and 75% negative
- 4-H Youth Program is more administrative than other positions; should be recognized as effort is substantial
- Should 4-H be a less than advisor role; program manager instead
- Alternatives to pay raises; low cost home loans
- Professional society membership costs should be allowable to be reimbursed

Sub-Region 2 – Central Coast and Southern Region -- Juan Guerrero

- Written report in appendix
- Sent survey out to staff in February
- Morale is low

- Vacancies fuel low morale; people now have to do more with no additional benefits
- Advisors have been able to secure additional funds so there is less need to work with campus-based specialists
- Regarding Ph. D's about 50% / 50%; how will this change CE role in the counties. Few new graduates have few applicable agriculture skills—operating equipment, planting, teaching nutrition with Food Stamp recipients
- March visit with President Dynes; salary issue raised and he stated that no change will come about because we are too unique to make a changes.

UC Berkeley Campus -- Maggi Kelly

- Written report in appendix
- Lots of on-campus pressures
- Peer reviewed publications formerly OK are not OK; publications must now be in top-flight peer reviewed publications
- Inconsistencies across departments for merits and promotions, etc.
- Extension activities are still scrutinized in merit reviews
- Specialists see themselves as statewide assignments but with fewer travel and other kinds of support is diminishing.
- Relationship between advisors and specialists—dialogue needs to be encouraged between advisors and specialists
- Rick Standiford's replacement—who will it be? Rick had broad leadership and expertise—need to replicate in replacement.
- Support money is stretched thinner and thinner or non-existent
- Christy Getz is the new Berkeley Campus representative for ACC.

UC Davis Campus – Art Craigmill

- Power Point presentation was given
- Supports having specialists merits and promotions reviewed and released via the AAC Personnel Committee
- 0% OR Appointments in animal and plant sciences dept is well received –so advisors could be involved again with hiring, advisory, etc.
- Advisors would apply – process not established yet
- Establish more linkage between advisors and campus
- Juan recommend that UCB and UCR watch this and consider this; should be equitable across ANR and on all campuses
- Advocating for statewide meeting for Advisors and Specialist following a campus meeting

- Re-implementing statewide status of specialists with counties now that administration happens independently
- Specialists did not feel they had any input—only CD's had input on this matter
- University Extension and Specialists from UCD are now working as a committee to better work together
- Model to work with web-based applications; started with Med school model and it does not currently work well with
- Suggests that web-based system be coordinated – not developed independently

UC Riverside Campus – No report as Bowman Cutter was not in attendance

April 27

Attending: Gloria Barrett, Mary Blackburn, Jodi Cassell, Chris Greer, Juan Guerrero, Diane Metz, Fe Moncloa, Dorothy Smith, Steve Vasquez, Paul Vossen and Lynn Wunderlich. Guests: Bill Frost, Linda Marie Manton and Rick Standiford

Program Leader Report – Bill Frost, Natural Resources & Animal Agriculture Program Leader

- Kearney Foundation for Soil Science
- Sea Grant
- Integrated Hardwood Pest Management
- Other Special Projects – get from Bill Frost
- PowerPoint Presentation—available on AAC Website
 - Bill asked questions of AAC –to encourage a better organization
 - Ways to Impact the organization in a positive way

Regional Director Report – Linda Manton

- PowerPoint program is available on AAC website
- WELD Program – 24-month program for CE county -based academics and specialists Three from CA--one from each region Ramiro Lobo, San Diego, Shannon Mueller, Fresno and Dorothy Smith, Amador/Calaveras
- Website: <http://www.ag.arizona.edu/extension/weld>
- New Positions: 11 positions approved 4CCS, 5CVR, 2 NMR
- Statewide County Director Conference is set for May 3-5 San Jose; Coordinated by CE Adm WG. Program: AVP Standiford opening Close – VP Gomes and President Dynes, Sessions: leadership, marketing, cross-county assignments, county director panel, program leader panel.
- Myers Briggs: CE staff qualified to administer: Ellie Rilla, Mike Murray, Linda Manton, Sonya Varea-Hammond. They are able and willing to UCCE staff for team building.

- **Good to Great** is a book written by Jim Collins. The book has been read by Program Council members and many County Directors across the state. It is recommended reading for all CE staff. Linda gave a brief review of the key points of the book.

Linda's thoughts:

- What is CE facing – morale problems and quality of work due to loss of people, loss of opportunities or too much assignment.

ANR Update – Rick Standiford, Associate Vice President

- PowerPoint Presentation—available on AAC website

College of Ag and Environmental Sciences--Associate Dean Jim McDonald

- PowerPoint Presentation-available on AAC website
- Showed budget reductions—lost 30 staff employees

Informal questions and conversation continued following lunch. Paul Vossen asked that advisors salary inequities be acknowledged and addressed with a plan. Paul asked that some money be set aside

Next Academic Assembly Council Meeting Date: October 4-5 2005 Steve Vasquez

Adjournment

Appendix:

Program Committee Report by Cindy Fake, Chairperson

This report is prepared for the Academic Assembly Council as a summary of program committee accomplishments since October, 2004. Current Program Committee activities focus on administering the Distinguished Service Awards and Professional Society Travel Funds. Our third responsibility, which is providing training opportunities for CE academics, has been on hold due to lack of funding.

Program Committee Membership and Responsibilities

Program Committee Chair: Cindy Fake (term as chair ends 2005, as past chair, 2006)

Ramiro Lobo will be taking over as Chair of the Committee in July 2005.

Lead for Distinguished Service Awards 2004 Matteo Garbelotto (term ends 2005)

Jeanette Sutherlin (term ends 2007) will be taking over DS Awards for 2006.

Lead for Professional Society Funds Thomas Chao (term ends 2006)

Lead for Training Ramiro Lobo (term ends 2006)

Project Updates

Professional Society Travel Funds

Thomas Chao has done a great job of administering the Professional Society Travel Funds program over the last three years. The award process has become much more competitive as the number of applications continues to increase and funds remain limited.

The Professional Society Travel Fund reimbursement program is still on a quarterly system, despite our stated intention to change it. The awards have become a competitive process as a result of limited funds. In recent quarters, we have funded about half of the applicants. In the first quarter of 2004-05, there were 67 eligible applications, and 31 were funded (46%). In the second quarter, there were 56 applications and 25 were funded (45%). In the third quarter, there were 36 applications and 18 were funded (50%), which used almost all of the funds allocated for the year. I did not send out an e-mail reminder for the fourth quarter, so as a result, there were only 5 applications, and 2 were funded.

Generally, applications are not funded because the applicant provides insufficient information or fails to meet the deadline. Individual e-mail reminders were sent out for three of the last four calls. The messages encourage applicants to complete all of the application and submit it by the deadline.

Distinguished Service Awards

The Program Committee administers the Distinguished Service Awards Program. Matteo Garbelotto served as chair of the selection committee and coordinated the award process in 2004. He did an excellent job, and should be commended for his creativity and perseverance.

In 2004, awards were given for outstanding research, extension, and teamwork; and for the first time, the Outstanding New Professional award was also given. Distinguished Service Awards given in 2004 were:

Outstanding Research:

Sheri Zidenberg-Cherr of the UC Davis Dept. of Nutrition

Outstanding Extension:

Steve Tjosvold, Farm Advisor, Environmental Horticulture, UCCE Santa Cruz County

Outstanding Team Work:

Ann King, Environmental Horticulture Advisor, UCCE San Mateo County

Julie Newman, Environmental Horticulture Advisor, UCCE Ventura County

Karen Robb, Environmental Horticulture Advisor, UCCE San Diego County
 Steve Tjosvold, Farm Advisor, Environmental Horticulture, UCCE Santa Cruz County

Outstanding New Professional:

Juan Nunez, UCCE Kern County Farm Advisor, Veg Crops and Plant Path

The office of the Vice President funded the awards at \$5,000 each for the outstanding extension, research, and new professional awards; and \$10,000 for team work.

The call for applications went out in March 2004, and a poster was provided to each county office and department to advertise the award. Applications were submitted in June, and final decisions were made by the Awards Committee in October. The 2004 Distinguished Service Awards were announced in December by the office of the Vice President. It was also announced at that time that the awards are now biennial, so the next awards will be in 2006. Jeanette Sutherlin has agreed to be the lead for the DSA's for 2006.

There were not a lot of applications in 2004, perhaps due to the uncertainty of funding in the original announcement. A total of ten applications were received for all awards, with only one or two applications in several categories. Despite the small number of applications, the Program Committee believes that the Distinguished Service Award program is important to maintaining morale by rewarding excellence.

CE Training

No training was organized during this period due to the lack of funding.

Report of the Rules and Election Committee

1. The election has not been held. The call for nominations went out in March and nominees were submitted for the following:

Pres-elect.: 1 nominee Chris Greer

Rules and Election committee to replace Leigh Taylor Johnson:

5 nominees from the CCSR

Rules and Election Committee to replace Doug Gubler:

1 nominee, Frank Wong, UCR Specialist

When the ballot was sent to Oakland to be sent out by ANRLIST-SERV, I received no response. I have submitted the ballot to them 5 times and still no response. I assume that the person in charge of the LISTSERV is out of the office. I have asked Leigh Johnson to see if she could send the ballot from her machine on Monday the 25th of April but have not heard back as yet. Will continue to submit until we get some action.

2. In other action, Dorothy Smith has been voted on the Rules and Election Committee to serve a term of 3 years (2005-2007). Welcome Dorothy.

3. Warren Bendixon retired and thus no longer serves as a member of the Rules and Election Committee.

4. Due to the realignment of regions from 5 to 4, the Rules and Election Committee will now have 4 members instead of 5.

5. The Personnel Committee will replace Carol Collar, Jim Hill, and Dennis Pittenger in 2005. Martha Lopez and Paul Olin have both consented to have their terms on the Personnel Committee extended by one year to 2006.

6. Regional and Campus Committees

Sub-Region 1 NCMR- Gary Markegaard is leaving the committee in 2005

Sub-Region 2 NCMR- Those leaving the committee in 2005 include: Lynn Wunderlich, Dorothy Smith, Dan Desmond, and Holly George and there is still a vacancy left from last year.

Sub-Region 1 CVR- Darlene Liesch will leave the committee in 2005 and there is one vacancy.

Sub-Region 2 CVR- Committee ok through 2006.

Sub-Region 1 CCSR- Those leaving the committee in 2005 include Charles Go and Maria de la Fuente.

Sub-Region 2 CCSR- Juan Guerrero leaving committee.

UC Berkeley Campus Committee- Maggi Kelly leaving committee and 2 vacancies exist.

UC Davis Campus Committee- Those leaving committee in 2005 include Karen Klonsky, Art Craigmill and Delsey Whisson.

UC Riverside Campus Committee- OK through 2006

7. Leigh Taylor Johnson has volunteered to serve as AAC Secretary for next term.

Submitted by Doug Gubler, Chair Rules and Election Committee 2005.

Personnel Committee Report to Assembly Council, April 26, 2005

Ad Hoc Chair Training in January. Evaluations show that training was useful and that folks prefer face-to-face training. Greater emphasis was placed on the importance of offering constructive criticism to colleagues when writing the reports.

During our April meeting in Oakland, we reviewed Ad Hoc reports, contacted Ad Hoc chairs and asked them to clarify or re-write reports. We discussed the electronic submission. Ten candidates submitted their PR electronically this year as a pilot. Preliminary feedback to date demonstrates the following:

What Worked well:

- No problems with bibliography and sample publications.
- Reduced copying cost and mailing PR's by county and regional offices.
- Liz Gomez office has no problems initializing each web site.

Areas that need improvement:

- Uploading documents with signatures such as position descriptions, letters of evaluation and Ad Hoc report with signature sheet.
- CD's need to review the PR's following the timeline.

Next steps:

- In September we will announce dates: e-submission cut off date
- Alert CD's and administrators on e-submission process and timeline.
- Share strategies for reviewing: book marking it as you read it on the web.
- At PR training, focus on e-submission and uploading.

We sent electronic surveys to candidates, county directors, regional directors and program leaders to examine their challenges and opportunities while submitting, and/or reviewing the dossiers. Since Program Leaders are currently reviewing the documents, the survey data has not been compiled.

We presented the *Streamlining Merits* proposal to Rick Standiford. He welcomed the initiative and will be working with his staff and regional directors to identify how merits, DANRIS, annual assessments and other reporting requirements can be integrated. Rick reminded the Personnel Committee that our charge is

to represent Specialists as well, and asked us to compile their promotion data and track record. The committee will discuss this at our next meeting in May.

Glenn Nader and Fe Moncloa will meet with SAC and Rick to further discuss the *Streamlining Merits* proposal and the 2005 promotion process on May 19 in Davis.

Mike De Lasoux was nominated as the next PC chair elect. Fe Moncloa will serve as Chair 05-06.

Assembly Council Sub Regional Report, North Coast and Mountain Region, 4-26-05 by Paul Vossen:

I spoke with the advisors in my office and sent emails to all of the advisors in my sub-region to get their feedback on the following questions:

1. What are your major concerns as an academic advisor?
2. If you mentioned low salaries above, how do you feel about a PhD requirement for future academic advisors?

These were their responses:

- Unfair advancement for lower ranks
- Low salaries – full title advisors left behind in scale adjustments – no cost of living increases compared to others
- Erosion of academic staffing levels for CE
- Lack of financial support for regional or cross county assignments
- Pay scale inequity between advisors and specialists
- Traditionally PhD was a research position. If CE is to become solely research, who will do the outreach that President Dynes praised us for? If we are going to continue to provide educational programs then there is no justification for a PhD. Farm advisors are already specializing and when advisors have years of experience they are extremely valuable to UC and the community. A PhD requirement is an excuse by administration, not a reason.
- I don't believe the VP, he is using a PhD requirement as a convenient excuse
- Salaries should not be set on parity with specialists and faculty unless expectations are at the same levels – but the scale should be the same if we are to be valued as true academics. There needs to be the understanding that Farm Advisors may never reach the higher academic scales due to differing expectations. A PhD should be required only if the expectations in the position description demand such training. If our hiring criterion is centered on public service then we cannot expect to be evaluated as academics. If we expect UC level research and educational programs, however, then PhD's and commensurate performance evaluation and salaries should be the norm.
- Advisors must have salaries commensurate with the job market; pay that is similar to other professionals in other agencies and organizations in order to attract and retain the most qualified and committed candidates.
- A PhD is not required and in many cases is a hindrance, because with it is a requirement to publish scientific articles that are not read by our clientele.
- What is the current and future definition of an advisor? Perhaps advisors are becoming specialists and specialists are becoming the faculty – most faculty are doing genetic engineering research and out of touch with industry.
- We have lost a lot of advisors and can no longer serve our industries and constituents

- Ag – Natural Resources – Human Resources are in competition with each other
- Support for advisors and specialists needs to be reestablished
- Salary increases.
- Advisors provide a unique service and link to UC and the public – no less important, so why did we not get a cost of living increase like the specialists and faculty..... and why did lower ranks get an increase leaving out full title advisors? A cost of living increase by any other name is still a cost of living increase.
- UCCE is not competitive in the employment market
- I'm concerned about allowing UCCE advisors to do consulting within their own county. We are paid by the tax payers and this could be a potential conflict of interest. We should be able to consult, however, where there is no conflict of interest.
- Our low salary is embarrassing and an insult – no wonder there is low morale
- Forget the PhD requirement; just give us the raises (cost of living increases) comparable to the average of UC employees from faculty to lab assistants over the last six years or since the specialists split off.
- ANR administration does not care about Cooperative Extension and chose to keep cost of living increases from Advisors without justification. This will be a loss of over \$300,000 to me over a ten-year period including interest. How do you think that makes me feel when the VP will retire with a big fat salary? The VP has overseen a huge decline in our ranks and we can no longer provide even close to the research and educational services we once did for the people of California. The VP deserves to be fired for what he has done
- When an administrator asks me to do something extra now, I feel like telling them to go jump in the creek. Doing more with less is out.
- I see nurses, teachers, Ag Commissioners, clerical staff and many other occupations all around me getting raises. I would be able to accept it if we had gotten something when times were good and the faculty and specialists got nice cost of living increases.
- Don't let the administrators divert the issue away from justified cost of living increases for Farm Advisors by asking the question of PhD requirements. That is just an excuse to justify administration's lack of respect for the outreach role of Cooperative Extension. Nothing will happen until the current VP retires and when he does – good riddance! True incompetence is in the works; instead of realizing a mistake was made and trying to do something positive about it, the mistake is denied and further entrenchment is evident. Then an attempt is made to justify the mistake with the excuse that advisors did not deserve a cost of living increase, because they don't have PhD's.

Report to Academic Assembly Council, April 26, 2005.

By Lynn Wunderlich, representing the North Coast and Mountain Sub-region #2 (Amador, Calaveras, El Dorado, Inyo-Mono, Lassen, Mariposa, Modoc, Placer-Nevada, Plumas-Sierra, and Tuolumne Counties).

Responses to “What are the current major concerns for academic advisors?” included the following:

- Concern about the FSNEP program. The program is becoming very difficult to match funding and there is concern that we will have to eliminate it from the foothill counties.
- Lack of leadership within the Division. A strategic plan for the Division was developed some time ago but some feel there is little work to assure that we are on course or that we are addressing critical issues. Maybe revisit the strategic plan with some guidance from outside sources that

represent a variety of our stakeholders. Look at some of the more radical proposals being floated for Extension and 4-H.

- Lack of Specialist support for youth development.
- Lack of Specialists for ag. need an AG. Water quality leader (someone who understands ag. first) and the irrigation specialists are too overloaded to take on such a huge issue that will require all their time. Ideally, if this issue is to be such a focus of ANR, we would have a WQ specialist for each region-one for the state would not be enough.
- Decisions affecting refilling positions. During the Pomology Extension Continuing Conference (PECC), many Advisors expressed concern for major Farm Advisor positions not being refilled and that “issue” oriented positions were being proposed instead. This means that large gaps are not being filled, even though new positions are being offered. There appears to be a lack of input from Advisors for prioritizing new positions. Advisors are not asked what needs they see, just told what new positions are going to be opened up. Shouldn’t Advisors, who understand their clientele’s concerns and issues, share in decisions that affect not only their own workload but also in satisfying their clientele’s needs?
- Lack of focus on “extension” and more focus on “peer review publishing” is a concern. The pressure is to do it all-but we are most rewarded, in terms of accomplishing full title and up, when we focus on research and peer review publishing. To do this, other extension efforts, newsletters, farm calls, etc., must suffer (unless you have a full time SRA to do the research for you).
- Discrepancy between Region discretionary funds. Evidently the other regions have significantly more discretionary funds than NCMR (think these \$ come from retirements and resignations) Advisors in the other regions each received an additional \$3000 for professional development this year (while NCMR Advisors only received \$1000). Also other regions have been able to hire program reps. from region funds. Many advisors feel this is unfair.

The Salary range did emerge as a key issue as well, but Advisors were split on whether requiring a PhD for future hires would help the issue:

- Salaries are an issue – it’s getting to be more and more expensive to live in California – how do you attract people to CE and/or keep them here?
- Salary scale is an issue for AAC to work on, although the removal of Associate Step 4 and the proposed 3% cost of living increase are steps in the right direction.
- Many academics have stated that the salary inequity is hurting morale and UC’s ability to attract new hires.
- In education and youth development salaries tend to be lower than for scientist and researchers in the private sector. There is still more concern about salaries at the more junior titles and the ability to recruit quality staff.

Thoughts against the PhD:

- PhD for future academic advisors is ridiculous. We don't pay enough to attract a PhD candidate (unless they have no other employment options), our jobs are so diverse while a PhD will tend to specialize in one area, we have little support dollar for advisors, etc. It's not to say someone with a PhD could not do a good job if this was a job they wanted – it just should not be a requirement.
- Show me the money: the Administration will not increase the salary scale even if the PhD were required.
- Under our current county structure we need Advisors who are somewhat adaptable to emerging local issues, and changes in ANR priorities, over their career. The ability to help people APPLY science in a practical fashion is every bit, if not more important than simply conducting science for new discovery. Practicality and an ability to effectively relate scientific information to clientele in a meaningful way are attributes found probably more often in applicants with MS compared to those with PhD's. Those attributes came out in the Listening Sessions from our clientele.
- While changing requirements so that all new academic positions must be filled by Ph.D.s would respond to the argument of 'comparable pools' currently put forth by administration, I'm not sure that it serves CE and its mission. Many UCCE positions are generalist in nature. The experience of obtaining a Ph.D. teaches an individual to focus intently on one problem or one set of problems, to the exclusion of other issues. Many successful Ph.D.s lack the juggling skills to be a successful CE academic, responding to diverse needs of clientele.
- Many of the most effective, well-respected Advisor's that I interact with are not PhDs. We do not want to lose people like them from our system in the future.

Thoughts for the PhD:

- Should our structure change to a clustered, sub-regional office situation, then we may be able to become more specialized and the PhD requirement MIGHT make sense.
- Salary is still an issue, and the only way UC is ever going to do anything about it is if we accept the PhD idea.
- Advisors are split on a PhD requirement; however I would support that move and believe other more progressive Advisors would also support it.
- Advisors, especially new hires, are expected to do research and accomplish peer review publications-especially to become Full title. To do this we need to compete for ever-limiting grant funds. Having a PhD will allow new hires to compete better for grants and will also make publishing in peer review journals easier. If our Administration did not require and focus so much on the peer review publishing-PhD would not be such a good idea. Only those persons with interest in extension type of work will apply so being too specific in nature should not be a concern.

Other ideas for salary:

- Many Advisors are in support of regular cost of living increases as a way to boost salaries for advisors.

- If the new consulting guidelines are implemented as suggested by AAC AND IF CDs & Regional directors will allow consulting - that will help to make the job package more attractive.

**Academic Assembly Council
Report for Central Valley Region: Sub-Region 1
April 26-27, 2005 by Anna Martin**

As requested by Gloria Barrett, I posed the two questions by e-mail to the advisors in our sub region and received four responses. The responses were very similar in content and are summarized below. One advisor took time to send me a detailed e-mail in response so I am including his response in quotes as it was e-mailed.

1. What are the current major concerns for academic advisors?
 - Loss of academic FTE's.
 - Increased expectations and the corresponding overload being experienced by many advisors.
 - Loss or lack of support especially at the county level if academic advisor FTE's are not replaced as they retire or leave their position.
 - "My major concern is that I will be the only Advisor left in Merced in 10 years, and because of that I will have no county support whatsoever and will be working out of my house/car with absolutely no support from UC (car, gar, phone, office expenses, etc.). After all, why would the county provide support for one Advisor? This is based on my observation that Merced County ranks very low on position priorities and because CE is replacing lost advisors at a rate of 1:5 (1 hire for 5 retired). I have my doubts that in the future this ratio will change very little, based in large part to the direction that CE seems to be heading, as is very obvious from your question #2."
2. How do you feel about a PhD requirement for future academic advisors?
 - All four advisors were opposed to a mandatory PhD requirement for future advisors.
 - "I am very much opposed to a PhD requirement for Advisors. This is why: it implies that the future for UCCE Advisors is nothing but on-farm research and that extension activities and assisting clientele are worthless activities because they don't bring in the money. I fail to see how requiring a PhD increases our interaction with clientele and garners the support of county superintendents and farmers/kids/parents/minorities. Furthermore, it seems if all advisors had PhD's they would basically be Specialists so now what is the role of the Specialist? Or the Ag Professor on campus? Many Advisors already have their doctorate degree. There is nothing wrong with this since they all knew that it was not required and they took the job as an advisor with the full knowledge that research was only a part of the overall job and that extension activities were a necessary part. Many advisors can be very good at their jobs and get promoted without having to spend 80% of their time on research. It is not the getting the degree that I am opposed to, but the requirement for it and the implications of that requirement. And the implications are that the current model for UCCE is NOT the model that will be used in the future, contrary to all listening session reports and administrative reassurances. Here is what I read into the requirement: UCCE has decided that its niche in California ag is research, since that is what a University does. To do research well requires personnel with doctorate degrees. But it is not necessary to have very many of these people because they do very little other activities that take a lot of time and because they are expensive. Researchers write grants and get paid by companies to do research, then go to professional meetings and tell other researchers about their research, right? So you make the PhD a requirement, write the position where research accounts for the bulk of the time of the position, and everybody who applies is a pure researcher who really likes to do research and very little else. Of course, this doesn't solve the problem of actually meeting with clientele, driving around the county to look

at problems, or do any activities related to the issues of our clientele. It doesn't help with trying to recruit county directors, since all a researcher wants to do is research. I find it ironic that CE now hires SRA's and Program Reps (people without PhD requirements) to do much of the extension work formerly done by Farm/4H Advisors because CE won't/can't hire an actual Advisor."

"One could argue that instead of having a few Advisors all with PhDs and high salaries a better model would be to have a lot of Advisors with bachelor's degrees and lower salaries. In reality I know this won't work because it doesn't work in other states and because there wouldn't be a lot of salary difference between a new advisor with a doctorate or bachelors. But it does bring to light another issue, and that is salary. Will you be paying these new Advisors on the Specialist salary schedule, which is currently 50% more than Advisors? Seems that would be commensurate with their expanded responsibilities."

"Another big mistake with the "all research all the time" model is that on-farm research isn't as easy to do as apparently some think it is. Farmers manage commercial fields, not research farms. Instead of being in the county to provide help and assistance to the growers, now we're bugging them to let us put out another trial. In short, we've just gone from being an asset to a pain in the ass. Please tell me how this will improve our relations within the county/region where we work? How will this garner the support of the Board of Sups to keep supporting our ever decreasing presence?"

"Making a PhD a requirement might sound good on paper, but it is a bad idea. There would be definite effects that could fundamentally change CE as we know it. It is my opinion that research should be just a part of an overall extension program; in fact, I think that it should only support the Advisors extension program. Here in California, we have already changed this model such that extension activities support the research program. This is akin to putting the cart in front of the horse, but it is nonetheless the model we have morphed into, probably in response to the increased research money that comes in. Whether this was done on purpose or not is irrelevant--the result has been far greater PhDs and far fewer Advisors. CE has survived because we've stayed above a critical level of personnel, but when you drop below some point (200? 150?) you might just find that you've "educated" yourself right out of business."

"Just for your information, I ran these comments by both my County Director and my Program Director, and they said to "write them down". It is not meant as an attack on the current administration in any way. I know that my opinion is basically worthless and probably incorrect. And no, I do not have a PhD."

Sub-region I (Alameda, Contra Costa, Monterey, San Benito, San Luis Obispo, San Mateo-SF, Santa Barbara, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz) Report by Charles Go

What are the current major concerns for academic advisors?

Increased responsibilities resulting from specialist types campuses are hiring - gene jockeys, more basic scientists - little relation to CE disciplines, little concern for county work.
Lagging salaries and loss of positions. The two combined mean we are expected to do more work while earning less money. Advisors not only feel like we are going backward, I think we can prove it in real dollars.
1) Non-competitive salaries, 2) Poor program funding support

Santa Barbara: Replacing retiring advisors. SB Co is sinking below critical mass. We (co. staff and academics) are concerned for our future in terms of county support.
Lack of communication among academic staff and between academic staff and administration. Insufficient staff - number of new positions approved is less than number resigning or retiring. Teamwork declining as staff numbers decline. Disparity in pay especially for Full Title Farm Advisors.
Salaries have lagged in comparison to academics on campus. This has been on top of no cost of living increase for several years.
One thing that I wouldn't mind being addressed by AAC is professional society and association fees. As I understand it, campus CE people can get their-- or a portion of their-- professional society fees paid for through UC funds.
Cost of living

What are some ideas and solutions to address the concerns you have raised above?

Campuses make Specialists be involved with counties/advisors by making it a requirement (with teeth) for evaluation.
Raise our salaries; refill positions.
1) Keep pestering administration & legislature; continue facilitating opportunities for outside consulting & other compensated time 2) Keep pestering administration & legislature; encourage granting agencies to make more funding available for fundamental extension needs (to pay everything from travel costs to cell phone bills to office materials) as opposed solely to research needs.
Do not know. We are discussing options with persons that may be able to help.
I am impressed by the visibility of Rick Standiford and Maxwell Norton - these were proactive appointments. Raise requirement for promotion packet from Full Title VI to Full Title VII. This has been intimidating for some Advisors near retirement and would be a benefit for Full Title Advisors that costs very little.
We need to pay the existing advisors a fair wage and we will just have to come out of open positions until our overall financial position improves.
I may be wrong, but one way or another, the cost can be very burdensome-- especially to those at the lower ranks, and since it really is a requirement for our jobs, I would like to see if ANR/UCCE can support us in some form..... perhaps a \$150 per year allowance to apply to the society or group of our choice, or being allowed to use discretionary or in-service funds, etc.
Follow the format other organizations such as USDA, Red Cross, etc., use

How do you feel about a PhD requirement for future academic advisors as a way to address the low salary issue?

I think that would be a mistake - wrong solution to the right concern.
I don't see how this would help at all. Does this mean that we would then have Ph.D.'s earning low salaries and doing menial work such as investigating pig abuse or answering questions about dying houseplants? Shifting some of the direct service pieces of our jobs to Program Reps and hiring Advisors regionally to extend knowledge and conduct research seems more feasible.
The Extension PhD's that I've talked to also complain about the relatively low salaries; they may have higher salaries than the MS group as a whole, but they still lag behind other comparable non-Extension positions. Given the same amount of total funding to operate Extension, one must choose between having fewer PhD level advisors or more MS level advisors; not sure that having fewer PhD is the better option.
C.E. has recruited some excellent advisors from the MS or MA ranks. I think it would be foolish to eliminate this group of potential candidates from recruiting pools. I think PhDs will float to the top in any pool if they have superior qualifications. We should always hire the best person available and that person may have a Masters degree!
Cooperative Extension has been changing over the years to Cooperative Applied Research Service so maybe a PhD would be appropriate for future hires. From observing current employees though, a PhD versus a Masters is no guarantee of better performance.
Only if it is absolutely necessary. Some of the best advisors do not have a PhD. I think the way it is going, we will have more PhDs becoming advisors just because they will have more education and experience when they apply for a new position. In that respect they will be strong candidates

They shouldn't require PhD if they are not willing to pay better. I'm talking from personal experience.

Other Comments:

I feel like I should complete these endless surveys but I have never seen that they make one bit of difference. It would be helpful if you would explain how this is to be used and what the response is from the ultimate recipient.

Keep up the good work.

NONE

More lead time for AAC elections- the recent nominations only gave us a couple of days to respond.

Thanks

Good luck and thank you!

Sub-region II (Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego, Ventura)

What are the current major concerns for academic advisors?

Pay inequity Unfilled positions, Lack of leadership

Salary at the full title level is too low. There is no consideration of the cost of living in some of the more expensive urban counties and the economic disadvantage advisors suffer in these areas . Long range plans for the division to keep us relevant and competitive.

1. The recent salary adjustments for Assistant and Associate Advisors was a good step. However, salaries overall continue to lag increases in cost of living considerably. Serious investment needs to be made in raising salary levels for all advisors. The new consulting policy may be of some assistance, but it is not a substitute for across-the-board salary range increases. For example, consulting will not help everyone, it is not equally available to everyone, it is not steady income, and it will not raise the HACP which is important to advisors nearing retirement. Questions linger about what types of consulting will be OK and what will not. Further, increased consulting may detract from advisors' academic programs and slow the salary growth that is possible via merits and promotions. 2. In the last few years, UC administrative procedures for hiring and purchasing have grown increasingly burdensome for UCCE advisors. This detracts seriously from time needed for research and education and it makes it difficult to implement grant and contract obligations.

Equity in pay and advancement (particularly for 4-H advisors who have a huge administrative load with little way to reflect that on PRs); erosion of benefits; erosion of working conditions - we are below critical mass; our leadership - what are they doing to promote our work, etc? Differentials for those living in high cost areas.

Increased academic rigor in performance expectations with inadequate resources to meet them. Also, performance expectations do not align with the continuing nature and design of CE Advisor positions to obtain adoption of innovations / be agents of change from the University.

Salary inequity between CE Specialists, Experiment Station academics and UCCE Advisor academics. I have been slapped in the face and basically told I am no longer as valued as my academic colleagues on campus (as I once was). The 18% salary raise they got a few years ago from then UC President Atkinson as compared to the 3% UCCE advisors got has produced a huge salary chasm that needs to be bridged. This difference continues to increase exponentially with time after each %age COLA adjustment. This magnification of salary inequity really hits home at retirement, where our campus peers will enjoy a huge differential in retirement benefit over their retirement years! This pisses me off and is very demoralizing. I once held the title Specialist, but relinquished it in lieu of having to be based on a campus rather than in the counties where I can accomplish the most. I continue doing the same job (same position description) yet my salary is now \$20-25,000 less per year than had I relocated to a campus. This will significantly affect my retirement benefit.

campus county relationships. We don't hear much about this anymore. Refilling positions on campus

Loss of campus support (non-replacement of specialists).Marginalizing of advisors' work by UC Pay not keeping up with inflation. Unequal compensation for full title advisors (in the long-term

this affects our retirement).
We need more CE academic staff in our region as well as the rest of California. CE Advisors are under paid.
salary scale is too low
1. Adequate staffing in my program area, Youth development. 2. Training opportunities for staff held in southern California instead of always being held in northern California where the Davis campus is situated. 3. That politics be kept out of the appointment of program leaders.
I have no concerns at this time except why is the START Program discontinuing
1) we are not truly academic--i.e. not treated like our colleagues on campus. 2) Our leadership (top ANR) is defunct and needs replacement. 3) Our critical mass has fallen below sustainable levels for the organization to function well. 4.) There is a schism between the HR and agricultural sides of our organization. Many offices are becoming less and less academic because the HR side is not hired with the same academic credentials. Program reps with no understanding of academic appointments outnumber farm advisors in some counties.
1. That we have fewer and fewer advisors to do more and more work. In time with the retirement the workgroups will be drained of participants. The Counties that are without youth advisors are trying to survive and sometimes the adjoining counties are beginning to see people go over boarders to counties with advisors and more developed programs.

What are some ideas and solutions to address the concerns you have raised above?

Sue the University. Ask Dynes to make filling positions a priority. Get rid of Gomes
Out of the box, creative planning. glad the campus absorbing county units was tabled. Hopefully the Deans realize the complexity and cost they would have to deal with. President Dynes seems to appreciate the UC ANR delivery model. We need to seize this opportunity and fine tune our operation and gain his support in building the organization to match his vision.
1. Continue to press for increases in salary levels for all advisors. Assertively pursue data on recruitments that fail or in which the top candidates decline due to low salary levels. Also pursue data on resignations and early retirements due to low salary levels. 2. Ask ANR administration to meet with UC campuses to educate them on the nature of UCCE operations and the need to streamline procedures for our hiring and purchasing. It would be extremely beneficial to meet with union representatives about a dispensation for hiring vendors to perform short-term tasks instead of going through the burdensome classification and hiring process for small jobs.
Really look at the PR process...if we are going to be required to do administrative work, allow a category for that the way CDs are allowed to include that on their PRs. Not fair otherwise.
A Vice President that is in touch with reality of Extension's role and dilemmas instead of being a bean counter and maintainer of the status quo.
Immediately bring academic Advisors' salaries in line with their CE Specialist and Experiment Station peers. The work Advisors do is no less important and is just as valuable at the work performed by their campus peers. There never was any legitimate reason for the divergence in compensation.
Program leaders develop mini-meetings on subjects inviting specialists (and faculty) and advisors. These should be 1 day and topic specific. Deans should give us input into what positions are being considered (if any). Maybe a needs assessment for advisor needs re specialist support.
Commitment to replace specialists with specialists. Adjusting to cost of living in local areas. Change review period from 3 to 2 years for full title advisors. Bring a suit against UC per the recent Supreme Court decision regarding age discrimination.
Hopefully the budget will be approved with the Governor's Pact with the UC intact. Increased funding to ANR should be used to fill positions of critical need in CE throughout the state and used to increase salaries for Advisors.
1. Support of restructuring plans that enhance deliver to the population. Do not ignore the idea of regionalization just because budget is not currently in critical situation. Need to ignore regional and county boundaries in staffing decisions. 2. Put more emphasis in the importance of training for all levels of CE including CDs, Advisors and staff. Take advantage of technology to deliver training opportunities. Hold regional directors and program directors accountable who do not provide adequate opportunity for staff training. 3. If the program leader is doing a good job let that

person continue, do not push for a replacement just because someone does not like that person and has an axe to swing.
If budget continue to be cut we need to use the START Program as a solution.
Replace top ANR administration with a new set that understands and values cooperative extension.
They are concerns that will take money and staff and we currently have neither so I do not think there is a solution. I do think the expectations of the university will have to be examined to see if we have enough people to participate (and still cover their work in their counties) on all the committees and workgroups.

How do you feel about a PhD requirement for future academic advisors as a way to address the low salary issue?

What difference would that make? Hiring would still be at the Assistant level and there would still be the large discrepancy between campus and county pay. When I was hired I could buy a house at 5 times my salary, now it's 15 times.
Since I have one, I'm not that concerned, however, current advisors without a Ph.D. should be grandfathered in so they don't get caught up in the that was then, this is now type of situation.
The PhD is not required for all faculty, so this is not a sufficient reason to deny appropriate compensation to advisors. If the PhD is required, we will not be able to recruit from the pool of highly qualified SRAs and Program Rep's who have master's degrees.
Okay, I guess, but the starting salaries here are so low...also, if you are going to do this, you have to address the 4-H issue...not many PhDs are going to want to come in and handle this administrative nightmare.
Requiring a PhD to obtain higher salary is the wrong way and reasoning to deal with the salary issue of CE Advisors. Degree requirements are dictated by the job duties and expectations. Salary is determined by the value and merit of the duties performed.
That seems reasonable, since nearly all new hires have PhDs anyway, especially in the Farm Advisor ranks. We hire from the same pool that the campuses hire from. We have SRA's working for us with PhD's. This action should be immediate and should grandfather in all Advisors hired before any such new policy or requirement.
Good idea. I support it without reservation. Current advisors should not be disadvantaged by the change. It needs to be tied to a salary change. And advisors grandfathered in should receive the salary change as well. In other words, don't create the problem that happened many years back with specialists when some of them were hired on the agronomist series which had a different (and better) salary scale (I'm talking 15-20 years ago).
Fail to see how that will address the salary issue. If there's money to pay for Ph.D. in the future there should be ways to pay for non-Ph.D.s now.
I favor the proposed requirement of a Ph.D. for all new hires of Advisor positions in order to gain salary equity.
Good idea, but I'm not sure if it will help in addressing the salary issue
Good idea, but I'm not sure if it will help in addressing the salary issue
Requiring a PhD does not ensure better employees. It just gives individuals within the University more status to feel good about themselves. If you provide competitive salaries first and evaluate performance more efficiently you attract more highly qualified employees and help those who are not performing at the appropriate level to do better. Which means qualified PhDs would stand a better chance in the selection process. A person who is barely competent, even with a PhD, and finds this is the only place they can get a job so they settle for the lower pay or someone who performs at a level less desirable because they have not been given good counsel is less valuable than even someone with just a Masters who is highly motivated and competent.
That question seems like a contradiction. If there is a PhD Requirement, the salaries should be higher.
Yes. We are already doing this because many of the new hires have PhD's anyway. At least three of us have obtained PhD's while on the job as advisors. If we can do it, so can others if they want to.
I think a PhD for these positions will cause qualified people to look elsewhere for work. You will also weed out the people that have experience but no PhD you need diversity in the YD program. The advisors are getting further and further detached for their counties as it is. When this happens the counties have no reason to support us.

Other Comments:

I read the burnout concern in the AAC minutes. I'm not sure if upper management realizes how true this is. Many of us do this job because it allows us to help people and we are proud of the caliber of information and people in the organization. However, some administrators take advantage of this and do not seem to realize how burned out many of us are. Instead of relief they keep heaping more and more work on us. I need to see that there is some light at the end of the tunnel before I burn out or jump ship.

Thank you for representing us!

Let's hurry up and compensate UCCE employees fairly. In fact, there should be retroactive salary increases to make up for lost compensation since Atkinson's idiocy.

I think the UCCE should spend more time encouraging workgroups and committees to make use of technology to meet, instead of holding face to face meetings that consume so much travel, time and money and always seem to be held at the Davis campus.

UCB Report—Maggi Kelly

- UCB specialists are still dealing with support cutbacks.
- Less support dollars leads to increased grant support, and not all grants allow/encourage outreach (although some do).
- Rick Standiford's position has yet to be filled.
- Christ Getz is the new UCB representative to AAC

