



UNIVERSITY of CALIFORNIA
Division of Agriculture & Natural Resources



University of California Agriculture and Natural Resources
Academic Assembly Council

DRAFT MINUTES - not approved

June 2-3, 2009 Davis, CA

Members Attending:

Paul Vossen, President
Leigh Johnson, President-elect
Fe Moncloa, Immediate Past President
Brenna Aegerter, Secretary
Sheila Barry, Chair of committees for DANRIS-X and Central Coast and Southern Region
Chris Greer, Chair Welfare and Benefits committee
Max Moritz, Chair UC Berkeley committee
Steve Wright, Chair Central Valley Region committee
Joyce Strand, Chair Academic Coordinators committee
Jeannette Sutherlin, Chair Program committee
Shelley Murdock, Chair Personnel committee
Jennifer Hashim-Buckey, Chair Rules and Elections committee

Guests Attending:

Gideon Zeidler, President-elect for 2009-2010
Dorothy Smith, chair-elect Personnel committee
Jim Bethke, chair-elect Program committee
Jim Downer, chair-elect Rules and Elections committee
Margaret Collins, representing Rachel Elkins, Chair of North Coast and Mountain Region committee
Rick Standiford, ANR Associate Vice-president

Motions made:

- Motion to approve corrected minutes of April 28, 2009 meeting- corrected Shelley's name spelling, added attendees that were present but not listed as such (Fe Moncloa and Jim Downer)
- Motion to approve minutes of March 31- April 1, 2009 meeting
- Motion to accept the Merit and Promotions committee's version of the proposed revision to the "Performance Expectations for Advisors" policy, with comments generated from this meeting going to Fe Moncloa.
- Motion to change AAC By-Laws to create a new standing committee titled "Academic Policy Review" with the purpose of considering general policy on academic personnel and related matters. The committee will review standards and policies developed by ANR's Office of Academic Affairs. Appoint ad-hoc committee to look at policies currently under review (above) and to develop wording of change to by-laws.
- Motion to change AAC By-Laws to require that before one serves on Personnel committee one must first serve on another AAC committee
- Motion to change AAC By-Laws to require that anyone seeking nomination for President Elect must have previously served on an AAC committee.

- Motion to appoint Jennifer Hashim-Buckey as AAC secretary.
 - Motion to make a statement to administration regarding the budget decisions: “Representing our colleagues, it is imperative that AAC serve an integral role in discussion, deliberation and negotiation regarding immediate UC ANR budget issues and decisions. AAC has appointed three academics to represent us in this critical decision-making process.” Create an Ad-hoc AAC Budget Advisory committee; the charge of the committee is to provide input on the budget process during this critical time.
-

Minutes:

Motion to approve corrected minutes of April 28, 2009 meeting- corrected Shelley’s name spelling, added attendees that had missed (Fe Moncloa and Jim Downer)

Motion to approve minutes of March 31- April 1, 2009 meeting

Note: minutes posted online should be labeled as “draft minutes – not approved” – until they have been approved by AAC.

Merit and Promotions committee Report:

Chair Steve Wright reported on the activities of this special ad-hoc committee formed to look at the proposed revision to policy on ‘performance expectations for advisors’. Committee concerned about wording of proposed revision especially regarding first authorship, committee concerned about advisors retaining the importance of their local program, maintaining local visibility. Committee members are Shelley Murdock, Cindy Fake, Eric Natwick, Leigh Johnson, Jeannette Sutherlin, Sheila Barry, Steve Wright (chair). Draft wording of a new potential revision was completed by the committee; some revisions were done by Fe Moncloa in consultation with Rick Standiford. The end result is that we now have two versions (committee’s and Fe’s versions). Leigh Johnson commented that the term “growth” is vague to her. The phrases “sustained growth” and “continual growth” to her are overly linear and might serve as a disincentive for risk-taking. When starting work in a new area of research there is a learning curve and productivity may decline for a time; productivity may be cyclical rather than linear. Discussion about wording, possible change to introduction. Leigh suggested adding a sentence about taking advantage of opportunities to change focus of program, taking on new projects, encouraging risk-taking.

Discussion about how we define growth in Affirmative Action. Jeannette Sutherlin mentioned that she was once told that we (ANR) are good at inviting people to the table, but we are not good at getting them to the table. At upper ranks, we need to be doing things to get under-represented people to the table. At upper ranks, advisors should be sharing their affirmative action expertise with others.

Note: Administrative section at end of proposed revision is being worked on by CE administrative working group.

President Vossen stated that the committee’s document is now in the hands of Fe Moncloa and Rick Standiford, and that we request that they take Leigh’s comments into consideration.

Rick Standiford said he will take the final version from AAC and decide what he can live with and bring it back to AAC. Rick feels that it is a tremendous improvement over the previous versions. He made one comment about the committee’s version- that the four criteria (cite APM?) are 1) extending knowledge, 2) research & creative activity, 3) Professional Competence and 4) University and Public service (AA is not one of the criteria)

Motion to accept the Merit and Promotions committee’s version of the proposed revision to the “Performance Expectations for Advisors” policy, with comments generated from this meeting going to Fe Moncloa.

Report from ANR Associate Vice-President Rick Standiford

Rick reported on the ANR budget situation. He mentioned that there are no budget letters yet (ANR budgets). ANR might be looking at a cut as high as 20%. This is a horrible cut, but the good news is that we are being treated the same as campuses (which has not been the case in the past). Carry forward funds are unlikely to be approved. They are trying to use temporary dollars to cover the cut until retirements and other permanent cuts can cover the gap. At the same time, they would like to move forward with some of the strategic plan implementation. They don’t want to lay off academic staff. Other staff? Reorganize regional offices? Statewide programs? There may be some non-academic staff layoffs. There will soon be a furlough policy in place, which we haven’t had in the past. Regents may vote in July on the furlough question. Dan Dooley is not in favor of across the board cuts, he would rather eliminate lower priority programs. Steve Wright had list of questions for Rick Standiford on furloughs, Rick wasn’t able to answer most of them. We would not be able to use grant funds to fill gap in salary (across the board cut, even for positions that are funded with grant money, so will also affect SRAs etc.). Plan is to move ahead with merits and promotions- that is what they are doing on campus and the argument has been made that we should be treated the same. AAC can expect to get a budget, but it may be a cut over previous years and AAC unlikely to get carry-forward funds.

County budgets are severely impacted. ANR administration in the future will meet with California State Association of Counties (CSAC), a statewide group of county administrators.

Jeannette thinks we need to find new partners (other than counties), but Chris Greer made the point that we don't want to discourage those counties that do provide high levels of support.

Rick reported on proposed changes to merit and promotion process for advisors

- 1) Decision –making in SAC: Regional director no longer will vote on cases in their region, other RDs will vote (RD gets to write letter so that is in effect their vote). This was implemented in the recent 08-09 cycle.
- 2) SAC composition – Increase membership to include two county-based advisors on SAC – The feedback from the survey was mostly positive, the negative comments were: 1) if it isn't broke, don't fix it and 2) major time commitment for county-based people to serve (several years, lots of packages to read). (One side note: Advancement to steps 7, 8, & 9 don't require ad hoc committee, but an ad hoc committee can be requested by the advisor.) Rick is looking for input on this proposed change to SAC composition. How would these advisors be selected? Personnel committee to nominate several people and forward names to Administration? AAC to appoint or nominate people? Or both to nominate people? Self-nominations from advisors, with justification? Rick will discuss more with Personnel committee at July meeting.
- 3) Ad-hoc committee to include someone outside program area. Feedback from survey: 1/3 liked, 2/3 did not like. People concerned about their own level of expertise to judge candidates in other program areas and also fear of having your package reviewed by people that might not understand what excellence is in your program area. One possibility would be option to have a person from outside your main program area – self-identification done online could have more than 3 choices (more than just Ag, Nat Res, and Human Res). Personnel committee's suggestion was that this be made optional. AAC was generally positive about this, but recognizing that 2/3 of survey respondents didn't like it.
- 4) Streamlined PR process. (Theme-based rather than project-based PRs). 80% support from survey. Negative: many people are invested in the current process, many people collect information based on projects, they have "one-pagers" ready to go. Rick's inclination is to give people the choice of either project-based or theme-based. Leigh suggested an exception to page limits for full title six packages (covering 15 years). Dorothy: one negative would be training ad hoc committees on the two methods. Rick admitted it was difficult on SAC looking at both streamlined merits and PRs as they had different formats. Rick mentioned that self-statement becomes even more important for streamlined merits. There was discussion about a "cold-turkey" approach versus phasing in over time. Rick will discuss more with the Personnel committee at their next meeting.

Dan Dooley and Rick Standiford met yesterday with the Provost and the Chair of Academic Senate regarding the status of CE specialists. Current status is analogous to title of "Clinical Professor"; for whom the Senate Chair strongly supports equivalent status. However, the Academic Senate committee looking at this can only be made up of senate members, though, so no representation from CE. So Rick is working on individual issues one by one; for example, MOP loan for advisors and specialists, Specialists being able to vote on senate packages, and tenure for CE academics. Note that Fe Moncloa has document with tenure status of county-based and specialists in other states.

Leigh asked about the possibility of raising salary scale for advisors to same level as Specialists. Rick replied that he hadn't been asked to look at this. If it is a priority, we can develop a rationale. But these are very different series with different criteria. Paul Vossen added that the issue is really that the CE advisor series needs a salary adjustment, but obviously that isn't going to happen in the current budget crisis.

Discussion about AAC having more of a consultative role in policy development.

Fe Moncloa enjoyed her appointment with Rick and Carolyn and saw the value of having an end-user involved in the policy process. Seeing her position ending, she proposes that AAC form a standing committee titled "Academic Policy" with the purpose of considering general policy on academic personnel and related matters. The committee will review standards and policies developed by ANR's Office of Academic Affairs. There are other policies that have not been updated in years and were written without our input- sections that Carolyn is working on now or that Fe had on her "to-do" list but may not have time to finish before her position ends.

Academic Senate has this type of input on policy, but it is part of their Personnel committee. It is too much to add this to the AAC Personnel committee's responsibilities. Leigh asked Rick if this could play a role in your fight on our behalf? Rick: if there are policies that diminish the contributions of CE academics, then to that extent, yes, it would help.

Update on policy revisions: Fe is currently working on section 315, Section 336: Performance evaluation. Carolyn is working on section on demotion and dismissal, Next in line on Fe's list: emeritus status.

Discussion about forming a standing committee, or forming ad-hoc committees as needed to look at a particular "batch" of policies. Rick Standiford mentioned that he won't be able to replace Fe, but that this standing committee could take the place of that position. Leigh mentioned that members need to have sufficient experience with CE to evaluate policy, but that the committee also needs to work closely with AAC and not get off on their own too much.

Paul: How should people be selected to this committee? Fe: change by-laws to create this as a new standing committee – so people would be appointed by rules and elections.

Perhaps we should start as an ad-hoc committee so that we could move quickly and take advantage of the momentum created by Fe's accomplishments and those of the special committee.

Volunteers: Chris Greer, Steve Wright (chair), Kevin Day, Joyce Strand will talk to Academic Coordinators, suggestions: Frank Mitloehner to represent Specialists.

Motion to change AAC By-Laws to create a new standing committee titled "Academic Policy Review" with the purpose of considering general policy on academic personnel and related matters. The committee will review standards and policies developed by ANR's Office of Academic Affairs. Appoint ad-hoc committee to look at policies currently under review (above) and to develop wording of change to by-laws.

Ad-hoc committee will report back at next AAC meeting with wording for by-laws change.

Motion to change AAC By-Laws to require that before one serves on Personnel committee one must first serve on another AAC committee

Motion to change AAC By-Laws to require that anyone seeking nomination for President Elect must have previously served on an AAC committee.

President's report:

President Vossen reported on his efforts to improve communication between the administration and AAC. Goal is to set up monthly conference call meetings between executive committee and Rick Standiford to keep each other posted on what the other is doing. Perhaps set up on a regular schedule (e.g. 3rd Thursday of each month) and then if meeting is not needed it could be cancelled.

President elect's report:

President elect Leigh Johnson talked about the future of AAC. She would facilitate having Rick and Dan participate in at least one AAC meeting per year. Rick asked that she invite him to any meeting she wanted him to attend and he will try to attend. Dan Dooley's time is limited due to his appointment in the President's office. Invite Dan if you want, but in that case we should schedule the meeting many months in advance and should hold it at UCOP Oakland. Leigh is also interested in inviting Deans, Program Chairs, and Regional Directors. Fe suggested inviting Barbara Allen-Diaz, Rick suggested Kay Taber.

Regarding the implementation of strategic vision, Leigh asked Rick what role there is for AAC in the next year?

Rick replied that one idea is to fund high-priority issues, essentially, have "turbo-charged" core issues grant program to get groups organized around key issues, groups would use this as seed money to go after grants from other places. Funds might come from core-issue grant funds, workgroup funds, some competitive grant funds, some Smith-Lever funds? There will be task forces on that and another on county structure. Assembly members would obviously be on those task forces. Nothing has been decided yet; he can keep us posted on the monthly conference call.

Paul suggested that Rick use representative committees to get input from the assembly.

AAC Budget – current ledger: \$17,341 remaining after Distinguished Service Awards are subtracted.

There was discussion about whether to have 2 or 3 meetings a year, and discussion about the possibility of making one meeting per year a conference call. Max Moritz commented that he would prefer a single day meeting rather than two half-days.

Motion to appoint Jennifer Hashim-Buckey as AAC secretary.

Jennifer will also take over posting files to web site. In the future, send minutes out to AAC for any changes/corrections with one week deadline prior to posting. Paul may decide to have an electronic vote on minutes to approve prior to posting.

DANRIS-X committee:

Chair Sheila Barry reported that her committee's work has been done mostly by conference call, though Sheila met with Steve Quarles to work on the template and with Pat Day and Katherine Webb-Martinez.

Committee found that advisors had similar feelings about what didn't work with current system.

They have created a template which she showed us. They got rid of dates and resolved lots of other issues that people had in common. There is some question about whether programmers can do all the things they suggested. Some people had told Pat Day they wanted CASA integrated into DANRIS-X, but Sheila thinks this isn't a priority (keep them separate for now). Sheila wants the committee to stay involved and meet with the programmers, etc. They want to see it through to the end and work on the implementation of their suggestions. Paul said the committee is doing great work- "keep going, we appreciate it".

Rick Standiford will follow up with Pat Day to see how things are going from her perspective. Sheila and her committee will continue to serve, but Sheila will be on sabbatical leave. Committee member Steve Quarles can report back to AAC on progress in implementation of the recommendations and testing of beta versions.

Discussion about ANR budget:

We need to ensure that AAC is in the loop regarding updates on the budget. Role of AAC in this process? Discussion about layoff policy (ANR 320) – 3 months notice to employees with less than 3 years of service. We should include this section (ANR 320 - separations) in the policies reviewed by the new committee. Steve wondered why SRAs on soft money must be furloughed. Jeannette explained that University says it is an issue of fairness, all UC employees to be treated the same, regardless of the source of funds used to pay their salary. Should AAC make a statement to administration about effects of furloughs on our ability to fulfill our contractual obligations (FSNEP, SRAs working on grants). E.g. “If a furlough happens, grant-funded employees should not be impacted”. Should we survey our constituents? Chris Greer mentioned that there is likely a legal issue – that people in the same title must be treated the same. There was concern voiced not only about staff hours being reduced, but also about staff getting worried and finding another job. Regarding academic staff, the commitment of the University is to find a place for academics if county office closes. But in the current economic situation, this is problematic (i.e. spouse may not be able to relocate, can't sell house...). Discussion about the need for the University to have a “master plan” – how to fund county-based offices in the event that half the counties in California don't have the money to fund CE. People in assembly (or AAC) should be involved in this planning process. Discussion of possible survey: how will cutbacks affect your program, affect your staff, contract obligations, likelihood of staying with the University. Discussion of furlough vs. pay reduction – furlough on pay stub is a “deduction” so you pay tax on the furlough amount, but it will preserve your retirement salary level. Should we make a statement to administration that we (AAC) expect to be at the table to represent our constituents as the decisions are made about how to implement budget cuts?

Motion to make a statement to administration regarding the budget decisions: “Representing our colleagues, it is imperative that AAC serve an integral role in discussion, deliberation and negotiation regarding immediate UC ANR budget issues and decisions. AAC has appointed three academics to represent us in this critical decision-making process.” Create an Ad-hoc AAC Budget Advisory committee; the charge of the committee is to provide input on the budget process during this critical time.

Paul Vossen will let Rick Standiford know that we have formed committee and ask for reply, then Jeannette Sutherlin will let three other potential committee members know.

Who would these 3 people be: One from each of three program areas? Representative for Statewide programs? Possibilities: Rachel Surls (LA Co.), Morgan Doran, Steve Orloff, Jeannette Sutherlin (chair)

Personnel committee:

Chair Shelley Murdock reported on the activities of her committee, a written report was also submitted. Discussion about recruiting new committee members – What is role of committee chair? What is role of Rules and Elections chair? Can a committee chair recruit new members to be appointed by Rules and Elections?

Welfare and Benefits committee:

Chair Chris Greer reported that Chuck Ingels is chair elect, and John Karlik is interested in serving update on Exit survey – the only formal exit survey is getting CASA up to date until the last day. Carolyn Frazier said they have been tasked with developing an exit interview. Chris offered W & B could help design the interview and followed up with Rick Standiford and Chuck Ingels. Note there currently is an exit survey for non-academic staff. Add this to the Academic Policy committee's charge? Or just have that committee add language to the separation policy, and have Welfare & Benefits committee work on the interview itself.

We need that information from exit interviews. Why are people leaving? Administration could provide us a summary of the responses to protect confidentiality.

*Action item: Welfare and Benefits committee will prepare an exit interview and let Carolyn Frazier know that they are working on it. Committee will report back to AAC on interview.

Consulting policy – reported on the development of survey of constituents. Question whether furloughed time is then free for consulting, or must you still get approval from UC? Jim Downer says the approval process is not working in his region. Why don't advisors have the same consulting benefits as Specialists?

*Action item: Welfare & Benefits committee will continue to work on consulting issue.

Shelley Murdock: Discussion about Adobe Connect trainings on various topics – first of which could be on consulting.

Rules and Elections committee:

Chair Jennifer Hashim-Buckey reported that Jim Downer is chair elect. Committee is working on filling vacancies on standing committees. Call for nominations closed Friday. 11 people nominated for Personnel committee, 3 for Program

committee, 3 for Welfare & Benefits. Rules and Elections committee has determined a fair process, they will e-mail the current chair with the list of nominees and ask for candid and professional comments via e-mail or telephone (will be kept confidential). Results will be returned by mid-June in case committees planning to have meetings in early July. For the Regional, campus and Academic Coordinators committees – it is the chair's charge to solicit new members and have elect new chairs. Chairs should attempt to balance program areas and regions on their committee (but program area balance more critical than geographic balance).

Program committee:

Chair Jeannette Sutherlin reported that James Bethke is chair elect and two new members will be coming on. Budget for Professional Society Travel awards is separate from regular AAC budget. Next year chair Bethke should remind President elect Gideon to include in the AAC budget request \$30,000 for Distinguished Service Awards.

North Coast and Mountain Region committee:

Committee member Margaret Collins reported on behalf of chair Rachel Elkins who could not attend. Two members are rotating off committee, Deborah Giraud has offered to serve, and a second person is in the works, by July 1 they expect to have full committee membership. Paul will talk to Rachel about responding to the constituents to follow up on their surveys responses.

Central Coast and South Region committee: No report.

Central Valley Region committee: No report.

Academic Coordinators committee:

Chair Joyce Strand reported on activities of her committee, a written report was also submitted. Many of the policies covering academic coordinators also cover academic administrators (there are a few – director of RECs, Sea Grant director, perhaps Hansen Trust director?) Regional directors are also academic administrators but they have not been included as they are not members of the Assembly.

UC Berkeley committee: No report.

UC Davis committee: No report.

UC Riverside committee: No report.

Discussion of AAC representation of CE Specialists and Issue of Equivalent Status

Jim Downer questioned how and why does AAC represent CE Specialists? Response was that ANR policy does cover Specialists. And they are not part of the Academic Senate. At Davis, Specialists are organized into the Academic Federation. So Academic Federation can go to the Dean with an issue and the Dean can take the issue to Rick Standiford, but if the same request is also coming from AAC to Rick Standiford, then so much the better. Discussion about whether we should make a statement that if Specialists are granted equivalent status, then advisors should be too. Is this premature? Comment that Specialists have a much stronger case and they aren't there yet, so perhaps we are putting the cart before the horse. Comment that Academic titles are covered by Academic Personnel Manual which is produced by Academic Senate? So we are telling senate what to do? President Vossen suggested that we table this and discuss it at the next meeting if Leigh Johnson so chooses. Perhaps invite somebody on Academic Senate to explain. We thank Rick Standiford for his efforts in this area and urge him to continue working for equivalent benefits & status for both advisors and specialists.

Next Meeting:

Leigh Johnson will try to schedule meeting as soon as new committee chairs are determined.