



**UNIVERSITY of CALIFORNIA
Agriculture & Natural Resources**

**Academic Assembly Council Agenda
October 12 & 13, 2004
Mission Inn, Riverside, CA**

Attending:

Officers:

Gloria Barrett, President
Steve Vasquez, President-elect
Diane Metz, Secretary 2004-2005
Chris Greer, Chr. Sub-region Representative to Executive Committee
Bowman Cutter, Acting Campus Representative to Executive Committee

Committee Representatives:

Mary Blackburn, Chr., Strategic Plan Committee
Cindy Fake, Chr., Program Committee
Leigh Johnson, Rules and Elections Committee Representative
Fe Moncloa, Personnel Committee Representative
Dorothy Smith, Chr. Welfare and Benefits Committee

Regional Representatives:

Bo Cutter, Riverside Campus
Jim Hill, Davis Campus Representative
Paul Vossen, Chr., NCMR, Sub-Region # 1
Lynn Wunderlich, Chr. NCMR Sub-Region # 2
Anna Martin, Acting Chr., Sub-Region # 1
Chris Greer, Chr. CVR Sub-Region #2
Charles Go, Chr., CCSR Sub-Region # 1
Juan Guerrero, Chr. CCSR Sub-Region # 2

Others Attending:

Gerald Higginbotham, Welfare and Benefits Committee
Karen Klonsky, Welfare and Benefits Committee
On October 12th only: Lanny Lund, Karen Varcoe, Carolyn Frazier, Refugio Garcia, Ken Churches, Linda Marie Manton and Joe Morse

Unable to Attend:

Dan Marcum, Past President
Maggie Kelly, Berkeley Campus

Desired Outcomes:

Review and fill committee vacancies
Accept Committee and Sub-Region Reports

ANR Updates

Finalize Exit Interview Questions and Strategic Plan

Discuss Academic Salary Scale Adjustment

Agreement on Action Items

- 9:00 a.m. Welcome and Introductions
- **Nomination of Secretary** for the AAC 2004-2005 Meetings
Diane Metz was nominated for the position. MSC that Diane Metz serve in this position.
 - **Budget:** AAC budget was sent as status quo; **copies were sent to all AAC representatives**
 - **Travel:** Carolyn Frazier sent worksheet and the correct travel form will be sent to all AAC members. Steve Vasquez will follow up.
- 9:30 Approval of last minutes—Approved the April 27-28, 2004 minutes that are on the AAC website.
- 9:40 Select Regional and Campus Chairs to serve on Executive Committee—approved Chris Greer as Sub-region chair. Members present elected Art Craigmill to be the campus representative on the Executive Committee with Bowman Cutter, UCR, filling in for today's meeting.
- Updated the *AAC Committee List* with input from the committee chairs and Rules and Elections Representative, Leigh Johnson. (*See attachment of the committees*).
- 9:45 President's Report—Gloria presented work to date since the beginning of her term in July using a PowerPoint presentation
- Leigh Johnson suggested that we discuss salary issues and other issues to prepare for AVP Lanny Lund's visit at 11:00 a.m.
- It was discussed that advisors' salaries need to be re-coupled with specialists for salary adjustments.
 - More discussion followed with comments about the change between specialists and advisors.
 - It was suggested that we get buy-in from Regional Directors. If we had an advocate for salary changes besides Dr. Gomes, this might be an avenue to implement salary change.
 - Get Deans and Chancellors on our side. *They are already on our side—examples from UC Davis and UC Riverside*
 - Our position requirements are such that we are required to work in ways analogous to many faculty. We are not asking for equal salary but the same range-adjustment as specialists.

- We will discuss this with Lanny when he arrives.

10:00

Committee Reports

Program Committee (Further details can be seen in full report found in the appendix.)

Professional Society—budget is down and about 50% get turned down while applications are up. Tom Chao is the person working on this aspect of the committee

Cindy Fake will send an email to all the assembly members regarding Professional Society deadlines and procedures as well as budget limitations. Applications are done by website submission. Then they are forwarded to Tom Chao for action.

Cindy gets the applications directly –not according to policy of sending online. She also received complaints directly. Cindy has been sending out email messages that remind people of the deadlines. It was suggested that Regional Directors also send reminders to all their regional staff. Perhaps, people pay more attention to messages from Regional Directors.

Distinguished Service Award: Though the applications were not huge in number, there were adequate people who did apply. The selection process is proceeding. It is hoped that the decisions can be announced by December 1st. *This date is only an estimate.*

It was recommended that publicity for DSA be done more thoroughly in the future. Announcements should be sent via several modes—through Regional Directors and to the ‘all staff’ were suggested. Posters went to people other than CD or Office manager.

Charles Go recommended that the Regional Representative be sent the posters as well.

Training from AAC: Money has not been available for this aspect of the committee; therefore, no trainings are being planned. This was acknowledged as unfortunate.

The Program Report was accepted as presented.

Action Item: Notice to remove old Professional Society money applications from offices

Welfare and Benefits Committee—Dorothy Smith reported that they do work on assignment. They developed an *Exit Interview* form. The committee feels this is a Human Resources Administration and that the committee can advise and assist with this task.

The committee is now receiving comments on this exit interview form.

It was requested that failed search data be collected and shared with UCOP as well as those for

Report was accepted.

ACTION ITEM: Attached is the **DRAFT Exit Interview Form—** please review and respond to Dorothy Smith by **November 12, 2004.**

Rules and Elections Committee Report

ACTION ITEM: **Bylaws changes** voted upon in April 2004 have not been posted to website. Get them from Leigh Johnson

Report was approved

Personnel Committee—Fe Moncloa presented the report

Salary Actions: A chart was passed out. Two appeals are currently going forward

Letters of Evaluation will only be required for Promotions Merits to FT VII and above

Website Examples and Evaluation:

- There will be more examples on the web
- Working on the development of an electronic submission of PR. 15 people are currently testing the method
- Streamlining the Merit Process

PR Training Dates

- Ad Hoc Chairs' Training is January 20, 2005
- UC Davis area Training is October 26, 2004
- Ontario Training is October 28, 2004
- New *Blue Book* will be presented
- SAC findings will be shared with people who attend the trainings

ACTION ITEM: Leigh Johnson recommended at the PR training that people attending be encouraged to belong to AAC committees. Fe Moncloa agreed to have it discussed and will talk to Glenn Nader to include it at all of the sessions.

If anyone responds at these training events, the Personnel Committee was directed to submit responses to **Doug Gubler, UCD, Chr. Rules and Elections Committee**

11:00

ANR Update

Associate VP Lanny Lund who brought
Regional Directors and Program Leaders
Varcoe and Morse

The following comments were made by Director Lanny Lund.

Budget Update:

Past year's budget CE had no designated cut but still took an undesignated cut. So we will have to take about \$600,000 cut. Merits were only partially covered using unallocated resources. Director Lund stressed that there are NO discretionary resources left.

This coming year: A compact for no more additional cuts to UC has been made with governor. Range adjustments, funding merits and fully funding student workload but none for re-building of programs. *Note: All of this is a speculation at the moment.*

Program Leaders:

Agriculture Production—Maxwell Norton
Natural Resources and Animal —Bill Frost
Human Resources—Karen Varcoe
Agriculture Policy and Pest Management--Joe Morse

Maxwell Norton was recently selected to serve in this role and Bill Frost was recently re-appointed. Program Leaders Varcoe and Morse's terms are up this year. They can reapply and others can apply later this year or early next year.

Associate VP—in the process of hiring

Advisor Salary Scale Changes: The way the system works is that the normative time in a rank as it operates on campuses is 6 years for all academics—except for UCCE Advisors which was 8 years. Now the normative time is 6 years for all individuals. The changes affected 63 people.

Other Items:

Cost Recovery Committee: The Implementation Committee is working on this with CD Administration Sounding Board members.

Rate and Recharge Committee: Administration is in the process of establishing such a committee so recharge rates can be justified and put into place.

Request for Review of ANR by President Dynes Advisory Commission:

- Strategic Plan for UC; it seems that there is NOT a systematic strategic plan for all of UC
- Another review is requested as a result of letter from Academic Council (reps from 10 campuses and Larry Pitts) want a report. The feeling is that they want the ANR funds now held and managed in 3 campuses to be split between 10 campuses.
- Next step will be to appoint a Blue Ribbon Committee to clarify where ANR is going in the next 20 to 25 years
- Ag Experiments Stations received a review in early 2000's. The team who did this review was in-house UC people and external people. This review received accolades following the review.

Specialist Support

- Being strongly considered
- But the only way to get more support funds is to not re-fill specialist slots as people retire or resign.
- Administration is trying to establish the minimum level of support. For years that \$40,000 but the amount has eroded to \$10,000. More discussion is critical.

Sustainability:

- Continuing to look at this aspect of CE health.
- Existing Units are exploring what this means to them.
- Program Leaders are meeting today (10-12-04) to discuss
- New SAREP Director is being appointed due to completed term

Water Resources Center

- Consideration is being given to moving it from UC Riverside

Ag Water Quality

- Proposal to use Kearney Funds to kick start this project

Master Gardener Office

- Considering a statewide MG office from Slossen Endowment

Core Issue Grant Proposals

- 1999 Funds put in workgroups
- 1999 ANR endowments payouts were allocated to workgroups
- Worked OK but . . .
- Old competitive projects grants went well; so this a re-invention of this program so the best projects are funded.
- Allocated funds are directed to high priority areas
- PPAC
 - Identified critical and target issues
 - Passed on to Program Committee to rank

- Only critical in 2002-2004 time frame—40 were identified
- Program Committee took the 40 and reprioritized to 21 which are ranked
- Call on Sept 15 and due Nov. 15. Process is web-based, online submission
- Offers seed money and program redirection
- Projects *must be* collaborative
- Workgroups are still encouraged to apply for the Core Grants
- \$800,000 available from endowments
- Issues—8 of them and each as two targets of opportunity

Discussion Following Director Lund's Presentation:

- Salary Changes—AAC members discussed the fact that the changes seemed to discriminate against Full Title folks.
 - Lanny pointed out that the change was the 'Time in Rank' opposed to monetary adjustment for all staff.
 - Leigh Johnson brought up the Range Adjustments for Faculty and the feeling that Advisors be re-coupled with faculty range adjustments and asked for PL, RD and Assc. VP be advocates for UCCE Advisors
 - Paul Vossen brought up that UCCE advisors were not included in the recent changes—and their salaries are 18% behind the Consumer Price Index.
 - Leigh Johnson stated that UCCE Advisors need this support to make headway in salary inequity arena.
 - Lanny verbally supported the request to be an advocate the Range Adjustments for Faculty issue. Discussion followed which articulated the difference between Salary Scale Issue versus Range Adjustments for Faculty.
 - Leigh Johnson acknowledged that AAC is working on Salary Scale issue for the long-term but in the short term the work with keeping the Range Adjustment presented and pursued was good.
 - Linda Manton verbally stated that given the appropriate questions regarding hiring and exit issues that the data could be generated so that for AAC could have data statewide or region-wide or program-wide.
 - **ACTION ITEM:** Regional Directors and Program Leaders MUST be invited to each AAC meetings formally on an annual basis and informally through email announcements.

Lunch

1:00 pm Karen Varcoe, Program Leader, shared what she sees as her role as Human Resources Program Leader and the efforts on the Program Council.

1:00 pm **Sub-Region and Campus Reports**

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

Sub-Region 2 –North Coast and Mountain Region—Lynn Wunderlich

See total report in the appendix.

Campus and County Connection Report:

- Workgroups, statewide coordinating conference, CORE grants; best ones are those where specialists contact counties or those who prize communities
- Ways to enhance would be that one pay schedule would help Salary Issue—step in the right direction but that more needed to be done.
- President Dynes review and also the tour of the state
- Position refills

Sub-Region 1 – Central Valley Region—Anna Martin represented the southern part of the Central Valley region due to Dan Munk’s inability to attend and has assumed the role of chairperson for this sub-region.

Enhancing campus/county connections:

- Make funding approval and promotions for campus-based academics contingent on working with county-based academics.
- Provide adequate funding for research, extension, and education.

Other concerns:

The salary scale revision was a significant step in making our salaries more equitable and appealing at the Assistant and Associate Advisor level. However, concerns were expressed that the steps at the top end (Full Advisor level) were not adjusted.

- We need marching orders from our UCCE leaders as to future resources/staffing. The following concerns were expressed:
 - Moving Advisors into County Director positions without backfilling the advisor positions may be detrimental to our county support.
 - Being uncertain about our future resources/staffing makes it difficult to plan research and programs.

Sub-Region 2—Central Valley Region—Chris Greer

Concerns:

- This sub-region wants a statistical support person
- Others want to push the PhD issue as a requirement
- Rank in years adjustment; promoted from Assc. Step IV to Full Title I

Charles Go recommended that Personnel Committee look into the ‘Years in Rank’ issue to see how it affects people going from Step IV to Full 1 and Asst. IV to Assc. 1.

Make sure that it is the same from region and ask that they try to address this at the upcoming PR Trainings.

ACTION ITEM: Personnel Committee will clarify the ramifications of normative time change and help communicate what is clarified. Once data is gathered make a recommendation should be from Associate IV to Full title1. Recommend that the people who went from Associate IV to Full I should be elevated to Full II.
MSC

Sub-Region 1 – Central Coast and Southern Region—Charles Go

Per the request from President Barrett, the CCSR polled its staff on the following questions.

1. What steps can we take to increase campus-county program connections?
2. What efforts are underway in your area to enhance the campus -county connection?
3. Other issues of concern.

Responses: 21 people responded; their actual responses are found in the appendix. N=21, Sub-region I = 10, Sub-region II = 11; Sub-region I (Alameda, Contra Costa, Monterey, San Benito, San Luis Obispo, San Mateo-SF, Santa Barbara, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz) Sub-region II (Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernadino, San Diego, Ventura)

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

Topics Important to Sub-region:

1. Salary inequity—advisors are unhappy that the salary inequity has never been resolved.

- Salary increases given to faculty and specialists were not given to advisors.
- Subsequently, advisor salaries have fallen behind and are no longer in par with campus personnel.
- Salary inequity is demoralizing to advisors

2. County Support: Advisors in large urban counties have difficulties demonstrating the worth of CE to their county Board of Supervisor members. CE budgets to urban counties are tiny in terms of percentages in times of county economic problems. CE has been reduced or cut out of county budgets completely. How does CE appear in LA Times or SD Union and make itself known to the entire county or region? Is 4-H only about raising animals to be shown at the fair?

3. Filling Advisor Positions with Program Representatives: NFCS and 4-H advisor positions are increasingly being filled with program representatives

instead of the advisor level employee. There is fear among advisors that these two areas are being de-emphasized. With program representatives, are we creating a group of 2nd class employees with CE?

UC Berkeley Campus—no report

UC Davis Campus -- Jim Hill

- **Equivalent Position** not moving ahead; this is felt to be unfortunate.
- **Consulting Policy:** Campus consulting policy is more liberal than the one is in place in the counties. Dean Neal Van Alfen wants the consulting policy to be reviewed as it is inconsistent now. Jim Thompson received all the policy changes over the years. Right now, if advisors act as consultants, they have to take a day of annual leave but campus people can do consulting one day per week without taking time off for consulting.
- **Advisor Consulting Policy:** Dr Gomes suggested that specialists fall under the Senate level while Advisors are not subject this kind of connection.
- **UNIX—**Brought to their committee as a concern by Diane Barrett. They have very high overhead costs.
- The choice is between hiring more specialists OR providing more monetary support for the specialists. Davis has, currently, the least amount of support moneys.

UC Riverside Campus Report—Bowman Cutter

- Faculty Equivalent Status—Want this change for grants and getting data
- Re-organization of the campus is a concern
- Kearney Funds on Ag. Water Quality program a concern because of the site change
- Could CE have direct links to State Water Quality Board; have a formal liaison would also help the SWQB to save money on consultants
- Specialists are worried about requiring publications in high impact journals for promotion

ANR Update – Vice President Reg Gomes

- Associate VP Selection is Happening; look for announcement soon
- Lanny Lund's retirement—March 2005 (begins leave then)
- President's Advisory Commission—
 - Met for the 2nd time and discussed goals for UC as a whole
 - What Kind of study should be done?
- Tours with President Dynes will continue to happen but they will stop calling them inaugural tours

- Thursday, October 14 going to Redding; also looking at four programs
 - Alumni Reception in Redding
 - Later October 25—Napa County reception at COPIA and a dinner of leaders sponsored by Mondavi
 - November 26—Sonoma County--Sudden oak death and other issue; 4-H Center in Healdsburg.
- Reg suggests that AAC look into the evaluating the Specialist and Advisor Consulting Policies

4:30 pm Adjourned the meeting for the day; regroup at 8:00 a.m. for breakfast

October 13 Revised Agenda

8:00 a.m. Breakfast

8:30 a.m. Call to Order and Agenda Review

8:45 a.m. Review Themes from Yesterday's Reports

9:00 a.m. Themes Emerge for AAC Projects

1. Consulting Issue—Juan Guerrero Reporting

Action: Evaluate and Consider Revision of Existing Policies

Who: Juan, Gerry, Cindy and Jim Hill

- Define Consulting Policies in Each Region
- Get clear definition of the Campus Policy and that for the Academic Senate (benefits that accompany the consulting policies on all three campuses
- Specialists within three AG campuses—what are the consulting policies that pertain to them.
- What are consulting policies in other states CE and how do they view consulting policies for CE staff
- Positives: Enhances UC—especially international
- Morale Booster to have a more liberal policy
- Increase personal knowledge and capability of advisors
- Negatives: Conflict of interest
- Limit of consulting time—limit of days per year
- The policy of consulting within the state

- Consulting with CD before working in that county
- If we are county-based faculty, then our consulting based policies should be in line with those of our campus-based peers

Plan of Action:

Committee will discuss and research above items and be prepared to discuss them at the April meeting.

Salary Issue

Action: Letter to thank Dr. Gomes for the good things and to state that we were pleased to hear that he would support. Range Adjustments at the same percentage for all academic UCCE employees—in fact, all of those not represented by a union. Also, send the copy of the letter we send to Dr. Gomes to all UCCE academics. Copy deans, RD's and program leaders

Who: Leigh, Charles, Anna and Paul

Action: Define Range Adjustment and Salary Scale for peers

Ph. D Requirement for Advisors—Chris, Lynn, Mary, Fe and Steve

Weaknesses: Managing Volunteer Program

Opportunities: Salary upgrade; Specialists already did this in the 80's and they are now members of Academic Senate

Threats: Would current UCCE Advisors be allowed to continue in their positions without a PhD?

ACTION ITEM: Develop a web based survey but before that Sub-region reps talk to their staff

- Peer Group Definition
- Off-scale salary at Hiring
- Advancement at UCB in ½ steps
- Accelerating Advancement—compression of years in rank
- Marketplace value of advisor, within and outside
- Evaluation of recruitment pools
- DRAFT-- Exit Interview Form and Questions
- Dorothy will send it out and get it edited and sent out to Regional Directors
- Dorothy will talk to Ken Churches
- Juan will talk to Regional Director Gonzalez

- Steve will talk to Linda
- Unsatisfactory and Failed Searches—RD's and CD's
- Dorothy will ask what kinds of data

Cultivating relationships --Cultivating Relationships—with Deans, Regional Directions and Program Leaders—Gloria, Dorothy and Diane

- Publish brochure and distribute with current membership and project goals for this year
- Present at meetings where advisors gather so that AAC can be explained
- Place articles in ANR
- Have regional reps attend CD meetings
- Be added to agenda to the Program Council to explain AAC issues and action plans
- Invite Deans, RD and Program Leaders to AAC meetings

Campus and County Connection

- Internal Relationships between UCCE Assembly member and AAC

9:50 a.m. Group Reports were given; notes are above and group reports can be found in the appendix portion of this document

10:00 a.m. Review Action Items for Work by AAC with Recommendations and Deadline Dates

10:30 a.m. Break—Check out of rooms

10:55 a.m. **What Next for These Reports?**

- Actions and Reactions to the Suggestions
- Ad Hoc committee for Consulting Issue—Chr. Juan, Gerry, Dorothy Smith, Jim Hill and Cindy Fake
- Ad Hoc Committee for Ph. D Issue: Karen Klonsky, Lynn Wunderlich, Mary Blackburn, Chr.= Steve V. and Chris Greer Steve will recruit others
- Ad Hoc Committee for Cultivating Relationships: Gloria Barrett, Leigh Johnson, Dorothy Smith and Diane Metz
- Chairs are encouraged to recruit appropriate others

- **ACTION ITEM:** Progress Reports should be sent to Gloria Barrett by January 20, 2005
- **ACTION ITEM:** Executive Committee meet with Reg Gomes the end of February 2005; also invite Lanny Lund and the Rick Standiford, new Associate VP, to share plans and what has been accomplished to date.

11:05 a.m. Finalize Strategic Plan—M. Blackburn

ACTION ITEM: Mary, Diane and Mario work on getting it the same. Change Core Values to Desired Outcome before the Planning Objectives. Mary Blackburn will set up a meeting with Diane Metz and Mario Moratorio in November so that Gloria has full report no later than December 15, 2004

Reconcile the two documents and make sure that it goes to Gloria no later than December 15.

11:45 a.m. Summarize Desired Outcomes—did we achieve

Next Meeting-- April 26-27, 2005 in Davis

Possible Locations to Consider for the April Meeting:

- Buehler Alumni Center
- Woodland Hotel
- DANR Building on Hopkins Rd. Davis in the Plum Room
- Start at 10:00 a.m. (People can get there without incurring two overnights)
- Fe send the Tax Exempt form to Gloria Barrett to assist with arrangements

Noon Working Lunch

Improve the Website—ask for a link to AAC on the home page.

ACTION ITEM: Present this idea at the January Executive

Meeting Evaluation:

- ✓ Have some business to discuss with dignitaries
- ✓ Have time before the administrators come to develop question list; reach a common mind set
- ✓ Great location—thanks to Gloria
- ✓ Time before administrators show up so we get our act together. We can identify key issues that are foremost in our minds
- ✓ Do minutes with Action List and a Summary

- ✓ Request to have Administrators come the second day of the meeting at the beginning of the day
- ✓ Salary Issue – Is Assembly Council conceding that the salary inequity that occurred in the 1990's? We need to continue pursuing this matter.

1:00 pm Adjourn the Meeting

Appendix:

SUB-REGION DETAILED REPORTS:

North Coast and Mountain Sub-region # 1—Paul Vossen

North Coast and Mountain Sub-Region – 1 (*Del Norte, Humboldt, Lake, Marin, Mendocino, Napa, Shasta, Siskiyou, Sonoma, and Trinity Counties*)

1. The primary issue on the minds of advisors in my region who have responded to a request for feedback on their concerns, problems, program needs, and professional needs, regarding the policies and welfare of academic employees is “Their unfair treatment in regards to salary scale.”

Everyone who has spoken to me or communicated by email has said similar things, such as:

- Unfair.
- A slap in the face to those who have done a good job here for many years.
- This is just another way to divide and conquer.
- This makes me upset and not trusting of University Administration. I’ve done “more with less” for the last 10 years and this is how I got rewarded – How demoralizing.
- I am outraged that the dedicated career employees in the full title rank (who have been faithfully laboring through the difficult times, who advanced through ALL FOUR Associate steps, and who are the ones who have made the sacrifices and have been working to try and hold this organization together by covering vacancies etc.) have been further insulted by being left out of the scale adjustment. What are they thinking?
- Yes, our salaries are higher, but I would maintain that our responsibilities and abilities are also higher at this point in our careers. Besides, how can the administration decide who NEEDS a raise and who doesn't? Regardless, there's no way around the fact that by not treating the full title advisors the same, the administration has just FURTHER DEVALUED OUR WORK compared to all of our other colleagues.
- The Assistant and Associate level advisors certainly deserve a step increase; in fact they should have received a 2 step increase. The full title advisors have earned at least a step increase. Two to one would not have been fair, but one to zero is outrageous.
- We have lost people to higher paying jobs in the recruitment process and this helps to fix it, but it is unfair to everyone else; it may even be illegal and well worth a lawsuit.

- I am outraged by the fact that I have worked for several years to achieve the rank of Full Title II only to see my junior colleague who has worked six years less, receive the same pay!
- Administration does not support Cooperative Extension and this is just one more way they are showing their ignorance and lack of support for Cooperative Extension programs. It was not the assistant and associate level advisors or the specialists who rallied the industry leaders and received support for UCCE from our state legislators. It was the group of hard working advisors who have years of experience working with industry that garnered the budgetary support for UCCE. What an insult to now leave them standing in the cold.
- This is strike three: (1) First, all of UCCE gets separated out from the group of faculty they were always part of to give them a 15% + increase over 5 years. (2) Then the specialists get separated out from the advisors in getting their raises. (3) Now the junior farm advisors get a raise leaving the full title advisors with nothing. This policy has and will continue to cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to each advisor. Can you guess how that makes me feel, especially when we have been doing an excellent job serving the needs of California's agricultural industries?
- The last time we received any cost of living increase was in October of 2001 when we got a 0.5% raise. I watched the people around me in UC, private industry, and in other closely related fields all get nice raises in the late 90's and early 00's. I'm depressed and I'm not going to continue to work the extra hours or put in the extra effort on weekends after being treated like this. The loser is the University as a whole, because my representation is not as strong as it once was.
- I'm not a bit surprised by this unfair treatment of certain people within the same salary scale. We have been treated as second class ever since the current administration took office. There is no passion for the role played by UCCE in California.
- Our scale is now 18.51 % behind in real dollars compared to where it was in 1991 taking into account the increase in the US Consumer Price Index. It is outrageous to unfairly discriminate against the long term career employees who have devoted their professional lives toward building the reputation of the University of California. This must be addressed in an equitable manner for all ranks, adjusting all UCCE Salary scales to bring them more in line with changes in the cost of living that have taken place over the past 13 years. Assembly Council needs to make some motions, support them, and confront the administration on this issue.
- See attached table on the Cost of Living and Scale Adjustments vs. Consumer Price Index.

2. Another issue brought up by two people were the positive steps taken recently to reduce the burden of writing a PR. Shortening the PR process is imperative.
3. Other issues: Amend the performance approval process to include a requirement for faculty and specialists to work with UCCE. There is not enough outreach by faculty and specialists to advisors.

North Coast and Mountain Sub-region #2 Report: —Lynn Wunderlich

Representing Amador, Calaveras, El Dorado, Inyo-Mono, Lassen, Mariposa, Modoc, Placer-Nevada, Plumas-Sierra, and Tuolumne Counties.

Key issues for AAC that emerged from Advisors in our sub-region included the following:

1. Efforts to enhance the campus-county connection and how that connection currently functions.

How the campus-county connection currently works:

- Statewide coordinating conferences: such as the Pest Management Conference and initiation of a Statewide Animal Production conference.
- Workgroups. Some comments said workgroups were a great way to maintain campus-county connections; others thought this method was ineffective, perhaps especially within Human Resources.
- Coordination in developing grant proposals: The recent announcement of ANR Core Issues grants is being received very well and there should be a continued effort to provide such opportunities. Efforts to coordinate proposals for water quality funds are another example.
- Informal faculty-advisor meetings to discuss projects.
- Advisors working with Graduate Students and student interns on research projects.

Concerns with how the current system works:

- Our jobs are different but the emphasis now for both campus and county-based personnel is on research and publication, traditionally a Faculty/Specialist's job. Advisors are responsible for connecting with communities and seeing that research based knowledge is implemented causing change. Specialists should have more responsibility in funding research and publishing. Right now the emphasis is that we all are specialists.
- The best campus-county connections come from working with Specialists who believe in, and are committed to, engaging communities. They do this to learn from the community and to provide applied research in an attempt to meet community needs. Other than these few examples, mostly from HR, and

Specialists giving annual research presentations at local Ag. and NR meetings, this engagement of communities by campus-based personnel appears to be somewhat rare (or I didn't get many examples of such).

- Sometimes Advisors are contacted by campus faculty after grants have been developed and funded but field connections are needed to complete the work. The Advisor may provide the necessary contacts to fulfill the obligation, (time-consuming), but be left out of the development of the research and written publication that comes afterward, which in this current environment, Advisors need. *How can Advisors leverage their "on the ground" networking and expertise in field practicality in order to forge equity in all aspects of research development with faculty?* It seems one way is to require an Extension person on the proposal to begin with (like with the ANR Core Issues Grants).
- Some feel our system currently encourages Advisors to get stand-alone grants, 1st author pubs, and really not work with campus Specialists. There are many instances where Advisors work in the same subject area as Specialists and Faculty without much if any communication. On the other hand, Specialists and Faculty now work in an environment that has little encouragement to work with Advisors. Old fashioned connecting people and campus and communities seems to be out. This emphasis on grants and pubs seems to narrow programs and shrink us smaller than our numbers.

Ideas on how to improve the campus-county connection:

- Maintain and fund workgroups.
- Continue grant calls that require campus-county partnerships.
- Reward the campus-county connection by advancement and create one pay scale for all CE personnel: reward is what drives real impact and teamwork. The reward system needs to equally reward advisors for the role that they play and specialists for their role. Return to a career path that allows advisors who like specialization to transfer to campus and become specialists and allows advisors who wish to, to stay in the counties.

The lack of one pay scale and the lack of a career track allowing some county folks to move to campus have clearly created the two-class system. All CE should be on one pay scale with varied job classifications according to location, responsibility and mission.

- Change the structure of ANR: some feel strongly that a campus based program for Extension would be a more effective way to align county Extension staff with campus faculty.

2. **Salary Changes.** Members weighed in on the recent salary increase and reduction of ranks for Assistant and Associate Advisors. All said that was a step in the right direction but many said more needed to happen:

- Still an equity issue: Full Title folks were also treated inequitably when they served in those ranks. So the equity issue has only been partially addressed. Should have been adjusted across the board.
- Intention was to address our ability to attract quality applicants and retain them. This was not intended to be a review of appropriate salaries for all advisors - that is a larger issue that still needs to be done. Overall, for the Division, this was an excellent step. In a period of limited resources it was the right move and we should applaud the Vice President for making it happen. Perhaps when the State budget recovers we can explore additions to the Full Title series.
- One pay scale for all. Some feel the council needs to flat out declare "the improvement in pay is nice, but we recommend everyone with a CE appointment in California should be on the same pay scale" with the current specialist scale to be renamed "Ladder Ranks - Cooperative Extension Series". The Specialist series needs to add a junior scale to accommodate Master's hires, which may occur with new Advisors. Advisors should have the opportunity to shift over to the specialist pay scale when they advance, now dropping 2 or 3 steps. We should consider beginning all Ph.D.'s at Asst I and reinstate the junior scale for M.S. hires.
- The council should look at how off scale salaries are being used. At UCB we're seeing 1/2 step increases, so an interesting and concerning set of values of how advancement occurs is being used.
- The recent change in the salary schedule was a positive step. It is critical to recruiting talented new Advisors.

3. **Other issues: the Senate's review of ANR, restructuring ANR and refilling positions.**

- Several members noted the June 22 letter to President Dynes from the Academic Council, which respectfully requests a formal and broad evaluation of DANR. Some thought the AAC should be involved in this and also in President Dyne's tour around the state. There should be some follow-up to this letter.
- Some members continue to believe there should be an external UC study (external to the Division) of how we can best meet the Land Grant Extension mission. The Deans proposed model might not have been fully explored. In the interim AAC might meet immediately with the new Associate Vice President and Deans to consider ways to make this a priority in the Division and on the campuses.

- Refilling positions: Members see refilling of positions “at the top” while county positions remain vacant and note that this is not in keeping with what was discussed during the Listening Sessions. Members request that this process become clear: we need information and a timeline on when vacant positions will be filled and an understanding of the process for allocating to regions.
- Central Administration: Some members asked how the division is working to create more consistency between regions with regard to refilling positions. Is anyone looking at inefficiencies of operating 3 regions when we only have 237 academics? Would it be more economical to have one central administration for all the county administrative/management functions?

4. Other issues: ANR vision, staff morale, workload, and celebrating our good work.

- There appears to be for some a continuing decline of staff morale. This could be linked to several issues:
- The lack of a clear vision of where ANR is headed. The strategic plan was a start but doesn't seem to be alive as a guide to the organization future. The PPAC effort also seems to have been lost as a program-planning tool.
- Workloads: Do we wear too many hats? Some members brought up the concern that overloading staff with assignments that are too demanding. (e.g.- Regional Directors, County Director's who also have several programmatic roles) prevents us from being thoughtful and reflective in our work.
- Celebrating our good work: California Ag is one tool but there should be others. Perhaps we need someone responsible for staff personnel issue rather than assuming the RD's and CD's can do it all.

Sub-Region 1 – Central Coast and Southern Region Report—Charles Go

I. Responses: N=21, Sub-region I = 10, Sub-region II = 11; Sub-region I (Alameda, Contra Costa, Monterey, San Benito, San Luis Obispo, San Mateo-SF, Santa Barbara, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz) Sub-region II (Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernadino, San Diego, Ventura)

II. Projects or partnerships with campus.

Sub-region I: 9 Yes, 1 NO

Sub-region II: 10 Yes, 1 NO

III. If Yes, tell us how it was created? How is it's progress? What makes it work?

Sub-region I Responses:

- Workgroup. Actually it is probably going to end since Stephen Russell left.
- In several instances, campus academics received funding for projects and approached me to cooperate on local field sites for these projects. This has been a workable arrangement so far, because each member uses their strengths; campus academic secures funding, UCCE arranges sites & coordinates local field activities.
- Mutual interest and grant funding brought us together. We are meeting all grant guidelines. it works because the project is conducted at the county level and grant administration is conducted at the campus level.
- I was introduced to this Specialist over 20 years ago by another Farm Advisor. We have developed a mutual respect for each other by working together closely for two decades. We know that we can share ideas, projects and funding. Other campus-based personnel I have worked with either have little interest in working with county-based projects, have stolen ideas or funding or are good for only one project until their funding runs out. There is little interest in continuity of relationships.
- It was created by communicating with campus colleagues who had similar interests and developing projects that compliment each contributor's area of expertise.
- All of my projects have campus Co PIs or collaborators. I work with colleagues on the Berkeley, Davis, and Riverside campus. We work as a team. Through work groups. Some work well; some don't.
- It was created through a call from my campus collaborator. The progress is slow, it requires local and campus collaboration and there are many conflicts. What makes it work is still in progress.

Sub-region II Responses:

- I have personal relationships with faculty on campus that I developed as a student and through collegial activity. It works through mutual respect for each persona and their work.
- Typically, a campus member contacts me about a project. In two cases I've contacted people because I didn't the lab to do it.
- In one case, I approached a researcher who had facilities and experience that were needed for a project that addressed a clientele need. In two other cases, the researchers contacted me. In one case, industry contacted both of us. All four situations, the projects are moving forward. In two cases portions of the work are now published. One of the other projects is in the second season but one report has been made to the

funding agency and the last project is still in the first season. In all cases, it is the initiative of the researchers that is behind the success of the projects.

- In 2002, I conducted collaborative research with a UCSD Economics professor. It was funded by a state law and a state agency asked me to be PI. I issued an RFP, selected the professor with the aid of an advisory committee, and the contract with the state agency was set up as a multi-campus award. We worked together on the research; because it was an economics study, he led in the design and much of the statistical analysis. I contributed contacts with clientele, collected much technical data and provided extensive support for a research survey. We co-authored a study report and we are working on a journal article.
- The contact was originally made following up on contact information provided by an advisor in the county where the campus is located. The professor is currently on our advisory committee for a school-based learning center. It works because the professor is open to collaboration, we have overlapping interests and these are some funds to support collaboration.
- The relationships have come about effortlessly through common research interests. Presentations at meetings and journal publications were the avenues of information that led to working cooperatively.
- I needed assistance in an area of entomology that I am not too familiar with. This involved a poultry manure composting program, where we had to rear and count flies resulting from different manure management methods. I worked with Alec Gerry at UCR.
- Advisors became aware of a specialist with expertise in a vital area identified by the County and a relationship was formed based on common goals. The initial collaboration has resulted in additional projects because of the recognition by those involved that each brings a unique perspective and talent that would not be possible working as individuals.
- Individual contacts. Mutual interests. Funding for both parties.

IV. Steps to Enhance County and Campus

Sub-region I Responses:

- I think collaborations depend on personal relationships. I really don't know what ACC can do to encourage them.
- Availability of travel funds for personal meetings with campus colleagues could help.

- Recommend hiring another youth development specialist. I had a long-lasting partnership with Stephen Russell. He is no longer in Davis, yet I still collaborate with him.
- Help clarify authorship protocol on publications. Who should be on as author, what constitutes being an author, etc.
- Work on communications throughout our organization - I hear little from administration, AAC, CAFAS, etc. There are not even any good rumors! Only my CD can provide me with any minimal information about anything within this organization. Many Advisors are feeling isolated.
- Push for change in the merit evaluation system that will reward cooperative efforts.
- As a part of its efforts to increase visibility AAC could document and promote the campus-County connections already in place and encourage others.
- That's hard since our own administration doesn't respect AAC.
- Strengthen both county and campus staff by hiring more people. For years, we have been losing staff but the work is not lessening. We have been doing more for less and this has to stop. In addition, campus staff need to be accountable to a different PR process that requires and rewards them for working with county staff, not the current measure which uses on campus performance.

Sub-region II Responses:

- There are none that can be taken by AAC to achieve this goal. It is a bigger issue that is out of AAC's hands.
- Tie campus advancement to collaboration with county. I like this new CORE initiative and hope it will do more to increase collaboration.
- Any effort to increase visibility of county and campus personnel to one another would be the greatest step that I can see possible in increasing partnerships that address important issues short of providing additional funding sources for collaborative projects.
- Promote support for workgroups, both existing ones and new ones for disciplines that do not have active workgroups and for cross-disciplinary, issue-based workgroups. Note that CSU campuses also have faculty who are potential collaborators.
- Encourage advisors to participate in society meetings and to publish their research. The campus based contacts will follow, at least from my experience.

- This may sound naive, but I would like to know more about what the specialists do (actually all campus-based individuals) so that I would more easily be able to find a match when I need assistance with my program. In addition, it would be useful if the campus-based personnel would be informed of our programs-particularly those who are just starting out and need publications and extension experience or credit for doing the extension part of their jobs.
- Improve the coordination and interaction between campus and county programs in order to increase collaboration. Also recognize these collaborations as vital to the connection between the campuses and the outside world.
- Facilitate funding transfers between campus and county. Collaboration should be a major consideration on merit and promotion actions. People should clearly articulate how they are connecting to campus and or the counties.
- Funding that is not tied to tons of paperwork and connections with willing people on campus

V. Issues AAC should focus on:

Sub-region I Responses:

Vacancies and how to fill them:

- The loss of Specialists is eroding the connection between campus and UCCE offices; rehiring vacant positions needs to be a priority.
- Even though the pay adjustment due to various standards of living issue seems to be dormant due to Lanny's retirement, I believe that this is an issue that needs to be in the front burner until it is resolved. I live in an urban county, and my salary qualifies me for low-income housing loans in this county. I am looking to purchase a home, and all that I can afford is a home in the low-income neighborhoods.
- Benefits--with the rising cost of health care, people in the system at higher salaries are being penalized for having more education, more responsibility, etc. health care contributions from UC should be equal across the board. Other examples of higher paid staff being penalized is that PR's get extra vacation time this year because they didn't get a raise. Lots of advisors didn't get a raise and they did not receive extra vacation days either.
- Other than internal communications which I have already mentioned, what about leadership - most of our leadership either is near retirement age or has announced their retirement. Who is going to lead us? Do a survey of why campus-based personnel and county-based personnel are not working more closely together. Many campus-based personnel seem to ignore us in the counties despite request for assistance or suggestions about joint projects.

- Salary improvement, effort should be made to make up for losses in pay that we not given to advisors. Increases were given to campus based staff salary scales.
- AAC has a plan it is expected to put on the web shortly after the October meeting. It needs to address the top priorities and start implementing the plan of action.
- Figuring out what it can and cannot do.
- First, look into how to reward full title staff. The salary adjustment did not apply to this group and send a negative message. Retention of our senior staff is as important as recruitment of new staff. Second, send a message that doing more for less is not ok. We are now at a point where we need to make decisions on re-staffing. AAC should deal with issues of whether we want to fill staff into same positions as before or reallocate the funds for new positions or to fund the retention of current staff. Another related issue is if we are not getting new staff hired, how can we re-organize and cut responsibilities to point a direction for our survival as an organization for the future.

Sub-region II Responses

- AAC should focus on the salary inequity. I can not make end meet any more even though I am a full title advisor. I work two jobs to pay my bills.
- Salary equity. Advisor replacement/refill positions. Making sure counties have adequate staffing.
- Salary equity issue remains important for full-title advisors. Regions are asking for priorities for new positions and AAC should foster discussions and encourage administration to take care of salary lag for existing academics, before hiring more.
- Union representation.
- I still think the salary issue is going to be big, but I would like to see continued discussion of *collaboration* issues.
- Advisor salaries related to Full Title ranks. Find a positive and supportive proposal, working with program council or even the executive council to find something that will work. Advisor salaries need to be tied to specialist and faculty salaries so they will receive the same COLAs and increases. Big order I know.

Sub- Region 1 – Central Coast and Southern Region Report—Juan Guerrero

Central Valley Report—Sub-region #1—Anna Martin

How to enhance campus/county connections?

- Make funding approval and promotions for campus-based academics contingent on working with county-based academics.
- Provide adequate funding for research, extension, and education.

Other concerns:

- The salary scale revision was a significant step in making our salaries more equitable and appealing at the Assistant and Associate Advisor level, concerns were expressed that the steps at the top end (advisor level) were not adjusted.
- We need marching orders from our UCCE leaders as to future resources/staffing. The following concerns were expressed:
 - Moving Advisors into County Director positions without backfilling the advisor positions may be detrimental to our county support.
 - Being uncertain about our future resources/staffing makes it difficult to plan research and programs.
 -

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Personnel Committee -- Presented by Fe Moncloa

Here is a summary of the salary actions over years in percentages:

	2001	2002	2003	2004
Accel/Promo	50	50	25	100
Promo	63	65	80	78
Accel/Merit	67	70	89	86
Merit	88	93	90	91

Appeals	2000	2001	2002	2003
Filed	6	11	3	2
Approved	2	1	1	1

Two Appeals were filed this year. Action is pending at this time.

2004 salary actions

	# of cases	Approved	Denied
Accelerations	11	10	1
Promotions	23	18	5
Merits	63	58	5
Term Review	3	3	0

Letters of Evaluation

This year there will be a change in the letters of evaluation requirement during the PR process, since CD will now be requesting them. Letters of evaluation will now only be required for:

- Promotions
- Merits to FT VII and above

We hope this will help reduce the workload of documents that are of questionable value to SAC in the promotion process.

Electronic Submission

Martie Lopez is chair of a subcommittee that is organizing the web site that will allow the electronic submission of the PR. It will be modeled after the Agronomy Dept. at UCD that has utilized this technology in the promotion and Merit process. 15 individuals representing all regions and program areas will pilot this process, with the goal that all will be able to use this process next year.

Streamlining Merits

Lanny Lund has asked the committee to address standardizing the annual assessment document and academics' data collection. This will help academics after long periods without developing a PR.

PR Trainings Davis - October 26; Ontario – October 28 and Ad Hoc Chair Training - Jan 20, UCD

Program Committee Report –Presented by Cindy Fake

Introduction

This report is prepared for the Academic Assembly Council as a summary of program committee accomplishments over the last five months. 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
Lead for Awards (Chair of Distinguished Service Awards Selection Committee)	Matteo Garbelotto
Lead for Professional Society Funds	Thomas Chao
Lead for Training	Ramiro Lobo

Our committee is currently short one member.

Project Updates

Professional Society Travel Funds

Tom Chao is responsible for administering the Professional Society Travel Funds program. 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 previously stated intention to change it to three times a year. The first announcement from Oakland in the 2004-05 fiscal year was for a quarterly application, so we postponed the change until 2005-06.

For the last six quarters, we have sent out an e-mail reminder just before the application deadline. This is probably a contributing factor to the increase in applications, but it is

worthwhile because of the amount of positive feedback and recognition of Academic Assembly Council from CE academics. I will continue to send out the reminders.

Professional Society Travel Fund reimbursements have now become a very competitive process. In recent quarters, we have funded less than 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 2003, the program committee developed a matrix for evaluating applications. Point values are assigned for specific criteria: whether the applicant is presenting a paper or poster, serves on a committee, how many times s/he has received Professional Society funds, and whether s/he has other funding. New advisors are given preference, even without a presentation, as it is important to their professional development. Applications are then ranked based on points, and awards are made based on available funds.

Often, applications are not funded because the applicant provides insufficient information or fails to meet the deadline. Many applicants apparently still believe that awards are pretty automatic, regardless of the quality of the application, which is no longer the case. Past e-mails have encouraged applicants to complete all of the application and submit it by the deadline, future e-mail reminders will include more information about the process.

The matrix has worked very effectively, streamlining the decision-making process. What may be delayed, in some cases, is the notification to the applicants. However, given the reduced staff and increased workloads in Oakland, this is understandable. Carolyn Frazier in Oakland has been very helpful and responsive to Program Committee requests for changes to the application and system. For example, in the past, applicants were uncertain whether their application had been received, and there is now a message to that effect that appears when the application is submitted. She has also requested that anyone who has difficulty submitting an application contact her directly. That information will be included in future reminders.

Distinguished Service Awards

The Program Committee administers the Distinguished Service Awards Program. Matteo Garbelotto is responsible for coordinating the award process, and serves as chair of the selection committee.

In 2004, there will be awards for outstanding research, extension, and teamwork; as well as an award for New Professionals in the first 10 years of a UC career. The office of the Vice President has generously funded the awards at \$5,000 each for the outstanding extension, research, and new professional awards, and \$10,000 for team work.

The call went out in March, and Matteo developed a wonderful poster that was provided to each county office and department to advertise the award. Applications were submitted in June. There were not a lot of applications, perhaps due to the uncertainty of funding in the original announcement. However, the Distinguished Service Awards are important to maintaining morale by rewarding excellence.

Delays in constituting the selection committee over the summer mean that the selection committee is now in the process of decision-making. In the future, it may be more

appropriate for the selection committee to meet in the fall. The plan is to make the awards by the end of November.

CE Training

No training was organized during this period due to the lack of funding. Should funding become available, another statistical training would be desirable.

In addition, given the reduced personnel and increasing workloads for many CE academics, a series of workshops on time and stress management could also be helpful to maintaining a healthy Cooperative Extension.

AD HOC ACTION COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Consulting Policy Group Report:

Below is the report from the *ad hoc* committee regarding consulting for CE academics. Jim Hill, Gerry Higginbotham, and Cindy Fake are on this committee with me.

Regarding consulting policies for CE advisors, we consider that the following items should be evaluated:

1. How are consulting policies for advisors in each of the three regions being now applied?
2. On the three campuses (UCB, UCR, and UCD), how are consulting policies being applied to members of the Academic Senate (faculty)? If faculty does undertake consulting on UC time, which UC benefits pertain?
3. On the three campuses, what consulting policies pertain to CE Specialists?
4. How do other state CE view consulting for their CE academics? Which other states permit their CE academics to consult? For those states that do permit their CE academics to consult, what are the pertinent administrative policies that pertain?
5. What are the net benefits of consulting for both CE academics and for UCCE?
 - ✓ Positives – In areas outside California, the stature of UCCE is enhanced. Were UCCE academics permitted a more liberal consulting policy, morale for UCCE academics would certainly increase. The knowledge gained by CE academics when they consult would enhance program delivery for CE academics in their own county programs.
 - ✓ Negatives – What conflicts of interest might eventuate with a more liberal consulting policy? What if a CE academic consults overseas and the increased production in that country directly competes with California agriculture? What would be the maximum number of days per year that a CE academic might consult? What are the institutional liabilities that might eventuate when CE academics consult within state?
6. To what degree are CE academics equivalent to campus academics? Should consulting policies pertinent to CE academics be in alignment to those of Senate Academic faculty on the campuses?

Our committee will attempt to have some answers for these questions by January of next year.

---Juan N. Guerrero
Ad hoc committee chair

Salary Issues Group Report:

DRAFT of Letter sent to Dr. Gomes from AAC

Dear VP Gomes,

Thank you for your successful work on the adjustment of normative times for assistant and associate advisor titles to reflect those of academic series such as campus faculty and specialists. This action demonstrates the recognition of the academic status of the advisor positions. Hopefully, this will enhance ANR's ability to hire and retain highly qualified advisors in assistant and associate ranks. [Gloria can look at the letter send with announcement]

We were also very pleased to hear of your expectation that any future range adjustments would be applied equally to all university employees except those who are unionized. On that basis, our expectation is that there will no longer be differential range adjustments for some titles.

We were also happy to hear of your commitment to advocate, on behalf of the University of CA Cooperative Extension advisors, for future percentage range adjustments that are equal to those granted to specialists and faculty. This is especially timely if the economy and other factors allow for the fulfillment of the compact made with the Governor.

Finally, as representatives of the Academic Assembly and in our advisory capacity to you, we ask that you immediately inform and involve us in any university proposed salary and range adjustments. We want to partner with you to improve the morale of the advisors and specialists, and to strengthen their ability to help the division fulfill its mission.

Sincerely,

Gloria J. Barrett
Academic Assembly Council President

CC: Deans of the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources (check title on each campus), Program Council and Academic Assembly Members, Provosts

SALARY PH.D. REQUIREMENTS Group Report:

Strengths

- ❑ Salary
- ❑ Makes us more competitive for grants and the development of relationships
- ❑ Assuming we get the salary change, we would have a stronger pool of candidates
- ❑ Can hustle more money for support staff

Weaknesses

- ❑ Applied research expertise may be limited in some Ph.D. programs
- ❑ Will Ph.D.'s be charged with managing a volunteer program? Or will this task be delegated to others.

Opportunities

- ❑ Respect
- ❑ Salary
- ❑ A similar change took place with the Specialists in the 80's, we can learn from them.
- ❑ Peer recognition
- ❑ Stronger collaboration with campus faculty and specialists
- ❑ Would we become members of the senate?

Threats

- ❑ Implementation. Would this be grand fathered in?
- ❑ Research and publication emphasis, instead of outreach. We need to keep a balance.

Next Steps:

1. Sub-region Chair's will contact CE advisors and introduce them to the topic and let them know that survey is in the works.
2. Develop a web based survey and cover letter. It needs to be anonymous.

Cultivating Relationships Group Report:

Internal

1. Publish and distribute brochure
2. One page informational sheet: projects for 04/05, committee and regional chairs
3. Speak to county directors at regional meetings
4. Speak to HR, FSNEP/EFNEP, Workgroups: where advisors gather
5. Article to ANR Reports

External

Regional, Deans and Program Leaders

1. Ask regional representative to attend county director meetings
2. Face to fact meetings
3. Ask to be included on agenda for Program Council to discuss pertinent issues
4. Invite deans, Regional Directors and Program Leaders to attend AAC meeting