



University of California Agriculture and Natural Resources
Academic Assembly Council

MINUTES

October 1 - 2, 2009
Office of the President
1111 Franklin Street, Oakland, CA

MEMBERS ATTENDING:

- Leigh Johnson, President
- Paul Vossen, Past-President
- Gideon Zeidler, President-Elect
- Jennifer Hashim-Buckey, Secretary
- Alec Gerry, Specialist Committee Chair & Riverside Campus Committee
- Rachel Elkins, Advisor Committee Chair, NCMR
- James Bethke, Chair, Program Committee
- Chuck Ingels, Chair, Welfare and Benefits Committee
- Jim Downer, Chair, Rules and Elections Committee
- Joyce Strand (representing Dorothy-Smith, Chair) Personnel Committee
- Steve Wright, Chair, CVR & rep. Academic Policy Committee (ad hoc)
- Jeanette Sutherlin, Chair, ANR Budget Advisory Committee (ad hoc)
- Max Moritz (representing Pat Crawford, Chair) UC Berkeley Campus Committee
- Joe DiTomaso, UC Davis Campus Committee

GUESTS ATTENDING:

- Dan Dooley, ANR Vice President
- Barbara Allen-Diaz, Associate Vice President, Academic Programs and Strategic Initiatives
- Kay Harrison Taber, Associate Vice President, Business Operations

MOTIONS MADE:

Motion: To charge Welfare and Benefits Committee to review the consulting policy.

Motion: To appoint an ad hoc Advisor and County Director Representation Committee to investigate current structure, poll constituents and bring recommendations back to AAC regarding input on a new representation structure.

Motion: For chair to communicate to Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) to members that the recommendations have been reviewed by AAC and accepted with some minor discussion and changes, including the addition of Fee for Service recommendation. Following review, BAC will submit budget reduction recommendations to administration.

Motion: To approve minutes of June 2-3, 2009 meeting.

ACTION ITEMS:

Action Item: Executive Committee will recommend to administration that AAC have peer representation on the decision making body of merits and promotions and advise them that we will continue to communicate to them ideas for which we would like participation.

Action Item: AAC Executive Committee will bring to administration a request for confidential formal annual evaluation process by Advisors of Administrators (CDs, others). Process should be applied uniformly. There is a need to have an

expected outcome. For example, results should be a part of evaluation process by supervisor (RD, others). Changes would be at the discretion of supervisor.

Action Item: Executive Committee will request that administration include AAC in the loop on crafting a programmatic leadership structure for ANR.

Action Item: AAC will authorize Executive Committee to request administration to provide full funding for Distinguished Service Awards to be available in 2011. President-elect Zeidler will request budget from Joni Rippee for DSA in spring (February).

Action Item: Executive Committee to request administration to look at allocation of CE funds to campuses and whether it is appropriate to have funds distribution applied uniformly. Communicate the mechanism and processes of CE funding at the campus level to Specialists (as proposed by Alec Gerry).

Action Item: Executive Committee to request administration that AAC be involved in the new-hire orientation process and to provide an AAC presentation during orientation.

Action Item: AAC President Johnson will follow up with Joni Rippee to get figures and expenditures on AAC committee expenses and determine how to allocate cuts for the 2009-10 budget.

Action Item: AAC President Johnson will schedule a conference call with Dean Klingborg.

Thursday, October 1, 2009: GET ACQUAINTED WITH ANR LEADERS

Dan Dooley, ANR Vice President
Barbara Allen-Diaz, Associate Vice President, Academic Programs and Strategic Initiatives
Kay Harrison Taber, Associate Vice President, Business Operations

Presentations by ANR Leaders: *Kay Harrison Taber, Associate Vice President, Business Operations*

Kay Harrison Taber, Associate Vice President, Business Operations gave a presentation entitled *Looking Forward with Numbers* to the council to address budget reductions. She stated that total reductions to the University are about \$800M and she noted that every way the University is doing business is being discussed. Taber commented that it was fortunate that UC-ANR has the Strategic Vision to direct the decision making process and that ANR is being treated equitably and similarly to the campuses and noted that ANR could've taken a disproportionate cut. She explained the reductions to ANR in three categories:

- Temporary reductions (Total: \$5.613M)
- Permanent reductions (Total: \$5.214M)
- Unfunded liabilities (Total: \$3.600M)

In short, the budget shortfall (budget reductions and unfunded liabilities) is about \$9M. More information on the presentation may be found on the [AAC website](http://ucanr.org). The new UC-ANR organizational chart may be found here: <http://ucanr.org/orgchart.cfm>

Questions:

(Gideon Zeidler): What is the projection of next year's deficit?

(Kay Taber): Could be another reduction. President is pursuing another funding source to makeup the anticipated reductions.

(Steve Wright): AAC is involved in 315, Performance Standards, what's happening with this? ANR 340, Sabbatical and consulting policy?

(Kay Taber, Barbara Allen-Diaz): 315 is in Policy Office. K. Montano, with comments, edits. Kay asked to be held as our structure is changing. Only in hesitation mode. Don't want to put in system until titles and structures have been resolved. ANR 340 – not sure. No movement.

(Steve Wright): AAC has a committee in place to provide input where it is needed.

(Leigh Johnson): Shall we forward recommendations? Or wait?

(Barbara Allen-Diaz): Looking at organizational structure and how to be more efficient. AAC is already on the list to provide input.

Leigh Johnson, AAC President, noted that we wanted to take the opportunity to meet our leaders and offer our support, as this is a time of transition and we are 300 member-wide so we can provide input/feedback. We have structure and the ability to charge our committees for special purposes. President Johnson and the committee chairs introduced the structure and purpose of AAC (to advise and assist administration and foster academic excellence). It is noted that one way to maintain academic excellence is through awards and noted the peer review process effect on individual academic programs. She explained that AAC frequently polls constituents and brings results back to administration and repeated that we have an organized structure to provide input to administration.

Barbara Allen-Diaz asked about equivalent status and how AAC interacts with Academic Senate (AS). President Johnson noted that there was none to date. Alec Gerry, Specialist Committee Chair & Riverside Campus Committee rep. explained that CE Specialists have had discussions with AS. AS has set up committee to look at equivalent status. There is currently a discussion to decide who should be included in AS and it is likely that inclusion will be extended only to those with teaching responsibility. There was discussion about the Advisor-Specialist continuum and damage to the system when Specialists were moved to campuses. There was additional discussion about fair pay for Advisors and their increasing role to function as Specialists. What is a comparable CE advisor salary? Not the same as other states. Many programs are akin to specialists and even faculty programs in other states. CE Advisors feel as if we were left behind (40% over 8-9 years). AAC represents EVERYBODY.

Presentations by ANR Leaders: *Dan Dooley, ANR Vice President*

Dan Dooley, ANR Vice President, began the discussion by saying a lot is happening and he noted that an announcement detailing major restructuring of ANR to achieve \$9 million in permanent budget reductions and to position the Division to implement the Strategic Vision will be released tomorrow (<http://ucanr.org/pdfs/10-2-09.pdf>). Vice President Dooley explained that it was clear that the changes are dramatic but that they were driven by both budget and issues. He was very pleased with information that came out of breakout sessions of the Statewide Conference and reiterated that he was opposed to across the board cuts as he didn't want to sacrifice the quality of exceptional programs. The goal was to achieve 20% cut, without sacrificing a single academic position. The process began with a look at statewide programs and administrative organization. He noted that they compared the reductions in Advisors, Specialists, AES from 1990 to current date and did not see similar downsizing in the administrative organization. He is committed to streamlining and prefers to see dollars funneled to programs and not to administrative costs. In addition, they investigated how current programs align with the Strategic Vision. He noted that statewide program competitive grants funds and endowment funds would be consolidated and allocated to support various strategic initiatives, each with 5 year missions. A larger proportion of funding would support critical issues and that the initiatives should promote multidisciplinary projects and be positioned well to attract external funding.

Questions:

(Paul Vossen): With respect to federal dollars, will they fund positions? Or grant funds?

(Dan): Grant Funds. Is cautious about funding positions with this type of funding source. There is \$38B in new funds for science. This administration's commitment to advancing science initiative is ambitious. This is an INVESTMENT of which yields returns, not an expenditure.

(Alec Gerry): The Strategic Initiatives give CE opportunities to interact with campuses; will ANR enter campus?

(Dan): Foolish that ANR wouldn't be involved with campuses as the initiatives extend beyond outreach opportunities. Challenge is not to dilute our resources, but to create synergies. The goal is to develop 5-Year missions that evolve and bring people into the system that can help us meet the goals of the initiatives.

(Jim Downer): What is your view of the Strategic Vision? Is it a living document?

(Dan): It is the living document. We need a demand-based vision that asks what are California's main issues? We want to work backwards to determine how to solve those issues with our resources. The planning process is almost as important as the results. As we organize around major areas, there must be an accounting procedure to review the issues and be sure that they are still relevant.

(Paul Vossen): AAC is here to continue to provide input and feedback from our constituents on pending policies and organizational changes. We are interested in academic excellence.

(Dan): Knows who AAC is. Doesn't have all the answers. Has unique skills that he brings to the table: strong advocate for the importance of science. Can make compelling arguments for our organization. Also, can listen to a number of

opinions and rationalize them, synthesize them. Finds value in reaching out too many groups – committed to engagement. At this time, not prepared to let AAC know specifically how we can be of service.

(Max Moritz): Questions working with faculty outside of ANR and makes a point that Natural Resources have worked across campuses traditionally.

(Dan): Definition of programs at the federal level no longer rigid, or discipline based (entomology, horticulture, etc.) . Looking at much broader defined issues. For example, don't define as Agriculture, but as "Sustainable Food Systems" – this takes into account many different disciplines.

(Paul Vossen): Can we meet with Barbara on a regular basis?

(Dan): Is willing to meet.

(Leigh): We have committees to handle a variety of issues (Personnel, Program, Advisors, Specialists, etc.). Do you want us to continue communicating?

(Dan): YES! But don't wait for me to tell you how to be involved. AAC should take the initiative to make recommendations of where to be involved.

(Leigh Johnson): Notes Don Klingborg wants to consult AAC.

(Dan): The motivation behind this decision was based on the fact that several counties threatened to eliminate CE offices and to deal with county deficit stress. There is a need to have robust conversations with individual counties about the current situation and changes to administrative models that may provide savings to both the UC and the counties. Currently investigating models, consolidation at the county level for cost savings. Noted large counties with large programs will be affected differently than smaller counties which may become clusters.

(Joe DiTomaso): Is there any coordination between ANR with respect to the Strategic Initiatives and the campuses?

(Barbara): We've had multiple meetings with the Deans. Continue to talk to them about the SV and how campuses may use it. Meetings will continue.

(Barbara): Very interested in engaging AAC. Expect a 20% cut to AAC Budget. Use total - 20% as base budget. Business operations will have a unit that will have direct communication with AAC.

(Kay): Budget ad hoc committee? (Leigh): How can the committee be helpful to Kay? (Kay): Would like to be invited to AAC to talk about budgets. Trying to maintain transparency!

(Jeanette): Furlough, consulting and workers compensation? Question is being worked on. No answer.

(Leigh): Will our performance expectations be changed/reduced?

(Kay): Managers need to determine where cuts to programs will be made and ask the question: *What is not going to be done?*

(Leigh): Notes Grant funded staff are critical. Very pleased that grant-funded employees were exempt, because if they weren't, advisors would have to pick up the work.

(Kay): Will recommendations from Budget ad hoc committee be forwarded to Kay? (Jeanette): YES!

(Leigh): Several requests from advisors on consulting and furlough. Can advisors consult on furlough days?

(Kay): All the same rules apply, if you already have an agreement for research on a specific issue or project in the county you reside in then you cannot, because the University is already being compensated for those duties/functions. Send consulting questions to Barbara.

GET ACQUAINTED WITH ANR LEADERS: RECAP, ACTION ITEMS, MOTIONS AND DISCUSSION

In general, the group felt that administration wanted to hear from AAC and that discussion on policies is an open door. Steve Wright suggested following up with an email outlining the areas that AAC wants to go after. Jeanette Sutherland noted that Barbara Allen-Diaz is the appropriate person to contact with such issues. Administration will continue to support the operations of AAC, but at a reduced level of 80% of last year's budget (20% cut = \$8,000). There was some discussion and decisions of allocating the cuts. There was also discussion about Distinguished Service Awards (\$30K, every other year) and the request for funding. Additional items discussed included the failure of the AAC Budget Advisory Committee and other committees to be able to react quickly in light of administration's swift decision making process regarding program cuts and other changes. There was comment that Executive Committee should always be consulted before committees move forward with fast-tracked (without a public comment period) recommendations to administration. The day's session concluded with a discussion on consulting and consulting on furlough days. President Johnson noted that this is a charge of the Welfare and Benefits Committee and a motion was made and passed unopposed.

Action Item: AAC President Johnson will follow up with Joni Rippee to get figures and expenditures on AAC committee expenses and determine how to allocate cuts for the 2009-10 budget.

Action Item: AAC will authorize Executive Committee to request administration to provide full funding for Distinguished Service Awards to be available in 2011. President-elect Zeidler will request budget from Joni Rippee for DSA in spring (February).

Motion: To charge Welfare and Benefits Committee to review the consulting policy.

(Second): Jim Downer.

Call Question: Motion approved.

Meeting Adjourned. 5:00 PM.

Friday, October 2, 2009: AAC BUSINESS MEETING

DISCUSSION ITEM 1: *Dean Donald Klingborg's request for consultation on new CE and County Relationships*

Dean Klingborg was invited to the meeting but could not attend. President Johnson explained the survey she did regarding advisor assignment and the stress of county finances. She noted that it was not a level playing field across counties, there were county director challenges regarding cross-county assignments and a discussion on who might pay for those services. A suggestion was made to request a conference call with Dean Klingborg to discuss our concerns and recommend people who might represent AAC on a decision-making taskforce. It was suggested that it would be wise for those on the taskforce to investigate "regionalization" of other states (WA, OH, IA, IL). Paul Vossen and Jeanette Sutherlin volunteered to sit on taskforce. Other suggestions included Rachel Surls, Terry Salmon and Steve Orloff as other potential members. Dean Klingborg also wants to consult on Advocacy.

Action Item: AAC President Johnson will schedule a conference call with Dean Klingborg.

DISCUSSION ITEM 2: *Revisit Policy Committee as a Standing Committee?*

Discussion about whether the charges, since they are mostly personnel issues, should be moved to Personnel Committee. There was agreement among members that the charge is too large to add to the responsibilities of Personnel Committee, even though the committee may already be reviewing some of the policies. It is noted that AAC should be at the table at the beginning of the discussions during policy changes or creation of new policies and ANR administration should consult with AAC regarding committee findings. ANR (Carolyn Frazier) needs to know that AAC has a committee that is willing to address ANY of the policies in the Personnel Handbook and that AAC could give comment/recommendations. Motion was revisited from June, reapproved and added criteria to the policy committee charge. The charge is as follows: Committee should compare against the APM. Keep up with changes. Should review policies and list those that might need to be amended. Don't move on policies that don't need revision. On approval by AAC Executive Committee, it will direct committee for review of existing policies and bring those changes back to Executive Committee and not directly to administration.

DISCUSSION ITEM 3: *AAC Advisor Committee structure in light of reorganization*

A question was raised, in light of reorganization to one statewide unit, does AAC still want to maintain three regional advisor committees? There was a suggestion to breakdown advisors by program area:

1. Ag Policy and Pest Management
2. Agricultural Productivity
3. Human Resources -- -- will they have critical mass to staff a committee
4. Natural Resources and Animal Agriculture

Jeanette Sutherlin raised the importance to have CDs on the committees as they are privy to important/sensitive information. A charge was given to the Bylaws Revision Committee to change the structure to reflect programmatic areas instead of geographical areas. It was mentioned that regional representatives are elected positions and a question as to current terms that have not expired when the changes take place? A charge was give to Rules and Elections Committee to look at current membership and terms, then move them by programmatic area if term has not expired. Following discussion it was decided that no major changes should occur as we do not know that the new structure will look like. We could be organized by initiative. AAC may need to revisit this issue, poll constituents and then vote. It was mentioned that no changes should take place until after June 30. A charge was given to Secretary Hashim to put together a list of issues from the Advisor Survey and a motion was made to create a committee to investigate the current structure and possible changes to regional committees. Rachel Elkins volunteers to chair the committee.

Motion: To appoint an ad hoc Advisor and County Director Representation Committee to investigate current structure, poll constituents and bring recommendations back to AAC regarding input on a new representation structure.
Chair: Rachel Elkins. Members: Jim Downer, Steve Wright.
(Second): Paul Vossen.
Motion: Approved.

Discussion continued regarding program evaluation and how the peer review process might change with respect to the new structure. Popular sentiment was echoed for the need to have two advisors on SAC. These items should be discussed with Barbara Allen-Diaz. The group is reminded that there will be too many changes in the coming months and that further discussion is premature. A suggestion was made to prioritize a list of issues from AAC and then wait until reorganization occurs.

Action Item: Executive Committee will recommend to administration that AAC have peer representation on the decision making body of merits and promotions and advised them that we will continue to communicate to them ideas of which we would like participation.

OFFICER REPORTS

President's Report (Leigh Johnson): President Johnson reported that she is communicating with Dean Klingborg and developing a relationship and communication with Associate Vice Presidents Barbara Allen-Diaz and Kay Harrison Taber.

Past-President's Report (Paul Vossen): Past-President Vossen raised an issue regarding a process for Advisors to evaluate our administrators. The question is asked whether this is an appropriate role of AAC, of which the group was in agreement. A suggestion is made to bring to Administration a request for a formal annual evaluation process by Advisors of administrators (CDs, others).

Action Item: AAC Executive Committee will bring to administration a request for confidential formal annual evaluation process by Advisors of Administrators (CDs, others). Process should be applied uniformly. There is a need to have an expected outcome. For example, results should be a part of evaluation process by supervisor (RD, others). Changes would at the discretion of supervisor.

Discussion continued about the consolidation of leadership and its effect on merits and promotions AND program direction. Concern was raised that there is less people to use as a sounding board. President Johnson wants to bring this point up to administration (Barbara). No formal action item until we have more information on new structure.

Action Item: Executive Committee will request that administration include AAC in the loop on crafting a programmatic leadership structure for ANR.

President-Elect's Report (Gideon Zeidler): President-elect Zeidler noted he will follow up with Joni Rippee about the AAC Budget, let her know that it will be 80% of last year's budget and request the ledger after travel expenses for the annual meeting have been submitted.

Secretary's Report (Jennifer Hashim-Buckey): Secretary Hashim received updates and approval of the 2009-10 AAC Committee Roster. New photos were taken of the group to be placed on the website and it was suggested that AAC, Academic Assembly Council and Assembly Council be listed as searchable terms on the www.ucanr.org A to Z. A motion was made to approve the minutes from the June meeting. Paul Vossen mentioned that he received approval from Rick Standiford to post his comments in the minutes. Additional discussion included a charge to Rules and Elections Committee to 1) contact the members of CSR to report to him the status of the committee and appoint vacancies if necessary 2) to recruit a CD for CVR Regional Committee membership (request for HR) and the need to look staggering terms and 3) communicate to Mike Marzolla that his term will expire on 2011.

Motion: To approve minutes of June 2-3, 2009 meeting.
(Second): Leigh Johnson.
Motion: Approved.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

STANDING COMMITTEES

Personnel Committee Report (Joyce Strand rep. Dorothy Smith): A report was submitted to the group (see Addendum). Committee met in early July with SAC. If issues arise, they will address them. Discussed the addition of two advisors to SAC. Discussed the expectation of publications and that letters of evaluation will be cut down to 6 maximum. New annual evaluation training will be provided through Breeze. Discussion of new "thematic" format. Rick insisted that there be a choice of old format or new format and it appears in 4 e-books. Divided the training among new advisors and advisors that have been in the system in light of anticipated question differences. All trainings to be delivered through Breeze.

Program Committee Report (James Bethke): Reported that the committee has handled travel reimbursements for last year. He added that there are new members, but they have not met formally. In January they will begin working on the Distinguished Service Awards for 2011.

Action Item: AAC to authorize Executive Committee to request administration to provide full funding for Distinguished Service Awards to be available in 2011.

Action Item: Executive Committee to request administration to look at allocation of CE funds to campuses and whether it is appropriate to have funds distribution applied uniformly. Communicate the mechanism and processes of CE funding at the campus level to Specialists (as proposed by Alec Gerry).

Welfare and Benefits Committee (Chuck Ingels): Asked for clarification on whether the Academic Policy Committee will review the consulting policy? Reminder: a motion was made to charge the Welfare and Benefits Committee to review the consulting policy. A charge was given to Welfare and Benefits to poll our constituents about the consulting policy and to review exit-interview questions and determine what has done traditionally.

Rules and Elections Committee (Jim Downer): Reported that Sheila Barry is on sabbatical leave and that there has been no movement on this committee. Cynthia Barnett is willing to Chair the committee. Rachel Elkins is charged with sending an email to the Regional Chairs to remind them of their charge and contact Cynthia Barnett to reconstitute the CCSR Committee.

AD HOC COMMITTEES

Academic Policy Review Committee (Steve Wright): Reported that the committee will follow thru with Barbara Allen-Diaz regarding the work on ANR 315, the Sabbatical Leave and Consulting Policy. He noted that he forwarded letter from Fe Moncloa and the committee would like input on the list.

ANR Budget Advisory Committee (Jeanette Sutherland): Reported that the committee met with Rick Standiford until the end of his term. A report was submitted to members entitled, *ANR Budget Reduction Recommendations*, detailing thirteen points from the committee (See Addendum). She noted that it has gone no further than the committee and President Johnson. A discussion followed regarding the addition of fee for service and concerns were raised about fund-raising. A motion was made.

Motion: For chair to communicate to Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) to members that the recommendations have been reviewed by AAC and accepted with some minor discussion and changes, including the addition of Fee for Service recommendation. Following review, BAC will submit budget reduction recommendations to administration.

(Second): Joyce Strand.

Motion passes.

REPRESENTATIVE COMMITTEES

CE SPECIALIST CAMPUS COMMITTEES

UC Berkeley (Max Moritz): There was discussion of CE supplemental funds. Bottom Line: Dean committed to 50/50 split. Issue of equivalent status was discussed. He noted that many new specialists have an adjunct appointment and take on graduate students. What will happen if SSP eliminated? There is a concern that many departmental services are disappearing, grants/contracts staff, etc. Wondering how it will affect Specialists?

UC Davis (Joe DiTomaso): Specialists will meet Monday. Discussed Strategic Initiatives. Specialists will meet first with Specialist Advisory Committee and then with the Dean. Will ask if the Dean is coordinating with ANR. Conducted a survey with CE Specialists and will announce the results soon. Equivalency status (formalize salary structure, tenure,

emeritus status, 11 month status using 1 month of salary on grants, want “professorship” title, graduate student oversight, equity review to readjust rank/step) with professors. Want to get agreement signed. Davis, Berkeley and Riverside are working together. Committee is currently developing goals for the year – will send report from meeting to AAC. He noted that the main focus is on equity issues and that Mentoring Handbook is complete.

UC Riverside (Alec Gerry): Reported that the committee has not met for 2 years. Committee wants to work with other campuses. Will forward results of surveys to AAC, so that we may aid in advocating for important issues. He noted that the committee will have a meeting in November.

CE ADVISOR REGIONAL COMMITTEES

NCMR (Rachel Elkins): Reported that the committee conducted a constituent survey (70% turnout) about who AAC is and what we do (see addendum). Asked what are we going to do with the results? Mentioned a need to target education to new advisors. Recommendation: AAC should actively work within the new-hire orientation process and that information about AAC be included the orientation. She noted that the committee was using the Collaborative Tools site to accomplishing business and provide information to AAC members and constituents. There are two new members, Deborah Giraud and Missy Merrill-Davies. These changes have been updated on the membership roster.

Action Item: Executive Committee to request administration that AAC be involved in the new-hire orientation process and to provide an AAC presentation during orientation.

CVR (Steve Wright): A report was emailed. See addendum.

CCSR (Sheila Barry): No report given.

ACADEMIC COORDINATORS (Joyce Strand): Reported that Academic Coordinator membership currently down to 8 members. Used Rachel’s survey and sent out to membership. She did not want to report major issues at this time.

ANR Advocacy Program (Steve Nation): Some council members remained to discuss advocacy issues with Steve Nation.

**Respectfully Submitted,
Jennifer M. Hashim-Buckey**