

Academic Assembly Council

19 July 2018, ANR Building

Attendees: Van Bustic, Ben Faber, Katherine Soule, Chris Greer, John Karlik, Tom Turnini, Betsy Karle, Richard Blatchford, Jim Downer, Kendra Lewis

Approval of previous minutes: Approved. ****CORRECTION NEEDED**** Return on investments needs to be changed from **4.5% to 14.5%**.

Reports:

President (Soule): Purpose of AAC is to advise and assist when developing new policies and procedures that affect CE advisors and specialists. AAC needs to be more engaged with this phase of policy making and for engaging the members AAC represents, especially new academics. Assembly council is not the equivalent of the Academic senate, role is advisory and serves at the pleasure of the Vice President. Wendy and Mark Bell, can't attend today's meeting and will call in as they are in the field. Wendy suggested to Katherine that AAC meetings be scheduled 2 yrs in advance so she can get these meetings on her calendar to avoid conflicts.

Discussion of **by-laws changes**, development of three regional sections to take more localized leads on issues. Lukewarm support for the regional divisions, personnel from these "regions" should/could represent the "region" and issues at AAC and highly varied. For example, lumping SD and Imperial Valley under "southern" not practical/representative of issues affecting the "southern" division as they have unique identities. 125 members required for quorum for voting on issues, suggestion is that this should be changed to a simple majority for meeting quorum requirements as 125 is too high. Not certain what this number would be for a quorum – need to consult with Jennifer Bunge, UCOP budget director for number of employees from which the 50+% quorum could be made.

Bylaw changes need to be posted for 2 weeks for review/comments, then an electronic vote will be made to approve/reject suggested changes. Van moves this suggestion, Hoddle seconded. **Tunyalee** to supervise this process.

Policy Review by AAC when new policies are being developed and before they are released for public comment, such as changes to academic handbook, etc. prior to ANR approved update. Ad hoc committee suggested, so not a standing committee, but appointed on an as needed basis, decision was made to move from standing to ad hoc committee, and there is a provision for ad hoc committees that is already in the by-laws.

AAC meetings to follow **Robert's Rules of Order** – move to eliminate the need to follow Robert's Rules for AAC meeting. Hoddle opposes the removal of this parliamentary meeting system. Others supported the move.

Assembly Council – AAC representation – no stipend for person, travel will be covered, minimum qualification requirements set by AAC and Wendy for nominees. Current program council, two people are at large representatives, other members are Deans, Strategic Initiative Leaders, etc., Chris Greer to put together a list of CE folks who met minimum requirements to fill this position. Once by-law finalized

“selected” list of people would be approached for a start in Jan 2020, which is the planned start date for the “official” appointee (just one person needed).

Diversity representation with respect to geography and program probably not being met by AAC sub-committees. This structure may be hard to meet given ebbs and flows of personnel numbers available/willing to serve on these committees.

Most committees, including Campus-based specialists, probably not meeting committee meeting requirements. Davis Specialists are well organized they meet for 2 hrs/month for a campus-wide meeting (Specialist committee meets for 1 hr, then goes to the Dean for 1 hr to meet and discuss issues raised from the earlier 1 hr meeting = 2 hr meeting time), Berkeley does nothing, UCR meets once a month for coffee to discuss issues.

Committee Reports:

AAC Secretary – should be present at all meetings, update web based rosters, and to have name tags at meetings (Karlik’s requests)

Rules and Elections (Surendra): Current/past members named by Soule (Surendra not present but provided a report). Bustic elected as president elect to replace Soule.

Personnel (Turnini): Primary activity was a review of negative results from program reviews (PRC and ad hoc committees). Individual reviews of files made by committee members then group discussion of all the files via conference call. Downer suggested this should be brought up in AAC and to have these data reviewed/recorded in the minutes. 16 files had negative reviews. 30 day appeal process. To meet Downer’s concerns, *Personnel Committee is to produce a summary table of total files submitted, approved, denied, appealed, merits, accelerations, etc.* Karlik indicated that this type of report is needed to show committee’s activity so there are no accusations of AAC “doing nothing”, it provides transparency to the PRC review process, especially for new advisors.

Program Committee: Becky – submitted nothing, not at meeting. Travel and awards under purview of this committee.

Welfare & Benefits (Karlik): Committee reconstituted with Ben Faber, Rebecca ?? and Dipa ?? serving with Faber. Karlik will rotate off in spring 2019. Powerpoint presentation prepared by Karlik. Summary follows Salary increases for CE advisors analyzed by Karlik in an excel spreadsheet. 2017 salaries bumped up 4.5% in Oct 2017, in July 2017, 3 months earlier, variable % increases given when added together these total increases ranged ~5-8%. These set the new salary references on which further increases will be based. Post Oct. 2017, ~3% increase in salaries made with equity adjustments and advisor salaries have increased overall by 5-8.5% above the published salary scales produced by UCOP. This is possible to be above UCOP salary scales, this can be discretionary, but complicates salary book keeping. Conclusion from Karlik is that advisor salary increases have been very good, especially when compared to previous years.

Advisor Representative Committee (Karle): Notes passed out from a zoom meeting held prior to this meeting. Committee asked to address issues pertaining to accessing library resources from off campus. Training program needed on how this can be done when advisors are off campus via pulse-secure. Lewis with 4-H has instructions on how to access library materials and this can be put into AAC newsletter.

County level internet access - protocols may block access to needed sites and need administrator permission to access certain sites (Downer's comments – big problem for Ventura Office – access restrictions). Internet access – upgrades in process, updated schedule on upgrade progress requested. Greer's comments on internet upgrade progress – bids very high, so REC's prioritized over county offices because of research bias and ANR owns RECs not county building where infrastructure would be upgraded. It was argued that counties should pay for these upgrades as counties own the buildings not ANR.

Recharge fees for RECs – the effects on research efforts at RECs fewer folks will use them, will affect financial sustainability of RECs, new advisors at disadvantages because they don't have grants to get this work going. Should ANR provide additional subsidies for new advisors to offset costs for new programs?

Annual evaluations of personnel in the counties helps keep things on track deals with issues in a timely fashion, but could be revised so that they take less time. Big counties vs. small counties have different numbers of personnel to evaluate which affects time commitment to this process (days vs. weeks).

Cost of living issues need to be addressed, salaries too low in some areas and makes positions undesirable because salary is insufficient to live in particular areas. Cost of living increases have been made (Karlik covered this – see above) 3 or 4% depending on title. Salary requirements affected by qualifications MS vs. Ph.D. for comparisons to ladder rank faculty on campus.

Pressure to communicate via social meeting for some advisors – effective extension is the goal, however you get there is fine and will vary by program, clientele, etc. up to individuals/supervisors etc. Expectations for service commitments – how much value do these have, especially for early career personnel trying to get program going but other expectations required. Most of this covered in handbook for advisors on how to determine appropriate balances.

Mentoring would be helpful for new advisors so they don't feel/become overwhelmed.

Health care costs vary enormously depending on where you are located. Baby delivery \$250 at Davis vs. \$6,000 in more remote rural areas. A challenge that welfare & benefits committee has engaged before but can't effect change, this needs to come from UCOP to negotiate better deals for out of pocket health costs.

Further surveys soliciting concerns will also request potential solutions to the concerns that are raised and these can be discussed.

Academic Coordinator (Kendra Lewis reporting for Sandy): Need additional members and need to figure out directions for this committee to be effective within AAC.

Specialist Reports:

UCB: Van reported for UCB. Making multi-campus personnel cost sharing easier – new structures in place, UC Path will help with this. Research vs. extension efforts for split appointments, some concerns voiced, but doesn't seem to affect promotions depending on where preference efforts are placed, perhaps not a significant issue for UCB Specialists. **Salary savings** – buy back salary with a grant – ANR keeps benefits, salary goes into acct for largely unrestricted use, College/Dept take 25% of the salary

saving, 75% goes into the account with/without expiry date. Can do this for 1/11 of salary and cash in 20 hrs of vacation. This is not the same/is different to getting paid for summer salary.

UCD: Three projects being worked on – (1) recruiting top talent for open positions is proving difficult. (2) Difficulty promoting/explaining titles to folks not familiar with the system (e.g., reporters) as these extension specialist titles don't resonate like "professor" e.g., professor in extension, professor in residence. No action taken yet on potential title change. (3) Graduate certificate in extension being developed – high student interest in initial offerings, aiming for a 1 yr certificate program, 3 courses offered (well developed), internship with an extension specialist/clientele group, finish with a capstone experience (still working on what this will be). Greer suggests that they need to get off-campus advisors involved as this is a difference experience compared to campus interactions (perhaps doing this during the internship?)

UCR: REC fees major concern, and packet of emails/letters etc. presented to AAC. Points from Greer include fees vary by REC depending on location as infrastructure costs (e.g., water consumption/use fees) vary a lot.

Program Council Liason (Greer): Listed meeting schedule, discussed call for positions, some aspects are confidential such as inputs on 5 yr reviews, prioritizing positions, decisions on competitive grants. ANR budget call process discussed. Program council membership discussed and if sufficient breadth is represented across all programmatic areas.

John Fox: (1) Guidelines for children at ANR and (2) Exit interviews. Should children have been at the recent UC ANR Statewide Event? No documents on how to handle children at ANR events or in the workplace. This needs to be addressed. Statewide event unable to handle the presence of kids. Children not be present at talks, evening receptions, poster receptions, crowded events, some saw it as good, others that it was inconvenient/potential liability/dangerous. There was inconsistent messaging over there could be kids/no kids at these events.

Breastfeeding at meeting handled badly about 12 people got very worked up over the issues of kids being present and breast feeding at the meeting. Need to get clarification on what is permissible at these meetings, some young mothers won't attend these meetings because they can't bring the kids. Mother's felt out of place because no places to breastfeed and put in awkward positions to ask if they can do it and where, ready access to private space that is not inconveniencing other people, e.g., use of a storage cupboard for breastfeeding, needed keys for access, and other people needed to get materials from storage cupboard.

Starting point – assumption was kids shouldn't be at the meetings – disruptive to the meeting, hard for breastfeeding mothers can't leave kids at hotel/home to attend the meeting. Draft document to address these issues prepared and circulated for review. Faber suggested that some of the County policies be reviewed as they have guidelines in place already. Draft document will be made available for comment, aim to have a document ready for "breast feeding awareness week."

Exit surveys of leaving staff, outside exit survey that is used prepared by an HR group that ANR belongs too. If too few people leaving, anonymity of the survey results are not possible, so online survey won't report a result. Problem compounded further by <20% response rate. Another problem may be the

timing of the request for the “exit interview.” There is no process on “what to do with this information” once it is attained, no processing or infrastructure to address issues. The software for the exit interview designed for big companies, questions not ANR specific, so little utility for ANR. Need to develop ANR-specific exit interview. Who would take ownership of the data, analysis, interpretation, follow up actions/recommendations? Ad hoc committee to be formed for academic exit interviews to be made up of AAC and non-AAC members. Five years of resignation data can be assessed to look for preliminary trends/reasons for departures. How much effort should be invested in this effort? Questionnaire needs to be simple and quick to do. Unanimous agreement on forming an ad hoc committee to look into exit interviews and to make recommendations. Ad hoc members to be appointed and this process is to go through rules and elections committee.

Mentor Guidelines: Request made for an ad hoc committee on this. Greer sent out guidelines in response to this request. 1 page guidance document requested, motion to form an ad hoc committee, unanimous decision, Turnini to be chairman, David Lewis, Karlik, Gemma Miner (to be asked) to be members.

Conference Call with Wendy Powers and Mark Bell:

Budget updates, \$5 million cut expected to reduce operations for next year’s budget, possibly could be reduced again in successive years, but could also increase again. Ways to meet reduction being investigated, competitive/matching/all grants likely to be eliminated to help with cost recovery, current grants are running into 2020. Wendy thinks the \$5 million cut likely to be permanent (over budget on statewide conference which is another concern).

ANR pulled out/separated in UCOP budget – clarifies budget streams, especially with respect to ANR. Could have negative implications for ANR as still under UCOP umbrella, but could be a benefit if singled out for extra support.

Huron report updates: meeting today on this – Humiston will participate, budget questions being addressed, especially campus allocations made by ANR. Multiple areas still under review, and interviews with top ANR personnel (including Wendy) being made. Recommendation expected in March 2019 and will be presented to UC Regents. Lot of interest in money that is moved from ANR onto the Campuses – uncertain as to what this interest will translate too with respect to recommendations. Wendy used this as an opportunity to educate investigators on the role of campus based specialists. Release of new positions – 5 positions still under review, hiring will be slowed and refills are given priority, announcements likely in September. Reversion pool numbers uncertain at this time and finalized specialist retirements will be known in August. Replacement for Greer’s vice provost position on hold.

UCB – Salary savings queries – specialists should be eligible for this, but campus administrators are skeptical about this program and eligibility. Van asked Wendy to bring this up at next Program Council Meeting so UCB specialists can take advantage of salary savings to build a pot of money with few spending restrictions. Wendy uncomfortable with Campuses taking % of the salary savings as this is Anr money.

REC Fee Increases: Five concerns synthesized and presented to Wendy

1. Academics feel they were not included in discussion and decision making regarding the rate increases
2. Academics received inaccurate information over time about estimated rate increases, so they were unprepared for the increases they received
3. Academics were not given a reasonable period of time to raise funds to cover the increases once they were finalized
4. Academics have grant-funded research projects they cannot afford to complete and will not be able to meet their research objectives
5. Academics have not received finalized rates for next year and cannot accurately estimate costs for projects going forward

Questions:

1) How does the increases impact with industry partnerships? Uncertain, could have an impact, possibly a zero sum game on either commodity groups supporting the salaries or research – not sure where the balance will be met and how cost recovery will support RECs. \$200K cost estimates for one project will require 4 FTE to support the proposed work, but even at this \$200K cost the work is still being heavily subsidized by ANR.

2) How will ANR respond to downward spiral if projects are pulled? REC managers planning for this and developed budgets anticipating reductions in acreage/time - anticipate recovery as new funding models and increased commodity supports are developed. If cost recovery not possible acreage will be sold off. 80% subsidization for the last 5 years means most REC's are in the red, \$5 million budget cut coming which means sell offs etc. may be coming sooner rather than later. 45-55% subsidization of projects will be tolerable to ANR. Skilled labor at RECs seen as a benefit over lesser skilled contract labor, still these costs may still be too high.

3) Existing contractual agreements – need to be made with REC director to determine if fee increases will be made or not. REC director can exercise discretion here and will need to view the grant - is it a 5 year NIFA grant vs. a 1 yr commodity grant? Annual grants subjected to accelerating yearly increases for REC fees as these are new contracts that are made each year. 5 year grants with approved finalized budgets should not be subjected to cost increases as budgets are already fixed for the period under concern.

4) Can rates be honored through the life time of the grants? The goal is to have cost stability over the life time of the contract, so cost projections over the life time of the grant need to be made with the REC director before budgets finalized and agreed upon.

5) Communication inconsistencies – responses to proposed REC fee increases run gamut from poor to being very good. Possibly REC specific communication issues with users has led to issues, Wendy not involved with these follow up discussions after cost recovery plan implemented.

New Business: UCRP (Karlik) unanswered question for Chief Investment Officer on funding returns for UCRP.