



UNIVERSITY of CALIFORNIA
Division of Agriculture & Natural Resources



University of California Agriculture and Natural Resources
Academic Assembly Council

CONFERENCE CALL MEETING MINUTES
MINUTES

Thursday, January 7, 2010
8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

MEMBERS ATTENDING:

Leigh Johnson, President
Paul Vossen, Past-President
Gideon Zeidler, President-Elect
Jennifer Hashim-Buckey, Secretary
James Bethke, Chair, Program Committee
Dorothy Smith, Personnel Committee
Chuck Ingels, Chair, Welfare and Benefits Committee
Jim Downer, Chair, Rules and Elections Committee
Rachel Elkins, Advisor Committee Chair, NCMR
Kris Lynn-Patterson, Academic Coordinators Committee
Steve Wright, Chair, CVR & rep. Academic Policy Committee
Alec Gerry, Specialist Committee Chair & Riverside Campus Committee
Joe DiTomaso, UC Davis Campus Committee
Max Moritz, UC Berkeley Campus Committee

GUESTS:

Kim Rodrigues
Associate Dean Don Klingborg

MOTIONS MADE:

Motion: To approve modifications, as discussed to the AAC by-Laws.

Motion: To approve the minutes of the October 1 & 2 meeting.

Motion: Council to appoint Steve Wright to serve as interim President-elect through June 30, 2010.

ACTION ITEMS:

Action Item: Send out a call for volunteers from regional representation committees to serve on and provide input to Klingborg's future committee regarding new county-CE organizational models. Develop final list of names, titles, regions for submission.

Action Item: AAC Secretary Hashim to implement ratification process by sending a report detailing the By-Law modifications (with new language) to Assembly members along with supporting material (old vs. new By-laws).

Action Item: Executive Committee will discuss lines of communication between AAC and Administration. AAC needs the ability to communicate directly with Administration.

Action item: Instruct Personnel Committee that they follow through with previous recommendations of improving the transparency by appointing 2 advisors to SAC.

Action Item: Welfare & Benefits Committee will develop and submit a survey to CE advisors regarding the frequency and location of consulting practices and poll advisor's issues or challenges about the current policy. Furthermore, W&B will submit survey for approval by Executive Committee prior to submission to all Advisors.

Action Item: Secretary will post current roster of AAC Committee Members on Collaborative Tools website.

Action Items: Executive Committee will recommend that Administration examine the amount of money that is provided to Specialists, Advisors and Academic Coordinators directly in support of their extension activities.

Action Item: Council recommends that Regional Representation Committee Chairs annually survey their constituents on their knowledge of the role of AAC, which committees affect them, which issues they want AAC to address.

Action item: Council to update the AAC Brochure and develop New Advisor Orientation Curriculum during the next Assembly Council Meeting.

Action Item: Secretary to request that all committee chairs post their reports to Collaborative Tools.

Thursday, January 7, 2010, 8:45 a.m: ASSOCIATE DEAN DON KLINGBORG

Associate Dean Don Klingborg met with AAC via teleconference. During this meeting he discussed his charge as per VP Dan Dooley to lead strategic advocacy and communications initiatives and examine and propose new county-CE organizational models that will continue to deliver high quality programming within a more stable funding model. Within the role of advocacy and communications, he noted that administration encourages/allows local level lobbying to our elected leaders. He explained that much of this effort should be directed to secure local/county funding (Board of Supervisors, etc.) and to create an informed legislature. Within the role of examining new county-CE organizational models, he explained that the goal was to trim administrative costs and move any excess dollars into programs and to create a stable source of funding to keep programs intact. He stressed that the most important component of CE was the programmatic unit, that no models have been officially proposed and that he is in the "discovery mode" now.

Over the next weeks he will be meeting with RDs and CDs throughout the state to receive input from the county and regional level and that these meetings are a part of the discovery process. Questions were raised among AAC members regarding the widely varying needs of individual counties and the difficulties of advisors to move between counties because CDs are concerned about reciprocity for cross-county work. There was some discussion of how to mitigate those challenges. For example, Dean Klingborg noted how the MOUs are set in many counties which build firm boundaries for program delivery to home counties. It might be possible to redefine program delivery and support funding by using the argument that state and federal dollars should be evenly distributed among its citizens equally and to develop core programs in each county and any additional services that a county requires, they need to pay for in full (references Minnesota model). During this discussion a question was raised as to how other states are dealing with these same problems. Klingborg responded that administration is collecting data from other states, but it would not be appropriate to adopt a model. The best method is to develop a new and unique model that serves California. It was noted that California is unique and CE works really well in most counties. An AAC member noted that it is understood among CE personnel that a few counties were struggling with funding and a question was raised concerning how large problem was statewide and how does coming up with an entirely new model solve the problem? Klingborg responded that the main issue was money—most all counties were in trouble, but at varying degrees. How can we rebuild CE given that we are below critical mass? He emphasized that over the next decade CE will lose the majority of people we already have and that the highest need is hiring. We are on the path of senescence and obsolescence. The plan is to build support that brings in new revenue. He also mentioned the fact that CE hasn't been hit harder shows how well CE performs.

Discussion moved to current organization and the fear of moving away from the county-based model. The concern being that if we restructured into "clusters" we may completely lose support from individual counties. Klingborg understands that there is a need to maintain a connection with a county to receive county support and believes that could still be maintained in "cluster model", but this is just one example. There is a need to become leaner and meaner. The past response has been if counties drop support below a certain threshold, the UC will withdraw all support. But these levels are arbitrary between counties. CE budgets are mainly on the discretionary side of counties budget, which puts it at risk. The group discussed the role of personal relationships with clientele and that they are at the heart of who we are as an organization. Personal relationships include county supervisors, growers, clientele, etc. where we are trusted source of information. Whatever the model, it must maintain the relationship.

The discussion came to a close with President Johnson asking how AAC could be of further assistance during Klingborg's discovery process. She asked if a committee had been formed or if there is a liaison to facilitate the input process. She noted that AAC has an exceptional vehicle to census constituents through our regional representative committees. Klingborg responded that no committee had been formed and that he was early in the process. At this point he is

speaking to RDs and CDs, though he noted that it was essential that everyone be given an opportunity to be heard and that he needs to create a team to filter input. At this point he was being kept busy "patching" the counties that are in immediate financial crisis and this process expends a lot of administrative energy. His main focus was to be sure that this did not continue to occur in a total of 58 counties. President Johnson introduced a survey conducted by the AAC Representative Committee, Chaired by Steve Wright. Rachel Elkins delivered [report findings](#) which echoed the concern that people are worried about losing their local connection and with this, local support (both financial and political). The report mentioned that many are already operating in cross-county assignments. She emphasized that stakeholder education is a must as new models are being proposed. She ended by mentioning the regional committees are active, routinely correspond through collaborative tools and are able to poll constituents and send out results rapidly. Discussion ends.

Thursday, January 7, 2010, 9:55 a.m: KLINGBORG DISCUSSION REVIEW

President Johnson asked the group how to provide input to Dean Klingborg. The group decided to develop a list of members ready to communicate as committees are formed. It is noted that volunteers should be representative of different regions and both Advisors and Specialists (to represent campus). Several members volunteered to be placed on committee as per request including, Jim Downer, Paul Vossen, Chuck Ingels and Alec Gerry/ Max Moritz.

Action Item: Send out a call for volunteers from regional representation committees to serve on and provide input to Klingborg's future committee regarding new county-CE organizational models. Develop final list of names, titles, regions/campus/group for submission.

President Johnson announced that President Elect Zeidler had emailed his resignation during the break and that she had accepted it. Council by-laws require the Council to appoint an Interim President Elect to serve through June 30, 2010. During this spring's election, a new President, President Elect and Rules and Elections Committee member must be selected for 2010-2011.

Thursday, January 7, 2010, 10:15 a.m: AD HOC BY-LAWS REVIEW COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS, DISCUSSION AND RESOLUTION ADOBE CONNECT PRESENTATION

GUESTS ATTENDING

Dan Marcum, AAC Ad Hoc By-Laws Review Committee Member

AGENDA

1. AAC Ad Hoc By-Laws Review Committee Report Adobe Connect Presentation
2. Discussion of modifications
3. Amendments to modifications per discussion
4. Straw poll to accept By-Laws modifications by Issue
5. Motion to approve and propose modifications
6. Selection of By-Laws Ratification Process

ISSUES

Issue 1: Representation for Advisors under the new ANR structure that will have no regions

Committee Action: Review Committee made no changes to the current structure and simply refers to regions as "Former Regions".

Discussion: None

Straw Poll: Accept

Issue 2: Qualifications to run for office and performance expectations in office for the President and President-elect

Committee Action:

1. Added the language (p.3), "*candidates for President-elect must have served at least one term, in good standing, on the Council or Committees of the Assembly and have an Associate Cooperative Extension Advisor/Specialist rank or higher*" to the By-Laws (Section V. A., 2a.), thereby requiring both qualifications to ensure that the candidate is familiar with the role and function of AAC and our organization's needs.
2. Added the language (p.11), "*The Rules and Elections Committee will validate that only qualified candidates appear on the ballot (V. A.)*."

Discussion: Change language to "*candidates for President-elect must have served at least two terms, in good standing, on the Council or Committees of the Assembly or one term as a Committee Chair.*"

Straw Poll: Accept with changes.

Issue 2: Qualifications to run for office and performance expectations in office for the President and President-elect

Committee Action: Included two new "Duties and Privileges" to the office of President (p. 2):

- 1) Prepares brief quarterly reports to the Assembly (via the AAC website) detailing target issues, activities and/or accomplishments of the Council and Committees of the Assembly, instead of a single annual report (Section V. A., 1.c.2.).
- 2) The President has the privilege of being a member of, and attending all Representative, Standing and Special Committee meetings (Section V. A., 1.c.4.).

Discussion:

- President Johnson proposed that quarterly reports should be forwarded to the Secretary to be posted on the AAC Website. Furthermore, the Secretary should serve as Council webmaster – new language proposed, "5. *Secretary serves as AAC webmaster*" (Section V, 3. 5.).
- President Johnson proposed to change language to:
"1. *Presides at all meetings of the Assembly and the Council, leads the Council in carrying out its Mission, Purpose and Duties as specified in the By-Laws (II., III. and VII.B.), chairs the Executive Committee and performs other duties as specified in the By-Laws.*"
- Council proposes to modify language:
"4. *Has the privilege of attending all Representative, Standing and Special Committee meetings.*"

Straw Poll: Accept with changes.

Issue 3a Recall provisions for officers

Committee Action: Inserted provisions for recall of officers and changed the terms for filling vacancies for President and President-elect (pp. 3-4).

1. A recall would be initiated by petition as a result of officer inactivity and/or non-performance of duties specified in the By-Laws and would be finalized with a vote by 2/3 vote of Council (Section V. C.).
2. If the office of President-elect were to become vacant, either through recall or resignation, a mid-term election would be held to fill the position (Section V. B. a.; X. C.).
3. Proposed recall language is as follows: "*A recall election of any elected or appointed officer may be held if an officer is inactive or not fulfilling the responsibilities as stated in the By-Laws (V.A). A recall is initiated when a petition signed by at least thirty (30) members of the Assembly (requesting recall) is presented to the Rules and Elections Committee. The Rules and Elections Committee shall determine the validity of each signature, certify the petition and conduct a confidential election by the Council within thirty (30) days. Elected or appointed officers will be removed from office for non-performance of their position by a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the Council membership (VII. A). Following removal of an officer, the Rules and Elections Committee will solicit nominations for and conduct a general mid-term election to fill the office (X.C).*"

Discussion: Change the petition to require a percentage of the Assembly versus arbitrary number of Assembly members. Council proposed to modify Language to: "*A recall is initiated when a petition, signed by at least 10 percent of Assembly members (requesting recall), is presented to the Rules and Elections Committee.*"

Straw Poll: Accept with changes.

Issue 3b Vacancy of elected officers

President Johnson and Dan Marcum proposed to change the language to:

a. *President and/or President elect. If the President's office becomes vacant, the President-elect assumes the office of President for the remainder of the unexpired term and the following regular term. The Rules and Elections Committee will conduct a mid-term election for President-elect. If both the President and the President-elect offices become vacant, the most immediate Past President, who is available, will become President until the Rules and Elections Committee completes a mid-term election for both offices (X.C-D).*

Issue 4: Minimum number of candidates necessary for an elected office

Committee Action: Added the language (p.11), "*a valid number of candidates for an election are one with no maximum number of candidates.*"

Discussion: Grammar, change language to, "*a valid number of candidates for an election is one with no maximum number of candidates.*"

Straw Poll: Accept with changes.

OTHER ITEMS

Item 1: Removal and Replacement of a Representative/Standing/Special Committee member or chair.

Committee Action: Moved position from Section X. Procedures to Section IX. Committees of the Assembly (IX. F.). Separated provisions for removal and replacement of members and chairs (p. 10).

Discussion: President Johnson notes that Rules and Elections Committee has responsibility to appoint Standing Committee members. Representative Committees are responsible for organizing themselves. Does this change allow R&E to intervene in Representative Committees? I would propose that the order be that Representative Committees chairs be reminded by R&E to fill their committee seats and to replace inactive members. If this is not successful, then R&E would attempt to find a suitable candidate to chair a representative committee and recruit suitable members. The President needs to be free to focus on presidential duties. Discussion continued among Council members.

President Johnson and Council members proposed new language:

"F. Removal and Replacement of a Representative/Standing/Special Committee member or chair.

1. Members. Upon request of a committee chair, Rules and Elections Committee shall contact an inactive committee member. If he/she is not fulfilling committee responsibilities, Rules and Elections Committee will remove him/her from that committee and appoint a replacement to serve the remaining term.

2. Chairs. If a Representative/Standing/Special committee chair is not fulfilling committee responsibilities and does not respond satisfactorily to the requests of the Rules and Elections Committee, the President shall direct Rules and Elections Committee to remove the inactive chair, identify a suitable replacement committee member, and appoint that person to complete the member's term. In the event that the Rules and Elections Committee Chair is not fulfilling committee responsibilities and is unresponsive, the President shall consult with the members of the Executive Committee and members of the Rules and Elections Committee. Upon their approval, the President will remove the inactive chair, identify a suitable replacement committee member, and appoint that person to complete the member's term. The Rules and Elections Committee shall then elect a new committee chair."

Straw Poll: Accept with changes.

Item 2: Elections and Balloting (Section X. C.)

Committee Action:

- Confidential voting -- Added the language (p.11), *"All ballots and other voting materials, except election results, shall not be disclosed to any member of the Council or Assembly."*
- Election tie-breakers -- Added the language (p.11), *"In the event of a tie, a majority vote of the Council between the two candidates decides who is elected to office."*

Discussion: None

Straw Poll: Accept

Item 3: New requirement for Personnel Committee Members

Discussion: Motion was made during the June AAC meeting to add the requirement that one must first serve on another AAC Committee prior to serving on Personnel Committee. Point was made that this must be inserted into the By-Laws. Council members agreed and proposed new language into membership requirements that, *"members must have first served on another AAC Committee prior to serving on Personnel Committee."*

Straw Poll: Accept

Item 4: Academic Policy Review Committee

Discussion: Motion was made during the June AAC meeting to add a new standing committee to the By-Laws entitled "Academic Policy Review" with the purpose of considering general policy on academic personnel and related matters. Council members agreed and Secretary proposed that new language be inserted to Section X.C.2.

"e. Academic Policy Review

1. Membership - consists of four members of the Assembly, including one Advisor from each Former CE Region and one CE Specialist or Academic Coordinator representative selected and appointed by the Rules and Elections Committee. Members must have held an academic appointment in University of California Cooperative Extension for at least six years prior to serving on this committee.

2. Duties

- a. Reviews academic standards and policies affecting members of the Assembly as directed by Council.*
- b. May appoint ad-hoc committees to assist as needed.*
- c. Reports findings and recommendations to Council."*

Straw Poll: Accept

Motion to approve and propose the modifications

Motion was made to approve the modifications as discussed (Paul Vossen). Motion was seconded (Jennifer Hashim). Motion was approved.

Selection of By-Laws Ratification Process

Council had two options to begin the By-Laws ratification process. By-Laws of the Assembly can be modified either:

1. By a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the Council except that on a petition signed by twenty-five (25) Assembly members the proposed modification will be submitted to the Assembly membership by mail ballot or,
2. By a majority affirmative vote of those members returning a mail ballot.

Motion was made to ratify by a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the Council.

Motion (Paul): Ratify by a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the Council (Paul Vossen). Motion was seconded (Rachel Elkins). Motion was approved.

Action Item: AAC Secretary Hashim to implement ratification process by sending a report detailing the By-Law modifications (with new language) to Assembly members along with supporting material (old vs. new By-laws).

Thursday, January 7, 2010: COMMITTEE REPORTS

STANDING COMMITTEES

Personnel Committee Report (Dorothy Smith): Committee report was submitted to AAC Collaborative Tools site and can be found [here](#). Personnel Committee has been busy conducting PR trainings and PR writing workshops for new advisors, establishing Ad hoc peer review committees and conducting Ad hoc chair trainings. Training reports will be shared with SAC members. All meetings were/will be conducted online through Adobe Connect. Several members will be rotating off the committee -- Shelley Murdock CD/YD (F), Stephen Quarles NR (M), Cindy Fake Ag (F) and Joyce Strand Academic Coordinator IPM (F) and this information has been shared with Rules and Elections Committee for replacement. A question was asked during the report-- is there been a case during the Ad hoc Peer Review Process when a peer review committee has recommended action on merits and promotions and outcome has been changed by Administration? Not sure. It was noted that Kim Rodrigues will act as Executive Director of Academic Personnel and she is the liaison between Personnel Committee and Barbara Allen-Diaz. President Johnson is concerned that AAC must also continue to maintain a direct link to top ANR Administration, as per its charge.

Action Item: Executive Committee will discuss lines of communication between AAC and Administration. AAC needs the ability to communicate directly with Administration.

Action item: Instruct Personnel Committee that they follow through with previous recommendations of improving the transparency by appointing 2 advisors to SAC.

Program Committee Report (James Bethke): Committee report was submitted to AAC Collaborative Tools site and can be found [here](#). Committee members have changed since July 2009. Two members termed out, one member resigned. The three new members are Pam Geisel, Paul Olin, and Mike Marzolla (finishing Steve Dasher's term). New members were welcomed and introduced to the duties of the Program Committee and the Program Committee Handbook using Collaborative Tool Program Committee site. A formal request was made for a replacement for Paul Olin who resigned from committee on November 4th. He will be on sabbatical leave for the next year and will not be able to participate fully. The request was made to Jim Downer, Chair of the Rules and Elections Committee. On November 8, 2009, the Professional Society Reimbursement Requests for the first quarter Jan to March 2010 were evaluated. There were 27 proposals, 2 applications were disqualified due to time frame of the meeting or provided an incomplete application, 5 considered and not funded, and 20 were funded. On January 4, the 2010 second quarter call for Professional Society Meeting Reimbursement Awards, which covers professional society travel from April through June, 2010, was emailed to academics by Joni Rippee. The applications can be found online (<http://groups.ucanr.org/AAC/>) and are due Friday, February 5th, 2010. The next call to apply for the next quarter (July 1 through September 30, 2010) will be available the first week in April. The next meeting will include a discussion of the Distinguished Service Awards.

Welfare and Benefits Committee (Chuck Ingels): The main topic of discussion was changes, recommendations and clarifications of the consulting policy. Committee report was submitted to AAC Collaborative Tools site and can be found [here](#). It was noted that all UC faculty and Specialists follow the Academic Policy Manual alone, so the ANR policy covers all Advisors. The ANR policy was derived from the APM, but further restrictions were placed on ANR largely because Advisors have specific county clientele whereas Specialists have statewide responsibilities and no specific clientele. It was apparently believed that Advisors would have greater potential conflict of commitment due to our local clientele. A few people have suggested that all UC academics should use the APM policy, but this is unlikely. There were four main Issues of discussion and the committee's recommendations are listed below. There were several questions raised during discussion including: *What are we going to do with these recommendations? Who decides on the Policy? We need to know who consulting requests will be going to and who decides? How much consulting is going on? Develop survey tool – to get information.*

Issue 1: 48-Days of Consulting

Original

VII. A. 1. Time Limits. A full-time academic appointee on a fiscal-year (11-month) appointment may engage in compensated outside professional activities for up to forty-eight (48) days during the months of active service.

III. A. Application. At the same time, the obligations of academic appointees to UC and ANR require that outside activities must not interfere with an academic appointee's commitment to UC.

Revision 5/19/08

IV. A.

5. Approval shall be based on demonstration that the proposed outside Category I or II activity:
 - c. Will not interfere with the full performance of the academic appointee's primary UC obligations; nor over commit the academic appointee to such an extent that it impedes his or her progression in rank and step;

Committee response: Consulting is a privilege afforded to advisors. It is a demonstration of professional competence and it can increase knowledge. It is his or her choice to spend up to 48 days consulting. If he or she can consult this many days and still get a merit or promotion, such activity should be encouraged. If this amount of consulting results in merit or promotion denials from lack of effort (commitment), that was the choice of the advisor. The choice of the advisor must be respected.

Clarification: Consulting is on UC time.

Issue 2: 30-Day Notification

Original

VII. B. 2. A request for prior approval must be submitted at least thirty (30) days prior to the beginning of the activity to allow for adequate time for review. (Nonetheless, on an exception basis, the Regional Director and/or other responsible administrator shall have authority to allow for a review time of less than 30 days if they deem it appropriate.)

Committee response: Although some consulting activities can be planned 30+ days in advance, such as college courses, many opportunities are lost due to this long waiting period.

Rewording options (or both):

1. A request for prior approval must be submitted at least fourteen (14) days prior to the beginning of the activity to allow for adequate time for review. (Allow for up to 30 days?)
2. In some cases, the exact time frame for the consulting activity may not be known until days beforehand. For such activities, pre-approval is made for a range of possible dates and number of days within the fiscal year. Then, prior to the actual consulting activity, notice is given three (3) days in advance of the consulting.

Rachel: Who is responsible administrator on the consulting policy? Used to be CD and RD.

Chuck: Not sure. Will find out.

Chuck: Which of the two options to ask for???

Leigh: Both be requested because 2. is an exception to 1.

Issue 3: Consulting in Neighboring County

Original

VII. B. Prior Approval

4. Approval shall be based on demonstration that the proposed outside activity:
 - c. Will have no relevant overlap with the academic appointee's primary UC obligations

VII. C. Location of Outside Activity

1. Irrespective of the location of the proposed outside activity, the proposed activity must be beyond the course and scope of activities performed as regularly assigned duties.
2. If the proposed outside activity is in a different county(ies), region(s), or ANR unit(s), prior approval is required from the responsible administrators in all involved county(ies), region(s), and/or other ANR unit(s).

Committee response: In some cases, consulting proposals have been denied because an activity was in a neighboring county. If the neighboring county has no advisor available from whom to solicit advice (including cross-county advisor), there should be no problem and the proposal should be approved. The main criterion should remain: any UCCE advisor requesting consulting should be approved to do so if that advisor (or another UCCE advisor) would not be expected to provide the service (gratis) as part of their day-to-day advisor role.

Issue 4: Definition of "Day" (as opposed to actual hours of consulting)

Original

VII. A. Time Limits

2. For compensated outside professional activities, “day” is defined on a case-by-case basis, using common sense and customary practice. UC recognizes and supports the diverse hours and schedules devised by academic appointees to accommodate research and creative work activity, University service, and University-related public service.

Revision 5/19/08 (No change)

Committee response: We need clearer guidelines to report partial consulting days. We can’t report partial days on our leave report but often consulting opportunities or even classes taught are not for the whole day. Some advisors are told to lump together the partial days to end up with a whole day of consulting. This is awkward because partial days may be weeks or even months apart and then the day they are reported is not the day they happened.

Other Issues in RD Response (issues that were included in the email to them)

1. No clear definition of conflict of interest. A clear definition must be communicated to advisors with more specific examples.

Action Item: Welfare & Benefits Committee will develop and submit a survey to CE advisors regarding the frequency and location of consulting practices and poll advisor’s issues or challenges about the current policy. Furthermore, W&B will submit survey for approval by Executive Committee prior to submission to all Advisors.

Rules and Elections Committee (Jim Downer): Committee is working to replace positions for the Program Committee and UCD Specialist Committee. Given the sudden resignation of President-elect, Gideon Zeidler, Rules and Elections will appoint a replacement and the replacement will serve out the remainder of the year, according to the existing By-Laws. Another election will occur in the normal cycle for both the President and the President-elect. Members discussed potential replacement and decided to ask Steve Wright.

Action Item: Secretary will post current roster of AAC Committee Members on Collaborative Tools website.

Motion: Council to appoint Steve Wright to serve as interim President-elect through June 30, 2010.

ACADEMIC COORDINATORS (Kris Lynn-Patterson): Committee report was submitted to AAC Collaborative Tools site and can be found [here](#). Generally, the AC Representative Committee is concerned with the omission of the AC title in lists of current issues. ACs realize that as a group, they can still fall through the cracks occasionally, but they also know that many strides have been made to fill these. There was concern with at least one on the committee, who still feels “left out of the loop” in regard to communications. ACs now have an E-Book for merit review, and this is really appreciated.

AD HOC COMMITTEES

Academic Policy Review Committee: No report.

REPRESENTATIVE COMMITTEES

CE SPECIALIST CAMPUS COMMITTEES

UC Riverside (Alec Gerry): Reported that there is not enough financial support for the “extension” part of their job. There was discussion among Specialists on how they would take the 20% budget cut. It was explained that the majority of dollars go into a research fund, the remainder is divided and doled out to researchers to support extension activities. The cut is determined by the % Extension appointment. Most of the cuts went to extension activities. Research monies were largely kept intact because it would affect federal matching funds for all campus-based researchers (not just specialists). Current estimate to support extension activities is about \$3,500 per year. Specialists feel that this amount is simply not enough to support extension activities. Reminded everyone that as they look at restructuring, that there is a chunk of money going to campus and as ANR is paying for extension activities by Specialists, not sure that the \$ allocation matches the degree of extension activities.

Action Items: Executive Committee will recommend that Administration examine the amount of money that is provided to Specialists, Advisors and Academic Coordinators directly in support of their extension activities.

UC Berkeley (Max Moritz): Noted that Specialists are not eligible for AES funds. Approximately \$6,000-\$7,000 to support extension and outreach funds. 50-50 split between CE Specialists and departments. Also received 20% cut. Noted that they can carry over funds from previous year. Serious differences exist between the campuses, but not convinced that it is problem. How are CE funds being used? Deans have the discretion to determine how the funds are used. Staff lay-offs continue. Morale pretty low. No actions for AAC to take.

UC Davis (Joe DiTomaso): Committee report was submitted to AAC Collaborative Tools site and can be found [here](#). Gives update on Specialist support though Davis--\$500 per specialist, but \$3,000 travel budget and must apply for individually. Reports that the CE Specialists at UC Davis have established a 6-person advisory committee that meets for 2 hours every month. In the first hour, the committee discusses relevant issues related to CE Specialists on campus and in the second hour, the committee meets with the Dean of the College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences (Neal Van Alfen) to discuss these issues. College is undergoing a major reorganization, and much of our concerns deal with how this reorganization will impact specialists. For example, currently some departments have only 1 or no CE Specialists. If the college reorganizes into fewer larger units, it is felt that a threshold number of CE Specialists are necessary to ensure a voting peer group for merits and promotions and to maintain the outreach continuum. The two other issues are assigning one of our Associate Deans to represent CE Specialists in all matters related to the college. Group is currently drafting a proposal to the Dean to determine the areas of representation needed. The second activity that the Specialist Advisory Committee is engaged in is setting guidelines to account for what we expect to be major changes in CE Specialists activities, both in outreach and research. This is based on the changes being made to the college and to ANR. They hope to have a document on this by the beginning of summer. No actions for AAC to take.

CE ADVISOR REGIONAL COMMITTEES

NCMR (Rachel Elkins): Committee report was submitted to AAC Collaborative Tools site and can be found [here](#). Noted that Rachel Elkins' term ends in June. There were no formal meetings this quarter, however the committee issued a request for input from NCMR Assembly members (December 23, 2009) via email and Collaborative Tools. The results of the survey are as follows: While there is much concern about the future of ANR in general, particularly as it pertains to organizational structure and perceived movement away from county-based offices to a more regional approach, there were few responses to this request from NCMR Assembly members. There is a "wait and watch" attitude among many. The committee feels that the effects of potential "clustering" on important county relationships and support must be considered carefully. In this regard, CDs from the North Coast Sub-Region have developed a map and tables showing who serves these 7 counties, distances between various locales that must be traveled by cross-county advisors, and monetary contributions from UC, county and grant sectors. This is being done to inform Dean Klingborg. One person expressed that AAC should respond rapidly and pro-actively to issues such as consulting policy and county organizational structure by forming an ad-hoc committee to quickly survey the Assembly, interact with administration as appropriate, and develop a report for AAC for discussion and submission to Administration. It was also mentioned that the consulting policy is really about pay inequality, and that until this gets resolved (especially younger) advisors will seek supplemental income, perhaps at the expense of building and maintaining well-rounded, locally-based applied research and extension programs. The outcomes of an enhanced consulting policy, of course, can only be evaluated over time.

Action Item: Council recommends that Regional Representation Committee Chairs to annually survey their constituents on their knowledge of the role of AAC, which committees affect them, which issues they want AAC to address.

CVR (Steve Wright): No report given.

CCSR (James Bethke): No report given. No meetings.

Action item: Council to update the AAC Brochure and develop New Advisor Orientation Curriculum during the next assembly Council Meeting.

Action Item: Secretary to request that all committee chairs post their reports to Collaborative Tools.

OFFICER REPORTS

President's Report (Leigh Johnson): Has spent much time working with administration behind the scenes. Reminds the group that an email was sent out (dated 12/1/09) that detailed several issues and concerns among Assembly members. She would like AAC members to review them and discuss among your committee members to determine if they are widespread and could be addressed constructively by Assembly Council. The issues include the following:

- Maintain AAC's direct communications with VP and AVP as per AAC mission;
- Risks to Advisors' career status posed by "definite" appointments policy and 5-year initiatives plan;
- Implications of continuing to hire new academics, despite salary reductions via furloughs;
- Create process to continue work among years on "issues under study" (similar to Academic Senate)

Past-President's Report (Paul Vossen): No report given.

President-Elect's Report (Gideon Zeidler): No report given.

Secretary's Report (Jennifer Hashim-Buckey): See Ad Hoc By-Laws Review Committee Recommendations, Discussion and Resolution Adobe Connect Presentation notes above.

Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,
Jennifer M. Hashim-Buckey