

AAC meeting Feb 5 2025

Meeting attendees was not recorded

Reports

Rules and Election: two candidates for secretary, waiting on candidate statements. Working on other elections so that everyone can be seated on July 1. Discussion on allowing committee members to continue (reappointment) or have new members

Program: about to send off travel grant announcements. Got an increase in funds but no formal announcement yet

Welfare and Benefits: trainings on sabbatic leave and consulting coming up. Trouble pinning down Daniel and Tina.

Chris Greer suggested reaching out to Brent, since he is the one who ultimately approves leave requests

Finishing exit interviews – only 3 responses out of the last 20 departures

Personnel: ad hoc committee started late December, reports are due Feb 10. Four committees by subject matter rather than by rank. Peer review committee is meeting soon, > 100 advancement requests so anticipate a lot of work. Daniel is going to make changes?

Andy Lyons: PRC is increasing from 14 to 16. Cases will be discussed by half of the committee. Reduces the work load and time commitment of committee members

Chris Greer: All PRC members used to have to review negative cases

Whitney Brim-Deforest: Daniel is on PRC as well as a final reviewer -> should be separate review layers and a possible conflict of interest.

Ali Montazar: this is incorrect, Daniel facilitates PRC but does not vote so it is not a conflict of interest

Advisor Representative: 17 responses to the last survey:

Questions about ANR and UC administrative policy

Frustration about new HR and IT tickets and lack of support, also no administrative password for UC computers

Questions about Daniel's role

Advisor rep committee wants to create a FAQ, maybe create a meeting with upper admin and advisors to address

Whitney BD: why aren't people going to their CD for some of these questions?

Nick Clark: we view this as a mentoring and onboarding issue, or this may be a CD competency and availability issue

Chris Greer: IT is woefully underfunded. Some trainings are done by UCOP, not ANR

Multiple Academic Titles: unclear if academics based on campuses are eligible to join this committee?

Answer: if hired through ANR, yes, if hired through AES, no.

Concern about losing ANR-based specialists, other specialists have yet to be polled on whether to form a separate committee

Academic Coordinators: lost 3 members but gained 1 now, 1 soon to join

Updating the roster of ACs: there are now 42

Want to continue doing onboarding for ACs

Professional development funding for ACs is still an issue since they are required to do professional competency work. Maybe more work needs to be done to make sure directors give their ACs funds

Berkeley specialists: no new updates

Davis specialists: nothing new. Anxiety that specialist positions aren't getting filled

Riverside specialists: Glenda and Brent will be visiting

Ex officio: leadership wants to change the strategic initiatives, but program teams will not be changing. Strategic initiatives will be shifting to program areas, and program teams will be slotted into one, and only one program area

Senior admin wants to try to rehire the old Mark Bell position

One issue: no good way to initiate any new program teams, also admin in general wants fewer program teams

President's report: feb 20 town hall, which is a place to provide input for new plan on program areas

Wellness reimbursement: academics can participate again, in the process of redoing it

Annemiek Schilder: it was depleted in 24 or 48 hours the last time around

Want to have an in person meeting in Davis, either May 1 or August 7. Two day meeting

Discussion concludes to meet on April 30 and May 1

#### Q&A with Brent

Trying to put together guidance on hot button issues with the new presidential administration

Only have received a few stop orders on specific grants, most things are continuing as usual

How we message impacts and the work we are doing needs to be more nuanced, but at the same time, (direct quote from Brent) “we do what we do unapologetically”

Previous Trump administration said they were going to follow civil rights laws and review programs, but never actually did anything, left everything at “open review”

Program area realignment: 6 new areas

Each will have a chair in place of the SI leaders

Co-led by an advisor and campus-based representative

Goal is to have better alignment between RECs and counties

Program areas are a new layer above program teams, replacing strategic initiatives

PT will exist, workgroups will still exist

Concern from AAC members about how things will fit in certain silos – some workgroups that used to be in one silo may be split. Also, some program teams seem aspirational