

Cooperative Extension Advisor Status Task Force

January 29, 2007

Charge to the Committee

The Cooperative Extension Advisor Status Committee was appointed by Vice President W.R. Gomes on May 15, 2006. The text of the full committee charge is contained in Appendix 1. Broadly stated, the committee was charged to:

- Compare policies and procedures for Cooperative Extension (CE) Advisors to CE Specialists and Agricultural Experiment Station (AES) Scientists;
- Evaluate the procedures for appointments, merits, accelerations;
- Make recommendations for policy changes.

Members of the Committee included:

- Richard B. Standiford, Assoc. Vice President, ANR (Chair)
- J. Keith Gilless, Professor and Executive Associate Dean, UCB-CNR
- Julie Beal, Director, Academic Affairs, UCD-CAES
- Jim MacDonald, Professor and Executive Associate Dean, UCD-CAES
- Tim Paine, Professor, UCR-CNAS and ANR Ag. Policy and Pest Management Program Leader
- Harry Carlson, CE Advisor, Modoc and Siskiyou Counties and Director, Intermountain Research and Extension Center
- Sharon Junge, CE Advisor and County Director, Placer and Nevada Counties
- Terry Salmon, CE Specialist and County Director, San Diego County
- Fe Moncloa, CE Advisor, Santa Clara Co. and Chair Elect, Academic Assembly Council
- Steve Vasquez, CE Advisor, Fresno Co. and Immediate Past Chair, Academic Assembly Council

Comparison of Academic Policies for CE Advisors with other ANR Academics

The committee began its work with an assessment of CE Advisors within UC ANR. Currently there are approximately 230 CE Advisors within ANR. CE Advisors are an essential element in the research-development-delivery continuum, with responsibilities for extending educational information, conducting applied research, participating in public and university service, furthering their professional competence, and incorporating the goals of affirmative action into every aspect of their program. APM-335 defines the CE Advisor series. Various APM sections and ANR policies (within the ANR Administrative Handbook) provide the general guidelines for administration of the series. The committee spent considerable effort researching these policies and comparing them to the corresponding policies for the CE Specialist and AES "Agronomist" series. Table 1 below presents a comparison of the various academic policies for each of these ANR academic series.

Table 1. Academic policies affecting ANR academics.

Academic Policy	CE Advisor	CE Specialist	AES Agronomist
General Guiding Policies	APM 335; ANR 305-II	APM 334; ANR 305-III	APM 320
Off-scale Salary (APM 620; ANR 330)	ANR 330 sets initial off-scale maximum and requires return to scale. Not consistent with faculty approach. Policy needs revision to be consistent with new APM 620.	Guided by campus procedures.	Commonly utilized in initial appointment. Most retain off-scale salary throughout UC appointment. APM 620 (draft) removes constraints on initial offer level.
Career Equity Review	Not done for CE Advisors.	Not done for CE Specialists.	Utilized by campuses. Provides opportunity to ensure equity among faculty. See UCD FAQ document.
Equivalent Status (APM 115)	Not provided equivalent status with corresponding ranks in the professor series	Not provided equivalent status with corresponding ranks in the professor series. Argument for granting CE Specialists equivalent status.	Provides "equivalent status" to AES agronomists, which allows them to be treated on the same basis as corresponding ranks in the professor series
Retention Guidelines	Retention actions uncommon other than efforts by RD's to discuss broad benefits of UC employment.	Occasionally done for CE Specialists with outside job offers.	Efforts to retain valued faculty is relatively common, usually by matching salary of competing offer.
Faculty Recruitment Allowance Program (APM 190-E)	Not available to CE Advisors.	Not widely used for CE Specialists. Some cases approved by exception.	Guided by APM 190 Appendix E. Commonly used in recruitment of new faculty.
MOP loans	Not available to CE Advisors.	Not available to CE Specialists.	Available to AES Agronomists. Commonly used in recruitment of new faculty.
Consulting Policy (APM 025, ANR 345)	Policy for advisors virtually same as faculty.	Guided by campus policy.	APM 025 sets policy for consulting.
"Family Friendly" Policy	Has not been officially incorporated into academic policy.	Guided by campus policy.	Guided by campus policy.
Spousal POP	Not utilized in Advisor recruitment.	Not commonly used in Specialist recruitment.	Commonly used for recruitment of campus faculty.
Family Accommodations for Childbearing & Childrearing	APM 760 – Up to 12 weeks for childbearing or adoption, with (Vacation/Sick Leave) or without pay.	APM 760 – Up to 12 weeks for childbearing or adoption, with (Vacation/Sick Leave) or without pay.	APM 760 – Up to 12 weeks for childbearing or adoption, with pay.

Academic Policy	CE Advisor	CE Specialist	AES Agronomist
<i>Stop the Clock</i>	Not available to CE Advisors.	APM 334 – Extension to eight year limit may be granted by the Chancellor, by exception.	APM 133 – Allows the tenure clock to be stopped for each qualifying birth/adoption or serious illness.
<i>Active Service-Modified Duties</i>	APM 760 – To qualify, must be responsible for 50% or more of the care of a child. Workload reduction possible. Must use sick leave or vacation in proportion to time reduced, or leave without pay.	APM 760 – To qualify, must be responsible for 50% or more of the care of a child. Workload reduction possible. Must use sick leave or vacation in proportion to time reduced, or leave without pay.	APM 760 – To qualify, must be responsible for 50% or more of the care of a child. Full relief from teaching with no additional duties assigned. No reduction in pay.
<i>Family Medical Leave Act</i>	ANR Handbook 340 – eligible for total of 12 workweeks in the leave year; paid (vacation/sick leave) or unpaid.	APM 715 – eligible for total of 12 workweeks in the leave year. Actual practice varies by campus – At UCD, standard practice to allow up to 6 months. (Paid vacation/sick leave) or unpaid. Qualifying service (1250 hours) waived.	APM 715 – eligible for a total of 12 workweeks in the leave year. Actual practice varies by campus – At UCD, standard practice to allow up to 6 months, paid. Qualifying service (1250 hours) waived.
<i>Term Review/Tenure</i>	ANR 310-VIII. All appointment levels have three 2-year terms.	APM 334-17.Term positions until promotion to Associate title triggering conversion to indefinite term.	APM 115. Tenure available for Agronomists under Equivalent Status.
<i>Start-up Package</i>	\$10,000 from regional academic salary savings for start-up for all CE Advisors.	Start-up budgeted from salary savings from Specialist funds. Amount varies by disciplinary needs.	Start-up from both campus and college funds. Varies by disciplinary needs.
<i>Educational criteria</i>	APM-335 requires Bachelor's degrees; but MS required by practice.	Require PhD by practice.	Require PhD by practice.
<i>Sabbatical leave</i>	ANR 340-IV.CE Advisors receive same sabbatical leave privileges as faculty.	APM 740.CE Specialists receive same sabbatical leave privileges as faculty.	APM 740 defines privilege.

Current Demographics

The committee evaluated the current demographics and years of service for all CE Advisors. It is very clear that the Division is in a state of rapid change. A general summary of separations of CE Advisors from 2001 to 2006 and anticipated retirements over the next 10 years reveals the following information:

- 64 separations have taken place over the past 5.5 years
 - 78 percent retired

- 7 percent term not renewed or dismissed
 - 9 percent accepted other jobs
- An additional 47 retirements are anticipated over the next 5 years, and 108 over next 10 years
- By the end of 2007 fifteen percent of the CE Advisor workforce will have been hired since the start of 2005.

Highest Degree

Although APM 335 describes the CE Advisor minimum qualification as a BS degree, the committee found that the highest degree earned was usually an MS or PhD. The current degree status of the CE Advisors is as follows:

- 30 percent of all CE Advisors have a PhD;
- 48 percent of all CE Advisors with less than 20 years of service have PhDs;
- 67 percent of all CE Advisors with less than 5 years of service have PhDs;
- 89 percent of the CE Advisors hired in 2005-06 have PhDs;
- No CE Advisors have been hired with only a BS in the last 23 years;
- All CE Advisor position descriptions required an MS or higher.

Nationwide, California has by far the highest percentage of county-based CE academics with PhDs. For example, in New Jersey, Alaska and Arizona 10 percent of their county-based Cooperative Extension academic staff have PhDs. No other state has over 10 percent with PhD's. The large number of PhD-level county CE Advisors in California reflects a long history of encouraging applied research as a part of the program of work of UC ANR advisors. Research by local CE Advisors has contributed significantly to the success of California agriculture.

Off-Scale Salaries

ANR has worked within APM 620 and ANR Handbook 330 to guide off-scale salaries for CE Advisors. The general information on off-scale salaries for CE Advisors is as follows:

- Currently 18 CE Advisors have off-scale salaries (8 percent)
- 36 percent of all Asst. Advisors have off-scale salaries
- 55 percent of 2005-06 recruitments filled with off-scale salaries
- 47 percent of all recruitments since 2001 were filled with off-scale salaries
- Current ANR policies require a return to scale

Recent CE Advisor Recruitments

Of the 15 most recent recruitment efforts, 9 were successful:

- 9 successful searches
 - 4 on-scale, 5 off-scale
 - 8 have PhDs
 - 8 from California
- 6 failed searches
 - 1 with no qualified applicants
 - 5 failed due to issues with salary, housing costs, or immigration issues

Recommendations

Based on the comparisons of academics within ANR and an assessment of the population of current CE Advisors, the committee developed a list of recommendations designed to support the CE Advisor series in a variety of ways that would be more consistent with the treatment of other academic series within the ANR continuum to improve the recruitment and retention of world class CE Advisors.

The committee recommends implementation of a new off-scale policy for CE Advisors. The off-scale salary provides an opportunity to attract the best CE academics to California and to retain its most effective Advisors. Virtually all AES Agronomists and CE Specialists hired in the last five years have been hired with off-scale salaries to compete with the market for the best academics. The committee found significant variation in administration of off-scale salaries for CE Advisors from the practice used on campus for CE Specialists and AES Agronomists. APM 620 is currently undergoing significant revision to remove the limits of off-scales, and the requirement to return to scale. Appendix 2 is a recommended policy for off-scale salary administration for the CE Advisors, patterned after the revised APM 620 and campus versions of this policy. This would replace the current ANR 330 policy.

The committee recommends development and implementation of a formal Career Equity Review for CE Advisors. Career equity reviews are formalized on the campuses to allow a systematic opportunity for faculty to be evaluated to determine if their current rank and step are appropriate for their academic accomplishments. The committee recommends that along with the revised off-scale salary (see above), which will most directly affect new hires, it is essential to concurrently adopt a career equity review. Appendix 3 provides a draft of a process for Career Equity Review for the CE Advisors, patterned after the model utilized by campuses.

The committee recommends revision of APM 335 to reflect the current policies for minimum educational level. The current APM 335 makes reference to the minimum BS degree for CE Advisors. The policy for over 20 years has been that an MS is required. In recent years, a majority of CE Advisors hired have a PhD. The series concept needs to be consistent with the current expectation for the duties expected of the CE Advisor, and should closely parallel APM 334 (for CE Specialists) and APM 320 (for AES Agronomists).

The committee recommends the ANR's academic affairs office research opportunities to address housing cost differentials and develop acceptable policies to attract high quality candidates from other states. In the past several years, virtually all new CE Advisors hired in ANR have been from within California. The high housing cost has made it difficult to recruit out-of-state candidates. The Mortgage Origination Program (MOP) and "Faculty Recruitment Allowance" (APM 190-E) are used in most new hires for faculty with Agricultural Experiment Station appointments. The committee researched these two policies, and

found that currently these are available only to members of the Academic Senate and Senior Management Group.

The committee recommends appointment of a task force charged with a complete overhaul of the merit and promotion process and the concept of term appointments for CE Advisors .The committee evaluated the current process used for evaluation of CE Advisors and concluded that the process to evaluate CE Advisors is significantly more cumbersome and time-consuming than campus processes used for AES Agronomists and CE Specialists. The committee also found the process much less inclusive, e.g., there is no analog to a departmental vote. The committee also was concerned that the term review process for senior level searches discourages top level national candidates from applying for Advisor positions; even if they had earned tenure at their former institution they would have no security of employment with ANR for six years. The committee developed some key principles to guide a reform of the merit and promotion process and term review process, which are shown in Appendices 4 and 5. The committee applauds the new “Streamlined Merit” process which was recently implemented for normal merits for CE Advisors.

The committee recommends these policies be highlighted on the ANR website and brochures produced that could be included in the information packets provided to applicants invited for interview. It is further recommended Regional Directors and County Directors be periodically reminded of these policies so that they can pass this information along to the county advisors.

The Committee recognized that ANR and UC has established family friendly policies for CE Advisors including, but not limited to, family and medical leave, family accommodations for childbearing and childrearing, and active service-modified duties. These policies are identical to non-Senate academic staff on the campuses, and the committee views these policies as proactive and important. More could be done however, the “stop the clock” policy (APM 133) for faculty allows the tenure clock to be stopped for each qualifying birth/adoption or serious illness applied for child-bearing faculty to lengthen the tenure period. This policy could be used as a pattern for CE Advisors in the term review process. It is the committee’s belief that consistently informing prospective candidates about UC’s Family Friendly policies could be a beneficial recruiting tool.

The committee recommends a regular, strategic approach to orientation, and greater flexibility in application of start-up funds for new CE Advisors.

With the large number of new hires anticipated over the next decade within ANR, the role of an effective orientation program is essential to ensure successful careers by new hires within ANR. Furthermore, having access to start-up funds plays a significant role in the start of a career. The committee developed some guiding principles for both orientation and start-up (see Appendix 6). There are significant opportunities to more closely link orientation and start-up opportunities with campus colleagues and improve the research-extension continuum.

The committee recommends ANR develop operating guidelines to help Regional Directors and the Associate Vice President retain valued CE Advisors when ANR is threatened by their loss to comparable employment opportunities.

The committee observed there is no consistent operating guidelines to retain CE Advisors offered positions elsewhere. Retention efforts are appropriate when ANR feels a particular CE Advisor has demonstrated outstanding achievement and their exit would result in a void that would disrupt programs and be difficult to fill. Retention efforts should be specific to individuals and the tools available should be applied as appropriate to particular retention situations. The committee drafted Appendix 7 to help begin the development of operating guidelines for a retention strategy.

The committee recommends highlighting opportunities for sabbatical leave and consulting in recruiting CE Advisors.

The committee observed that the sabbatical leave policy for CE Advisors exactly mirrors their campus colleagues. This privilege is not available to most non-Senate academic series and is a significant benefit for CE Advisors. The consulting policy for CE Advisors has been recently changed to more closely match campus colleagues, with some minor changes reflecting the public service mission of the CE Advisor. This is also a significant benefit of the CE Advisor series.

Conclusions

The committee attempted to closely follow its charge to carefully evaluate the CE Advisor academic policies, practices and guidelines. The list of recommendations above can be implemented through a modification of ANR policy, development of operating guidelines, and in some cases, modification of the Academic Personnel manual. Given the large number of anticipated new hires needed in the CE Advisor series over the next decade, it is essential to implement these changes now to ensure that the University of California can continue to attract the top CE academics in the country.

Appendix 1.

Charge to Committee: (from W. R. Gomes)

I appreciate your willingness to serve on the committee to examine the status of Cooperative Extension Advisors at the University of California. The committee's charge will be to examine a number of issues, primarily advisor non-salary compensation, academic policies, and characterizing pools that affect the status of Advisors and to make recommendations for changes where appropriate.

Agriculture and Natural Resources recognizes that long standing issues related to CE Advisor salary scales has been reviewed and discussed at great length. The charge of this committee is not to look at the advisor salary scale per se, but to closely evaluate the academic policies for CE Advisors (ANR Administrative Handbook, Section 300 - Academic Personnel; Academic Personnel Manual Section APM-335; other sections of ANR and APM that apply to CE Advisors) and seek ways to acknowledge the important contribution of Cooperative Extension Advisors to the mission of UC.

AVP Standiford and I have discussed formation of this committee with a number of individuals and groups, including the Cooperative Extension Administrative Working Group, the Academic Assembly Council, the ANR Regional Directors, and members of the ANR Executive Council.

In making your review, you should consider the following points. These are not intended to limit the scope of the review and you should feel free to identify and address other issues of policy and practice which are pertinent to the status of Cooperative Extension Advisors.

- 1. Develop a matrix of current academic policies and procedures for CE Advisors (i.e., consulting policies, salary equity adjustments, off-scale policies, educational requirements, retention packages, housing allowances, access to MOP loans, "Family-Friendly" policies, start-up packages, foreign scholars/Visa's) and compare these to the CE Specialist and AES Agronomist series.*
- 2. Compare the procedures and processes used to evaluate Cooperative Extension Advisors for appointments, merits, promotions and accelerations to campus procedures for CE Specialists and AES Agronomists.*
- 3. Determine whether educational requirements for recruiting and appointing CE Advisors are appropriate and accurately reflect the pool of top candidates. Evaluate if policies ensure that ANR can offer competitive recruitment packages. Evaluate the types of incentive programs for new hires that could be applied.*

At the first meeting of the committee, we will provide you with background information that will assist in your deliberations. As you proceed with your review, you will undoubtedly wish to request additional information. Because of the importance I place on this topic, I have asked AVP Rick Standiford to personally chair this committee. Interim Director Frazier's office will provide staff and clerical support to the committee and defray costs of travel and meeting expense.

*I would like to have your final report by **September 30, 2006.***

I thank you in advance for your willingness to take on this important assignment.

Appendix 2. Off-Scale Policy Subcommittee:

Section ANR-620 Policies and Procedures for the Administration of Off-Scale Salaries	Date: 10/01/06 Supersedes: ANR 330 Responsible Department: Academic Personnel
---	--

This section supplements UC Policy APM-620.

620-0 Policy

Off-scale salaries may be approved to allow increased flexibility in salary administration for the purpose of recruiting or retaining advisors, while maintaining the integrity of the University of California salary scales. This document is a statement of Division policies and procedures governing the approval and administration of off-scale salaries.

620-2 Rationale

As stated in APM-620, salaries should be on-scale to the greatest extent possible. However, it is recognized that certain conditions may justify salaries that depart from the standard salary scales. These include market conditions that command a higher salary than permitted by the University of California salary scales for a given rank and step, and retention situations where an individual has received an offer of a comparable position at a higher salary from a competing institution. Off-scale salaries are granted under the condition that recipients will meet or exceed the normal standards for academic advancement, and are subject to review and regularization or renewal as outlined in Section ANR-620-18, below. An off-scale salary may also be used in the very limited number of cases when needed to compensate for added responsibilities in cases not covered by standard administrative stipends, or to provide appropriate flexibility in circumstances not specified above, but in which there is compelling reason to do so.

620-4 Definitions

- a. Base salary--the annual salary specified in the UC salary scales (see <http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/tab0506/tabcont.html>) for an academic appointee at a particular rank and step.
- b. Off-scale salary--the total annual salary received by an academic appointee whose salary exceeds that specified in the UC salary scale for individuals at the same rank and step.
- c. Off-scale increment--the difference between the off-scale salary and the base salary.
- d. Regularization--the process of merging an off-scale salary with the UC salary scale via gradual reduction in the size of the off-scale increment.

620-6 Responsibility

- a. Responsibility for recommending an off-scale salary or an increase in an existing off-scale salary rests with the county director. Such recommendations are submitted to the appropriate regional director accompanied by full documentation of the conditions that support the action. The regional director will review the situation, forwarding the documentation and a recommendation to the office of the vice president for final action.

- b. Responsibility for coordinating the review of recommendations for off-scale salaries and for making decisions regarding such recommendations rests with the office of the vice president. The vice president's office may consult with the Senior Administrative Committee (SAC) as needed. The vice president is also responsible for the administration of ANR off-scale salary policy including apprising regional directors and county directors of policies and procedures governing off-scale salaries, monitoring division record-keeping and reporting practices on academic personnel with off-scale salaries.

620-10 Criteria

The criteria for judging the appropriateness of an off-scale salary for an individual advisor include the following:

- a. Market considerations
 - (1) Selected disciplines may, due to market considerations, command salaries in excess of those permitted by the UC salary scales for a given rank and step. The vice president will be responsible for obtaining data on salaries in selected disciplines at peer institutions. These data will provide the basis for reviewing off-scale salary recommendations based on discipline-based market considerations.
 - (2) Independent of discipline, some individuals may, due to market considerations, command salaries in excess of those permitted by the UC salary scales for a given rank and step. Review of recommendations for off-scale salaries in such cases will be based on the comprehensive documentation provided in those individual cases.
- b. Retention

An advisor may receive an offer of a position with a higher salary at a comparable institution. To retain the advisor, it may be necessary to adjust the individual's salary through the off-scale salary mechanism. Documentation of the competing offer and its terms must be provided along with the recommendation from the county director to retain the advisor.

620-12 Policy for off-scale salaries based on other factors

There may be cases when off-scales are needed to compensate for added responsibilities in cases not covered by standard administrative stipends, or to provide appropriate flexibility in circumstances not specified above, in which there is compelling reason to do so. In such cases, a temporary off-scale increment may be approved by the associate vice president. A recommendation for a temporary offscale is initiated by the regional director, who consults with the county director and then forwards the recommendation to the associate vice president. If approved, the off-scale increment shall be in effect for a specified period of time which coincides with the added responsibilities or other factors needed mitigation.

620-18 Review of off-scale salaries

- a. Policy

An off-scale increment is limited to appointees continuing in the academic series they occupied when the off-scale salary was approved. All off-scale salaries other than those governed by Section ANR 620-12 are granted and continued as long as the recipient continues to make normal advancement. Recipients of an off-scale salary are expected to meet or exceed the standards for normal academic advancement.

b. Review mechanism

Continuation of an off-scale salary is contingent upon normal academic progress. Should an individual with an off-scale salary increment defer a merit review for one year at any time, or be denied a regularly scheduled merit, the off-scale salary increment shall be reduced by 25% on the subsequent July 1. At the time of a second, consecutive deferral or denial of a merit review, the off-scale salary shall be reduced an additional 25% from the initial amount on the subsequent July 1. A third, consecutive deferral or denial shall result in a review and recommendation by the SAC regarding regularization of the remaining off-scale increment.

c. Off-scale salary limitations

University policy dictates that normally no off-scale salary may exceed 10% above the on-scale salary of an academic appointee in the same series at the highest rank and step. In cases of individuals at senior ranks with large off-scale increments, this limitation may result in restriction of the salary growth that normally results from merit increases. Where appropriate and fully justified on the basis of the academic record, such individuals may be put forward for advancement to Above-Scale.

d. Exceptions

In the event that a new salary scale is approved, individuals with off-scale salaries prior to the adoption of the new scale will receive a total salary equal to: (a) the salary associated with their rank and step on the new scale or (b) their original off-scale salary, whichever is larger. The off-scale increment is then redefined as the difference between their total salary and that on the new scale.

620-24 Authority

Authority to approve and to set off-scale salaries rests with the vice president.

620-80 Procedures

- a. Base salary and the off-scale increment shall be recorded and reported separately in the Payroll System of each academic appointee with an off-scale salary.
- b. Both annually and in each individual pay period, the base salary and the off-scale increment will be displayed separately wherever income and deductions are itemized.
- c. Range adjustment of academic salaries shall also be applied to the off-scale increment. Based on rank and step, the percentage of increase will be applied to the off-scale increment as it is applied to the base salary, rounded to the nearest \$100.
- d. Dossiers submitted in support of a personnel action should contain no reference whatever to an off-scale salary. No "+" notation shall be added to the rank/step designation for individuals with off-scale salaries during merit or promotion reviews. Correspondence regarding off-scale salaries will be kept separate and apart from the academic review process, except as noted under Sections ANR-620-6-b and 620-18-b.
- e. The vice president will provide the SAC with an annual summary of approved off-scale salaries.

- f. ANR will keep the Office of the President informed on division coding and reporting practices so as to facilitate and ensure accurate corporate reporting.

Appendix 3 Career Equity Review Subcommittee:

CAREER EQUITY REVIEW

APM - xxx
DRAFT
9/7/06

xxx-0 Policy

- a. A career equity review (CER) is a review that is designed to examine those rare cases in which the cumulative effects of normal personnel actions, from the initial hiring onward, may have resulted in an inappropriate rank and step. The goal of a CER is to assess the candidate's overall record in order to determine the appropriate rank/step placement that is commensurate with his or her record of research, teaching, professional activity, and service. The purpose of a CER is to recalibrate rank and step, not salary. The review consists of an assessment of the candidate's overall record, not just the accomplishments during the normal review period, using the University's established criteria for the requested rank and step.

xxx-A Eligible Titles

- a. Titles with which off-scale salaries may be used:
 - (1) Associate Specialist in Cooperative Extension.
 - (2) Specialist in Cooperative Extension, Steps I-VIII
 - (3) Associate Cooperative Extension Advisor
 - (4) Cooperative Extension Advisor, Steps I-VIII
- b. Once a Career Equity Review occurs, two positive advancement reviews must be completed before another CER may be requested. Exceptions to this policy will be considered on a case by case basis by the Associate Vice President before the review is initiated. If the time period since last promotion is less than or equal to 5 years, a Career Review file will include materials since the previous promotion or appointment, whichever occurred first. In all cases, a complete bibliography will be included in the file.

xxx-B Requesting a Career Equity Review

- a. For CE Advisors and Associate CE Advisors, the CER is initiated by the candidate's written request in the county and follows the procedures for promotion, complete with extramural letters. A Career Review solicitation letter must be used for all extramural evaluators. The candidate needs to specify a rank and step for which he/she wishes to be considered. The written request for a CER must provide justification for such a review. Possible justification may include, but is not limited to, the following:
 - 1) The cumulative record warrants a reclassification, even though no one review period did
 - 2) The rank/step was inappropriately low at the time of initial hiring
 - 3) Work and contributions have been overlooked or undervalued by the county and/or other reviewing agencies.
- b. Alternatively, the CE Advisor or Associate CE Advisor candidate may (upon written request to his or her Regional Director) elect to have his/her Career Review file initiated and prepared at the appropriate Regional Director's office. The Regional

Director's office assembles the file, including letters requested from extramural evaluators. The RD consults with the County Director and the candidate for the names of potential reviewers and may also solicit additional reviewers. Upon completion of the file (after the RD has met with the candidate to review the contents of the file), the RD forwards the file to the County Director for review. Thereafter, the file is handled by the normal procedures for promotion.

- c. The career equity review process for CE Advisors is the same as used for promotion.
- d. The process for CER of Specialists and Associate Specialists in Cooperative Extension must follow a similar path used for CER of AES I&R faculty used by his or her campus, modified for the merit and promotion process established in each AES college for CE academics.
- e. The CER must be initiated by the candidate. County Directors, Regional Directors, Department Chairs, Deans, and SAC may identify an individual who should be considered for a CER, but the candidate must make the request.

xxx-C **Evaluation**

- a. For CE Advisors, there should be an automatic evaluation for a career equity review at a promotion step.
- b. One or more specific areas of the candidate's record must be identified that are believed not to have been previously evaluated properly, or the area(s) of the record that indicate that the candidate was not hired at a rank and step commensurate with his or her accomplishments. The Program Review process will consider the justification provided plus the overall record of extension, research, extension, and creative activities, university and public service, professional competence, and affirmative action.
- c. If the time period since last promotion is less than or equal to 5 years, a CER file or Program Review will include materials since the previous promotion or appointment, whichever occurred first. In all cases, a complete bibliography will be included in the file.
- d. There is no option for appeal of the outcome of the Career Review process. Because the CER is essentially an appeal of former actions, the decision regarding the CER will not be subject to reconsideration or appeal.

Appendix 4

Merits and Promotion Subcommittee:

I. Guiding Principles:

- A. UC ANR has long been recognized for international excellence in the development and implementation of an integrated research, design, and delivery system to discover new information and solve problems facing urban, agriculture and natural resource communities.
- B. The criteria for appointment, merit, and promotion in the University of California and ANR must expect, encourage, and recognize excellence in extension, research, professional recognition, and university and public service.
- C. The evaluation process employed for appointment, merit, and promotion in the University of California and ANR must be open and transparent, fair, and sufficiently flexible to reward excellence and creativity in all areas of endeavor.

II. Criteria for promotion, appointment, merit.

A. Standards for Cooperative Extension Advisors

1. Educational Requirement: BS or BA for Cooperative Extension Advisors (APM335-10).
2. General language of performance quality. APM 335-10 specifies that candidates for merit, promotion, or appointment will be judged based on “performance” in four criteria (extension, applied research, professional competence, and university and public service). This language is repeated and expanded in ANR Administrative Handbook Section 300.
3. Term Review. Three successive two year term appointments are applied no matter what appointment level.
4. Peer Evaluations: *Ad hoc* reviews required at promotion, acceleration, appeals, mid-rank reviews, and cycle reviews. Only one individual with subject matter expertise is required. Files also evaluated by County Director, Regional Director, Program Leaders, and Senior Administrative Council.
5. Evidence of Research/ Creative Activity and Impact: The ANR Administrative Handbook states that “Skills in the area of applied research and creative activity should also be demonstrated” for merit advancement at the Assistant Advisor rank. There is only a requirement for program balance at the Associate rank. The requirements listed in the ANR Administrative Handbook for Advisor rank are: “Candidates considered for promotion from the Associate to Full Title rank must have developed an excellent program, incorporating the four advancement criteria and outreach/diversity efforts. Program accomplishments must show excellence in developing and conducting extension educational programs. This should include authorship of peer-reviewed publications and county or statewide publications that are designed for clientele use.” In essence, there is a requirement for incorporation of research or creative activity into a candidates overall program, some evidence of publication in peer-reviewed literature, and client-based publications.

6. Evidence of Extension Activity and Impact. The Program Review document combines the Extension, Research, and Creative Activity into a single section with separate project reports. The format for the single page project report has 9 separate subheadings with some options for inclusion of additional information in appendices.

B. Comparisons with Agronomist Series

1. Educational Requirement: None specifically listed.
2. General language of performance quality. APM 210 states: "*Superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement, is an indispensable qualification for appointment or promotion to tenure positions.* Insistence upon this standards [sic] for holders of the professorship is necessary for maintenance of the quality of the University as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge." Typically, each campus will expand on the details of the expectations in the campus Calls. However, the language is qualitative rather than quantitative and there is sufficient flexibility to account for expectations in different areas of study and different types of creative activity.
3. Term Review. The term appointments exist but are ignored in practice. A formal appraisal is required and described in APM 220.83: Formal appraisals of Assistant Professors shall be made in order to arrive at preliminary assessments of the prospects of candidates for eventual promotion to tenure rank as well as to identify appointees whose records of performance and achievement are below the level of excellence desired for continued membership in the faculty. The general rules of APM - 220-80 apply here...Normally each Assistant Professor shall be appraised well in advance of possible promotion to tenure rank (at least two and one-half years before the anticipated effective date of the promotion). A case of initial appointment from outside the University, with anticipation of promotion within two or three years after appointment, obviously calls for an exception to the general rule. Each Assistant Professor shall be appraised no later than the first half of the appointee's sixth year of service in the University with the title Assistant Professor or with this title in combination with other titles as defined in APM - 133-0-a and 133-0-b.
4. Peer Evaluations: *Ad hoc* reviews required at promotion to Associate Professor and advancement above scale. The *ad hoc* reviews are discretionary at all other steps. All files subject to Departmental review (may or may not have a separate Chair's letter that accompanies but is separate from Department letter), Dean's review, and Committee on Academic Personnel (merit actions may vary by campus with the Dean's evaluation as the terminal step). The Departmental evaluation is critical element in evaluating impact and contributions in specific discipline. The subsequent steps are important for conformity to university standards. Promotion steps are also accompanied by letters from individuals within UC and from outside the university at national and international levels.
5. Evidence of Research/ Creative Activity and Impact: In the area of research, the APM specifies "There should be evidence that the candidate is continuously and effectively engaged in creative activity of high quality and significance." Since

"publications in research and other creative accomplishment should be evaluated, not merely enumerated." (APM 210-1-d-(2)), both the quality of publication outlets and impact of the research in the field are important factors. Peer-reviewed publications or documentation of creative activity in areas where that is the most important outlet is the standard for evidence of creation of new knowledge. Impact is much more subject to qualitative assessment and frequently falls to the Department or Chair to provide an appropriate analysis.

6. Evidence of Extension Activity and Impact. While there is no formal requirement for extension activity, teaching contributions are analogous for the purposes of this analysis. A list of courses taught, class size, and units offered is accompanied by a list of graduate students supervised, undergraduates mentored, and post-doctoral scientists supported. Quality of teaching is assessed through formal student evaluations of classes, peer evaluations from other instructors, and solicited student letters. These forms of evaluation can also contribute to determining impact.

C. Recommendations

1. Educational Requirement: Eliminate specific requirement in APM. Rely on convention of specifying in the job announcement. The trend has moved to a minimum of a MS degree with a Ph.D. degree preferred in many areas.
2. General language of performance quality. Language that mirrors the expectations articulated for professorial series (APM 210) should be developed and used as a preface for Section 315.III of the DANR Administrative Handbook.
3. Term Review. Eliminate the term appointments for individuals appointed at the Associate Advisor and Advisor titles. Adopt a convention that individuals appointed at the Assistant level are subject to dismissal at the end of the first two terms only in extreme circumstances. Implement a formal appraisal process for the Assistant Advisor ranks at year four of service that provides meaningful critical evaluation of performance, guidance, and an appropriate time for correction of identified deficiencies.
4. Peer Evaluations: *Ad hoc* reviews required at promotions and mid-rank reviews (year 4 for Assistant Advisors and advance to Advisor, Step VI). *Ad hoc* committees may be appointed at other reviews as necessary. Only one individual with subject matter expertise should be required, but in an advisory capacity. This process should be maintained as an important contribution to ensuring conformity to ANR standards. Similarly, files should also be evaluated by County Director, Regional Director, Program Leaders, and Senior Administrative Council. However, there should be an additional evaluation step inserted into the process that is to be conducted by a disciplinary or programmatic panel drawn from ANR academics. This panel should be commissioned by AVP in consultation with the appropriate Program Leader with the charge of critically evaluating the contributions and impact of the candidate's performance in the review period within the context of the area of expertise.
5. Evidence of Research/ Creative Activity and Impact: The requirements for design, implementation, and dissemination of research by CE Advisors are subject to passionate debate. Currently, there is no formal requirement for publication of results in peer-reviewed publications until advancement to full title. If this approach

is taken literally, it is a recipe for failure. It is bordering on impossible for an individual to begin to develop the practice of designing conducting, analyzing, and writing studies suitable for peer-reviewed publications at mid-career. If there are commitments on the part of ANR and its county partners to provide the resources, infrastructure, and rewards for generation of new knowledge such that the Advisors are not laboring under an unreasonable set of expectations, then publication of peer-reviewed papers should be expected as evidence of developing, expanding, or established research programs of advisors at all titles. The standard is excellence but level of expected productivity is not uniform across ranks. There are higher expectations of individuals at higher ranks and at higher steps within ranks. Evaluation of contributions of research should be based on quality, significance, and impact rather than enumeration. In the Program Review, a Research and Creative Activities section could be composed of a three or four page narrative (total for this section and not by project) that describes goals, methods, results, and impacts would be accompanied by a list of research and creative activities (collaborators, roles, grant support, number and titles of peer-reviewed papers published, number and titles of other publications, etc. The publications should be sorted by a categorized system, e.g., reviewed scientific, books, technical, popular, etc.).

6. Evidence of Extension Activity and Impact. Research and Creative Activities and Extension Activities should be placed in separate sections of the Program Review. While the two areas are very frequently related, they are sufficiently distinct that they deserve separate evaluations. Emphasis should be on originality, creativity, and impact rather than on activity. For example, a three or four page narrative (total for this section and not by project) that describes goals, methods, roles, and impacts would be accompanied by a list of program activities (numbers of meetings, number of classes, numbers of attendees, etc.). Evaluations at the end of meetings or peer evaluations of extension activities would also be appropriate.

Appendix 5 Subcommittee Report on Definite Term Appointments

PROPOSED POLICY

VIII. DEFINITE APPOINTMENTS

The policy governing definite appointments in CE is intended as a personnel and program management tool; it enables the administrator to evaluate the employee, and it provides flexibility in assessing staffing needs in relation to program priorities. The conditions governing definite appointments are as follows:

1. All appointments to the positions of Assistant CE Advisor, Academic Coordinator, or Academic Administrator series shall be filled by definite appointments, unless an exception is granted by the Associate Vice President to meet extraordinary circumstances and needs that are identified by a Regional Director or other hiring authority.
2. All appointments for the position of Associate CE or CE Advisor shall be indefinite appointments until terminated by retirement, demotion or dismissal.
3. A definite appointment commits a position for a period of time with a specified beginning and ending date.
4. All definite appointments shall be for a four year period and renewable for a two-year period, unless a different term is prescribed by a funding source, funding limitation or policy, or is approved by the Associate Vice President.
5. An incumbent appointed to an indefinite position shall not be converted to definite appointment status when he or she is transferred to a vacant position in another location.
6. The PVA must include a statement that the position will be filled for a specified period of time. It must also state that if the position is renewed, based upon program needs and funding at the end of the specified term, the incumbent's continuance in the position will depend upon a positive performance evaluation, as determined by the Regional Director or other hiring authority.
7. A letter offering an appointment to an individual must contain a description of the terms and conditions of the appointment.
8. Employees with definite appointments are eligible for all rights and privileges enjoyed by academic employees on indefinite status including sick leave, vacation leave, retirement and health benefits, merit increases, range adjustments, and annual performance evaluations by supervisors. Employees with definite appointments are also subject to the terms and conditions of all other applicable sections of this Handbook and of the APM. An employee in a definite appointment position accrues credit toward eligibility to apply for sabbatical leave.

9. If a program is terminated, or if the workforce is reduced, for programmatic or fiscal reasons, employees with definite appointments who are laid off before the end of their term shall be treated in the same way as employees with indefinite appointments in the application of the University's layoff policy for non-Senate academic appointees. They also have access to the grievance procedures covering non-Senate academic appointees.
10. After the first two years, an Advisor shall receive midterm mentoring review. This review should be based on evidence submitted by the incumbent in a program review dossier for the purpose of review and written comment by his or her immediate supervisor, and by a committee of his or her peers, and from their supervisor and Regional Director. Upon completion of four years of service, the Regional Director or other appropriate hiring authority, must conduct an evaluation of his or her performance. The normal merit and promotion process and/or a committee of peers is used to assess the individual's performance.
11. Before an incumbent completes the next two-year appointment, the Regional Director or other appropriate hiring authority must conduct an evaluation of his or her performance. The evaluation should be based on evidence submitted by the incumbent in a program review dossier for the purpose of review and written comment by his or her immediate supervisor, and by a committee of his or her peers. In the case of an individual who is not recommended for continuation in an indefinite status, the responsible Regional Director or other appropriate hiring authority has the authority to notify that individual that his or her appointment will not be continued or converted to an indefinite status appointment. For appointees with more than three years of service, at least four months notice must be given; for appointees with less than three years of service, at least three months notice must be given. Salary may be given in lieu of notice.
12. No individual may serve more than three consecutive periods of appointment, or a total of six years, in definite status. Employees in initial definite appointment positions whose appointments are not to be renewed shall be given notice of their termination date no later than three months prior to the end of the term. In the event that three months notice cannot be given, salary in lieu of notice may be given.

Appendix 6

Orientation & Startup Support Subcommittee Report:

We recommend that:

1. ANR conduct annual orientation workshops for new advisors, either regionally or statewide using a variety of communication mediums. The costs of attending such workshops should be covered centrally by ANR.
2. ANR build and maintain a simple “quick glance” webpage with links to orientation materials.
3. ANR continue to provide periodic, although probably not annual, orientation conferences of the kind held from 4/25-26/06 in Sacramento, emphasizing opportunities for collaboration between AES Scientists, Specialists, and Advisors.
4. ANR establish a budget for funding startup needs in excess of the standard \$10,000 provided to all new Advisors, in recognition of the wide range of infrastructure and support situations into which new advisors are being hired, and the differences in the cost of initiating a program for Advisors with different disciplinary orientations. Requests for funding from this budget will be jointly approved by the hiring County Director and appropriate Program Leader.
5. ANR establish a budget for funding special professional development activities for new Advisors in addition to standard \$1000/year available to them. Requests for funding from this budget will be jointly approved by the hiring County Director and appropriate Program Leader.
6. The Executive Associate Deans from the colleges at UCB, UCD, and UCR host campus visits for new advisors to introduce them to AES Scientists and Specialists that might be potential resources or collaborators for them. The costs of attending such workshops will be covered jointly by ANR and the campuses.
7. ANR establish mentoring committees for new Advisors including at least one AES Scientist, one Specialist, and one Advisor. The membership of the committee will not be limited to individuals who have the same disciplinary orientation as the new Advisor, but will be knowledgeable with regard to ANR programs in that field. Mentoring committees will meet with the Advisor annually during their first several years of employment, at least in teleconference format, to provide feedback on the advisor’s proposed program of work.
8. Mentoring committees for new Advisors will help organize visits during the first several years of employment to introduce them to potential resources or collaborators at RECs, state and federal agencies, ANR administrative support units (e.g., Communications), etc.

Appendix 7 Retention Policy Subcommittee:

UC ANR Retention for CE Advisor positions

Statement of Intent

Retention efforts are appropriate when ANR feels a particular CE advisor has demonstrated outstanding achievement and their exit would result in a void that would disrupt programs and be difficult to fill. Retention efforts are specific to individuals and the tools available will be applied as appropriate to particular retention situations.

Draft Retention Guidelines:

Retention efforts can be initiated after a written job offer.

- Increase in salary using the Off-scale policy. Off-scale salary increase would generally be made to match or compete with documented job offers that include a salary above the candidate's current salary, or to retain advisor because of market conditions. These off-scale salary increases will be maintained as long as there is normal merit and promotion progress.
- Restructure or change position including title and duties as warranted by new assignment. Reassignment into unfilled positions may be considered following standard personnel and recruitment policies.
- Faculty recruitment allowance could be used when an advisor is offered a position (transfer) to another location within the State.
- Program support could be used as appropriate for labor, equipment, or other needs to promote retention.
- The POP program could be considered for retention. The vicinity of most county offices to a UC campus makes it difficult to implement this program for on-campus jobs so other models should be explored. County offices could build relationships with CSU, Community Colleges, federal agencies, and county and city governments (reciprocal arrangements or ANR paying for transition period).
- Family friendly policies are important for retention efforts as they may keep people from looking outside the system.
- Career Equity Reviews could be used to keep advisors in the system by adjusting their salary to levels that accurately represent their body of work.
- Better retirement information available to individuals about their own retirement and a dollar value placed on "time" in the retirement system.
- Promotion increment (decoupled salary) would make mid rank and senior rank salaries more competitive and will help with overall retention of advisors.