



Department of Agricultural and Resource Management Agents

Strategic Plan

Presented to

**Dr. Larry S. Katz
Director of Extension**

From

**Daniel Kluchinski, Chair
and
Department Faculty and Staff**

January 4, 2013

(Revised May 1, 2013)

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Methodology	5
Discussion and Recommendations	7
Regional Collaboration.....	7
Program Types	8
Programmatic Areas	11
Staffing Options	13
Identification and Prioritization of Programs and Personnel Needs	14
Ranking of Personnel Needs.....	18
Budgetary Considerations	19
Faculty and Staff Hiring Protocol.....	20
Engagement and Support	22
Next Steps	23
Appendices	24
Appendix 1. Brainstorming Notes on Future Staffing Models, September 14, 2011	24
Appendix 2. Notes from December 2011- January 2012 Conference Calls	26
Appendix 3. Status of Department and Planning Activities Presentation, April 4, 2012.....	32
Appendix 4. ARMA <i>ad hoc</i> Staffing Committee Report, April 2012	36
Appendix 5. New Jersey Commodity Values (\$), 2010	41
Appendix 6. RCE Agriculture and Resource Management Related Programmatic Working Groups, September 2012	42
Appendix 7. ARMA Program Areas and Staffing with Percent Effort, September 2012.....	46
Appendix 8. ARMA Personnel with Expertise and Position Type, as of January 1, 2013	47
Appendix 9. Extension Specialists with Expertise and Department as of January 1, 2013....	51
Appendix 10. Ranking of ARMA Identified Personnel Needs, March 2013	54
Appendix 11. ARMA County Agent Hiring Protocol, 1987	56
Appendix 12: ARMA Departmental By Laws, Revised 2007	57

Introduction

All universities engage in research and teaching, but the nation's more than 100 land-grant colleges and universities have a third critical mission -- extension. "Extension" means "reaching out," by land-grant institutions to "extend" their resources, solving public needs through non-formal, non-credit programs. Cooperative Extension outreach and research in agriculture, horticulture and natural resource management has a long history across the United States and in New Jersey.

Cooperative Extension programs are largely administered through county and regional extension offices, which bring land-grant expertise to the most local of levels. County Agents, staff and related county-based personnel have served a broad range of clientele for nearly 100 years.

Today, the Department of Agricultural and Resource Management Agents (ARMA) of Rutgers Cooperative Extension (RCE) serves the residents of New Jersey through the development and dissemination of research-based information. Broadly defined, our programs assist commercial businesses, governmental agencies, and residents through personal or group requests for assistance, information and consultation on issues related to agriculture, the environment, and natural resources management. Our goal is to teach people new skills and information so they can make better informed decisions and changes in themselves, their businesses, and personal lives.

Through assessment of needs and advice from our clientele, programmatic teams and working groups develop educational and research programs on relevant issues that provide assistance and skills development. Our work is a collaborative effort with Extension Specialists, university based subject matter experts. Funding comes from enabling legislation and agreements with Federal, State and County sources.

Financial support from the state of New Jersey and Federal government to the New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station (NJAES) has undergone dramatic declines over the past decade. County government funding has fluctuated in many locales; the lack of stability in some cases has made longer term planning difficult while underfunding of Rutgers personnel salaries have required the use of federal and state funds to cover shortfalls. These facts have exerted pressure on administration to use financial resources more efficiently and strategically. As a result, over recent years, the number of ARMA faculty and staff positions supporting these efforts has declined while our mission areas have broadened to meet changing needs and audiences.

NJAES and Rutgers Cooperative Extension must plan for a future in which traditional funding sources may continue to be unstable, where programmatic efforts may need to be amended, where a broad array of clientele needs are still addressed, and where historical staffing numbers and position types may change. In addition, this situation has increased the need for collaboration with new internal and external personnel and organizers, and funders and granting agencies.

Simultaneously, it is critical that RCE's Department of Agricultural and Resource Management Agents continue to support the agricultural complex in its broadest sense and production agriculture in particular. Increased regulation and complexity of various industries – agriculture and horticulture, aquaculture and fisheries, forestry and natural resources management – have increased the need for NJAES research and extension programs to help solve problems and offer skills and solutions to our clientele. However, this does not mean that the proportion of the NJAES resources dedicated to production agriculture can or will remain at the same level as it was in the past. Indeed, New Jersey is not the same. Increasing numbers of non-commercial audiences – homeowners and residents, local and county government officials, and others – require our assistance on issues related to pest and vector control, home gardening and community agriculture, and the environment. How that balance is achieved must be determined.

In September 2011, Director of Extension Larry Katz officially charged the Rutgers' Department of Agricultural and Resource Management Agents (ARMA) to develop a comprehensive strategic plan that focused on the prioritization of programmatic areas and staffing for the next five years in our ever changing fiscal, legislative and social environment.

This document prioritizes the Department's agricultural and resource management programming priorities and hiring needs in the near future. Contained within are recommendations that address multiple factors that must be addressed in order to sustain and build programmatic efforts and personnel to conduct them. These factors include an affirmation of how we are internally structured, a clear delineation of programmatic areas and program types to focus our efforts on, a determination of expected outcomes that measure our success, the hiring of new high priority personnel with input from clientele, the efficient and thoughtful use of resources, and the individual and collective engagement of ARMA and other RCE personnel needed to make it happen.

Methodology

Department Chairman Daniel Kluchinski constructed and supervised a consensus-based process to gather internal information and opinions, published data on industry trends, and strategies used by Cooperative Extension administration at sister institutions that would help to meet Director Katz's charge.

Kluchinski convened two face-to-face meetings of department personnel on September 14 and December 6, 2011. These preliminary discussions included an informal SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) analysis, and breakout sessions regarding future programmatic area foci and issues related to future staffing (Appendix 1).

To follow up on these discussions, four conference calls were held December 14, 16 and 20, 2011, and January 6, 2012, to gather additional thoughts from the departmental faculty and staff. The conversations focused on 3 ideas – staffing models and regionalization, programmatic focus areas and marketing, and base vs. local need and "emerging issue" programs (Appendix 2).

Chairman Kluchinski met with Director Katz on February 6, 2012 to provide an overview of the process and some of the findings.

On April 4, 2012, Kluchinski presented a summary of historical information and results of the process to date to the ARMA Department and Director Katz. The presentation included staffing losses and gains over the past 5+ years, and a projection of potential retirements within the next five years. In addition, a base county staffing model and thematic programmatic areas were discussed (Appendix 3).

In April 2012, an *ad hoc* committee was named to assist with gathering additional information on staffing by current programmatic areas/working groups, and recommendations for future staffing in programmatic areas of increasing and decreasing importance. The final report (Appendix 4) included information on agricultural commodity values (Appendix 5), current RCE Working Groups and members (Appendix 6), and current ARMA programming areas and personnel with a retirement projection (Appendix 7). An informal presentation and discussion of findings was made to the Department on May 1, 2012.

Katz and Kluchinski met in April 2012 with Dr. Michael Westendorf, who serves as the Extension Specialists Liaison, to review specialist assignments. A separate effort by the Director's office was outlined to conduct this assessment. Kluchinski compiled an inventory of all current ARMA faculty and staff and their expertise (Appendix 8). The existing range of current subject matter expertise of Extension Specialists was also compiled (Appendix 9).

A meeting with junior ARMA faculty was held on June 5, 2012 to solicit additional input and afford an opportunity to share their thoughts and concerns.

During summer 2012, Chairman Kluchinski held several informal conversations with Agricultural and Natural Resource Program Leaders in the Northeast US and elsewhere to gather information and input on their staffing plans, programmatic foci, and tactics they have used to plan for their organization's future under tightening financial constraints. This information was used in the analysis of ARMA's situation and in the formulation of recommendations.

Information related to marketing and branding of ARMA and RCE programmatic focus areas was reviewed and used to develop recommendations. This work was completed by an *ad hoc* ARMA Banner Programs Committee in 2008.

The Department members and Director Katz were provided in mid-August 2012 a draft strategic plan document for their review. They were encouraged to comment and respond to the plan using an archived forum feature via Rutgers Sakai. The ARMA Department Council met on September 5, 2012 to discuss the plan draft as did the entire membership at the ARMA Fall Department Meeting on September 20, 2012. There was agreement on the conceptual ideas and recommendations outlined in the plan. However, additional work was needed to compile detailed information on programs and programmatic teams. To that end, the comment period was extended to September 30, 2012 to increase participation and engagement. Discussion among working group and functional teams was encouraged.

In mid-November 2012, the Department members were provided a mechanism to report the outcome of their two months of conversation. The web based questionnaire allowed individuals and working groups to provide:

- identify current programmatic efforts
- indicate the programmatic focus and the type of program (base, local need or emerging issue)
- discuss programmatic objectives and evaluation methods to measure impact
- an assessment of current personnel involved in the program
- an assessment our current strengths and weaknesses that must be addressed through training, staffing, collaboration, and,
- a determination of needed financial resources and support, and ideas for obtaining this support.

On December 12, 2012 the summation of the input was presented by Chair Kluchinski, and program prioritization and hiring priorities were determined and agreed upon by consensus. In early 2013, the plan draft was shared with Director Katz and cross-referenced with reports from the State Board of Agriculture and the NJAES Board of Managers on hiring priorities.

In mid-March 2013, ARMA Department personnel were asked via on-line survey to rank ARMA positions and Extension Specialist positions previously rated as high priority hires. These data were presented to the department and RCE Administration in early April 2013 (Appendix 10). The Department adopted the plan by majority vote on May 1, 2013.

Discussion and Recommendations

Significant changes in future federal, state and county funding are influencing Rutgers Cooperative Extension's and Department of Agricultural and Resource Management Agents' ability to conduct business following historic and current staffing and operational models. If current funding trends continue, reductions in future staffing will impact the breath of programmatic areas offered by Rutgers Cooperative Extension. To that end, the following recommendations are presented to systematically plan for future program focus and implementation, and decisions on staffing patterns, staff types, and programmatic leadership regardless of overall decreased or increased funding.

Regional Collaboration

Many Department personnel have historically worked in single counties while lending support to regional and statewide efforts. In addition, some have worked in multiple counties as area or regional agents, or in statewide roles, both formally and informally. While this has been effective in meeting the needs of clientele, it has not provided any clear, uniform designations for internal planning and implementation of programs. In addition, county funders are typically parochial in their utilization of funds, but have expressed increased interest in potential regionalization or sharing of services. Current personnel work in a hodgepodge of overlapping geographical areas with no clear and meditated distinction to aid in developing and implementing a strategic plan.

It is recommended that the state should be divided into 5 regions (Table 1). These internal regional designations will help us to delineate composite funding sources and levels, staffing types and numbers, programmatic activity and planning, and geographical delivery. These regions are delineated based on numerous factors discussed during this planning process including agricultural output/productivity, non-agricultural land use, environmental and natural resource management issues, and audience types and numbers. For example, 70% of agriculture production comes from counties in the southern two-thirds of the state. This provides a basis for dividing counties north of Mercer-Monmouth from those located to the south. Then, in northern NJ, many factors related to the urban/suburban counties near New York City create unique conditions from the counties west of Passaic-Union.

This should not be interpreted as a physical reassignment of personnel; rather this forms an internal regional construct to be used for ARMA educational program or research planning purposes. It also allows for communication among personnel across programmatic areas to enhance knowledge and information sharing, and potential collaboration within and across programmatic areas.

The five regions are:

Table 1. Regional Designations for Enhanced Internal Communication and Collaboration.	
Region	Counties
Northeast	Bergen Passaic Essex Hudson Union
Northwest	Sussex Warren Morris Hunterdon
Central	Somerset Mercer Middlesex Monmouth
Southwest	Burlington Camden Gloucester Salem Cumberland
Southeast	Ocean Atlantic Cape May

Personnel working within a region are expected minimally to conduct joint annual planning exercises to determine programmatic foci, efforts (field research, demonstrations, educational sessions, evaluative research, etc.) and funding opportunities (county, grant, gifts, etc.). There is an expectation that common objectives and methods to evaluate impact of these activities will be developed. A significant level of activity should occur within the region(s) in which individual personnel are assigned. County-hired program assistants should be included in these discussions and planning activities.

County-based, departmental personnel will then work with colleagues within the Department and with other RCE departments and Extension Specialists, working groups (See Appendices 6, 7, 8 and 9), and other external entities to develop outreach and research programs within one or more regions, or statewide.

Recommendation 1: ARMA will adopt a regional model for internal communication and planning to facilitate program development, personnel activities, staffing, funding, etc.

Program Types

Planning discussions led to the designation of three programs types that ARMA (and perhaps all of RCE's related agricultural and natural resource management

programming) should use to organize and prioritize future efforts. These designations provide the opportunity to make internal determinations about what we do (and don't do), what is offered to our diverse clientele, how the programs should be organized and funded, what staffing is needed to maintain or develop new functional teams, and how we market our activities to clientele and decision makers.

The program types include base programs, local issues programs, and emerging issues programs; defined as:

1. Base Programs

- Our core programs that address the most significant needs of our clientele.
- Developed around thematic or subject matter topics of statewide importance, with clear objectives delineated, such as:
 - increased use of Integrated Pest Management practices
 - enhanced farm profits through agritourism activities
 - greater adoption of sustainable food production practices
- Included are “mandated” regulatory programs such as agricultural water certifications, pesticide education, etc.
- Offered across the state in every region and if able, every county. Regional variations are possible based on differences in audience, needs, etc. For example, pesticide education in the northeast region might focus more on Pest Control Operators, while in others regions it may focus primarily on commercial agricultural operators.
- Funding comes for state and federal funding, or significant grants.
- Objectives and anticipated outcomes must be developed and evaluated to provide timely outcomes and document impact and return on investment.
- Staffing includes faculty (tenure track and non-tenure track) and salaried staff. Temporary support staff may be hired based on funding.

In addition, we must consider the various mandated services (regulation determined) and “good-will” service functions that we provide. We must determine how to more efficiently conduct these efforts, or if we have adequate resources to continue to do them at all.

2. Local Needs Programs

- Developed around local unique issues, conditions or needs
- These are issues that we identify, or that are of interest to county clientele or decision makers.
- Focused on thematic or subject matter topics, such as:
 - improved Barnegat Bay water quality
 - increasing understanding of Highlands regulations
 - reducing losses in cranberry production due to disease occurrence
- Offered in a single county or multiple counties, regionally or multi-regionally.
- Funding comes from county funding, grants and/or other local support dollars. State or federal funding may also be used.

- Objectives and anticipated outcomes must be developed and evaluated to provide timely outcomes and document impact and return on investment.
- Staffing includes faculty (tenure track and non-tenure track) and salaried staff, with focus on county-hired staff. Temporary support staff may be hired based on funding.

Local needs can be determined by the regional team and by local county personnel. By addressing local needs, these programs offer greater potential for local county funding, grants in aid, etc. These programs will afford the greatest opportunities for use of local volunteers, advisory groups, etc. as partners in delivering these programs.

3. Emerging Issue Programs

- Developed around new and emerging issues
- Based on input of clientele, academic assessment, funding opportunities, etc.
- Focused on thematic or subject matter topics, such as:
 - documenting the spread of the invasive aquatic weed Water Chestnut
 - enhancing volunteer efforts on hunger relief efforts
 - developing certified nutrient management plans to increase compliance with new regulations
- Offered in counties, region or statewide based on the extent of the issue, local need, etc.
- Funding comes from county funding, but grants and/or other local support dollars most likely will be the basis of support.
- An emerging issue may require an effort over 1-3+ years, but once completed the program ends, or may be adopted as a local needs or base program if funding is available.
- Objectives and anticipated outcomes must be developed and evaluated to provide timely outcomes and document impact and return on investment.
- Staffing includes faculty (tenure track and non-tenure track) and salaried staff to direct and implement. Temporary support staff may be hired based on funding.

All three program types afford faculty and staff the opportunity to use their expertise to conduct research and extension education efforts. New or enhanced statewide base, local needs and emerging issue programs may afford the greatest success for recognized individual scholarship, external funding, and collaboration with peers from Extension Specialists, SEBS research and teaching faculty, and other RCE departments.

Future planning efforts must build on agricultural industry information provided in Appendix 4 and 5. In addition, for program planning and development, US Census data and other sources must be consulted to determine societal, environmental, social and financial trends that affect New Jersey's residents and our traditional or new clientele. The allocation of resources for identified priority program, regardless of type, must be based on clientele need. ARMA believes it is important to recognize three types of

clientele: 1) those clientele who are making a living and gaining income and benefit from our expertise; 2) those clientele who are not making a living from, but benefit from our expertise, and; 3) future audiences which could benefit from extension programming.

Recommendation 2: All ARMA conducted activities and projects related to specific subject matter, issue or commodity programmatic areas will be catalogued as base, local need or emerging issue programs.

Programmatic Areas

Rutgers Cooperative Extension's Department of Agricultural and Resource Management Agents must define the overall programmatic or thematic areas under which our efforts are focused. This allows us to bundle what do under broad, overarching programmatic focus areas. Programmatic areas should also be a basis for delineating future ARMA efforts that broadly focus on topics related to economics, health and environment.

The proposed programmatic focus areas for ARMA, based on work of an *ad hoc* departmental committee, include:

- **Growing the Garden State**
 - Base, local or emerging issue programs will fall under this programmatic area and includes current and future efforts related to the economic sustainability of the broadly defined agricultural industry. For example:
 - Integrated Pest Management
 - Agriculture in the Middle
 - Organic agriculture
 - Beginning and new farmer
 - Risk Management
- **Horticulture for the Health of it**
 - Base, local or emerging issue programs will fall under this programmatic area and includes current and future efforts that relate to the horticultural industry, and needs of residential clientele, land management professional or decision makers, etc. For example:
 - For healthy individuals, including:
 - Home horticulture
 - Master Gardener Program
 - Horticulture therapy
 - For healthy communities, including:
 - Community and urban gardening
 - Rain gardens
 - Home pest control
 - For a healthy environment, including:
 - Home and school IPM

- Water quality
- Invasive species
- **Conserving and Sustaining Our Natural Resources**
 - These base, local or emerging issue programs will fall under this programmatic area and includes current and future efforts that relate to the environmental sustainability of resources under agriculture, land and forestry management, etc. For example:
 - Water quality and quantity
 - Storm water management
 - Environmental Stewards Program

These defined programmatic areas allow us to better articulate how our individual and collective efforts tie into larger programmatic focus areas. They also allow us to better market what our organization does to decision makers and clientele.

Recommendation 3: ARMA will utilize the three Programmatic Areas to thematically identify our programs and related activities, and to publically market our efforts and accomplishments. Over the next year, these areas must be further developed through an iterative process that includes:

- a summation of current efforts,
- an aligning of programmatic objectives and methods to measure impact,
- a coordination of efforts to build stronger teams,
- an assessment of current personnel and their subject matter expertise, and
- an assessment our current strengths and weaknesses that must be addressed through training, staffing, collaboration, etc.

Existing and new working groups may serve as the mechanism for these discussions. However, a full assessment of all working group and their participants must also be first conducted (based on preliminary information in Appendix 6, 7, 8 and 9). Working groups can best identify statewide and regional programs, and help to develop or reaffirm programmatic objectives and methodologies (research, outreach).

There however must also be serious discussion about important clientele needs that are not being addressed effectively or at all by RCE or ARMA. For instance, if agricultural productivity is the primary basis for our programming and staffing, why do we not have significant programs in top valued commodity sectors such as nursery production, greenhouse or field crops (See Appendix 5)? We must consider these types of issues and expand our thinking beyond the current level of programming and staffing we have. To be considered are what programs or activities we can cease to free up resources for other important programming needs.

Recommendation 4: Effort must be made to think strategically about important social, economic, environmental and agricultural issues that we do not have capacity to be engaged in, but should be. Guidance from RCE Administration and clientele is necessary to make these determinations.

Staffing Options

Current staffing in the Department is listed in Appendix 8 and reflects the personnel hired by Rutgers or County governments as of January 1, 2013. Future hiring may include Rutgers tenure track or non-tenure track faculty, hired salaried or hourly employees, or county hired staff as outlined below in Table 2.

Table 2. Rutgers University Staffing Options			
PERSONNEL	RUHR CLASSIFICATIONS	HIRING AUTHORITY	FUNDING SOURCE
ARMA Department Members			
County Agents (tenure track faculty)	Class 1	Rutgers	Federal, state, county
County Agent (non-tenure track faculty)	Class 1	Rutgers	Federal, state, county or grants
Program Coordinators	Class 1	Rutgers	Federal, state, county
Program Associates	Class 1	Rutgers	Federal, state, county
Non-ARMA Department Members (administrative reports only)			
Temporary Employee	Class 3	Rutgers	Grants, contracts, sundry
Temporary Employee (Casual and Seasonal)	Class 4	Rutgers	Grants, contracts, sundry
Program Assistants	NA	County	County, grants, contracts

Funding will be one factor to consider. More permanent sources of funding will be used to hire faculty or salaried permanent staff. Staffing however should be purposeful and match future needs to support programming rather than filling a vacancy because it has occurred or maintaining subject matter focus based on the previous employee's expertise, location, etc. This includes a determination of personnel numbers, type of positions, and a base staffing goal based on the type of programs being conducted.

Recommendation 5: To that end, the ARMA Department recommends a future staffing plan for county based personnel:

- The ARMA base staffing minimum will be one tenure track agent per county (21 total), or more if justified.
- Additional agent hiring will be based on funding and programmatic support.
- Senior level staff and non-tenure track faculty are necessary, especially when a programmatic focus area requires adequate staffing and additional leadership or expertise.
- County-hired Program Assistants will focus on base programs, such as Rutgers Master Gardeners Program, home/consumer horticulture and related topics under the supervision of Rutgers personnel.
- Programmatic teams should ideally include one or more Extension Specialists, one or more agent, and one or more staff members.

- Programs consisting of one faculty or staff member are discouraged as they are typically unsustainable.

Identification and Prioritization of Programs and Personnel Needs

The ARMA Department personnel were solicited in November-December 2012 via an internal questionnaire to identify current and future programmatic areas and new hires needed to support and expand programming. A prioritization (rating of high, medium and low) of programs and personnel needs identified was conducted via a consensus process on December 10, 2012; results are presented in Tables 3 through 5. Each table provides a complete list of all programs and personnel needs listed under the three ARMA Programmatic Areas sorted by Program Type (base, local needs or emerging) rated.

In Table 3, the prioritizations of program and personnel needs for the “Growing the Garden State” programmatic area are presented. In total, 12 base programs, 1 local needs program, and 2 emerging issues programs were identified. Of these 15 programs, 11 were rated as high priority. In addition, a total of 38 positions to be hired were identified and 21 were rated as high priority. Seven of the identified positions were also on the NJAES Board of Managers’ list of preferred positions.

Table 3. “Growing the Garden State” Program and Personnel Needs Prioritization				
BASE PROGRAMS				
Program Name	ARMA Priority	ARMA Identified Personnel Needs	ARMA Priority	Hiring Priority Rank
Agritourism	High	(1) Faculty - Specialist in financial management and risk management	High	
		(1) Faculty or staff (?) - Farm safety	Medium	
Tree Fruit Production and IPM	Medium	(1) Faculty - County Agricultural Agent - fruit and wine grape	High	
		(1) Faculty or staff (?) - Peach Fruit Evaluator/Statistician	Low	
		<i>See Specialist in Irrigation under Vegetable Production</i>		
		<i>See Specialist in Soil fertility/nutrition under Vegetable Production</i>		
Field and Forage Crop	High	(2) Staff - Program Associates - one north, one south	High	
		(1) Faculty - Specialist in Entomology	High	
		(1) Faculty - Specialist in Weed Science	Medium	
		(1) Faculty - Specialist in Field and Forage Crops	High	
Nursery Management and IPM	High	(1) Faculty - Specialist in Nursery/Nutrient Management	High	BOM list

		(1) Faculty - Specialist - Nursery Entomologist/Invasive species	High	BOM list
		(1) Faculty - County Agricultural Agent - landscape management	Medium	
		(1) Faculty - County Agricultural Agent - commercial nursery issues	High	
Landscape IPM	High	(2) Staff - Class 4	Low	
Shellfish Aquaculture Support and Development	High	(1) Faculty - Specialist in Shellfish Aquaculture	High	BOM list
		(1) Faculty - County Agent in Fisheries	High	
Vegetable Production	High	(1) Faculty - Specialist in Vegetable Entomology	High	BOM list
		(1) Faculty - Specialist in Vegetable Culture (northern NJ)	High	BOM list
		(1) Faculty - Specialist in Cropping Systems (irrigation management)	High	BOM list
		(1) Faculty - Specialist in soil fertility, nutrient management and soil health	High	BOM list
		(1) Faculty - Specialist in Post-harvest topics	Medium	
Animal Science and Value Added Marketing	High	(3) Faculty - County Agricultural Agent (north, central and south regions)	High	
		(3) Staff - Program associates (north, central and south regions)	Medium	
		(1) Faculty - Specialist in Animal Science	Medium	
Greenhouse and Nursery IPM	Medium	(1) Faculty - County Agricultural Agent	High	
Small Fruit Production	Medium	(1) Faculty - Specialist in Small Fruit	Medium	
		(1) Faculty - Specialist in Enology	Medium	
Wildlife damage control in the home landscape	High	(1) Faculty - Specialist in Wildlife Management/Damage	High	
Food Safety	High	(1) Staff - Program Associate or Program Assistant	High	
LOCAL NEEDS PROGRAM				
Program Name	ARMA Priority	ARMA Identified Personnel Need	ARMA Priority	NJAES Board of Managers
"Pineland Ag" - Blueberry and Cranberry, including blueberry IPM	High	(1) Staff - 0.2 FTE program associate for blueberry IPM	Low	
EMERGING ISSUES				
Program Name	ARMA Priority	ARMA Identified Personnel Need	ARMA Priority	NJAES Board of Managers
"Ag-in-the-Middle"	High	(1) Faculty - County Agent or Staff - business management	High	
		(1) Staff - support	High	

Bioenergy	Medium	(1) Faculty - Specialist in Bioenergy	Low	
-----------	--------	---------------------------------------	-----	--

In Table 4, the prioritizations of program and personnel needs for “Horticulture for the Health of It” programmatic area are presented. In total, 1 base program, 1 local needs program, and 2 emerging issues programs were identified. Of these 4 programs, 3 were rated as high priority. In addition, a total of 8 positions to be hired were identified and 2 were rated as high priority. Of the identified positions, two were on the NJAES Board of Managers’ list of preferred positions.

Table 4. “Horticulture for the Health of it” Program and Personnel Needs Prioritization				
BASE PROGRAMS				
Program Name	ARMA Priority	ARMA Identified Personnel Need	ARMA Priority	NJAES Board of Managers
Master Gardener / Consumer Horticulture	High	(1) Staff - Program Coordinator - statewide	High	
		(3) Staff - Program Assistants in Hudson, Salem and Warren Counties	Medium	
LOCAL NEEDS PROGRAMS				
Program Name	ARMA Priority	ARMA Identified Personnel Need	ARMA Priority	NJAES Board of Managers
Horticultural Therapy	High	(1) Staff - Class 4 - seasonal (March-October)	Low	
EMERGING ISSUE PROGRAMS				
Program Name	ARMA Priority	ARMA Identified Personnel Need	ARMA Priority	NJAES Board of Managers
Urban Agriculture and Community Gardening, School Gardens	High	(1) Faculty - Specialist in Vegetable Entomology	High	BOM list
		(1) Faculty - Specialist in Vegetable Crops	Medium	BOM list
		(1) Faculty - Specialist in Small Fruit	Medium	
School IPM	Medium	None		

In Table 5, the prioritizations of program and personnel needs for the “Conserving and Sustaining Our Natural Resources” programmatic area are presented. In total, 6 base programs, 0 local needs, and 1 emerging issues program were identified. Of these 4 programs, 3 were rated as high priority. In addition, a total of 3 positions to be hired were identified and 1 was rated as a high priority. None of the identified positions were on the NJAES Board of Managers’ list of preferred positions.

Table 5. “Conserving and Sustaining our Natural Resources” Program and Personnel Needs Prioritization				
BASE PROGRAMS				

Program Name	ARMA Priority	ARMA Identified Personnel Need	ARMA Priority	NJAES Board of Managers
Rutgers Environmental Stewards	High	(1) Staff - Program Coordinator	Low	
Coastal Water Quality	High	(1) Faculty - Environmental Agent - water quality, natural resource management, general agriculture	High	
Stormwater Management	High	(?) Staff - Program Associates	Low	
Water Conservation	Medium	(1) Staff - Program Coordinator	Low	
Sustainable Residential Landscapes	Medium	None		
Watershed Plan Implementation and Local Water Pollution Prevention	High	None		
LOCAL NEEDS PROGRAMS				
Program Name	ARMA Priority	ARMA Identified Personnel Need	ARMA Priority	NJAES Board of Managers
None		None		
EMERGING ISSUE PROGRAMS				
Program Name	ARMA Priority	ARMA Identified Personnel Need	ARMA Priority	NJAES Board of Managers
Invasive Species (land, aquatic, etc.)	High	None		

In addition, the following support staff hires were identified and prioritized (Table 6). These positions have the potential to cut across programmatic and departmental lines to provide support and enhance outreach. Although they were rated as low priority, they are potential important future hires to be considered by RCE Administration.

Program / Services Area	ARMA Identified Personnel Need	ARMA Priority
Master Gardeners & Bioenergy Development	(1) Staff - Program Associate (?) for on-line education	Low
	(1) Staff - Videographer to digitize existing curriculum and create educational modules for on-line instruction	Low
Safe Practices for Urban Gardening	(1) Staff - Spanish language professional for bi-lingual programming	Medium
Field and Forage Crop	(1) Staff - Social media/web/video	NR
Ag Communications	(1) Staff - Communications, web development, web design, IT infrastructure	NR
Extension & Research for Commercial Fruit Growers	(1) Staff - Grants management	NR
	(1) Staff - Grant writer	NR
On-Line Ag Education and Outreach	(1) Staff - Program evaluation	NR
		NR = not rated

Ranking of Personnel Needs

In March, 2013, an on-line survey was distributed to ARMA personnel to determine a ranking of the high priority positions identified above to provide a ranking of ARMA personnel and Extension Specialist hiring priorities. These outcomes are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Ranking of Priority ARMA and Extension Specialist Personnel Needs	
County Agricultural and Resource Management Agents and Staff (ARMA) Positions	
1	Nursery Management and IPM - (1) County Agricultural Agent - commercial nursery issues
2	Greenhouse and Nursery IPM - (1) County Agricultural Agent
3	Tree Fruit Production and IPM - (1) County Agricultural Agent - tree fruit and wine grapes
4	"Ag-in-the-Middle" - (1) County Agricultural Agent or Staff - business management
5	Master Gardener / Consumer Horticulture - (1) Staff - Program Coordinator - statewide
6	Food Safety - (1) Staff - Program Associate or Program Assistant
7	Field and Forage Crops - (1 or more) Staff - Program Associates
8	Coastal Water Quality - (1) County Environmental Agent - water quality, agriculture and natural resource management
9	Shellfish Aquaculture Support and Development - (1) County Agent in Fisheries
10	Animal Science and Value Added Marketing - (1 or more) County Agricultural Agent
11	"Ag-in-the-Middle" - (1) Staff - general support
Extension Specialists Positions	
1	Nursery Management and IPM - Specialist in Nursery/Nutrient Management
2	Nursery Management and IPM - Specialist - Nursery Entomologist/Invasive species
3	Vegetable Production - Specialist in Vegetable Entomology
4	Field and Forage Crops - Specialist in Field and Forage Crops
5	Vegetable Production - Specialist in Cropping Systems (irrigation management)
6	Vegetable Production - Specialist in Soil Fertility, Nutrient Management and Soil Health
7	Vegetable Production - Specialist in Vegetable Culture (northern NJ)
8	Agritourism - Specialist in Financial Management and Risk Management
9	Field and Forage Crops - Specialist in Entomology
10	Shellfish Aquaculture Support and Development - Specialist in Shellfish Aquaculture
11	Wildlife Damage Control (home landscape) - Specialist in Wildlife Management/Damage
12	Urban Agriculture and Community Gardening, School Gardens - Specialist in Vegetable Entomology
*BOM = Position listed by Rutgers NJAES Board of Managers as a priority hire position	

Recommendation 6: The priority ranking of personnel needs will be utilized by Chair Kluchinski, in consultation with Director Katz, to move forward with future departmental

hires. The Department encourages the use of this information that mirrors that of the Rutgers NJAES Board of Managers, to plan for future Extension Specialist hiring.

Budgetary Considerations

Budgetary projections will serve as a significant determining factor in the number and type of hiring within the ARMA Department in the near future. This includes a determination of the continued financial support by county government for cost-shared positions, and what we need to do in order to secure those resources to sustain and enhance existing programs, and build new programs.

The allocation of available state and federal funds will be the purview of the Director and Executive Dean. In addition, the availability of county funds for hiring and maintaining current staff, and operating expenses is crucial; without it little hiring will occur. Current funding attitudes must be assessed in order to plan for future growth or maintenance of the personnel needed to implement base, local needs and emerging issue programs. This includes an assessment of counties that are unlikely to provide funds for hiring within the next few years. An inventory of county funding assessments will be necessary, and must serve as a basis for establishing hiring plans in the short and long term based on completed programmatic plans.

As previously indicated, a minimum base staffing plan of a minimum of one county agent per county (21 agents) is preferred by the Department, with additional staffing by Rutgers and county hired personnel, and soft-dollar funded staff when resources are available. Overall a minimum of 30 FTEs should be maintained within the department by Rutgers-hired personnel. Extension Specialist support will be necessary to provide additional expertise and effort to programs.

Recommendation 7: RCE administration must work with County Extension Department Heads (CEDH) to determine the availability of funds to support new hires that are identified and prioritized based on the process outlined in the recommendation under the “Programmatic Areas” section of this document.

In addition to traditional federal, state and county funding, other sources of revenue are necessary to allow for current personnel and future hires. The Department strongly supports, regardless of audience, some discussion of user fees. Fees for specific services or educational sessions should be determined, and the collected profits centralized once local expenses are recovered. This historic lack of systematic fee determination and collection precludes the opportunity for asset accumulation that can be utilized to support future programmatic efforts.

Recommendation 8: The Department encourages a conversation with NJAES Administration about the establishment of user fees and a mechanism for fee collection, accounting, distribution, etc. The RCE Revenue Enhancement Task Force Report on revenue generation (<http://njaes.rutgers.edu/revenue/>) should be consulted and viable options implemented to enhance financial resource generation, management and use.

Additional fiscal resources must be secured via grants, contracts, agreements and donations. A determination of fiscal expectations is required from the Director of Extension in order for a business plan to be developed.

Recommendation 9: An ARMA focused business plan must be developed, but greater input and information from the Director of Extension and other NJAES Administration is necessary.

Faculty and Staff Hiring Protocol

As new departmental hires are approved, the following procedures should be followed:

Faculty: The hiring protocol for faculty positions within the ARMA Departmental was codified in a June 1987 document (See Appendix 11) and the ARMA Departmental Bylaws (See Appendix 12) under Article V-Committees. Specifically, they state the following procedure and process to be followed:

1. Develop a position description (Line Authorization and Recruitment Form or LARF)
 - Meet with local advisory groups
 - Meet with ARMA personnel from surrounding counties and county with vacancy
 - Discuss with relevant specialists
2. Review search procedure with Affirmative Action Committee
3. Publicize position according to University standards and suggestions of Affirmative Action Committee
4. Department Chair selects a search committee, the composition of which includes:
 - Department Chairman
 - Member of Affirmative Action Committee
 - Other department members for county where search is being conducted (if applicable)
 - Faculty member from relevant subject matter area
 - Members from Advisory Committee (usually County Board of Agriculture)
 - CEDH if not included above
5. Candidate screening by subcommittee of Search Committee.
6. Search committee conducts interviews at vacancy site, seminars open to public are presented.
7. Search committee recommends candidate to Director of Extension and Executive Dean of SEBS.
8. Dean offers position to candidate.

In addition, as per Bylaws Article II – Membership, the Department is to be consulted on all new appointments and reassignments:

“All faculty members of the Department regardless of rank will be consulted on all new appointments to the Department. Such consultation does not substitute for the requirement that the tenured faculty members at or above the rank of the individual nominated for appointment formally act on the recommendation for appointment. The Department Chairperson shall provide information to all Department members on candidates seeking reassignment in the Department from another academic unit. The Department Chairperson shall then request input from all Department members in an effort to advise the Dean and/or Director prior to the decision to reassign that faculty member from another academic unit to membership in the Department.”

Recommendation 10: The Department expects that the process to determine faculty hiring needs and determine duties in consultation with clientele advisory groups be followed in order to comply with historic hiring protocols and current departmental bylaws.

Staff: The hiring of Class 1 staff (Program Coordinators and Program Associates) has historically followed a less involved process than outlined above for faculty. While the ARMA Departmental Bylaws outline the makeup of a search committee (see below), the overall planning and assessment of clientele or programmatic need has been more of an administrative process than department driven process.

“2. Staff Searches: It shall be the duty of the staff search committee to prepare a position description for approval by the Department Chair, advertise the position, facilitate search committee meetings, evaluate and correspond with applicants, and recommend to the Department Chairperson a candidate for the vacant position. The search committee should consist of an uneven number of people (3 or 5). The immediate supervisor of the position will chair this search committee and, with the approval of the Department Chairperson, select faculty or staff in relevant subject matter areas to serve as search committee members. A representative of the RCE Affirmative Action Committee must attend the initial meeting of the search committee.”

As the nature of staffing patterns change, and the potential for a greater percentage of staff and non-tenure track faculty occurs, a process to engage the department and clientele in establishing priorities will be necessary.

Recommendation 11: The ARMA Department will develop a protocol that provides greater input from the department members and clientele on the “front end” of hiring Class 1 staff and non-tenure track faculty positions. The purpose will enhance the optimal use of resources to build stronger programmatic efforts of the department. Full and part-time county-hired personnel are essential and important members of our programmatic teams. When possible or necessary, we will look toward local county-funded hires to serve as program assistants who forward our local programming. This has been historically true in our home horticulture programming and Master Gardener

Program, and should continue over time. This will require continued financial support from county governments.

Recommendation 12: In addition, Rutgers-hired Class 4 employees, both seasonal and casual, will serve as viable staffing options for individual faculty and senior-level staff when funding is available through grants or other sources.

Engagement and Support

ARMA staffing needs are directly correlated with the presence of functional programmatic teams led by engaged and proactive subject matter experts, Extension Specialists; this role may be filled by County Agents or senior staff. While some programs can and are currently being run without specialist leadership (due to vacancy or lack of engagement), ideally a compliment of personnel serving in a statewide authority with collaboration in regions and counties is essential.

ARMA however does not stand alone. RCE must focus on programs more so than departments. It is essential that future planning include not only an assessment of ARMA but also Extension Specialists and other Extension personnel with subject matter expertise or interest. They all are potential and desired participants on effective teams that must focus their collective efforts on identifying issues and developing solutions through research and education.

Recommendation 13: An assessment must be conducted of the current specialists, their extension appointments, and their level of proactive work and meaningful engagement with agents and staff. In addition, meaningful engagement must be defined to include what are the expectations of Extension Specialists with major and minor appointments.

Rutgers NJAES does not necessarily have all the skills and peoplepower to handle expected yet unknown changes. Assistance with program development, implementation and assessment are necessary; this includes some plan for providing expertise (contractual?) on program design, evaluation, statistics, etc. Additional training of existing personnel, leave times to study and develop new skills or knowledge, and cross-training to broaden team capability and maintain and stimulate professional interests should be considered. RCE must keep its workforce up-to-speed and skilled to do their jobs more effectively and efficiently.

Recommendation 14: Rutgers Cooperative Extension must enhance and support efforts to increase volunteer management skills, and to help personnel “re-tool and re-school” themselves to enhance engagement in new, emerging or changing program areas.

Recommendation 15: There must be an administrative expectation that all personnel will be engaged in the process of identifying program focus areas, developing measurable objectives and outcomes, and developing ongoing and future collaborative

efforts. We also recommend a commitment by RCE Administration to provide support in order to make the outcomes of this strategic plan successful. Despite tight economic times, fiscal support such as operating funds or internal competitive grants should be a priority.

Next Steps

This strategic plan is a living document. It proposes a set of interrelated mechanisms and recommendations for program identification and prioritization, future staffing patterns, and procedures that help us to define and build capacity to meet the needs of our clientele. Over time, the following next steps will be pursued:

- Implement the internal model of regional collaboration to facilitate communication, programmatic development, planning, etc. beyond county borders.
- Determine objectives, anticipated outcomes, evaluation methods, and plans of work for programmatic areas. Working groups will be center for these activities. In addition, programmatic teams will:
 - Identify non-ARMA personnel (specialists, extension and academic departments, outsiders) who can join in collaborative efforts.
 - Identify team needs (money, support, personnel and partners) for each programmatic area.
 - Determine traditional and non-traditional sources of funding.
- Administration will provide support funding (when available) to priority programmatic areas.
- The Chair will work with the Director to conduct a continued assessment of county financial support for hiring, as well as other partnerships with non-governmental agencies and other funders.
- Chair will pursue the hiring of priority positions as identified, and share ARMA hiring recommendations with appropriate decision makers regarding Extension Specialists.
- The Department and Chair will evaluate type of hires (TT faculty, NTT faculty, RU staff, county staff) based on source of funds and need (short term or longer term issue) for the identified programmatic areas.

Appendices

Appendix 1. Brainstorming Notes on Future Staffing Models, September 14, 2011

The basis for this discussion was the proposed base minimum staffing plan of 1 tenure track agent per county. Is this the best model? Does agricultural based economy (our historic staffing model) current define staffing needs?

Breakout Group 1

Input from stakeholders is needed – practicing clientele groups, such as Boards of Agriculture

Changes in demographics in production agriculture as well as other non-agricultural sectors

Use of internet, etc. allows broader outreach but expertise is necessary (training) as well as support staff working in the field to assist with content creation, development.

Need the technical expertise of specialists to find answers

Regionalization is tough when county fiscal support is based on what is being done with allocated resources.

How do we decide what gets priority – production ag, non-production ag, residential clientele needs, how is that facilitated?

There needs to be better collaboration between the teaching, research and extension missions, and mutual support and engagement is necessary. However, teaching by extension personnel is only a one-way collaboration.

Staffing pattern – 1 production agricultural agent per county, and other staffing for related resource management/ natural resources needs.

Need expertise and support for grant writing – already provided via SEBS Grant Facilitation Office.

Breakout Group 2

Key factors are money and people

We need to develop revenue generating mechanism that are centralized and that generate funds for programmatic work.

Team Formation – Regional Approach includes Specialists in the field offices, 2 agents per county but perhaps unrealistic, 1 agent per county and regional agents on secondary crops, environmental resource areas, supported with Program Associates or other county-hired staff.

Need on-line and other training of personnel AND volunteers. We do not adequately invest in professional development and training, and provide resources for people to better do their job.

NJ trends – commercial landscape, commodity vs. niche crops, land management, Agritourism, consumer horticulture, energy, water

Breakout Group 3

Have to focus on clientele groups – how do we define?

Field and forage

Food production – fruit, vegetables, aquaculture

Food safety

Ornamental horticulture

Homeowners

Urban agriculture

Environmental quality – who is the clientele? What responsibility does RCE have relative to other agencies?

How do we staff given limitations?

Regionalization – works as is

How does Specialization fit in – at what point does this become a luxury? DK – not sure what they mean here – generalists are better? Worried we go the WV model of agent does it all – ineffective!

Need to focus on public relations in “influential” areas

Need a model to rank and balance importance within a region.

Appendix 2. Notes from December 2011- January 2012 Conference Calls

NOTE: Some comments have been redacted to protect confidential, personal opinions made by participants

Conference Calls Details and Attendance

- **December 14, 2011 Conference Call, 1:00 to 2:30 PM**
Attendance: Dan Kluchinski, Bill Bamka, Michelle Infante-Casella, Dean Polk, Bill Sciarappa, Dave Schmitt, Ray Samulis and Jim Johnson
- **December 16, 2011 Conference Call, 1:00 to 2:30 PM**
Attendance: Sal Mangiafico, Madeline Flahive DiNardo, Wes Kline, Meredith Melendez, Dave Lee, Dave Schmitt, Mary Cummings, Steve Komar, Dan Kluchinski, Bill Hlubik, Michelle Infante Casella and Jack Rabin
- **December 20, 2011 Conference Call, 1:00 to 2:50 PM**
Attendance: Dan Kluchinski, Nick Polanin, Bruce Barbour, Bob Mickel, Gef Flimlin, Joel Flagler, Steve Komar, Rick VanVranken and Dean Polk
- **January 6, 2012 Conference Call, 1:00 to 2:30 PM**
Attendance: Dan Kluchinski, Pat Rector, Sal Mangiafico, Mike Haberland, Michele Bakacs, Amy Rowe and Cara Muscio

Conference Call Notes

The following 3 ideas served as the basis for the discussion. Note that the input for each idea is summarized across all conference calls.

IDEA A: Revision of “historic” staffing model in which Rutgers faculty agents and staff hires were based on agricultural productivity of the counties. A three tier system was followed for many years (2 agents in high production counties, 1 agent + 1 program associate in medium production counties, and 1 agent in low production counties).

However, currently, the ARMA hired staffing patterns are (based on “home office” of personnel):

- Counties with 2 agents and 2 Rutgers-hired Program Associate/Coordinator – Atlantic, Gloucester
- Counties with 2 agents and 1 Rutgers-hired Program Associate/Coordinator – Hunterdon
- Counties with 2 agents - Burlington, Cumberland, Middlesex, Morris, Ocean, Salem, Somerset
- Counties with 1 agent and 1 Rutgers-hired Program Associate/Coordinator - Essex, Sussex
- Counties with 1 agent only – Bergen, Camden, Cape May, Union, Warren, Monmouth

- Counties with Rutgers-hired staff (Program Associate or Program Coordinator) – Mercer
- County with no Rutgers-hired faculty or staff – Passaic, Hudson

NOTE this does NOT include county-hired program assistants, etc. ONLY RCE full time (Type 1) hires.

- How do we maintain/expand this relative to funding?
- How do we define “agriculture” – just production ag? Is that still appropriate?
- How do we expand “non-production ag” programmatic areas, such as home horticulture, horticultural therapy, environmental issues, etc. and related activities?

How do we define regionalization?

- Regionalization (area agent) – RU subject matter based?
- Team of people who work on subject matter issues in a “region” or state
- Set counties = a region with personnel who only work within those counties

Issues with county funding?

December 14, 2011 Conference Call

- [REDACTED] - Natural Resources, Equine, Production Ag = formula to calculate this
- [REDACTED] - Need to change our programs beyond production ag, but that has been our traditional sources of funds
- [REDACTED] – we need to discuss beyond terms of clientele. Who are the clientele and what are their concerns?
- [REDACTED] – how do we allocate our programming based on clientele?
- [REDACTED] – factor in duplication of resources, such as by SCDs, watersheds association
- [REDACTED] – not a fair distribution of ERMA’s in the county.
- [REDACTED] - We need to maintain unique services. [REDACTED] asked what we are doing now that we should not be doing. Variety trials – industry does not focus their resources to us. If this is important what do we give up? [REDACTED] – with [REDACTED] retirement there will be no one to do that.
- [REDACTED] – what is our interaction with specialists and researchers? We need to stress our need for them to be engaged.

- Discussion of non-tenure track faculty at Dept. meeting?

December 16, 2011 Conference Call

- [REDACTED] – does the legislation require us do certain programs? Ag vs. non-ag.
- [REDACTED] – production ag needs to be our main focus
- [REDACTED] – Our strongest supporters is the ag community. [REDACTED] – is that due to our focus on them therefore their support is greatest?

- [REDACTED] – local counties support their work, no matter where they go and what they do as long as they are serving their counties. Others disagreed.
- [REDACTED] – stress the idea of “shared services” to sell the idea of regional work.
- [REDACTED] – pilot a “shared services” model in a pair or trio of services. [REDACTED] – need to have better figures that can show the county what dollar value there is of the support that comes to the county (agents, specialists, etc.)
- [REDACTED] stressed that this may NOT work – counties will require greater accounting for what their agent/money is being used.
- [REDACTED] – non-traditional ag programming – we have broadened our programs to include this and this is good and a good thing. But we should not give up our traditional support and programs.
- [REDACTED] – use the traditional model with others... get other groups to support us based on our programs of depth.
- [REDACTED] – other rural states use less of their dollars for ag production programming than we do. In New Jersey other agencies provide these services (rural development, family services, etc.).

[REDACTED]

December 20, 2011 Conference Call

[REDACTED]

- [REDACTED] – licensed pesticide applicators could be a justification. How about MGs? Don't get stuck exclusively on one model.
- [REDACTED] – need to develop a summary for resources (ag, forestry, etc.) in order to help us make decisions.
- [REDACTED] – ag was our clientele since they were engaged with us, provided support, and had deep historic roots. We need to gather support. We can just have people with needs but they need to cultivated and appreciate us.
- [REDACTED] – we can train our clientele to advocate for us.
- [REDACTED] – we need to better define ourselves – broader is better.
- [REDACTED] – what is unique about what we do? On other calls it was said that this was commercial agriculture.
- [REDACTED] – mission focused on land management – agriculture, landscape, etc.
- [REDACTED] – people management related to ag and horticulture is done too
- [REDACTED] n – JOE article about internet and extension. We need to meet our audiences in new and different ways.
- [REDACTED] – aquaculture is agriculture, commercial fishing is 3rd top receipts in NJ. What are we going to do to meet these needs?

January 6, 2012 Conference Call

- [REDACTED] – ag is the primary audience that should be served when considering staffing. Is there a perception that ag is the focus and everyone else is second

class? [REDACTED] stated production agriculture links to so many other needs including resource management.

- [REDACTED] – staff are committed. Not sure what the balance should be but they are essential to our organization. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] An agent is necessary in each county; provides expertise and stability. However staff can run and coordinate programs. Program should dictate staffing numbers, not the other way around...
- [REDACTED] – how do we justify need? Not always easy to do. Do we survey the public as to what their needs are -> what our priorities are?
- [REDACTED] asked where we draw the line. How do we determine what we do and don't do with the number of personnel we have?

IDEA B: Programmatic or “banner programs”. This is based on an ARMA *ad hoc* committee's (2007-2008) findings to determine marketing plans. In their report, the committee came up with 3 overall programmatic areas that would be used for “public relations” and planning. Under each, smaller teams would be established or continued to address these areas:

- **GROWING THE GARDEN STATE:** _____ insert various commodities to suit, for example, aquaculture, ornamentals, equine industry, ag economics, biofuels, sports turf, field crops, etc.
- **HORTICULTURE FOR THE HEALTH OF IT**
 - For individuals – including home horticulture, Master Gardeners, horticulture therapy, etc.
 - For communities – gardening, rain gardens, school IPM, etc.
 - For the environment – IPM, water quality, rain gardens, etc.
- **STRIKING THE BALANCE WITH NATURAL RESOURCES** including air, water, soil, wildlife, people, land use, etc.
 - Includes

December 14, 2011 Conference Call

- [REDACTED] – these really are the base programs that are discussed in Idea C
- [REDACTED] – this is more of a way to “sell” what we do.

December 16, 2011 Conference Call

- [REDACTED] – we need to do this by naming teams that are functioning and articulating clearly what they are.
- [REDACTED] – doesn't understand it.
- [REDACTED] – we don't have to use this syntax but he likes the ideas for marketing.

December 20, 2011 Conference Call

- [REDACTED] – marketing and promotional piece

- [REDACTED] – sometimes we need to hit people between the eyes – be clear in common sense way. This is one way we can focus on our works in communities.
- [REDACTED] – can use these thematic programs for self-assessment – are our programs cutting it?

IDEA C: Defining Base Programs vs. Local or “Emerging Issue” Programs

Base programs – Determined and offered based on state and federal funding, or perhaps larger continuing grants.

- These programs would be offered across the state to every county. These might include IPM, agritourism, etc.

Local needs or Emerging Issue programs – based on county/grant funds

- These programs would be specifically tailored to a county or region based on county funding and/or grant or other support dollars. These might include topics that relate to local unique issues, conditions or needs.
- An emerging issue may require an effort over 1-3+ years, but once completed the program is finished, and then new emerging issues are focused on. Objectives and anticipated outcomes must be developed and adhered to. Could utilize short term hired staff or NTT faculty to direct and implement under the direction of faculty.

December 14, 2011 Conference Call

- [REDACTED] - Why don't we draw lines anymore? Why don't we determine what we do or don't do anymore? How do funding, staffing, and changing ag dynamics all come into play? Difficult to make decisions. Impact level? Clientele numbers? We could utilize outsiders to help us with emerging issues? They support this idea but don't think it will work because of timeliness of hiring. Not sure that this the way they think it should be done. More worried that if they are going to not have people to work with them anymore... self-focused.
- [REDACTED] – She likes a hybrid of Idea A and C. Define programmatic areas – such as agriculture, Natural resources, Home horticulture, etc. What do we have in current staffing? What resources do we have?
- [REDACTED] - likes this idea of teams, with coordinators that might oversee these activities from county or state offices?
- [REDACTED] – maintaining or expansion of staff most likely will not occur. We have to prioritize and make decisions about what we don't have... We are not in the proper profile (do not match the tiering in Idea A) – already don't have it in line. We need to institutionally or departmentally need to “draw lines” and determine priorities.

December 16, 2011 Conference Call

- [REDACTED] – likes the idea of base and local programs as well as others.
- [REDACTED] – concerns that we shouldn't be chasing the money

- [REDACTED] – RU typical is successful at grants but poor at getting large grants to do so. These build capacity.
- [REDACTED] – historic specialist model – delivery of training to get us up to speed on issues and information. Better report is needed.
- [REDACTED] – Asked if there is interest in allocating resources to a person who would work with you to develop and deliver programs; perhaps a statewide coordinator? This was supported in concept. When asked if one less agent would be hired to do this, the support was less. They prefer someone to support them in getting grant dollars,
- [REDACTED] – need to look for funding from our programs, compete with OCPE, etc.

December 20, 2011 Conference Call

- [REDACTED] – base vs. emerging issue and county based/local programs
- [REDACTED] - Does this model make us more reactive to needs? Do we lead a community in getting things done?
- [REDACTED] – concern about faculty / staff replacement. Agents have taken on specialist roles. [REDACTED] agrees.
- [REDACTED] – best match.
- [REDACTED] – ag agent with a historically supported audience has greater.
- [REDACTED] - Should all new “non-ag” hires be non-tenure track faculty?
- [REDACTED] – need to make an assessment whether or not we hire NTTF or TTF. [REDACTED] – why not senior staff? Do so ONLY for grant funded positions.
- [REDACTED] – have an inventory of counties, etc.
- We need to institutionally or departmentally need to “draw lines” and determine priorities. [REDACTED] indicated clientele/stakeholder input is needed to do this.

January 6, 2012 Conference Call

- [REDACTED] - Concern that grants are difficult from a sustainability standpoint.
- [REDACTED] – option B or C make the most sense for planning and marketing.
- [REDACTED] – strategic plans are important and thank you. What we do and what we don't do is important.

Appendix 3. Status of Department and Planning Activities Presentation, April 4, 2012

The following information was prepared as a PowerPoint™ presentation and presented to the ARMA Department faculty and staff on April 4, 2012

Current ARMA Personnel Numbers & Types

30 Tenured/Tenure Track Agents

- 8 County Agent III (Assistant Professor)
 - Bakacs, Carleo, Haberland, Komar, Mangiafico, Muscio, Rector and Rowe
- 9 County Agent II (Associate Professor)
 - Bamka, Flahive DiNardo, Infante Casella, Kline, Mickel, Nietzsche, Pavlis, Polanin and Sciarappa
- 13 County Agent I (Professor)
 - Barbour, Cowgill, Flagler, Flimlin, Frecon, Hlubik, Johnson, Kluchinski, Lee, Polk, Rabin, Samulis and VanVranken

8 Staff

- 2 Program Coordinators (Grade 5)
 - Melendez and Zientek
- 6 Program Associates (Grade 3 and 4)
 - Atanassov, Bawgus, Cummings, Rettke, Rizio and Schmitt

Current Affiliated Personnel Numbers and Types

13 County-hired “Program Assistants”

- Provide assistance or lead Master Gardener programs, horticultural and agricultural outreach; administrative office support
- Bromley, Carson, Costaris, DeMonte-Bayard, Fogerty, Larson, Magron, McMinn, Pemberton, Schoch, Szkotak and Weidman

Class 4 (part-time) Employees

- 12 to 14 are currently active
- Up to 24 are on our current list of named employees

ARMA Current vs. Recent Changes

Current Staffing

- 30 Tenure Track Agents and 8 Staff

“Recent” Staffing Losses

- 8 Tenured/Track Agents and 1 Staff
 - Chamberlain, Mohr, Obal, Tietjen, Tweed, Perdomo, Probasco and Willmott
 - Oleksak

Recent "Gains"

- 5 Tenured/Track Agents
 - Bakacs, Haberland, Mangiafico, Rector and Rowe

Net Loss

- 3 Agents and 1 Staff

Future Real and "Potential" Changes

Faculty Agents

- 1 Agent Retirement Planned = Frecon
- 1 Agent Position – Unsuccessful Tenure = Muscio
- 6 or more Agents Eligible for Future Retirement = Barbour, Cowgill, Flimlin, Johnson, Mickel, Lee, Samulis

Therefore, 8 or more Agents may be lost. There is potential of a reduction of Agent positions to 22 or more.

Staff

- Staff retirements may also occur. No inventory has been conducted.

Personnel Gains

- Addition of staff (RCE and county-hired), tenure track faculty and non-tenure track faculty
- Non Tenure Track Faculty
 - Rank equivalence in:
 - Salary
 - Academic rights and responsibilities
 - Comparable standards and procedures for appointment and reappointment
 - Guarantees of academic freedom and due process.
 - See Rutgers Policy 60.5.2 for details
 - New University wide policy is under development (note added 8/2012)

Budgets

Federal

- Formula funds (~\$3.5 M) have been "flat" for last four years; potential decrease in FY14
- RCE is ~\$3.5 M of the total
- Surplus monies (\$3 M) nearly spent.

State

- NJAES budget reduced from \$28 M to \$21 M in last four years.
- RCE is ~\$7 M of the total

County

- Budget (salary only) is ~\$6.1 M (down 5% from 2009)

Budgets – Salary Expenditures (2011 data)

Salaries for “agricultural” related personnel within RCE are ~\$12 M

- Ag = agricultural viability (1°), home garden/environment (2°), IPM (3°), water quality (4°), equine (5°), aquaculture (6°), energy (7°) and food safety (8°)
- Sources are Smith Lever, State, County, and Other (grants, contracts, etc.)

Total RCE salary expenditures are ~\$16.6 M

- All of the above, plus childhood and adult obesity and youth development.

Budget – ARMA Personnel Salaries

ARMA faculty salaries total ~\$3.1 M+ (2012 data)

- Average salary for County Agent I ~\$110 K

ARMA staff salaries total ~\$440 K+

- Average salary for staff for ~\$55 K (2012 data)

Therefore, ARMA current total salary costs are \$3.59 M

In future, base salary expenditures will NOT increase!

Background Information – (Feb 2012 data)

<u>University Mid Point Salary</u>	<u>ARMA Mean</u> (rounded for <u>confidentiality</u>)
Class 3 = \$47,649	\$44,000
Class 4 = \$54,797	\$59,000
Class 5 = \$63,016	\$60,000

\$3,049,757 2010 ARMA Faculty Salary totals

+ 3.5% increase with 2012 contract

= \$3,154,757 salary expenditures for 2012

Staffing Models

Historic model, based on agricultural productivity

- 2 agents
- 1 agent + 1 staff
- 1 agent

Substitution model not sustainable

- Replace “like with like” when vacancy occurs

New model based on available financial resources and priority programmatic needs

Proposed Base Staffing Model

A minimum of 1 Tenure Track Agent per county

- 20-21 total Tenure Track Agents
- Must be hired with county, state and/or federal money

Current staff numbers are maintained/increased utilizing available monies from:

- County, state and/or federal money
- Vacated ARMA Agent positions funds
- Grants, contracts, gifts and other “temporary” funding sources

Non Tenure Track Faculty

- To be hired when expertise is necessary, funds are short term?

Increase multiple-county responsibilities

- Smith Lever funds to help pay for travel, expenses?

Formalize with counties

- Seek agreements for multi-county payment toward county share of salary contribution

Future Programmatic Areas

Base Programs

- Core programs
- Based on county need and RCE priorities
- Determine personnel and future needs
- Specify roles and expectations
- Determine what needs to be addressed (objectives)
- Determine what we no longer will be doing

Emerging Issue Programs

- Based on new and emerging issue and funding
- Funding from “short term” sources
- Hire personnel for specific tasks and outcomes

Marketing Our Programs

“Growing” The Garden State

- Insert topic to suit need, e.g. aquaculture, ornamentals, equine, marketing, energy, turfgrass, field crops, etc.

Horticulture for the Health of It

- For individuals – home horticulture, Master Gardeners, horticulture therapy, etc.
- For communities – gardening, rain gardens, school IPM, etc.
- For the environment – IPM, water quality, rain, etc.

Striking the Balance with Natural Resources

- Including air, water, soil, wildlife, people, land use, etc.

Appendix 4. ARMA *ad hoc* Staffing Committee Report, April 2012

The committee met last week on 4/19/12. Present were Dave Lee, Ray Samulis, Bill Hlubik, Rick VanVranken, Joel Flagler, Peter Nitzsche, Bruce Barbour and Dean Polk. We came to consensus on a number of items for developing a plan and filling new hires.

Underlying Principles:

- 1) Agriculture needs to be at the forefront in developing a staffing plan. They are our core component of clientele. (I like Michele's summary so find it attached below- we should use it)
- 2) We are below the minimum personnel needed to provide educational programming for the major commodities as gleaned from the 2010 dollar value of the major NJ commodities. Several areas have no agents at all or just one statewide. Data gleaned from 2007 Ag census also attached.
- 3) Our commitment must be to the tenure track system for agricultural agents.
- 4) At least one faculty tenure track agricultural agent should be located in each county with appropriate natural resource and conservation agents as needed.
- 5) If non-tenure track staff is hired to fill a need they should have the county agent title at the lower non-tenure ranks. This leaves a future path to tenure track in place.
- 6) Our existing needs assessment process should be continued as the process for determining the staffing pattern in a county as to agents, their job description

Needs Assessment Process:

Up until recently we had a very logical and inclusive practice in Extension of convening the agents from neighboring counties to discuss a recent or anticipated vacancy which focused on changes that had occurred since the last person was hired, a current needs assessment, regional needs and future trends. The output from that meeting was then shared at a meeting of stakeholders where a similar needs assessment and discussion took place. From that the department chair would draft and circulate a proposed job description for the new hire. All of this discussion was program driven and it was always a major consideration whether the position had a substantial enough programmatic component to sustain the career of a tenure rack faculty member.

Meanwhile the chair and the director determined what the funding needs were in order to make the position in question eligible to move forward to the hiring process. This was done in the context of the overall strategic plan for extension and the staffing needs of ARMA and the other departments.

If we did not have the funds to fill a position at the current time we waited and worked on it till the cooperating partners could meet all the necessary requirements. Sometimes a position could remain vacant for years, but at least we had defined the need and we had a wish list ready when favorable conditions emerged. Leaving a position vacant without at least doing this much seems like abandoning the position.

Agriculture as our Departments Core Component

Although politically farmers in our state only represent less than 2% of the vote, agriculture in our state impacts everyone and the majority of our residents' value agriculture when they look at the big picture. People value the "buy local" trend and support referendums on farmland preservation. Although other programs may outreach to larger numbers of citizens, we still need to make education and support to commercial agriculture one of our top, if not the top priority in extension. While others value our programs, commercial farmers rely on our information for their way of life and income. This is why our programs in commercial agriculture are so critical to that group of clientele.

Comment- the state is not homogenous, each county or each area has different resources and clientele, each with their own needs. Production ag forms the base of our programming, then comes resource management, then comes everything else (and there is a lot of that).

Other Areas of programmatic need and sources of funding:

- 1) Land Management: Integrating many of our traditional foci such as forestry, deer herd reduction, invasive species, agriculture, water quality, parks, wildlife management areas, watersheds, and groundwater recharge and pest control. And some new ones like climate change adaptation, sustainable energy production and citizen science. Funding sources to be developed to support this in the future would be the county and municipal open space taxes and state green acre and farm preservation funding which will increasingly be used for management as preservation acquisition comes to a close.
- 2) School IPM
- 3) Value to Ag: It's interesting to see that even though the number of farms can go down along with average acreage, the value of what they sell can go up. This reinforces the idea that extension (i.e. our department) helps those farms be successful and adds value to those farms and the NJ economy in general. If we were not helping those growers be successful, then maybe they wouldn't employ so many farmworkers. According to the statistics by county, in 2007, NJ agriculture employed 24,385 hired workers, and paid them \$237,683,000. That would be over \$237 million injected into the NJ economy by farm payrolls that we helped create by helping those growers be successful. I think that at the core of our plan, We Have to Support Production Ag. Everything else radiates out from that.

http://www.agcensus.usda.gov/Publications/2007/Full_Report/Volume_1,_Chapter_2_County_Level/New_Jersey/njv1.pdf

How do NJ Counties Compare in Ag (Table 7 from unpublished *Ag in the Middle* report by Rabin, et al.)

NJ County	Farm Numbers	Change from 2002	Land in Farms (Acres)	Acres Change from 2002	Avg. Farm Size (Acres)	Size Change from 2002	Market Value of Ag Sales (000s)	Total Sales Change from 2002	Avg. Sales per farm	Avg. Sales Change from 2002
Atlantic	499	+9%	30,372	0%	61	-9%	\$128,339	+63%	\$257,193	+49%
Bergen	89	-2%	1,177	-8%	13	-6%	\$8,694	+15%	\$97,685	+18%
Burlington	922	+2%	85,790	-23%	93	-24%	\$86,302	+4%	\$93,603	+2%
Camden	225	+4%	8,760	-15%	39	-18%	\$18,554	+36%	\$82,464	+31%
Cape May	201	+2%	7,976	-21%	40	-22%	\$14,586	+30%	\$72,567	+27%
Cumberland	615	0%	69,489	-2%	113	-2%	\$156,939	+28%	\$255,186	+28%
Essex	13	-13%	184	+20%	14	+39	\$710	-4%	\$54,631	+11%
Gloucester	669	-3%	46,662	-8%	70	-5%	\$93,883	+42%	\$140,333	+47%
Hudson	No farm production data available									
Hunterdon	1,623	+7%	100,027	-8%	62	-15%	\$69,745	+65%	\$42,973	+54%
Mercer	311	+2%	21,730	-13%	70	-15%	\$18,646	+52%	\$59,956	+49%
Middlesex	236	-14%	18,717	-14%	79	0%	\$41,854	+84%	\$177,346	+115%
Monmouth	932	+4%	44,130	-7%	47	-11%	\$105,413	+29%	\$113,104	+24%
Morris	422	+4%	17,028	-1%	40	-5%	\$27,312	-35%	\$64,720	-37%
Ocean	255	+18%	9,833	-20%	39	-32%	\$11,515	+7%	\$45,159	-9%
Passaic	103	+47%	1,981	+30%	19	-12%	\$6,318	+4%	\$61,343	-29%
Salem	759	+1%	96,530	0%	127	0%	\$79,962	+10%	\$105,351	+9%
Somerset	445	+1%	32,721	-10%	74	-10%	\$18,911	+26%	\$42,496	+25%
Sussex	1,060	+3%	65,242	-14%	62	-16%	\$21,242	+44%	\$20,040	+40%
Union	15	-17%	126	-31%	8	-17%	\$2,483	-63%	\$165,549	-56%
Warren	933	+15%	74,975	-4%	80	-16%	\$75,477	+90%	\$80,897	+66%

Atlantic and Cumberland Counties are distinct in average sales per farm > \$250,000. The eight south and central counties have 70% of its ag production value while the 12 northern counties have 30%. Hudson County reports no agriculture.

Aggregate Farm Products Output per Resident per Year among Northeast states.
(Table 5 from unpublished *Ag in the Middle* report by Rabin, et al.)

State	Aggregate Farm Sales per Resident	Population est. 2008 (USA = 304.07 mil)	Population Density per sq. mile est. 2000 (USA = 80)
CT	\$158	3.50 mil	703
DE	\$1,245	0.87 mil	401
ME	\$468	1.32 mil	41
MD	\$326	5.63 mil	542

MA	\$75	6.50 mil	810
NH	\$151	1.32 mil	138
NJ	\$114	8.68 mil	1,135
NY	\$227	19.49 mil	402
PA	\$467	12.45 mil	274
RI	\$63	1.05 mil	1,003
VT	\$1,087	0.62 mil	66
VA	\$374	7.77 mil	179
WV	\$327	1.81 mil	75

First column is a calculated value, not distinguishing food and non-food farm production. In NJ, approximately half of all production is nursery, turf, ornamentals and floriculture. Therefore, NJ presently produces only \$57 in aggregate food output annually per resident.

Data sources: US Census population estimates and 2007 Ag Census to calculate aggregate farm products output per resident per year among Northeast states.

VT and DE surprise us with their high ag sales output per resident and RI, MA, NJ, NH, and CT surprise us with their low output per resident.

NJ population density is extraordinary. Density increases expenses, increases demands for generating higher net farm income. India has about 800 persons per square mile. Lots of business opportunity, but farmer-neighbor-municipal nuisance conflicts, lack of livestock, competing resource conflicts, cost of land and improvements and taxes make it difficult for agriculture. Creates the Impermanence Syndrome even among profitable farms. RI is dense, but not very populous; fewer challenges.

Future Programmatic Foci

The ARMA Department is in the process of identifying key programmatic areas that reflect our major impact areas. We want to look at the current picture, but also project new areas where ARMA personnel could have impact in the future.

Please take a moment and help us assemble a list of new potential programming areas, along with new potential partnerships and new client and stakeholder groups that might be sources of future funding, marketing, as well as new areas for having positive impacts, etc. The attached short list is the start. Please add your ideas to it; keep it as a list with a few clarifying words to describe or show an example. Think big and wide, don't be limited to current budgetary realities or existing program areas. Let's look into the crystal ball and see what opportunities might be coming in the next 5 years:

- School gardens (with curricula, link to food systems, grow-your-own, etc.)
- Special services school districts (horticulture with students who have disabilities)
- Housing authority (gardens, community activity around growing food, beautification)

- Hospital gardens (passive landscapes, active enabling gardens, horticultural therapy) examples seen at Bergen Regional Medical Center, Hackensack University Medical Center, etc.
- Health Departments (municipal/ county: ornamental plantings, clean communities grant)
- Mental Health centers; Horticultural Therapy activities
- On-Farm nutrition education and youth gardening; HealthBarn USA model at Abma Farm
- Dept. Public Works: partnering on planting trees at schools
- Civic groups partnering on gardening projects (e.g. Rotary International)
- Veterans administration: assist veterans with horticulture activity, beautification, vocational training
- Community gardens for towns, diverse groups
- Commercial Agriculture production support for farmers, ag professionals, commodity group and related agencies.
- Pesticide education and support for the “green industry”, public and private pest service providers, and commercial agriculture.
- Marketing and financial education and extension outreach support for commercial agriculture
- Land management – integrating many of our traditional foci such as forestry, deer herd reduction, invasive species, agriculture, water quality, parks, wildlife management areas, watersheds, groundwater recharge and pest control. And some new ones like climate change adaptation, sustainable energy production and citizen science. Funding sources to be developed to support this in the future would be the county and municipal open space taxes and state green acre and farm preservation funding which will increasingly be used for management as preservation acquisition comes to a close.
- Commercial greenhouse crop production (vegetables, ornamentals) in urban brownfields & vacant lots
- Increased shellfish gardening with environmental groups and citizens to promote environmental education and stewardship
- County historic sites—landscape/gardens
- Health Care centers/senior services—landscape/gardens/horticultural therapy
- Cooperating with other county agencies—mosquito (education), recycling, parks.
- Medicinal plants—greenhouse & fieldwork
- Growing nutraceutical plants
- Farm machinery and ag skills
- Survival food production
- Bioenergy crops as alternative fuel
- Farm computer software
- Environmental solutions for the garden state
- International ag on-line; smartroom sessions
- Marketing specialty crops
- Infusing seafood into Community Supported Agriculture, food cooperatives, and other alternative markets

Appendix 5. New Jersey Commodity Values (\$), 2010

RANK	AGRICULTURAL SECTOR	VALUE (\$)
1	Vegetables + Potato	\$250,130,000
2	Nursery/Turf	\$214,870,000
3	Fisheries and Aquaculture	\$178,080,158
4	Greenhouse	\$165,531,000
5	Animal and Animal Products	\$133,069,000
6	Blueberry/Cranberry	\$95,170,000
7	Field Crops - Potato	\$79,153,000
8	Apples/Peaches	\$56,611,000
9	Honey	\$556,000

Source: 2010 New Jersey Annual Statistics Bulletin

Appendix 6. RCE Agriculture and Resource Management Related Programmatic Working Groups, September 2012

The following list of programmatic focused working groups was solicited via an email to ARMA Department personnel in September 2012. **Note that this list may be incomplete in listing all of the current RCE working groups as well as the members of each group.**

Consumer Horticulture/Master Gardening

Richard VanVranken
Mona Bawgus
Dale Reid
Joel Flagler
Brooke McMinn
Ray Samulis
Rebecca Szkotak
Jennifer Matthews
Jenny Carleo
Viola Carson
Jan Zientek
Mary Cummings
Michelle Casella
Rebecca Magron
Win Cowgill
Barbara Bromley
Bill Hlubik
Rich Weidman
Pat Evans
Diane Larson
Pete Nitzsche
Sylvia DeMonte-Bayard
Linda Schoch
Elaine Fogerty
Joe Gyurian
Lisa Chiariello
Madeline Flahive DiNardo
Daniel Kluchinski
Nick Polanin

Fisheries, Aquaculture and Seafood Work Group

Gef Flimlin
Bonnie McCay
Susan Ford
Monica Bricelj
John Kraeuter
John Wiedenmann

Olaf Jensen
Phil Neubauer
Mukund Karwe
Michael DuBois
Rebecca Jordan
Rich Lutz
Steve Carnahan
Tom Grothues
Mike DeLuca
Dave Bushek
Eleanor Bochenek
Josh Kohut
Lisa Calvo

Urban Ag Working Group

Jack Rabin
AJ Both
Pete Nitzsche
Bill Hlubik
Madeline DiNardo
Amy Rowe
Jan Zientek

Organic Land Care Working Group

Michele Bakacs
Bill Hlubik
Amy Rowe
Jan Zientek

Cranberry/Blueberry Working Group

Dean Polk
Gene Rizio
Bill Sciarappa
Peter Oudemans
Cesar Rodriguez
Gary Pavlis
James Polashock (USDA)
Mark Ehlenfeldt (USDA)

Small Fruit Working Group

Gary Pavlis
Jim Polashock
Mark Ehlenfeldt
Dan Ward
Ray Samulis

Peter Nitzsche
Cesar Rodriguez-Saona
Peter Oudemans
Jerry Frecon
Jack Rabin
Nick Vorsa
Dave Schmitt
Brad Majek
Dean Polk
Gene Rizio
Win Cowgill
Bill Sciarappa

Vegetable Working Group

AJ Both
Robin Brumfield
Jenny Carleo
Gerald Ghidiu
Joseph Heckman
Mel Henninger
Bill Hlubik
Kris Holstrom
Wes Kline
Brad Majek
Joe Ingerson-Mahar
Meredith Melendez
Michelle Infante Casella
Peter Nitzsche
Tom Orton
Jack Rabin
Cindy Rovins
Ray Samulis
Bill Sciarappa
Rick VanVranken
Andy Wyenandt

Animal Science Team/Working Group

Michael Westendorf
Steve Komar
Dave Lee
Bill Bamka
Bob Mickel

Water Working Group

Jim Murphy
Mike Haberland

Michele Bakacs
Mary Cummings
Pat Rector
Sal Mangiafico
Chris Obropta
Elaine Rossi
Lisa Galloway Evrard
Madeline DiNardo
Bruce Barbour
Jim Johnson
Bill Sciarappa
Bill Bamka
Allyson Salisbury
Jason Grabosky
Amy Rowe
Dina Fonseca
Don Schaffner
Joe Heckman
Josh Kohut
Caroline McLaughlin – NJ Sea Grant
Heather Saffert – Clean Ocean Action

Nursery Working Group (no longer active as a group)

Jim Lashomb (retired)
Jim Johnson

Tree Fruit Working Group

Dean Polk
Dan Ward
Win Cowgill
Joe Goffreda
Peter Nitzsche,
Brad Majek,
Norm Lalancette
Ann Nielsen
David Schmitt
Atanas Atanassov
Gene Rizio
Jerry Frecon

Appendix 7. ARMA Program Areas and Staffing with Percent Effort, September 2012

Note: The following table includes only ARMA faculty and staff, and therefore does not include county-hired personnel. Department members were asked in September 2012 to self-identify; not all did therefore these data are best estimates by the *ad hoc* Committee. Percent = Major programmatic areas of at least 25%. Highlighting indicates an employee who may or will be eligible to retire within 5 years.

IPM and ICM		Ag Marketing		Pesticide Education		Home Horticulture / Master Gardeners		Natural Resources Management / Environmental Stewards		Ag Business /Risk Management		Landscape Contractors (Lawn and Turf Mgmt.)		Vegetables	
Name	Percent	Name	Percent	Name	Percent	Name	Percent	Name	Percent	Name	Percent	Name	Percent	Name	Percent
Atanassov	100	Carleo		Carleo		Bawgus		Bakacs		Kline		Flagler	25	Nitzsche	
Polanin		Casella		Bamka		Cummings		Barbour	50	Lee		Flahive	25	Carleo	
Polk	90	Komar	25	Casella		DiNardo		Cummings		Rabin				Casella	75
Rettke	100	Melendez		Hlubik	5	Flagler		DiNardo		Samulis				Hlubik	15
Rizio	100	Nitzsche		Kline		Polanin		Haberland		Cowgill	25			Kline	50
Schmitt	100	Rabin		Nitzsche		Zientek		Mangiafico	100	VanVranken	25			Melendez	50
Cowgill	25%	VanVranken	25	Polanin		Flahive	25	Muscio		Melendez	50			Rabin	
Johnson	25	Hlubik	20	Polk	10	Komar	25	Rector						Samulis	
Flagler	25			Samulis				Rowe						Sciarappa	25
				Sciarappa	25			Sciarappa	25					VanVranken	25
				VanVranken	25			Flahive	25						
				Flahive	25			Bamka	25						
				Flagler	50										
Aquaculture / Fisheries		Field and Forage Crops		Greenhouse/Flowers		Livestock / Equine		Nursery		Small Fruit, Grapes and Cranberries		Tree Fruit		Land Management (Invasives, etc.)	
Name	Percent	Name	Percent	Name	Percent	Name	Percent	Name	Percent	Name	Percent	Name	Percent	Name	Percent
Flimlin	100	Bamka	75	Carleo		Komar	25	Johnson	75	Nitzsche		Atanassov		Barbour	
		Kluchinski		Casella	25	Lee		Polanin		Pavlis		Cowgill	50	Rector	
		Komar	25			Mickel				Samulis		Frecon		Polanin	
						Sciarappa	25			Hlubik	5	Rizio			
												Schmitt			

Appendix 8. ARMA Personnel with Expertise and Position Type, as of January 1, 2013

PERSONNEL WITH EXPERTISE BY LOCATION	POSITION TYPE
State Office	
Kluchinski, Daniel, <i>Chair</i>	Faculty
Quinn, Carol, <i>Administrative Assistant</i>	Class 1 Staff
Rabin, Jack, <i>Associate Director, NJAES</i>	Faculty
Atlantic County	
Bawgus, Mona, <i>Program Associate, Agriculture – Home and Consumer Horticulture</i>	Class 1 Staff
Pavlis, Gary, <i>County Agricultural Agent – Viticulture, Small Fruit, Blueberries</i>	Faculty
Rizio, Eugene, <i>Program Associate, Fruit IPM</i>	Class 1 Staff
VanVranken, Richard, <i>CEDH, County Agricultural Agent - Vegetables</i>	Faculty
Bergen County	
Ackerman, Joan, <i>Horticultural Assistant</i>	Class 4 Staff
Flagler, Joel, <i>CEDH, County Agricultural Agent – Commercial Horticulture, Horticultural Therapy</i>	Faculty
Reid, Dail, <i>Horticultural Consultant</i>	Class 4 Staff & County Staff
Burlington County	
Bamka, William, <i>County Agricultural Agent – Field and Forage Crops</i>	Faculty
McGinn, Brooke, <i>County Horticulturist</i>	County Staff
Samulis, Raymond, <i>CEDH, County Agricultural Agent – Vegetables, Blueberries, Cranberries</i>	Faculty
Camden County	
Haberland, Michael, <i>County Environmental and Resource Management Agent – Camden/Burlington</i>	Faculty
Szkotak, Rebecca, <i>Program Assistant –Consumer Horticulture</i>	Class 4 Staff
Cape May County	
Carleo, Jenny, <i>County Agricultural Agent –Commercial Ag. & Horticulture</i>	Faculty
Matthews, Jennifer – <i>Annie’s Project and related grant functions</i>	Class 4 Staff
Cumberland County	

Carson, Viola, <i>Horticultural Consultant</i>	County Hired Staff
Johnson, James, <i>CEDH, County Agricultural Agent – Commercial Horticulture, Nursery</i>	Faculty
Kline, Wesley, <i>County Agricultural Agent- Vegetables</i>	Faculty
Essex County (Roseland Office)	
Rowe, Amy, <i>County Environmental and Resource Management Agent – Essex/Passaic</i>	Faculty
Zientek, Jan, <i>CEDH, Senior Program Coordinator, Rutgers Urban Gardening</i>	Class 1 Staff
Gloucester County	
Cummings, Mary, <i>Program Associate, Home and Commercial Horticulture</i>	Class 1 Staff
Frecon, Jerome, <i>CEDH, County Agricultural Agent – Tree Fruit, Peaches</i>	Faculty
Infante-Casella, Michelle, <i>County Agricultural Agent- Vegetables</i>	Faculty
Lubelski, Deborah	Class 4 Staff
Schmitt, David, <i>Program Associate, Tree Fruit IPM</i>	Class 1 Staff
Hunterdon County	
Atanassov, Atanas, <i>Program Associate, Fruit IPM</i>	Class 1 Staff
Cowgill, Winfred, <i>County Agricultural Agent –Tree Fruit</i>	Faculty
Magron, Rebecca, <i>Horticultural Consultant and Research Associate</i>	County Hired Staff
Mickel, Robert, <i>CEDH, County Agricultural Agent – Livestock</i>	Faculty
Mercer County	
Bromley, Barbara, <i>Horticulturist</i>	County Hired Staff
Melendez, Meredith, <i>Senior Program Coordinator – Agriculture</i>	Class 1 Staff
Middlesex County	
Bakacs, Michele, <i>County Environmental and Resource Management Agent – Middlesex/Union</i>	Faculty
Hlubik, William, <i>CEDH, County Agricultural Agent – Commercial Horticulture</i>	Faculty
Pemberton, Donna, <i>Program Assistant, Agriculture</i>	County Hired Staff
Weidman, Richard, <i>County Program Associate, Commercial Agriculture and Horticulture</i>	County Hired Staff
Baculis, Jessica	Class 4 Staff
Buitrago, Joshua	Class 4 Staff
Richiusa, Carol	Class 4 Staff

Smela, David	Class 4 Staff
Theobald, John	Class 4 Staff
Wolenter, Michael	Class 4 Staff
Monmouth County	
Quinn, Vivian, <i>Program Assistant</i>	County Hired Staff
Sciarappa, William, <i>CEDH, County Agricultural Agent - Vegetables, Small Fruit, Forages</i>	Faculty
Larson, Diane, <i>Home Horticulturist</i>	County Hired Staff
Hulm, Brian	Class 4 Staff
Neyhart, John	Class 4 Staff
Magovern, Robert	Class 4 Staff
McIntyre, Peter	Class 4 Staff
Soldo, Kevin	Class 4 Staff
Morris County	
Demonte-Bayard, Sylvia, <i>Horticulturist</i>	County Hired Staff
Nitzsche, Peter, <i>CEDH, County Agricultural Agent - Vegetables, Small Fruit</i>	Faculty
Rector, Pat, <i>County Environmental and Resource Management Agent – Morris/Somerset</i>	Faculty
Ocean County	
Costaris, Charlene, <i>Horticultural Consultant</i>	County Hired Staff
Flimlin, Gef, <i>CEDH, Marine Extension Agent – Commercial Aquaculture</i>	Faculty
Schoch, Linda, <i>Horticulturist, Master Gardener Coordinator</i>	County Hired Staff
Passaic County	
Fogerty, Elaine, <i>County Agricultural Assistant – Horticulturist</i>	County Hired Staff
Salem County	
Rammel, Harriet “Penny”, <i>Milk Quality Technician</i>	Class 4
Berkowitz, Jasen, <i>Program Assistant, Agriculture-Water Quality</i>	Class 3 Staff
Lee, David, <i>CEDH, County Agricultural Agent – Livestock, Dairy, Risk/Financial Management</i>	Faculty
Marandola, Michael, <i>Program Assistant, Risk Management Program</i>	Class 4
Stanczyk, Chad, <i>Program Assistant, Risk Management Program</i>	Class 3 Staff

Kelly Steimle, <i>Program Assistant, Risk Management Program</i>	Class 3 Staff
Banasiak, Marie	Class 4 Staff
Somerset County	
Gyurian, Joseph, <i>Horticultural Consultant</i>	County Hired Staff
Polanin, Nicholas, <i>County Agricultural Agent - Urban Forestry, Natural Resource, Statewide Coordinator-Master Gardener Program</i>	Faculty
Sussex County	
Komar, Stephen, <i>County Agricultural Agent – Agritourism and Business Development, Commercial Agriculture</i>	Faculty
Lisa Chiariello, <i>MG Program Coordinator</i>	Class 4 Staff
Union County	
Flahive-DiNardo, Madeline, <i>County Agricultural Agent-Commercial Horticulture, Pesticide Training</i>	Faculty
Warren County	
Barbour, Bruce, <i>CEDH, County Agricultural Agent-Horticulture, Statewide Coordinator - Environmental Steward Program</i>	Faculty
Rutgers Marucci Center – Blueberry and Cranberry	
Polk, Dean, <i>IPM Agent, Fruit</i>	Faculty
Elder, Larissa	Class 4 Staff
Rutgers Plant Diagnostic Lab	
Rettke, Steven, <i>Program Associate, IPM – Greenhouse, Nursery & Landscape</i>	Class 1 Staff

Appendix 9. Extension Specialists with Expertise and Department as of January 1, 2013.

NAME	TITLE	DEPARTMENT
Arneson, Keith	Specialist in Meteorology	Environmental Sciences
Bonos, Stacy	Specialist in Plant Breeding & Genetic Improvement	Plant, Bio. & Pathology
Both, Arend-Jan	Specialist in Controlled-Environment Engineering	Environmental Sciences
Brumfield, Robin G.	Specialist in Farm Management	Ag., Food, and Resource Economics (DAFRE)
Byrd-Bredbenner, Carol	Specialist in Nutrition	Nutritional Sciences
Clarke, Bruce	Specialist in Turfgrass Pathology	Plant, Bio. & Pathology
Fagan, Julie	Specialist in Companion Animal Science	Animal Sciences
Fitzgerald, Nurgul	Specialist in Health Promotion and Behavior	Nutritional Sciences
Fonseca, Dina	Specialist in Entomology	Entomology
Franke, Bill	Specialist in Food Science	Food Science
Gaugler, Randy R.	Specialist in Insect Pathology & Biological Control	Entomology
Ghidiu, Gerald M.	Specialist in Vegetable Entomology	Plant, Bio. & Pathology
Goto, Seiko	Specialist in Landscape Architecture	Landscape Architecture
Gottlieb, Paul	Specialist in Land Use Policy	Ag., Food and Resource Economics (DAFRE)
Gould, Ann	Specialist in Ornamental Pathology	Plant, Bio. & Pathology
Govindasamy, Ramu	Specialist in Marketing	Ag., Food and Resource Economics (DAFRE)
Grabosky, Jason	Specialist in Urban Forestry	Ecology, Evolution, and Natural Resources
Hamilton, George C.	Specialist in Pest Management	Entomology/Pest Management
Hart, Stephen	Specialist in Weed Science	Plant, Bio. & Pathology
Heckman, Joseph R.	Specialist in Soil Fertility	Plant, Bio. & Pathology
Helsel, Zane	Specialist in Agricultural Energy	Plant, Bio. & Pathology
Henninger, Melvin R.	Specialist in Vegetable Crops	Plant, Bio. & Pathology
Hoffman, Daniel J.	Specialist in Community Nutrition	Nutritional Sciences
Janes, Harry W.	Specialist in Vegetable Production	Plant, Bio. & Pathology
Jensen, Olaf P.	Specialist in Fisheries Science & Aquatic Ecology	Marine & Coastal Sciences

Kohut, Josh T.	Specialist in Physical Oceanography	Entomology
Koppenhofer, Albrecht	Specialist in Turfgrass Insect Pest Management	Marine & Coastal Sciences
Krogmann, Uta	Specialist in Solid Waste Management	Entomology
Lalancette, Norman	Specialist in Tree Fruit Pathology	Environmental Sciences
Lashomb, James H.	Specialist in Ornamental Pest Management	Plant, Bio. & Pathology
Majek, Bradley A.	Specialist in Weed Science	Entomology
Malinowski, Karyn	Specialist in Equine Science	Plant, Bio. & Pathology
Murphy, James	Specialist in Turf Management	Equine Science Center
Nielson, Ann	Assistant Specialist in Tree Fruit	Entomology
Obropta, Christopher C.	Specialist in Water Resources	Plant, Bio. & Pathology
O'Neill, Barbara M.	Specialist in Financial Resource Management	Environmental Sciences
Orton, Thomas	Specialist in Vegetables	Ag., Food and Resource Economics (DAFRE)
Oudemans, Peter	Specialist in Blueberry and Cranberry Pathology	Rutgers Agricultural Research & Extension Center
Palmer, Debrah	Specialist in Community Nutrition	Plant, Bio. & Pathology
Ralston, Sarah L.	Specialist in Equine Nutrition Science	Nutritional Sciences
Robson, Mark	Specialist in Entomology	Animal Sciences
Rodriguez-Saona, Cesar	Specialist in Blueberry/Cranberry Entomology	Entomology
Schaffner, Donald W.	Specialist in Food Science	Plant, Bio. & Pathology
Schilling, Brian	Specialist in Agricultural Policy	Food Science
Simon, James	Specialist in New-Use Agriculture	Food Policy Institute
Tavernier, Edmund	Specialist in Agricultural Policy	Plant, Bio. & Pathology
Turpin, Barbara J.	Specialist in Air Quality Management	Ag., Food and Resource Economics (DAFRE)
VanGessel, Mark	Specialist in Field and Forage Crop Weed Science	Environmental Sciences
Vodak, Mark C.	Specialist in Forestry	University of Delaware Research & Education Center
Vorsa, Nicholi	Specialist in Blueberries & Cranberries	Ecology, Evolution, and Natural Resources
Wang, Changlu	Specialist in Urban Entomology	Plant, Bio. & Pathology
Ward, Daniel	Specialist in Pomology	Entomology
Westendorf, Michael L.	Specialist in Livestock & Dairy	Plant, Bio. & Pathology

Williams, Carey A.	Specialist in Equine Management	Animal Sciences
Winfree, Rachel	Specialist in Pollination Ecology	Animal Sciences
Wulster, George J.	Specialist in Floriculture	Animal Sciences
Wyenandt, Andrew	Specialist in Vegetable Pathology	Plant, Bio. & Pathology

Appendix 10. Ranking of ARMA Identified Personnel Needs, March 2013

The ARMA faculty and staff positions identified as high priority hires ranked 1 = highest priority through 11 = the lowest priority.

Priority Hire Rank	County Agricultural and Resource Management Agents and Staff (ARMA) Positions	Mean
1	Nursery Management and IPM - (1) County Agricultural Agent - commercial nursery issues	2.66
2	Greenhouse and Nursery IPM - (1) County Agricultural Agent	4.03
3	Tree Fruit Production and IPM - (1) County Agricultural Agent - tree fruit and wine grapes	4.63
4	"Ag-in-the-Middle" - (1) County Agricultural Agent or Staff - business management	6.00
5	Master Gardener / Consumer Horticulture - (1) Staff - Program Coordinator - statewide	6.03
6	Food Safety - (1) Staff - Program Associate or Program Assistant	6.25
7	Field and Forage Crops - (1 or more) Staff - Program Associates	6.41
8	Coastal Water Quality - (1) County Environmental Agent - water quality, agriculture and natural resource management	6.91
9	Shellfish Aquaculture Support and Development - (1) County Agent in Fisheries	7.16
10	Animal Science and Value Added Marketing - (1 or more) County Agricultural Agent	7.50
11	"Ag-in-the-Middle" - (1) Staff - general support	8.44
Total respondents = 32		

The Extension Specialists positions identified as high priority hires ranked 1=highest priority through 12=the lowest priority.

Priority Hire Rank	Extension Specialist Positions	Mean	BOM Listed
1	Nursery Management and IPM - Specialist in Nursery/Nutrient Management	3.53	yes
2	Nursery Management and IPM - Specialist - Nursery Entomologist/Invasive species	4.22	yes
3	Vegetable Production - Specialist in Vegetable Entomology	4.63	yes
4	Field and Forage Crops - Specialist in Field and Forage Crops	6.00	
5	Vegetable Production - Specialist in Cropping Systems (irrigation management)	6.34	yes
6	Vegetable Production - Specialist in Soil Fertility, Nutrient Management and Soil Health	6.69	yes
7	Vegetable Production - Specialist in Vegetable Culture (northern NJ)	6.91	yes
8	Agritourism - Specialist in Financial Management and Risk Management	7.06	

9	Field and Forage Crops - Specialist in Entomology	7.38	
10	Shellfish Aquaculture Support and Development - Specialist in Shellfish Aquaculture	8.25	yes
11	Wildlife Damage Control (home landscape) - Specialist in Wildlife Management/Damage	8.38	
12	Urban Agriculture and Community Gardening, School Gardens - Specialist in Vegetable Entomology	8.63	
Total respondents n=32			

Appendix 11. ARMA County Agent Hiring Protocol, 1987

From ARMA Departmental document, June 1987

Develop a position description (Line Authorization and Recruitment Form or LARF)

- Meet with local advisory groups
- Meet with ARMA personnel from surrounding counties and county with vacancy
- Discuss with relevant specialists

Review search procedure with Affirmative Action Committee

Publicize position according to University standards and suggestions of Affirmative Action Committee

Department Chair selects a search committee, the composition of which includes:

- Department Chairman
- Member of Affirmative Action Committee
- Other department members for county where search is being conducted (if applicable)
- Faculty member from relevant subject matter area
- Members from Advisory Committee (usually County Board of Agriculture)
- County Extension Department Head (CEDH) if not included above

Candidate screening by subcommittee of Search Committee.

Search committee conducts interviews at vacancy site, seminars open to public are presented.

Search committee recommends candidate to Director of Extension and Executive Dean of SEBS.

Dean offers position to candidate.

Appendix 12: ARMA Departmental By Laws, Revised 2007

New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station RUTGERS COOPERATIVE EXTENSION

**School and Environmental and Biological Sciences
Rutgers University**

Department of Agricultural and Resource Management Agents

BYLAWS

ARTICLE I - INTRODUCTION

It shall be the mission of members of the Department of Agricultural and Resource Management Agents (ARMA) to bring the scientific knowledge and resources of Rutgers University to bear on solving economic and social problems of local importance to agriculture and natural resources management in New Jersey. With the intent to implement positive change for all residents of the state, Department members have the responsibility to interpret, deliver, or develop research-based information. All Department members will focus their energies on environmentally responsible and economically productive uses of New Jersey's natural resources. Programs shall be held in cooperation and coordination with other elements of Rutgers Cooperative Extension (RCE), the New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station (NJAES), the United States Department of Agriculture, and Rutgers University, and in accordance with their policies and procedures. All Department activities and programming will be offered without regard to race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age, disability, political beliefs, sexual orientation, or marital or family status.

ARTICLE II - MEMBERSHIP

A. General: Members of the ARMA Department shall include persons currently employed and holding rank of County Agent V (equivalent to Assistant Instructor) and above by Rutgers University, and currently employed Program Coordinators and Program Associates. All other persons assigned to the Department, including those who are serving on a per diem or part-time basis, may be invited by the Department Chairperson, when appropriate, to participate.

All faculty members of the Department regardless of rank will be consulted on all new appointments to the Department. Such consultation does not substitute for the requirement that the tenured faculty members at or above the rank of the individual nominated for appointment formally act on the recommendation for appointment. The Department Chairperson shall provide information to all Department members on candidates seeking reassignment in the Department from another academic unit. The Department Chairperson shall then request input from all Department members in an effort to advise the Dean and/or Director prior to the decision to reassign that faculty member from another academic unit to membership in the Department.

B. Voting: All Department members shall have the right to vote on Department matters except for voting on personnel matters that concern reappointment, promotion, tenure, dismissal and similar actions. During consideration of faculty for reappointment, promotion, and tenure, only tenured members of the Department at or above the rank for which the candidate is being considered are allowed voting privileges. The Department Chairperson shall have a vote on all matters even if that individual does not have a major portion of a line within the Department.

ARTICLE III – DEPARTMENT OFFICERS

Chairperson: The selection, duties and rights of the Chairperson shall conform to Section 50.1.7A and 50.1.7B of the Rutgers University Policy Library.

50.1.7A: Department and Program Officers. The principal officer of administration for each department or program within the individual academic units shall be, respectively, a department chairperson or a program director.

A. In academic units which are organized departmentally, a department chairperson shall be appointed by the appropriate Dean or director, with the approval of the appropriate Provost, for a term of no more than five years. When a vacancy shall occur through expiration of term or otherwise in a department which includes three or more members at the rank of associate professor or professor, members of the department at the rank of assistant professor or higher who are in their second or subsequent semester of service in the department and instructors with at least one full year of service in the department shall by ballot nominate to the Dean one of the professors or associate professors for appointment as department chairperson.

As soon as it becomes known that an “election” for Department Chairperson is imminent, the incumbent Chairperson or acting Chairperson will schedule a special Department meeting to take place within two weeks following the announcement by the School of Environmental and Biological Sciences Secretary of the names of those faculty members who are interested in being nominated to the Dean and/or Director of the academic unit for appointment to the Chairperson position.

At this meeting, each “candidate” will be asked to present his/her qualifications for the position, experience relating to it, philosophy about it, any other pertinent information, and to be prepared to answer questions. If there is only one candidate, a special meeting of the Department need not be called.

B. Under the Dean and/or Director of the academic unit of which the department is a part, it shall be the duty of a department chairperson to have general administrative responsibility for the program of the department; to plan with the members of the department ongoing improvements in the department's programs, to evaluate continuously the instructional, research, and administrative processes of the department, and to make appropriate recommendations to the Dean and/or Director; to evaluate periodically members of the department, and report the evaluations as required; in consultation with the members of the

department on indefinite tenure to recommend appointments, reappointments, promotions, non-reappointments, and dismissals in accordance with University policies and regulations; to see that adequate supervision, advice, and training are afforded new members of the department and other members who might profit thereby; to collect and maintain thorough records of each member's teaching, scholarship and service, taking particular care to measure teaching effectiveness objectively and continuously by such means as peer reviews and student evaluations; and generally to promote the effectiveness of the department, school and University by every appropriate means.

The Department Chairperson will be an ex-officio member of all standing and ad hoc committees.

Secretary: It shall be the function of the Secretary to record, maintain, and arrange for the distribution of the minutes of the Department meetings to the members. The Secretary shall be appointed by the Department Chairperson from all members of the Department at the first meeting of the fiscal year, beginning July 1, for a term of one year.

Parliamentarian: The Parliamentarian will preside over Department meetings and procedures as they relate to the current Robert's Rules of Order. The Parliamentarian shall be appointed by the Department Chairperson from all members of the Department at the first meeting of the fiscal year, beginning July 1, for a term of one year.

ARTICLE IV - MEETINGS

There shall be at least two Department meetings during the year. Members shall be informed in writing at least fourteen days in advance of the meeting date. Additional meetings may be called at the discretion of the Department chairperson or by petition of five members of the Department. A simple majority of the voting members shall constitute a quorum.

ARTICLE V - COMMITTEES

A. Personnel Committee: This committee shall serve in an advisory capacity to the Department Chairperson in departmental personnel matters and in determining who the Department will recommend for promotion. Membership of the personnel committee shall consist of all tenured members of the Department with the rank of County Agent I (equivalent to full professor) or above. If the Department Chairperson is being considered for promotion, one member of this committee will serve as his / her ad hoc chairperson.

B. Reading Committee: Initiated during periods of promotion or reappointment, this committee shall function to review the candidate's scholarly work as presented in their reappointment or promotion packet and prepare a written assessment for the Department's consideration. Each Reading Committee for Department faculty shall be chaired by a tenured member of the ARMA faculty at or above the rank for which the candidate aspires. Reading Committees shall consist of at least three faculty members at or above the rank for which the candidate aspires; two from the ARMA department and one from within the

candidate's subject area. The Reading Committee shall not make a recommendation on the reappointment or promotion.

C. Department Council: This council is advisory to the Department Chairperson, and provides input and advice on issues relevant to the Department and its membership. It shall be the objective of this committee to promote the effectiveness of the Department and provide for long-range planning. The Department council shall consist of five Department members. Allowing for equal member representation, there shall be one member each from the Southern, Central, and Northern regions of the state. The two remaining members will be selected from the Personnel Committee. A chair and vice-chair shall be elected from the committee membership. Members shall serve a term of two years. They shall be elected by their peers in the region served, or by the personnel committee as applicable. One member shall be elected annually from the personnel committee, while the regions shall rotate appointments with one being elected the first year and two the second. Members shall be allowed to serve no more than two consecutive terms. There shall be a minimum of two meetings per year.

D. Search Committees:

1. Faculty Searches: It shall be the duty of the faculty search committee to assist in advertising the position, facilitate search committee meetings, evaluate and correspond with applicants, and recommend to the Department Chairperson a candidate for a vacant position. Voting membership of a faculty search committee shall consist of a member of the Department's Personnel Committee, a member of the Department's Affirmative Action Committee, the Department member(s) from the county for which the search is being conducted, a faculty member from a relevant subject matter area, one or more members of the appropriate Cooperative Extension Advisory group, and County Extension Department Head if not included above. The Department Chairperson shall serve as an *ex officio* member, make the appropriate appointments and shall designate the chairperson of each search committee. A representative of the RCE Affirmative Action Committee must attend the initial meeting of the search committee.

2. Staff Searches: It shall be the duty of the staff search committee to prepare a position description for approval by the Department Chair, advertise the position, facilitate search committee meetings, evaluate and correspond with applicants, and recommend to the Department Chairperson a candidate for the vacant position. The search committee should consist of an uneven number of people (3 or 5). The immediate supervisor of the position will chair this search committee and, with the approval of the Department Chairperson, select faculty or staff in relevant subject matter areas to serve as search committee members. A representative of the RCE Affirmative Action Committee must attend the initial meeting of the search committee.

E. Educational Resource/Training Committee: It shall be the duty of this committee to identify multi-media and training needs relevant to the educational responsibilities of the Department. This committee shall consist of seven members of the Department elected at the spring meeting by the Department membership for three-year terms on a rotating basis.

A chairperson and secretary will be selected at the first meeting of the fiscal year beginning July 1 for a one-year term.

F. Mentoring Committee: The mentoring program is designed to foster excellence in the Department's extension education programming. It encourages the protégé to seek answers and become an effective problem-solver.

1. Faculty Mentoring: It shall be the duty of this committee to communicate with the faculty protégé the reappointment and promotion/tenure process at Rutgers, and the academic and programmatic expectations of the institution. 'The Mentoring Committee Handbook', by Jim Johnson and Philip Neary, adopted as an official document of the Department, is to be utilized in the mentoring process. Its guidelines outline the mentoring committee's duties and responsibilities. Mentoring committees shall be appointed for all Department members working toward the academic rank of County Agent II (equivalent to Associate Professor). Faculty mentoring committee appointments shall be made within 2 months of hire and shall consist of at least two tenured members of the ARMA Department. Protégés will be consulted by the Department Chairperson prior to appointment of that individual's mentoring committee. A tenured member of the Department shall chair the committee. One of the two tenured ARMA Department members shall be in the same program area of the protégé if possible. Additionally, one resource person will be selected to serve as a member of the committee, who should be the equivalent rank of County Agent II or Associate Professor but does not have to have a tenure track appointment. They may also be from another academic department at School of Environmental and Biological Sciences. They will serve as consultant to the mentoring committee. This person should have expertise in a program area that has been identified as that to be strengthened for the protégé. The purpose is to enable the junior faculty member to serve clientele while meeting the criteria expected of Rutgers University faculty members. Faculty Mentoring Committees will meet a minimum of once a year, providing a written program and progress assessment to the protégé and Department Chairperson. The Chair of this committee will call the initial meeting, with all subsequent meetings called by the protégé.

2. Staff Mentoring: It shall be the duty of each Department member who supervises program associates, program coordinators or other Department staff, to develop and maintain a mentor/protégé relationship. The supervisor should contact faculty and staff in relevant program areas to assist in the mentoring process. An infrastructure should be designed to satisfy the needs of the protégé, but should include at least one formal meeting per year with a written program and progress assessment to the protégé and Department Chairperson in accordance with the current University Performance Appraisal Policy.

G. Affirmative Action Committee: It shall be the duty of this committee to review the affirmative action policies of this Department and assure compliance. The affirmative action committee shall consist of three members of the Department, two of which will come from the female or minority membership. The members of this committee will be elected at the spring

meeting for three-year terms on a rotating basis. The Department Chairperson will chair the meetings of this committee.

H. Awards and Recognition Committee: It shall be the duty of this committee to promote, assist and facilitate recognition and award nominations of deserving Department members, volunteers, program area teams, and advisory boards and other supporters of the Department in various internal and external recognition programs. Membership on this committee is available to all members of the Department, especially those who have garnered national or high-level recognition for programming, leadership and/or outreach efforts. There shall be one member each from the Southern, Central, and Northern regions of the state for this committee. Members will be elected at the first meeting of the fiscal year beginning July 1 for a three-year term.

I. Ad Hoc Committees: Ad hoc committees may be appointed by the Department Chairperson at his/her discretion or by a majority of the voting members or at the direction of the University to meet specific requirements.

ARTICLE VI - AMENDING THE BYLAWS

The bylaws may be amended by two-thirds vote of the Department membership providing a notice of the proposed change is submitted in writing to the Department membership at least fourteen days prior to the meeting at which action is contemplated. To keep the Bylaws in accordance with University regulations will not require the vote of the Department membership. However, Department membership will be notified of any changes.

ARTICLE VII - AUTHORITY FOR PROCEDURE

Robert's Rules of Order Revised shall govern the Department meetings and the committee meetings of this Department provided they do not conflict with the bylaws of this Department.

A resolution, motion, or report that will commit the Department to any policy position must be submitted to the Department Chairperson and Secretary for distribution to allow receipt of the document by the entire membership at least fourteen days prior to the meeting at which action is contemplated. A two-thirds vote of the membership is required to enact policy position changes. If two-thirds of the membership is not present, a majority vote of those present will be required to initiate a mail ballot of the membership.

Approved at department meeting May 14, 1975
Approved as amended at department meeting January 2, 1991
Approved as amended at department meeting April 27, 1993
Approved as amended at department meeting May 12, 1998
Approved as amended at department meeting December 10, 1999
Approved as amended at department meeting April 20, 2004
Approved as amended at department meeting October 14, 2005
Approved as amended at department meeting September 17, 2007

