

Minutes of November 7, 2011 Meeting  
CalPac Certification Panel  
Minutes of Open Session  
Draft: Mike Connor (edited by L. Ford): November 11, 2011

The panel met in conjunction with the regular CalPac fall meeting at the Ag Center in Modesto on November 7, 2011. Panel members present—Bartolome (Exec Sec), Bush, Connor, Ford, Gustafson, and Pearce. Panel members absent—Frost and Horney. Guests--Pete Van Hoorn (public) and John Harper (newly nominated to the panel).

## OPEN SESSION

The open session of the meeting was called to order at 4:05 pm by Chair Larry Ford. Ford announced that John Harper and Larry Forero had been nominated to the panel by the CalPac Board of Directors, and will be forwarded to the Board of Forestry for appointment.

1. Minutes of the August 11, 2011 conference call open session were approved. Motion by Bush, second by Pearce, unanimous vote.
2. A new CRM brochure, authorized by the Board of Directors and developed under contract by Karen Sweet, was reviewed. A discussion of where a CRM is required ensued. Federal agencies probably won't accept the CRM requirements.
3. Current panel members are:

Larry Ford, Chairman, term ending November 2015  
James Bartolome, Executive Secretary  
Bill Frost, ex-officio as PFEC representative  
Rob Pearce, November 2012  
Jon Gustafson, November 2012  
Marc Horney, November 2012  
Lisa Bush, November 2011; she retires from the board at the end of this meeting  
Mike Connor, November 2011; he accept another term until 2014  
John Harper, November 2014  
Larry Forero, November 2014

The Panel thanks Lisa Bush for her many years of dedicated service to the panel and her profession.

4. Discussion of recommendations for a revised ARM definition and discipline for unlicensed practice was postponed until Eric Huff can be present. CalPac's ARM program cannot be supported by the Board of Forestry because such wording is not included in the legislation. The panel agreed that while it is not supported by the state, it can still be an effective CalPac program.
5. Discussion of means of increasing the efficiency of panel meetings was led by subcommittee members Bartolome and Connor. The conclusions are as follows:
  - A. Connor will serve as recording secretary.
  - B. The meetings will be structured as follows:
    - In-person meetings will occur twice a year at CalPac section meetings, before or concurrent with board meetings. Adequate prior notice should be given, and the meetings should be timed no earlier than late morning (with at least 2 hours before reporting to the board), to help assure attendance. These meetings will be used for application reviews and any controversial topics. There appeared to be consensus

agreement to Bush's suggestion of including time limits for discussion along with each agenda item. There was also consensus on Gustafson's suggestion to invite the section's President and chair of the Professional Affairs Committee to our meetings.

- Conference calls will be reserved for unusual, well-defined topics; a conference call will also be scheduled the week prior to the CalPac section board meeting to cover introductory and other non-controversial agenda items, and thus to save time for core items covered at the in-person meetings.
- Emails can be legally used to inform panel members and to request simple yes/no answers directly to the Secretary, but not for discussions among panel members.

C. We should develop a prioritized list of issues and tasks for the panel's agenda. Individuals or subcommittees will volunteer or be assigned to each issue/task. It is important that we share with the CalPac board the opportunities for section committees and individuals to become involved in solving these issues for the betterment of the section. Without involvement of panel members and other section members some of the lower priority issues may not get addressed until they become more urgent or move up in priority.

6. Gustafson suggested the panel provide guidance to CRM applicants regarding items to be discussed in their letters of reference. The panel agreed this should result in more useful letters. His suggestions follow, including some edits by Ford and Connor:

- Make sure to secure at least one letter of recommendation from a CRM speaking specifically to your technical capabilities. The CRM application is incomplete without one.
- If you are requesting substitution of related educational and experience for the more traditional academic program identified as "range" or "rangeland management", ask at least one of your recommenders, preferable CRMs, to address how the substitution may be justified.
- Advise your recommenders why you are seeking certification. Most people pursue the certification in pursuit of the California state license to practice rangeland management as well as to demonstrate their commitment to appropriate management of rangeland resources. Be sure to specify your motivations for seeking your certification when approaching your supporters so that you are properly represented.
- SRM is deeply concerned as to the ethics of those who would represent themselves as a CRM. Ethics is a subject that should be addressed in at least one of your letters of recommendation.
- Collaboration with other professionals on a technical level is an important part of being effective as a professional. At least one of your letters should speak to your ability to work collaboratively towards specific goals.
- Academic records speak for themselves, but unfortunately, transcripts don't always speak to the ability to acquire knowledge outside the context of a purely academic setting. At least one of your letters should address your ability to pursue and acquire new technical knowledge specific to rangeland resource science and/or affiliated disciplines such as watershed management, wildlife management, forestry, or restoration ecology.

Gustafson will send the panel a revised draft memo by email incorporating the above points. Panel members are requested to respond directly to Gustafson with comments by December 15.

Adjourned to Closed Session