

Labor Management Decisions

Volume 1, Number 1

Spring 1991

Management Choices Front and Center

Howard R. Rosenberg
Director, Agricultural Personnel
Management Program

Labor management is not at the top of every farmer's agenda these days. Despite the Gulf war ceasefire, the remaining man-made and natural crises of our day continue to draw more attention on and off the farm. And the great flurry of worry and activity prompted by the 1986 immigration law has settled down, as its provisions have been implemented with no apparent shrinkage in the supply of agricultural labor.

Of the farm managers I have encountered lately who are very concerned about labor management, most, unfortunately, are fixed on questions about compliance with state and federal laws. With all the "have to's" governing employment relations, it is easy to lose sight of the real purpose of labor management, which is to get work done. And that happens not by boning up on legislation or filling out forms but rather by dealing with workers. In structuring work conditions and in personally interacting with employees, farmers make countless labor management decisions every day that affect us all one way or another.

Farm Work, Management, and Results

Amount and types of labor needed on farms vary from commodity to commodity. But human work is critical to all agricultural production, and a substantial part of total production cost goes for labor. Roughly 75 percent of all work on California farms is performed by hired employees. Agricultural wages paid in this state during 1990 approached \$3 billion and were more than 20 percent of total production expense.

The use of aggregate economic statistics in policy making and cost-per-acre averages in farm budgeting tends to reinforce a misconception that labor costs are fixed by formula. But costs for labor and other production inputs are subject to human control. Relationships between the amount and effects of wage payments are

Welcome. This is our first issue under this name, although articles by Agricultural Personnel Management Program staff members have appeared from time to time over the past several years in the University of California Cooperative Extension newsletter *Economics*. APMP Area Farm Advisors Gregory Encina Billikopf (Stanislaus County) and Stephen R. Sutter (Fresno County) also publish newsletters for their clientele (see page 14), as well as contribute to this statewide publication.

Labor Management Decisions will be published three times a year — Spring, Fall, and Winter. Subscriptions are offered free of charge upon request; send the form on page 16 to APMP or phone 415/642-2296 to remain on or be added to our distribution list. Your comments are welcome. We will publish letters in future issues, as space permits.

In this issue:

Management Choices Front and Center	1
Grant Program	3
Freeze Assistance for Farm Workers	4
Hearings of the Commission on Agricultural Workers ..	6
Turning to Farm Labor Contractors	7
USDA Farm Labor Statistics	8
Farm Personnel Policies by Computer	9
Getting Injury and Illness Down on the Farm	11
New Immigration Law Includes Provisions for Families	12
Resources	13
Events	15
Contributors	15

not at all straightforward. Labor expenses and what they buy can vary substantially, even when part of similar production technologies in the same county. Differently managed farms with the same total wage bill can exhibit great differences in production quantity and quality. An expenditure for labor can purchase quite a range of contributions from employee effort and ideas, just as it can be joined by variable costs associated with worker absenteeism, turnover, accidents, and grievances.

How workers perform is determined by what they can do and what they want to do. Personnel management practices affect both. What growers expect, permit, encourage, support, and reward influences the attitudes

PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT IN CONTEXT			
Influences and Constraints →	Management Decisions	→ Personnel Outcomes	→ Results
Technology	Organizational Structure	Ability	PRODUCTION
Product Competition	Job Design	Motivation	
Labor Market	Recruitment	Satisfaction	
Financial Status	Selection	Absenteeism	COSTS
Manager Attitudes/Values	Training and Development	Turnover	WORKLIFE
Tradition	Supervision	Accidents	
Laws and Regulations	Performance Appraisal	Mistakes	
Union Contracts	Compensation and Benefits	Ideas	EARNINGS
Worker Interests/Needs	Employee Communications	Grievances	
	Problem Resolution		

and behavior of employees — and of unpaid farm family workers. The same wages can constitute part of a higher or lower quality of worklife for employees. Through its effects on worker performance, then, labor management can contribute to both business results and individual satisfaction in agriculture.

Furthermore, what agricultural workers do on the job has impact beyond the farm gate. Their performance, and thus decisions by which human resources are applied in agricultural production, affect commodity prices and quality, natural resources, and the social fabric of rural communities. When an irrigator with garbled instructions or a gripe leaves the valves open too long, valuable water is wasted and crops may suffer. After a strawberry picker with too many thumbs or an untrained technique fills trays rapidly in order to maximize piece-rate earnings, badly bruised fruit shows up on the market shelf or in the family refrigerator. The excessively rich orchard spray mixed by an uninformed or careless applicator may be a drain on the grower’s budget as well as a health hazard to humans on the ranch and perhaps even in an adjacent subdivision.

Nested Labor Issues

People who provide labor, who manage labor, and who look out for the public interest face respectively different though interrelated sets of “labor issues.” Individual farm workers decide how and where to seek employment, and whether to accept it if offered. Once in a job they make choices about staying or leaving, exerting themselves physically and mentally, and trying to improve their situations. Workers base these decisions on their own aspirations, needs, and talents as well as how they perceive other available job opportunities.

The reality of those opportunities is determined largely by employers operating, in turn, within their own business and personal contexts. In a sense, agricultural employers and supervisors contend with the same labor

issues about content and conditions of work that managers of production always face. They need to organize and elicit human work that turns raw materials into marketable goods and services. Key decisions for farmers start right with choice of crops, production systems, and equipment, which together determine the tasks to be done by people.

From there the challenge of personnel management, simply put, is to employ the most capable people in the tasks and under the conditions that draw their best work. Several types of decisions affect whether capable people are attracted to jobs, how long they stay, and how well they perform. How to formally engage labor — through direct employment, farm labor contractors, or independent contractor agreements — is basic. Other important decisions include what tasks to combine into jobs, where to recruit for employees, and how to select them for specific assignments, orient them to work conditions and performance expectations, help them develop skills, establish pay rates and benefits, deal with problems that arise, and provide for ongoing communication.

A host of public policy decisions inspires and limits the employer’s hand. Some of them, such as those on international trade, touch providers and managers of labor indirectly through effects on supply and demand in product markets. Others, more clearly “labor issues,” create laws pertaining directly to (1) specific terms of employment (e.g., minimum wages, safety standards, rest periods), (2) interactions between employer and employee (e.g., pre-employment screening, collective bargaining, dismissal), and (3) the supply of labor (e.g., immigration rules, public training, and job search assistance).

Our Center of Attention

These sets of issues are obviously connected. Employer policies (or lack of them) form a major part of the environment for individual worker decisions. Similarly,

public policies condition how employers view and cope with the issues at their level. The influence is not, of course, one-way. Employers consider likely worker response to their management practices. Likewise, intelligent public policy anticipates managers' reaction to its incentives, requirements, and restrictions.

Choices at all levels are certainly worth examining. The emphasis in *Labor Management Decisions*, as in the DANR Agricultural Personnel Management Program, is on those made by farmers and supervisors at the level of the firm. All information and work presented in this publication, though wide ranging, is connected by its relevance to such labor management decisions in agriculture. Our main intent is to expand understanding of the choices farmers make as personnel managers, factors impinging on them, options in management policy and practice, means for implementing them, and their outcomes for various stakeholders.

The core of these decisions is represented by the second column of the accompanying table. Factors that influence them are not only laws and regulations but also production technology, product and labor market conditions, financial status of the firm, employer attitudes and values, tradition, union contracts, and worker interests and needs.

Misunderstandings, conflicts, and waste have resulted from such casual practices as hiring without specifying job responsibilities, presuming rather than screening (pre-hire) for job-relevant qualifications, setting wage rates through an irregular series of individual bargains, and allowing foremen full discretion to recruit, assign work, administer discipline, and resolve problems their own way. Farmers can avoid many problems unilaterally by adopting some basic management tools and techniques to which the APMP provides reference.

The Rest of the Nest

Though the focus here is on management, it will take well-informed, often coordinated efforts of policy makers, managers, and workers to successfully meet the complex of challenges facing agriculture today. By no means will farm managers by themselves be able to cope with all the labor implications of intensified product market competition, abnormally severe weather, new equipment and technologies, large-scale immigration from cultures familiar and unfamiliar to us, swings in the overall economy, environmental protection measures, prospective trade agreements, and social service and physical infrastructures bursting at the seams.

Our program content is therefore enriched by and, we hope, significant to public policy and worker decisions. Contributions to the Agricultural Personnel Manage-

ment Program, and these pages, ought to be far more diverse than they would have been 20 or even 10 years ago. Your comments and participation are most welcome.

As on McLuhan's "Spaceship Earth," we are not only passengers in the enterprise California Agriculture. We are all crew. □

Grant Program

APMP funds have been granted to support research and education projects in a variety of disciplines. An important criterion for program funding is a project's likelihood of providing practical guidance to personnel management decision-makers. Eligible projects serve at least one program objective and are led by a principal investigator or co-investigator who is an academic staff member of the University of California or California State University. Funding is based on recommendations of ad hoc technical advisers who review proposals anonymously in a two-stage process. The APMP mails out its requests for preliminary proposals in the fall.

The following list of projects funded by the APMP since 1989 illustrates the broad range of potential contributions to farm personnel management:

■ *Legal Research for Publication on Agricultural Labor Laws*. Daniel L. Egan, Boalt Hall School of Law, Berkeley, in cooperation with Howard R. Rosenberg, CE Specialist, Agricultural and Resource Economics, Berkeley. \$6,004.

■ *Growers' Decisions to Hire Labor Contractors and Custom Harvesters*. Suzanne Vaupel, Research Agricultural Economist, Sacramento, in cooperation with Kaimanu A. Francisco, former Farm Advisor, UCCE, Hollister. \$6,010.

■ *Survey of California Farm Employers*. Philip L. Martin, Professor, Agricultural Economics, Davis. \$3,600.

■ *Effects of Pay Basis on Results of Leaf Removal for Canopy Management in San Joaquin Valley Vineyards*. James J. Stapleton, IPM Advisor, Parlier; Kathleen M. Kelley, Farm Advisor, UCCE, Modesto; and William W. Barnett, IPM Advisor, Parlier. \$7,310.

■ *Educational Video on Selection of Agricultural Employees*. Marcia Ceesay and Guadalupe Sandoval, Agricultural Workers' Health Centers, Stockton, in cooperation with Gregory E. Billikopf, Farm Advisor, UCCE, Modesto, and Harry Stroble, Production Director, Visual Media, Davis. \$9,163. Also \$7,500 to Visual Media, UC Davis.

■ *Women's Career and Mobility Patterns in Ventura Agriculture.* Committee on Women in Agriculture, Ventura County Commission for Women, in cooperation with Lawrence K. Yee, UCCE Director, Ventura. \$17,316.

■ *Initial Response of Farm Employers to the Immigration Control and Reform Act of 1986.* David Mitchell, Graduate Student, Agricultural and Resource Economics, Berkeley, in cooperation with Howard R. Rosenberg. \$3,200.

■ *Assisting Southeast Asian Farmers in Understanding Compensation Regulations and Developing Record Systems.* Stephen R. Sutter, Farm Advisor, UCCE, Fresno. \$4,000.

■ *Wage, Benefit, and Training Practices on California Dairies.* Barbara A. Reed, Farm Advisor, UCCE, Merced. \$15,000.

■ *Assessing Effectiveness of Skills Training for Almond Shaker Operators.* Stephen R. Sutter and Mark W. Freeman, Farm Advisor, UCCE, Fresno. \$4,450.

■ *Potential Effects of Modified Tools for Citrus Harvest Production and Workers* Stephen R. Sutter and Mark W. Freeman, UCCE, Fresno. \$4,450.

■ *Determinants of Vineyard Pruning Cost.* Gregory E. Billikopf, Farm Advisor, UCCE, Modesto, and Maxwell Norton, Farm Advisor, UCCE, Merced. \$1,280.

■ *Educational Video on Mixtec Farm Workers in California.* Stefano Varese, Professor, Native American Studies, Davis; James I. Grieshop, CE Specialist, Applied Behavioral Sciences, Davis; John Reed, Production Manager, Instructional Television, Davis. Phase I: \$3,000.

■ *Decision Making in the Family Farm Business.* Amy Lyman, Lecturer, Applied Behavioral Sciences, Davis. \$5,946.

■ *Booklet for Farm Workers on Management of Personal Finances.* Karen P. Varcoe, CE Consumer Education Specialist, Riverside; Connie Costello, Staff Research Associate, Riverside; and Myriam Grajales-Hall, Information Representative, Riverside. \$16,657.

The following projects have successfully completed preliminary review and are pending decision at the full-proposal stage:

■ *A Comparison of Management, Hiring, and Compensation Practices of Direct-Hire Growers and Farm Labor Contractors.* Jeffrey M. Perloff, Professor, Agricultural and Resource Economics, Berkeley; Suzanne Vaupel, Research Agricultural Economist, Sacramento; David Runsten, California Institute for Rural Studies, Davis; and Stephen R. Sutter, Farm Advisor, UCCE, Fresno.

■ *Creating Employment Alternatives for Timber Industry Millworkers Facing Job Displacement Due to New or Impending Shifts in Legislative Policies.* Peter C. Passof, Acting County Director, UCCE, Ukiah, in cooperation with Edward J. Blakely, Professor, Department of City and Regional Planning, Berkeley, and Donald Nelson, Timber Industry Labor Consultant, Fort Bragg.

■ *Computerized Data Base Personnel Management Tool for California Strawberry Farms.* Louie H. Valenzuela, Area Farm Advisor, UCCE, Santa Maria.

■ *Farm Labor in the San Joaquin Valley Citrus Industry.* Juan Vicente Palerm, Associate Professor, and Fred Krissman, PhD candidate, Anthropology, Santa Barbara.

■ *Managing Farm Safety Programs: Instructional Video and Manual.* Stephen R. Sutter, Farm Advisor, UCCE, Fresno, and Guadalupe Sandoval, Agricultural Workers' Health Centers, Stockton. □

Freeze Assistance for Farm Workers

San Joaquin Valley farm and agri-related businesses rely on the services of, on average, about 200,000 hired workers. The December 1990 freeze and the drought have hurt many thousands of them, as well as their employers. The full extent of the freeze damage was not known immediately, but even after it became clear that workers as well as growers would be seriously affected, state and federal governments were slow to act. They have sometimes responded to obvious needs only after prodding by people concerned about the situation, such as Steve Sutter, UCCE, Fresno. Several sources of assistance are now in place, although funding limits, restrictions related to immigration status, and fear of jeopardizing legal status even when eligible for aid have kept most workers and their families from getting all the help they need.

One of the first steps taken was a hearing held by the Joint Legislative Rural Caucus on January 11, 1991, at the UC Kearney Agricultural Center. The caucus heard much testimony about crop damage and some about unemployment caused by the freeze.

The same day Governor Wilson declared a state of emergency in 17 counties, and a week later he wrote to President Bush requesting implementation of (1) disaster unemployment assistance (DUA), (2) emergency (ex-

pedited) food stamp distribution, and (3) emergency food distribution, as provided under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (DREAA). To aid employers, Small Business Administration and Farmers' Home Administration emergency loan as well as Internal Revenue Service casualty loss programs were requested. Not included in the Governor's request, according to Sutter, was activation of DREAA provisions for individual and family grants, legal services, crisis counseling assistance and training, community disaster loans, and temporary mortgage or rental payment assistance.

The governor appointed Donald R. Irwin as State Coordinating Officer and Governor's Authorized Representative, responsible for liaison with local authorities and with federal agencies (phone 916/427-4201). A Disaster Field Office was set up in the State Office of Emergency Services' Sacramento headquarters and a hotline established for callers to obtain information on freeze emergency programs (1-800-525-0321).

On February 11, President Bush declared a federal disaster in more than 30 California counties. Eleven days later, the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Food and Nutrition Service began shipping some kinds of food to hard-hit Tulare County. Disaster unemployment assistance benefits ranging from \$40 to \$190 per week, retroactive from December 23, 1990, were made available through August 17, 1991. Under current DUA/Unemployment Insurance rules, undocumented workers are not eligible for unemployment benefits.

Two bills were introduced into the State Assembly in mid-February to help unemployed workers. Assembly Member Rusty Areias' bill, AB 367, would amend the State Unemployment Insurance code to extend unemployment benefits an additional 26 weeks for workers laid off as a result of the freeze. AB 472 (Areias) would provide an additional supplemental grant of \$50 per week to individuals receiving unemployment compensation because of certain natural disasters, as determined by the Employment Development Department.

Numerous public agencies, private organizations, and individuals have responded to the need for food assistance, but despite these efforts, the help received so far has fallen short. The California Department of Economic Opportunity announced an emergency intervention grant of \$65,499 in March, primarily for food vouchers but also for utilities and rent assistance, to help eastern Fresno County families hurt by the freeze. Later the agency granted \$123,000 to support 600 freeze-affected families. The USDA provided an additional \$2 million in emergency food assistance in April. Farm organizations have also contributed to food relief, including a recent \$8,000 grant from the Fresno County Farm Bureau. In Tulare

County, a network of 42 food providers had distributed 1.13 million pounds of food by late March. But Curtis Lynn, UCCE County Director, reported that "At least three times more food is needed than is currently being received."

To date, the emergency food stamp program — which would provide help to people regardless of immigration status — has not been implemented in any county. Late in February, the USDA Food and Nutrition Service, Western Region, turned down a request from Tulare County to authorize emergency food stamps. The county appealed in late March but was denied again on April 25. Undaunted by its neighbor's experience, Fresno County applied for emergency food stamp relief on May 9.

The freeze also exacerbated the housing difficulties of many farm workers. Assembly Member Jim Costa introduced AB 481 in mid-February to reappropriate \$525,000 of unexpended funds to repair freeze-related damage to temporary residential centers for migrant farm workers operated by the Department of Housing and Community Development. AB 707, by Assembly Member Bill Jones, would amend the Health and Safety Code to include mortgage or rental assistance for persons in danger of becoming homeless as a result of a natural disaster.

Steve Sutter, described as "one of the heroes of the freeze" by the *Visalia Times-Delta*, urgently requested the State Office of Emergency Services to ask for federal rental and mortgage assistance under Section 408(b) of the Stafford Act before the March 13 deadline. On March 13, the state asked the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for an extension so that it could poll agencies. The purpose was to learn what supplementary federal benefits of all types might be needed, including temporary rental or mortgage payment assistance.

Governor Wilson, while visiting Tulare County on March 26, said he would ask President Bush for additional federal relief, including emergency food stamps and rental and mortgage payment assistance. The rental and mortgage assistance report was sent to FEMA, and on April 17, the President approved FEMA housing assistance for freeze-affected families.

Because effects on immigration status of accepting aid have not been clear, many IRCA-legalizing workers and their families have hesitated to apply even for the assistance to which they were entitled. Not all fears were allayed by statements from government officials, such as a press release from the INS Commissioner, issued at the end of January in response to a request from Steve Sutter. The statement assured newly legalized aliens that accepting freeze-related relief assistance would not jeopardize their status. And in April, FEMA Regional Director

(San Francisco) and Federal Coordinating Officer William Medigovich announced that "aliens will not jeopardize their applications for legal residency under the Amnesty program if they apply for or receive disaster assistance from FEMA." □

Hearings of the Commission on Agricultural Workers

Philip L. Martin

Over the past several months, the Commission on Agricultural Workers has held a series of public hearings in California and other states to examine effects of the agricultural labor provisions of the Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) of 1986. The 12-member commission was created by IRCA to answer several questions related to the special agricultural worker (SAW) program and the demand for and supply of farm labor. Originally scheduled to report to Congress on its findings and recommendations by November 1991, the commission has been granted an extension to November 6, 1992.

California is the only state in which the commission has conducted two hearings — in Visalia on August 23 and 24, and Coachella on December 6 and 7, 1990. Hearings also have taken place so far in Oregon (July 1990), North Carolina (September 1990), Texas (January 1991), and Florida (February 1991). A third California hearing is likely this year in the Central Coast.

Commission member Philip L. Martin, Professor of Agricultural Economics, University of California, Davis, has summarized the testimony given by growers, workers, and other speakers at hearings to date. The following report has been excerpted from Dr. Martin's summaries.

Testimony presented at each hearing of the Commission on Agricultural Workers has focused on local issues and conditions, but several common themes have emerged: (1) there is currently an abundant supply of farm workers; (2) IRCA has generally not changed employment practices, pushed up wages, increased union activities, or affected U.S. competitiveness; (3) production in labor-intensive agriculture has continued to expand since 1985; and (4) IRCA's provisions may have contributed to more reliance on labor contractors and other intermediaries.

Employer representatives estimate that 20 to 40 percent of current seasonal workers are "documented illegals," that is, post-IRCA arrivals who have purchased the documents needed to satisfy Form I-9 requirements. Employers argue that if there were effective enforcement, a labor shortage would develop, and thus some type of guestworker program for agriculture is needed to

insure against it. Most farmer testimony appears to indicate that the existing H-2A guestworker program, while fine for some of agriculture, is not workable for most. Employers want something other than H-2A that is more sensitive to local labor market conditions than the provisions for replenishment agricultural workers (RAWs). No one, however, has presented to the commission a clear plan for such a program.

Testimony by farm workers and their advocates tends to focus on the interconnected issues of the oversupply of workers, the rising importance of farm labor contractors, stable or falling wages, and diminished fringe benefits (especially health insurance). Housing is another concern, as farmers have taken many more of their worker facilities out of operation than they have added in recent years. It seems that the oversupply of workers is at the root of these problems, but we have heard little about how to diminish or regulate the influx. Instead, there appears to be an implicit assumption that, if IRCA could not do it, nothing can. Appeals for more labor laws and strict enforcement seem destined to fail, if even those farm labor contractors who offer minimum and sub-minimum terms of employment can get all the workers they want.

Witnesses before the commission have expressed two major requests of government that should be articulated further. If farmers want a non-H-2A alien worker insurance program and the RAW program is inadequate, they need to spell out what the program should look like. If farm workers want limits on the post-IRCA influx of workers that is keeping wages down and encouraging the use of labor contractors, they should explain how the influx can be limited. If farm workers argue that control over the influx is secondary to labor law enforcement within the United States, it seems important to explore how such enforcement might occur.

As the commission moves closer to the deadline for its report to Congress, it will seek to formulate positive conclusions and recommendations regarding policy choices. One such choice might be to reinvigorate the employment service in some manner (not yet suggested) to match seasonal workers and jobs and thus make farm labor contractors less vital. Exploring the current employment system and possible alternatives raises questions about responsibility for labor matters. How much responsibility does a grower who plants labor-intensive crops have to secure a workforce? Should the U.S. government ensure that labor will be available at the minimum wage by making foreign workers available? If so, then under what terms and conditions should employers have access to such workers?

From the testimony thus far, mostly negative lessons have been learned. Simply legalizing farm workers, for

example, has apparently not set in motion gradual farm labor market adjustments that encourage employers to plan for a predominantly legal, less vulnerable, probably higher wage workforce. By implication, if Congress were to enact another version of IRCA's agricultural provisions, it would once again fail to bring about changes in farm management and improved conditions for farm workers.

Witnesses in future hearings may address these issues by suggesting what sorts of programs might work for a particular commodity and area, as well as the probable effects on the area's agriculture and farm workers. A greater emphasis on public interest testimony may be needed to obtain a broad new look at the future of labor-intensive U.S. agriculture. □

Turning to Farm Labor Contractors

A labor market development of much current interest within California agriculture is the pronounced increase of farm labor contractor (FLC) activity over the past 10 to 15 years. Many farmers in California have shifted from directly hiring agricultural workers to procuring labor through FLCs and custom harvesters. These contractors recruit workers and provide such other personnel management services as transporting workers, supervising in the field, and handling payroll.

In 1988 the California Employment Development Department cited an 11 percent increase over 1987 in the number of agricultural laborers employed by farm labor contractors as the year's most significant change in the agricultural labor market. EDD data for 1989 indicate that FLCs are responsible for 20 percent of all farm employment in California and a majority of fruit and vegetable harvest work in most regions.

Farm labor contracting has existed in California for more than 100 years, facilitating information flow and matching between growers and workers in the labor market. First used here in the 1870s, when large numbers of Chinese entered the farm labor force, farm labor contracting has varied in importance over time.

Subject to licensing requirements in California since 1939, contractors came under specific federal law in 1963. Federal regulation of FLCs is currently centered in the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act of 1983 (MSPA). A contractor is defined as "any person, other than an agricultural employer, an agricultural association, or an employee of an agricultural employer or agricultural association, who, for any money or other valuable consideration paid or promised to be paid, performs any farm labor contracting activity,"

which means ". . . recruiting, soliciting, hiring, employing, furnishing, or transporting any migrant or seasonal agricultural worker."

Recent initiatives in the California legislature reflect the increased importance of farm labor contractors. Assembly Bill 3550 (Waters), signed by Governor Deukmejian in September 1990, requires all FLCs to register with the Agricultural Commissioner in each county where they do business. Adding to existing state and federal licensing requirements, this law became effective January 1, 1991. A main purpose for its passage is to ensure that FLCs are aware of their responsibilities for worker safety.

Meetings to inform labor contractors about the new law, registration procedures, agricultural safety regulations, and other relevant topics were presented in January by APMP in cooperation with CE County Directors, Agricultural Commissioners, and EDD staff in Fresno, Monterey, and Orange counties. The simultaneous sessions drew a total audience of 385. Thanks to Steve Sutter, Sonya Hammond, and Mike Henry for organizing and hosting.

Additional regulation of labor contracting has been proposed. Assembly Bill 318 (Polanco), as introduced early this year before substantial amendment, would have obligated both growers and FLCs to report to the Department of Industrial Relations on contracts into which they enter with one another.

Why have growers turned to contractors to provide labor? What do they expect and what do they get by shifting from direct hire to FLCs or custom harvesters (CHs)? Under APMP sponsorship, Suzanne Vaupel has recently completed a pilot study of issues in Monterey County growers' decisions to hire FLCs. Three principal research questions Vaupel addressed were: (1) What types of work are FLCs and CHs being hired to do and what services do they provide? (2) What are growers' experiences with and opinions about the work of FLCs and CHs? (3) How stable are the relationships between growers and FLCs and CHs?

No previous work had examined reasons for and results of decisions to alter prior patterns of direct recruitment and hire in individual firms. Farmers have had no organized body of empirical evidence to consult when considering a shift to FLCs. Vaupel's findings will be abstracted in the next issue of *Labor Management Decisions*. A copy of her full report is available from the program office for \$1 copying cost (check payable to "UC Regents," or cash is okay).

The Employment Development Department has contracted with the APMP to conduct a major study of FLC

business practices in relation to (1) customers (growers and packing houses), (2) employees, and (3) government agencies. Interviews are being conducted with a total of 180 labor contractors, and with smaller numbers of grow-

ers and workers, in the Imperial, Ventura-Santa Barbara, Fresno, San Joaquin-Stanislaus, and Monterey County areas. A final report is due to EDD by January 1992. □

USDA Farm Labor Statistics

Farm Personnel Policies by Computer: Review of One Software Package

Norman J. Hetland and Howard R. Rosenberg

Many farm employers have found written personnel policies helpful to guide decisions and clarify what workers and managers can expect of one another. Policies can save much administrative time and help reduce the incidence of supervisory decisions that violate a public law or a private sense of fairness. Not all farmers who appreciate the potential of communicating policies through employee handbooks, however, have the time to develop one.

For several years reference books and consulting services have provided example policies that could be used verbatim or modified for individual firms. Computer software packages now offer similar aid, plus the facility to print policies in handbook form bearing the company name. Most of these programs, while allowing the user to edit standard wording, give little or no basis for weighing the appropriateness of a given policy in different contexts. A notable exception, by KnowledgePoint, Petaluma, CA, is Personnel Policy Expert, which won a 1989 Excellence in Software Award from the Software Publishers Association.

Personnel Policy Expert (PPE) is advertised as an "expert system," providing on-screen information about policy topics (including applicable laws) and posing diagnostic questions about management preferences and company circumstances. User responses to these questions are automatically factored into draft policies that can be edited and printed as a customized handbook. Of 14 computerized policy generators that we were able to identify in a recent search, only PPE, priced at \$495 (semi-annual updates cost \$95 per year) claims this form of user-friendliness. Most of the others, producing rather generic policies without education or diagnostics, retail for \$40 to \$170.

The complete set of PPE files occupies about 2.5 megabytes of disk space. Operation requires an IBM-compatible computer with 512K RAM plus two floppy drives or a hard disk, the latter making both installation and operation much easier. Installation onto a hard disk is simple, takes just a few minutes, and proceeds exactly as outlined in initial sections of the User Manual. While the manual is attractive and clear, on-screen instructions are sufficient to guide the user after installation.

Drafting a policy with PPE is as straightforward as booting up the program, choosing one of the 65 topics

from the Policy Selection menu, reading the introductory statement on that subject, and answering questions (two to four on most topics; range is zero to twelve) that may then appear on screen. In seconds, the screen displays a draft policy that can then be saved as either final or provisional, subject to editing and approval. Reviewers can record comments that will be stored in the file — but not printed — with each draft policy. Policy statements can be edited through a basic utility provided within PPE or exported for editing in a full-feature word processing system. Any combination of policies, at provisional or final stage, can be printed as a paged manual (again, through either PPE or a more sophisticated word processor) ready for reproduction.

Policy Content

The 65 handbook topics in PPE are generally pertinent to firms in various industries. They are organized into nine groups:

Introduction: Title Page; Welcome; Organization Description; Introductory Statement; Employee Acknowledgment;

Employment: Nature of; Employee Relations; EEO; Relatives; Physical Exams; Immigration Law; Conflicts of Interest; Outside Employment; Nondisclosure (of proprietary information);

Employment Status and Records: Employment Categories; File Access; Reference Checks; Record Updates; Probationary Period; Applications; Performance Evaluation;

Employee Benefits: General; Vacation; Child Care; Holidays; Workers' Compensation; Sick Leave; Voting Time; Bereavement; Relocation; Jury Duty; Witness Duty; Benefits Continuation (COBRA);

Programs (and their sources) for IBM-compatible systems include: WELCOME! (Abracadata, Ltd.); FastSF52 (Apt Corp.); Encyclopedia of Prewritten Personnel Policies (Bureau of Law & Business, Inc.); Policies and Procedures for Management and Human Resource Administrators/An Employee Handbook that Works (Dwile Heggem & Associates, Inc.); Policy and Procedure Manual Software (EDDON Corporation); Employee Manual (High-Impact Communication Services); Company Policy and Personnel Workbook (PSI Research); The Personnel Department Management Manual and Employee Handbook (The Arbor Consulting Group, Inc.); Model Personnel Policy Manual 3.0 (The Personnel Department Store); and Personnel Policy (Power Up Software Corp.). For the Macintosh, programs available are Employee Handbook Builder (Jian) and Company Policy (PSI Research). Thanks to Richard B. Frantzreb, Advanced Personnel Systems, Roseville, CA, for leading us to most of these.

Timekeeping/Payroll: Timekeeping; Paydays; Termination; Severance Pay; Pay Advances; Pay Corrections; Deductions and Setoffs;

Work Conditions and Hours: Safety; Work Schedules; Phone and Mail; Smoking; Rest and Meals; Overtime; Equipment and Vehicle Use; Emergency Closings;

Leaves of Absence: Medical; Family; Personal; Educational; Military; Maternity;

Employee Conduct and Discipline: Conduct and Work Rules; Drugs and Alcohol; Sexual and Other Harassment; Attendance and Punctuality; Personal Appearance; Return of Property; Resignation; Security Inspections; Solicitation; Drug Testing;

Miscellaneous: AIDS.

Thirty-one of the topics (e.g., Employment Categories, Termination) are identified as “Primary,” i.e., most commonly found in employee handbooks. Thirteen, including 11 from the Primary list, are further noted as “Legally Important” for inclusion in handbooks.

The policy areas covered by PPE are not equally pertinent or suitable to agricultural firms. Inappropriate topics can simply be neglected by growers, however, and others adapted or augmented to fit. Topics on which PPE offers a nice set of options generally applicable to farm management include: employment categories; probationary periods; performance evaluation; work schedules; overtime; leaves of absence (all kinds); employee conduct and work rules; attendance and punctuality; and employee relations.

Standard policies on some topics covered could be elaborated to better suit farm situations. For example, agricultural employers may want to substantially edit PPE policies on safety, time keeping, and verification of employment eligibility (under “immigration law”).

Among policies likely to be less important in agricultural operations are those on nondisclosure, use of phone and mail systems, educational leaves, and personal appearance. Topics on which PPE has no policy, but for which farmers may want one, include seasonal layoff and recall, wet-time and standby pay, determination of piece rates, and company housing. The program allows for insertion of such policies created by the user.

Company policies on some PPE topics, though rare or inconceivable just 10 years ago, are of growing significance today: smoking in the workplace; maternity-related absences (including those to prevent exposure to toxic substances); solicitation; drug testing; and AIDS.

All draft policies and informational screens in PPE have been reviewed and edited for legal implications by

Richard J. Simmons, well-known attorney specializing in employment law. Most policy statements are less than a page long, though they range up to three or four. Perhaps because of the care taken to ensure compatibility with laws, several statements strike us as rather “corporate” or bureaucratic. Legal reasons for having such voice may be offset by human reasons for moderating it. One wonders how some of the language would go over with, say, a peach picker or a D-6 chisel operator.

Operational Features

While the intricacy of policy and advice text varies across subjects, the process of creating a policy draft is quite standard. Informational screens on most topics offer function-key access to additional comments about specific policy issues. Cross-reference screens help maintain consistency among related policies. After viewing drafts that result from different sets of answers to the diagnostic questions, one can compare, sift, select, and combine policy alternatives.

For about 10 of the topics, a single screen summarizes all of the questions to be asked. Though this feature is obviously most useful for topics with more complexity and policy variation, it would be nice to have for initial overview of every topic. Below are summaries of how PPE treats two representative subjects.

■ *Sick Leave:* After generally introducing issues for employers to consider in deciding whether and in what form to provide a sick leave benefit, PPE asks 10 questions, some with two parts. A more specific information screen appears before each question. The user is prompted for choices about which categories of employee are eligible; how long a new hire has to wait before using leave credits; at what rate the leave accrues, and whether any adjustment is made for shift differentials and alternative work schedules; how short a period of leave is allowed; what maximum number of days can be accrued; whether a physician’s release is required to return to work after a given number of sick days; and how use of sick leave is tied to workers’ compensation and disability benefits. Cross-references to other benefits policies and to dependent sick leave are offered, as is a help screen for calculating sick leave for flextime employees. The program then generates a policy running about a page and a half.

■ *Conduct and Work Rules:* PPE opens the topic with reasoned advice that it may be better not to specify too much. It then asks the user to select all applicable forms of prohibited conduct from a list of 18 types. Examples are theft, falsification of records, use of alcohol and drugs, fighting, insubordination, safety or health violations, sexual harassment, absenteeism, and unsatisfactory performance. A cross-reference information screen and question prompt the user to indicate the company

stance on employment "at-will." Depending on the responses, the draft policy may range from three paragraphs to two pages.

Though PPE's help screens and policy drafts are conditioned on user responses to diagnostic questions, PPE's internal decision trees and output alternatives are not as intricate as those of most sophisticated "expert systems." All questions are topic-specific. One could imagine a souped-up version with, in addition, a few introductory questions on such characteristics as legal form of the business, nature of product line, number of employees, turnover rate, and employee literacy level, the answers to which would globally affect policy tone and content. Unless and until such a feature is added, PPE's crude editing facility should get plenty of use.

Other, simpler refinements would be useful. For example, no helpful beep warns the user when an obviously out-of-range response to a question (e.g., 10,000 years) is entered. Some sets of alternative answers contain overlapping categories (e.g., "probationary employees" and "all employees") that could be presented to show their logical relationships or recast into mutually exclusive choices. And some questions calling for verbal answers cannot cope with more than one word or labels longer than eleven characters. None of these problems is fatal, of course. Any flawed policy drafts that result can be edited later, though correction is tedious where a single answer affects several passages.

The Bottom Line

Is Personnel Policy Expert worth acquiring? Merely as a fancy checklist of policy components to consider, it encourages managers to think ahead and inform workers about terms of employment. If it thus enables people on a ranch to work together more effectively, or helps avoid turnover, lawsuit, or costly effects of demoralization, PPE pays back more than its purchase price. Some of the cheaper programs and even printed references, however, could serve the checklist function just as well at much lower cost.

But PPE and other policy software packages are more than checklists. They are tools for thoughtfully developing and producing a document that can communicate to employees and third parties the organizational culture as well as specific expectations of people at work. Just because the costs of operating without such a document are hidden does not mean they are small. If any tool can spell the difference between having and not having an articulate employee handbook on key personnel issues, it is easily worth \$495 and more.

PPE does not come cheap, but its ease of use makes it possible for many farmers who "haven't had the time" to

finally create their first handbooks, largely because it reduces to a few hours the time needed. Taking advantage of its customizing features and updates, users can inject agricultural terms into generic language and then keep their policies current with changes in company preference and the law.

We have both been charged with writing personnel policy manuals for previous employers. One of us, in the crush of fire-fighting, barely got beyond drafting a few essential policies in either of two companies. The other managed, in about three weeks, to crank out a handbook with several ill-advised statements and a couple of regrettable omissions. With Personnel Policy Expert, we could have done each drafting job quite well in a day at most, and then rapidly and painlessly integrated the numerous changes imposed by upper-level managers. PPE is direct and unstressful — the kind of burden reliever that computer programs are supposed to be.

Now if the program just had a search-and-replace feature, so that all occurrences of an unwanted term at the policy creation level could be altered at once. And if KnowledgePoint would break down and write a Macintosh version for us zealots who know what "user friendly" really means. □

Getting Injury and Illness Down on the Farm

"Safety pays, a growing number of companies find. Safety and productivity, once viewed as antagonistic, have become bedfellows. Some companies say better safety practices improve morale, boost output, trim worker compensation costs, and strengthen public relations." [Wall Street Journal, January 29, 1991]

While managing for safe operations yields its own reward to growers and workers, state and federal laws add to employers' motives for providing a safe, healthful workplace. Senate Bill 198, which amended the California Labor Code in late 1989, added to employers' specific obligations for injury prevention. Coupled with rising costs for workers' compensation insurance, this legislation has intensified interest and activity on the farm safety front.

The longstanding if small DANR Farm Safety Program has been greatly augmented by a five-year grant from the National Institute for Safety and Occupational Health (NIOSH) to create an Agricultural Health and Safety Center at UC Davis. In a recent newsletter, William Steinke, Director of the Farm Safety Program, lists safety training videos and films available for free loan (see "Resources" section, pages 13 and 14).

SB198 directed the California Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board to issue by January 1991 a more comprehensive general standard governing worksite safety. The new regulation requires every employer to establish *and document* (those with less than 10 employees are exempt from documentation mandate) by July 1, 1991, an effective injury and illness prevention program containing, at minimum: (1) identification of the person responsible for implementation; (2) a system for ensuring program compliance; (3) a system for communicating with employees on health and safety matters; (4) procedures for identifying and evaluating workplace hazards; (5) a procedure to investigate workplace injury or illness; (6) methods for correcting hazardous conditions; and (7) safety training for employees. Farmers are encouraged to direct questions about the requirements to local Cal/OSHA representatives or to Richard Jones, Cal/OSHA Consultation, 395 Oyster Point Blvd., 3rd Fl., Wing C, Rm. 325, South San Francisco, CA 94080.

University Extension, Davis, has conducted a series of half-day workshops on "Complying with Cal/OSHA's Injury Prevention Standard in the Agricultural Workplace." Funded as part of the NIOSH grant, these sessions were held in six cities from late April to early May.

APMP staff have conducted and participated in several meetings to help farmers strengthen their safety programs, with an eye on the July 1 deadline for complying with SB198 requirements. A workshop last February in Stockton, organized by Farm Advisor Gregory Billikopf and Lupe Sandoval of the Agricultural Workers' Health Center, covered the main points of the law, means of controlling liability, hazard evaluation, causes and investigation of accidents, worker safety training, discipline policies in the safety program, incentives to reduce accidents, safety committees, workers' compensation, medical questions, and program documentation. A free booklet, *Written Injury and Illness Prevention Program*, includes abstracts of many of the presentations, and lists the speakers and their phone numbers (see "Resources").

Steve Sutter has held safety workshops for growers since last August and has developed references to aid in program design and documentation. *Written Accident and Illness Prevention Programs* and *Selected Safety Orders Affecting Agricultural Employers* are both available at no charge (see "Resources"). An upcoming seminar on Establishing Accident and Illness Prevention Programs is the second of two this spring co-sponsored by UCCE and Farm Bureau in Tulare and Fresno counties. Scheduled for June 20 at the UC West Side Field Station in Five Points, the program is much the same as one held in Visalia on May 10, including presentations on understanding and living with SB198 requirements, establishing and practicing a safety policy, and pesticide safety (see "Future Events, page 15") □

New Immigration Law Includes Provisions for Families

On October 1, 1991, additional immigrant visas will be made available and provisions for temporary "family unity" consideration (currently called "family fairness") will take effect under the Immigration Act of 1990, passed by the U.S. Congress last October. To help alleviate a reported 7- to 12-year backlog of applications to immigrate to the United States, the Act establishes 700,000 new immigrant visas to be issued annually in fiscal years 1992 to 1994. Of those, 55,000 are set aside for spouses and children of aliens granted legal resident status under the Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) of 1986.

IRCA included no provisions for the families of legalizing aliens. As a result, until the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) Commissioner issued guidelines in February 1990 to standardize and clarify procedures, nonlegalized spouses and children who wanted permission to remain and work in the United States were subject to case-by-case decisions by individual INS District Directors applying their own standards of humanitarian consideration. Though helpful, even the 1990 policy left some uncertainties about procedures and safeguards for applicants. The new Act represents acceptance by Congress of the family fairness concept and offers some improvements over current guidelines, but questions still exist. Some of these may be answered when INS issues regulations for administering the law enacted last fall.

Consideration based on family fairness developed as a temporary measure allowing families to stay together, when one or more members have qualified for IRCA legalization and the others have not, and recognizing the long wait for regular immigrant status (using form I-130). Under both the current guidelines and the new law, permission for families of legal residents to stay and to work here is granted for a year at a time; spouses and children need to reapply annually.

Major differences between the new law and current INS policy are a later cutoff date for eligibility (residence required in the United States since May 5, 1988, instead of November 6, 1986) and the definition of "child" as under age 21 instead of 18. In the meantime, INS February 1990 family fairness guidelines for spouses and children of aliens legalized under IRCA still apply (described in "Family Fairness Guidelines Offer A Little More Certainty," *Economics: Trends in Human Resource Management*, No. 16, August 1990.)

The Immigration Act of 1990 specifies the qualifications for family unity, or "temporary stay of deportation

and work authorization for certain eligible immigrants." Effective October 1, those eligible to apply will be spouses and unmarried children (under age 21) of people with temporary or permanent residence cards. The families must: (1) be generally eligible as immigrants, (2) have entered the United States before May 5, 1988, and (3) have resided here since then.

Employment authorization is to be granted as under the February 1990 guidelines. Besides revising the entry date and the definition of "child," the new law makes several other changes to the current rules. It omits the requirement that the family reside with the legalized alien. Having entered the United States on the basis of a misrepresentation will no longer be a ground for exclusion from family fairness benefits. A person still may be deported if excludable on certain criminal or political grounds, but the list is narrower than under previous policy. The new law declares ineligible an alien who has been convicted of a felony or three misdemeanors in the United States, or has participated in the persecution of others.

Under the new law, spouses and children who are granted temporary permission to remain will be subject to the same restrictions from "public welfare assistance" as the legalized alien to whom they are related. Current INS policy does not include such restrictions.

The present INS guidelines provide family fairness benefits for children born outside the United States after November 6, 1986, but who entered before February 2, 1990. The new law gives no protection to such children. Also uncertain is the status of children who turn 21 before October 1. Families who entered after May 5, 1988, will not qualify at all under the new law.

Until October 1, with the current INS policy still in effect, the only persons eligible for family fairness are spouses and unmarried children under age 18 who entered the United States before November 7, 1986 (or children born after November 6, 1986, who entered before February 2, 1990) and have resided with the legalized alien. Families who do not qualify under those terms but who will be eligible under the new law are being advised to get their papers ready and wait until October 1 to file. INS has indicated it will not apply the terms specified by the Immigration Act of 1990 until October 1.

Since the family fairness policy was issued early last year, INS had received 53,351 applications for family fairness in the Western Region by April 27, 1991; 35,442 have been adjudicated and 22,965 (65 percent) of those approved. □

Resources

Video Tapes, Films, and Slide Sets

A Systematic Approach to Employee Selection. Four California farmers and farm managers who have successfully used systematic procedures to recruit and hire agricultural employees describe the process and results in a new video produced by Lupe Sandoval, Agricultural Workers' Health Centers, Stockton, and Gregory Billikopf, UCCE, Modesto. All four growers had encountered serious problems with traditional selection processes before trying a more methodical approach.

The approximately 1-hour video uses narration, farmer testimony, and examples to introduce benefits and techniques of job analysis, structured interviews, ability tests, and medical exams in employment decisions. Step-by-step procedures used by the farmers are shown. The video has a large segment on practical tests and a section on medical screening showing the various exams that can be conducted by qualified medical facilities.

The video is being sold for \$20, or is available on loan for \$5 in California (\$7.50 out of state). Make checks payable to the UC Regents and mail to: Selection Video #V90-Y, Visual Media, University of California, Davis, CA 95616-8748 (phone 916/757-8980).

Safety Training Films, Videos, and Slide Sets. The Farm Safety Program has a library of safety training materials for loan at no charge. Contact the Farm Safety Library, Agricultural Engineering Extension, University of California, Davis, CA 95616 (phone 916/752-0563). Slide sets and additional pesticide safety videos are also available for purchase or for loan at a nominal charge from Visual Media, Davis 95616-8980 (phone 916/757-8980).

Publications

Labor Management Laws in California Agriculture. Publication No. 21404, by Howard R. Rosenberg and Daniel L. Egan, published November 1990, 136 pages, \$10. Integrated summary of state and federal laws clarifies what is required, allowed, and prohibited with respect to (1) specific terms of employment (such as wages, rest periods, and safety standards), and (2) interactions between employers and workers (as in pre-hire screening, collective bargaining, and dismissal). Specific statutes, administrative rules, and case precedents are discussed within the context of the types of management decisions they affect. Footnote references, a directory of government agencies, a list of court cases cited, and an extensive subject index are included.

The book is available from ANR Publications, University of California, 6701 San Pablo Ave., Oakland, CA



Braceros being questioned and examined for indications of their agricultural experience, 1943. Photo courtesy of Jack Lloyd.

94608-1239 (phone 415/642-2431). Order with check payable to the UC Regents for \$10, which includes tax and handling.

Application of the Makewhole Remedy under California's Agricultural Labor Relations Act: Litigious Refusals to Bargain. Monograph and Research Series: 50, by Walter Fogel, published 1989, 145 pages, \$11. The study focuses on technical refusal to bargain cases involving a newly or recently certified union, showing how the remedy has been applied over the years and under the changing composition of the Agricultural Labor Relations Board. Also discussed is the larger issue of litigation challenging union representation of employees.

Copies may be purchased from the UC Institute of Industrial Relations Publications, 1001 Gayley Avenue, 2nd floor, Los Angeles, CA 90024-1478 (phone 213/825-9191). Order with check payable to the UC Regents for \$11 per copy, plus \$1.50 postage and handling (plus 50¢ each additional book ordered). California residents add 6% sales tax (7% in Los Angeles).

The Illustrated Guide to Pesticide Safety. Worker's Packet (Publication 21488), \$4, includes five copies of 6 x 9 edition (48 pages). **Instructor's Packet** (Publication 21489), \$5, includes one copy of 8.5 x 11 instructor's edition (80 pages) plus five copies of 6 x 9 worker's edition. Both are written in easy-to-read style with comic book illustrations and captions in English and Spanish. The instructor's edition also provides space for employers to customize training data to each operation and contains ready-to-use training records and other required forms, as well as tables of acute toxicities, special hazards, and requirements for medical monitoring, reentry level, and protective clothing and equipment.

Send check or money order payable to UC Regents (price includes tax and handling) to: ANR Publications, University of California, 6701 San Pablo Avenue, Oakland, CA 94608-1239 (phone 415/642-2431).

Written Injury and Illness Prevention Program. Booklet including abstracts of several presentations at a safety workshop last February is available at no charge from Gregory Billikopf (for address, see page 15).

Written Accident and Illness Prevention Programs. A free booklet distributed at the Visalia and Five Points safety workshops, contains a model guideline safety program in English and Spanish, sample forms, information on the law, inspection checklists, and a list of UC Cooperative Extension safety videos. Write or phone Steve Sutter (see page 15).

Selected Safety Orders Affecting Agricultural Employers. Numerous Cal/OSHA orders related to worker protection, access to medical records, operation of equipment, use of tools, and the like have been compiled by Steve Sutter in a 30-page booklet. The orders are presented as published in source volumes, without interpretation or annotation. For a free copy, contact Sutter or Betsey Tabraham (see page 15).

Newsletters

Labor management. APMP Farm Advisors Gregory Billikopf and Steve Sutter both publish newsletters several times a year on all aspects of personnel management. Recent issues have provided information on such subjects as labor laws, farm safety, worker legalization, work-site poster requirements, wage rates, tax withholding, and workers' compensation. To be added to the mailing list for *People in Ag: Managing Farm Personnel*, write or phone Gregory Encina Billikopf. For the *Agricultural Personnel Management Newsletter*, contact Steve Sutter.

Safety and Health. *Safety and Occupational Health in Agriculture*, a newsletter published by the Farm Safety Program, of the UC Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources, is available at no charge. It presents information on developing and implementing safety programs in agricultural workplaces. Contact William E. Steinke, Director, Farm Safety Program, Agricultural Engineering Extension, University of California, Davis, CA 95616 (phone 916/752-1613).

Farm Labor Information. *Voice of the Fields (La Voz del Campo)*, now in its second year, provides agricultural labor market information, consumer education articles, and reports on legal matters, health and safety, events, and other subjects of interest to farm workers. It is published bi-weekly by La Cooperativa, 2222 N Street,

Sacramento, CA 95816, with support from the U.S. Department of Labor through California Employment Development Department. It is distributed by several worker training organizations and is posted in EDD offices and various community establishments. □

Events

Incentive Pay Workshop Held in February

Speakers at a workshop held in Modesto on February 5 discussed aspects of dairy science, such as quality and productivity measurement, while giving practical suggestions for employee incentives related to reproduction, calf health, milk quantity and quality, and feeding. Topics presented by a University of California Cooperative Extension Labor Management Farm Advisor, Dairy Farm Advisors, and an Animal Scientist included steps in creating an effective incentive pay program, as well as motivating employees to work toward decreasing days open, reducing calf mortality, enhancing milk production, maintaining milking equipment, increasing milk quality, and improving feeding management. Three dairy farmers spoke on their experiences with incentive pay.

A free publication, *Employee Incentive Pay in Dairies*, with abstracts from most of the presentations, is available from Gregory Billikopf.

Future Events

Agricultural Labor Research Symposium. June 5 and 6, 1991, at Sterling Suites, Napa Valley, 1075 California Boulevard, Napa, California. Co-sponsored by the California Employment Development Department (EDD) and University of California, the conference will be organized around three panels discussing farm workers, agricultural labor management, and labor contractors. Conference registration is \$60. For more information, phone EDD, Labor Market Information Division: Fran Styron (916/427-4685), or El Chong (916/427-4936). Hotel information: Sterling Suites (707/253-9540).

Establishing Accident and Illness Prevention Programs. June 20, 8:30 a.m. to noon, at the UC West Side Field Station, Five Points. Program will cover SB198 requirements (Dan Dobrinen, Cal/OSHA Consultation Service), establishing and practicing a safety policy (Steve Sutter), and pesticide safety (Manuel Jimenez, Farm Advisor, Visalia). For more details, or to reserve space, contact Steve Sutter. □

Contributors

Special contributors to this issue:

Norman J. Hetland, Staff Research Associate, Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics, UC Berkeley (page 9)

Philip L. Martin, Professor, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of California, Davis (page 6)

Special thanks also to:

Donna Coultice, Director, and *Madeline Van Wagenen*, Immigration Reform, Western Region, U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, Laguna Hills, California (for information on family unity, page 12)

Valerie Small Navarro, Immigration Project Director, California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation, San Francisco (for information on family unity, page 12)

Vijaykumar S. Pradhan, Statistician, Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics, UC Berkeley (for table and graph, page 8)

Agricultural Personnel Management Program Staff:

Gregory Encina Billikopf, Area Agricultural Personnel Management Farm Advisor (Stanislaus, Merced, and San Joaquin counties), UC Cooperative Extension, 733 County Center III Court, Modesto, CA 95355 (phone 209/525-6654)

Howard R. Rosenberg, Director, APMP, and Specialist, Cooperative Extension, Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720 (phone 415/642-7103)

Stephen R. Sutter, Area Agricultural Personnel Management Farm Advisor (Fresno, Kings, Merced, and Tulare counties), UC Cooperative Extension, 1720 South Maple Avenue, Fresno, CA 93702 (phone 209/488-3285)

Betsey H. Tabraham, Coordinator, APMP, 319 Giannini Hall, University of California, Berkeley 94720 (phone 415/642-2296)

In accordance with applicable State and Federal laws and University policy, the University of California does not discriminate in any of its policies, procedures, or practices on the basis of race, religion, color, national origin, sex, marital status, sexual orientation, age, veteran status, medical condition, or handicap. Inquiries regarding this policy may be addressed to the Affirmative Action Director, University of California Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources, 300 Lakeside Drive, Oakland, CA 94612-3560. Telephone (415) 987-0097.

Agricultural Personnel Management Program
University of California
319 Giannini Hall
Berkeley, CA 94720

Nonprofit
Organization
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
Berkeley, California
Permit No. 1

Labor Management Decisions is published three times a year by the Agricultural Personnel Management Program, Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources, University of California. Articles may be reprinted with credit.

We welcome readers' opinions, news items, and other information. Letters will be published as space permits.

To continue or begin receiving *Labor Management Decisions*, please fill out the form below and send to:
Agricultural Personnel Management Program, 319 Giannini Hall, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720.
Phone: 415/642-2296. FAX: 415/642-6108.

FREE SUBSCRIPTION

- Please: keep my name on
 add my name to the free mailing list for *Labor Management Decisions*:

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP CODE _____