



Henry C. Powell
Telephone: (510) 987-0711
Fax: (510) 763-0309
Email: henry.powell@ucop.edu

Chair of the Assembly and the Academic Council
Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents
University of California
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200

May 11, 2010

**PROVOST AND EVP PITTS
VICE PRESIDENT DOOLEY**

Re: Recommendations for DANR Review Metrics

Dear Larry and Dan:

Following the Senate's 2009 review of the recently completed academic review of the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources, the Academic Council found that the review had not been as rigorous as expected. Accordingly, Council tasked the Senate's committees on Planning and Budget and Research Policy to develop metrics that could guide future reviews and the Division's strategic planning process. UCORP and UCPB have now developed a set of recommendations, which Council has unanimously endorsed. Both the critique of the academic review and the recommended metrics for future reviews are contained in the attached joint letter from UCORP and UCPB.

In accordance with the two committees' suggestions, Council requests a response to the report by November 15, 2010. Council recommends that this response be used as a benchmark for DANR's next five year review. We hope that these recommendations are helpful to you as you re-envision DANR's role and goals. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Henry C. Powell'.

Henry C. Powell, Chair
Academic Council

Copy: Academic Council
Martha Winnacker, Academic Senate Executive Director



UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY (UCORP)

Greg Miller, Chair

grgmiller@ucdavis.edu

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET (UCPB)

Peter Krapp, Chair

krapp@uci.edu

Assembly of the Academic Senate

1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor

Oakland, CA 94607-5200

Phone: (510) 987-9466

Fax: (510) 763-0309

April 6, 2010

**HARRY POWELL, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL**

RE: DANR Review Metrics

Dear Harry,

As you know, the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources (DANR) was the subject of an [academic review](#) in the fall of 2008, which was then reviewed by the Academic Senate in the spring of 2009. The [Senate review](#) found several shortcomings in the academic review. The Academic Council then tasked UCORP and UCPB to devise further guidelines to help DANR generate a more compelling analysis in the future. Specifically, then-Chair Croughan wrote that “Council tasks your committees to develop jointly a series of queries to DANR that will facilitate critical thinking by DANR about its new strategic vision and how to attain it. We anticipate that many queries will focus on financial planning and the identification and adoption of sequential, actionable steps to achieve the Division’s articulated goals.” This report contains our recommendations for additional metrics to improve subsequent DANR academic reviews.

We highlight four main areas, each of which is accompanied by specific questions and measures in the attached document.

- I. Defense of Overall Organizational Structure: We feel that the review, and even the accompanying strategic vision, does not address the organizational structure of DANR. Issues of centralized administration are not explored or justified; the reasoning behind federated programs is not presented; and administrative efficiency is not addressed.
- II. Justify Programmatic Changes: When program changes are announced, they are seldom accompanied by the rationale supporting those changes. Similarly, the plaudits contained within the academic review are not supported by accompanying data. It may be that these data exist and are easily accessible, but they were not shared with Senate reviewers of the academic review. The impacts on cost, research, and education must be clearly explained and accompany changes.
- III. Development and Fulfillment of Appropriate Evaluative Metrics for Each Arm of DANR: The various arms of DANR have distinct missions, and statements of fulfillment must be accompanied by relevant and clear data. Again, the rigorous self-study DANR conducted suggests that these metrics probably exist, but they were not shared with Senate reviewers.
- IV. Explicit Description of Educational Efforts: The nature and level of the education conducted by DANR personnel is neither explained nor quantified.

In order for these recommendations to be most useful, we feel that the Academic Council should request that DANR provide the relevant information to the Senate within six months of their receipt of this request. We do not intend to conduct another academic review, nor do we propose that the Academic Senate re-evaluate the 2008 academic review. Instead, we ask that the responses be held as the benchmark against which DANR's next regular, 5-year academic review can be measured and improvement shown.

Finally, we remind both DANR and the UC Provost of this observation by Senate respondents to the DANR review: "The recommendations were simultaneously found to be both too vague and too grand: without clearly defined goals, 'reconceptualization' is an abstraction, and without a clear identity 'claiming a greater public profile' is problematic." Periodic reviews need to stimulate critical thinking about DANR's strategic vision, in ways that are demonstrably implemented in concrete steps. It is our hope and expectation that DANR will articulate its concrete goals with greater clarity, and demonstrate how it is approaching them.

Sincerely,

Greg Miller, Chair
UCORP

Peter Krapp, Chair
UCPB

cc: UCORP
UCPB
Martha Winnacker, Executive Director, Systemwide Academic Senate

Suggested Academic Review Metrics for DANR

I. Defense of Overall Organizational Structure

DANR currently has a presence at Berkeley, Davis, and Riverside, with a management structure based in Oakland.

- Why these campuses?
- What advantage is provided by centralized administration?
- What advantage is provided by centralizing administration at OP rather than at one of the three participant campuses?
- How are responsibilities sorted into centralized and decentralized? Are the lines separating them clear, and are they the appropriate allocations of these functions?
- Are there cost savings realized through this structure?
- What synergy between campuses is facilitated by a central administration?
- Could a service center model be adopted instead?

We suggest that one relevant measure of the efficiency of the centralized management model is per-FTE administrative cost. A meaningful evaluation would compare UC's figures with those of other land grant universities (e.g., Purdue, Texas AM).

II. Justify Programmatic Changes

DANR recently announced changes to several programs, including the Small Farm Center, Agricultural Issues Center, Mosquito Research Center, Integrated Hardwood Range Management Program, Sustainable Agriculture and Research Education Program. There have also been changes to various competitive grant programs. Do these changes further DANR's realization of its vision? We suggest the adoption of quantitative metrics, shared with the Senate in the spirit of shared governance, such as:

- What are the budget considerations behind the decisions? Were there other considerations?
- What metrics of performance were applied?
- What relation do these centers have to the academic mission? The outreach mission?
- What impacts will these changes have on academics and outreach? Again, quantitative metrics are required.

III. Development and Fulfillment of Appropriate Evaluative Metrics for Each Arm of DANR

DANR consists of distinct entities such as the Agricultural Experiment Stations, Cooperative Extension, 15 state-wide programs, and 10 research and extension centers. Each of these presumably has similarly distinct missions with appropriate metrics of success. For example, for the Agricultural Experiment Station the appropriate metrics are probably those associated with UC academic units, like:

- Budgetary metrics: internal vs. extramural funding, support from industry vs. government, centralized vs. on-campus expenditures, administrative vs. operational vs. research expenditures
- Research metrics: publications, patents, scholarly presentations, and grants (including cost recovery)
- Service metrics: outreach to commodity groups, presentations

Suggested Academic Review Metrics for DANR

- Instructional metrics: numbers of Senate and non-Senate faculty, students advised, student credit hours per FTE, degrees granted per FTE
- Unique or additional metrics applied to AES and Cooperative Extension FTEs

Each segment of DANR needs to present its applicable metrics and its success in meeting each.

IV. Explicit Description of Educational Efforts

It remains unclear to what extent DANR takes responsibility for offering courses with definite syllabi, defined credits, exams, grades, etc. These must also be included in the future, sorted by appointment type, if such activities are undertaken by DANR personnel. If DANR personnel teach under the auspices of a campus department and a split appointment, such should also be made clear.