



Robert C. May
Telephone: (510) 987-0711
Email: robert.may@ucop.edu

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

December 1, 2018

**DAVID MARSHALL, EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLOR, UC SANTA BARBARA
CHAIR, UC ANR ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Re: Draft Report of the UC ANR Advisory Committee

Dear David,

I invited Senate divisions and systemwide committees to review the draft report of President Napolitano's UC Agriculture and Natural Resources Advisory Committee. Six Academic Senate divisions (UCB, UCD, UCLA, UCM, UCSC, and UCSD) and one systemwide committee (UCPB, through its Task Force on ANR) submitted comments. These comments were discussed at Academic Council's November 28, 2018 meeting and are attached for your reference.

I have also asked the UCPB ANR-TF to dig deeper into its proposed Recommendation 5 concerning the integration of ANR and its mission across the UC system, and to make some specific recommendations to the Academic Council about how to connect non-AES UC faculty directly with ANR facilities and personnel.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have additional questions.

Sincerely,

Robert C. May, Chair
Academic Council

Encl.

Cc: Academic Council
Senate Directors



UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET (UCPB)
James Steintrager, Chair
jsteintr@uci.edu

Assembly of the Academic Senate
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200
Phone: (510) 987-9466
Fax: (510) 763-0309

November 27, 2018

**ROBERT MAY, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL**

RE: Draft Report of UC ANR Advisory Committee

Dear Robert,

The University Committee on Planning and Budget's Task Force on Agriculture and Natural Resources (TF-ANR) has reviewed the draft report of President Napolitano's UC Agriculture and Natural Resources (UC ANR) Advisory Committee. TF-ANR's report is enclosed.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "J. Steintrager", with a stylized flourish at the end.

James Steintrager, Chair
UCPB

Encl.

cc: UCPB
UCPB ANR-TF
Executive Director Baxter

November 27, 2018

To: James Steintrager
Chair, University Committee on Planning and Budget

Re: Draft Report of UC ANR Advisory Committee

Dear Jim,

The University Committee on Planning and Budget's Task Force on Agriculture and Natural Resources (TF-ANR) convened a special meeting to discuss the recommendations in the draft report of President Napolitano's UC Agriculture and Natural Resources (UC ANR) Advisory Committee, charged by the President to consider options for the structure, governance, and funding of the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources (ANR). TF-ANR was given a regrettably short comment period, which presented a challenge for full participation of our membership. The Task Force this year includes faculty members from the Berkeley, Davis, Irvine, Los Angeles, Merced, San Diego, Santa Cruz, and San Diego campuses. It also includes members from the University Committee on Research Policy, the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs, and the University Committee on Educational Policy, who have added their voices to this letter.

TF-ANR is largely in accord with the recommendations concerning funding and reporting structures. General support was expressed for Recommendation 1, maintaining UC ANR's status as a systemwide program within the UC Office of the President, as well as Recommendation 4, retaining campus oversight of and reporting responsibility for State AES funds. TF-ANR believes there is a need to clarify Recommendation 3, concerning the proposed combination of "corridor" and set-aside funding models, which seems to suggest that ANR will receive both a fixed amount and also an amount that fluctuates with the larger UC budget. TF-ANR members also wondered whether the new budget and funding structure will allow the proposed Governing Council to effectively evaluate the ANR budget and various funding priorities such as 4-H. Indeed, the report did not indicate metrics beyond the corridor model for determining how budget changes might be allocated.

There was overall support for the proposed Governing Council outlined in Recommendation 2, though several specifications were suggested. We recommend adding language to clarify that the President appoints the three Academic Senate members based on recommendations by the Senate. In the tradition of shared governance, TF-ANR would like Senate representatives on this Governing Council to play the role of official Senate liaisons. If it is deemed necessary that the President select and appoint faculty members to the Council, then it will be an Administrative Committee and will not play a formal role in shared governance. As such, the ongoing problem of a lack of regular accountability of ANR to the Senate will remain unaddressed, including an ongoing examination of ANR's budget in the context of UC's overall priorities. Additionally, members expressed concern that the membership of the Governing Council could end up including only or mostly individuals from the three AES campuses. We would underscore here and throughout the importance of achieving a "healthy balance of representation from campuses that have AES schools and colleges and campuses that don't" (p. 23). A healthy balance would

recognize that seven campuses do not have AES schools and three do. Finally, there is a need to clarify the relation of the Governing Council to the existing four governing bodies, and some TF-ANR members support further discussion of the proposed elimination of the Senate's representative to the Program Council (p. 23).

TF-ANR agrees with the report's sentiment that ANR would be a more effective operation if it could integrate more fully into the University's larger academic mission and promote collaborations that bridge the full UC. The report mentions at various junctures the goal of identifying "linkages and opportunities across campuses and disciplines" (p. 28). TF-ANR feels this issue is critically important and that it merits greater attention in the report. Members agree with the aspirational aspect of the statement that "UC ANR is as important for California today as it was 100 years ago" (p. 12), given current issues such as climate change, water limitation, and health and nutrition. However, ANR is not uniquely poised to address these matters, and TF-ANR members feel the non-AES campuses have collectively developed strengths in aspects of these issues that often exceed those in ANR, and that accelerated progress will ultimately require the combined efforts of ANR and the AES and non-AES campuses.

While the report is a good step forward in bringing more connections and perspectives to the attention of ANR leadership, the evolving nature of the issues ANR engages with should be emphasized in the report, and a UC-wide strategy articulated for addressing them. TF-ANR suggests that a fifth recommendation be added to the report that specifically targets the need for greater integration between all the campuses and ANR. This fifth recommendation might include some specific recommendations to connect non-AES UC faculty directly with ANR facilities and personnel, such as funding for undergraduate or graduate training, or joint-research pilot projects. Historical examples of programs that have successfully used a competitive funding model to build integrated research programs include the multi-campus units Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation and the Institute of Geophysics and Planetary Physics. The UC National Laboratory Fees Research Program is another good example of a program that enhances interactions. After running a program that provides incentives for research and curricular integration, the next step would be to evaluate its success and recommend best practices for further integration between ANR and all the campuses. TF-ANR feels strongly that an expanded intellectual interaction between ANR and the non-AES campuses is needed, and that a concerted plan and effort will be required to realize this goal.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback at this juncture and would be keen to participate in ongoing discussions of these recommendations.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Eleanor K. Kaufman".

Eleanor Kaufman
Chair, UCPB Task Force on ANR
Vice Chair, UCPB



320 STEPHENS HALL
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

November 26, 2018

ROBERT MAY
Chair, Academic Council

*Subject: Draft Report and Recommendations of the UC Agriculture and Natural Resources
Advisory Committee*

Dear Robert,

On November 19, 2018, the Divisional Council (DIVCO) of the Berkeley Division discussed the draft report cited in the subject line, informed by commentary of our divisional committees on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA), and Research (COR).

DIVCO's discussion echoed CAPRA's commentary, which is appended in its entirety.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Barbara Spackman'.

Barbara Spackman
Chair, Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate
Cecchetti Professor of Italian Studies and Professor of Comparative Literature

Encl.

Cc: Jennifer Johnson-Hanks, Chair, Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation
John Colford, Chair, Committee on Research
Deborah Dobin, Senate Analyst, Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation, and Committee on Research



November 15, 2018

PROFESSOR BARBARA SPACKMAN
Chair, Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate

Re: CAPRA comments on the Draft Report of the UC ANR Advisory Committee

Dear Chair Spackman;

At its November 14th meeting, CAPRA discussed the draft report of the UC Agriculture and Natural Resources (ANR) Advisory Committee. The report, which came out of the Huron report's directive that there be reviews of the structure and governance of a number of UCOP units, is very helpful in describing the importance of ANR to the UC system and the state of California. The committee is supportive of the report's recommendation that the unit remain within UCOP as a direct report to the UC President. CAPRA also supports the report's recommendation that ANR use a combination of the "set-aside" and "corridor" funding models to establish more stable and sustainable budgets and promote transparent governance.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

With best regards,

Jennifer Johnson-Hanks, Chair
Committee on Academic Planning and
Resource Allocation



OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
KURT SCHNIER, CHAIR
senatechair@ucmerced.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95343
(209) 228-7954

NOVEMBER 29, 2018

ROBERT MAY, CHAIR, ACADEMIC COUNCIL

RE: DRAFT REPORT FROM THE UC ANR ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Dear Robert:

The draft report of the UC ANR Advisory Committee was distributed for optional comment to standing committees and school executive committees of the Merced Division of the Academic Senate. Additionally, Professor Joshua Viers, the campus Director of the Center for Information Technology Research in the Interest of Society (CITRIS), and the campus's representative to the Senate's Task Force on Agriculture and Natural Resources (TFANR), was invited to comment. Comments were received from the Committee on Research (CoR) and Director Viers. These are appended. All remaining groups declined to comment.

The Committee on Research (CoR) endorsed the draft report and offered the following two suggestions:

- ANR headquarters should be located more centrally within the State of California. For example, the Fresno area may be a potential option due its agricultural relevance.
- Increase awareness among the UC campuses about ANR's mission. Specifically, highlight ANR's capability to support or enhance faculty outreach and research activities; for example, this could lead to contributions to the development of grant proposals and potential, additional revenue for UC ANR.

Director Viers raises a number of issues that he believes should be addressed before the report is finalized. These include broader contextual issues that have the potential to inform ultimately the Advisory Council's recommendations, as well as several specific recommendations for revisions to the report. We hope these can be considered as the Senate finalizes its response.

We thank you for the opportunity to opine.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Kurt Schnier".

Kurt Schnier, Chair
Division Council

CC: Divisional Council
Hilary Baxter, Executive Director, Systemwide Academic Senate
Laura Martin, Executive Director, Merced Senate Office

Encl (3)

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

ACADEMIC SENATE, MERCED DIVISION
COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH
MICHAEL SCHEIBNER, CHAIR
mscheibner@ucmerced.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95343
(209) 228-4369

November 28, 2018

To: Kurt Schnier, Chair, Division Council

From: Michael Scheibner, Chair, Committee on Research (COR)

A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading "Michael Scheibner", is placed to the right of the "From:" line.

Re: UC ANR Report

At our November 28 meeting, CoR reviewed the draft report from the UC ANR Advisory Committee. CoR endorses the recommendations contained in the report, but we offer two suggestions:

- 1) ANR headquarters should be located more centrally within the State of California. For example, the Fresno area may be a potential option due its agricultural relevance.
- 2) Increase awareness among the UC campuses about ANR's mission. Specifically, highlight ANR's capability to support or enhance faculty outreach and research activities; for example, this could lead to contributions to the development of grant proposals and potential, additional revenue for UC ANR.

We appreciate the opportunity to opine.

cc: Senate Office

Professor Kurt Schnier
Chair, Academic Senate,
Merced Division

November 27, 2018

Dear Kurt,

Thank you for extending the opportunity to opine on the systemwide solicitation for comments on the "Draft Report and Recommendations: UC Agriculture and Natural Resources" dated November 5, 2018, and developed by the UC Agriculture and Natural Resources (UC ANR) Advisory Committee charged by President Janet Napolitano to consider options for UC ANR's structure, governance, and funding. I write to you as Campus Director for the Center for Information Technology Research in the Interest of Society and the Banatao Institute, a campus organized research unit at UC Merced with an emerging portfolio of agricultural technology research in partnership with UC ANR and stakeholders throughout the San Joaquin Valley.

There are several issues with the draft report that should be addressed before finalized. These include some broader contextual issues that appear to be missing from its presentation. I raise these with the intent to spark further scrutiny of the report and its recommendations. Secondly, I also suggest some specific recommended changes to the report and other potential points of improvement.

Broader Contextual Issues:

- 1) California has changed dramatically since the inception of the University and the origination of ANR. Likewise, the needs of the State, especially as it pertains to agriculture and natural resources management, have also changed. The tone and content of the draft report do not capture the essence of this shift, and most importantly appear to gloss over the need for more substantive changes and further suggest the status quo is sufficiently adequate for our future. To quote: "UC ANR is as important for California today as it was 100 years ago." I would argue that it is more important today, but that its actions do not fully reflect the full potential of the University.
- 2) The impetus for this ad hoc review is evidently in response to the Huron Report (*Huron's Report for the Organizational Optimization Engagement; Jan 2018*), which made some recommended changes to the UC as a whole, some of which were focused on the management and execution of ANR. While this Huron Report did not appear to provide very detailed analyses with respect to the future of ANR, there was obviously sufficient content in their investigation to warrant inclusion of recommended change(s) to ANR (and it is not the first such report to do so).
- 3) Despite a lengthy discussion of ~4 pages on the origin and formation of ANR as a result of several congressional acts (Organic, Morrill, Hatch, Smith-Lever, etc.), there is but mere mention of the designation of Agricultural Experiment Station (AES) campuses. In fact, it is presented as a *fait accompli* that the three designated campuses (Berkeley, Davis, and Riverside) have been, and only will be, considered AES despite their genesis over 110 years ago (see footnote 10).
- 4) The designation as AES is important, as the report goes on to note, largely because of the federal flow through dollars and their matching state funds that fund AES faculty at the AES campuses, and their research activities. The designation is also important because it makes those entities and their faculty agronomists eligible for competitive funding streams from federal agencies not available to UC researchers, "as well as eligibility and preferential status for UC researchers carrying out projects sponsored by the National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA) and other federal agencies." (Pg 8) Yet, in Appendix A, it states that ANR "has served to protect the rights of all UC campuses from attempts by the USDA to designate only a single campus as 'the' land-grant campus for California." It remains unclear how the UC can designate only three campuses as receiving AES funds, but maintain that all campuses should be considered land-grant to receive other USDA funds. Clearly, every campus engages in research important to ANR's mission, and most if not all receive USDA funding. Therefore, the AES designation does not appear to be supported by any rationale other than historical precedent.

- 5) While the intent of the report – and its recommended path forward – may be to “promote collaborations and connections across the University” there is little evidence that the draft recommendations will achieve this aim.
- a) In Recommendation 1, it appears that this recommendation was largely in response to the Huron Report’s suggestion that ANR be moved to UC Davis. The counterarguments to moving ANR to a specific campus include loss of identity, potential for preferential action, and lack of realized cost savings. With respect to identity, it is clear that the large presence of AES faculty at UC Davis, and physical presence of ANR in the City of Davis, have steered popular perception to think that ANR is already headquartered at UC Davis. With respect to potential for preferential action, it is clear that AES designation – and governance by AES Deans – already results in preference for funding, direction, and priorities. There was no serious analysis to suggest that administrative savings could not be met with co-location at a campus. At minimum, a more central location within the state and lower cost-of-living would result in long-term operational savings.
 - b) In Recommendation 2, the suggested mission of the governance body would help achieve a “healthy balance of representation from campuses that have AES schools and colleges and campuses that don’t.” (Pg 23) It is not clear if that balance actually means equal weight by interest (50/50) or by campus designation (30/70). Further it is clear that this recommendation has the potential to ensure that current ANR/AES interests are cemented as is. If an overarching objective is to have better UC integration, and buy in by the Academic Senate, then leaving the representation on the governance body to presidential appointment will not help achieve this aim. As currently formulated, it could be that 3 of 3 campus leadership positions could come from AES campuses, plus at least one AES/UCCE academic representative, two AES deans, and three ANR stakeholders, resulting in 9 of 14 members representing a status quo perspective.
 - c) In Recommendation 3, the funding model as recommended remains opaque. Within the recommendation there are sufficient number of both platitudes and counter examples that it is difficult to tell what exactly is being proposed. For example (Pg 26), it is suggested that “UCOP and UC ANR should continue to work together to explore ways to conceptualize and present the AES funding that is distributed across the UC system” and “it would be helpful to convey in budget presentations that both federal and State AES funds are distributed via formula to AES campuses.” These funds are not distributed across the system, only to AES campuses, and therefore the recommendations in this section are unclear if not contradictory.
 - d) In Recommendation 4, it is clear that this recommendation is to keep the status quo for expediency and ease of accounting, and the fact that AES funds are so narrowly distributed that it would not necessitate an overarching role for ANR.

Specific Issues:

- 1) The report uses the term stakeholder in several interchangeable ways: (a) in the charge of the committee, stakeholders are described broadly so as to collect “input from all relevant stakeholders”; (b) in its conclusions, the committee’s recommendations are to be “more transparent and understandable for the public and UC stakeholders”; (c) internal and external stakeholders, including statewide organizations and local governance, and is defined very broadly (Pg 47); and (d) with the preponderance of usage – especially to emphasize its recommendations and counterpoints – stakeholders are quite literally 21 individuals from ANR leadership, campus leadership, and UCOP leadership. This mischaracterization is underscored in Footnote 1 (“after consulting with internal and external stakeholders¹”). Thus, the term ‘stakeholders’ is used broadly where necessary to convey a sense of buy-in across a vast constituency, but used more strategically to narrowly define the outcome of the report and its recommendations. I recommend that this distinction terminology be called out: where the input from the “stakeholder interviews” in Appendix F. is used, that these stakeholder viewpoints be couched as from ‘interviewees’, not from stakeholders. At minimum, Footnote 1 should be fixed to clearly spell out that external stakeholders, as defined elsewhere in the report, were not used.

- 2) The constitution of the governance council (Recommendation 2) currently suggests that it include two Deans from AES campuses. It is unclear what advantage these appointments would have to the council. It is currently stated that they would serve to “inform the Governing Council about the exemplary research being conducted.” (Pg 22) It is not clear why all of AES leadership would not be held responsible to ANR and the council, and furthermore why their reporting would not include less than exemplary performance. If such appointments are necessary, I recommend that their appointment be balanced by Deans from campuses with UCCE Specialist appointments, if not drawn from all campuses. Broader faculty representation, from all UC campuses, is also warranted.
- 3) With the desire for increased transparency in budgetary matters, the report should correct the figure in Appendix C (Pg 58) to reflect that Federal AES funds are UCOP Flow Through funds and be depicted the same as the State AES funds, which are shown as a red arrow to the three AES campuses. Nowhere in the supporting information does it suggest that these funds are discretionary. While they may be “included in the UC ANR Budget” (Pg 45), it is clear that all federal AES funds are passed through to AES campuses (Pg 51, 59). The figure as currently depicted would lead one to believe that the pot is somehow mixed and that recipients with green arrows are somehow considered in the process of allocating those funds. At minimum a third color should be used to distinguish the nature of these funds is not singly AES Flow Through. Alternatively, the AES designation could be revisited.
- 4) There exist a number of models to improve cross-campus collaboration, though few examples are provided in the draft report despite the stated desire to “strengthen ... partnership with the Academic Senate and broader collaboration with all ten UC campuses, will support UC ANR’s efforts to fulfill its statewide mission and strategic plan.” One such approach is seed grants, such as those administered by CITRIS; these are small amounts of seed funding to distributed annually through competition to generate innovative research. This seed grant model was also adopted by the UC Water Security and Sustainability Research Initiative, or UC Water, a UCOP funded MRPI project. In these cases, \$500k+ is awarded annually to investigators that form collaborations between two or more campuses. A similar model could be followed to increase collaboration between ANR (UCCE/AES) researchers and other campuses. This would not only expand the reach of ANR, but also importantly draw graduate student researchers from all campuses into areas of discovery that are of high importance to the State and thereby “further integrate UC ANR with the University’s broader academic enterprise.” This is one example. There are many other mechanisms to achieve this aim.

Again, thank you for taking the time to consider these points in any response to the Academic Senate.

With warm regards,



Joshua H. Viers
Professor, Civil & Environmental Engineering
Director, CITRIS & the Banatao Institute
Co-Director, UC Water Security & Sustainability Research Initiative

cc: Sam Traina, Vice Chancellor for Research and Economic Development, UC Merced
Mark Matsumoto, Dean, School of Engineering, UC Merced
Catherine Keske, Chair, Executive Committee, School of Engineering, UC Merced



1156 HIGH STREET
SANTA CRUZ, CALIFORNIA 95064

Office of the Academic Senate
SANTA CRUZ DIVISION
125 CLARK KERR HALL
(831) 459 - 2086

November 30, 2018

**Robert May, Chair
Academic Council**

RE: Draft Report of UC ANR Advisory Committee

Dear Robert,

My invitation for divisional Senate committees to comment on the UC ANR Advisory Committee's draft report garnered no responses. I then worked with Professor Brent Haddad, a member of the UCBP TF-ANR, to confer with knowledgeable faculty conducting research in relevant disciplines. In addition to providing them with the draft report, we also circulated TF-ANR's response. As a non-ANR campus with a long history of agricultural research, Santa Cruz regrets the short timeframe for the review, which certainly dissuaded Senate committees and many faculty members from offering feedback. Following is a summary of the feedback we did receive.

Faculty are particularly supportive of the recommendation that the ANR governance structure be expanded so that non-ANR campuses have an opportunity both to participate in setting research priorities and to benefit more fully from ANR's reputation and funding streams. Along these lines, faculty were in complete agreement with the TF-ANR's "Fifth recommendation," which essentially calls for broadening UCANR activities at all of the campuses. In addition, faculty were generally appreciative of efforts to include a UCCE Specialist at UC Santa Cruz (and other UC campuses that are not officially designated as the 'land-grant' campuses), but they also point out that there are still many other ANR activities from which UCSC researchers (both faculty and graduate students) are excluded. On the whole, they are concerned that UCSC does not benefit from the state funding that ANR receives for agriculture research and education, despite the fact that UCSC has been a leader in agroecology and organic agriculture research since the campus's founding; they argue that the current structure by which ANR receives and funnels state funds to the ANR campuses puts UCSC and other non-ANR campuses at a distinct disadvantage and that this should be rectified moving forward.

Thank you, again, for the opportunity to provide feedback at this juncture.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kimberly Lau".

Kimberly Lau, Chair
Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

Cc: Michael LaBriola, Principal Policy Analyst, Systemwide Academic Senate



OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
9500 GILMAN DRIVE
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0002
TELEPHONE: (858) 534-3640
FAX: (858) 534-4528

November 21, 2018

Professor Robert C. May
Chair, Academic Senate
University of California
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200

SUBJECT: UC San Diego Comments on Agriculture and Natural Resources (ANR) Report

Dear Robert:

The Senate has been given little time to confer on the draft tiger team ANR report through the usual committee review process. However, Senate leadership has been able to consult knowledgeable faculty and is happy to comment.

While it was relatively easy at the inception of ANR to differentiate agricultural research from the basic research that the rest of the UC system conducted, the mission has evolved to cover broader perspectives on food, farming, forestry, and the environment. This argues for ANR expanding from the three AES campuses to other parts of the UC system. For example, agriculture and food security in the future will be intimately tied to climate change and extreme weather, research on which has a big footprint at campuses such as UCSD.

The UCSD Senate strongly supports keeping ANR as a systemwide entity at UCOP, reporting to the President. We also support the formation of a Governing Council with *at least* three Senate representatives and for a budget process that provides more oversight than at present. Finally, we strongly support the inclusion of other UC campuses in ANR.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Horwitz, Chair
Academic Senate, San Diego Division

cc: M. Corr M. LaBriola R. Rodriguez

From: Academic Senate Chair <aschair@ucdavis.edu>
Sent: Saturday, December 1, 2018 9:47 AM
Subject: ANR Draft Davis Comments

Dear Chair May,

The following synthesizes a limited number of comments on the ANR Draft from the Davis Division. Given the short time frame, combined with the disruption from campus closure, we were unable to send this out for full consultation.

We are supportive of ANR remaining at UCOP with a VP that reports directly to the President. However, we have serious misgivings about the second recommendation: The creation of a Governing Council that will advise the VP. Our concerns are summarized here:

Role. The role of the Governing Council is unclear. What is its charge? Is it a body intended to educate policy makers about ANR, or is it the actual policy-making body with genuine oversight of the budget? If its role is purely educational and advisory, it is unclear that it will have any real impact on how ANR is being run.

What are the “similar governing committees” at UC, and what are their roles? Will this Governing Council share these roles? Some entities are listed on p. 21. None of them are nearly as large or complex as ANR. What is the evidence that their operations can be scaled up in an effective way for ANR?

The draft report suggests that a review of existing groups may be needed once this is implemented. Why? What functions would it be absorbing? Would the group(s) who have those functions currently be the more sensible group(s) for executing them?

Membership. The composition of the Governing Council is problematic. A slate of potential Academic Senate members should not be selected by the Academic Council—it should be selected by UCOC.

It is unclear what the role of the Chair will be, as the VP will set the agenda and “frame council discussions.” This makes the Chair sound like a figurehead. As presented, the Governing Council seems more like an Advisory Board than a Governing Council. This is particularly problematic given that the Governing Council will participate in the VP’s performance evaluations.

Why is the Provost a member? It may be more appropriate to have someone from Academic Affairs who reports directly to the Provost.

The group’s membership also doesn’t seem completely congruent with its responsibilities. The group appears to have an internal orientation in terms of its responsibilities. Why are 20% of the members external? Why should a campus Chancellor be advocating for ANR and ANR’s budget on this Council? Why does the Governing Council need to educate others in the UC system about ANR? Can’t ANR engage campuses, etc., directly?

Budget. The rest of the discussion about the Governing Council seems to be about budget oversight. Are there any models of this approach to oversight elsewhere in the UC? Just because the funding model is complex doesn’t mean a whole new group of people, especially one consisting largely of members without specialized budgeting expertise, is warranted. For that matter, the distribution of

members doesn't seem to match the funding streams, e.g., the only people involved in the non-campus operations are the ANR VP and one CE Specialist or Advisor. Does this mean the budget oversight isn't substantive in terms of the actual activities ANR undertakes?

Best,
Kristin

Kristin H. Lagattuta, Ph.D.
Chair, Davis Division of the Academic Senate
Professor
Department of Psychology and Center for Mind and Brain
University of California, Davis
1 Shields Avenue
Davis, CA 95616
(530) 747-3801

UC Los Angeles

Comment #2

Well, I read up to the appendices. In essence, it is clear that the review committee did a lot of work and considered nearly all, if not all, the alternatives. I would go with their recommendations. The ANR is seemingly giving up a lot of autonomy, and gaining a lot of bureaucracy (governing council) in order to stabilize their budgets and provide transparency and accountability to their funding sources. Only time will tell if this actually works out that way. The issue of silos versus collaboration is a little less clear, since this has been a very successful silo that already depended almost entirely on collaborations throughout the system. I agree particularly with their reporting directly to the President as that will help circumvent some of the bureaucracy.

Comment #2

I do think that any divisional statement supporting the presence of the 3 Senate members on the proposed Governing Council would be for the good. Admittedly, UCLA is one of the campuses least directly involved with ANR, but still I think a statement of support for Senate involvement would be of value. This is an entity with a \$200 million budget, half of which passes through UCOP, and very little Senate oversight.