

REPORT OF THE
ANR REORGANIZATION REVIEW
COMMITTEE

December 2002



BACKGROUND

The ANR Reorganization Review Committee was appointed in February 2002 by ANR Associate Vice President Henry J. Vaux, Jr. The formation of the committee was preceded by two focus group sessions involving county directors and advisors/specialists and an external review of the Agricultural Experiment Station. In the letter of appointment, Dr. Vaux specified the following charge to the committee:

The Review Committee is charged with planning and conducting this initial review of the organizational structure. In making your review you should identify:

- Elements of the new structure which have worked well and meet the expectations of the Transition Team and Vice President.*
- Elements of the new structure which have not fully met the expectation of the Transition Team and the Vice President and which require modification and/or strengthening.*
- Actions which should be taken to modify and/or strengthen the elements of the new structure which have not lived up to expectations.*

REVIEW CRITERIA

In accomplishing its task, the committee met formally a total of four (4) times – beginning in June 2002, but there were many informal discussions which took place. At the first meeting, the following criteria, a modified version of the *Organizational Management Strategies* found on pages 21-22 of *The Challenge of Change*, were established. These criteria served as guidelines for the review process.

1. Establish a mission-based organization, with

- a. An integrated, programmatic-based structure;
- b. Strong cooperation between AES and CE to coordinate, support and deliver mission-based programs;
- c. Expansion and upgrading of the workgroup concept;
- d. Enhanced partnerships and involvement of volunteers that expand the reach and scope of DANR's programs.

2. Create an inclusive, accountable and visible process for resource allocation, which features

- a. A streamlined administration that links accountability and control of resources;
- b. ANR's mission and priorities as the basis for resource allocation;
- c. Flexibility of some funds for high priority programs;

- d. Annual reporting to stakeholders and staff about accomplishments;
 - e. Review of programs on five-year cycles.
3. **Salary advances are related to the mission and recognition awards are given for excellence.**
 - a. Advancement criteria specifically recognize the unique mission of ANR to ensure the AES/CE continuum is maintained;
 - b. ANR awards recognize programmatic and organizational excellence.
 4. **Develop and ensure an effective internal communications infrastructure and effective public relations, by**
 - a. Planning and implementing an integrated and effective communication system based on modern technology;
 - b. Creating systems for easy public access to ANR information.
 5. **Broaden the funding base and ensure effective external communications, by**
 - a. Creating a development office to enhance CE and supporting development of research facilities;
 - b. Creating mechanisms to enhance policy makers' understanding of our programs and ANR's credibility with the public.

REVIEW PROCESS

During the review process, information was gathered using a questionnaire and by personal interviews with ANR senior managers. The questionnaire was sent via e-mail to all academic staff through members of the ANR Executive and Program Councils, Directors of Statewide Special Programs and Projects, Directors of the Research and Extension Centers, members of the (former) Organizational Strategy Teams, and selected external constituents who participated in focus groups sessions held in the early stages of ANR's strategic planning efforts. A total of 48 responses to the questionnaire were received. The affiliation of the respondents was as follows:

Cooperative Extension – 32
 Agricultural Experiment Station – 5
 Other (External, etc.) - 10
 Unidentified – 1

Common themes emerging from the questionnaire responses included:

- Geographical aspects of the organization (size of the regions)
- Program leadership
- Communications

- AES/CE continuum
- Role of CE Specialists
- Pay issues for Advisors
- Administrative efficiency
- Relationship/degree of responsiveness to clientele (internal and external)
- Statewide Special Programs/Projects and Research and Extension Centers
- Role of Program Leaders
- Role of Program Council
- Role of Executive Council (strategic directions are more geared to AES and do not give guidance in how CE needs to respond)
- Roles of Associate Vice President and Vice President

The major themes emerging from the questionnaire responses formed the basis for questions posed by the committee to senior ANR managers. Those interviewed during a day-long committee interview session included:

Vice President W. R. Gomes
 Assistant Vice President for Programs and Academic Personnel Lanny Lund
 Assistant Vice President for Development Toby Winer
 Dean Neal K. Van Alfen (CAES/UCD)
 Susan Laughlin (as former Regional Director of the Central Coast/South Region)
 Regional Directors Linda Marie Manton, Kimberly Rodrigues and Refugio Gonzalez
 Program Leaders William Frost, Joseph Morse, Michael Reid and Karen Varcoe
 Associate Deans Donald Klingborg, and Don Cooksey
 Natural Reserve System Director Alexander Glazer
 Office of Governmental and External Relations Executive Director Steve Nation

Associate Vice President Henry Vaux provided commentary during the initial meeting. Additional interviews were conducted separately by committee chair Rausser and other members of the committee with individuals who were not available on the day of the committee interviews or who needed more time for their responses.

The final meeting of the committee focused on the themes emerging from the personal interviews, and this discussion formed the basis of the recommendations that follow.

BACKGROUND FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

As background for the recommendations contained in this report the committee concluded that:

- On the whole, the ANR organizational structure resulting from the reorganization of 1999 was an improvement from the prior organizational structure;
- Additional improvement is still possible, however, and in the committee's view:
 - Process costs can be decreased;

- The organizational structure must be realigned to become more horizontal, reflecting mutual lines of authority and responsibility.
- Fundamentally, the value of creating program leader positions has not been realized. This led the committee to the conclusion that these leadership positions should be either empowered or eliminated.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In the current organizational structure, the Associate Vice President is the chief operating officer and serves as the chair of the ANR Executive Council. The Executive Council is comprised of the Deans from the three agricultural colleges and the School of Veterinary Medicine and the Assistant Vice President for Programs and Academic Personnel. The Vice President is an ex-officio member of the Council. The Vice President's primary responsibilities focus on external relations, development of support, and representation of the Division in the broader University community.

Recommendation 1: Appoint the Vice President of ANR as Chair of the Executive Council.

Reason: To provide direct leadership of the ANR programmatic mission and closer coordination with campus missions and strategic directions. It is critical that the Vice President be completely connected to the planning and function of the enterprise and, therefore, to provide direction and leadership.

Recommendation 2: Program Leaders become full members of the Executive Council.

Reason: In the present organizational structure, the Program Leaders are charged with providing statewide programmatic direction, coordination and focus for the Division in the program areas of Agricultural Policy and Pest Management, Agricultural Productivity, Human Resources and Natural Resources. As defined, these positions have been assigned much responsibility, with little actual authority and very limited resources. The committee agreed unanimously that the positions should either be empowered or eliminated. Becoming voting members of the Executive Council presumes the former, not the latter.

As full members of the Executive Council, the Program Leaders would provide another dimension of knowledge and experience to the Council's bi-monthly discussions and decisions. Their participation would also raise their visibility within the Division as a whole, and lessen the ambiguity that exists about their specific role and functions.

Recommendation 3: Assign direct responsibility for administrative and programmatic functions of work groups and Statewide Special Programs/Projects to Program Leaders, with a corresponding increase in staff and resources.

Reason: To strengthen and clarify the role of Program Leader.

Recommendation 4: Eliminate the Assistant Vice President position and assign the associated responsibilities and authority to the Associate Vice President.

Reason: To streamline the organizational structure, reduce budgetary expense, and decentralize program execution.

The present geographical structure of the regions was the topic of numerous comments from questionnaire and interview respondents and discussion by the committee. Although it was concluded that changing the geographic organization once again did not make sense, the committee agreed on the following recommendation to address this area of concern:

Recommendation 5: Streamline regional office functions.

Reason: To increase administrative efficiency, eliminate duplication of effort, and reduce administrative workload on the counties.

In the present organizational structure, the Director of the Natural Reserve System (NRS) reports directly to the ANR Vice President.

Recommendation 6: Reassign the reporting relationship of the NRS Director to the Program Leader for Natural Resources in the same fashion as the Directors of other Statewide Programs and Projects (see recommendation 3).

Reason: To provide the NRS with a closer link to the programmatic mission of the Division.

At present, the Executive Director of the Office of Governmental and External Relations (OGER) has no connection with either the Program or the Executive Councils.

Recommendation 7: Include the Executive Director of OGER as a member ex-officio of the Program and Executive Councils.

Reason: To effectively communicate and bridge internal programs and external relations.

At present, the academic support units (Research and Extension Centers, Kearney Agricultural Center and ANR Analytical Laboratory) report directly to the Assistant Vice President for Programs and Academic Personnel. Considerable concern was expressed both in questionnaire responses and during interviews that the area of responsibility for the Assistant Vice President was too broad.

Recommendation 8: Reassign the reporting relationship for the academic support units from the Assistant Vice President for Programs and Academic Personnel to the Associate Vice President.

Reason: The current responsibility assigned to the Assistant Vice President is unmanageable.

The ANR Office of Development Services was created in the reorganization of 1999. An over-all plan for ANR fundraising efforts has not been developed; however, in order not to compete with ongoing development activities on the campuses, the office has concentrated efforts on raising funds for county-based Cooperative Extension programs. The Assistant Vice President for Development Services has recently left the University, and in the current budget environment, there is uncertainty about whether this position will be filled. In essence, the focus should be on the big-ticket infrastructure items since most county-based CE programs are pretty well connected and can raise funds themselves.

One major finding and recommendation of the AES Review Committee earlier this year was that California's position as a preeminent AES unit depends heavily upon critically needed upgrades in its research facilities. Raising the needed funds for these upgrades is a task that no one campus or facility acting alone can accomplish.

Recommendation 9: Define clearly the role and overall goals of the ANR development function and add as a major focus the raising of funds for capital projects and facilities at field stations and on the campuses.

Recommendation 10: If a new development director is to be appointed, the ANR Executive Council should play a major role in the selection of the candidate and in the development of the scope of work and program priorities.

SUMMARY

While the majority of respondents provided favorable comments and feedback on the effectiveness of the ANR reorganization, specific areas of concern did emerge. The foregoing recommendations represent the findings of the ANR Reorganization Review Committee, and are based on the information provided to the committee, both orally and in writing, during the review process. We wish to acknowledge the contributions and cooperation of all individuals who responded to the questionnaire and who participated in a candid and open fashion during the interview process.

Committee Members:

Professor Gordon Rausser, UCB (Chair)
Professor Howard Ferris, UCD
CE Specialist Victor Gibeault, UCR

County Director Sharon Junge, UCCE, Placer/Nevada Counties
Professor Susan Kaiser, UCD
Karen Miller, Royal Oak Farms
CE Specialist Richard Standiford, UCB
John Veysey, John Veysey Farms
County Director Jack Williams, UCCE, Sutter/Yuba Counties