

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

# Interim Report of the Portfolio Review Group

---

2012-2013 University of California Systemwide  
Research Portfolio Alignment Assessment

6/13/2013

## ***Contents***

Letter to the Vice President .....	3
Executive Summary .....	4
Background and Process Overview .....	5
Principles, Objectives, and Considerations .....	5
Program Summaries and Supporting Information .....	5
Deliberation Process.....	6
Findings and Recommendations .....	6
UC Research Initiatives: Multicampus Research Program and Initiatives and Lab Fees Research Program .....	6
Keck Telescopes.....	7
UC Observatories (UCO) .....	8
UC Natural Reserve System .....	8
California Institutes for Science and Innovation .....	9
UC Mexus.....	9
California HIV-AIDS Research Program.....	10
UC Research Initiatives: Proof of Concept Commercialization Gap Grants .....	11
Research Opportunity Fund .....	11
Conclusion and Next Steps: Plan for Future Assessments .....	12
Appendix 1: Portfolio Review Group Charge.....	13
Appendix 2: Principles, Objectives, and Considerations .....	15
Appendix 3: Conflict of Interest.....	17

## ***Letter to the Vice President***

I am pleased to transmit this interim report on behalf of the members of the Portfolio Review Group. This report is the first step in a three-step process to assess the University's portfolio of systemwide research programs and recommend ways to optimize both investments and decision-making to ensure the highest value and impact to the entire UC system. We welcome feedback from this interim report and on the early stages of our progress, as we believe it will help us continually improve and refine our framework for assessment.

The committee would like to acknowledge and thank the directors and staff of the programs we have reviewed in this 2012-13 assessment, who have taken the time to provide us thoughtful and informative summaries and data about their programs. This information was critical to our work and thinking, and their efforts are greatly appreciated.

Finally, I want to thank the individual members of the committee for all their hard work. To a person, they have brought great trust, commitment and integrity to this effort, as well as an abiding belief in the importance of this work.

We hope this interim report provides an important step forward. We look forward to the next steps, and welcome your feedback.

Sincerely,



Paul R. Gray  
Chair of the Portfolio Review Group

## ***Executive Summary***

The Portfolio Review Group (the committee) was appointed in the fall of 2012 and charged with reviewing the Systemwide Research Portfolio (the portfolio) and assessing alignment of programs within the portfolio against three principles for systemwide research investments (the principles). These principles were recommended by the Principles, Process, and Assessment (PPA) Task Force<sup>1</sup> during the 2011-12 academic years, and lay out key characteristics that should be present in research programs supported by systemwide funds. These aspects include a record of and/or potential for leveraging external support and/or shared facilities (principle 1); facilitating multicampus engagement and efficiency (principle 2); and achieving impact benefitting the state of California (principle 3), all in ways not achievable on a single campus. The principles were adopted by the committee after slight modification and used in the 2012-13 portfolio assessment. As a basis for the 2012-13 portfolio assessment, each of the 11 programs included in the assessment was asked to provide a narrative program summary and supporting data. The committee then followed a process of voting, discussion, subsequent re-voting, and further discussion to arrive at an alignment assessment for each of the portfolio programs. Assessment of the alignment of these programs to the principles was based on information provided to the committee by the program directors and was not independently verified.

All the programs examined make important contributions to UC and the committee concluded that each program should be continued in some form. With respect to the narrower question of the program's alignment with the principles, the committee found that four programs (Keck Telescopes, UC Observatories, Natural Reserve System, and two of the components of the UC Research Initiatives: Multicampus Research Initiatives and Programs and Lab Fees Research Program) substantially align with the principles. Five other programs (the four Institutes for Science and Innovation and UC Mexus) align well with two of the three Principles and have the potential to achieve better alignment with a third. Three programs (California HIV-Aids Research Program, UC Research Initiatives: Proof of Concept Commercialization Gap Grants, and Research Opportunity Fund), provide important and useful outcomes but are substantially misaligned with the principles. Consideration should be given as to whether these three programs should continue as part of the systemwide research portfolio as well as to what alternative structures and/or sources of funding might be more viable or appropriate.

The committee noted that the 2012-13 assessment was limited in scope and only included a subset of programs in the systemwide research portfolio. The review did not include an examination of funding levels. Future efforts of the committee will assess additional programs as well as funding balance across the entire portfolio.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Task Force on University-wide Research Principles, Process and Assessment. See Task Force Report here: [http://ucop.edu/research-graduate-studies/files/research/documents/ppa\\_report.pdf](http://ucop.edu/research-graduate-studies/files/research/documents/ppa_report.pdf)

## ***Background and Process Overview***

The Portfolio Review Group (the committee) was appointed in the fall of 2012 and charged with reviewing the Systemwide Research Portfolio (the portfolio) and assessing alignment of programs within the portfolio against three principles for systemwide research investments (the principles). The committee was convened by the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies. His charge to the committee is included in Appendix 1. Briefly, the committee's founding year tasks were to: (1) Assess the alignment of systemwide research programs relative to the principles for systemwide research investments; (2) Report on the current research portfolio's value to the UC system; and, (3) Refine working definitions, indicators, and processes to improve future assessments.

Members were nominated to serve on the committee by the campus chancellors and/or the University-wide Academic Senate. Members of the committee were selected to include a balance of faculty and administrative perspectives, to appoint members from a broad range of roles and academic disciplines, and to ensure a deep knowledge of UC's research enterprise. Appointments were made for the 2012-13 assessment (one year) with an option for re-appointment.

## ***Principles, Objectives, and Considerations***

This committee built on the principles for systemwide research investment recommended by the Principles, Process and Assessment (PPA) Task Force<sup>1</sup> and further supplemented the principles with working definitions, objectives, and considerations. A first draft of the principles, working definitions, objectives, and considerations was developed in consultation with the committee chair, PPA co-chairs, and members from both the committee and the PPA task force. This draft was presented to the committee in their January meeting and subsequently adopted by the committee with slight modifications. The principles, objectives, and considerations used in the 2012-13 assessment are included in Appendix 2.

The principles, working definitions, objectives, and considerations collectively served as a framework for the committee's assessment and provided guidance and structure to program directors as they developed program summaries and supporting information in response to the committee's needs. The committee expects to periodically revisit the principles, working definitions, objectives, and considerations to ensure they continue to provide a useful and relevant framework for systemwide research portfolio investment and assessment.

## ***Program Summaries and Supporting Information***

For this 2012-13 assessment, the committee based their findings and recommendations primarily on a program summary and supporting information provided by each program's director. Each director was asked to provide a program summary and supporting data to familiarize the committee with the program's mission, goals, and activities and to demonstrate how the program's activities (and systemwide funds) directly contribute towards achieving the principles. A formatted template was provided to assist in collecting and presenting information in a uniform and consistent fashion. Directors were given six weeks to prepare their submissions. Submissions were processed by UCOP staff for consistency in formatting and presentation and provided to the committee in advance of the April meeting.

While specific data and information was requested, directors were given a wide scope in suggesting additional considerations, metrics, or indicators relevant to their programs. This allowed each director to introduce their program using appropriate language and data and allowed members to experience

the diverse variety of programs and reporting evidence included in the portfolio. In the several cases where external program reviews had been completed recently, those reviews were made available to the committee.

### ***Deliberation Process***

The committee met in person in January, April, and May, 2013, for the 2012-13 assessment. Prior to the first committee meeting, program directors were advised to begin preparing a program summary and supporting data to support the assessment.

At its first meeting, the committee adopted the principles as modified, discussed the scope of work, and agreed to a process and work plan for the next six months. The committee met again in April to perform an initial alignment assessment and begin deliberations on a set of recommendations. Members were given access to program summaries and supporting data and asked to perform individual assessments of each program's alignment prior to the meeting.

Members participated in all program assessments and discussions (in person or through unattributed written comments), except where a direct conflict was identified (see Appendix 3). After all programs were discussed individually, the committee considered alignment across the entire portfolio. Member assessments were compiled into unattributed group reports and used to inform discussions. Based on these discussions, members grouped the programs by degree of alignment and discussed recommendations for individual programs within each group.

A draft report of the committee's findings and recommendations was compiled and circulated to the committee for comment after the April meeting. The committee met a final time in May to finalize recommendations and begin planning for the 2013-14 assessment.

### ***Findings and Recommendations***

The following narrative summarizes the committee's main findings regarding alignment of each program relative to the principles as well as consensus recommendations for each program. For the purpose of this discussion, the Proof of Concept Commercialization Gap Grants program within the UC Research Initiatives program is treated separately, since the findings and recommendations are different for that component. Also, the California Institutes for Science and Innovation are treated together, as the findings and recommendations for the institutes are very similar.

#### ***UC Research Initiatives: Multicampus Research Program and Initiatives and Lab Fees Research Program***

##### ***Findings:***

We concluded that these two components of the UC Research Initiatives are well-aligned with Principle 1 (leveraging external resources and shared facilities) and very well-aligned with Principle 2 (facilitating multicampus engagement and efficiency), with the former being a particularly strong aspect of the Lab Fees Research Program. For both components, assessment of alignment with Principle 3 (impact for California) was difficult due to their diverse multi-investigator nature. There is some evidence, however, that these components could provide significant impact. Given that these components have recently completed their first round of funding, we expect they will now embark upon

a serious effort to capture and measure outcomes. A key aspect of the Multicampus Research Program and Initiatives program that the committee found compelling was its support of multicampus initiatives in the Humanities. This support has the potential to provide impact in the UC system that is difficult to achieve any other way.

***Recommendations:***

We recommend the program carry out a comprehensive assessment of return on investment and broader impacts resulting from their first round of funding so that alignment with Principle 3 can be more effectively evaluated. Furthermore, in regards to alignment with all three principles, outcome and impact measures will need to be tailored to the specific areas of research supported. For example, measures like “research dollars leveraged” will need to take into consideration the norms, the overall availability, and the relative equality of access to extramural funding within the field or discipline.

Future consideration should also be given to providing larger, more concentrated grants in areas of strategic focus or priority for the University. This may produce greater (and more measureable) impacts for the program. However, given recent cuts to program funding, the committee understands that this may not be possible without a serious re-evaluation of funding strategies. Therefore, the committee recommends meaningful engagement with program stakeholders and governance committees to discuss options for providing larger, more concentrated grants.

***Keck Telescopes***

***Findings:***

This program aligns very well with Principle 1 (leveraging external resources and shared facilities), providing access to a unique, world-class facility that gives the UC system a competitive advantage in attracting astronomy faculty. However, funding leverage data was difficult to evaluate. While the most important impact of Keck is fundamental scientific discovery with attendant benefits far beyond just California, the committee found some degree of alignment with Principle 3 (impact to California). This comes from the benefit to the state of overseeing the leading set of astronomical facilities in the world and the accompanying extensive public outreach and program engagement. Alignment was found most strongly in Principle 2 (facilitating multicampus engagement and efficiency). There was consensus that the telescopes are operated efficiently and that this is a good example of an activity that should be run centrally. The lack of multicampus collaborative grants was noted but was not of major concern. There was, however, a general concern that operational costs had not been reviewed by external experts in 15 years. Members noted that regular operational reviews should be standard practice for these types of shared facilities.

***Recommendations:***

We recommend that the Keck telescopes undergo regular review of its operational costs by external parties with experience in doing such reviews in order to better understand where greater efficiencies might be found. We understand that an operational review is currently under way with results expected in June 2013.

The committee also recommends further assessment of Keck’s funding leveraging, extending current reporting on grants made directly to Keck to include estimates of grants to UC faculty that were made possible by UC’s funding of the Keck telescopes.

## ***UC Observatories (UCO)***

### ***Findings:***

This program aligns very well with Principle 1 (leveraging external resources and shared facilities), especially with regard to the instrumentation labs. As in the case of the Keck telescopes, opportunities for public outreach and engagement contribute to a reasonable alignment with Principle 3 (impact for California). The committee agreed that UCO aligns well with Principle 2 (facilitating multicampus engagement and efficiency), particularly in regards to the efficiency of centralized management.

Members noted that the operation and management of the observatories is currently under review by the UCO Board that was convened by UCOP for this purpose. It is expected that several concerns noted by the committee will be addressed by UCOP and the UCO Board in their review. These concerns include: staffing at the Lick Observatory; the use of systemwide funds in support of astronomy faculty salaries; and the development, on an appropriate timescale, of decommissioning plans for older observatory facilities in conjunction with plans being developed for the next generation of new facilities. Members agreed that these concerns are more appropriately assessed by the UCO Board and that results should subsequently be reported to the committee.

### ***Recommendations:***

The committee strongly supports the work of the UCO Board and requests an update on the Board's activities and outcomes prior to the 2013-14 assessment. The committee anticipates that the UCO Board's findings will inform the committee's consideration of UCO in the context of the broader research portfolio.

## ***UC Natural Reserve System***

### ***Findings:***

This program aligns extremely well with Principle 1 (leveraging external resource and shared facilities) and well with Principle 3 (impact for California). Alignment is also good for Principle 2 (facilitating multicampus engagement and efficiency). This system is a very important asset for the UC system, for the state, and for the nation; both as a research tool and for its contribution to conservation and biodiversity.

### ***Recommendations:***

We recommend more be done to publicize and highlight UC's contributions to the state in preserving these unique ecosystems for research, teaching, and public service. Heightened awareness of the program could help increase usage of the Natural Reserve System by researchers both in the state and around the country, potentially expanding the program's overall impact. It is not clear to the committee that the current size and scope of the program is sustainable, given the present revenue streams. Consideration should be given both to generating more revenue and to restructuring the program to a more sustainable scope. A strategic planning exercise could help create a vision for the program, create a more aggressive communications plan, identify ways the reserves could be used more as a system, and develop a sustainable financial model.

It was unclear to the committee why the White Mountain reserve is managed and funded in a different configuration from the other reserves. Consideration should be given to instituting consistent management and funding practices throughout the program. The committee would also like clarification

of the program budget to better understand other sources of funding (including campus and external funding) and how it is used to complement UCOP support.

## ***California Institutes for Science and Innovation***

### ***Findings:***

All four California Institutes for Science and Innovation (the institutes) aligned well with Principle 1 (leveraging external resource and shared facilities) and extremely well with Principle 3 (impact for California). In general, the institutes were less strongly aligned with Principle 2 (facilitating multicampus engagement and efficiency), with the strength of alignment varying significantly among the institutes. Specifically, the institutes whose activities are mostly localized on two campuses (CalIT2, CNSI) were ranked somewhat lower on this principle. Collectively the institutes engage virtually all the campuses in some way and a subset of the campuses in very substantial ways. However, the committee found that there is unrealized potential for multicampus engagement and, to varying degrees; the individual institutes could do more in this regard. This was also noted in the recent external reviews of the institutes.

### ***Recommendations:***

Means should be sought to increase the multicampus engagement of the institutes wherever possible and appropriate. While the committee was supportive of efforts to do this, we recognized that the institutes have evolved to their present operating structures and funding models over time. If not considered carefully, centralized efforts to further broaden intercampus collaborations have the potential to lessen the impact and diminish the focus of the institutes. It is important to avoid unintended consequences of changing the present operating structures. We therefore suggest the appointment of a working group to consider (in greater depth than would be possible for the committee) the present and future configuration of these institutes and how they might evolve over time. While, the committee expects to consider funding levels across the portfolio as distinct from the alignment question as we go forward with our work, in the case of the institutes, funding models could be an additional focus of the suggested working group.

Regardless of whether a working group is created, the committee suggest that the institute directors work together to identify synergies, efficiencies, overlaps, facility sharing opportunities, and collaboration opportunities between and among the institutes. Since there is significant overlap in the areas of interest, the whole may be able to achieve more than the parts acting alone. The directors must lead this process for it to succeed.

## ***UC Mexus***

### ***Findings:***

The program has good alignment with Principle 3 (impact for California) primarily because of its importance as an element of the overall strategic relationship between California and Mexico. Evidence of the impact of the research in the program *per se* is sparse because the individual projects are small and diverse as opposed to being concentrated around themes or objectives. The program has some degree of alignment with Principle 2 (facilitating multicampus engagement and efficiency) and some degree of alignment with Principle 1 (leveraging external resource and shared facilities) through its leveraging of CONACYT funding.

### ***Recommendations:***

UC Mexus is an important program for the state and should continue in some form. Given that the MOU with CONACYT will be renegotiated in the near future, a new strategic plan is needed to guide this future agreement. Alignment of the program would benefit greatly from more focus, perhaps around a limited number of strategic themes that could be determined together with CONACYT. It is important for both CONACYT and UC to put forward their individual priorities as a starting point for a constructive dialog on optimizing the joint program. Improved multicampus engagement should be one of UC's priorities. A formal program review may help contribute to this direction setting process. As part of this review, the committee recommends an assessment of data available regarding the impact of the program upon faculty and graduate student diversity.

Consideration should be given to whether this program should be included in the systemwide research portfolio, as it appears it might be more suitably funded as part of an international program portfolio involving research and graduate education.

## ***California HIV-AIDS Research Program***

### ***Findings:***

This program has been a key part of California's leadership in attacking the AIDS epidemic over the past thirty years and its activities remain an important element among what has become a large array of such efforts across the country. Originally conceived and funded as a state program administered by UC for the state, this program has had a broader focus than other programs in the research portfolio due to its support of HIV/AIDS-related research across the state at both UC and non-UC institutions. The program has created several partnerships between UC researchers and external organizations that are working to advance HIV/AIDS treatment and prevention. These partnerships include community clinical interventions, trials of new approaches to HIV treatment and prevention in the field, policy research and development, and other public health related activities. Funds are also used to support pilot research and training grants available to both UC and non-UC investigators.

A determination of alignment with the principles was difficult since the nature of the program is fundamentally different from the other programs reviewed, as one would expect given its history. While there is some data to indicate leveraging of other support, the data is seven years old and needs updating. By its nature, the program does not involve development and sharing of major research facilities. Thus the committee can't conclude that there is strong alignment with Principle 1 (leveraging external resource and shared facilities) based on the available data. The program relies heavily on multi-sector collaborative efforts but they are primarily collaborations between UC faculty on a given campus and external entities. While there is certainly some intercampus research collaboration, this is not a particularly strong aspect of the program. While the program therefore demonstrates efficiency in management, alignment with Principle 2 (facilitating multicampus engagement and efficiency) is only adequate. As far as the committee was able to determine, the program's current and potential impact for California is large and, therefore, we judge the alignment with Principle 3 (impact for California) to be strong. However, on the whole, while the committee viewed the program as important and needed, it has concerns about the program's overall alignment with the principles.

### ***Recommendations:***

The components of the program involving faculty and graduate student research (i.e. the pilot research programs, training grants, and perhaps parts of the policy research programs) could potentially

be adapted so as to align well with the principles. For the remainder of the program, a different mode of funding is needed since those components are unlikely to, even with restructuring, align with the principles. We recommend a strategic planning process to investigate the long-term options and potential for this program. As part of this strategic planning process, the program director should make a concerted effort to strengthen collaboration and coordination with the other HIV/AIDS research efforts within the UC campuses.

## ***UC Research Initiatives: Proof of Concept Commercialization Gap Grants***

### ***Findings:***

The committee chose to consider the Proof of Concept Commercialization Gap Grants (POC) component separately from the other two of the UC Research Initiatives components. In principle, the POC, like similar programs on campuses and in the institutes, has the potential for economic impact in California through promotion of business formation and new enterprises. However, POC is too new to have demonstrated this impact to any major degree. Thus the committee can only conclude that someday POC may align well with Principle 3 (impact for California). However, because POC is not a multicampus program, alignment with Principle 2 (facilitating multicampus engagement and efficiency) is weak. Additionally, there is no evidence of leveraging external support or facilities which shows weak alignment with Principle 1 (leveraging external resource and shared facilities). We conclude that there is not overall alignment between POC and the principles. Moreover, it is not at all clear that a systemwide approach is compatible with an effective Proof of Concept Commercialization Gap Grants program.

### ***Recommendations:***

Programs that bridge the gap between discovery and application are critically important for UC and the state and should continue and, in fact, be strengthened. However, the committee felt that the best place for these efforts is on the campuses through efforts like those in the institutes to incubate and stimulate translational activities and new business startups. Successful Proof of Concept Commercialization Gap Grants programs (at UC and other universities) need to be closely linked to the individual faculty and students carrying out the research as well as to the ecosystem of investors and entrepreneurs affiliated with individual campuses. This close linkage is harder to achieve in a systemwide program. We recommend that future efforts be left to the campuses and that UCOP's role in this area be restricted to providing campuses assistance when requested and to helping campuses provide comprehensive and coordinated responses to Regent's, media, federal, and state inquiries related to such matters.

## ***Research Opportunity Fund***

### ***Findings:***

The committee felt that this program should be considered separately from the other programs included in the 2012-13 assessment and should not be judged by its alignment with the principles. This program appears to have evolved from its inception as a discretionary fund for the VP-RGS and later to have included a competed grant component.

### ***Recommendations:***

The committee believes it desirable that the VP-RGS have a discretionary fund to be able to respond quickly to opportunities, seed new efforts, and support fast-moving and innovative research that might not allow time for a full proposal cycle. However, we do not believe that the Research Opportunity Fund

should be assessed by this committee as part of the systemwide research portfolio. The committee notes that opportunities seeded with this fund may very well develop into systemwide research programs that would be included in the portfolio and then appropriately be assessed by this committee. Until that time the VP-RGS should decide how best to manage this fund and how to make decisions about its use. As such, we recommend this program be removed from the systemwide research portfolio and evaluated separately by the Vice President according to its own success criteria.

If there is to be a component of this fund that is regularly allocated through a proposal competition with the attendant longer-term cycle, we recommend that consideration should be given to moving that aspect to the Multicampus Research Programs and Initiatives program, which we found efficiently manages such awards and competitions. If this competed aspect is continued, the committee suggests greater outreach to the community of investigators in order to increase awareness and utilization of these funds.

### ***Conclusion and Next Steps: Plan for Future Assessments***

In 2013-14, the committee expects to assess the alignment of a second set of programs included in the systemwide research portfolio. With some modification, the 2013-14 assessment will follow a similar methodology as described in this report. In addition, we plan to develop a process for examining funding balance across the portfolio and to apply that methodology to some or all of the programs that have undergone an alignment assessment. Finally, we intend to develop a sustainable annual and multiyear plan for the portfolio review process to be implemented in future years.

# ***Appendix 1: Portfolio Review Group Charge***

PORTFOLIO REVIEW GROUP (PRG) – CHARGE TO THE COMMITTEE

DATED: 01/17/2013

The UC Office of the President (UCOP) invests<sup>1</sup> in a limited number of systemwide research programs and facilities to serve UC-wide needs and strengthen research capacities throughout the UC system. The overall objective of the Portfolio Review Group (PRG) is to help optimize the investments in this portfolio given constraints on overall funding capacity. The PRG should:

- 1) Provide advice to the Vice President of Research and Graduate Studies (Vice President) on the overall value and unique purpose of the systemwide research portfolio to the University and the State of California.
- 2) Provide recommendations on how to improve UC's return on current investments. This includes recommending changes to the configuration and investment levels in the programs within the portfolio.
- 3) Advise the Vice President about strategies for growing or evolving UC investments in systemwide research to strengthen and/or balance the research portfolio.

The PRG will provide written reports to the Vice President. Final decisions about investments in research will be made by the UC President, in consultation with the UC Provost and Vice President. Recommendations will be made available to the UC community to ensure transparency about systemwide research funding.

The PRG will be responsible for carrying out the following principle tasks:

- 1) Develop working definitions and indicators for the Principles for Systemwide Research Investments (Systemwide Principles) provided by the Vice President (see attached).
- 2) Utilize the Systemwide Principles, and the working definitions and indicators (referenced above), to carry out an evaluation of the systemwide research portfolio based on information provided by Program Directors, program reviews and UCOP analyses. The committee may request additional information, from Program Directors or UCOP staff, as needed. The committee should consider both the overall performance of the portfolio in delivering value based on the Systemwide Principles and the relative value of individual research investments compared to the dollars invested. Based upon this evaluation, the committee will provide recommendations to the Vice President on priorities and adjustments within the current mix of research investments.
- 3) Consider and recommend long-term strategies for maintaining a vibrant and well-balanced research portfolio that is responsive to the needs of the University and State. Based on the Systemwide Principles, the committee should consider different approaches to identifying and evaluating new opportunities and/or areas for growth. The committee may also consider different models for funding or project competition and selection.

Additional tasks:

- 4) During the course of its deliberations, the committee should develop suggestions for more effective strategic directions and management of individual portfolio programs. These suggestions should be noted and communicated to the Vice President as appropriate.

PRG Membership:

- A) Composition: Members will be appointed by the Vice President from a slate of faculty nominees drawn from across the UC system; administrators from the campuses and UCOP; and individuals not employed by UC (External), as deemed necessary by the Vice President. Committee membership shall be maintained at approximately 50% academic faculty and 50% administrative members.
- B) Nominations: The Vice President will select administrators and external members from nominations from campus chancellors, taking into account representation by a broad range of roles and academic disciplines on and an emphasis on individuals with a deep knowledge of research (e.g. Vice Chancellors for Research). The Vice President will work with the Chair of the Universitywide Academic Senate to solicit nominations for faculty members.

---

<sup>1</sup> In FY2012-13, UCOP invested close to \$85 million of UC's funds to support programs within the UC systemwide research portfolio.

**ATTACHMENT A: Addendum to PRG Charge: Deliverables for Founding Committee Cycles**

In the initial founding term (Cycle 1) of the PRG, the committee will be charged with completing the following specific tasks and deliverables by June 30, 2013:

- 1) Carry out an evaluation on an initial set of research programs assigned to the systemwide research portfolio and use that experience to refine the working definitions, indicators, and process. Provide a report that summarizes how well the current portfolio provides value to the UC system, based on the Systemwide Principles provided below. The report should assess the alignment or “fit” of each research program individually, and the portfolio, as a whole. The committee may recommend some programs as “well-aligned” with Systemwide Principles, and may note others of questionable fit, based on the information provided. These latter programs may require more investigation. The committee is invited to recommend a process for further investigation of these programs, or specific questions they would like to ask of Program Directors. NOTE: Additional research programs may be included in the systemwide research portfolio as the committee’s work progresses.
- 2) Based on experience gained in the first cycle of evaluations, develop, refine and implement an annual process for evaluation of overall quality and appropriateness of the components of the systemwide research portfolio.

# Appendix 2: Principles, Objectives, and Considerations

Attachment 1

## Considerations for Conducting the Principle Alignment Review

REVISED BY PORTFOLIO REVIEW GROUP ON 01-18-2013

<b>Principle #1: Act as one system of multiple campuses to enhance UC's research capacity, influence and advantage.</b>	
<b>Objective</b>	<b>Considerations</b>
1. Provide UC faculty and students with access to unique facilities, resources, and/or opportunities that sustain and extend UC's competitive advantage.	1. What opportunities, resources or facilities provided by the program can uniquely leverage UCOP funds to position UC as a world leader in research, scholarship and/or creative work?
	2. What is the scope of access to these unique systemwide opportunities, resources or facilities for UC faculty, students and researchers? How does it go beyond that which could be achieved through a single campus initiative or activity?
	3. How do the unique systemwide opportunities provided by program help attract and retain faculty, researchers, technical staff and students, significantly enhancing campus recruitment/retention efforts?
2. Enable successful competition for sponsored research projects and grants for which proposals from a single campus would be substantially less competitive.	1. How does the program enable successful competition for sponsored research projects and grants for which proposals from a single campus would be substantially less competitive?
	2. How does the program's approach to research project development and research project collaboration build systemwide engagement, consensus and support that encompasses (and benefits) multiple campuses?
<b>Principle #2: Promote efficient inter-campus collaborations and systemwide economies of scale.</b>	
<b>Objective</b>	<b>Considerations</b>
1. Ensure efficient operation/management of shared research, facilities, systems, and/or staff.	1. How does the program operate/manage systemwide shared research resources, facilities, systems, and/or staff more efficiently than might be managed by a single campus program or initiative?
	2. Is the program's operational efficiency periodically evaluated and how are recommendations for improvement implemented?
2. Demonstrate systemwide engagement and collaboration beyond that present on a single campus.	1. How does the program regularly engage multiple campuses to encourage and identify opportunities for collaborations and broader participation that can extend and leverage UC's existing research expertise and resources across UC campuses?
	2. How does the program engage additional UC campuses, similar programs, and/or external organizations to promote collaboration, share administrative functions, and avoid duplication of effort to achieve higher efficiencies?

### Considerations for Conducting the Principle Alignment Review

REVISED BY PORTFOLIO REVIEW GROUP ON 01-18-2013

<b>Principle #3: Serve the State and citizens of California.</b>	
<b>Objective</b>	<b>Considerations</b>
1. Collectively impact Californians through research addressing current and emerging issues of strategic importance to the state	1. How does the program demonstrate UC's commitment to public outreach and inclusion, citizen engagement, and broader public education?
	2. How does the program deliver significant impacts, either locally or across California, in economic, social, environmental, energy, health, security, and/or other area of public interest?

## Appendix 3: Conflict of Interest

Attachment 2

### CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Updated 2013-04-08

Conflicts of interest exist when a review committee member can be viewed as being in a position to gain or lose personally, professionally, or financially (including for commercial reasons) from a research program under consideration by the Portfolio Review Group (PRG). In order to ensure that the fairness and objectivity of the reviews are not compromised by such conflicts, the guiding principle of University of California is to avoid both actual and perceived conflicts.

PRG members must identify and declare potential conflicts of interest (or their appearance), and may be asked to recuse themselves from the direct review and discussion of a program for which a conflict has been identified. A group member should notify the PRG chair and UCOP staff immediately upon identifying a potential conflict. If a conflict arises at the meeting, the member should notify the Chair, who may then ask the member to recuse him/herself from the discussion and review of the program in question.

There are two primary categories in which conflict may occur:

#### **PRG Member Personally Engaged with Program or Department Under Consideration by**

**PRG:** If the PRG member is named as an affiliated faculty or staff, is engaged in the oversight of the program (e.g. sits on executive boards, has direct reporting line to or from the program), has received funding, or expects to hold some appointment or position with the research program under consideration by the PRG or holds an appointment in a department that would participate in the research program under consideration by PRG, there is a *prima facie* conflict. PRG members would be recused from participating in such discussions and would instead be assigned to lead or participate in discussions on research programs from other departments or research units.

**PRG Member Has a Relationship with Program:** A conflict is considered to exist if the group member has a professional or close personal relationship with the Program Director or other primary member of the research program team. Examples of this category include:

- A PRG member's spouse or registered domestic partner, family member, business partner, is named in the program summary as affiliated faculty or staff, or the member is aware that this person will be invited to join the staff under specific circumstances.
- The PRG member and key program personnel have co-authored a peer-reviewed publication within the last five years.
- At the time of the PRG meeting, the PRG member and key program personnel are actively collaborating, or are planning to collaborate on other research.
- In the recent past, the PRG member and key program personnel had a close professional relationship, e.g., advisor/student, postdoctoral mentor/fellow.

**You will be required to sign a form disclosing any potential conflicts of interest you might have in evaluating research programs within the UCOP Research Portfolio.**

*Thank you for agreeing to serve as a member of the Portfolio Review Group for the University of California. Please contact Debbie Shen, PRG Project Lead, if you have any questions ([Debbie.Shen@ucop.edu](mailto:Debbie.Shen@ucop.edu)).*