

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

# Report of the Portfolio Review Group

---

2012-2013 University of California Systemwide  
Research Portfolio, Cycle 2 Programs Findings  
and Recommendations

2/6/2014

## ***Contents***

Letter to the Vice President .....	3
2012-2013 Portfolio Review Group Members .....	4
Executive Summary.....	5
Summary of PRG Findings and Recommendations for Cycle 2 Programs.....	6
Background and Process Overview.....	7
Principles, Objectives and Considerations .....	7
Program Summaries and Supporting Information .....	8
Deliberation Process.....	8
Findings and Recommendations.....	8
San Diego Supercomputer Center .....	9
Institutes for Transportation Studies .....	9
Pacific Earthquake Engineering Center .....	10
Tobacco Related Disease Research Program .....	11
California Breast Cancer Research Program.....	11
UC Cancer Coordinating Committee .....	12
Institute for Research on Labor and Employment .....	13
California Program on Access to Care .....	13
Center for Studies in Latino Health and Culture .....	14
US Mexico Treaty and Accords to Prevent and Recover Doubly Taxed Social Security and Income Funds .....	14
Medical Investigation of Neurological Disorders .....	15
Conclusion and Next Steps.....	15
Appendix 1: Portfolio Review Group (PRG) – Charge to the Committee (01/17/2013).....	16
Appendix 2: Considerations for Conducting the Principle Alignment Review (Revised 05/24/2013).....	19
Appendix 3: Conflicts of Interest (updated 09/23/2013) .....	21

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

On behalf of the members of the Portfolio Review Group, I am pleased to transmit the final report on Cycle 2 systemwide research programs. This report, along with the previous Cycle 1 reports, completes the committee's charge to review the systemwide research portfolio and make recommendations for optimizing UC's systemwide research investments to ensure the highest value and impact for the system. The findings and recommendations presented in this report represent a strong consensus among the committee members. All committee members supported the funding recommendations in the report. One of the sixteen committee members disagreed with certain aspects in the narrative discussion of the San Diego Supercomputer Center recommendations.

I want to express my deep appreciation to the members of the PRG who have been exceptionally thoughtful and diligent in their analysis. Their commitment and integrity has been critical to the progress made in conducting this review of UC's systemwide research portfolio. We are greatly indebted to the staff who supported the committee and to the programs directors who provided thoughtful and informative summaries upon which this report is based. This information was critical to our work and their efforts are greatly appreciated.

I welcome your feedback on this report.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Paul R. Gray". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned to the right of the word "Sincerely,".

Dr. Paul R. Gray  
Chair, Portfolio Review Group

## ***2012-2013 Portfolio Review Group Members***

### **Paul Gray, PRG Chair**

Professor Emeritus and Executive Vice  
Chancellor and Provost Emeritus

### **Robert Price, UC Berkeley**

Associate Vice Chancellor for Research and  
Professor of Political Sciences

### **Harris Lewin, UC Davis**

Vice Chancellor for Research and  
Professor of Evolution and Ecology

### **Michael Kleeman, UC Davis**

Professor, Civil & Environmental Engineering  
and immediate past Chair of the of the  
University-wide Committee on Research Policy

### **John Hemminger, UC Irvine**

Vice Chancellor for Research and  
Professor of Chemistry

### **Steve Olsen, UC Los Angeles**

Vice Chancellor of Budget, Finance and Capital  
Programs and Chief Financial Officer

### **Timothy Tangherlini, UC Los Angeles**

Professor in the Department of Asian Languages  
and Cultures

### **Juan Meza, UC Merced**

Dean of the School of Natural Sciences

### **Robert Clare, UC Riverside**

Professor of Physics and Chair of the  
University-wide Committee on Research Policy

### **Marylynn Yates, UC Riverside**

Dean of the College of Natural & Agricultural  
Sciences and Professor of Environmental  
Microbiology

### **Sandra Brown, UC San Diego**

Vice Chancellor for Research and  
Professor of Psychology and Psychiatry

### **Keith Yamamoto, UC San Francisco**

Vice Chancellor for Research, Executive Vice  
Dean of the School of Medicine and Professor of  
Cellular & Molecular Pharmacology

### **Tejal Desai, UC San Francisco**

Professor of Bioengineering and Therapeutic  
Sciences and of Physiology

### **Michael Witherell, UC Santa Barbara**

Vice Chancellor for Research and  
Professor of Physics

### **David Stuart, UC Santa Barbara**

Professor of Physics

### **Tyrus Miller, UC Santa Cruz**

Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies and  
Professor of Literature

### **Susan Gillman, UC Santa Cruz**

Professor of Literature

## ***Executive Summary***

The Portfolio Review Group was appointed by Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies Steven Beckwith in the fall of 2012 and charged with:

1. Reviewing the Systemwide Research Portfolio (the portfolio) and assessing alignment of programs within the portfolio against three principles for systemwide research investments,
2. Making recommendations on priorities and adjustments in the current mix of research investments.
3. Suggesting long-term strategies for maintaining a vibrant and well balanced research portfolio.

The alignment assessment was completed for the first group of portfolio programs, referred to herein as the cycle 1 programs, in the spring of 2013 and was conveyed to the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies in the PRG Cycle 1 Interim Report.<sup>1</sup> The committee's assessment of priorities and adjustments in research investments was completed for the cycle 1 programs in September and October of 2013, and reported to the Vice President as the PRG Cycle 1 Final Report of the PRG in early January 2014.<sup>2</sup> The committee subsequently assessed the alignment and investments priorities of the second group of portfolio programs, herein referred to as the cycle 2 programs, in January 2014. The findings and recommendations from this assessment of cycle 2 programs are the subject of this report.

As a basis for the committee's deliberations, the program director for each of the cycle 2 portfolio programs was asked to provide a narrative summary and supporting data. The committee's assessments were based on the information provided by the program directors. This information was not independently verified. For both the alignment assessment and the analysis of research investment priorities, the committee followed a process of individual assessment followed by committee discussion and recommendation development. Each cycle 2 program was treated individually before the committee discussed the cycle 2 portfolio programs as a group.

Each of the cycle 2 portfolio programs assessed by the committee contribute to the UC system in some way. However, the committee found that some of the cycle 2 portfolio programs should not be supported at the systemwide level while others should not be considered part of the UC Systemwide Research Portfolio. The committee's recommendations on research investment priorities for the cycle 2 portfolio programs are summarized in the table below.

---

<sup>1</sup> University of California, Office of the President. *Interim Report of the Portfolio Review Group: 2012-2013 University of California Systemwide Research Portfolio Alignment Assessment*. Oakland, CA. June 13, 2013. <http://ucop.edu/research-graduate-studies/files/research/documents/prg-2013-interim-report.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> University of California, Office of the President. *Report of the Portfolio Review Group: 2012-2013 University of California Systemwide Research Portfolio: Cycle 1 Programs Findings and Recommendations*. Oakland, CA. January 2014. [http://ucop.edu/research-graduate-studies/files/research/documents/prg\\_cycle1\\_final\\_report.pdf](http://ucop.edu/research-graduate-studies/files/research/documents/prg_cycle1_final_report.pdf)

***Summary of PRG Findings and Recommendations for Cycle 2 Programs***

<b>Systemwide Research Program</b>	<b>Findings on Alignment to Systemwide Research Investment Principles</b>	<b>Near term Recommendations and Priority of Systemwide Research Investments (trajectory of systemwide research funds)</b>
SDSC	Mostly Aligned	Maintain current level of systemwide research investment
ITS	Aligned	Maintain current level of systemwide research investment
PEER	Aligned	No change in funding structure
TRDRP	Aligned	No change in funding structure
CBCRP	Aligned	No change in funding structure
CRCC	Aligned	No change in funding structure
IRLE	Not Aligned	Remove program from systemwide research portfolio: Redirect funds to higher priority research investments
CPAC	Not aligned	Remove program from systemwide research portfolio: Redirect funds to higher priority research investments
CESLAC	Not Aligned	Remove program from systemwide research portfolio: Redirect funds to higher priority research investments
TAX	Not Aligned	Remove program from systemwide research portfolio: Redirect funds to higher priority research investments
MIND	Partly Aligned	Remove program from systemwide research portfolio: MIND is a UC Davis Institute.

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

The University of California, Office of the President provides funding for a small number of research programs and facilities intended to mutually benefit the University and the State of California. The current mix of systemwide research investments arose over many decades in response to different opportunities or political imperatives. While the size and composition of the Systemwide Research Portfolio (the portfolio) had evolved over time, a comprehensive review of the portfolio had not, up till now, been done.

To help ensure that the current and future systemwide research portfolio provides optimum systemwide value, the University of California, Office of the President established the Portfolio Review Group (the committee). The committee was convened in by Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies Steve Beckwith in the fall of 2012. Members were nominated to serve on the committee by Campus Chancellors and the University-wide Academic Senate and were selected to include a balance of faculty and administrative perspectives, a broad range of roles and academic disciplines, and a deep knowledge of UC's research enterprise. Initial committee appointments have been extended through June 30, 2014.

The charge to the committee is included in Appendix 1. Briefly, the committee was charged with:

1. Reviewing the Systemwide Research Portfolio and assessing alignment of programs within the portfolio against three principles for systemwide research investments,
2. Making recommendations on priorities and adjustments in the current mix of research investments.
3. Suggesting long term strategies for maintaining a vibrant and well balanced research portfolio.

To manage the workflow of the committee and respond to the committee's charge in a timely manner, the programs comprising the portfolio were evaluated in two cycles. The committee's January 2014 report contains the committee's findings and recommendations on the alignment and investment priorities for cycle 1 programs.<sup>3</sup> The findings and recommendations presented in this report reflect the committee's assessment of the alignment and investment priorities for the cycle 2 programs.

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

The committee built on the principles for systemwide research investment recommended by the Principles, Process, and Assessment Task Force<sup>4</sup> and further supplemented the principles with working definitions, objectives and considerations (see Appendix 2). The principles, working definitions, objectives and considerations served, collectively, as a framework for the committee's assessment and provided guidance and structure to program directors in developing program summaries and supporting information responsive to the committee's needs.

---

<sup>3</sup> University of California, Office of the President. *Report of the Portfolio Review Group: 2012-2013 University of California Systemwide Research Portfolio: Cycle 1 Programs Findings and Recommendations*. Oakland, CA. January 2014. [http://ucop.edu/research-graduate-studies/files/research/documents/prg\\_cycle1\\_final\\_report.pdf](http://ucop.edu/research-graduate-studies/files/research/documents/prg_cycle1_final_report.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> University of California, Office of the President. *The Task Force on University-wide Research Principles, Process, and Assessment*. Oakland, CA. June 2012. [http://ucop.edu/research-graduate-studies/files/research/documents/ppa\\_report.pdf](http://ucop.edu/research-graduate-studies/files/research/documents/ppa_report.pdf)

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

The committee based their findings and recommendations primarily on the 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 as well as 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. Submissions were processed by UCOP staff for consistency in formatting and presentation and provided to the committee several weeks in advance of the January 2014 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 appropriate and allowed members to experience the wide range of programs and reporting evidenced included in such a diverse portfolio. In cases where an external program review had been completed recently, those reviews were made available to the committee.

## ***Deliberation Process***

The deliberation process applied by the committee to assess cycle 2 portfolio programs mirrored the process applied to the cycle 1 programs. Committee members reviewed the available program materials, performed individual assessments of each program's alignment to the systemwide principles, and made recommendations on systemwide research investment priorities. 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 systemwide investments across the cycle 2 portfolio programs. Members unable to attend all or part of the meeting were consulted offline by the chair following the meeting. A draft report of the committee's findings and recommendations was compiled and circulated to the committee for comment after the January meeting. The final report on cycle 2 programs (this document) was delivered in February 2014.

## ***Findings and Recommendations***

The following narrative summarizes the committee's main findings and recommendations regarding both programmatic alignment and priorities for systemwide research investments for the cycle 2 programs. Systemwide investments in cycle 2 programs come from different sources. Several of the cycle 2 programs—San Diego Supercomputer Center; Institute for Research on Labor and Employment; California Program for Access to Care; Center for Studies in Latino Health and Culture; and, US Mexico Treaty and Accords to Prevent and Recover Doubly Taxed Social Security and Income Funds—are principally supported through UCOP discretionary funds. Other programs— Institute for Transportation Studies; Pacific Earthquake Engineering Center; Tobacco Related Disease Research Program; California Breast Cancer Research Program; UC Cancer Coordinating Committee; and Medical Investigation of Neurological Disorders—are principally supported by funds restricted to that purpose by legislative action, endowment terms, or other constraints.

## ***San Diego Supercomputer Center***

The San Diego Supercomputer Center (SDSC) was established in 1985 with NSF support and continued under an NSF, National Partnership for Advanced Computational Infrastructure grant that continued until 2005. Subsequent operating support has come from both UC systemwide and San Diego campus resources, which in the most recent year were approximately \$2.6M and \$2.1M, respectively.

The committee found that SDSC is an important systemwide infrastructure investment that will be difficult to justify as a systemwide program if it continues to engage and serve primarily the UCSD campus. The committee found that the program potentially aligns with Principle 3 (impact for California). The committee found that the program aligns very well with Principle 1 (leveraging external resources and shared facilities) and has potential to align with Principle 2 (facilitating multicampus engagement and efficiency). However, this potential is currently not adequately realized. While there was some evidence that researchers across multiple campuses, the vast majority of SDSC users are located on the San Diego campus. This may be a reflection of the San Diego centric focus of the Center's governance board, which is entirely comprised of UCSD members, and organizational identity as a UCSD Organized Research Unit.

The center is very well positioned to significantly increase its systemwide value by expanding the access to the facility and the Center's expertise. In particular, the committee suggests that a significant increase in the program's systemwide value could be achieved by addressing problems in large-scale computing and data science; coupling the Center's expertise in scientific computing and big data to domain-specific fundamental scientists across a wide range of disciplines on multiple campuses.

The committee found that the program's activities have become increasingly diverse; including, hosting a wide variety of databases and providing a diverse array of computing services. Since some of the most impactful opportunities available at the Center involve helping domain scientists manage, analyze, and interpret large datasets in new and unique ways, we recommend that Center's strategic planning ensure that opportunities for direct support of faculty across the system not be diminished by the process of providing more routine hardware and software computing and storage services.

**Recommendation 1:** Systemwide investment in the Center should be kept at current level for three years, during which time the Center should develop and implement a plan for increasing systemwide research engagement, collaboration, and participation wherever possible and appropriate.

**Recommendation 2:** The Center should immediately take steps to strengthen participation and governance beyond UCSD.

**Recommendation 3:** The program should be reevaluated for alignment with systemwide research investment principles and level of systemwide investment in three years. If attempts to broaden the participation are unsuccessful, consideration should be given to transitioning support for the Center to UCSD.

## ***Institutes for Transportation Studies***

UC's Institutes for Transportation Studies (ITS) supports a broad array of research, teaching, and outreach activities in transportation related fields. This work is primarily centered on four campuses with minor participation from researchers at other UC campuses. The program is allocated one million dollars annually as part of the California Department of Transportation annual appropriation. In addition this permanent state funding, the program successfully competed for systemwide funding through the MRPI program. The MRPI award is the only discretionary, systemwide research investment in the program.

The committee found that ITS aligns well with systemwide research Principle 1 (leveraging external resources and shared facilities) and has been highly successful in leveraging external research support and provides faculty with access to numerous important experimental facilities. Similarly, the program aligns well with Principle 3 (impact for California). The committee found that the program's impact on state and national transportation practices, from an engineering, technology, and policy perspective, has been significant.

Currently, the program partially aligns with Principle 2 (facilitating multicampus engagement and efficiency). Although there is some collaboration as evidenced by the successful MRPI project, the four campus Institutes operate with considerable autonomy. The committee received four separate reports from the four campus ITS offices, as opposed to a single integrated one, indicative of the level of program integration. The committee found that there is potential for a more integrated multicampus/systemwide program not realized in the current operating and oversight structure. The impact of the program could be greater by broadening campus participation and collaboration as well as by extending multidisciplinary initiatives and activities beyond traditional disciplines affiliated with the program. The program should consider a strategic initiative, perhaps facilitated by an advisory board, to address:

- Strategic opportunities to increase multicampus engagement in the Institutes, wherever possible and appropriate, including UC campuses that do not currently have ITS centers.
- Areas of overlapping research interests and projects between Institutes and strategies for more closely aligning cross Institute research initiatives in the future.
- Areas of duplication in the management of the Institutes and how that may evolve over time to a more combined administration.
- Apparent inequities across the campuses that might be addressed by modifications to the governance structure.

**Recommendation 1:** The committee does not recommend any changes to the existing funding structure.

**Recommendation 2:** Through an external advisory board or independent program review, the program should examine opportunities to increase intercampus collaboration and opportunities to broaden the mix of disciplines involved wherever possible and appropriate.

**Recommendation 3:** The level of systemwide investment should be reassessed after the program review.

### ***Pacific Earthquake Engineering Center***

The Pacific Earthquake Engineering Center (PEER) was established in 1996 by legislative action and received NSF Engineering Research Center funding from 1997 to 2008. The program's ten participating institutions, including five UC campuses, develop and disseminate engineering methodologies and systems to address and mitigate earthquake risks. Collectively, the member institutions provide a preeminent collection of seismic experimental facilities. PEER annually receives one million dollars as part of the State Transportation appropriation. Currently, PEER does not receive systemwide research support.

The committee found that PEER well aligned with Principles 1 (leveraging external resources and shared facilities) by achieving excellent leverage in attracting external resources and providing faculty with access to unique facilities that could not be provided by a single campus. Similarly, the program is very well aligned with Principle 3 (impact for California). The program's impact for California has been

extensive; influencing, for example, building codes and earthquake preparedness activities. The programs current and ongoing activities are poised to continue providing this valuable benefit for the state. The program was aligned Principle 2 (facilitating multicampus engagement and efficiency); however, the committee found that an opportunity may exist to improve alignment with Principle 2 by fostering stronger relationships with other earthquake research networks across UC (such as the Southern California Earthquake Center (SCEC) or Network for Earthquake Engineering Simulation (NEES)). Additionally, there may be an opportunity to more effectively involve campuses without graduate earthquake engineering programs. If the program decides to increase participation in the program from across a wider range of disciplines on multiple campuses, it may be appropriate to reassess the systemwide investment in order to accelerate such enhancement.

**Recommendation 1:** The current funding structure should be maintained.

**Recommendation 2:** The program should consider expanding its scope both in terms of disciplines by for example expanding beyond campuses that have graduate earthquake engineering programs, and organizationally establishing or enhancing partnerships with sister programs such as SCEC or NEES.

**Recommendation 3:** The program should be re-evaluated after three years, and if the broadening of scope has occurred consider supplementing its funding with systemwide resources.

### ***Tobacco Related Disease Research Program***

The Tobacco Related Disease Research Program (TRDRP) is a competitive grant program administered by the University on behalf of the state as dictated by the Tobacco Tax and Health Protection Act of 1988 and funded by the Cigarette and Tobacco Products Tax. There is no systemwide investment in this program. In the 2011-13 period, the program awarded \$22.5M in research grants; \$9.6 of which was awarded to UC investigators. In administering the program, UC acts as an agent for the state in pursuing the goals and objectives defined by the Tobacco Tax and Health Protection Act of 1988.

No systemwide funds are used to support this program. Nonetheless, the committee found that the program aligns well with all three Systemwide Research Principles. The program provides UC faculty with unique opportunities through the funding it provides. There is also evidence that the program enables leveraging of other funding. Most importantly, however, the impact for California has been significant: smoking in California has declined more rapidly than the country at large since the passage of Proposition 99. The committee observed that the program's awards fit in a larger tobacco and cancer research funding context. Like CBCRP and CRCC, the TRDRP program enjoys an autonomy and flexibility not enjoyed by many other funders, providing the program a higher degree of risk-taking and opportunities for supporting new research programs and seeding new activities. The committee recommends that the program leadership keep this flexibility in mind when setting research strategies so as to maximize impact.

**Recommendation 1:** The current funding structure should be maintained.

**Recommendation 2:** The program should take full advantage of the program's inherent flexibility to make high-risk investments to complement the funding patterns from other funding agencies with less flexibility.

### ***California Breast Cancer Research Program***

Like TRDRP, the California Breast Cancer Research Program (CBCRP) is a competitive grant program administered by UC on behalf of the state pursuant to the Breast Cancer Act of 1993. The program is

solely funded by the Cigarette and Tobacco Products Tax and voluntary check off on state income tax returns. From 2011 to 2013, the program awarded \$18.5M in research grants: \$10.4 of which were grants with at least one UC investigator. By administering the program, UC acts as an agent for the state in pursuing the goals and objectives defined by the Breast Cancer Act of 1993.

No systemwide research funds are invested in this program. Nonetheless, the committee found that the program aligns well with all three Systemwide Research Principles. The committee found that CBCRP provides faculty with unique opportunities through the funding it provides. There is evidence that the program provides considerable leveraging of other funding. The support provided by the program is spread across most of the campuses and there is evidence of significant multicampus collaboration of various types. The impact for California is evidenced by extensive outreach programs involving breast cancer awareness and treatment advice, especially for underserved populations.

The committee observed that, as is the case for TRDRP and CRCC, the program's awards fit in a larger cancer-research funding context. The CBCRP program like TDRP and CRCC, enjoy an autonomy and flexibility not enjoyed by many other funders such as NIH, and thus can fund higher risk projects, and focus more on program initiation and seeding new ideas. The committee suggests that the program leadership keep this flexibility in mind when setting research strategies so as to maximize impact.

**Recommendation 1:** The current funding structure should be maintained.

**Recommendation 2:** The program should take full advantage of the program's inherent flexibility to make high-risk investments to complement the funding patterns from other funding agencies with less flexibility.

### ***UC Cancer Coordinating Committee***

The UC Cancer Coordinating Committee (CRCC) competitively awards seed funding of promising new cancer research on all ten UC campuses. A total of \$5.4M was awarded over the two year period 2011-13. Per the program's funding criteria, half of the awards must go to new assistant professors. Funds awarded by the program are derived from endowments explicitly designated for this purpose. This program is currently managed by a faculty member and one staff person at UC Davis. The program's governance is assisted by a large committee with representation from all ten campuses. The program objectives are defined in the various endowments to support this research

Currently, no systemwide investments are used to support this program; nonetheless, the committee found that the program aligns well with the three Systemwide Research Investment Principles. The program's emphasis on funding junior faculty members and seeding new initiatives at the early state provides a valuable funding opportunity; the ability to take risks and seed new activities allows CRCC to have disproportionately large impact in an area with much larger funders like NIH.

The committee found that the program's current operations are working well and achieving the objectives laid by the various endowments. The committee recommends that CRCC undergo standard external reviews at appropriate intervals to insure the continued health of the program.

**Recommendation 1:** The current funding structure should be maintained.

**Recommendation 2:** The program should undergo standard periodic reviews.

## ***Institute for Research on Labor and Employment***

The Institutes, located at the Berkeley and Los Angeles campuses, were established in 1945 as the Institutes for Labor Relations. Throughout their history, the Institutes have supported a mix of research, education, and community outreach in the general area of labor and employment. Presently each Institute receives approximately \$1M annually in unrestricted systemwide support.

While the Institutes have a long history of important contributions, the committee did not find that they currently align well with the systemwide principles for research investment. The committee found that the program is neither adequately leveraging external resources nor showing a pattern of providing faculty with access to unique facilities or opportunities, characteristics expected for alignment with Principle 1 (leveraging external resources and shared facilities). Similarly, while the committee found some participation at campuses beyond UCLA and Berkeley, the vast majority of the activity and expenditures are on those two campuses: giving only weak alignment with Principle 2 (facilitating multicampus engagement and efficiency). The committee found that the program potentially aligns with Principle 3 (impact for California). Overall, the committee found that the systemwide investment in the program may return a greater value to the system if redirected to other research programs that have higher priority in the systemwide research portfolio.

**Recommendation:** The systemwide investment in the program should be redirected to other, higher priority research opportunities. Future support for the Institutes should be provided by the respective campuses or other appropriate sources.

## ***California Program on Access to Care***

The California Program on Access to Care (CPAC) was founded in 1997 within the UC California Policy Research Center and subsequently moved to the School of Public Health on the Berkeley campus. Its mission is to advise state government decision makers on maintaining or expanding access to health care among vulnerable populations.

CPAC has provided and continues to provide important public policy advice to California decision makers, an especially important contribution given the fundamental changes to the health care landscape brought about by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. Thus, the committee found potential alignment with Principle 3 (impact for California). However, based on the materials provided, the committee found the program substantially misaligns with both Principles 1 (leveraging external resources and shared facilities) and Principle 2 (facilitating multicampus engagement and efficiency). The committee did not find evidence that the program significantly leveraging external resources for the system or providing access to unique facilities. While there is evidence of involvement of faculty from other campuses, based on the materials provided, it appears that the majority of both program expenditures and activities are centralized on the Berkeley campus. The committee could not identify a compelling reason for CPAC to continue as a systemwide research program as opposed to a Berkeley campus program. The committee found that the current systemwide research investment may return higher systemwide value if redirected to research programs and opportunities of greater systemwide value.

**Recommendation:** The program should be transition out of the systemwide research portfolio and to a Berkeley campus program with a funding source appropriate to that.

### ***Center for Studies in Latino Health and Culture***

The Center for Studies in Latino Health and Culture (CESLAC) provides science-based, data-driven studies to help decision makers guide California's economy and institutions as the state's demographics shift towards a Latino majority. Materials provided to the committee indicated that a number of demographic data sets have been created and disseminated. While providing access to and curating these datasets may provide a unique resource for UC researchers, program utilization data was not provided to the committee and, therefore alignment with Principle 1 (leveraging external resources shared facilities) could not be demonstrated. With respect to Principle 2 (facilitating multicampus engagement and efficiency), the committee found that as program activities, affiliates, expenditures, and governance are entirely on the UCLA campus, CESLAC does not align with Principle 2. The committee found that the program potentially aligns with Principle 3 (impact for California).

UC has the potential to play a critical role as a state and national leader in research to inform public policy and economic decisions as demographics shift. There may be an opportunity for the program, perhaps through the systemwide Multicampus Research Programs and Initiatives (MRPI) program, to create a truly multicampus network of similar efforts. However, for the program as it is currently constituted the committee could find no reason that this should be a UCOP program as opposed to a UCLA campus program. Therefore, the committee found that the current systemwide research investment in the program may return higher value to the system if redirected to research programs that have higher priority from a research perspective.

It may be appropriate to support the existing external outreach and advocacy components of the program as part of a larger initiative that encompasses a wide variety of activities of joint importance to both California-Mexico. However, such a broad initiative should not be considered a systemwide research investment.

**Recommendation 1:** The program should be transition out of the systemwide research portfolio and to a UCLA campus program with a funding source appropriate to that.

**Recommendation 2:** The program's leadership should consider bringing together other similar programs on other campuses in a competitive proposal for funding through the MRPI program.

### ***US Mexico Treaty and Accords to Prevent and Recover Doubly Taxed Social Security and Income Funds***

The US Mexico Treaty and Accords to Prevent and Recover Doubly Taxed Social Security and Income Funds program develops information on and understanding of social security tax and income tax issues for individuals emigrating from Mexico. The program also engages in outreach to inform decision makers about the program's research outcomes. The program received about \$200K of systemwide discretionary funds in the most recent fiscal year; however the program and its expenditures are entirely at the Los Angeles campus. While the objectives of the program may be very worthy, the committee found that it does not align with the systemwide research principles. The committee found no evidence that the program leverages external funds, provides access to unique facilities or capabilities to the system. Similarly, the committee could find no evidence of systemwide efficiencies realized by maintain the program as a systemwide research program as opposed to a UCLA campus program. The existing research components of the program may be appropriately funded via competitively awarded systemwide funds (e.g. the MRPI or the UC-MEXUS programs). The external outreach and advocacy components, however, should not be supported by systemwide research funds. The committee found that the systemwide investment in the program may return higher value to the

system if redirected to research programs and opportunities that have higher priority from a systemwide research perspective.

**Recommendation:** The program should transition out of the systemwide research portfolio to a UCLA campus program with a funding source appropriate to that.

### ***Medical Investigation of Neurological Disorders***

The Medical Investigation of Neurological Disorders (MIND) Institute at UC Davis was launched in 1998 and today is aimed at finding effective treatments and cures for autism and other neurological disorders. The Institute is housed in its own building, has an annual expenditure rate exceeding \$20M, and has over 30 active, affiliated faculty: all at UC Davis.

The program's operating budget is now a part of the UC Davis permanent budget and is supplemented by income from several endowments designated to support the Institute. There is no systemwide investment in the program. The program summary provided to the committee indicates that it is a highly successful and effective research institute on the Davis campus with no systemwide investment. As such, the committee found no reason to regard MIND as a systemwide research program, and concludes that it should be regarded as a UC Davis entity.

**Recommendation:** The program should be removed from the systemwide research portfolio and credited as a successful UC Davis program.

### ***Conclusion and Next Steps***

The committee found that, for several programs in the cycle 2 group, the systemwide research investment may return higher value to the system if redirected to support programs of higher priority from a research perspective. We recommend that UCOP continue its support of UC's research enterprise and ensure that systemwide research investments remain in the systemwide research portfolio to support emerging research opportunities. This report completes the first two elements of the charge to the committee. The committee will next discuss long-term strategies for maintaining and evolving a vibrant and well balanced UC systemwide research portfolio and thus complete the final element of the current committee charge.

## ***Appendix 1: Portfolio Review Group (PRG) – Charge to the Committee (01/17/2013)***

The UC Office of the President (UCOP) invests<sup>5</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:

---

<sup>5</sup> In FY2012-13, UCOP invested close to \$85 million of UC's funds to support programs within the UC systemwide research portfolio.

- 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.

**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.

**ATTACHMENT B: Principles of Systemwide Research Investments**

*The Vice President of Research and Graduate Studies charges the PRG with the following Systemwide Principles to help guide its work. These principles were derived from the work of a joint task force of UCOP, Academic Senate and campus administrators (the PPA Task Force) which convened in FY2011-12 to discuss a framework to guide future decision-making and evaluation of research investments.*

Each UC campus has a unique and competitive research enterprise that is responsive to its faculty and students, and to its sponsors and stakeholders in research. As a ten-campus public university system, however, UC has unique opportunities and responsibilities to invest in research that is

different and beyond what can be done on a single campus. In addition to the objective of supporting research of the highest quality and impact, the following three principles define the goals and purpose that drive and distinguish UC-wide research investments.

1. Principle #1: Act as one system of multiple campuses to enhance UC's research capacity, influence and advantage. With ten campuses, three national laboratories, state-wide resources and networks, the UC system offers researchers access to opportunities and a competitive advantage that a single campus cannot provide on its own. Acting as a network of multiple campuses, UC can invest in efforts that bring the best and most diverse minds together to define challenges, secure funding, and solve significant problems. This provides more opportunities for UC's world-class faculty and creates larger and stronger collaborative resources and networks that can enhance the entire research community.

2. Principle #2: Promote efficient inter-campus collaborations and systemwide economies of scale.

Finding ways for UC researchers and administrators to cross campus boundaries and work together effectively is a key goal of UC-wide investments. Not only does this generate energy and ideas among UC researchers across the system, but it leads to shared innovation and efficiencies in how we conduct and manage research, resulting in savings or financial gains that can be reinvested in UC-wide research.

3. Principle #3: Serve the State of California.

As California's research university, we implement research on behalf of the state in a fair and impartial basis. UC research has a unique capability to address many of the greatest challenges facing California today. UC seeks to create and grow industries that support California regional economies and to educate a culturally literate, knowledgeable workforce that will continue to lead the growth of California and optimize the State's return on its investment in UC.

## ***Appendix 2: Considerations for Conducting the Principle Alignment Review (Revised 05/24/2013)***

<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 current and emerging 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?

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

### ***Appendix 3: Conflicts of Interest (updated 09/23/2013)***

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 scoring of program summaries for which a potential 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 abstain from the scoring of that program.

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 scoring these programs 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 but are not limited to:

- 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)).*