PORTFOLIO REVIEW GROUP
MEETING MINUTES – UPDATED 4-17-2013
RESEARCH PORTFOLIO ALIGNMENT REVIEW MEETING
APRIL 3 - 4, 2013

STATUS.
These minutes are presented to the Portfolio Review Group (PRG) as a record of their second meeting.

PRG MEMBERS PRESENT:
1. Paul Gray, Chair
2. Harris Lewin, UC Davis (remote participant)
3. Michael Kleeman, UC Davis
4. John Hemminger, UC Irvine
5. Steve Olsen, UC Los Angeles
6. Timothy Tangherlini, UC Los Angeles (remote participant)
7. Juan Meza, UC Merced
8. Robert Clare, UC Riverside
9. Marylynn Yates, UC Riverside
10. Sandra Brown, UC San Diego
11. Michael Witherell, UC Santa Barbara
12. David Stuart, UC Santa Barbara
13. Tyrus Miller, UC Santa Cruz
14. Susan Gillman, UC Santa Cruz

PRG MEMBERS ABSENT:
1. Erin Gore, UC Berkeley
2. Keith Yamamoto, UC San Francisco
3. Tejal Desai, UC San Francisco

UCOP STAFF PRESENT:
1. Debbie Shen, Project Lead
2. Dorothy Miller, Support Staff
3. Katherine Mitchell, Facilitator

SUMMARY.
PRG members met in-person over two days (April 3rd and 4th) at in the Beckman Center in Irvine, CA to review programs within the systemide research portfolio and assess alignment with systemwide principles for research investment (attachment 1).

Members were given access to materials provided by the directors (program summaries and supporting data) several weeks in advance to read through and prepare for the meeting.

Conflicts of Interest were reported and managed prior to and during the meeting using the guidelines discussed and adopted at the January PRG meeting (attachment 2).

DAY ONE:
Chair Gray opened the meeting on the first day with a welcome and a round-the-table check-in.

Chair Gray then provided an overview of the committee's work, the agenda and the goals for the meeting. UCOP staff (D. Shen/D. Miller) gave a brief overview of the review process and answered member questions.

Chair Gray reminded members of the confidentiality of the day's discussions and the materials provided.

Chair Gray then started review discussions. Each program within the Systemwide Research Portfolio was discussed separately. Approximately 30 minutes was allotted for each program discussion.

After program discussions were completed, the committee then considered alignment across the entire portfolio of programs. Members also discussed options for grouping results and recommendations. The committee agreed to consider this question overnight and reconvene in the morning.

Chair Gray adjourned at 5:00pm. The committee agreed to start Day Two at 8:00am.

DAY TWO:
Chair Gray began day two with a recap of the previous day's discussions and an overview of the day two agenda. The committee then continued discussions begun at the end of the previous day.

ACTION: Members requested clarification on the timing and expectations for the group report. The Chair agreed to clarify these questions with the VP-ORGS.

UCOP staff (D. Shen) then provided a brief overview of materials provided in response to member questions in the January meeting, followed by a brief Q&A.

The Committee then discussed next steps.

ACTION: Members requested an update on membership appointments and other programs under consideration for inclusion in the systemwide research portfolio.

Members agreed to allow time for the Chair to clarify member questions and propose a plan for next steps. Members agreed to hold dates for a May meeting for continued discussions.

Chair Gray again reminded members of the confidentiality of the meeting discussions and materials.

Chair Gray adjourned the meeting early at 11:30am, and thanked committee members and staff.

Considerations for Conducting the Principle Alignment Review
REVISED BY PORTFOLIO REVIEW GROUP ON 01-18-2013

Principle #1: Act as one system of multiple campuses to enhance UC's research capacity, influence and advantage.

Objective	Considerations
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?

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

Objective	Considerations
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

Principle #3: Serve the State and citizens of California.	
Objective	**Considerations**
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?

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).