

PORTFOLIO REVIEW GROUP
MEETING MINUTES
RESEARCH PORTFOLIO ALIGNMENT REVIEW MEETING
MAY 24, 2013

STATUS.

These minutes are presented as a record of the third meeting of the Portfolio Review Group (PRG).

PRG MEMBERS PRESENT:

1. Paul Gray, Chair
2. Erin Gore, UC Berkeley
3. Michael Kleeman, UC Davis
4. Steve Olsen, UC Los Angeles
5. Timothy Tangherlini, UC Los Angeles
6. Juan Meza, UC Merced
7. Robert Clare, UC Riverside
(remote participation)
8. Marylynn Yates, UC Riverside
(remote participation)
9. Keith Yamamoto, UC San Francisco
10. Tejal Desai, UC San Francisco
11. David Stuart, UC Santa Barbara
12. Michael Witherell, UC Santa Barbara
13. Tyrus Miller, UC Santa Cruz
14. Susan Gillman, UC Santa Cruz

PRG MEMBERS ABSENT:

1. Harris Lewin, UC Davis
2. John Hemminger, UC Irvine
3. Sandra Brown, UC San Diego

UCOP Staff Present:

1. Debbie Shen, Project Lead
2. Dorothy Miller, Support Staff
3. Emily Rader, Support Staff
4. Lifang Chiang, Support Staff
5. Katherine Mitchell, Facilitator

The third meeting of the PRG was held on May 24th in the Franklin Building of the Office of the President in Oakland, CA.

Chair Gray opened the meeting at 10:00am, and thanked the members for attending.

The committee discussed the draft report titled Interim Report of the Portfolio Review Group: 2012-2013 University of California Systemwide Research Portfolio Alignment Assessment (interim report). Members were surveyed on their level of agreement with the current draft and a few revisions were suggested and agreed to by the group.

APPROVAL. A vote was taken, and attending members unanimously agreed to approve the interim report with the requested revisions, pending approval by absent members.

ACTION. The committee requested that the interim report (with revisions) be circulated to absent members for their review and approval. Upon approval by all members, the report will be transmitted to the Vice President, and subsequently posted on the [PRG website](#).

The committee discussed preparations for a fall assessment, which would extend the scope of the portfolio assessment to an additional set of research programs. The committee was notified that the list of programs to be included will be finalized soon. The committee discussed lessons-learned from the recently completed alignment review, and agreed to move forward with a similar process for the fall assessment, in order to ensure consistency. The committee suggested some minor changes be made to the data requested of the programs, in order to ease the reporting burden to the programs.

APPROVAL. After discussion, the committee agreed to minor revisions to the Considerations for Conducting the Principle Alignment Review for clarification purposes. Revisions will be posted to the [PRG website](#). The committee then agreed to adopt this revised version for use in the upcoming fall assessment.

ACTION. The committee discussed a potential schedule for the fall assessment, and requests that UCOP staff begin to poll dates now, in order to schedule PRG fall meetings.

The committee discussed next steps in arriving at funding level recommendations. Members reviewed the group charge, and discussed a potential framework, considerations and approaches. Members agreed that it would be helpful to look at data for the entire portfolio at once (including both recently review programs and programs to be reviewed in the fall).

ACTION. A subcommittee was appointed by the chair to develop a more detailed plan arriving at funding level recommendations.

Finally, the group briefly discussed a longer-term plan for the PRG. This discussion was deferred until after the completion of both the alignment and funding-level assessments for the full portfolio of programs.

Chair Gray adjourned the meeting at approximately 1:30pm and thanked committee members and staff.

Considerations for Conducting the Principle Alignment Review

REVISED BY PORTFOLIO REVIEW GROUP ON 05-24-2013

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 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?
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 05-24-2013

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 areas to serve the public interest?