

December 10, 2014

**HARRIS LEWIN**Vice Chancellor--Research  
Office of Research**RE: Organized Research Unit (ORU) 5-year Review  
Center for Healthcare Policy and Research (CHPR)**

The CHPR ORU review was forwarded to all Davis Division of the Academic Senate standing committees including school and college Faculty Executive Committees. Responses were received from the Committees on Research and Planning and Budget as well as Graduate Council. As expected, the Committee on Research (COR) provided a substantial portion of the input provided below.

The ORU review committee was thorough in identifying areas for improvement. CHPR seems poised to undertake new efforts. One excellent recommendation is to develop an external advisory board and we would encourage that to happen. However, concerns were raised during Academic Senate review of the report. The Committee on Planning and Budget encourages CHPR to pursue greater on-campus collaboration, which could also lead to a stronger research presence (e.g., with geography or community development graduate groups). COR unanimously agrees that CHPR should persist. COR recognizes CHPR is very productive, associates are heavily engaged in publication and have a fantastic grant success rate.

The CHPR's limited involvement with undergraduates and the high school internship program were discussed. CHPR involvement in these areas may hinder center development. ORU's should have limited interaction with undergraduate students. UC Davis policy 220-01 states: "An ORU may have other academic functions ordinarily carried out by departments of instruction and research, e.g., it may sponsor research conferences and meetings, advise on graduate curricula, or provide support for graduate students and graduate programs, but an ORU cannot have jurisdiction over courses or curricula and cannot offer formal courses for credit unless it has been specifically empowered to do so."

COR noted some reviewers advocate for more internal and external funding. COR agrees with the NIH and foundation grant suggestions. Foundation grants, even with low indirect costs, are also a great idea, especially because many allow the center to impact stakeholders. However, COR doesn't see the justification for internal funding as this center seems to be on much more solid financial footing than many. It is unfortunate that the School of Medicine (SOM)/campus funds 10 percent of the director's salary. Regardless, the model still seems to work well. COR thinks that before increased internal funding is considered it would be important to know what the center would do with such money.

The review report questions CHPR's policy impact, claims that the center has low visibility, and advocates for marketing. COR is not convinced that CHPR does not impact policy. The issue is the impact is difficult to identify or quantify. Further, a quantitative metric to determine the extent of impact would be hard to achieve and given the clear success of CHPR, COR does not see sufficient benefit to justify the cost. Shifting the focus will likely be a distraction from CHPR's strength. Should CHPR spend their time and resources marketing? Should this highly successful director start writing five-year vision and business plans and doing round tables to increase their impact?

COR believes the issue is structural. COR believes the structural issue deserves more attention from SOM and campus administration. CHPR is located in Sacramento and away from the medical campus. CHPR location is a major impediment to incorporating undergraduate students. Likewise, graduate students who work with the center will have their lives fragmented between two cities and off campus. One problem is that the center has "limited input into the expansion of brain power for health policy across campus" and again we believe this derives specifically from location. The reviewers mention that the center reaches out to high schools. While intriguing, the review lacks detail about high school outreach efforts. The review suggests that the center find a way to increase visibility, attract faculty to be in residence at the center, etc. There is also a suggestion for long-term planning to actually bring the center onto a UC campus and advocate for increased space.

Overall, from an academic perspective, CHPR is successful. The review emphasizes management goals, "assertive and externally focused leadership", internal managerial backup, etc. Again, altering CHPR faculty and leadership focus may decrease the rate of success in academic areas. Arguably, accomplishing management goal recommendations would most benefit the School of Medicine and campus as a whole. Therefore, the associated expense should be funded from central sources rather than from existing CHPR sources.

Sincerely,



André Knoesen, Chair  
Davis Division of the Academic Senate  
Professor: Electrical and Computer Engineering