



Davis Division Academic Senate

Request for Consultation Responses

ORU Review-Healthcare Policy & Research (CHPR)

December 2, 2014

ORU 5-year review: Center for Healthcare Policy and Research (CHPR). The Academic Senate received a request late last spring to review the ORU review for CHPR. The review is provided for review and feedback.

Graduate Council

November 14, 2014 9:24 AM

No response at this time.

Planning & Budget

December 2, 2014 1:24 PM

CPB reviewed and discussed the ORU review for the Center for Healthcare Policy & Research (CHPR). The review committee expresses significant criticism in the review, yet agrees that the center is clearly productive and doing excellent work. Some of the criticisms are easily addressable and the CHPR seems poised to undertake new efforts.

CPB notes that two areas of concern in the review were the limited involvement with undergraduates and the high school internship program. Both of these two areas of concern may be hindering the development of the center. With implementation that address review concerns, CHPR may have greater opportunity to flourish. CPB would also encourage greater on-campus collaboration, which could also lead to a stronger research presence (e.g., with geography or community development graduate groups).

Research

November 26, 2014 8:46 AM

COR reviewed and discussed the five year ORU review for the Center for Healthcare Policy & Research, particularly paying attention to the questions of whether the unit should continue in existence, noting strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations.

COR unanimously agrees that this center should persist! It is very productive and is doing a great job doing at what it's doing. Associates are heavily engaged in publication and have a fantastic grant success rate (17 million \$ income, 425 publications, 40 projects, 68% grant success rate including a very valuable T32 training grant). COR sees no risk and no downside to sticking with this center. There is a lot that this center contributes to the university.

Some reviewers advocate for more internal and external funding. They suggest an NIH P-grant which COR agrees would be a logical step. Foundation grants, even with low indirect costs, are also a great idea, especially because a lot of these allow the center to have the kind of impact on stakeholders we'd like to have. 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 SOM/campus only appears to pay 10% of the director's salary but 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. Cover more of the director's salary? Hire staff and to do what? Marketing and outreach- how?

The review questions to what extent the center impacts policy, claims that the center has low visibility, and advocates for marketing. COR doesn't see a convincing argument that the center does not impact policy, more that it is hard to tell. COR would imagine that finding a quantitative metric to determine the extent of impact would always be hard to achieve and the committee doesn't see why we would bog down in that concern given the clear success of the center. The center is doing swimmingly. Should they spend their time and resources marketing? Really, should this highly successful director start writing 5 year vision plans and business plans and doing round tables to increase their impact? Won't that actually be a distraction from what the center already appears to be good at? Should someone hire a marketer? If that's the case, then likely that cost should be borne by the university or SOM. We're not convinced the center needs it, and if the SOM wants it, they might choose to implement it and pay for it.

A large part of the problem is structural: the center is in Sacramento and apparently not even on the Sacramento medical campus. The decision to split UC "Davis" off to Sacramento was made a long time ago and now the whole campus community reaps the rewards of the decision. COR doesn't doubt the center can't teach undergrads: incorporating Davis-based undergrads in Sacramento activities is always a hassle both for Sacramento staff and particularly for Davis-based undergrads and it's hard to imagine that an off-campus center would be common destination for undergrads. 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 the remote location. The reviewers mention that the center has outreach to high schools

but had no details. That's intriguing. 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 an actual UC campus and advocate for increased space. That seems like a pretty big task with such intense needs for space already but as long as the center is a satellite, COR thinks these problems will persist.

One excellent recommendation is to develop an external advisory board and we would encourage that to happen.

Overall, the review truly appears to have been written by administrators, with a heavy emphasis on management goals, "assertive and externally focused leadership", internal managerial backup, etc. Those are fine, but are unlikely to be strengths of the center's current faculty and leadership. Arguably, accomplishing these would most benefit the SOM and campus as a whole and the costs should be borne by someone besides the center. From academic perspectives, the center is quite a success.