April 11, 2023

TO: Elizabeth Watkins, Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor
CC: Rodolfo Torres, Vice Chancellor for Research and Economic Development
    Gerry Bomotti, Vice Chancellor for Planning, Budget & Administration
    Yunzeng Wang, Dean, School of Business
    Executive Council

RE: Transparency in Establishment and Operation of Centers

The publicity involving the relationship between the UC Riverside School of Business Center for Economic Forecasting Development (CEFD) and Beacon Economics, LLC (Beacon) brought to the front the need to clarify the operating rules for affiliations between UCR Research Centers and external vendors and commercial entities. Although the ties between CEFD and UCR have since been terminated, the incident brings up a set of important issues that go beyond this case. Considering the attached salient points raised by the Senate Committee on Planning and Budget, the Executive Council endorses, echoes, relays, and agrees with the calls and concerns from faculty around this issue and instance. Moving forward, the Executive Council takes the opportunity brought on by the news coverage of the Beacon Economics, LLC, to request a review and an implementation of an oversight plan.

In particular, we request the following:

(1) Updating the UCR Operating Principles for Research Centers (December 2005);
(2) Transparency in the establishment procedure and the clarification of reporting timeline, accountable bodies, and reviewing after the establishment;

---

1 Los Angeles Times coverage: https://www.latimes.com/business/story/2023-02-16/uc-riverside-should-investigate-economics-research-center-faculty-say

(3) Clarification of the UCR faculty appointment and of UCR student involvement in research centers;
(4) Clarification of UCR licensing agreements entered with external bodies, especially businesses.

Executive Council is concerned with protecting UCR’s reputation, to ensure that the research centers bearing the UCR brand do not compromise the prestige and history of UCR. We look forward to hearing the steps taken towards transparency and accountability in the operation of research centers.

Sincerely,

Sang-Hee Lee, Chair
Executive Council
The Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) writes to request clarification on several matters arising from the recent publicity (references below) concerning the relationship between the UC Riverside School of Business Center for Economic Forecasting Development (CEFD) and Beacon Economics, LLC (Beacon). In doing so we stress that we are not intending to question the quality or outcomes of reports generated by CEFD/Beacon that have been published with the UCR name and/or logo affixed to them. Our concern extends more generally to the operating rules for UCR Research Centers and the use of UCR identity (branding, email addresses, professional titles) by external vendors and commercial entities. Specifically, we have questions regarding the establishment and governance of the CEFD:

1. Was the Center for Economic Forecasting Development (CEFD) approved by the VCRED or EVC as required by UCR Operating Principles for Research Centers (December 2005)?

   a. Are the UCR Operating Principles for Research Centers (December 2005, as posted on the RED website) still current? Would the CEFD be exempted from the Operating Principles for any reason?

   b. If CEFD is defined as a Research Center: Did the CEFD submit an annual research report and undergo an annual review as required by the Operating Principles? Did the CEFD undergo a five-year external review as required by the Operating Principles?

   c. If CEFD is not defined as a Research Center: Is it considered an Administrative or Service Center? (“An Administrative or Service Center is a unit that does not carry out research as its primary mission, but exists to provide a service for the campus or for the community, such as a teaching center, an outreach center, or a public relations centers. Procedures for the establishment and review of these centers will be established by the Executive Vice Chancellor.”) What are the EVC’s procedures for establishment, academic oversight, and review of these centers, and were they followed in this case?
Dear Sang-Hee,

VC Torres and I agree that a wholesale revision of the UCR Operating Principles for Research Centers is long overdue. Such guidelines will enable us to clarify the definitions of our various research entities, their composition (faculty, students, postdocs, staff, volunteers), their leadership, and their funding structures, and to set rules for annual reporting, periodic review, and external agreements.

Before we embark on this update, we need to do a complete audit of all of the existing centers at UCR. It will be important to get all of our current research entities into alignment before we embark on the establishment of new ones. RED has tried in the past to undertake such a study, but met with reluctance from faculty to respond in a timely fashion. We sincerely hope that this new request from the Senate Executive Council will enable us to get 100% participation.

VC Torres is in the process of appointing a new Associate Vice Chancellor. Once that person is in place, they will oversee both the audit of existing centers and the development of a new set of operating principles. We hope to have a draft guidance ready for Senate consultation sometime during fall quarter.

I’ve also attached some information about the Center for Economic Forecasting. Please note that UCR is not renewing the contract with Beacon to operate the center, which is currently inactive. The School of Business is exploring options for a faculty-led center, but will not move forward until we have the new set of updated Operating Principles for Research Centers in place.

Best regards,

Liz

Elizabeth Watkins
Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor
Professor of History
University of California, Riverside
951.827.1129 | Elizabeth.Watkins@UCR.edu
April 11, 2023

TO: PROVOST WATKINS

CC: VICE CHANCELLOR TORRES
VICE CHANCELLOR BOMOTTI
DEAN WANG

RE: Transparency in Establishment and Operation of Centers

Dear Provost Watkins,

On behalf of Executive Council Chair Lee, I enclose a letter from Executive Council regarding Transparency in Establishment and Operation of Centers.

Kind regards,

Cherysa Cortez
Executive Director, Academic Senate
University Office Building 221
951.827.6154 | cherysac@ucr.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA RIVERSIDE

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail communication and any attachments may contain confidential and privileged information for the use of the designated recipients named above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this communication in error and that any review, disclosure, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the Academic Senate Office immediately by telephone at (951) 827-6154 or email at cherysa.cortez<at>ucr.edu and permanently delete all copies of this communication and any attachments.
The status of the Center for Economic Forecasting

The center is not “shut down” or closed, though it has been inactive since the expiration in December 2022 of the UCR School of Business contract with Beacon. The School of Business is exploring options for the center’s future, including faculty leadership of the center.

Beacon’s status with the university

Acting in its role as the UCR-affiliated Center for Economic Development and Forecasting, the independent research and consulting firm Beacon Economics was contracted several years ago by UCR to provide research on matters related to the regional economy. The 2015 agreement, which expired in December 2022, provided that Beacon would host conference events and conduct UCR-sponsored research.

UCR is not renewing the contract with Beacon to operate the Center for Economic Forecasting. The partnership between Beacon and UCR has been valuable in establishing the Center for Economic Forecasting as an important voice in the region.

The decision not to continue with Beacon leading the center was based not on Beacon’s performance or ethical concerns. The expiration in December 2022 of the contract with Beacon provided an opportunity to consider whether a contractor-led center is the best option moving forward.

UCR plans to discuss with Beacon managing the annual Inland Empire Economic Forecast Conference, which has been well received by the community. Those conversations have not occurred yet.

The university is exploring options for a UCR faculty-led center.

What initiated the LA Times articles?

The LA Times articles were initiated following the United Auto Workers, or UAW, union’s discontent with a Beacon Economics report issued several months ago on the issue of increasing the minimum wage for fast food restaurant employees. The report, which suggests wage increases will negatively impact consumer prices, included UCR’s branding. UAW has advocated for higher fast-food worker wages.

The minimum wage report has since been clarified at UCR’s request to indicate the report was neither commissioned nor endorsed by UCR.

As with university research, Beacon’s findings — including those in the minimum wage report — may prove unpopular with some audiences for reasons that transcend the integrity of the methodology. The university respects the freedom of speech and academic freedom at the heart of research.

What are the allegations against the center and Beacon?

There are no allegations of misconduct related to the center or Beacon. The questions raised centered on when it is prudent to use the Center for Economic Forecasting’s name — and by extension the UC Riverside brand — on reports issued by Beacon.
• The School of Business’s contract with Beacon stipulated when it was appropriate for the university brand to be used in Beacon’s report. With staff turnover in the School of Business since the center’s 2015 creation, this provision suffered from inattention.
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Elizabeth Watkins <elizabeth.watkins@ucr.edu>
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4 attachments (1 MB)
22-23.SHILtoEWreCenters.4.11.23.pdf; Re- [Executive Council] Transparency in Establishment and Operation of Centers.eml; UCR Operating Principles for Academic Research Centers_042024.pdf; UCR Research Centers_042024.pdf;

Dear Sang-Hee,

Per the Senate’s request of 11 April 2023, please find attached the draft of updated Operating Principles for Academic Research Centers at UCR along with a list of existing research centers at UCR. Both the document and the list were developed by VCRED Torres and AVCRED Coss in collaboration with my office and the deans and associate deans of the colleges and schools. Once we hear back from the Senate, we will start a normalization process to bring all existing centers into compliance with the new operating principles.

Sincerely,

Liz

Elizabeth Watkins, PhD (she/her/hers)
Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor
UC Riverside
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I. General Information

I.A. Introduction

This document defines a new designation of Academic Research Center (ARC), which will apply to certain existing units that support faculty research activity at UCR. This document also lays out the procedures to be used for reviewing and disestablishing existing such units on campus, as well as guidelines for the creation of new ones.

I.B. Definitions

UCR has a wide variety of units that facilitate collaborative, interdisciplinary, or multidisciplinary research. Although the term “center” has been used for a collection of different research entities, below is an inventory of titles currently in use at UCR and a brief description of how they differ from what will henceforth be known as ARCs.
Academic Research Center: An ARC is a unit that furthers research in a designated field. It may also engage in public service activities stemming from its research program. An ARC facilitates collaborations by multiple investigators on a research problem of common interest and/or between other units and departments. As such, an ARC may be housed within an academic department, college, or school, or span several colleges and schools. An ARC may be initiated with a defined amount of institutional support; it may be the result of a federal or other external award; or it may originate as a line item from the state legislature.

Institute: While the term “institute” has not been consistently used, it refers to a major unit, larger than other types of centers, that coordinates and promotes continual faculty and student research across a wide area, often spanning multiple departments, schools, or colleges, and perhaps even extending beyond campus boundaries. An institute may also engage in public service activities stemming from its research program. While “institute” can continue to denote a unit that involves several centers, the centers will be covered by the procedures for ARC set forth in this document.

The campus stipulates the terms and conditions for creating ARCs, including administration, programs, budget, and a process for regular review; the appointment of a director, internal and/or external advisory committee(s) if appropriate; the campus reporting relationship; and instructions for regular progress reports.

ARC differs from:

UC Multicampus Research Unit (MRU): An MRU comprises facilities and personnel located on two or more campuses, often receiving funding from the University of California Office of the President (UCOP). The MRU is appointed by the president and reports through the UCR Chancellor’s designee on the campus that hosts the MRU’s administrative headquarters. The president retains ultimate responsibility for matters of general policy and intercampus coordination; the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee oversees the MRU’s administrative relationship with the campus including matters related to personnel, services, and space. See https://tinyurl.com/ucopmru for further information and https://ucop.edu/research-initiatives/programs/mru/review-requirements.html for information on the five-year review of an MRU.

Currently there is only one MRU hosted on the UCR campus, UC-MEXUS, https://alianzamx.universityofcalifornia.edu/research-and-innovation/uc-mexus-programs, which is part of Alianza MX, https://alianzamx.universityofcalifornia.edu, the systemwide program umbrella related to educational and research activities with Mexico. Additionally, Alianza MX houses two non-MRU but systemwide units: the UC-Mexico Initiative and the Casa de La Universidad California in Mexico City.

Other UC Multicampus Institutes, Initiatives, or Programs: The UC Office of the President, or its designee, oversees in full or in part other systemwide research entities, such as the non-MRU components of Alianza MX and the California Institutes for Science & Innovation (Cal-ISI), https://ucop.edu/innovation-entrepreneurship/ie-resources/ie-alliances/cal-isis.html. Currently, UCR participates in the California Institute for Telecommunications and Information Technology (Calit2), https://calit2.org. These entities have specific functioning and review guidelines established by the UC system.
Organized Research Unit (ORU): An ORU is formally recognized by both the campus and UC system and supported by significant institutional commitments. It requires campus level approval by the Chancellor, after advice by the Academic Senate, the relevant Dean(s), and the Vice Chancellor for Research & Economic Development. An ORU involves an organized group of participating faculty and is established to foster and promote the development of collaborative, interdisciplinary research that enhances the research goals of the campus. An ORU facilitates research and research collaborations; disseminates research results through research conferences, meetings, and other activities; strengthens graduate and undergraduate education by providing students with training opportunities and access to facilities; seeks extramural research funds; and carries out university and public service programs related to the ORU’s research expertise.

ORUs may be focused on a designated field and need not be interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary in nature. A director, appointed by the Chancellor’s designee, oversees the administration, oversight, budget, space, personnel, and scholarship of the ORU. An ORU is subject to an annual report and a five-year review under UC policies and has certain limitations on its lifetime. ORUs are provided with a substantial budget and administrative independence, similar to that of academic units. See https://tinyurl.com/ucopor for further information on administrative policies and procedures and designations of ORUs. Currently, there are no ORUs at UCR, and the campus is not considering the creation of such a unit.

Share Equipment Laboratory or Facility or Core: A “core facility” is a unit that establishes and maintains a unique group of instrumentation resources used by faculty and researchers in one or several departments, sometimes with the help of full-time research staff appointed in accordance with established guidelines. Typically, these units have approved recharge rates for the services they provide. These cores reside either within a college or school or in the RED office. The processes and authority for reviewing such units, appointing directors, etc. are established by the head of the unit which has authority over them (i.e., the Dean or VCRED).

Research Support Station: A “research support station” is a unit that provides physical facilities for interdepartmental research in a broad area (e.g., agriculture), sometimes housing other units and serving several campuses. A Station may comprise several Facilities. Terms such as “unit,” “analytical center,” “observatory,” or “vivarium” may also be used to define the functions of these units more specifically. Such units are often self-supporting and have indefinite lifetimes. The continuation of these centers depends on evaluation during the periodic campus budgetary approval process by the Chancellor.

Administrative Center or Service Center: An “administrative center” or “service center” is a unit that does not carry out research as its primary mission, but rather exists to provide a service for the campus or for the community, such as a teaching center or an outreach center. The continuation of these centers depends on evaluation during the periodic campus budgetary approval process by the Chancellor.

Research Program: “Research program” describes the research endeavors of an individual faculty or a small group of faculty that does not rise to the level of an ARC.
Finally, an ARC differs also from a brand-new type of research organization recently created on the UCR campus:

**Campus Interdisciplinary Research Center (CIRC):** A CIRC is a unit devoted to research topics that require the involvement of faculty from at least three different colleges or schools. A CIRC reports to the VCRED through its director and receives a central budget allocation through RED and a percentage of the indirect cost recovery (ICR), or more properly called facilities and administrative costs (F&A), generated from externally sponsored awards. The CIRCs are renewed after a successful five-year review conducted by the RED office and are closely tied to the campus’ overall strategic plans. The process for their creation and review is detailed at [https://research.ucr.edu/vcr/opportunities](https://research.ucr.edu/vcr/opportunities).

The rest of this document delineates the process for establishing, reviewing, and terminating an ARC. The guidelines for transitioning existing centers and institutes to the new ARC structure will be provided in an upcoming companion document.

**II. Establishment of Academic Research Centers**

ARCs complement the academic mission of the university. They provide a flexible means of addressing today’s research questions and are most commonly created to address significant societal and scientific problems. Identifying a solution often requires the combined expertise of faculty in multiple scholarly disciplines. Although academic departments support both instruction and research, ARCs often best facilitate collaborations in research and scholarship across departments and colleges/schools. The most important function of an ARC is its role in providing a site for intellectual discussion and work. It provides a framework in which people with overlapping research interests can come together collaboratively. An ARC can facilitate research by providing personnel, space, equipment, and other necessary resources, funded by both external and internal sources. Additionally, it can provide a way for external constituencies to find faculty with certain expertise. Moreover, it can help identify external sponsors and supports proposal writing.

Before the creation of a new ARC, the faculty involved should have conversations with their corresponding deans and chairs. In general, there are no funds specifically designated to the periodic creation of new ARCs. Therefore it is important to determine early in the process how an ARC may be supported if one is created. All proposals for new ARCs must be reviewed and approved by the dean and department chair of the proposed center director’s main academic appointment. The Vice Chancellor for Research & Economic Development and the Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies may be consulted if the proposed ARC is intercollegiate or entails significant graduate student training via training grant support.

How a new ARC is created and reviewed will depend on the rationale for its creation and the type of resources needed for its operation. In some cases, an ARC may be created in response to the common interest of faculty members to synergize their expertise, which may not need additional funds. In other cases, an ARC may receive an investment from the dean(s) based on their unit’s strategic plan. The latter type of ARC will undergo a more rigorous internal process than the former. The creation of other types of centers may follow a call from a funding agency. These centers undergo the merit review of the funding agency, and their existence is dependent upon continued extramural funding. They still need formal approval from the corresponding dean.
II.A. Principles Governing the Establishment of Academic Research Centers

Although ARCs may originate in a variety of ways, there are certain principles and processes that should guide their establishment:

- Each ARC must have a clearly defined mission that supports the major strategic objectives and core academic mission of the campus, college(s)/school(s), and/or departments.
- An ARC must contribute to the research activities of the campus, college(s)/school(s), and/or departmental faculties. It must contribute to the intellectual capital of the campus and the education of graduate and undergraduate students and may involve teaching and training opportunities.
- The mission and activities of any new ARC should not duplicate those of an existing department or center on campus or within the college(s)/school(s) or departments. Proposed new ARCs must be reviewed in the context of other activities that are ongoing within the campus to ensure that the campus's overall efforts in a given field of inquiry is strengthened.
- ARCs are often, though not always, interdepartmental, providing opportunities for new relationships on campus, within the college(s)/school(s), departments, or broader intellectual communities.
- ARC directors should serve for specified terms as defined in the proposal for their establishment, especially if they receive compensation. Appointment letters for externally recruited new faculty who may serve as directors should specify limited terms.
- An ARC’s focus should be defined broadly enough to attract the intellectual and professional participation of a critical mass of faculty members. Additionally, students should be involved in a center’s work and activities in significant and systematic ways.
- An ARC should only be formed when multiple faculty members plan to be significantly involved in the work of the center, and its viability does not depend on the work of a single faculty member. Individual faculty can establish their own research programs.
- An ARC should be financially self-sustaining or deemed worthy of core support or cost-sharing by appropriate campus unit(s) at the time of their establishment. ARCs should not expect any reallocations of F&A unless agreed upon by the corresponding dean(s).
- Funding for the establishment of an ARC should be designed with sufficient flexibility to accommodate shifting intellectual priorities or organizational arrangements over time.
- All ARCs must be subject to regular review, with meaningful participation from impartial outsiders in addition to that of center constituencies.

II.B. Application to Establish Academic Research Centers

After conversations with the dean(s) and department chairs involved, the case for the establishment of a center must be made in a formal application to the appropriate dean(s) and must include the following elements.

1) **A strategic plan describing the mission and goals of the proposed research center, with short-term objectives covering the initial period of operation and longer-term objectives that provide appropriate flexibility over time.** The plan should point out the unique strength(s) of the ARC that support its establishment. The plan should also outline specific challenges, issues, and problems that the proposed research center intends to address. Additionally, it should address the anticipated contributions of the proposed ARC to UCR’s graduate and undergraduate teaching programs, as well as its impact on UCR’s external communities.
2) **A research plan for the first year of operation compared to subsequent years of operation.** The research plan must include the research areas that will define the proposed ARC, highlighting UCR’s recognized expertise and describe how UCR researchers will be encouraged to participate collaboratively to realize the research agenda of the proposed center. Also, the plan should inventory similar units that exist elsewhere (on and off-campus), describe the proposed center’s relationship to those units, and outline the contributions to the field that the proposed center is expected, which are not addressed by those units.

3) **An organizational and management plan.** The plan should include an organizational chart, a description of the role of the oversight committee(s) and selection process of committee members, as well as a description of how the director will be selected and reviewed, and the term of their appointment.

4) **Projections of numbers of faculty members and students, professional research appointees, and other personnel who will actively participate in the center for the first year of operation and in subsequent years.**

5) **Budget estimates for the first five years of operation to meet the strategic objectives of the proposed research center.**

6) **A business plan that details the mechanisms that will be utilized to achieve financial security.** The business plan should document the sources from which funding will be obtained to operate the proposed research center and comment on any commitments made to date.

   The distinction must be made between a budget and a “business model/plan.” A detailed budget outlines how money is to be spent; while a business plan details how the money will be obtained. Unless the ARC is being proposed with a finite fund and thus a finite lifetime, the research center application must include plans for the financial sustainability of the center.

7) **Statement of the immediate resource needs** (e.g., space, capital equipment, library resources) of the proposed ARC, related commitments for the first year of operation, and realistic projections of future resource needs.

   The level of detail to be provided in the above items will depend on the nature of the ARC and whether it will require investment of resources, at the discretion of the deans.

### III. Annual Report and Review of Academic Research Centers

#### III.A. Annual Review Overview

ARCs must be held accountable according to agreed-upon campus metrics for both their establishment and ongoing operation. The metrics for each center should be tailored appropriately to its mission and opportunities. Depending on the type of ARC and the area of scholarship, metrics may include but are not limited to:

- research and scholarly publications or creative output
- prestigious faculty awards
- peer-reviewed extramural funding
- industry awards
Each ARC will submit an annual report to the dean, that will form the basis for a five-year evaluation. In particular, the annual review should evaluate the “return on investment” in cases where substantial funding has been provided and explore future funding prospects, if applicable.

At the end of each fiscal year (i.e., by June 1), each ARC must prepare a report for submission to the dean or dean’s designee that contains the two sections described below. It is the responsibility of the ARC director to ensure the timely submission of the report.

A. Narrative Report
   A1. General Narrative: A short statement highlighting the main activities in which the center engaged during the review period, and how those activities align with the mission, goals, and objectives of the ARC, as well as address the challenges, issues, and problems central to the work of the center. The general narrative should also outline how the center contributed to UCR’s graduate and undergraduate programs, as well as its impact on UCR’s external communities during the review period.

   A2. Research Narrative: A summary of any significant trends during the review period.

   A3. Organizational and Management Structure Update: Describes any changes that have been made during the review period.

B. Data Report
   B1. Participating Personnel: Center should list names of all who actively participated in center activities during the review period (including UCR Senate faculty, other academics, professional/technical/research/staff, administrative and support staff, graduate students, undergraduate students, and advisory committee members).

   B2. Publications and Dissemination of New Knowledge or Creative Products: List of publications or creative products resulting from center participants, including books, journal articles, reports, web sites, artistic presentations, etc. Publications and creative activities listed should include only those that have resulted from programs administered through the center and should not include publications that have resulted from individual programs of researchers who may be affiliated with the center. Listed publications should identify those jointly authored resulting from collaborations among members of the center.

   B3. Distinguished Awards: List of prestigious awards from professional organizations/industry/etc. received or held by participants in the center.

   B4. Events Sponsored by the ARC: Details related to events sponsored by the center during the review period.
B.5. **Space:** Description and amount of space currently occupied by the ARC for both its administrative and research operations.

B.6. **Sponsored Funding Proposals and Awards:** List of proposals that have been submitted for external funding by the ARC and an indication of their funding status. The proposal list should only include projects where the intellectual content resulted from center collaborations, not proposals made possible solely due to the availability of center facilities and/or equipment.

B.7. **Funding Available:** Sources and amounts of all funding that support the center’s programs, as well as income from all sources, including publications or public outreach.

B.8. Any other information deemed relevant for the evaluation.

Data should be transferred to a five-year summary table, as described below.

### III.C. Annual Review

An annual in-person meeting will be held to discuss the information provided in the annual report. Such meetings will be held following the receipt of the report and will typically include the center director and the dean or officer to whom the center reports. The purpose of this review will be to assess the progress made in the previous year with respect to the center’s strategic, business, and budget plans. A record of the discussion and any recommendations for action will be made and attached to the annual report.

### IV. Five-Year Review of Academic Research Centers

#### IV.A. Five-year Review Overview

Five-year reviews of ARCs are conducted to provide an in-depth evaluation of the center’s programs and goals, to ensure that the research being conducted under the center’s auspices is of the highest quality, and to assess that campus resources are being wisely allocated in line with campus priorities.

Reviews should utilize the descriptive data provided in annual reports from the past five years to assess the quality and the adequacy of personnel, space and budget adequacy (if provided), the center’s success in meeting its purpose and objectives, the ARC’s return on investment, research accomplishments, and future plans for maintaining financial viability and adapting operations to meet the needs of the field.

All ARCs must establish a rationale for continuance, in terms of scholarly/scientific merit and campus priorities at five-year intervals. To begin a review, an ARC should develop a formal proposal and self-assessment for its continuance, support funds, and space in the context of current campus needs and resources. The proposal and self-assessment should include all the information required of proposals for establishing ARCs; assess the accomplishments of the ARC in the past five years, its specific contributions to research, graduate and undergraduate education, and public service; and describe the consequences if the ARC were to be discontinued. It should comment on the effectiveness of its administrative and governance structure and identify any problems.
It should present an updated business plan for the next five years of operation, as well as a plan for programmatic changes to enhance the reputation and contributions of the ARC to teaching and research at the campus level and in the national and international arenas. It should also consider whether the ARC should merge with others or be disestablished. Request for additional space, funding, or other resources should be realistic and consistent with the limitations, opportunities, and strategic plans of the unit and campus.

The performance of each director will be reviewed concurrently with the ARC review, following the same procedure. If the ARC is to be continued, the decision regarding the director’s appointment will be made by the campus official to whom the ARC reports.

At the discretion of the overseeing dean, a five-year review commensurate with the resources provided to the ARC may involve an internal and/or external review committee.

**IV.B. Review Procedures**

The appropriate dean or dean’s designee, potentially in consultation with the Vice Chancellor for Research & Economic Development for intercollegiate ARCs, establishes the review schedule for each ARC and is responsible for conducting the five-year review. The extent of the review, at the discretion of the dean, should be commensurate with the resources devoted to the ARC. For ARCs that receive significant funding from an academic unit, the dean may, at their discretion, consider creating either internal, external, or both types of review committees.

The appropriate dean will work with the ARC under review to ensure assembly of all review materials and prepare a letter to the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor summarizing the findings of the five-year review.

**Review Materials.** Background materials, including the self-assessment, are prepared by the ARC.

**Center Profile:**
1. Summary Table of Annual Reports for the Past 5 years
2. Detailed Reports from Annual Reports for the past 5 years

**Self-Assessment:**
1. Mission: A concise statement detailing the mission and goals of the center and any projected changes if the center is continued.

2. Evidence of accomplishments: The section should focus on the preceding five years, but should also consider the lifetime of the ARC, evaluating its success in meeting its stated mission and goals. This section may refer to the data under “Center Profile” above.
   a. Research:
      i. Describe the quality and significance of research accomplished and in progress.
      ii. Comment on significant trends within the disciplines represented in the unit and relate these to current research specialties in the ARC or on campus.
      iii. Comment on how the ARC benefits the campus in general overall, as well as specific academic programs.
iv. Comment on the ongoing productivity and influence of ARC participants, locally, as well as nationally and internationally. Comment on evidence of their prominence in the fields represented in the ARC.

v. Comment on the ARC’s collaborative/interdisciplinary work, its quality, and its impact on center research efforts and the campus.

vi. Describe the possible sources and availability of extramural funds to support the ARC’s research and activities.

b. Graduate Education:
   i. Describe contributions to graduate education at UCR.

b. Undergraduate Education:
   i. Describe contributions to undergraduate education at UCR.
   ii. Provide evidence that the ARC helped contribute to job placement rates or graduate/professional school enrollments for undergraduates after graduation, if any.

d. Public Service:
   i. Describe the ARC’s contributions to public service.
   ii. Describe interactions with other similar units in other institutions or other relationships with outside entities.
   iii. Describe other services that the ARC provides to the community, state, and nation, such as distribution of research information of policy significance and recognition by non-academic groups or governmental agencies.

3. Administration and Governance: Describe the administrative structure and operation of the ARC, including campus location and reporting lines (include an organizational chart for illustration). Describe the ARC’s advisory and/or governance committee(s), their roles, frequency of meetings, and if any changes are needed.

4. Problems and Needs: Assess the adequacy of the ARC’s resources (e.g., space, personnel, equipment, finances) to fulfill its mission and goals. Describe any constraints which prevent the ARC from functioning at a more optimal level (e.g., if more space is needed, describe the needs and benefits of additional space). Describe other resources that are needed by the ARC (e.g., capital equipment, FTE staff) and, if provided, the benefits that the ARC and UCR would accrue.

5. Projections for Next Five Years: Describe the ARC’s plans for the next 5 years, including plans for external fundraising through sponsored projects, gifts, and endowments, and plans for program changes to enhance the effectiveness of the ARC. It should be clear how the ARC’s plans will evolve from its present situation.

6. Justification for Continuance: If the director and participant faculty believe that the ARC should continue to exist, they should explain the unique contributions to research that the ARC provides, the benefits to UCR and its communities, and any other justifications for continuance that are not addressed elsewhere in the report.
V. Disestablishment of Academic Research Centers

The recommendation for disestablishing an ARC may follow a five-year review of the center, continued failure to submit annual reports, lack of necessary financial resources for the unit’s operation, or violation of any campus, university, state, or federal regulations or policies by the ARC. This also applies if there is demonstrated negligence in preventing such violations by any of the center’s members. After review, the appropriate deans, department chairs and center directors may recommend a request for disestablishment to the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor.

The phase-out period for a center to be disestablished should be sufficient to permit an orderly termination or transfer of contractual obligations. Typically, the phase-out period should not exceed one full year after the end of the academic year in which the decision is made to disestablish the unit. However, violation of any campus, university, state, or federal regulations or policies by an ARC, or a demonstrated negligence in preventing such violations by any of the center’s members may lead to the immediate disestablishment of the ARC.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORG/OVERSIGHT/REPORTING</th>
<th>NAME/YEAR ESTABLISHED/WEBSITE</th>
<th>DIRECTOR/HOME DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>ONGOING SUPPORT</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>MULTI-PI OR CENTER GRANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BCOE Monthly meeting, report to Dean</td>
<td>Center for Robotics and Intelligent Systems (CRIS)</td>
<td>Amit K Roy Chowdhury; Bir Bhanu Electrical &amp; Computer Engineering</td>
<td>$15,000 stipend from Dean as department status; $70,000 for equipment from Dean</td>
<td>seminars, symposiums</td>
<td>Currently 6 major multi-PI grants managed by the depts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCOE Monthly meeting, report to Dean</td>
<td>Center for Research and Education in Cyber Security and Privacy (CRESPP)</td>
<td>Yin Heng Computer Science &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>DARPA selected for funding, not started yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCOE Monthly meeting, report to Dean</td>
<td>Center for Ubiquitous Communication by Light (UC-Light)</td>
<td>Albert Wang Electrical &amp; Computer Engineering</td>
<td>Grant, none from BCOE</td>
<td>seminars, symposiums</td>
<td>Started as multi-PI grant, multiple grants, some multi-PI with SOM, other UCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCOE Monthly meeting, report to Dean</td>
<td>Energy, Economics and Environment (E3)</td>
<td>Nanpeng Yu Electrical &amp; Computer Engineering</td>
<td>A balanced portfolio between federal, state, and industry; None from BCOE</td>
<td>seminars, symposiums</td>
<td>Multiple grants from NSF, DOE, power companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORG/OVERSIGHT/REPORTING</td>
<td>NAME/YEAR ESTABLISHED/WEBSITE</td>
<td>DIRECTOR/HOME DEPARTMENT</td>
<td>ONGOING SUPPORT</td>
<td>ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>MULTI-PI OR CENTER GRANTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCOE</td>
<td>Data Science Center 2016 [datascience.ucr.edu]</td>
<td>Vassilis Tsotras Computer Science &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>Endowment, and a history of projects</td>
<td>seminars; research workshops; research collaborations</td>
<td>multiple grants from DOE, and industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCOE</td>
<td>Winston Chung Global Energy Center (WCGEC) 2011 [wcgec.ucr.edu]</td>
<td>In the process of hiring director</td>
<td></td>
<td>seminars, symposiums</td>
<td>multiple grants from DOE, industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCOE</td>
<td>Center of Innovative Materials for Energy and Environment (UC-KIMS) 2018 [mse.ucr.edu/research/biomaterials]</td>
<td>Jin Nam Bioengineering</td>
<td>Co-funded from joint research institutes in Korea</td>
<td>projects, seminars</td>
<td>multiple grants from DOE, industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHASS</td>
<td>Center for Ideas and Society 1989 [ideasandsociety.ucr.edu]</td>
<td>Dylan Rodriguez; Jeannette Kohl Media and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>Mellon grant</td>
<td>seminar, symposiums, public outreach</td>
<td>Mellon foundation grant for 3 staff + $68000/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHASS</td>
<td>Center for Iberian and Latin American Music 2004 [cilam.ucr.edu]</td>
<td>Walter Clark Music</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Annual conference; concerts, speakers, performers; online Journal; dissertation support; lecture series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHASS</td>
<td>Young Oak Kim Center for Korean American Studies 2012 [yokcenter.ucr.edu]</td>
<td>Edward Chang Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>admin support; Grant from Mellon Foundation</td>
<td>quarterly seminar, undergrad internship opportunity</td>
<td>Mellon foundation grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHASS</td>
<td>Latino and Latin American Studies Research Center 1964 [latinamericanstudies.ucr.edu]</td>
<td>Alfonso Gonzales Toribio Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>Mellon grant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mellon foundation grant $2.9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORG/OVERSIGHT/REPORTING</td>
<td>NAME/YEAR ESTABLISHED/WEBSITE</td>
<td>DIRECTOR/HOME DEPARTMENT</td>
<td>ONGOING SUPPORT</td>
<td>ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>MULTI-PI OR CENTER GRANTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHASS</td>
<td>Center for Labor Studies 2023</td>
<td>Ellen Reese Sociology</td>
<td>New</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNAS</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Center for Quantitative Modeling in Biology 2017 icqmb.ucr.edu</td>
<td>Mark Alber Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNAS</td>
<td>Center for Infectious Disease and Vector Research 2005 cdvr.ucr.edu</td>
<td>Karine Le Roch Molecular Cell &amp; Systems Bio</td>
<td>$5000-$10,000/year (not every year) from CNAS, IIGB; Biomed,</td>
<td>yearly daylong symposium, training grant application pending</td>
<td>Training grant application close to funding, waiting for notice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNAS</td>
<td>Alternative Earths Astrobiology Center 2015 astrobiology.ucr.edu</td>
<td>Timothy Lyons Earth and Planetary Sciences</td>
<td>NASA grants to Lyons, Admin support from Endowed chair position</td>
<td>collaborative papers, fellowships, weekly meetings, annual seminar series, public science night</td>
<td>Large grants awarded; NASA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNAS</td>
<td>Center for Conservation Biology 2002 ccb.ucr.edu</td>
<td>Darrel Jenerette Botany and Plant Sciences</td>
<td>$5000/year and admin support part time</td>
<td>Submitted joint grants, annual symposium</td>
<td>Submitted joint grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNAS</td>
<td>Environmental Dynamics and GeoEcology Institute (EDGE) 2016 edge.ucr.edu</td>
<td>Sandra Turner Earth &amp; Planetary Sciences</td>
<td>$2000-2500/year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNAS</td>
<td>Center for Plant Cell Biology (CEPCEB) 2002 cepceb.ucr.edu</td>
<td>Julia Bailey-Serres Botany and Plant Sciences</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Major training grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNAS</td>
<td>Center for Integrative Bee Research (CIBER) 2018 ciber.ucr.edu</td>
<td>Boris Baer Entomology</td>
<td>none from campus; grants and industry (BASF), beekeepers</td>
<td>14 faculty; various grants about 10/year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORG/OVERSIGHT/REPORTING</td>
<td>NAME/YEAR ESTABLISHED/WEBSITE</td>
<td>DIRECTOR/HOME DEPARTMENT</td>
<td>ONGOING SUPPORT</td>
<td>ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>MULTI-PI OR CENTER GRANTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNAS Yearly report to CNAS Dean</td>
<td>Stem Cell Center and Core Facility 2000 <a href="mailto:iestemcells.ucr.edu">iestemcells.ucr.edu</a></td>
<td>Prue Talbot Molecular Cell &amp; Systems Bio</td>
<td>$2000/year; 3 CIRM funded grants</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 CIRM funded grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOM SOM Dean, FAO</td>
<td>Center For Glial-Neuronal Interactions 2007 <a href="mailto:cgni.ucr.edu">cgni.ucr.edu</a></td>
<td>Monica Carson Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>$15,000/year + part-time admin support</td>
<td>yearly symposium, training grant submission, monthly meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOM SOM Dean, FAO</td>
<td>Center for Cannabinoid Research 2023 <a href="mailto:cannabinoid.ucr.edu">cannabinoid.ucr.edu</a></td>
<td>Nicholas DiPatrizio Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>$5000/year + part-time admin support</td>
<td>just started</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOM SOM Dean, FAO</td>
<td>Center for Molecular and Translational Medicine (MolMed) 2018 <a href="mailto:molmed.ucr.edu">molmed.ucr.edu</a></td>
<td>Maurizio Pellecchia Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>part-time admin support</td>
<td>yearly symposium, incubator</td>
<td>multi-PI grant with CNAS and City of Hole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOM SOM Dean, FAO</td>
<td>Bridging Regional Ecology, Aerosolized Toxins, &amp; Health Effects (BREATHE) 2020 <a href="mailto:breathe.ucr.edu">breathe.ucr.edu</a></td>
<td>David Lo Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>$5000/year + part-time admin support</td>
<td>yearly symposium, instrumentation grant submission, public outreach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOM SOM Dean, FAO</td>
<td>Center for RNA Biology and Medicine 2022 <a href="mailto:rna.ucr.edu">rna.ucr.edu</a></td>
<td>Sika Zheng Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>part-time admin support</td>
<td>yearly symposium, monthly meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOM Funding Agency</td>
<td>Center for Health Disparities Research 2019 <a href="mailto:healthdisparities.ucr.edu">healthdisparities.ucr.edu</a></td>
<td>David Lo Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>funding agency</td>
<td>public outreach, seminars</td>
<td>Multi-PI grant SOM CHASS SPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPP Dean</td>
<td>Center for Social Innovation 2004 <a href="mailto:socialinnovation.ucr.edu">socialinnovation.ucr.edu</a></td>
<td>Walter Clark SPP</td>
<td>none from campus</td>
<td>seminars, symposiums, conferences, podcasts, public outreach</td>
<td>Awarded grants from various Foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORG/OVERSIGHT/REPORTING</td>
<td>NAME/YEAR ESTABLISHED/WEBSITE</td>
<td>DIRECTOR/HOME DEPARTMENT</td>
<td>ONGOING SUPPORT</td>
<td>ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>MULTI-PI OR CENTER GRANTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPP Dean</td>
<td>Inland Center for Sustainable Development 2012 icisd.ucr.edu</td>
<td>Edward Chang SPP</td>
<td>Dir: 1 course release + $18,000; Kauffman Foundation &amp; NSF G&amp;G, Gift/subscription funding</td>
<td>seminar series, symposiums, public outreach, podcasts, case studies, annual report</td>
<td>Awarded grants from the Kauffman Foundation &amp; NSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPP Dean</td>
<td>Center of Crime and Justice Studies 1964 presleycenter.ucr.edu</td>
<td>Alfonso Gonzales Toribio SPP</td>
<td>Dir: 1 course release + $13,644; $200,000 from state; Haynes Foundation &amp; CA Workforce Board; G&amp;G?</td>
<td>student internships &amp; scholarships</td>
<td>Applied for and awarded grants from the Haynes Foundation &amp; CA Workforce Board;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPP Dean</td>
<td>Center for Geospatial Sciences 2023 spatial.ucr.edu</td>
<td>Ellen Reese SPP</td>
<td>Dir: $23,067; NSF</td>
<td>seminars</td>
<td>Applied for and awarded grants from NSF (direct and flow through) These were technically submitted thru SPP because Center was recently moved to SPP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d. May Administrative or Service Centers produce research reports or publications?

2. What is the UCR faculty membership of the CEFD? From the membership page on the School of Business website (which became inaccessible on 2/27/23), the membership was nearly or completely identical to the listing on the Beacon website with the same formatting being used with the exception of the header (https://beaconecon.com/about-us/our-people). Dr. Thornberg is listed as an Adjunct Professor on the CEFD version of this website. No UCR School of Business faculty members are listed as members of the CEFD. We recommend that the UCR faculty membership of the CEFD be clarified.

a. UCR Operating Principles require that “a center should not be formed except in circumstances in which several faculty members plan to be seriously involved in the work of the center, and the center’s viability does not depend on the work of a single faculty member.”(5) Are several faculty members involved?

b. UCR Operating Principles state that “students should be involved in a center’s work and activities in significant and systematic ways.”(5) Are students involved?

3. Is the faculty list on the School of Business website accurate and up to date? Dr. Thornberg is not listed as a faculty member on this list. The Agreement states that Dr. Thornberg serves as Director of the CEFD provided he remains both a UCR adjunct professor in good standing and an owner of Beacon.

a. If Dr. Thornberg is an academic employee, did he complete a Conflict of Interest statement as required of academic employees? How does the university handle a contract for consulting services with a company owned and operated by an academic employee?

4. We note that, in the UCR-Beacon Affiliation Agreement dated 9/15/2015 and signed by Dean Wang and Managing Partner Hanna of Beacon, an Advisory Council may be established with its “responsibilities and activities…determined by UCR in its sole discretion” (page 2 of the Agreement). Has this Advisory Council been formed and, if so, does its charge extend to oversight of the CEFD?

5. Can the precise role of the CEFD be clarified beyond its annual role in organizing and hosting the Annual Inland Empire Economic Forecast Conference? One impression, perhaps false, arising from the current controversy is that UCR’s brand may be associated with the published outcomes of Beacon’s research and analysis. In this context, what is the firewall between Beacon and UCR? Is Beacon undertaking any research for UCR SOB faculty and, if so, does this inevitably result in an unnecessary uncertainty as to what UCR’s role in Beacon’s business is?

a. The UCR-Beacon Affiliation Agreement (dated 9/15/2015) states, “Beacon shall pay to UCR ten percent (10%) of all Revenue (the 'University Fee') arising from services provided by Beacon pursuant to contracts entered into or on or after the
Effective Date (i) to any Person in the Inland Empire or (ii) pertaining to the Inland Empire.... The 'University Fee' is described "as consideration, in part, for the Affiliation's use of UCR's facilities ...support ...[and] license"(3). Are we correct in interpreting the University Fee as a payment to UCR for using UCR's brand on CEFD's research products?

6. Did UCR provide payments to Beacon LLC for its work on the Annual IE Economic Forecast? The Affiliation Agreement refers to a separate “Vendor agreement” with Beacon. Is that agreement still valid? What are its terms?

7. The CEFD website, on which it lists its commercial consulting services, displays the UCR logo prominently on its header as if CEFD is a unit within UCR. However, unlike other UCR units, this header does not direct the user to UCR; instead it redirects to the CEFD website. (Note that the CEFD website is no longer accessible as of 2/27/23.) What are the rules for use of university logo and branding by external entities?

a. In the Affiliation Agreement "The University hereby grants Beacon a non-exclusive...royalty-bearing license to use and display the University Marks during the term of this Agreement"(5). The Agreement states that the branding must be used only in connection to business in the Inland Empire (7). What are the UCR policies regarding such licensing agreements?

8. The Affiliation Agreement dated 9/15/2015 provides for an initial term of three years. Was the agreement extended in 2018? If so, may we request a copy of the extension or the current agreement?

Related to this matter is our previous concern noted to the Academic Council of the proposed use of UCR e-mails by Everspring in the School of Business’ proposed Self-Supporting MBA program. From the Agreement with Beacon (p2) “UCR shall provide e-mail accounts and a telephone number for the Affiliation.” We do not know if Beacon employees are using UCR e-mails, however the uncertainties arising from the current publicity increases our concern with relationships between UCR and vendors where the boundaries between the two become blurred.