COMMUNICATION FROM THE TASK FORCE ON REVIEW OF PROPOSED UCSF INSTITUTE FOR GLOBAL HEALTH

Sharon Hall, PhD, Chair

July 7, 2003

Daniel Bikle, MD, PhD
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate
Box 0764

Dear Dr. Bikle

Thank you for the opportunity to review the proposal for the establishment of an Organized Research Unit (ORU) - The Institute of Global Health at UCSF. Task Force members reviewed the proposal and conducted discussion by email during May, 2003.

The Task Force is enthusiastic in its support of the establishment of an ORU for the Institute for Global Health. The proposal submitted for review is comprehensive and well-justified – we highlight the following strengths as outlined in the proposal:

1. The Institute will provide wide-spread cooperation at UCSF and collaborating institutions on important issues in the arena of international health.

2. Faculty within the Institute are diverse and well-funded internationally recognized leaders in the area of global health.

3. The Institute will benefit both graduate and post-doctoral students.

4. The administrative planning of the Institute seems well-developed and appropriate.

5. The Institute has a successful track record for substantial extramural funding and collaborative educational and research endeavors.

Task Force members have identified the following areas of concern that merit further consideration and response:

A. While the proposal asserts that the ORU will strengthen education and research opportunities for graduate and post-doctoral students, actual projections of student numbers are not provided. It is therefore difficult to assess the impact of such numbers on faculty and other resources.

B. Although the proposal suggests that the Institute is self-supporting, it appears that multiple extramural grants will be the major source of funding. Additionally, the indirect cost recovery from the grants appears to be the sole source of revenue to support the administrative infrastructure of the Institute (personnel). Furthermore, there are ongoing costs related to leased office space and while it is implied that extramural funding will continue to be available to support these areas, ongoing
funding should be identified more explicitly. The proposal identified dependence on an unprecedented level of indirect cost recovery. The Task Force questioned the availability of adequate funding for the Institute if this level of funding was reduced.

C. The proposal does not clearly indicate why the mission of the Institute cannot be accomplished within the existing campus structure. Such a justification should be made.

D. The proposal does not adequately indicate that there is sufficient space for a proposed 50% growth of the program.

Thank you again for the opportunity to review this important document – please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Sharon Hall, PhD
Chair

Leonard Zegans, MD
Vice-Chair, UCSF Academic Senate

cc. Task Force Members:

Marguerite Engler, PhD, RN, MS, FAHA
Deanna Kroetz, PhD
Grayson Marshall, DDS, MPH, PhD
Norman Oppenheimer, PhD
Russell Pieper, PhD