Committee on Research

Annual Report 2005-2006

John Kurhanewicz, PhD, Chair

During 2005-2006, the Committee on Research enjoyed a productive year during which it met eight times. The Committee’s work was augmented by the use of electronic communications to gather data and facilitate communication among Committee members. Dorothy Bainton, MD, Professor and Vice Chancellor Emeritus, represented the Committee on the University Committee on Research Policy (UCROP). Professor John Kurhanewicz served as Committee chair.

Issues reviewed and acted on by the Committee included:

- Review and award of two cycles of Individual Investigator grants
- Review and award of Shared Equipment grants
- Selection of 49th Faculty Research Lecturer
- Selection of 6th Distinguished Clinical Research Lecturer
- Appointment of a subcommittee to review criteria and applications and make proposed changes related to Individual Investigator and Shared Equipment Grants
- Request from Divisional Chair Deborah Greenspan to evaluate current criteria for the Faculty Research lecture, Distinguished Clinical Research Lecture and make recommendations for changes, as well as consider the possibility of whether a new lecture for Translational Research should be implemented.
- Considered two presentations from the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost related to the Quality Improvement Program (QIP).
- Formation of a Task Force to review a proposal for a new Human Genetics Institute ORU (Organized Research Unit).

Individual Investigator Grants

In 2005-2006, the Committee received seventy-three (73) applications in total for Individual Investigator Grants. At its meetings of October 25, 2005, November 15, 2005 and June 7, 2006, the Committee reviewed the applications for Individual Investigator Grants requesting a total of $2,438,490.56. Committee members ranked each application using secret ballots and a scoring system similar to that of the NIH, where 1.0 = strongly recommend for full funding through 3.0 = not fundable. Additionally, as instituted in 2004-05, the Committee did not review any applications ranked 2.0 or higher by the initial reviewers unless either or both of the Committee’s assigned reviewers requested discussion. The Committee approved and recommended
that twenty-six (26) grants totaling $843,694.34 be considered for funding, depending on the total funds available to match the proposed research.

---

### Shared Equipment Grants

The Committee received twenty-two (22) applications during 2005-2006. At its meeting of March 14, 2006 the Committee reviewed applications totaling $725,702.99. Committee members ranked each application using a secret ballot and approved thirteen (13) grants totaling $412,104.99 for funding consideration.

---

### Selection of 49th Annual Faculty Research Lecturer

The Committee received five nominations for the 49th Faculty Research Lecture. Following extensive discussion of each of the five candidates, the Committee voted by secret ballot to select David Julius, MD, Professor and Vice-Chair in the Department of Cellular and Molecular Pharmacology, School of Medicine.

Dr. Julius joined the UCSF faculty in 1990. A major focus of Dr. Julius’ work is to elucidate molecular mechanisms of somatosensation and pain. His group has exploited the properties of natural products to discover a family of thermosensitive ion channels that enable sensory nerve fibers to detect hot or cold temperatures.

Dr. Julius serves on the Board of Directors of The McKnight Endowment Fund for Neuroscience and the Scientific Advisory Committee of the Damon Runyon Cancer Research Foundation. He is also a member of the National Academy of Sciences and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Dr. Julius’ lecture, entitled, *“Finding the Spice in Science: Inspiration from Peptides, Peppers, and Peppermints,”* was delivered to the campus community during Founder’s Week on Tuesday, April 25, 2006 at 3:30 p.m. in Cole Hall.

---

Each year, the Faculty Research Lecture proudly acknowledges the outstanding scientific achievements made by a member of the UCSF Academic Senate. Academic Senate members are asked to consider the contributions of their colleagues when they make nominations for this prestigious award so that the University community may recognize their scientific achievements.

---

### 6th Annual Distinguished Clinical Research Lecturer

The Committee was delighted to approve the selection of Michael A. Matthay, MD as recipient of the Sixth Annual Distinguished Clinical Research Lectureship. Dr. Matthay is known for his preeminence in the field of patient-oriented research related to mechanisms of active ion and water transport across the alveolar epithelium of the lung, with translation of these insights into understanding the resolution of pulmonary edema in patients. His research work has also focused on mechanisms of acute lung injury and sepsis, translating basic insights into clinical studies of critically ill patients as well as directing NIH supported clinical trials in the intensive care units at the UCSF Parnassus and SFGH sites.

Since 2001, this award has been bestowed on an individual member or members of the UCSF faculty with outstanding achievements in clinical research. Nominations are made by UCSF faculty, who consider the clinical research contributions of their colleagues and submit nominations for this prestigious award to the
Academic Senate Committee on Research. Each year, the Committee on Research selects the recipient of this award.

The Fifth Annual Distinguished Clinical Research Lecture will take place on Tuesday, October 17, 2006 at Noon in Cole Hall on the Parnassus Heights Campus and will be broadcast to other UCSF sites as availability permits.

### Task Force Reviewing Proposed UCSF Institute for Human Genetics

In a communication dated August 23, 2005, Sally Marshall, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, forwarded a proposal for ORU status for the Institute for Human Genetics for review by the Academic Senate. In accordance with our established procedures and the University compendium for this type of review, a Task Force was established composed of the following representatives: Two members each from the Committees on Research, Academic Planning and Budget and Graduate Council.

According to the proposal, UCSF has always had a significant presence in human genetics as evidenced by the number of prestigious awards achieved by the faculty. Yet these and other individuals in human genetics have operated and continue to operate in independent and isolated spheres within the university, with no central focus for their activities. This has led to independent and potentially duplicative efforts by many when they should have been collaborative, and loss of opportunities to create a more exciting and productive environment. In fact, it is not unreasonable to conclude that over past years the loss of valuable faculty from UCSF in the area of human genetics has occurred and can be at least partially attributed to the lack of institutional support in the form of a central structure, such as an ORU, of which they can be a component.

The Committee reviewed this proposal and the key issues of concern raised by the Committee in their report ([Appendix 1](#)) included:

#### Concerns with the ORU

1. The adequacy of long-term funding. The administrative core, which appears adequate, yet not overgrown in size, will cost approximately $500K per year to maintain. What are the long term funding mechanisms for the core after the 5-year start-up funding runs out?

2. Similarly, what will the equipment start-up funds be used for, what is their replacement cycle, and what ongoing plans are there for funding replacements?

3. The Task Force would like to see a budget that projects the transition to self-sufficiency.

4. The Task Force felt there was lack of planning for addressing ethical issues in genetics.

5. The Task Force would like to see an accounting of planned interactions with non-human genetics, including existing graduate programs, at UCSF.

#### Concerns with the Proposal

The Task Force asked for clarification of a number of aspects:
1. A key omission is that there is virtually no description of the “value added” to genetics research. The research descriptions are impressive but were nothing more than the research programs of each individual faculty member affiliated with the program. The proposal need not be all-inclusive, but should include detailed descriptions of three to four research agendas that will clearly be created by, or benefit from, the existence of the ORU.

2. Inclusion of a strategic vision statement.

3. A more detailed description of how the HGI will enhance collaboration. The research groups identified as affiliated with HGI are spread across multiple campuses. What mechanisms will be put in place to help overcome this, and how will the various facilities at the different campuses be used and interconnected?

4. How is the proposed ORU distinct from the Department of Human Genetics at UCLA?
   a. Does the HGI offer expertise in human genetics not available elsewhere in the UC system?
   b. Does the ORU have a regional benefit?
   c. Specifically, what will be done to enhance interaction with other UC programs in genetics?

5. What is the vision and what are the plans with regard to interaction with industry?

6. Clarification is needed with regard to two budget items.
   a. First, are the funds for postdoctoral fellowships start-up funds or an endowment?
      i. If start-up, what are the continuing needs and plans for funding?
      ii. If endowment, what are the plans and will it be adequate?
   b. Eight faculty recruitments are planned using the promised start-up funds. What is the planned balance of lab versus desktop researchers? The funding does not appear adequate to support many lab researchers.

While the Task Force also acknowledged the many benefits of the ORU, the members requested that the above additions and clarifications be made before recommending approval of this otherwise excellent proposal for an ORU in human genetics at UCSF.

**Research Travel Grants**

The Academic Senate Travel Grant Program was reinstated by the Academic Senate Committee on Research commencing July 1, 2005, following budget cuts in 2003 and 2004, which eliminated State funding for these awards. Travel Grants are made available to assist faculty to attend meetings of learned societies or organized conferences and/or to present important results of original research. The Committee recommended that $20,000 from the Research Committee’s allocation of Opportunity Funds be set aside to fund travel grants in amounts up to $500 for two funding cycles (January 1 – June 30 and July 1 – December 31). In order to qualify for a research travel grant award, faculty members must have appointments at 50% time or more, with five years of service or less at UCSF.

The Committee stipulated that grants be awarded on a ‘first come, first served” basis with no more than $10,000 to be spent for each funding cycle. In 2005-06 a total of 43 Research Travel Grants, totaling $16,891.34 were awarded.
July 1, 2005 – December 31, 2006 Financial Breakdown

The Senate allocated $10,000 in award revenue for dates July 1, 2005 – December 31, 2005. All qualified applicants were awarded Research Travel Grants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Qualified Applications Requested/Paid</th>
<th>24/24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding Available</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Requested (Reflects air travel that exceeds maximum $500 per award)</td>
<td>$13,126.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Funding Awarded</td>
<td>$9,824.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

January 1, 2006 – June 30, 2006 Financial Breakdown

The Senate allocated $10,000 in award revenue for dates January 1, 2006 – June 30, 2006. All qualified applicants were awarded Research Travel Grants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Qualified Applications Requested/Paid</th>
<th>19/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding Available</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Requested (Reflects air travel that exceeds maximum $500 per award)</td>
<td>$11,485.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Funding Awarded</td>
<td>$7,066.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A call for travel grants has been sent for funding dates July 1, 2006 – December 31, 2006.

Subcommittee Reviewing Grant Application Procedures

Due to the need for increased clarity and consistency within current Academic Senate Individual Investigator and Shared Equipment grant application procedures a subcommittee was formed to review and revise the existing grant guidelines. Subcommittee Chair Aouizerat along with members C. Broaddus, S. Habelitz, R. Oka, M. Springer, and K. Yang conducted many revisions over email to produce more specific and clear guidelines. The Committee is in the process of approving the changes and will formally recommend them to the Coordinating Committee of the Senate for review and approval at the first meeting in October 2006. (Appendices 2-5)

Quality Improvement Program

This year, the Committee on Research heard two presentations on QIP. QIP stands for Quality Improvement Program which was introduced this academic year by the Office of Research. The Office of Research unveiled this program to provide timely, efficient and investigator-focused services through the use of fully integrated administrative systems and state-of-the-art technological tools. The end result of QIP will be a measurably improved quality of life for all people engaged in the research enterprise through enhanced research services at UCSF. As part of process, the Office of Research will:

- Systematically analyze processes and outcomes to establish an effective quality improvement program
- Create performance standards, design measurement tools, incorporate technological advances, and begin monitoring and reporting
- Measurably improve quality of life for the people who do the work.
The Office of Research agreed to continue to solicit input from the Committee and keep them abreast of all developments.

**Consideration of a Translational Research Lecture**

In a communication dated April 21, 2006 (Appendix 6), Chair Greenspan indicated that both Drs. Washington and Marshall support the creation of a new Academic Senate Translational Research Lecture. In order to advance this initiative, she asked the Committee to review the two existing lectures now sponsored by the Academic Senate (Faculty Research Lecture and Distinguished Clinical Research Lecture) and to ensure that these two lectures and a new “Distinguished Translational Research Lecture Award” would each have a distinctly different purpose, as well as clear and distinct criteria that is not overlapping or redundant.

As such, she requested that the Committee develop and a set of recommended criteria that distinguishes the proposed Distinguished Translational Research Lecture from the two existing lectureships. She also requested that the Committee review the criteria for the existing lectureships to determine if any additional criteria or clarity is needed.

The Committee will continue to address this issue in the 2006-2007 year.

**Issues for 2005 – 2006 Academic Year**

The following are a list of ongoing issues for consideration by the 2005-06 Committee:

1. Identify resources necessary for the Senate Office to support and institute measures to more adequately monitor expenditures by faculty in receipt of Academic Senate funding.
2. Continue the work of the two newly formed Task Forces Reviewing Grant Guidelines and Online Application Submission.
3. Continue development of recommended criteria that distinguishes the proposed Distinguished Translational Research Lecture from the two existing lectureships and clarification of criteria for the existing lectureships.
4. Continue to review and give input on the Quality Improvement Project.

**Respectfully Submitted,**

**Committee on Research**
John Kurhanewicz, PhD, Chair
Chuck McCulloch, PhD, Vice Chair
Dorothy Bainton, MD, UCOR Rep
Donna Albertson, PhD
Bradley Aouizerat, PhD
Christopher Barton, MD
Lisa Bero, PhD
Courtney Broaddus, MD
Ken Covinsky, MD, MPH
Kevin L. Delucchi, PhD
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Prepared by:
Shilpa Patel
Senior Senate Analyst
514-2696
spatel@senate.ucsf.edu
December 5, 2005

Dear Sally,

Please find attached the report from the Task Force Reviewing the Proposed UCSF Institute for Human Genetics. The Task Force charged to review the Institute for Human Genetics ORU Proposal was composed of members from the Academic Senate Committees on Research, Academic Planning and Budget, and Graduate Council.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

David Gardner, MD
Vice Chair

FOR:
Deborah Greenspan, DSc, BDS
Chair

Encl/ Communication from Academic Senate Task Force on Review of Proposed UCSF Institute for Human Genetics – 11/21/05

cc: Charles Mc Culloch, Task Force Chair
All Task Force Members
COMMUNICATION FROM THE TASK FORCE ON REVIEW OF PROPOSED UCSF INSTITUTE FOR HUMAN GENETICS
Charles McCulloch, PhD, Chair

November 21, 2005

Deborah Greenspan, DSc, BDS
Chair, Academic Senate
University of California, San Francisco

Dear Dr. Greenspan,

Thank you for the opportunity to review the proposal for the establishment of an Organized Research Unit (ORU) — the Human Genetics Institute (HGI) at UCSF. The Task Force reviewed the submitted materials in accordance with the guidelines set forth in the Administrative Policies and Procedures Concerning Organized Research Units and met to discuss the proposal in October, 2005. The Task Force was highly enthusiastic about the creation of an ORU; however we have some serious concerns with the program. Additionally, the proposal itself needs clarification in several places.

Benefits of the ORU

The Task Force would like to commend the architects of the HGI. The institute is sorely needed, long overdue, and will clearly further research and education in genetics at UCSF. There is already an outstanding array of faculty associated with the HGI. Some clear benefits of establishment of an ORU were recognized:

- Raising the profile of genetics at UCSF
- Coalescing a scattered genetics-related infrastructure
- Improving training and teaching of genetics
- Enhancing recruitment of genetics faculty
- Forming the foundation for a graduate degree program (which the Task Force strongly encourages)
- Increasing the ability to raise outside funds in support of genetics programs
- Building new research programs

The HGI appears to have adequate allocated space, start-up funding (though see queries below), has recruitment of a superb director, and has a core administrative team in place.

Concerns with the ORU

1. The adequacy of long-term funding. The administrative core, which appears adequate, yet not overgrown in size, will cost approximately $500K per year to maintain. What are the long term funding mechanisms for the core after the 5-year start-up funding runs out?

2. Similarly, what will the equipment start-up funds be used for, what is their replacement cycle, and what ongoing plans are there for funding replacements?

3. The Task Force would like to see a budget that projects the transition to self-sufficiency.

4. The Task Force felt there was lack of planning for addressing ethical issues in genetics.
5. The Task force would like to see an accounting of planned interactions with non-human genetics, including existing graduate programs, at UCSF.

Concerns with the Proposal
The proposal also needs to be clarified in a number of aspects.

1. A key omission is that there is virtually no description of the "value added" to genetics research. The research descriptions are impressive but were nothing more than the research programs of each individual faculty member affiliated with the program. The proposal need not be all-inclusive, but should include detailed descriptions of three to four research agendas that will clearly be created by, or benefit from, the existence of the ORU.

2. Inclusion of a strategic vision statement.

3. A more detailed description of how the HGI will enhance collaboration. The research groups identified as affiliated with HGI are spread across multiple campuses. What mechanisms will be put in place to help overcome this, and how will the various facilities at the different campuses be used and interconnected?

4. How is the proposed ORU distinct from the Department of Human Genetics at UCLA?
   a. Does the HGI offer expertise in human genetics not available elsewhere in the UC system?
   b. Does the ORU have a regional benefit?
   c. Specifically, what will be done to enhance interaction with other UC programs in genetics?

5. What is the vision and what are the plans with regard to interaction with industry?

6. Clarification is needed with regard to two budget items.
   a. First, are the funds for postdoctoral fellowships start-up funds or an endowment?
      i. If start-up, what are the continuing needs and plans for funding?
      ii. If endowment, what are the plans and will it be adequate?
   b. Eight faculty recruitments are planned using the promised start-up funds. What is the planned balance of lab versus desktop researchers? The funding does not appear adequate to support many lab researchers.

The Task Force would like to see the additions and clarifications above before recommending approval of this excellent proposal for an ORU in human genetics at UCSF. Thank you again for the opportunity to review this important document – please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Charles McCulloch, PhD
Chair

Cc: John Huang, DMD, Task Force Member, Committee on Research
Norman Oppenheimer, PhD, Task Force Member, Academic Planning and Budget
Susan Sniderman, MD, Task Force Member, Academic Planning and Budget
Farid Chehab, PhD, Task Force Member, Graduate Council
Jeff Lansman, PhD, Task Force Member, Graduate Council
ACADEMIC SENATE – COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH
INDIVIDUAL INVESTIGATOR RESEARCH GRANT APPLICATION

Application Deadline: 
Friday, September XX, 200X (Fall Funding Cycle)
Friday, April XX, 200X (Spring Funding Cycle)

Number of Copies: 
26 + Original

Deliver to: 
UCSF Academic Senate
c/o Shilpa Patel
Room 253 Milberry Union East
Box 0764

Applicants will be informed of the outcome of their application approximately six weeks after the deadline date.

Award range: 
Up to $35,000

Contact: 
Shilpa Patel, Academic Senate Analyst
spatel@senate.ucsf.edu
(415) 514-2696

Funding is based on priority scores and on the availability of funds in specialty areas.

Application Cover Page – Click Here to Complete

Please note: Academic Senate grants are made available in part through endowment funds allocated to specific areas of research. To help the Senate Office when processing awards, please check all funding categories (e.g., epilepsy, cancer, Parkinson’s disease, heart, eye, circulatory ) that can reasonably be applied to this project on page 1 of the application cover page.

Comment: I think I can re-arrange things to make the funding categories table fit on the first page of the coversheet.

Deleted: vascular,
The Committee on Research (COR) invites applications for funds for research by new investigators and established investigators for (1) start-up funds; (2) short-term lapse of funding; (3) re-entry or (4) new direction. In all cases, it is expected that work supported by COR funds will lead the applicant to outside (extramural) funding. As a result, successful applications are usually well focused and present a clear pathway from the applicant's present state to the acquisition of extramural funding. The applicant should outline how the specific preliminary results to be obtained will be used to support a subsequent application for extramural funds. Description of specific experiments that will actually be performed or data to be collected is preferable to an exhaustive list of possible experiments or potential areas of data collection. Applicants are encouraged to begin writing their proposals early and to obtain advice from established investigators in their area of interest or to seek assistance from the Committee on Research and the Academic Senate Staff.

Please note: Grant applications received by the Academic Senate Office one month prior to the published deadline for submission are eligible for an optional “pre-review”. If requested, Academic Senate staff will check to determine if the grant meets administrative eligibility requirements (i.e. a complete and accurate budget, required documents, etc.). Academic Senate staff will not review the scientific merit of any grant. If a grant has been submitted within the timelines established for a pre-review, and if administrative deficiencies are discovered that would prevent your grant from being forwarded to the Committee on Research for consideration, applications will be returned to Principal Investigators for modification. Modified applications must be re-submitted on or before the published deadline.

ELIGIBILITY

Who's Eligible: Individuals with PI status are eligible. University policy confers PI status on faculty who are salaried at 50% or more of full time in the ladder-rank, in-residence, clinical X, adjunct, clinical or research series, and to appointees in the librarian series. PIs on sabbatical can apply for supplies and equipment. Preference will be given to new investigators and prioritized in the following order: Start-up, Short-term Lapse, Re-entry, and then New Direction.

Who's Not Eligible: Faculty without a salaried University appointment, visiting professors, specialists, residents, fellows, post-docs, graduate students and staff employees. The Committee will not fund curricular or administrative studies or research conducted by graduate students relative to ongoing studies and dissertations, and will not subsidize extramural and intramural budget reductions. Applicants who have been awarded an Academic Senate Individual Investigator Award within the last two funding cycles (12 months) are not eligible to apply.
HOW TO APPLY

An original and twenty-six copies of the application must be typed, single-spaced, double-sided and stapled. The type must not be smaller than 12 characters per inch. An application should be prepared with the same care given to outside agencies and should be written in terms that can be understood by Committee on Research members working in diverse fields of biomedical and other sciences, whose areas of specialization may not coincide with that of the planned work. Verbatim submissions of NIH grants will not be accepted.

The Academic Senate cover page must be used and can be downloaded by clicking here. The cover page may be typed or completed by hand. Nothing should precede the application cover page.

Supporting documents (transmittal letter from applicant, letters from department chairs and collaborators) must be included with the application and filed in the Appendix. School of Medicine faculty may concurrently apply to the Research Evaluation and Allocation Committee (REAC) for research grants awarded by the Dean of the School of Medicine. If a grant is submitted to both REAC and to the Committee on Research, you must provide the Committee on Research with four copies of the REAC grant, including the budget. Applicants who apply to both the Committee on Research and REAC are encouraged to submit non-overlapping or complementary budgets for the same project in order to avoid potential reductions of funding should both REAC and the COR approve funding for a project with identical budgets. In the event that an applicant opts to submit identical budgets for both the Committee on Research and REAC applications, a letter explaining how the budget would be adjusted in the event that both applications are funded. The letter should be included in the Appendix of the application. Failure to include this letter may result in arbitrary reduction of the applicant’s proposed budget by the Committee on Research.

Applications that are incomplete (e.g., failure to include supporting documentation in the Appendix, failure to complete the 18 items listed in the guidelines provided here) will be returned without review. Applications that contain the appropriate documentation but that are unclear, including those applications that deviate from the suggested proposal format, will be reviewed but are less likely to be given priority.

If the application is a resubmission, please include a section for your responses to the critique of the last review and a summary of the major changes made in the current resubmission.

SELECT ONE FUNDING CATEGORY

Start-up Category:

The Start-up Category is intended for junior faculty with four (4) years or less of service at UCSF who have achieved independent status and can show the need for funds to establish his or her own research. Investigators applying for first time support must indicate:

1. Whether there are start-up or matching funds provided by their department or Dean, or
2. The amount of any start-up or matching funds.
New investigators who are without committed laboratory space or resources (e.g., laboratory equipment necessary for the execution of the study aims) must include a letter (in the Appendix) from their Department Chair indicating that:

1. The investigator is independent,
2. The investigator is solely responsible for the proposed project,
3. The investigator's work does not overlap with ongoing work of others in the lab;
4. The project will not be transferred to a different department or institution without specific Committee on Research approval.

In almost all circumstances, an investigator can receive start-up funds only once; however, under exceptional circumstances and at the discretion of the Committee, a second request for funding may be considered. Any requests for continued support must include a summary of the previously supported Committee on Research study and a clear justification for requested on-going support. Please note: this category is intended to provide junior investigators in need of research support; priority will be given to those applicant’s without start-up funds. Those applicant’s eligible for this category that did not receive start-up funds, but who will receive matching funds will receive a higher priority.

Short-term Lapse Category:

The Short-term Lapse Category is intended for investigators who are experiencing a temporary interruption in funding and can document their hardship. A short-term lapse of funding designation (particularly when pending applications are not listed) must include a 5-year funding history for the applicant, a copy of the reviewers’ critiques and the applicant’s rebuttal.

Re-entry Category:

The Re-Entry Category is intended for investigators who have pursued non-classical pathways and now wish to resume their research careers. Such pathways include investigators who have relocated with a spouse or partner at the cost of the applicants program of research, or those who have dedicated their primary effort to teaching or clinical practice rather than to research.

New Direction Category:

The New Direction Category is intended for investigators at all levels. This category applies to investigators who wish to embark on a new and/or substantially different direction of research. It is the responsibility of the investigator to demonstrate that the proposed study is a distinctly new direction of research. For example, studies that are conceptually similar to those being performed in a different tissue or in a different animal model, with a different assay system, or on a different population in the investigator's current research program, would not constitute a new direction.
FORMAT FOR MAKING APPLICATION

1. **Cover Sheet**: Provide name, department, title, series, campus box and room location, phone, fax, and email of the Principal Investigator applicant. Identify the category/categories of funding for which you are applying. Provide the name of your project. Identify the total budget request for your project (see cover sheet template). **In addition, inclusion of the signed submission checklist provided on the last page of this document is mandatory.**

2. **Table of Contents**: Provide a one-page table of contents for the application, immediately following the cover sheet.

3. **Funding Category Justification**: Provide an explanation as to the funding category. **Not to exceed 300 words.**

4. **Abstract**: Provide an abstract of the research proposal. **Not to exceed 300 words.**

5. **Aims**: Describe the project's scope, objectives, and rationale. Specific aims for most research proposals can be itemized. There are usually no more than 2 - 3 specific aims for an eight-month to a one-year study. **Not to exceed one page.**

6. **Background**: Describe the background to the present application and the appropriateness to the state of the field of research. **Not to exceed one page.**

7. **Preliminary Studies**: Describe previous work accomplished by the applicant and co-investigator(s) relevant to the proposal. **Not to exceed one page.**

8. **Response to Reviewers’ Comments**: If the application is a new submission, please enter “New application”. If the application is a resubmission, please address the previous reviewer’s comments. **Not to exceed two pages.**

9. **Research Methods**: Describe the methods, information or techniques to be employed, the scientific basis for choice, data to be obtained, sample selection and control, data organization and analysis, management of biases, discrepant findings, errors of measurement and sample losses. Briefly describe any collaborative arrangements that will contribute to execution of the study aims. **Not to exceed two pages.** In the Appendix, provide details of collaborative arrangements and include a letter from each collaborator.

10. **Significance of this Research**: Explain how the results of the proposed work will advance the knowledge in this specific field and lead to extramural support. **Not to exceed one page.**

11. **Human subjects/vertebrate animals**: If human subjects are involved, provide details of the group from which samples will be drawn and the sampling methods to be used. If animals are used, identify the species, the approximate number to be used, a rationale for involving animals and the appropriateness of the species, and describe the proposed use of the animals. Human or animal studies should be justified with a power calculation, if appropriate. **This section is limited to 1/2 page per species (e.g., ½ page for human, ½ page murine).** Approval from CHR and CAR **must** be obtained before funds can be released and within six months of notice of approval of funding.

Comment: I agree with Brad's comment, and if we state clearly that failure to conform to these guidelines results in the application being returned, that is fine with me. However, recall that last year, I downgraded an application because one of these sections was a half-page too long, for the reasons that Brad stated, and I asked the committee if they felt I was being a big meanie. The consensus was yes... Perhaps we should take it up with the full committee.

Deleted: PI
12. References: For each cited reference (number sequentially starting with '1') include the name of the author, title of the article, name of the book or journal, volume number, page numbers, and year of publication. Not to exceed one page.

13. Biographical Sketch: Please submit a current NIH Biosketch (PHS 398) for each investigator.

14. Other Research Support: List current and pending research support (extramural and intramural), support source, identification number, project title, percent of time devoted to each project, role in project, term of project, notification date for pending applications, include notification date (e.g. receipt of summary statement from NIH) and annual direct costs. List the "aims" from current or pending grants that may overlap with this application.

15. Budget: Itemize expenses for personnel, supplies, equipment, research subject payments and travel. Only eligible expenses from these five budget categories will be considered.

16. Budget Justification: Justify expenditures by category: Personnel, Supplies, Research Subject Payments, Equipment, and Travel. If applicable, describe how the budget compares with pending and/or current research support, and why funding was not subsumed by those sources. (See notes on following page explaining the five categories of budget justification).

17. Letter to Adhere to Policy Relating to the Awarding and Management of Grant Funds:

Please read carefully

POLICY RELATING TO THE AWARDING AND MANAGEMENT OF GRANT FUNDS

The Academic Senate requires Principal Investigators and their Department Chairs to provide the Academic Senate with a letter that states agreement to adhere to the requirements of the Grant Award. This letter must include a Department Fund/Account to be used by the Academic Senate in the event that an overage above and beyond the total Grant Award appears in the Senate Fund/Account assigned to the Principal Investigator. Please include this letter with your original application. Only one copy is required.

18. Appendix: List Research Subjects and Environmental Protection Committee applications and/or approval number(s), letters from department chair and collaborator(s), and figures or drawings relative to the application. For the short-term lapse in funding category, include a copy of the reviewers’ critiques and the applicant’s rebuttal along with the applicant’s 5 year funding history.

Research Subjects and Environmental Protection Committees

Any applications involving the following Committees will not be funded unless there is evidence of (pending) approval: Committee on Animal Research (CAR), Biosafety Committee (BSC), Committee on Human Research (CHR), Radiation Safety Committee (RSC) and Radioactive Drug Research Committee (RDRC).
BUDGET JUSTIFICATION – List of Eligible Budget Categories and Expenses

Please clearly itemize the proposed budget according to the following categories and provide all the required information for each category.

Personnel Category
List the principal investigator, co-investigator(s) and other personnel and indicate the percent of effort for each (i.e. the percentage of daily working time to be spent by each investigator on the proposed project). Describe the specific function of each person on the budget justification page. The grant does not fund the salary of the principal investigator, co-investigator(s), consultants, postdocs, or individuals who would be considered inappropriate under the Office of Management and Budget, Circular A-21 (OMB A21) (e.g., administrative staff). Examples of allowed personnel include staff research associates, laboratory assistants, and clinical nurses.

UCSF Fee Remission Policy: Pertains to registered students appointed to research titles at 25% of the time or more for a full academic term. Copies of the Fee Remission Policy for Students with Research Appointments are available by telephoning 476-1558. If student remission fees are not budgeted by the investigator, the grant budget will be amended to cover that charge. University regulations allow students to work no more than 50% time during the academic year and 100% time during the summer months. This policy does not apply to non-resident tuition fees.

Supplies Category
Itemize consumable supplies, animals, statistical services and analysis. Equipment and software items costing less than $300 should be listed in this category. Charges for the use of UCSF owned equipment will be closely reviewed and must be accompanied by a rate sheet; radiology, clinical labs and sequencing charges usually fall under this category. Allowed charges for UCSF clinical services ordinarily fall below the "list price" that UCSF bills to third party payers. Investigators should negotiate charges with relevant clinical services and departments when preparing this application. If animals are requested, provide unit and per diem costs.

All supply and equipment expenses must be directly related to proposed research.

Research Subject Payments: A copy of the UCSF Research Subject Payment Summary is included with each CHR application packet if reimbursement is indicated on the Committee on Human Research (CHR) Cover Page. The guidelines for research subject payments applies when 1) a research protocol involving research subjects has been reviewed and approved by the Committee on Human Research which includes issuance of a CHR Approval Number and 2) the research department has completed and submitted a Research Subject Payment Summary Form to Accounts Payable with a copy of the CHR Approval Letter and a CHR Cover Page. Payments to research subjects are tax reportable as income; therefore, the PI should not make out-of-pocket direct payments to subjects and then seek reimbursement from UC. Purchases associated with research subjects such as translation services must be procured through University processes, i.e., Purchase Order. Your budget
must include a line item of the amount anticipated to cover all expenses related to Research Subject payments.

**Equipment Category**

Equipment is defined as non-expendable personal property having a useful life of more than two years and costing $300 or more per unit. Title to or ownership of all University property or material is vested in the Regents of the University of California. Without exception, equipment purchased with COR funds remains the property of the Regents of the University of California and cannot be transferred from the University. The investigator should indicate that a thorough investigation of the University Surplus Pool (502-3064) has been made and that the desired equipment is not available. If funded, the award can only be applied to the specified equipment. Please include the specific location where all equipment purchased with funds from the Academic Senate will reside. On the budget justification page, explain the need for the equipment, provide manufacturer’s price quotes for each piece of equipment and list alternate funding sources should the Committee offer partial funding. The Committee will not provide funds for a personal computer if its sole use is for the preparation of a manuscript.

**Manufacturer's Price Quote:** An application without a manufacturer's price quote for each piece of equipment over $300 will be rejected. Please make sure that you include any tax and shipping charges related to equipment purchases in your quote and budget total.

**Travel Category**

Funds for transportation are available to conduct field research and for the purpose of gathering data and research materials. These funds are intended for transportation costs exclusively and under no circumstance can they be used for subsistence (including hotels, registration fees etc.). Use of travel funds for the attendance of professional conferences or meetings is specifically disallowed.
Before submitting, please ensure that you have included the following:

- Page numbers for each page submitted
- Cover page
- Table of contents
- Funding category justification
- Abstract
- Aims
- Background
- Preliminary studies
- Research methods
- Significance of research
- Human subjects/Vertebrate animals
- References
- Biographical sketches
- Other research support
- Budget
- Budget justification
- Letter of agreement to adhere to policy relating to the award and management of grant funds
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- Research subjects and environmental protection committee RSEPC approvals
- Research subject payment documentation
- Letters from department chairs, collaborators
- Manufacturers price quote(s) for all equipment
- Identification of location for all equipment (address/Room #)
- Figures or drawings
- For short-term lapse category, provide a copy of reviewers' critiques and rebuttal with investigator's five (5) year funding history.
- REAC applications if applicable

I have reviewed my application and prepared the above submission checklist.

Applicant’s Name ___________________________ Applicant’s Signature ___________________________

I have reviewed my application and prepared the above submission checklist.
ACADEMIC SENATE – COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH
INDIVIDUAL INVESTIGATOR RESEARCH GRANT APPLICATION

Application
Deadline: Friday, September XX, 200X (Fall Funding Cycle)
            Friday, April XX, 200X (Spring Funding Cycle)

Number of Copies:  26 + Original

Deliver to: UCSF Academic Senate
c/o Shilpa Patel
Room 253 Milberry Union East
Box 0764

Applicants will be informed of the outcome of their application approximately six weeks after the deadline date.

Award range: Up to $35,000

Contact: Shilpa Patel, Academic Senate Analyst
spatel@senate.ucsf.edu
(415) 514-2696

Funding is based on priority scores and on the availability of funds in specialty areas.

Application Cover Page – Click Here to Complete

Please note: Academic Senate grants are made available in part through endowment funds allocated to specific areas of research. To help the Senate Office when processing awards, please check all funding categories (e.g., epilepsy, cancer, Parkinson’s disease, heart, eye, circulatory) that can reasonably be applied to this project on page 2 of the application cover page.
The Committee on Research (COR) invites applications for funds for research by new investigators and established investigators for (1) start-up funds; (2) short-term lapse of funding; (3) re-entry or (4) new direction. In all cases, it is expected that work supported by COR funds will lead the applicant to outside (extramural) funding. As a result, successful applications are usually well focused and present a clear pathway from the applicant's present state to the acquisition of extramural funding. The applicant should outline how the specific preliminary results to be obtained will be used to support a subsequent application for extramural funds. Description of specific experiments that will actually be performed or data to be collected is preferable to an exhaustive list of possible experiments or potential areas of data collection. Applicants are encouraged to begin writing their proposals early and to obtain advice from established investigators in their area of interest or to seek assistance from the Committee on Research and the Academic Senate Staff.

Please note: Grant applications received by the Academic Senate Office one month prior to the published deadline for submission are eligible for an optional “pre-review”. If requested, Academic Senate staff will check to determine if the grant meets administrative eligibility requirements (i.e. a complete and accurate budget, required documents, etc.). Academic Senate staff will not review the scientific merit of any grant. If a grant has been submitted within the timelines established for a pre-review, and if administrative deficiencies are discovered that would prevent your grant from being forwarded to the Committee on Research for consideration, applications will be returned to Principal Investigators for modification. Modified applications must be re-submitted on or before the published deadline.

ELIGIBILITY

Who's Eligible: Individuals with PI status are eligible. University policy confers PI status on faculty who are salaried at 50% or more of full time in the ladder-rank, in-residence, clinical X, adjunct, clinical or research series, and to appointees in the librarian series. PIs on sabbatical can apply for supplies and equipment. Preference will be given to new investigators and prioritized in the following order: Start-up, Short-term Lapse, Re-entry, and then New Direction.

Who's Not Eligible: Faculty without a salaried University appointment, visiting professors, specialists, residents, fellows, post-docs, graduate students and staff employees. The Committee will not fund curricular or administrative studies or research conducted by graduate students relative to ongoing studies and dissertations, and will not subsidize extramural and intramural budget reductions. Applicants who have been awarded an Academic Senate Individual Investigator Award within the last two funding cycles (12 months) are not eligible to apply.
HOW TO APPLY

An original and twenty-six copies of the application must be typed, single-spaced, double-sided and stapled. The type must not be smaller than 12 characters per inch. An application should be prepared with the same care given to outside agencies and should be written in terms that can be understood by Committee on Research members working in diverse fields of biomedical and other sciences, whose areas of specialization may not coincide with that of the planned work. Verbatim submissions of NIH grants will not be accepted.

The Academic Senate cover page must be used and can be downloaded by clicking here. The cover page may be typed or completed by hand. Nothing should precede the application cover page.

Supporting documents (transmittal letter from applicant, letters from department chairs and collaborators) must be included with the application and filed in the Appendix. School of Medicine faculty may concurrently apply to the Research Evaluation and Allocation Committee (REAC) for research grants awarded by the Dean of the School of Medicine. If a grant is submitted to both REAC and to the Committee on Research, you must provide the Committee on Research with four copies of the REAC grant, including the budget. Applicants who apply to both the Committee on Research and REAC are encouraged to submit non-overlapping or complementary budgets for the same project in order to avoid potential reductions of funding should both REAC and the COR approve funding for a project with identical budgets. In the event that an applicant opts to submit identical budgets for both the Committee on Research and REAC applications, a letter explaining how the budget would be adjusted in the event that both applications are funded should be included in the Appendix of the application. Failure to include this letter may result in arbitrary reduction of the applicant’s proposed budget by the Committee on Research.

Applications that are incomplete (e.g., failure to include supporting documentation in the Appendix, failure to complete the 18 items listed in the guidelines provided here) will be returned without review. Applications that contain the appropriate documentation but that are unclear, including those applications that deviate from the suggested proposal format, will be reviewed but are less likely to be given priority.

If the application is a resubmission, please include a section for your responses to the critique of the last review and a summary of the major changes made in the current resubmission.

SELECT ONE FUNDING CATEGORY

Start-up Category:

The Start-up Category is intended for junior faculty with four (4) years or less of service at UCSF who have achieved independent status and can show the need for funds to establish his or her own research. Investigators applying for first time support must indicate:

1. Whether there are start-up or matching funds provided by their department or Dean, or

2. The amount of any start-up or matching funds.
New investigators who are without committed laboratory space or resources (e.g., laboratory equipment necessary for the execution of the study aims) must include a letter (in the Appendix) from their Department Chair indicating that:

1. The investigator is independent,
2. The investigator is solely responsible for the proposed project,
3. The investigator's work does not overlap with ongoing work of others in the lab;
4. The project will not be transferred to a different department or institution without specific Committee on Research approval.

In almost all circumstances, an investigator can receive start-up funds only once; however, under exceptional circumstances and at the discretion of the Committee, a second request for funding may be considered. Any requests for continued support must include a summary of the previously supported Committee on Research study and a clear justification for requested on-going support. **Please note:** this category is intended to provide junior investigators in need of research support; priority will be given to those applicants without start-up funds. Applicants eligible for this category that did not receive start-up funds, but who will receive matching funds will receive a higher priority.

**Short-term Lapse Category:**

The **Short-term Lapse Category** is intended for investigators who are experiencing a temporary interruption in funding and can document their hardship. A short-term lapse of funding designation (particularly when pending applications are not listed) **must include a 5-year funding history for the applicant, a copy of the reviewers’ critiques and the applicant’s rebuttal.**

**Re-entry Category:**

The **Re-Entry Category** is intended for investigators who have pursued non-classical pathways and now wish to resume their research careers. Such pathways include investigators who have relocated with a spouse or partner at the cost of the applicants program of research, or those who have dedicated their primary effort to teaching or clinical practice rather than to research.

**New Direction Category:**

The **New Direction Category** is intended for investigators at all levels. This category applies to investigators who wish to embark on a new and/or substantially different direction of research. It is the responsibility of the investigator to demonstrate that the proposed study is a **distinctly new direction of research.** For example, studies that are conceptually similar to those being performed in a different tissue or in a different animal model, with a different assay system, or on a different population in the investigator’s current research program, would not constitute a new direction.
FORMAT FOR MAKING APPLICATION

1. **Cover Sheet**: Provide name, department, title, series, campus box and room location, phone, fax, and email of the Principal Investigator applicant. Identify the category/categories of funding for which you are applying. Provide the name of your project. Identify the total budget request for your project (see cover sheet template). In addition, inclusion of the signed submission checklist provided on the last page of this document is mandatory.

2. **Table of Contents**: Provide a one-page table of contents for the application, immediately following the cover sheet.

3. **Funding Category Justification**: Provide an explanation as to the funding category. **Not to exceed 300 words**.

4. **Abstract**: Provide an abstract of the research proposal. **Not to exceed 300 words**.

5. **Aims**: Describe the project's scope, objectives, and rationale. Specific aims for most research proposals can be itemized. There are usually no more than 2 - 3 specific aims for an eight-month to a one-year study. **Not to exceed one page**.

6. **Background**: Describe the background to the present application and the appropriateness to the state of the field of research. **Not to exceed one page**.

7. **Preliminary Studies**: Describe previous work accomplished by the applicant and co-investigator(s) relevant to the proposal. **Not to exceed one page**.

8. **Response to Reviewers’ Comments**: If the application is a new submission, please enter “New application”. If the application is a resubmission, please address the previous reviewer’s comments. **Not to exceed two pages**.

9. **Research Methods**: Describe the methods, information or techniques to be employed, the scientific basis for choice, data to be obtained, sample selection and control, data organization and analysis, management of biases, discrepant findings, errors of measurement and sample losses. Briefly describe any collaborative arrangements that will contribute to execution of the study aims. **Not to exceed two pages**. In the Appendix, provide details of collaborative arrangements and include a letter from each collaborator.

10. **Significance of this Research**: Explain how the results of the proposed work will advance the knowledge in this specific field and lead to extramural support. **Not to exceed one page**.

11. **Human subjects/vertebrate animals**: If human subjects are involved, provide details of the group from which samples will be drawn and the sampling methods to be used. If animals are used, identify the species, the approximate number to be used, a rationale for involving animals and the appropriateness of the species, and describe the proposed use of the animals. Human or animal studies should be justified with a power calculation, if appropriate. **This section is limited to 1/2 page per species (e.g., ½ page for human, ½ page murine)**. Approval from CHR and CAR must be obtained before funds can be released and within six months of notice of approval of funding.
12. References: For each cited reference (number sequentially starting with ‘1’) include the name of the author, title of the article, name of the book or journal, volume number, page numbers, and year of publication. Not to exceed one page.

13. Biographical Sketch: Please submit a current NIH Biosketch (PHS 398) for each investigator.

14. Other Research Support: List current and pending research support (extramural and intramural), support source, identification number, project title, percent of time devoted to each project, role in project, term of project, notification date for pending applications, include notification date (e.g. receipt of summary statement from NIH) and annual direct costs. List the "aims" from current or pending grants that may overlap with this application.

15. Budget: Itemize expenses for personnel, supplies, equipment, research subject payments and travel. Only eligible expenses from these five budget categories will be considered.

16. Budget Justification: Justify expenditures by category: Personnel, Supplies, Research Subject Payments, Equipment, and Travel. If applicable, describe how the budget compares with pending and/or current research support, and why funding was not subsumed by those sources. (See notes on following page explaining the five categories of budget justification).

17. Letter to Adhere to Policy Relating to the Awarding and Management of Grant Funds:

   Please read carefully
   POLICY RELATING TO THE AWARDING AND MANAGEMENT OF GRANT FUNDS

   The Academic Senate requires Principal Investigators and their Department Chairs to provide the Academic Senate with a letter that states agreement to adhere to the requirements of the Grant Award. This letter must include a Department Fund/Account to be used by the Academic Senate in the event that an overage above and beyond the total Grant Award appears in the Senate Fund/Account assigned to the Principal Investigator. Please include this letter with your original application. Only one copy is required.

18. Appendix: List Research Subjects and Environmental Protection Committee applications and/or approval number(s), letters from department chair and collaborator(s), and figures or drawings relative to the application. For the short-term lapse in funding category, include a copy of the reviewers’ critiques and the applicant’s rebuttal along with the applicant’s 5 year funding history.

   Research Subjects and Environmental Protection Committees

   Any applications involving the following Committees will not be funded unless there is evidence of (pending) approval: Committee on Animal Research (CAR), Biosafety Committee (BSC), Committee on Human Research (CHR), Radiation Safety Committee (RSC) and Radioactive Drug Research Committee (RDRC).
BUDGET JUSTIFICATION – List of Eligible Budget Categories and Expenses

Please clearly itemize the proposed budget according to the following categories and provide all the required information for each category.

**Personnel Category**
List the principal investigator, co-investigator(s) and other personnel and indicate the percent of effort for each (i.e. the percentage of daily working time to be spent by each investigator on the proposed project). Describe the specific function of each person on the budget justification page. The grant does not fund the salary of the principal investigator, co-investigator(s), consultants, postdocs, or individuals who would be considered inappropriate under the Office of Management and Budget, Circular A-21 (OMB A21) (e.g., administrative staff). Examples of allowed personnel include staff research associates, laboratory assistants, and clinical nurses.

**UCSF Fee Remission Policy:** Pertains to registered students appointed to research titles at 25% of the time or more for a full academic term. Copies of the Fee Remission Policy for Students with Research Appointments are available by telephoning 476-1558. If student remission fees are not budgeted by the investigator, the grant budget will be amended to cover that charge. University regulations allow students to work no more than 50% time during the academic year and 100% time during the summer months. This policy does not apply to non-resident tuition fees.

**Supplies Category**
Itemize consumable supplies, animals, statistical services and analysis. Equipment and software items costing less than $300 should be listed in this category. Charges for the use of UCSF owned equipment will be closely reviewed and must be accompanied by a rate sheet; radiology, clinical labs and sequencing charges usually fall under this category. Allowed charges for UCSF clinical services ordinarily fall below the "list price" that UCSF bills to third party payers. Investigators should negotiate charges with relevant clinical services and departments when preparing this application. If animals are requested, provide unit and per diem costs.

**All supply and equipment expenses must be directly related to proposed research.**

**Research Subject Payments:** A copy of the UCSF Research Subject Payment Summary is included with each CHR application packet if reimbursement is indicated on the Committee on Human Research (CHR) Cover Page. The guidelines for research subject payments applies when 1) a research protocol involving research subjects has been reviewed and approved by the Committee on Human Research which includes issuance of a CHR Approval Number and 2) the research department has completed and submitted a Research Subject Payment Summary Form to Accounts Payable with a copy of the CHR Approval Letter and a CHR Cover Page. Payments to research subjects are tax reportable as income; therefore, the PI should not make out-of-pocket direct payments to subjects and then seek reimbursement from UC. Purchases associated with research subjects such as translation services must be procured through University processes, i.e., Purchase Order. Your budget
must include a line item of the amount anticipated to cover all expenses related to Research Subject payments.

**Equipment Category**
Equipment is defined as non-expendable personal property having a useful life of more than two years and costing $300 or more per unit. Title to or ownership of all University property or material is vested in the Regents of the University of California. Without exception, equipment purchased with COR funds remains the property of the Regents of the University of California and cannot be transferred from the University. The investigator should indicate that a thorough investigation of the University Surplus Pool (502-3064) has been made and that the desired equipment is not available. If funded, the award can only be applied to the specified equipment. Please include the specific location where all equipment purchased with funds from the Academic Senate will reside. On the budget justification page, explain the need for the equipment, provide manufacturer’s price quotes for each piece of equipment and list alternate funding sources should the Committee offer partial funding. The Committee will not provide funds for a personal computer if its sole use is for the preparation of a manuscript.

*Manufacturer’s Price Quote:* An application without a manufacturer's price quote for each piece of equipment over $300 will be rejected. Please make sure that you include any tax and shipping charges related to equipment purchases in your quote and budget total.

**Travel Category**
Funds for transportation are available to conduct field research and for the purpose of gathering data and research materials. These funds are intended for transportation costs exclusively and under no circumstance can they be used for subsistence (including hotels, registration fees etc.). Use of travel funds for the attendance of professional conferences or meetings is specifically disallowed.
SUBMISSION CHECKLIST

Before Submitting, please ensure that you have included the following:

☐ Page Numbers for each page submitted
☐ Cover Page
☐ Table of Contents
☐ Funding Category Justification
☐ Abstract
☐ Aims
☐ Background
☐ Preliminary Studies
☐ Research Methods
☐ Significance of Research
☐ Human Subjects/Vertebrate Animals
☐ References
☐ Biographical Sketches
☐ Other Research Support
☐ Budget
☐ Budget Justification
☐ Letter of Agreement to Adhere to Policy Relating to the Award and Management of Grant Funds
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☐ Research Subjects and Environmental Protection Committee RSEPC Approvals
☐ Research Subject Payment documentation
☐ Letters from department chairs, collaborators
☐ Manufacturers price quote(s) for all equipment
☐ Identification of location for all equipment (address/Room #)
☐ Figures or drawings
☐ For short-term lapse category, provide a copy of reviewers’ critiques and rebuttal with investigator's five (5) year funding history.
☐ REAC applications if applicable

I have reviewed my application and prepared the above submission checklist.

__________________________________________    ___________________________
Applicant’s Name      Applicant’s Signature
APPLICATION FOR ACADEMIC SENATE INDIVIDUAL INVESTIGATOR GRANT

Principal Investigator Name: 
Faculty Title and Series: 
Department: 
Mailing Address: 
Telephone/FAX/E-mail: 
Address: 
Total Funding Request: 
Title of Project: 
Co-investigator(s): 

Select one: New submission Resubmission

Indicate any previous funding by COR: Date and amount of award

Principal area of proposed research (please check):

- Biochemistry
- Physiology
- Cellular & Developmental Biology
- Chemistry
- Epidemiology
- Pharmacology
- Genetics
- Clinical Medicine
- Bioengineering/Biomaterials
- Molecular Biology
- Immunology
- Nursing
- Policy Studies Social & Behavioral Sciences
- Other (specify):

Funding Category (please check):

- Start-up
- Short-term Lapse
- Re-entry
- New Direction

Revised 05/XX/06
Academic Senate grants are made available in part through endowment funds allocated to specific areas of research. To help the Senate Office when processing awards, please check all funding categories in the table provided below that can be applied to this project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epilepsy</th>
<th>Cancer</th>
<th>Parkinson's</th>
<th>Heart</th>
<th>Eye</th>
<th>Circulatory</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Next to each Research Subjects and Environmental Protection Committee (RSEPC) indicate if study is:

Approved (A)  Pending (P)  Not Applicable (NA)

- Animal
- Biosafety
- Chemical Safety
- Human
- Radiation Safety
- Radioactive Drug

Proposed Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>Supplies and Equipment [under $500]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>Equipment [over $500]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>Travel Reimbursement for Human Subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principal Investigator: I agree to accept responsibility for the scientific conduct of the project and to provide the required reports if a grant is awarded as a result of this application.

______________________________________   ______________________________________
(Principal Investigator Signature)     (Co-Investigator Signature)

______________________________________   ______________________________________
(Department Chair Signature)     (Co-Investigator Signature)

Please direct any questions to the Academic Senate Office - 514-2696

Revised 05/XX/06
INDIVIDUAL INVESTIGATOR GRANT CRITIQUE FORM October, 2006

IMPORTANT – Please return forms only by email to spatel@senate.ucsf.edu.

Instructions for Completion: This form should be completed by each reviewer. Please consider each area of review carefully, and make sure the form is as complete as possible. Please direct questions to: Shilpa Patel, Senior Senate Analyst, 514-2696, spatel@senate.ucsf.edu or John Kurhanewicz, Chair, 353-9410.

**FINAL PRIORITY SCORE:** [ ] **APPROVE AWARD?** [ ] **YES/NO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer’s Name:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer’s Telephone:</td>
<td>Fax:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant’s Name:</td>
<td>E-mail:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department:</td>
<td>Total Amount Requested: $</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Academic Senate grants are made available in part through endowment funds allocated to specific areas of research. To help the Senate Office when processing awards, please check all funding categories in the table provided below that can be applied to this project. In the general comments section of your review, please indicate any categories that were identified by the applicant that you deem inappropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epilepsy</th>
<th>Cancer</th>
<th>Parkinson’s</th>
<th>Heart</th>
<th>Eye</th>
<th>Circulatory</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The final priority score awarded to each application is determined by secret ballot during the review meeting. Please indicate a score below to guide committee members in their review of the application.

1.0 – 1.9 **Outstanding**
2.0 – 2.9 **Excellent**
3.0 – 3.9 **Good**
4.0 – 5.0 **Not Fundable**

In accordance with the funding category priority listed in the eligibility section of the IIG guidelines, the following weight will be applied to the final score to adjust for funding category: 1.00, Start-up (new investigator); 1.05, Short-term Lapse; 1.10, Re-entry; and 1.15, New Direction. Following triage of applications that are not fundable, the weight will be applied the mean score calculated from the score ballots collected following the discussion of a given application by the Research Committee.

Please note: it is essential that reviewers include constructive suggestions to improve the application. Regardless of whether the application is selected for funding, this information will be inserted into the award notice. Space for comments is provided at end of form.
The tables below are provided to aid you in your review. Please do not hesitate to contact Shilpa or the Research Committee Chairperson should you have any questions regarding their completion.

APPLICATION CATEGORIES

To assist you in evaluating the current proposal, the following two tables have been provided that itemizes the general criteria for each funding category. Please place an “X” in the “Yes” or “No” column for each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>START UP</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the applicant junior faculty?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a letter of support from the Department Chair?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the applicant independent?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the project distinctly that of the applicant?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are funds available to the applicant from other sources (e.g., start-up funds, matching funds), as indicated in the Letter from the applicant’s Dept. Chair?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHORT-TERM LAPSE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the previous 5 year funding history included?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are reviewer comments and rebuttal included?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW DIRECTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does this application represent a distinct new direction of research for the applicant?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RE-ENTRY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the applicant proposing to re-enter research from a non-research pathway (e.g. a pathway dedicated to teaching or clinical practice?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**GENERAL REVIEW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESEARCH PLAN</strong></td>
<td>Is the PI directly involved in project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are the aims, scope and rationale clearly described?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the background well described and appropriate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are the preliminary studies well described and pertinent?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are the research methods well described?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERAL</strong></td>
<td>Is the application written to permit an easy review?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is there scientific overlap with pending or existing grants?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the applicant a new PI?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the applicant a senior PI?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the funding category well-justified?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is it clearly explained how the results to be obtained will be used to support a subsequent application for outside funding?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will the results of the proposed work advance the knowledge in this specific field and lead to extramural support?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the use of human subjects/vertebrate animals justified?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BUDGET</strong></td>
<td>Is there budgetary overlap w/pending or existing grants?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has an application been made to REAC?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If so, does the REAC budget overlap COR budget request?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are personnel costs justified/appropriate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are travel costs justified/appropriate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is supply budget justified/appropriate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are equipment purchases justified/appropriate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For any equipment, is the manufacturer’s price quote included?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the overall budget justified?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMENTS
Please provide additional comments below, detailing the strengths and weaknesses of the application. Please do not limit your comments to a summary of the application, but include detailed criticisms. These comments will be given to applicants verbatim, and should be phrased appropriately.
April 21, 2006

John Kurhanewicz, PhD
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate Committee on Research
185 Berry Street 377
Box 0946 - Ste.350
University of California, San Francisco
San Francisco, CA. 94143 - 0946

Dear Dr. Kurhanewicz,

As a follow up to the actions of the Committee on Research related to the creation of a new Academic Senate Lecture honoring Translational Researchers at UCSF, I recently met with Executive Vice Chancellor Gene Washington and Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Sally Marshall to further discuss consideration of this proposed lecture.

Both Drs. Washington and Marshall support the creation of a new Academic Senate Translational Research Lecture. In order to advance this initiative, we have been asked to review the two existing lectures now sponsored by the Academic Senate (Faculty Research Lecture and Distinguished Clinical Research Lecture) and to ensure that these two lectures and a new “Distinguished Translational Research Lecture Award” would each have a distinctly different purpose, as well as clear and distinct criteria that is not overlapping or redundant.

As such, I would like to ask the Committee on Research to develop and a set of recommended criteria that distinguishes the proposed Distinguished Translational Research Lecture from the two existing lectureships. Additionally, I would like to ask that you also review the criteria for the existing lecturerships to determine if any additional criteria or clarity is needed and to forward your recommendations to me, as soon as possible, for consideration by the Coordinating Committee. In addition to developing a set of recommended criteria for a new lecture called the Distinguished Translational Research Lecture Award, please also think about the time of year when you would recommend that this lecture be given.

Regarding the Committee’s recommendation of the creation of a named lecture honoring Vice Chancellor and Professor Emeritus Dorothy (Dee) Bainton, Drs. Washington and Marshall indicated that they would like to discuss a potential separate lecture honoring former VC Bainton with the Chancellor.

Thank you for alerting me to the Committee’s on-going interest in pursuing these lectures and for all of the Committee’s hard work throughout the year.

Yours sincerely,

Deborah Greenspan, DSc, BDS
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate

cc: Academic Senate Office