COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH
Charles McCulloch, PhD – Chair

MINUTES
Meeting of September 13, 2006


Absent: K. Covinsky, S. Habelitz, J. Huang, P. Kwok, E. Murphy

The Committee on Research convened at 9:08 a.m. on Tuesday, November 15, 2005 in Room S-30. A quorum was present.

Approval of Minutes
The minutes of the meetings of June 7, 2006 and June 20, 2006 were approved unanimously.

Chair’s Report – Chair McCulloch
Chair McCulloch welcomed members and asked everyone to introduce themselves. He then reviewed bylaws, charge to the Committee, and grant assignments, and conflict of interest. He stressed the importance of having regular meetings and attendance.

Introduction to Committee Service – T. Maimon
Tamara Maimon, Director, Office of the Academic Senate, reviewed the latest issues facing the Committee including travel grants and the time change to the Distinguished Clinical Research Lecture. The lecture will now be held at noon time. She then explained how the endowment funds work and due to the specific bequests, awarding the monies is sometimes difficult. M. Springer commented that in his earlier submissions, he would get a denial letter with a very positive review with no indication as to why he was denied the funds. He requested that the denial letter include a statement acknowledging that the grant was not funded based on lack of funds not poor grant. L. Bero suggested following up on grants to see how many lead to NIH funding.

Expected Work Contributions – Chair McCulloch
Chair McCulloch again stressed attendance and the importance of participating in subcommittee work. He stated that he will be aggressively recruiting subcommittee members from meeting non-attendees.

Consideration of a Translational Lecture
Chair McCulloch went over the pros and cons of having a translational lecture. Pros included recognition of worthy faculty and inclusion of more types of research. One major concern is that more lectureships might dilute the prestige of each. Members M. Springer and P. Ling expressed commented that there will still be
large pockets of faculty that will continue to go unrecognized. P. Ling queried whether it would be possible
to get data on the applicants.

Grant Guidelines Revision – Vice Chair Aouizerat
Vice Chair Aouizerat reviewed the changes to the Individual Investigator Guidelines. Some of the changes
include: examples for the New Direction category with a warning that it is the hardest category to fulfill; a
checklist to aid the Senate Office; new size limitations. Also weight will be given to applications as the goal
of the grant has always been to fund new investigators. L. Bero queried whether we should inform
applicants that their applications are being weighted.

J. Koheler was concerned about how do rate an applicant with an already large start-up package. Many
members suggested posting the reviewer critique form for applicant reference. Also, the Committee decided
to pilot the weighting scheme. Some worried that weighting factors might offset the reluctance to fund the
more “rich” applicants. M. Springer clarified that start-up funds are taken into account while reviewing the
grant and the weighted factors come in at the end.

Vice Chair Aouizerat summarized the changes:
1. Add a statement in the beginning linking the critique (granting access to weighting)
2. Change “matching funds” to “other funds”;
3. Change “individual” to “individual research program”
4. Bold “Junior investigator in need of support”.

The revised guidelines for the Individual Investigator Grant were unanimously approved as amended.

Subcommittee Report on Review of Strategic Planning Initiative – L. Bero
L. Bero gave an overview of the report and informed the committee that the subcommittee reviewed mostly
Section B dealing with research directions. A summary of the Committee’s discussion can be found in
Appendix 1.

Discussion of Issues the Committee Could Proactively Address
Chair McCulloch solicited issues from the Committee that should be pursued. Some ideas included:
- Direct coordination with EVC’s Office of Research;
- Researcher rights with regards to inventions and patents;
- Mechanisms for interdigitating with the Clinical and Translational Scientific Institute (CTSI) –
  including perhaps a statement from this Committee on how we are work with Institute;
- Evaluation of work in evolving grant landscape: lack of an RO1 grant sometimes implies less than
  stellar research. If the Committee on Academic Personnel is working on this, perhaps this
  Committee can draft a communication to CAP and EVC expressing our view;
- Weigh in on the proposal for a Campus Core Research Facility (CCRF) which would provide
  instrumentation and specialized services that benefit a broad segment of the UCSF research
  community, and are available to the whole community. The Committee can ask Keith Yamamoto to
give a presentation.

There being no further business, Chair McCulloch adjourned the meeting at 11:15 a.m.
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Comments on Strategic Planning Goals and Design Teams from Committee on Research (Academic Senate)

Overall, the committee supported the approach of having the strategy design teams and having each team address the goals that are relevant to that team’s mission. We were also happy to see that a number of goals were repeated under different teams and that Goal #3 (provide a supportive work environment…) spans all teams.

1. DISCUSSION OF GOAL #4
Our major discussion involved Goal #4:
**GOAL #4: Foster the UCSF research enterprise across multiple sites; determine priority research areas, as well as the criteria for defining priorities, for further development. (emphasis added)**

The committee expressed some concern about the italicized phrase “determine priority research areas.” Comments ranged from a suggestion to delete this phrase to recognizing that defining priorities is very difficult in such a diverse research setting as UCSF.

It is our understanding that these priority research areas would direct the efforts of the UCSF development office. Therefore, we were concerned that this would be “a subtle form of discrimination” against faculty, particularly junior faculty, who did not fall within these research areas. We were concerned that these faculty would have decreased access to space and other resources. We also felt that doing meaningful research in these priority areas would be largely influenced by the amount of external funding available to those research areas and was out of the control of UCSF.

We were concerned that determining priority research areas would be a detriment to faculty retention and recruitment if it discouraged faculty from pursuing their interests. Any development of criteria for priority areas should mention developing mechanisms to provide resources in an equitable manner. Feelings of inequity or a lack of transparency about how resources are distributed can contribute to lack of a supportive work environment.

The committee suggested that developing criteria for priority areas should capitalize on our strengths and that focusing some research on common goals might be useful.

We suggested adding these additional questions under Goal #4:

- a. How do we identify the individuals who make decision about criteria for priorities? How do we insure equal voice and diversity across campuses?
- b. How do we increase the value of translational sciences on this campus?
- c. How can the UCSF research enterprise across all campuses be streamlined and supported? Are there redundant services that can be combined or inefficiencies that can be streamlined?

2. MISSING GOALS
We identified a number of issues that we felt should be explicitly mentioned as goals:

1. Supporting junior faculty, particularly to do research.
2. Developing mechanisms to allow faculty to recover more of the indirect costs from
grants. And, to make the process for distribution of indirecets more transparent to faculty.
This is relevant to streamlining research processes, fostering research, and promoting
 collaboration among campuses. For example, in multiple campus collaborations, each
campus charges indirects making these multi-campus grants less competitive. We
suggeset exploring mechanisms such as those at the VA where 10% of indirects go
directly to faculty administrative accounts.

3. Coordination of websites campus-wide should be a subgoal under developing
communication (Goal #12)

4. Achieving diversity in leadership should be a goal.

5. Improving the effectiveness and competitiveness of UCSF core facilities should be a
subgoal under providing facilities and infrastructure (Goal #14).

3. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS
We recommend that an evaluation plan be developed for every goal (how do we know we
are reaching these goals).

We felt that the variety of research on our campus should be recognized throughout the
document. For example, using the term “research disciplines” rather than “science,” or
explicitly defining “science” as including basic, clinical, and social.

We suggest that some experienced patients could be included as members of Team D:
Clinical Care.

We felt that “diversity” needs to be defined. Diversity in terms of ethnicity, research,
other criteria?

We were glad to see that the goals recognize that 1) the recruitment/retention issues will
differ for faculty, staff, students, residents, etc., 2) communication across campuses is a
serious challenge.

4. CLARIFYING CHARGES TO DESIGN TEAMS
We had suggestions for a number of questions that could be added to the charges to the
design teams as outlined below:

GOAL #5: Build novel interdisciplinary and inter-school approaches towards
education, research and health care that prepare UCSF for the future.*

a. What specific strategies are needed to promote interdisciplinary interaction
(dialogue) across schools

b. Given that one of the top ten values identified through the strategic planning work
is ”Diversity”. How do we foster the growth of ethnically diverse scientists of all
disciplines?
GOAL #6: Develop innovative education and research programs across professional schools that support the vision for UCSF of promoting global health.*
   a. What are the global resources available and who would be the partners?

GOAL #8: Work in partnership with the community to reduce health disparities.*
   a. What mechanisms and infrastructure are needed to facilitate these collaborations?
   b. How can this best be accomplished across UCSF’s professional schools?

GOAL #16: Ensure top quality institutional leadership.

Question a (What is the current process for selecting senior leaders and what would our ideal process look like?) should be followed up with b) how far is our current process from the ideal, what are the barriers to closing that gap?