Committee on Research  
Roland Henry, PhD Chair

MINUTES
Monday, January 24, 2011


GUESTS:  Heather Alden, Executive Director, Academic Senate Office

The Committee on Research was called to order by Chair Henry on January 24, 2011 at 10:00 a.m. in room S-226. A quorum was present at 10:15am.

Chair’s Announcements
Chair Henry updated the committee on the transition of RAP from CTSI to being housed within the EVCP.

The EVCP office is going to provide $200K over two years to fund RAP’s development. The annual RAP expense is $200K. The remaining amount is to be split between all the funding agencies. The annual RAP expense for COR will be between $13-$20K, depending on the number of grants distributed annually.

Approval of Minutes
The minutes of the December 13, 2010 meeting were approved with a correction to the attendance list. They will be posted to the Senate website by the Academic Senate office.

Wrap-up Discussion: RAP
Overall RAP received 104 applications and funded 58% of all grants. COR funded about half the number of grants that we usually fund based on value of the endowment funds and interest rates and the economy. By joining RAP, COR was able to have other agencies take on grants that we scored higher but didn't have the funds for; and allowed us to fund those that scored lower on our rankings list, but for which we had pockets of money.

Ongoing Issues
The central Office of Research at UCSF and Systemwide continues to undergo change. Chair Henry proposed that RAP may ultimately be folded into the current iMedRIS [http://its.ucsf.edu/main/9816-DSY.html] online submission system for the Committee on Human Research (CHR), the Clinical Research Centers (CRC), and the Gamete, Embryo and Stem Cell Committee (GESCR).

At present, Research Allocation Program (RAP) uses the Proposal Central program for its grant application processing. If RAP folded into iMedRIS it would allow the entire grant system to be supported by pre-existing campus systems and infrastructure.
Executive Director H. Alden recommended COR members create a list of logistical recommendations, and that information be delivered to both RAP Administration and Office of Research. Preliminary issues included:

1. Articulate when and how COR members will be appointed to RAP committees.
2. Clearly define RAP review committee membership. How many years can a faculty member serve on RAP? How should individual RAP review committee membership be defined? certain # of years, Senate members, clinical representatives?
3. Describe how RAP review committee chairs are selected. The process should be clearly defined and transparent.
4. COR members’ experiences with RAP review committees varied. Some COR members observed that their RAP review committee was well-run, while others expressed the following concerns:
   a. Clearly define COR members' roles on RAP review committees.
   b. Improve transparency and equity in the grant review assignment process. RAP committee members would like to participate in the grant review assignment process.
   c. Attendance and participation in the RAP review committee should be open to all faculty asked to serve on that committee, not only those who reviewed grant applications.
   d. Improve meeting scheduling administration. RAP review committee members need much further advance notice of meeting schedules.
5. Create a list of faculty (including COR members) available for ad hoc application reviews. This list could include COR members not assigned to specific RAP review committees.
6. Ensure that faculty from social and behavioral sciences are represented on Review Committees (both the types of committees AND having such faculty ON Review Committees)? Ensure that faculty from social and behavioral sciences are being represented on RAP review committees. Some RAP review committees may not need a dedicated member from social and behavioral sciences, but may benefit from ad hoc consultation with a social and behavioral sciences faculty member. COR members agreed that those who were willing to serve as a consultant reviewer could list their areas of expertise so they could be available for ad hoc reviews.
7. Members proposed being included in the appointment of grants to committees. If that is to occur however, a member from each funding agency would need to be included in the grant appointment process.

COR members concluded that while a faculty member serves on COR, they may also serve on a RAP committee. As soon as their COR serve ends, does their COR representation role on a RAP committee. They may choose to continue to review for RAP, but not as a COR (Academic Senate) representative.

Analyst Cleaver will draft a letter compiling the above and addressed to the RAP Executive Board.

COR Endowment Funds Situation – Heather Alden, Executive Director, UCSF Academic Senate

Executive Director Heather Alden provided an overview on the history of COR’s endowment funds and the results of a meeting she had with the Development Office. All funds were bequeaths, given to the Regents in wills to be put toward research in particular areas. Until these areas are resolved—i.e., cancer is cured—the Senate cannot use those funds for any other area of research, except as designated by the wills.

The Development Office said anything given to UC is coordinated through the UC Foundation office. It would take a Chancellor or VC opinion to designate such funds be directed to the Academic Senate.

Director Alden asked COR members what in their opinion was the value of having research funds come from the Academic Senate and within it the Committee of Research? Combined, members determined:

1. The Senate has the broadest reach among the faculty at UCSF. It encourages applicants from all schools and all avenues to apply and receive funding. Whereas some other funding agencies are
more narrowly focused: CTSI just on clinical or translational science for example; or REAC just on School of Medicine.

2. Committee on Research represents the will of the faculty—no other committee represents that. Ones’ peers confer funds and awards such as the Faculty Research Lectures.

The Senate office will initiate development of an ongoing online brief survey or progress report to route to past recipients of Senate endowment funds. This will enable the office to determine the long-term value—in re publications, additional grants, patents, etc.—of researchers receiving Senate grants.

Old Business
Analyst Cleaver reminded committee members of the upcoming Faculty Research Lecture — Basic Science being given by Dr. Lewis Lanier on Monday February 14 from 3:30 – 5pm in Cole Hall. It will also be simulcast to Mission Bay Campus, Rock Hall 102. Posters will be going up around campus this week.

New Business
None.

Chair Henry adjourned the meeting at 12:00pm.