Committee on Research
Roland Henry, PhD Chair

MINUTES
Monday, February 14, 2011


GUESTS: Julie Auger, Executive Director, Research Resource Program

The Committee on Research was called to order by Vice Chair Moskowitz on February 14, 2011 at 10:08 a.m. in room S-30. A quorum was present at 10:15 am.

Chair’s Announcements
Chair Henry is out of town at a conference. Vice Chair Moskowitz provided announcements.

As an update to last month’s meeting was the letter going to the RAP Executive Board. In particular was the angle of needed support for social and behavioral sciences representation and support. Also raised was issues with particular committees and what the campus-wide plan is in re supporting the development of IT systems. At the campus level, Clay Johnston is developing a subcommittee focused on clinical systems and technology. Analyst Cleaver will inquire of Dr. Johnston on this subcommittee.

COR members also highlighted comments heard from P.I.s outside of COR, who were concerned about not receiving a fair review due to lack of expertise and conflicts of interests issues with RAP Review Committee members.

Members wondered if a space could be added to the RAP application allowing applicants to request which committee their grant will be reviewed by? Separately, it would be good to allow P.I.s the opportunity to request it be moved to another committee, if it’s not appropriate. Perhaps allow the P.I. to list a primary and secondary committee they would prefer review their grant.

Members also discussed the potential merger with iMedRis and problems with it.

Analyst Cleaver reminded COR members of upcoming important dates and deadlines including the May and June meetings being review and decision meetings for RAP Grants and Faculty Research Lectures.

Approval of Minutes
The minutes of the January 24, 2011 meeting were approved with a correction to the attendance list. They will be posted to the Senate website by the Academic Senate office.
Presentation on the Research Resource Program – Julie Auger, Executive Director

Executive Director Julie Auger provided an overview of the Research Resource Program (RRP), which focuses on the business development and management of core facilities including administrative functions. Key facts are:

1. The 2007 UCSF Strategic Plan states that development of Campus Core Research Facilities (CCRFs) is one of the highest priorities for achieving the goal of translating research discoveries into improvement in human health.
2. In 2008, one out of every ten research dollars went to a UCSF core.
3. Scientific operations are left in the hands of core faculty and technical directors; the RRP structure provides administration functions and support.
4. Cores supported by RRP adhere to a set of key principles: equal access, non-competitive, educational & research components in addition to the service arm.

The Research Resource Program was established to address:

1. The increasing occurrence of ad hoc core development.
2. Overlapping services and competition among under-resourced cores.
3. Differential access and charges.
4. Diverse/non-consistent administrative practices across research units.
5. Lack of funding for new equipment and technologies needed for cutting-edge basic and clinical research.

Defining the Needs: Community Input

Constituent: Research Faculty/University
1. Informed strategic planning.
2. Business model development for sustainable investments.
4. Focus on education and R&D as well as service provision.

Constituent: Core Facilities
1. Advocacy for resources including capital technology funds, space and operating fund underwriting.
2. Better management tools (data, financial, personnel).
3. Professional career path development: provide core directors with the ability to hire and retain staff.

Strategic Priorities for RRP
2. Identify and Implement Best Practices in Administration.
3. Strategic Planning.

General Discussion

At present, UCSF has eighty-five core facilities. However, research has revealed that some of these may not actually be cores. In addition, many of the broad campus-wide decisions on the management of cores must be made at an institutional level. The idea that faculty are doing things on their “own” isn’t viable any longer.

Julie Auger foresees that RRP may end up being the oversight agent for all cores. Some COR members expressed interest in participating in the creation of an RRP Advisory Board. COR members thought an advisory board should address matters including:

1. If the department/group has sufficient initial funds and individuals to meet the requirements needed for the establishment of a core facility, do they have funds for the maintenance of it?
2. Having the scientific oversight to be included in the creation of core facilities—not just business applications.
3. The need for guiding checks and balances to be created for the management of a core facility. Examples include insuring that those at core facilities have the expertise to be beneficial to faculty using the facility; having the facility be usable during business hours or at least something other than between midnight and five a.m.

4. Training faculty to be self-monitoring of the core facility.

COR members raised questions of communicating about core facilities and RRP to the UCSF campus as a whole. Julie Auger spoke to barriers she faces in growing RRP— including communication and establishing monthly core director meetings. Such communication is critical for operational directors, especially so as to eliminate redundancy fears and business management issue. The existence of RRP is also a highly beneficial recruiting tool for departments and groups—if people are aware of it.

COR members encourage Julie Auger to contact the committee regarding the development of an RRP Advisory Board and to update the committee about progress on communication efforts.

**Old Business**
None.

**New Business**
None.

Vice Chair Moskowitz adjourned the meeting at 11:42am.
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