The Committee on Research was called to order by Chair Moskowitz on January 23, 2012 at 10:00 a.m. in room S-30. A quorum was present at 10:10 am.

Chair’s Announcements
Chair Moskowitz went over the results of the Research Allocation Program (RAP) Fall 2011 Funding Cycle, Committee on Research funded fourteen grants, with a maximum score of 3.7. RAP itself funded 40% of all submitted grants for a combined funding total of $2.3M.

Chair Moskowitz reminded committee members of the upcoming Faculty Research Lecture—Basic Science honoring Drs. Ying-Hui Fu and Louis J. Ptacek. The lecture is on February 15, 2012 from 3:30 – 5pm at Rock Hall, Mission Bay Campus. A live simulcast through Podcasts@UCSF will be available. A reception will follow at Rock Hall. The lecture’s title is “Human Genetics and Systems Neuroscience: Genes and Molecules to Human Sleep Behaviors”.

Finally, Chair Moskowitz updated Committee on Research members on her participation on the Research Advisory Board (RAB). At the January 2012 meeting, committee members discussed the recent lowering of the NIH Salary Cap. RAB and COR both request a communication from campus leadership on this lowering and how administration sees this impacting faculty at UCSF. From the Committee on Research viewpoint, this very much could impact mid-level and senior faculty who could end up with a salary cut. This would then leave departments to make up the difference, where no funds exist to cover it.

UCORP Update
UCSF UCORP Representative Ralph Marcucio updated the committee on matters covered at the Systemwide level. Discussed recently were the Review of the UC Observatories and the development of metrics to process and assess Systemwide Research projects.

Members had no comment on the draft Review of the UC Observatories. Discussed at length by Committee members was how to value and determine metrics for Systemwide projects. While healthcare research can be measured, how is research related to, for example, anthropology or history measured?
Members offered the following ideas:

1. Combining expertise of faculty from other UC campuses which could be funneled into one singular focus
2. Developing a standard Systemwide to compare everything to. Perhaps a UC economist can examine this.

Approval of Minutes
The minutes of the December 5, 2011 meeting were approved with revisions to Chair’s Announcements and attendance. They will be posted to the Senate website by the Academic Senate office.

Preparatory Discussion on UCOP Vice President Steven Beckwith Visit
Committee members discussed topics for VP Beckwith’s February 27, 2012 Committee on Research visit:

1. What is VP Beckwith’s vision for research in the UC Systemwide?
   a. How does VP Beckwith see UCSF within that overall vision?
2. How can/should Systemwide research projects be funded?
3. Efforts to afford and maintain graduate student tuition levels?
4. How does the Institute of Neurodegenerative Disorders fit into the overall multi-campus research initiative?
   a. Or QB3?
   b. Or the Global Health Program?
   c. Or Tobacco-related Research Projects?

Summation of Ryan Eye Endowment Fund Subcommittee Meeting
Subcommittee Chair Myers updated the committee on the outcome of the subcommittee meeting.

Chair Moskowitz also raised the issue of communicating to UCSF Academic Senate Chair and UCOP on including salary support in their grants. Member Lee offered suggesting that "a portion" of grant funds go towards funding salary.

Analyst Cleaver will examine the State, Federal, and Systemwide policies and develop a Communication to UCSF Academic Senate Chair Newcomer for committee members to approve via email.

CHR Subcommittee
J. Heldens, Director, HRPP gave an overview on how the Campus Committee on Human Research works. Changing government policies will impact CHR policies at a Campus level. Associate Vice Chancellor Boyd advised that the current structure of CHR can be changed. The goal however would be that any changes wouldn't negatively affect the volume or speed of proposals reviewed.

Breakdown of CHR proposals received:

1. 33% are standard clinical research proposals (clinical trials, etc.)
2. 33% are non-human contact research (examining patient medical charts, etc.)
3. A part of the remaining percentage includes behavioral studies that are difficult for CHR to review.
   The Case Study COR members reviewed earlier falls within this group
**Discussion Points**

1. Once on the Institutional Review Board, Chairs for CHR Committees are selected based on their participation level.
   a. Compensation for IRB members and Chairs at a campuswide-level is being explored.
      There is currently nominal compensation for IRB and IRB Chairs at UCSF. An examination of private institutions’ compensation shows that they pay more.
      i. Some departments separately compensate members.
      ii. Academic Affairs gives faculty members on IRB Committees a one year merit advancement for their service.
   b. A task force is examining this with recommendations being delivered to EVCP Bluestone with recommendations for tenure inclusion.
      i. COR members offered the idea of percent time or percent effort.

2. CHR Members are appointed for two years.
   a. There are no term limits. Current term participation is on average four years.
   b. COR members expressed both pros and cons of there being no term limits.
      i. Concerns included freshness of reviewers, or turnover, of evaluating members current skill levels.
   c. COR members requested there be a standardized Call for Service and a standardized Participation Form.
   d. UCSF HRRP doesn't have capacity to train people in research methodologies. However at every meeting, standards and protocols are explained. Other institutions do have annual IRB Retreats or required Trainings.
      i. COR members suggested having a new CHR committee be trained to tackle problem proposals.
      ii. COR members further requested standards be created to assist in the training of CHR members.
      iii. COR Members suggested the creation of a list of ad-hoc reviewers to pitch-hit for reviews where there isn't a faculty member with expertise on the CHR.
   e. AVC Boyd said that developing CHR review committees along both departmental and methodological lines is a pathway being considered.
      i. However how is “doing well” defined for CHR members?

3. UCSF CHR has an expedited committee review.
   a. A preliminary review of proposals can bump it to expedited review versus full committee. This has allowed for increased processing of requests.
   b. COR members asked if, within social and behavioral study proposals, CHR is required to approve every review question to be posed during a survey?
      i. Director Heldens said that's the nature of CHR reviews. If necessary, then yes, each question is to be reviewed and approved.
      ii. COR members supported the CHR idea that a new committee be developed to directly address social and behavioral science proposals.
         1. COR members asked if CHR could populate such a committee on an ongoing basis.
   c. COR members wondered about institutional memory of CHR reviewers.
      i. Director Heldens advised that there's no guarantee that a proposal is going to go to the same CHR committee. However, the Analyst assigned the proposal originally will keep the proposal all the way through the approval process. In the future, this should alleviate some of those similar examples from happening.

4. Appeals process for unapproved proposals
   a. Faculty members cannot overrule the CHR, however they should contact—as a first step—John Heldens or AVC Boyd directly.
b. Director Heldens said he's only seen one appeal in all his years with HRPP.
c. Every CHR Committee is open to receiving people who have appeal inquiries
d. If it's a first time first-review, the investigator is often invited to speak.

5. Evaluation of Review Quality
   a. There is no measure of the quality of review.
   b. Metrics exist for volume of proposals, but nothing on standards of review quality
   c. COR members suggested the development of a standard User Satisfaction Survey, where one of the questions raised addresses quality.

Director Heldens and ACV Boyd offered to return to the Committee on Research to present changes instituted or proposed by HRPP. COR members offered to be part of any committee or task force developed to examine such changes.

**Old Business**
None.

**New Business**
None.

Chair Moskowitz adjourned the meeting at 12:28pm.
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