Committee on Research  
Judith Moskowitz, PhD, MPH, Chair

MINUTES  
Monday, February 27, 2012

PRESENT:  J. Moskowitz (Chair), S. Nagarajan (Vice Chair), D. Apollonio, L. Dunn, D. Foster, S. Gansky, J. Hahn, R. Hendren, L. Julian, S. Kools, C. Kaplan, K. Lee, W. Li, M. Mankani, R. Marcucio, J. Myers, D. Xu

ABSENT:  S. Ho, G. Humfleet, V. Singh, M. West

GUESTS:  S. Beckwith, Vice President of Research & Graduate Studies, UC Systemwide

The Committee on Research was called to order by Chair Moskowitz on February 27, 2012 at 10:40 a.m. in room S-30. A quorum was present.

Chair’s Announcements  
Chair Moskowitz advised members that they may be getting invitations from Contracts & Grants on Limited Submission Review Committees. Chair J. Greenspan wanted more Academic Senate input.

The Communication from this committee on the Senate paying for a portion of faculty salary if requested in grant applications will be voted on at the next Coordinating Committee. If approved, it can go into effect with the RAP Spring 2012 cycle. The RAP website will be updated over the summer.

It is projected that RAP may need to create a one-time review committee for the Ryan Endowment Fund grants received this cycle. Any COR members not already serving on a RAP Review Committee and who have expertise in eye research – regardless of field – may be pulled to serve on this committee.

Follow-up Discussion: CHR  
Chair Moskowitz led a discussion on the presentation by CHR Chair Heldens and AVC Boyd at January’s meeting. Overall COR members appreciated the positive and receptive tone.

ACTION:  COR members will draft a follow-up Communication to CHR Chair Heldens and AVC Boyd to recommend a partnership between COR and CHR such that suggestions to CHR are developed and put into action. Of particular importance to COR members were the following suggestions:

1. Development of a Social Sciences-specific CHR subgroup委员会
2. Develop an avenue for faculty challenges to CHR decisions
3. Include in this are CHR decisions that are contrary to all of their previous decisions.
   a. COR Member Kaplan cited as an example the policy of giving $2 bills to physicians as incentives for filling out surveys. This standard was suddenly deemed “unethical” by a UCSF CHR committee. Even CHR Chair Heldens found this decision problematic.
4. Standardize CHR training or create a training checklist to verify CHR members are current on relevant topics and not challenging standard practices
   a. COR Members proposed soliciting anonymous responses from UCSF faculty on CHR issues to get a broader understanding of how widespread an issue this may be
b. COR members also asked about quality of CHR reviews and asked that questions pertaining to this be included.

c. CHR Subcommittee Chair Dunn will draft a survey. Once finalized, the Senate will distribute to allacad@listserv.ucsf.edu

Chair Moskowitz, CHR Subcommittee Chair Dunn, and Senate Analyst Cleaver will schedule a meeting with AVC Boyd to discuss next steps with her.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the January 23, 2012 meeting were approved with revisions to the discussion on the Committee on Human Research. They will be posted to the Senate website by the Academic Senate office.

UC Systemwide Discussion on Research & Graduate Studies – Steven Beckwith, VP

Steven Beckwith, Vice President of Research & Graduate Studies, UC System, provided members an overview of his background and the research policy from a UCOP perspective. In examining how UCSF fits into the UCOP research focus, VP Beckwith advised that UCSF has a history of science which is very relevant to society at-large. This is easy to sell and is supported by society. Further:

1. UCSF would benefit greatly from Systemwide collaborations that come through UCOP.
   a. For example, UCOP has a program where the fees garnered through the running of national labs is then given back to faculty through an open RFP call.
   b. At the last call, UCSF was the biggest winner in terms of number of submissions and number of winners. This was due to collaboration with Livermore researchers using new “light sources” to examine key molecules.

2. UCSF is poised to make a big difference in specific fields of healthcare. There is a influx of new methods and tools coming from biotech into academic settings which should/could be acquired, rented, or collaborated with thus expanding the academic reach and impact on the economy.

3. UCSF does an incredible job on very basic research that provides a solid overall background from which further very specific research can be accomplished.

4. Potential pathways for UCSF in the future:
   a. New demands on universities/academia especially in the form of drugs and drug delivery. However the number of clinical trials is decreasing due to cost.
   b. New approaches for healthcare which are a result of changes in numerous arenas such as public policy changes or insurance issues can serve as an impetus for exploration in telemedicine or other types of health and technology combinations.
   c. New expectations for technology transfer to address issues with a more immediate (economic) focus need to be curbed such that research—basic or specific—does not become a trend.
      i. There should be a deeper focus on basic science as you never know where the information or solution might come from.
   d. Predictive models for biology (i.e., genomic maps or computer modeling of nascent biology) have the potential to revolutionize UCSF.
      i. For example, they could determine the impact of pharmaceutical drugs in advance of testing them in people’s bodies.

VP Beckwith sees UCSF lacking in the following:

1. Stronger ties between biology and physical chemistry with bioengineering and bioinformatics. This includes physics, math, chemistry being linked with nanotechnology and such developing businesses. EVCP J. Bluestone and VC K. Yamamoto both have a vision that’s in line with VP Beckwith’s.
2. UCSF doesn't have a “light source” on campus as of yet. Lawrence Laboratory has one and is thinking of getting a new one.
3. A Supercomputer. VP Beckwith thinks should be acquired or a permanent collaboration with a technology company i.e. Google should be established. However if this second option is pursued, there is an increased policy drive to make big data sets public. If that push continues, then who is going to store the data and who is going to pay for that storing?
4. Development of nanofabrication labs should be pursued as well.

UC Systemwide Initiatives
VP Beckwith wants the UC Systemwide projects and systems to be transparent in how they’re formulated and managed including their funding. He asked that UCORP and UCSF Rep to UCORP, Ralph Marcucio, pay attention to this.
1. Of particular issue with multi-campus research units is recurring and repetitive funding mechanisms.
   a. Once these bodies are funded, they never seem to stop receiving funding, per VP Beckwith.
   b. However if they’re not delivering, why do they continue to get funding?
   c. VP Beckwith is examining what the value is for these big initiatives.
      i. Included in this is development of an evaluation system to examine if the UC System is getting the value for its continuous funding.

Patent Agreements
VP Beckwith provided an overview of the Stanford v. Roche suit that produced the revised agreement all UC employees involved in research have been asked to sign.

The main UC worry is of liability. The prior agreement was unclear if UC actually does own what its thinks its own in faculty discoveries. This new agreement is to insure that UC does own it and as such, can protect faculty as needed. Wendy Strikes, head of UCOP Policy Department, is handling the new Patent Agreement matter. To date only 43% have signed Systemwide.

Technology Transfer Office (TTO)
The policy at a UC Systemwide level is that UC will license its technology and patents but not sell them to companies. This is to insure that companies don’t purchase something with the sole purpose of burying it. As UC is a public institution, its developments are designed to be used.

As another example, Stanford University runs its TTO separate from revenue streams. This allows risks to be taken. It also enables good will from faculty who turn a profit and donate a portion back to the campus.

Graduate Student Tuition
COR members asked: “What should be done at a Systemwide level vs. a campus level?”

1. VP Beckwith responded by examining the 'sticker price' v. the actual price?
   a. The Regents set the former -- and it will continue to be raised esp. on out-of-state tuition - however the actual price is that by raising undergraduate tuition you will then have to raise graduate students too.
2. VP Beckwith argued that no campus is locked into this model. Each campus can do as it pleases about this ratio and expectation. For example, UCSD charges a single tuition - a blended fee for both in-state and out-of-state students.
   a. Each campus needs to handle it in a way that benefits it the most.
3. Member Kaplan also offered that another aspect to examine is that the price means students’ graduate with higher debt, which then makes them go into industry rather than research in order to pay off that debt.
Ideas to Explore for UCSF Research

1. There is a big opportunity to build formal ties to Lawrence Laboratory.
2. In the long run, strong ties to local UCB engineering should be strengthened as well as QB3.
3. UCSF should further explore the development of telemedicine.
4. UC Medical Centers can all be linked for clinical purposes. UCSF’s Clay Johnston and his team have developed UC BRAID to pursue this. This will help us get one IRB approved for all campuses. They’re seeking money for background research at present ($4-5M from UC Regents on a database to develop this). Ideally they’re seeking $1.5M annually.
   a. This is an example of an annual initiative VP Beckwith would like to fund if money is available.

VP Beckwith invites UCSF faculty to submit one-page white papers on 'brilliant' multi-campus ideas. He may not be able to fund however if there is a regular process of soliciting such things, he can take such ideas to the Regents and develop funding.

Old Business
None.

New Business
None.

Chair Moskowitz adjourned the meeting at 1:15pm.
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