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PRESENT: J. Moskowitz (Chair), S. Nagarajan (Vice Chair), D. Foster, S. Gansky, J. Hahn, R. Hendren, S. Ho, L. Julian, S. Kools, C. Kaplan, M. Mankani, J. Myers, M. West, D. Xu


GUESTS: R. Newcomer, Chair, UCSF Academic Senate, F. Chehab, Vice Chair, UCSF Academic Senate, H. Alden, Executive Director, UCSF Academic Senate Office, S. Patel, Senior Analyst, UCSF Academic Senate Office, and R. Henry, Chair, RAP Executive Board

The Committee on Research was called to order by Chair Moskowitz on March 19, 2012 at 10:40 a.m. in room S-118. A quorum was present.

Chair’s Announcements
Chair Moskowitz advised members that:

1. A thank you note was sent to VP Beckwith. COR advised that it would also assist in spreading the word on the word on the new Patent Agreement that faculty are being asked to sign.

2. The Research Allocation Program (RAP) received 191 grant applications for the Spring 2012 cycle. There were nine or ten eye fund grants. If all of those score well, COR will fund them all at the $50K level.

RAP Chair Henry commented that there are plans to create an additional RAP Review Committee as the volume of grants is growing beyond the capacity of current review committees.

COR Vice Chair Nagarajan asked about how departmental/school representation is achieved on RAP committees. RAP Chair Henry advised that at present it’s historical as RAP members serve three-year terms and most are still within that term limit. This will be examined in the future as turnover begins.

The administration is also determining how to increase RAP’s profile and insure that members participate. COR Member Kaplan suggested doing an annual RAP Call for Service. Chair Henry also suggested creating a mentoring program so as to get junior faculty involved. A third suggestion is to create a pool of former-RAP Grant Awardees who can now serve as ad hoc RAP grant reviewers.

Approval of Minutes
The minutes of the February 27, 2012 meeting were approved. They will be posted to the Senate website by the Academic Senate office.
Presentation on the UCSF Governance Task Force - R. Newcomer, Chair, UCSF Academic Senate, F. Chehab, Vice Chair, UCSF Academic Senate, H. Alden, Executive Director, UCSF Academic Senate Office, S. Patel, Senior Analyst, UCSF Academic Senate Office

UCSF Academic Senate Chair Newcomer presented on the current status of the UCSF Governance Task Force and the Faculty Oversight Committee. At present, the Task Force is soliciting from faculty “big sky” ideas that faculty want to see kept throughout any UCSF Governance changes.

After discussion, COR members concurred with the following:

1. UCSF faculty have been strengthened by their association with UC Systemwide Senate—in most matters except Senate Membership.
   a. COR members proposed development of a new title for UCSF Adjunct faculty whose primary focus is research with just a little bit of teaching. This type of faculty at UCSF should be part of the Senate as they aren’t Adjunct in the UC Systemwide definition or use of the series.

2. COR members pointed to the recent Lab Collaboration experience, as highlighted by UC Systemwide Vice President of Research & Graduate Studies, Steven Beckwith, where UCSF came up as one of the top winners.

3. Senate Chair Newcomer asked that COR members keep in mind that a Governance Council might have initiatives which the Senate and its membership might oppose.
   a. For example, biotech companies may argue that administering a short, low-value grant is not in their best interest.
   b. However the Senate would argue that this position goes counter to academic freedom and encouraging junior faculty to establish themselves and a grant history.

Further comments can be sent via email to Heather Alden, Executive Director, UCSF Academic Senate office.

Discussion of NIH Policy Revisions

Chair Moskowitz led a discussion on the proposed NIH revisions of Federal Policies “Relating to Grants and Cooperative Agreements: Cost Principles and Administrative Requirements (including Single Audit Act) [Document ID OMB-2012-0002-0001]”.

Members discussed the proposed changes and came to a consensus on the following:

In general, Committee members supported efforts to reduce paperwork and streamline research efficiency. Of particular recognition, members support:

1. The use of direct costs to pay administrative staff (Proposed revision B.5.)
2. Reduction of effort on the audit process (Proposed revisions A.1.-4.)

Of concern to Committee members however are the following proposed revisions:

1. Changes to Indirect Costs to a flat rate rather than a negotiated rate (Proposed revision B.2.)
   a. Such a change would have significant short- and long-term implications for universities.
   b. We strongly encourage an in-depth analysis of the potential consequences, including financial implications, be undertaken before implementing a flat indirect rate across the board.

2. Computing equipment “line item” issue (Proposed revision B.6.)
a. This could create a burden of work on administrative and faculty to track supplies below the UC university threshold of $5K.

b. Also, with the growth of technology, what is the complete definition of “computing equipment” to be covered by this revision?

c. Finally, with the price fluctuations of computing equipment, items that one day might be over the campus threshold, could be under the threshold by the time of purchase. Would such a change require line item burden of tacking?

Analyst Cleaver will route this Communication to the www.regulations.gov website on behalf of the Committee on Research, UCSF Academic Senate Division.

**Old Business**

None.

**New Business**

Senate Analyst Cleaver advised COR members of a Contracts & Grants (C&G) Survey that will be circulated, soliciting feedback on proposed revisions to their Research Administration website. Members are encouraged to respond. Combined comments will be routed—anonymously—to C&G following the close of the survey.

Separately, COR member Gansky commented that www.clinicaltrials.gov website is soliciting input on the burden of “providing results within one year of the last person’s follow-up.” Per member Gansky it took a half-day for requested results to be inputted into this website. The input that is being solicited is on the number of hours it takes to input as well as consistency in what information is sought and how it should be presented on this website.

Chair Moskowitz adjourned the meeting at 12:30pm.
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