The Committee on Research was called to order by Chair Moskowitz on May 21, 2012 at 10:00 a.m. in room S-30. A quorum was present.

Chair’s Announcements
Chair Moskowitz reminded COR members of the Senate’s Division meeting happening at noon today in HSW 300. There will be a vote on the Open Access Policy. Please attend and vote if you’re able.

Separately, we’ve received nominations for the Faculty Research Lecture in all three categories: Basic, Clinical, and Translational. We’ll be voting on these for the 2012-2013 year at the June 2012 meeting.

Approval of Minutes
The minutes of the April 16, 2012 meeting were approved. They will be posted to the Senate website by the Academic Senate office.

Discussion of Other Uses for Endowment Funds
Chair Moskowitz led a discussion on how and in what situations, Senate Endowment Funds, from which COR Grants are funded, would be used for other purposes around campus. This discussion arose as a result of the Ryan Endowment Fund—used to fund eye research—having been accidentally promised for use in another manner by campus administration.

Administration was unaware, at the point of making such a promise that COR had initiated a Special Call for Eye Research Grants in the amount of $50K. As such, the anticipated over $650K that was in the Ryan Endowment Fund has already been promised down to around $275K, through the Research Allocation Program’s Spring funding cycle.

Members determined the following:
1. COR reaffirmed its belief that all Academic Senate Endowment Funds should be distributed as a result of a transparent, open, competitive, peer-reviewed process.
   a. COR members support adding such language to the current committee bylaws.
   b. Senate Analyst Cleaver will initiate adding the bylaws and acquiring various committee approvals in an expedited manner.
2. To address the issue of excess accumulation of endowment funds, COR created a new mechanism for the distribution of money when it accumulates in the Endowment Funds.
   a. If the amount in a fund, at the end of a fiscal year, is $300,000 or greater, COR will initiate a Special Call for Proposals and/or increase the amount awarded with each proposal.
   b. This process would continue until the funds were spent.
   c. Therefore to address the funds remaining in the Ryan Eye Endowment Fund, COR intends to issue another Special Call for Fall 2012 for $50K grants.

**RAP Spring Funding Cycle**
Chair Moskowitz led a discussion on the RAP Spring Cycle final scores sheet. It was determined that COR will fund the following volume of grants (in connection with its Endowment Funds):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Endowment</th>
<th># of Grants ($30K level)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cancer Fund</td>
<td>½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer/Cardiovascular/Epilepsy/Heart Disease Fund</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye Fund</td>
<td>6 (each grant at the $50K level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>6½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart Disease Fund</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stomach Fund</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Volume of Grants Funded</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COR members agreed that it would fund grants which scored below a 3.2 and which fit into the various fund descriptions available. COR members supported holding a second Special Call for the Eye Research Funds in Fall 2012.

**Overview of Clinical Research Initiative – Susanne Hildebrand-Zanki, Associate Vice Chancellor, Research**
Susanne Hildebrand-Zanki presented on this new initiative that will require feasibility review to be done for all clinical studies being initiated at UCSF. Most departments already do these – so it should only affect those departments who are not in the practice already of doing them. The feasibility review will be a checklist and should take about half an hour to accomplish.

This initiative is to insure that feasibility issues are verified and resolved in advance. The creation of these additional protocols should reduce the amount of time CHR spends on its reviews—including elimination of most reviews that include a scientific review component.

A sign-off from an approved agency (i.e., NIH) would mean that a secondary CHR review would not need to be accomplished.

COR members requested Susanne Hildebrand-Zanki give the same presentation to the Senate’s Committee on Academic Freedom (CAF). This request came from the two separate aspects of the Clinical Research Initiative presented by AVC Hildebrand-Zanki: the practical logistical part of the initiative, and the scientific review aspect, which seemed underdeveloped and separate. This latter aspect raised concerns amongst COR members.

Senate Analyst Cleaver will coordinate with the Senate Analyst who staffs CAF.

**Old Business**
None.

**New Business**
None.
Chair Moskowitz adjourned the meeting at 12:00pm.
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