

Committee on Research
Edward L. Murphy, MD, MPH, Chair

ANNUAL REPORT 2008-2009

Total Individual Investigator Grants Awarded: 18

Total Shared Equipment Grants Awarded: 2

Total Grant Money Awarded: \$658,870.00

Issues reviewed and acted on by the Committee included:

- Review and award of two cycles of Individual Investigator grants
- Review and award of Shared Equipment grants
- Selection of the 2009 Faculty Research Lecturer
- Selection of the 2009 Distinguished Clinical Research Lecturer
- Biological Use Authorization Modification
- Committee on Research Affiliation with the Research Allocation Program (RAP)

Task Forces, Special Committees, and Sub-Committees:

- Continued consideration of a request from then-Divisional Chair Deborah Greenspan to evaluate current criteria for the Faculty Research lecture, Distinguished Clinical Research Lecture and make recommendations for changes as well as consider the possibility of whether a new lecture for Translational Research should be implemented
- Subcommittee Reviewing Research Allocation Program (RAP) Affiliation

Issues for Next Year (2009-2010)

- Work with BUA Committee to increase efficiencies
- Senate Approval and implementation of the Translational Research Lectureship
- Continued Integration with RAP

2008-2009 Members

Edward Murphy Chair	Tomoki Hashimoto
James Sorensen Vice Chair	Roland Henry
Tamara Alliston	Randall Kramer
Frances Aweeka	Teri Melese
Laurence Baskin	Patrick McQuillen
Mary Blegen	Judith Moskowitz
Dejana Braithwaite	Jean-Francois Pittet
Doranne Cuenco	Kathleen Puntillo
Kevin DeLucchi	David Saloner
Shareen El Ibiary	Jonathan Strober
McLeod "Mac" Griffiss	Ram Vaderhobli
Sharon Hall	Max Wintermark

Number of Meetings: 8

Senate Analyst: Shilpa Patel/Alison Cleaver (RAP Affiliation)

Budget

Throughout the year, UCORP discussed the ramifications of \$100M flat funding cut to the University. A restoration of inflation-adjusted full-funding for the University would require an additional \$900M for 2009-10. Such funding would cover faculty and staff raises, employer contributions to UCRP, enrollment growth, and restored programs. Unfortunately, only cuts are expected. In response, to rehired retirees, the University is trying to standardize its recall policies.

Multiple Research Units (MRUs)

UCORP was provided a summary of MRU funding issues and of the current recommendation, which is to require extant and proposed MRUs to compete for funding, rather than assume that funding will continue from year to year. The Office of Research and Graduate Studies (ORGS) is developed an RFP to compete for unrestricted research funds allocated by the Office of the President. Some concerns with the RFP included: that the page limit may be too low, that funding requests should be capped, and that more details regarding the matching campus funds requirement should be given.

Stimulus Package

In regards to the stimulus package, UCORP noted that there are two interrelated topics to consider: stimulus money itself and the president's overall budget. The stimulus funds must be used quickly, so consideration is being given only to projects "with legs." Members were encouraged to contact program officers if they have an unfunded project that received good scores; new projects are not appropriate for this funding. The president's budget includes new categories, or grand challenge areas, for new projects, especially in the areas of health, climate, and energy research.

Los Alamos

UCORP spent some time discussing UC's involvement in weapons development (pit production). The Committee reviewed the pit production report. Currently, any pits produced could be used in one of three ways: placed into warheads, dismantled for research, or stored for aging research. In 1996, when UC had sole proprietorship of the labs, the federal government ordered the production of 31 pits; the first was produced in 2007, and since then, 17 have been completed. It is not known if the federal government will place another order, but press reports suggesting an annual production of 50-80 pits was a hypothetical exercise never implemented; the current pit production limit at Los Alamos is no more than 20 pits per year. UCORP sought clarification on the difference between production and stewardship, arguing that any new pits constituted production. The government's position; however is that stewardship necessarily involves production as destructive testing requires a replacement device. Further, the science involved in both analyzing destroyed pits and creating new ones has led to notable increases in refereed publications in the actinide sciences. Chair Croughan noted that that (1) UC, as sole manager of Los Alamos National Lab (LANL) in 1996, agreed to assume pit production following the closure of the Rocky Flats, CO, facility, and (2) stewardship and scientific oversight have been endorsed repeatedly by the Senate. Some members of UCORP remain unconvinced and as such, UCORP will continue to monitor.

UC Seminar Network

UCORP has proposed a seminar network, consisting of streaming broadcasts via the web to multiple campus locations, multiple campuses, or directly to individual's computers, after which the talks could be archived. J. Pittet reported that members are enthusiastic and he recommended that the Committee endorse such an endeavor.

UC Seminar Network Proposal

Overall, members of the Committee were in favor of the proposal. Some of the comments included:

- This is a good idea that could potentially save a lot of time and money.
- There is the minor concern that some faculty members could be let go if their duties are covered by someone from another campus.

- Members wondered whether there was demand on the campuses to support such a program.
- What are the cost ramifications?
- Why not just upload to Youtube?

The Committee unanimously agreed to support the proposal.

Divisional Business

Individual Investigator Grant

In 2008-2009, the Committee received seventy-one (76) applications in total for Individual Investigator Grants. The Committee reviewed the applications for Individual Investigator Grants and ranked each application using secret ballots and a scoring system similar to that of the NIH, where 1.0 = strongly recommend for full funding through 3.0 = not fundable. Additionally, as instituted in 2004-05, the Committee did not review any applications ranked 2.0 or higher by the initial reviewers unless either or both of the Committee's assigned reviewers requested discussion. The Committee approved and recommended that eighteen (18) grants totaling \$578,870.00 be considered for funding.

Shared Equipment Grant

The Committee received two (2) applications during 2008-2009. Committee members ranked each application using a secret ballot and approved two (2) grants totaling \$80,000.00 for funding.

Continued Consideration of a Translational Lectureship

In a communication dated April 21, 2006, Chair Greenspan indicated that both Drs. Washington and Marshall support the creation of a new Academic Senate Translational Research Lecture. In order to advance this initiative, she asked the Committee to review the two existing lectures now sponsored by the Academic Senate (Faculty Research Lecture and Distinguished Clinical Research Lecture) and to ensure that these two lectures and a new "Distinguished Translational Research Lecture Award" would each have a distinctly different purpose, as well as clear and distinct criteria that is not overlapping or redundant. As such, she requested that the Committee develop and a set of recommended criteria that distinguishes the proposed Distinguished Translational Research Lecture from the two existing lectureships. She also requested that the Committee review the criteria for the existing lectureships to determine if any additional criteria or clarity is needed.

The Translational Research Lecture Subcommittee, previously chaired by former member Pam Ling, was led this year by Roland Henry. New members to the task force included Francesca Aweeka and Jonathan Strober. The task force drafted guidelines for all three lectureships for the committee's approval. (Appendix 1) These guidelines were presented to the Committee at the June meeting and were approved. The guidelines will be presented to the Coordinating Committee in the fall for further vetting and approval.

Turn-around Time for Biological Use Authorization Modifications

The Committee recently discussed the time required for the review of Biological Use Authorization (BUA) applications. In particular, the procedure for reviewing relatively simple modifications to existing protocols has raised concern among campus investigators. Minor revisions have taken more than 3 months for approval, presenting a significant limitation for investigators pursuing new research questions. The Committee, concerned that the current system is not configured optimally for either the Review Board or for the investigators it serves, contacted the BUA Committee to express concerns and exchange ideas on how this situation could be improved. (Appendix 2)

Selection of the 2009 Faculty Research Lecturer

The Committee received five nominations for the 51st Faculty Research Lecture. Following extensive discussion of each of the five candidates, the Committee voted by secret ballot to select Elizabeth Blackburn Ph.D., as the recipient of the 2009 Faculty Research Lectureship. Dr. Blackburn is a leader in

the area of telomere and telomerase research. She discovered the molecular nature of telomeres-the ends of eukaryotic chromosomes that serve as protective caps essential for preserving the genetic information - and she discovered the ribonucleoprotein enzyme, telomerase. Blackburn and her research team at the University of California, San Francisco are working with various cells including human cells, with the goal of understanding telomerase and telomere biology.

Dr. Blackburn's lecture, entitled, "Responses of Cells and Organisms to Perturbing Chromosome End Maintenance," was delivered to the campus community during Founder's Week in Cole Hall on Tuesday, April 14, 2009 at 3:30 P.M.

Each year, the Faculty Research Lecture proudly acknowledges the outstanding scientific achievements made by a member of the UCSF Academic Senate. Academic Senate members are asked to consider the contributions of their colleagues when they make nominations for this prestigious award so that the University community may recognize their scientific achievements.

Affiliation with the Research Allocation Program (RAP)

A subcommittee was formed to analyze the potential joining of COR with RAP. The subcommittee developed a proposal which was reviewed and approved by the Committee on Research at large. This proposal was also received and supported by RAP. It will be taken to the Coordinating Committee for approval to move forward in the new academic year 2009-2010.

Selection of the 2009 Distinguished Clinical Research Lectureship

Since 2001, this award has been bestowed on an individual member or members of the UCSF faculty with outstanding achievements in clinical research. Nominations are made by UCSF faculty, who consider the clinical research contributions of their colleagues and submit nominations for this prestigious award to the Academic Senate Committee on Research. Each year, the Committee on Research selects the recipient of this award. This year Dr. Walter L. Miller was awarded the DCRL; his lecture on steroid hormone biosynthesis will be given on September 29, 2009.

Appendices

[Appendix 1:](#) Revised and Approved Committee on Research Lectureship Criteria

[Appendix 2:](#) February 2, 2009 Communication from the Committee on Research to the Committee on Biological Use Applications (BUA)

Senate Staff:
Shilpa Patel, Senior Analyst
shilpa.patel@ucsf.edu; 415/514-2696