

RESEARCH ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)
February 2, 2016
8:30-10am
Medical Sciences Building, Chancellors Conference Room S-118

Attendees: Jane Czech, Clarice Estrada, John Ellis, Jennifer Grandis, Xiao Hu, Jean Jones, Mounira Kenaani, Jim Kiriakis, Gretchen Kiser, Larisa Kure, Steven Lazarus, Georgina Lopez, Irene McGlynn, Suzanne Murphy, Michael Nordberg, Theresa O'Lonegan, Christine Razler, Bill Seaman, Matt Springer, Paul Volberding

On Phone: Pam DenBesten

Not here: Chip Chambers, MC Gaisbauer, Vanessa Jacoby, Wallace Marshall, Synthia Mellon, Teresa Moeller, Thomas Neylan, Nirao Shah, Brian Smith

Guests: Dan Lowenstein, Mae Moredo

PRESENTATION: EVCP Research Priorities for 2016, Dan Lowenstein

See PowerPoint presentation attached

- 1 year since Dan left RAB as he took on his current role of Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost.
- Focus for 2016:
 - Business Development
 - Cores
 - Campus Footprint
- Business Development
 - Search underway, working with Spencer Stuart, for a high profile leader for overall external private industry partnerships to focus on external facing relationship building and business development
 - Pursuing 3-4 people, expecting something to happen in the next 4-6 weeks
 - Internal EVCP taskforce consisting of key scientist-entrepreneur stakeholders, is undertaking an assessment of the current Innovation, Technology & Alliances-Human Resources (ITA- HR), Org, focus to come up with recommendations by Spring
- Cores
 - We tend to use the word too loosely at UCSF. We are developing a specific definition with criteria.
 - UCSF can use Cores on other UC campuses, that information needs to be more widely dispersed (connecting the dots)
 - As it is very difficult to get new resources, we need to use what is already out there
 - This could help us with grant proposals, i.e. show the support we have available to us
- Campus Footprint-Parnassus/Mt Zion (PZ2025)
 - We will soon announce the efforts being undertaken by the PZ2025 taskforce
 - It has become clear that no one is entirely clear as to where the epicenter(s) of UCSF will be in the coming decades
 - We have a significant problem that many people at Parnassus think that everything is moving to Mission Bay
 - We are looking at the Long Range Development Plan that was developed some years ago, and it appears that there is no comprehensive, strategic approach to space redevelopment at Parnassus and Mt. Zion
 - We need to think of the system as a whole and what functions are needed
 - We are considering potential structural changes to the face of campus
 - Taskforce looking at this is now at 30 members
 - Started meeting in Oct 2015
 - Current recommendation for education:
 - Parnassus remain the epicenter for professional students
 - This drives a commitment to resources et al to Parnassus
 - IT
 - Library
 - It is no longer possible (land wise) to move things to Mission bay
 - Current discussion for research:
 - There is a significant number of individuals (identifying as basic scientists) that if given the choice would prefer to move to Mission Bay
 - 80% are at Mission Bay, 20% are at Parnassus
 - Not convinced that location matters in the 21st century, forcing community may not work, the main goal is to help connect people

Questions/Comments:

- Regarding space, we need to out all options on the table
 - All options will cost money, i.e.
 - Revitalize Parnassus vs. further building at Mission Bay

Next Steps:

- None specifically noted

PRESENTATION: New Resource Allocation Program (RAP) Electronic Application Form, Gretchen Kiser & Emanuela (Emy) Volpe

See PowerPoint presentation attached

- In 2015 launched the electronic application for intramural funding program (i.e. funding agencies internal to UCSF (20+)
- The software was developed using an external contractor and can be used across campus for other programs for a small fee
 - Cost \$50,000 to build, funding provided by agencies
- 3 month process (from submission to final approval)
- 30-40% of applicants funded
- The horse trading is amazing, the agencies within UCSF are very generous and want to give out all funding available

Next Steps:

- None specifically noted

External Partnerships

External Partnerships: Situation

- In 2014, EVCP office put together a Proposal to create a new, independent Office for Business Development, Innovation and Partnerships reporting to senior leadership with a leader from Industry or Academia with strong industry experiences
- **Rationale:** a landscape assessment indicated that while UCSF has strong relationships, we could be doing much more, given our location, expertise, and quality of research enterprise
- **Goal:** to Invest specifically in the business development and outreach function, generating, sustaining and growing relationships:
 - Pharma and biotech- build on what we have, identify others
 - Digital health and IT- expand footprint and build relationships with Silicon Valley powerhouses
 - Venture capital relationships and entrepreneurship building

Summary and Recommendations

Conclusions from Analysis

- In the most successful AMCs, **BD function has significant visibility and support**, and is part of the overall strategy and vision for the institution
- Multiple institutions are **consolidating functions related to business development**; e.g.: tech transfer, licensing, industry alliances to align incentives and strategy (e.g. MIT BD/TT reports to Provost)
- Entities which have been successful in building an entrepreneurial culture within their faculty are those which have invested in business development/outreach (e.g. MIT's Industrial Liaison Program) and provided incentives for faculty to work with industry (e.g. MIT, Stanford)
- Success is **defined by multiple metrics beyond financial ROI** including access of new inventions to society, faculty enrichment both financially and experiential and access to technology and long term new partnerships
- Digital and medical device domain expertise is lacking in most AMCs. We could develop an advantage in this area– given our prime location.

Recommendations (Detail)

- UCSF efforts have improved in the last decade but **lack of institutional support for early stage efforts, siloed school/institute efforts and lack of a user friendly interface limit opportunities**
- While UCSF has strong existing relationships and resources, we are, overall, **performing suboptimally given the scale of opportunity in our environment**
- Our focus has been **on bringing in revenue, rather than sustained and proactive relationship development**. As a result, while we have a number of strong agreements to our credit, we face a major and urgent challenge as many are set to imminently expire
- Our structure does not enable **proactive, aggressive relationship pursuit and development**; nor does it incent teamwork; both of which are required for success
- We have undertaken more than one review and assessment on this topic; and come up with similar recommendations and conclusions; without much action. **We need to act urgently on investing in this area to demonstrate our commitment to this area.**

What does Success Look Like?

Within 5 years or less UCSF will have evolved into a highly desirable partner from the POV of top prospective partners in Silicon Valley:

- UCSF is “open for business” – easy, reliable, efficient, accountable, fast
- Source of promising and diverse research ideas that can be commercialized
- Top of mind when it comes to thinking of potential partners for out of the box, creative new ideas
- UCSF and Silicon Valley are synonymous with Innovation in Health
- **And, for UCSF, diverse and additional sources of revenue from these partnerships.**

Cores

Research Resource Program (RRP)

Implementation of Core Strategic Roadmap - 2016

Phase I – Roadmap infrastructure projects selected based on modest budget requirement and potential for short-term impact.

Financial Management and Business Practices

- Expand the current recharge support services offered by RRP to larger core community.
- In collaboration with Program Management Office develop *Business Process Improvement* for Cores – to improve efficiency and reduce deficits.

Promote Core Availability (Marketing)

- Improve web presence, create comprehensive catalog of cores with accurate and standardized descriptions of core services.
- Organize *Core Fairs* to increase awareness of core resources.

Big Data – High Performance Computing Steering Committee

Collaboration with RDO, ICBS, QB3, IHG, MAC, HDCC, CDHI

- Support “Integration of HPC Facilities” business/governance pilot model for HPC (funded by ITG)
- Develop “Bioinformatics/Computational Science Gateway” to make existing bioinformatics/computational science and biostatistical resources accessible to all UCSF investigators.

Research Resource Program (RRP)

Strategic Plan for Long-Term Change

Goal: Rationalize the organization of core services.

- **Current State:** many “disease-centered” cores and duplication of services
- **Future State:** consolidated “Technology Centers” that serve all diseases groups and departments.
- **Process:** Advisory Committee of Stakeholders
 - Develop a model of core governance that incorporates departmental and institutional oversight and responsibilities.
 - Identify funding for core development and review applications for funding.
- **Model:** Single Cell Analysis Center (SCAC) – opening February 2016!
 - Consolidated management of flow instrumentation at PH has resulted in significant efficiencies and cost savings to core users.
 - Instrument centralization (flow and single cell genomics) in SCAC will lead to further efficiencies and improved availability of expert support.

UCSF Parnassus Heights and Mt Zion- an Unparalleled Opportunity




Summary: PZ2025 Taskforce

- **Objective:** To develop a compelling vision for the future of Parnassus and Mount Zion
- **Rationale:** An integrated vision and goals are needed to guide investments in programs and facilities at Parnassus and Mount Zion
- **Membership and Governance:**
 - Task force chaired by EVCP Lowenstein
 - Membership: researchers, educators, clinical leaders, and administrators at Parnassus and Mount Zion, as well as Capital Programs, Campus Planning, Campus Life Services, and University Development
- **Timeline:** Initially, Fall 2015- End 2016; based on output, tactical planning may go further TBD
- **Task force deliverables** (preliminary):
 - Guiding Principles for Parnassus and Mt Zion 2025
 - Integrated High Level Vision
 - Draft Proposal Outline with key priorities for patient care, research, education

Rationale and Context

- With recent emphasis on infrastructure, programs, and fundraising for Mission Bay, there is a perception of Parnassus and Mt Zion being “second tier” campuses
- Stated discontent among research faculty in particular, with multiple research and building investments being made and publicized at Mission Bay
- PH remains the home campus for all professional schools and students. Multiple core, critical programs will remain at Parnassus and Mt. Zion - and we are central to both communities in the city
- Initiatives exist to enhance infrastructure and buildings - such as Parnassus streetscape, renovations to key buildings, but there is no overarching vision or plan tying together these improvements






Rationale and Context

- With recent emphasis on infrastructure, programs, and fundraising for Mission Bay, there is a perception of Parnassus and Mt Zion being “second tier” campuses
- Stated discontent among research faculty in particular, with multiple research and building investments being made and publicized at Mission Bay
- PH remains the home campus for all professional schools and students. Multiple core, critical programs will remain at Parnassus and Mt. Zion - and we are central to both communities in the city
- Initiatives exist to enhance infrastructure and buildings - such as Parnassus streetscape, renovations to key buildings, but there is no overarching vision or plan tying together these improvements

Need for a compelling, integrated vision for future identify of Parnassus & Mt Zion

Draft Work Plan for PZ2025 Taskforce: Phase 1



10/15 11/15 1/16 2/16 4/16 6/16 Fall 2016 and beyond

Proposed Topics/Focus

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| <p>Taskforce kickoff Rationale , background, early ideas</p> | <p>Patient care initial vision Research scenario discussion</p> | <p>Education initial vision Capital plan process and status Agree on guiding principles and timeline</p> | <p>Basic research vision and priorities Clinical research input Existing PH improve status</p> | <p>UDAR discussion on elements of donor focused proposals Updated timeline</p> | <p>First draft of internal proposal, vision and scope</p> | <p>Refining of proposal sections with smaller workgroups Communication Approach Working closely with UDAR for donor discussions</p> |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|--|

Deliverables

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| <p>Workgroup structure aligned with themes: Patient care, research, education</p> | <p>Guiding principles Outline and timeline for proposal</p> | <p>For each area, top priorities in short to mid term Architect identified</p> | <p>Integrated Vision (Top Short and Mid Term Priorities)</p> | <p>Identification of category 2 and 3 projects for capital plan Plan for next steps</p> | <p>Preliminary input from leadership and reaction to vision</p> |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|

Guiding Principles: PZ 2025

- **People Centric:** Focus on satisfaction, productivity and quality of life and how to enable and support this
- **Function drives form:** buildings and enhancements are united by a common vision and purpose. Space should espouse and reinforce our values
- **Integration:** Research, education and patient care are contiguous - space demonstrates the continuum of UCSF's mission
- **Identity:** Parnassus and MZ have a unique identity as campuses, but seen as core to the larger, integrated vision of UCSF
- **Community:** Optimize the unique location of these campuses and their importance to, and within, our neighborhoods and locales

Key Questions: Shaping the Vision

Destination Campus- General

- *Why will Millennials and future leaders of the 21st century come to PH to study and work?*
- *Why will the sickest patients want to come to Moffitt?*
- *How can we attract and retain the best and brightest researchers to our campuses?*
- *How do we ensure both PH and MZ remain key cornerstones of the SF communities they are in?*

What is our Research Vision?

- How does Parnassus enable this today? What needs to change- first, urgently, then--in the mid, or longer term?
- How can we capitalize on synergies with the adult hospital?
- How can we showcase Precision Medicine, and what part of it, at PH?
- How do we leverage technology for optimal research productivity?



University of California
San Francisco

Resource Allocation Program (RAP)

*Update on the Electronic Solution for
Online Submission & Review Processes*

Emanuela Volpe, JD
Research Development Office

2-2-2016

How RAP Works

One Application, Many Opportunities, One Deadline



1. Funding agencies provide the details (RFAs) for the grant mechanisms they sponsor
2. Applicants choose the grant mechanism that best fits their proposals
3. RAP assigns applications to appropriate review committees based on both funding mechanism and research topic
4. Funding agencies choose to fund the best proposals. Agencies make final funding decisions based on their priorities

User Roles

- RAP Central
- Executive Committee Personnel
- Applicant
- Reviewer
- Review Committee Personnel
 - Review Committee Chairs
 - Support Staff
- Funding Agency Personnel
 - Faculty Directors
 - Program Managers

Review Process

1. Application Form
2. RAP Central – assigns applications to review committees
3. Executive Committee – confirms or changes review committee assignments
4. Rev. comm. Personnel – accepts/declines assigned applications & confirms committee roster
 - Support Staff manages review committee roster
 - Chairperson confirms applications assigned to committee

Review Process cont.

5. Reviewers – specify COI with applications assigned to the committee
& RSVP
6. Committee Chairs – assign reviewers A and B to applications
7. Reviewers – review assigned applications
8. Review Committees meet to review and score all applications
9. Distribution of final scores to the funding agencies

Review Process cont.

10. In person “Horse-Trading” meeting to make final funding decisions

11. RAP Central enters funding results into the system (funded, not funded, funded by whom, and award amounts)

12. System notifies applicants reviews are available

13. In future, we hope to build a reporting module (depending on available funding) that will enable all participating agencies to track and report return-on-investment.

Electronic Portal Sign In

Forgot your Password?



Resource Allocation Program (RAP)
A Collaborative Effort Among UCSF Funding Agencies

Welcome to RAP!

Internet Explorer is not supported

Through this portal you can:

- Create an account
- Start and continue edit a proposal until the deadline
- Submit a proposal
- Edit a submitted proposal until the deadline
- Check the status of your application
- Check the reviews of your application

Spring 2016 Cycle

Call for Applications:
Monday, January 25, 2016 (Grant Offerings Fully Updated)

Deadline:
Monday, February 22, 2016, at 2pm PST

First Time Users: fill the boxes below to create an account
Returning Users: sign in above
Users submitting on behalf of a PI: sign in using your PI's credentials

emanuela.volpe@ucsf.edu

.....

First Name

Last Name

Are you faculty? Yes No

Create a new Account

Application Form

5 Sections

- Details
- Investigators
- Project
- Review
- Proposal

1) Details

Applications for Fall 2015 are due by September 21, 2016 at 2:00pm.

Details Investigators Project Review Proposal

Application Details

This application has 5 sections (Details, Investigators, Project, Review, Proposal)

- As you complete each section, a green checkmark will appear in the progress bar at the top of the page to confirm your progress.
- Each section can be saved so you may exit and re-enter the application at any time.
- Sections not fully completed will not be saved unless you hit the SAVE button.

Grant Mechanism

Select a grant mechanism. Be sure to review [Submission Rules](#) before beginning your application.

Career Development

- Hardship Awards
- Independence Support Award
- Mentored Scientist Award Program in HIV/AIDS
- New Direction Awards
- Re-entry
- Under-represented Faculty in Clinical and Translational Research Awards

International

- International Mentored Scientist Award Program in HIV/AIDS

Multidisciplinary

- Team Science Grant

Pilots

- Alzheimer Disease Research Center (ADRC) Pilot
- Basic Science Award Program in HIV/AIDS
- Informing Tobacco Product Regulation
- Pilot Award Program in HIV/AIDS
- Pilot for Established Investigators in Basic and Clinical/Translational Sciences
- Pilot for Junior Investigators in Basic and Clinical/Translational Sciences
- Pilot in Integrative Medicine
- UCSF Nutrition and Obesity Research Center (NORC) Pilot and Feasibility Awards

Technology

- Catalyst Awards for the Development of Diagnostics, Devices, Therapeutics and Digital Health
- Shared Instrument Awards

Proposal Title

Submission Version

- New Submission
- For Resubmission

2) Investigators

Investigators | Application x
rapapp.ucsf.edu/application/investigators/532

UCSF Resource Allocation Program

Welcome emanuela.volpe@ucsf.edu | Dashboard | My Account | Admin | Logout | Contact

Applications for Spring 2016 are due by February 22, 2016 at 2:00pm.

Details | **Investigators** | Project | Review | Proposal

Primary Investigators

PI 1 (Contact PI) Information

The account user name must match the PI1 name. To submit on behalf of another investigator you must create a user account for them, if they don't already have one, or sign in using their credentials (their email and password).

Last Name **Middle Name** **First Name**

Email Address **Phone** **Extension**

To avoid spam & junk mail issues, use of web-based emails (Gmail, Yahoo) is discouraged. If possible, use a UCSF email address.

Degrees
 MD PhD MCR/MPH/MS DDS RN PharmD Other

If Other Degree

Rank

Faculty Series

School **Department**

Gender
 Male Female Other

Ethnicity

3) Project

rapapp.ucsf.edu/application/project/532

UCSF Resource Allocation Program

Welcome emanuela.volpe@ucsf.edu Dashboard My Account Admin Logout Contact

Applications for Spring 2016 are due by February 22, 2016 at 2:00pm

Details Investigators **Project** Review Proposal

Project Details

Abstract

One paragraph only, maximum 300 words

Budget Requested

\$

Does your budget include a component for travel?

Yes No

Does your project involve payments to international organizations/research expenses in other countries?

Yes No

Does your project involve human subjects?

Yes, CHR/IRB Approval # is

Yes, CHR/IRB Approval Pending

Yes, CHR/IRB Approval Planned

No, CHR/IRB Not Applicable

Does your project involve human stem cell?

Yes No

Does your project involve animal subjects?

Yes, IACUC Approval # is

Yes, IACUC Approval Pending

4) Review

Applications for Fall 2015 are due by September 21, 2016 at 2:00pm.

[Details](#) [Investigators](#) [Project](#) **Review** [Proposal](#)

Review Process Information

Type of Research
Select AT LEAST ONE.

Clinical Research Laboratory Research
 Computational Research Social/Behavioral Sciences Research
 Epidemiology/Statistical Research

Review Committee
Select the review committee you think is most appropriate for your proposal; RAP will reassign it if there is a more appropriate match. Resubmissions are assigned to the committee that did the initial review.

Basic HIV/AIDS, Infectious Disease & Global
 Cancer
 Career Development
 Clinical HIV/AIDS, Infectious Diseases & Global
 Clinical Sciences
 Digital Health Research

Health Policy & Social Sciences
 Independent Review (Catalyst Awards, Pilot Diabetes, Pilot Obesity)
 Molecular Medicine
 Neurosciences
 Technology

Request To Exclude Reviewer
All UCSF faculty are potential reviewers. You may name one potential reviewer you believe could not provide an impartial review and request that person not review your application. The Review Committee Chair will consider this request but is not required to accommodate it.

Last, First Name

Are you willing to be a RAP Reviewer?
 Yes No

Select a review committee that matches your expertise

Indicate your area(s) of expertise with five key words

5) Proposal

Applications for Fall 2015 are due by **September 21, 2016 at 2:00pm.**

Details Investigators Project Review **Proposal**

Proposal

Congratulations, your application is complete and ready for review!

- You can replace your proposal PDF by uploading a new PDF file.
- You can continue to make edits until the deadline of **Monday, September 21, 2015, 2pm PST**

1. Make sure your proposal is written according to the specific grant mechanism instructions.
2. **Upload your grant proposal as a single PDF file (including all supporting documents listed on the instructions) and SAVE the Changes**
3. **A congratulations message will appear to confirm your application is complete and ready for review. An email confirmation will be sent to you.**
4. You can verify that your application was successfully submitted by returning to your Dashboard and ensuring the 'Status' of your applicaiton is 'Complete'.

Proposal pdf

No file selected.

Upload your proposal as a single PDF file and SAVE the Changes.

Maximum file size is 15mb.

You can replace your proposal PDF by uploading a new PDF file at any time before the deadline.



RAP Assigns Applications to Review Committees

Fall 2015 - Assign Applications to Review Committees

Step 2 - Super Admin assigns each application to a Review Committee and a RAP-EC member.



Step 3 - Assignment Confirmation by RAP-EC

Filter the Applications

| all | Applicant | Title | Grant Mechanism | Submission Version | Type of Research | Requested Review Committee | Assigned Review Committee | Assigned RAP-EC |
|--------------------------|-----------------|---|--|--------------------|--|--|---------------------------------|-------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Volpe, Emanuela | test monday august 17 | Team Science Grant | New Submission | Laboratory Research | Neurosciences | Health Policy & Social Sciences | Barclay, Jennifer |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Nelson, Sarah | Sarah's August 17 TEST | Pilot in Integrative Medicine | New Submission | Laboratory Research Epidemiology/Statistical Research | Molecular Medicine | Health Policy & Social Sciences | Barclay, Jennifer |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Nelson, Sarah | 9.22.15 TEST | New Child Leave Award | New Submission | Clinical Research | Neurosciences | Health Policy & Social Sciences | Barclay, Jennifer |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Nelson, Sarah | testing 1/14/16 | Catalyst Awards for the Development of Diagnostics, Devices, Therapeutics and Digital Health | 1st Resubmission | Clinical Research | Health Policy & Social Sciences | Health Policy & Social Sciences | Barclay, Jennifer |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Nelson, Sarah | Phone number field test 1/19/16 | Catalyst Awards for the Development of Diagnostics, Devices, Therapeutics and Digital Health | 1st Resubmission | Epidemiology/Statistical Research | Health Policy & Social Sciences | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Nelson, Sarah | This is Sarah's resubmission TEST | Catalyst Awards for the Development of Diagnostics, Devices, Therapeutics and Digital Health | 1st Resubmission | Social/Behavioral Sciences Research | Independent Review (Catalyst Awards, Pilot Diabetes, Pilot Obesity) Previous Review Committee | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Dolan, Kristin | Screenshot TEST | Catalyst Awards for the Development of Diagnostics, Devices, Therapeutics and | New Submission | Clinical Research | Health Policy & Social Sciences | | |

Rev. Comm. Chairs Accept/Reject Applications

ned Applications

Health Policy & Social Sciences and mark each as either accepted or rejected
 the box to the right (to be visible to reviewers when they review their assigned proposals)

Meeting Details (shown to reviewers)

fdjsfska

Save these notes

t.

| Grant Mechanism | Submission Version | Exclude Reviewer | Status |
|--|--------------------|------------------|--|
| Catalyst Awards for the Development of Diagnostics, Devices, Therapeutics and Digital Health | New Submission | | <input type="radio"/> accept <input type="radio"/> reject |
| Catalyst Awards for the Development of Diagnostics, Devices, Therapeutics and Digital Health | 1st Resubmission | | <input type="radio"/> accept <input type="radio"/> reject |
| Catalyst Awards for the Development of Diagnostics, Devices, Therapeutics and Digital Health | 1st Resubmission | | <input type="radio"/> accept <input type="radio"/> reject |
| Catalyst Awards for the Development of Diagnostics, Devices, Therapeutics and Digital Health | 1st Resubmission | Nelson, Sarah | <input type="radio"/> accept <input type="radio"/> reject |
| New Child Leave Award | New Submission | Spencer, John | <input checked="" type="radio"/> accept <input type="radio"/> reject |
| Pilot in Integrative Medicine | New Submission | | <input checked="" type="radio"/> accept <input type="radio"/> reject |
| Team Science Grant | New Submission | | <input type="radio"/> accept <input checked="" type="radio"/> reject |

Rev. Comm. Support Staff Manage Rosters

Fall 2015 - Roster of Reviewers for Health Policy & Social Sciences

Before the review process starts please setup the roster of reviewers for **Health Policy & Social Sciences**. When you are done click the "Roster is Complete" button below to alert the RAP team.

You can edit the details for the review committee meeting in the box to the right. These will be shown to reviewers when they use RAP to review their assigned applications.

Meeting Details (shown to reviewers)

fdjsfska

Save these notes

Thank you for setting up the roster of reviewers for **Health Policy & Social Sciences**. You can come back to this page in the future to make changes.

Add a new Reviewer

| Reviewer | Department | Rank | Expertise | Meeting Status | |
|-----------------------------------|--|-----------|-----------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Barclay, Jennifer | SOM.Anthropology, History & Social Med | Professor | Neurology | Will attend in person | Remove Reviewer |
| Fisher, Gail | SOM.Anatomy | Professor | | Will attend via phone | Remove Reviewer |
| Kiser, Gretchen | SOM.Orthopaedic Surgery | | driving | Cannot attend but can review | Remove Reviewer |

3 Reviewers

© 2016 The Regents of the University of California

Reviewers Specify COI & Meeting RSVP

Fall 2015 - Conflicts of Interest and Meeting RSVP

Instructions

1. View applications that have been assigned to **Health Policy & Social Sciences**.
2. Indicate if you have any conflicts of interest (COIs) with any of the applications using the definition below.
3. Indicate your final RSVP details using the drop-down option to the right. Meeting details are provided above the RSVP form.

Definition - Conflict of Interest (COI)

For RAP, faculty working in the same department does not necessarily constitute COI. Unless the success or failure of an application affects a reviewer directly, there is no COI. If an applicant gets awarded and the reviewer receives a direct benefit from it, this is a COI. A reviewer is also in conflict if he/she feels that the relationship to the applicant will bias the review.

More specifically a long-standing friendship or a close relationship should be considered a COI. Any relationship with family members (spouses, siblings, parental, etc.) is to be considered a COI. Being a research mentor constitutes a COI. Being a career mentor does not constitute a COI.

Finally, in any given cycle, review committee members who submitted an application as PIs or co-PIs will be excused from serving if their application is being reviewed in the same committee where they belong, as this is also a COI.

Meeting Details

fdjsfska

My status for the meeting

Will attend in person

 You have reviewed all of the applications for conflicts of interest, thank you.

| Applicant | Co-Investigators | Title | Conflict of Interest? |
|-----------------|------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| Dolan, Kristin | | Screenshot TEST | <input checked="" type="radio"/> no <input type="radio"/> yes |
| Nelson, Sarah | | This is Sarah's resubmission TEST | <input checked="" type="radio"/> no <input type="radio"/> yes |
| Nelson, Sarah | | Phone number Field test 1/19/16 | <input checked="" type="radio"/> no <input type="radio"/> yes |
| Nelson, Sarah | | testing 1/14/16 | <input checked="" type="radio"/> no <input type="radio"/> yes |
| Nelson, Sarah | | 9.22.15 TEST | <input checked="" type="radio"/> no <input type="radio"/> yes |
| Nelson, Sarah | | Sarah's August 17 TEST | <input checked="" type="radio"/> no <input type="radio"/> yes |
| Volpe, Emanuela | Kiser, Gretchen | test monday august 17 | <input type="radio"/> no <input checked="" type="radio"/> yes |

7 Applications

Rev. Comm. Chairs Assign Reviewers

Reviewers for Health Policy & Social Sciences

and provide final meeting details by following the instructions below.

Reviewer A & B columns

Click the dropdown arrow to select the reviewer you wish to assign to that proposal

Click the dropdown arrow to assign reviewers A & B

Click the dropdown arrow to select the meeting within the Meeting Details box (reviewers will see this when they view assignments)

When the assignments are final, click the orange button to move the process to Step 7

Assign

Meeting Details (shown to reviewers)

fdjsfska

Save these notes

Selected reviewers.

| | Grant Mechanism | Submission Version | COIs | Reviewer A | Reviewer B |
|--------------|--|--------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| | Catalyst Awards for the Development of Diagnostics, Devices, Therapeutics and Digital Health | New Submission | | Assign | Assign |
| | Catalyst Awards for the Development of Diagnostics, Devices, Therapeutics and Digital Health | 1st Resubmission | Barclay, Jennifer | Barclay, Jennifer | Fisher, Gail |
| st 1/19/16 | Catalyst Awards for the Development of Diagnostics, Devices, Therapeutics and Digital Health | 1st Resubmission | | Assign | Assign |
| mission TEST | Catalyst Awards for the Development of Diagnostics, Devices, Therapeutics and Digital Health | 1st Resubmission | | Assign | Assign |
| | New Child Leave Award | New Submission | | Barclay, Jennifer | Fisher, Gail |
| ST | Pilot in Integrative Medicine | New Submission | | Barclay, Jennifer | Fisher, Gail |
| 7 | Team Science Grant | New Submission | Kiser, Gretchen | Fisher, Gail | Barclay, Jennifer |

Chairs/Support Staff Monitor Review Status

Health Policy & Social Sciences

review for Health Policy & Social Sciences

Meeting. Click to move to Step 8 when the Review Committee Meeting commences.

Applications

Meeting Details (shown to reviewers)

fdjsfska

Save these notes

| Grant Mechanism | Submission Version | COIs | Reviewer A | Reviewer B | Initial Average | Initial Std Dev | Final Average | Final Std Dev | Status |
|--|--------------------|-------------------|---|---|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|--|
| atylst Awards for the Development of Diagnostics, Devices, Therapeutics and Digital Health | New Submission | | ⚠ Fisher, Gail (incomplete) | ⚠ Barclay, Jennifer (incomplete) | | | | | ⚠ pending |
| atylst Awards for the Development of Diagnostics, Devices, Therapeutics and Digital Health | 1st Resubmission | Barclay, Jennifer | ✔ Barclay, Jennifer (2) | ⚠ Fisher, Gail (incomplete) | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | ⚠ pending |
| atylst Awards for the Development of Diagnostics, Devices, Therapeutics and Digital Health | 1st Resubmission | | ⚠ Barclay, Jennifer (incomplete) | ⚠ Fisher, Gail (incomplete) | | | | | ⚠ pending |
| atylst Awards for the Development of Diagnostics, Devices, Therapeutics and Digital Health | 1st Resubmission | | ⚠ Fisher, Gail (incomplete) | ⚠ Barclay, Jennifer (incomplete) | | | | | ⚠ pending |
| ew Child Leave Award | New Submission | | ✔ Barclay, Jennifer (8) | ✔ Fisher, Gail (6) | 7 (triage?) | 1.4 | 4.5 (triage?) | 2.1 | ✔ done |
| ilot in Integrative Medicine | New Submission | | ✔ Barclay, Jennifer (6) | ✔ Fisher, Gail (1) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 2.5 | 0.7 | ✔ done |
| eam Science Grant | New Submission | Kiser, Gretchen | ✔ Fisher, Gail (3) | ✔ Barclay, Jennifer (3) | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | ✔ triaged |

Reviewer Dashboard

Dashboard

Fall 2015

Applications submitted for Fall 2015 are currently being reviewed. You will receive a notification email when the review process has been completed.

[View ALL applications assigned to Health Policy & Social Sciences](#)

fdjsfska

Please review the following Applications for Health Policy & Social Sciences by clicking on each proposal's title.

| PI1 / PI2 | Title | Submission Version | Grant Mechanism | Budget | Review Status |
|-----------------|---|--------------------|--|---------------|---------------------------|
| Volpe, Emanuela | test monday august 17 | New Submission | Team Science Grant | \$30000 | ✔ Complete |
| Nelson, Sarah | Sarah's August 17 TEST | New Submission | Pilot in Integrative Medicine | \$900000 | ✔ Complete |
| Nelson, Sarah | 9.22.15 TEST | New Submission | New Child Leave Award | \$30000 | ✔ Complete |
| Nelson, Sarah | testing 1/14/16 | 1st Resubmission | Catalyst Awards for the Development of Diagnostics, Devices, Therapeutics and Digital Health | \$30000000000 | ✔ Complete |
| Nelson, Sarah | Phone number Field test 1/19/16 | 1st Resubmission | Catalyst Awards for the Development of Diagnostics, Devices, Therapeutics and Digital Health | \$88888888 | ❌ Incomplete |
| Nelson, Sarah | This is Sarah's resubmission TEST | 1st Resubmission | Catalyst Awards for the Development of Diagnostics, Devices, Therapeutics and Digital Health | \$40000 | ❌ Incomplete |
| Dolan, Kristin | Screenshot TEST | New Submission | Catalyst Awards for the Development of Diagnostics, Devices, Therapeutics and Digital Health | \$90000 | ❌ Incomplete |

Review Form

Review of This is Sarah's resubmission TEST

Review of RDO Test Proposal

1. Review the application
2. Answer all the questions below
3. Add confidential comments (as needed)
4. Select an overall score for the application



Nelson_Sarah_Fall2015_63.pdf
Uploaded 1/22/16 9:19 AM

This is a re-submission of an application that was originally submitted in a previous cycle.

[View the previous reviews](#)

1. General critique and summary of the proposal.

2. Significance. Does the study address an important problem? Does the proposed technology/approach address an important unmet need or improve upon existing technology/approaches aimed at improving health or managing disease through delivery of technology utilizing mobile devices or non-mobile systems (laptops, desktops, etc)?

Review Committee Meeting Live Scoring

Review Meeting for Health Policy & Social Sciences

1-9 (= Poor) for the overall impact/priority score, and not for the individual review criteria. [Click here](#) to view the detailed scoring rubric.

| Grant Mechanism | Submission Version | Budget | Reviewer A | Reviewer B | My Score |
|--|--------------------|---------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|
| Catalyst Awards for the Development of Diagnostics, Devices, Therapeutics and Digital Health | New Submission | \$90000 | 9 view | (view) | <input type="text"/> |
| Catalyst Awards for the Development of Diagnostics, Devices, Therapeutics and Digital Health | 1st Resubmission | \$40000 | 8 view | (view) | <input type="text"/> |
| Catalyst Awards for the Development of Diagnostics, Devices, Therapeutics and Digital Health | 1st Resubmission | \$88888888 | (view) | 1 view | <input type="text"/> |
| Catalyst Awards for the Development of Diagnostics, Devices, Therapeutics and Digital Health | 1st Resubmission | \$30000000000 | 2 | 3 | I have a COI |
| New Child Leave Award | New Submission | \$30000 | 8 (view) | 6 view | <input type="text"/> |
| Pilot in Integrative Medicine | New Submission | \$900000 | 6 (view) | 1 view | <input type="text"/> |
| Team Science Grant | New Submission | \$30000 | 3 view | 3 (view) | <input type="text"/> |

Review Committee Meeting Live Scoring Summary


Health Policy & Social Sciences

| | |
|-----------------|----------|
| Triaged 33% | 1 |
| 1-1.99 | 0 |
| 2-2.99 | 1 |
| 3-3.99 | 0 |
| 4-4.99 | 1 |
| 5-5.99 | 0 |
| 6-9.00 | 0 |
| Total | 3 |
| Mean | 3.5 |
| Median | 3.5 |
| Mean w/triage | 3.33 |
| Median w/triage | 3 |



| Grant Mechanism | Submission Version | COIs | Reviewer A | Reviewer B | Initial Average | Initial Std Dev | Final Average | Final Std Dev | Status |
|---|--------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|-----------|
| atalyst Awards for the Development of Diagnostics, Devices, Therapeutics and Digital Health | New Submission | | ✓ Fisher, Gail (9) | ✗ Barclay, Jennifer (incomplete) | 9 (triage?) | 0 | | | 🟡 pending |
| atalyst Awards for the Development of Diagnostics, Devices, Therapeutics and Digital Health | 1st Resubmission | Barclay, Jennifer | ✓ Barclay, Jennifer (2) | ✓ Fisher, Gail (3) | 2.5 | 0.7 | 3 | 0 | 🟡 pending |
| atalyst Awards for the Development of Diagnostics, Devices, Therapeutics and Digital Health | 1st Resubmission | | ✗ Barclay, Jennifer (incomplete) | ✓ Fisher, Gail (1) | 1 | 0 | | | 🟡 pending |
| atalyst Awards for the Development of Diagnostics, Devices, Therapeutics and Digital Health | 1st Resubmission | | ✓ Fisher, Gail (8) | ✗ Barclay, Jennifer (incomplete) | 8 (triage?) | 0 | | | 🟡 pending |
| ew Child Leave Award | New Submission | | ✓ Barclay, Jennifer (8) | ✓ Fisher, Gail (6) | 7 (triage?) | 1.4 | 4.5 (triage?) | 2.1 | 🟢 done |
| lot in Integrative Medicine | New Submission | | ✓ Barclay, Jennifer (6) | ✓ Fisher, Gail (1) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 2.5 | 0.7 | 🟢 done |
| am Science Grant | New Submission | Kiser, Gretchen | ✓ Fisher, Gail (3) | ✓ Barclay, Jennifer (3) | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 🟢 triaged |

Final Funding “Horse-Trading” Meeting



All Reviewed Applications Sort by Score

| School | Department | Title | Mechanism | Submission Version | Budget | BK | MCD | TB | Total |
|----------|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| Pharmacy | SOM:Biochemistry & Biophysics | Sarah's August 17 TEST | Pilot in Integrative Medicine | New Submission | \$900,000 | \$900,000 | | | \$900,000 1 |
| Pharmacy | SOM:Biochemistry & Biophysics | 9.22.15 TEST | New Child Leave Award | New Submission | \$30,000 | | \$30,000 | | \$30,000 2 |
| Pharmacy | SOM:Medicine | test monday august 17 | Team Science Grant | New Submission | \$30,000 | \$15,000 | | \$15,000 | \$30,000 3 |
| | | | | | | \$915,000 / 95% 2 / 67% | \$30,000 / 3% 1 / 33% | \$15,000 / 2% 1 / 33% | \$960,000 3 |
| School | Department | Title | Mechanism | Submission Version | Budget | BK | MCD | TB | Total |

Questions?

Thank you!



University of California
San Francisco