

FEEDBACK SUMMARY STATEMENT

THEME 2: RESEARCH INNOVATION

Student Response Summary

There were 27 student responses received, the majority of which expressed support for the overall proposal and the four recommendations advanced. Specific comments and suggestions are summarized as follows:

- Partner scholars with civic leaders (and alumni) to catalyze innovative social impact.
- Expand research opportunities to all students and integrate research as part of the undergraduate research experience (the UCI UROP Program was referenced as a model).
- Dedicated training for enhancing grant proposal writing, although there was some resistance to staging research opportunities as competitions.
- Support for the campus-wide health research initiative and use of medical devices for behavioral intervention (although the potential for privacy implications was raised).
- Support for greater commercialization of UCLA research to improve the pipeline of Bruin-led companies with an eventual return on investment through future revenue/donations.
- Incentives through compensation or innovation profits and pursuit of the various opportunities presented by the DTUCLA partnership.

One student wrote with reference to the Healthy Behaviors Initiative as a key area for innovation, social impact, and multidisciplinary effort, noting the exclusion of an important potential contributor, the Healthcare Business Association at the Anderson School (<http://www.andersonhba.com/>).

Faculty Response Summary

Fifty-one faculty responded to this plan with varied feedback regarding the specific recommendations, which are summarized below.

Expand the Research Base:

- There is a need for greater diversification of research efforts outside of STEM fields (arts, humanities, and social sciences) and for increased research collaborations, funding opportunities, and the development of applied technologies with stakeholders such as industry, government, NGOs, and investors. Although research has become more collaborative, university policies limit and hinder the ability to work closely and negotiate with potential industrial partners.
- The plan advances good ideas for increasing external funding for health and hard sciences research, although these efforts should all fall under the purview of the office of the vice

chancellor of research. The report appears to bias large external funding, not research impact or innovation.

- Resources should be directed to UCLA's two "little known" undergraduate research centers whose goals align closely with this plan. Support is needed to enhance their effectiveness and to support student scholarships for undergraduate research.
- Additional funding recommendations included: seed new research to support pilot project requirements; provide minimal funding to young researchers so they can focus on research and innovation; provide non-senate faculty with increased access to research funds and support for scholarly, community, and artistic work.
- Concern was expressed that ITAR-related funding will exclude the participation of international students and postdocs, who are an important part of our research program. There is also no indication of how much funding is available and what impact it would have on UCLA research in general.
- With fewer federal grants, UCLA needs to consider endowment growth as a means of supporting research and our considerable assets could leverage interest with donors (i.e., research opportunities for young and under-represented students). It is suggested that the university partners with the patron-based website benefunder and that the development office reach out to faculty to highlight and champion their research to potential donors.
- Providing greater assistance with grant proposal preparation, expert writing, and the development of multidisciplinary proposals was well received.
- Reducing bureaucracy and redundancy while enhancing research space and infrastructure will increase competitiveness and facilitate cross-campus collaboration and organization of campus efforts. Return of overhead to productive research centers would help with infrastructure maintenance and strategic recruitment of talent that will enhance competition for funding.

Downtown UCLA – Innovation:

- This initiative received overall praise for the opportunities a downtown campus would provide in support of UCLA's mission and as a platform for new research that will have true social impact. Research innovation topics could include domestic violence, child abuse, elder abuse, opioid addiction, PTSD, HIV/AIDS, family discord, fear of death and dying, teenage suicides, bullying and uprising divorce.
- UCLA's urban initiatives should not be concentrated solely downtown, but also include the valleys, satellite communities extending into Orange County, and the racial-ethnic neighborhoods of East L.A., Koreatown, South L.A., and Chinatown, as they add a vital dimension. Partnerships and relationships with these neighborhoods have been built over

decades by UCLA centers and should be a key part of any conversation around a downtown initiative.

- Innovation investment for longer term benefit could include mobile laboratories; additional incubator labs and research space for translating breakthroughs into cutting-edge therapies for patients; and support for drug development projects.
- One faculty member feels that a downtown presence may further fracture the faculty, “The faculty need to congregate more to benefit from synergies, not be more dispersed.”
- UCLA needs an impressive publication that promotes our research to an educated public and donors. Existing magazines only touch on some of the work underway. Coordination with department staff writers would prove helpful in this regard and could be helpful to faculty with writing grant applications.
- As education is a huge part of urban innovation, it is essential for UCLA to facilitate partnerships with urban public schools, establish interdisciplinary projects with GSEIS, Architecture and Urban Planning and Public Policy, and document the impact on K-12 students in under-served areas of Los Angeles.
- Contrary to the essence of the plan, ORUs, multidisciplinary research, and outreach appear to have devalued at UCLA, funding for multidisciplinary grants has been inadequate, and administrative burden is crippling creative science. Leadership needs to adopt a more personal and helpful approach, and look closely at what has worked and what has failed before engaging in future strategic moves.

Healthy Behaviors Research Initiative:

- Positive psychiatry focused on improving the wellbeing of students, faculties and communities at large is a significant public need – one that is fundable and requires multidisciplinary teams, which UCLA excels at.
- This initiative should leverage the existing UCLA Healthy Campus Initiative, which is well positioned to lead this work. Perspectives on health behaviors from Public Health, Psychology, Nursing, and Medicine are needed. Reaching full potential for technology solutions will require complementing end-user insights with broader perspectives from the traditional humanities, social sciences, and health sciences.
- Suggestions for additional points to be included in the initiative: a commitment to new approaches to health behavior theory and developing interventions (recent work in both the U.S. and U.K. was cited https://www.ucl.ac.uk/health-psychology/people/Susan_Michie); expansion of the what, why, and how bullets presented to include reference to emotional, physical and social wellbeing, additional campus units to connect research areas (including the HCI), and incentives for conducting interdisciplinary team research.

- Some concerns and resistance to the plan were expressed about the choice of technology for research innovation, coordination of the initiative, and ensuring respect for autonomy and investigator-initiated research.

University-wide Research Competition:

- Fresh approaches to identifying and prioritizing community/societal needs are essential (and need to be free of industry influence) to guiding the direction of research. In addition, reward structures tend to influence research and prestigious or lucrative research does not necessarily address critical needs of the community.
- Competition has its uses but demotivates those who don't win. Provide incentive for projects that are collaborations of UCLA faculty.

Staff Response Summary

Forty-two responses were received that were primarily positive with regard to the overall plan.

Specific feedback/recommendations included:

- The plan recommendations need to be fleshed out in more actionable detail for implementation – especially the downtown proposal that appears to be prohibitively expensive and ambitious in timeline and scope. DTUCLA should leverage the presence of UCLA Extension to support developing partnerships and avoid redundancy.
- Additional collaboration between north and south campus should be encouraged.
- Ensure inclusion of the Technology Development Group (TDG) expertise to monetize the research and innovation breakthroughs.
- Provide staff opportunities for engagement and participation as well as training.
- How is this plan relevant to the original premise, which is UCLA's unique position in a global city? Where is the commitment to leadership in cross-cultural research? Language and communication research? Studies that examine effects of global industry in relation to our society?
- DTUCLA is a powerful initiative; however, the "why" portion only addresses the public relations benefit, rather than the social impact on the community, transformative power of the program, and the reciprocal learning that will result.
- Aging infrastructure, staffing deficiencies, and existing campus resources need to be updated for expansion of research and innovation to be strategic and successful.
- The ideas presented are exciting, however, this plan calls for expanded initiatives and a new facility in a part of LA where UCLA is not well established. There is no discussion of costs, transparency of decision making, or interface with the committee drafting the civic

engagement plan. The partnership with city government fails to recognize universities nearby with longstanding, deeply rooted partnerships with the mayor's office and city government. With regard to seed funding, UCLA has had at least four seed funding programs over the last five years and should be looking at how to support the initiatives that come from these programs and how to scale the research in the next stage.

- The goals should be reframed to (1) identify and invest in signature programs such as the university-led grand challenges; (2) revolutionize our relationships with external constituents (foundations, industry, city/county/state); (3) identify and secure high profile funding in our areas of expertise; (4) continue to invest in and foster our innovation and entrepreneurship ecosystem; (5) develop and coordinate strategic communications specifically for research to better tell our stories by leveraging existing channels (newsroom, website and magazine) and developing new ones.

Alumni Response Summary

Ten alumni responded expressing general agreement with DTUCLA and an expanded research platform to attract talent, provide incentives and innovative funding (particularly to the humanities), and develop marketing strategies.