Dear Bob,

At its June 21, 2006 meeting, the Academic Council adopted the enclosed Statement of the Academic Council on Interaction Between UC’s Faculty and UC-Associated National Laboratories. The Statement, which was drafted by the Academic Council Special Committee on the National Labs (ACSCONL), will be brought to the Assembly for final Senate action in the fall. We wish, however, to provide you with the Statement now as a Council-endorsed position and ask that it be forwarded to the Regents as an informational item for their July meeting.

As you know, ACSCONL serves as the Council’s advisory body on UC’s management of the Los Alamos National Laboratory (LLNL), the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL), and the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL). Since the question of the role of UC faculty vis-á-vis the Labs is central to the charge and function of ACSCONL, the committee drafted this set of recommended actions that, if implemented, will ensure that faculty expertise and advice are brought to bear in UC’s continued but changed and still changing involvement with LANL, LLNL, and LBNL.

We would appreciate hearing your thoughts on these recommendations and any feedback that may come from the Regents. I look forward to informing you as to the final action on this proposal after it is considered by the Assembly in the fall.

Sincerely,

John Oakley, Chair
Academic Council

Copy: Academic Council
Maria Bertero-Barcelò, Executive Director

Encl: 1
The University of California (UC) has a long history of managing national laboratories for the federal government. This history began in 1943 with the establishment of the Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL). As of 1 June 2006, management of LANL has been assumed by Los Alamos National Security (LANS), a limited liability company (LLC). The LANS LLC was formed by UC in partnership with the Bechtel Corporation and two other industrial partners in order to qualify as an eligible bidder for the management of LANL under the terms set by the federal Department of Energy (DOE) in seeking competitive bids for the LANL management contract. UC continues to manage directly the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) and the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL). UC’s contract to manage LBNL was renewed in 2005, and with extensions has a potential term of 20 years. UC’s contract to manage LLNL extends through 30 September 2007.

UC and DOE have long emphasized the importance of UC’s prominence in science and research to the health of the UC-managed national labs. In discussing with the Board of Regents the rationale for bidding on the contract for LANL, President Dynes on 25 May 2005 noted that it is the “excellence of the science that (UC) can bring to the table.” Further, it is clear that the UC faculty is the core component of UC’s excellence in science and technology. UC faculty have played active roles in past oversight of UC-managed national laboratories through their positions on the President’s Council and its lab panels. However, there have been relatively few direct interactions between the UC faculty and the Technical and Scientific Staff Members (TSMs) of the Los Alamos and Livermore labs, other than a limited number of collaborations on specific projects such as those of UC Davis and UC Merced with the Livermore lab. (The Berkeley lab, which is located next to U.C. Berkeley and conducts only non-classified research, has had close collaborative relationships with many UC campuses.)

UC’s key responsibility within the LANS LLC that now manages the Los Alamos lab is to ensure LANL’s excellence in science and technology. We anticipate that a successful bid by UC and its LLC partners for the Livermore lab’s management contract, should the Regents choose to pursue such a bid, would assign to UC a similar responsibility. In order to maintain the scientific and technical excellence of the work performed at these labs in the absence of direct management responsibility, UC must draw on the resources of its faculty to an even more important degree than in the past.

The Academic Council Special Committee on the National Laboratories (ACSCONL) acts as the Academic Council’s advisory body on UC’s management of the Berkeley, Livermore, and Los Alamos national labs. After close consultation with UC’s Provost and the laboratory-management staff within UC’s Office of the President (UCOP), ACSCONL has recommended a series of actions whereby UC’s faculty and Academic Senate can facilitate the continued achievement of excellence in science and technology at national laboratories that are managed by LLCs in which UC is a partner. The Academic Council adopts these recommendations, believing that continued faculty and Senate engagement with the national
labs is in the best interest of both UC and the nation. Faculty participation in the operation and management of UC-associated national labs is warranted not only by the spirit and tradition of shared governance within the UC system, but also by the essential reality that UC’s expertise in science and technology resides in and flows from its faculty.

The Academic Council accordingly proposes the following actions and recommendations to assure that faculty expertise informs UC’s continued involvement with the Berkeley, Livermore, and Los Alamos national laboratories. Some of these are items we can accomplish as a faculty, acting through the Academic Senate; some require significant cooperation from UCOP. In regard to the latter we have substantial indication, as of ACSCONL’s meeting on 13 June 2006, that UCOP will work closely and cooperatively with the faculty with respect to future lab-management issues relating to the scientific and technical performance of UC-associated national laboratories.

1. ACSCONL shall recommend to the Academic Council an appropriate entity and review protocol for regular and broadly based Senate oversight of UC’s relationship with the national labs by Senate members who are informed and knowledgeable in regard to the labs.

2. The Academic Council recommends to UCOP that shared governance with respect to scientific and technical excellence at the national laboratories would be best achieved if the above entity worked in concert with the Office of the Provost and Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs, as well as with UCOP’s lab-management staff.

3. The Academic Council recommends that the Academic Senate have a substantial role in advising the President on the dispersal of UC’s share of fee monies associated with UC’s role in any lab-management contract, either directly or through an LLC. This should include advising on selected research areas and methods of collaboration in research of mutual interest to the labs and UC. These fees should support specific scientific and technical projects at the labs as well as synergistic scientific and technical activities at UC. These projects and activities should include the analysis of societal issues related to work done at the labs (e.g., understanding the effects of nuclear proliferation on the likelihood of international conflict or the interaction between civil liberties and efforts to improve homeland security).

4. To further these ends and to promote greater intellectual exchange and closer connections between the national laboratories and UC faculty, the Academic Council recommends that a committee composed of UC faculty, relevant UCOP and lab-management personnel, and laboratory TSMs, be immediately appointed and convened by UCOP for the purpose of promoting faculty-lab collaboration, with a view to establishing a permanent framework for periodic joint meetings of UC faculty and lab personnel focused upon particular programs and/or scientific disciplines.

5. The Academic Council recommends that the Academic Senate take the lead, in partnership with the national laboratories, to determine unmet educational needs that joint collaboration can address. The educational needs of undergraduate, graduate, and post-doctoral students at the national labs and on the campuses should be addressed.

6. The Academic Council recommends that the Academic Senate assist the national labs in their research and programmatic review procedures by identifying UC faculty with relevant technical expertise who would be willing to volunteer their service for these purposes. UC
faculty should be included both on relevant committees of any UC-associated LLC (such as the LANS LLC “Mission” and “Science and Technology” committees) as well as on focused technical-review panels at the national laboratories.

7. The Academic Council recommends that the Academic Senate share its procedures and faculty expertise in the national labs’ personnel review process, both in the design of such processes and also by serving on search committees and/or periodic career progress reviews.

8. The Academic Council recommends that the Academic Senate invite TSMs from the Labs to sit in as observers on systemwide Senate committees that address issues that might be of interest to TSMs (e.g., Academic Freedom, Academic Personnel, Faculty Welfare, and Research Policy, among others).