UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY (UCORP)
ANNUAL REPORT 2007-08

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:
The University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP), as specified in Senate Bylaw 200, is responsible for fostering research, for formulating, coordinating, and revising general research policies and procedures, and for advising the President on research. During the 2007-08 academic year, UCORP met eight times. This report briefly outlines the committee’s activities.

Investigation into Indirect Cost Recovery (ICR), AKA Facilities and Administration (F&A) Costs
Last year, the committee began an investigation into Indirect Cost Recovery (ICR), also known as Facilities and Administration (F&A) cost recovery. These monies are reimbursements to research institutions for the cost of conducting research—common examples are building maintenance and grant administration and accounting. Systemwide, federal ICR alone totals over $500M annually; this amount, however, falls short of fully reimbursing the University for its F&A expenditures. As UC’s total research increases, this gap between expenditures and recovery widens, putting the University on a downward trajectory in terms of net income relating to research. In today’s difficult budget climate, the danger of research being categorized as an “expense” is one UC can ill-afford.

As a result of last year’s investigation, UCORP submitted to the Academic Council an interim report which included three recommendations for the 2007-08 UCORP:

1. To form a joint UCORP-UCPB working group, to operate for the 2007-08 academic year, comprised of no more than 5-6 members, with the charge of gathering data, deliberating on these and related issues, and making specific recommendations to the Academic Council regarding matters of ICR and general research budgeting and accounting.

2. To explore options for tracking the use of ICR funds, and use of Opportunity Funds and UC General Funds, so that the extent to which ICR funds are used to support research can be documented and evaluated, and the extent of the research support deficit (if any) can be quantified and tracked over time.

3. That UCORP and UCOP should work together to develop strategies for improving UC’s research profile throughout the state and country, and to make clear to the public at large the unique importance of UC's research mission. Suggested strategies will be vetted through the Academic Council.

The Academic Council endorsed these recommendations, and this year, Chair Wudka, San Francisco Representative Pittet, and UCPB Vice Chair Conrad formed a subcommittee to work on the project. The fist step in the investigation consisted of gathering and understanding data on the manner in which ICR monies are dispersed by UCOP to the campuses. Chair Wudka volunteered to do this, and the requested data sheets for the period 2001-2007 were obtained from UCOP. However, assimilation of the data was a much slower process than expected. Eventually, it became clear that though the ICR funds are separated into categories according to a well defined formula,
the details of this formula, while being simple arithmetical expressions, are difficult to obtain. In addition, it appears that the data provided were not comprehensive.

By the end of the academic year, most of this preliminary work had been completed, but it is unfortunate that it proved impossible to obtain more concrete results in this period. Understanding this process is important, and the new era of transparency and accountability may bode well for subsequent endeavors.

Universitywide Research Programs

Restructuring Multicampus Research Units (MRUs):
Last year, the Office of Research and Graduate Studies established an MRU Advisory Board tasked to revise the MRU structure, nomenclature, and operating protocol. Vice Chair Carey served on the Advisory Board and provided periodic updates to the committee. The Advisory Board’s full recommendations will be presented to UCORP in the fall of 2008.

California Institutes for Science and Innovation (Cal ISIs):
Previously, at the request of Provost Hume and Academic Council Chair Brunk, the chairs of UCORP and UCPB developed a draft protocol for the review of the California Institutes for Science and Innovation (Cal ISIs). The protocol and additional recommendation were approved by the Academic Council and adopted by the Provost as the basis for a sequential review of the four Cal ISIs beginning with the review of the California Institute for Telecommunications and Information Technology (Cal IT2). Upon completion of the CalIT2 review, UCORP made further recommendations on the protocol, focusing on its efficacy and further developing guidelines for the preparation of an ISI Director’s Report to parallel the review panel guidelines in the adopted protocol.

This year, the California Institute for Quantitative Biosciences (QB3) was reviewed. The Senate’s compendium committees received the review in June and appointed subcommittees to draft their responses. UCORP will review the draft response in the early fall of 2008.

Department of Energy National Laboratory Issues
The committee received regular updates on the status of the Department of Energy (DOE) national laboratories’ management contracts, generally, and specifically, on the challenges and changes involved in transferring administration of (1) the Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) to the Los Alamos National Security, Limited Liability Company (LANS LLC) and (2) the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) to the Lawrence Livermore National Security, Limited Liability Company (LLNS LLC). Both LLCs are semi-independent management groups formed by UC, Bechtel, and others in response to DOE calls to change the administrative structure of the labs. Reports were provided by UCORP Chair Jose Wudka, a member of the Academic Council Special Committee on the Laboratory Issues (ACSCOLI), as well as by UCORP’s OP consultants, ex officio members, and invited guests. The topics addressed included: management transition issues, staff and scientist morale concerns, usage of the
management fees, unclassified research projects and collaboration opportunities, and the balance between scientific advancement and nuclear arms production.

**Agricultural and Environmental Research**
This year, UCORP confronted a number of agricultural and environmental research-related efforts. First, the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources (DANR), received a new Vice President and efforts for a long-awaited academic review of the division were given the green light. UCORP advised on the protocol for the academic review by suggested methodologies, metrics, and potential external reviewers. UCORP also met with both the incumbent associate vice president and the incoming vice president to learn more about the division and to foster greater collegiality.

Secondly, UCORP Vice Chair James Carey regularly updated the committee on developments surrounding proposed pheromone spraying designed to eradicate the light brown apple moth (LBAM), which has been frequently portrayed as a destructive invasive species. UCORP noted its concerns regarding the scientific rigor employed by advocates of spraying and explored more comprehensively the role of UC in advising the state in matters of scientific import.

Finally, various environmental research opportunities arose, and UCORP remained abreast of each. Among the emerging programs are the high-profile BP/UC Berkeley cooperative, the Energy Biosciences Institute (EBI), which is the largest joint-venture any UC campus has yet embarked upon, and the California Institute for Climate Solutions (CICS), a state Public Utilities Commission (PUC)-led effort. EBI was a source of both much publicity and controversy due to its unprecedented financial size and to attendant concerns of academic freedom. CICS was similarly a cause of much concern regarding its method of funding and its politically-challenging emergence.

UCORP will continue to monitor each of these important issues.

**Consultation with the Office of the President**
In addition to the above, consultants from the Office of Research and Graduate Studies regularly updated the committee on policy issues related to research, including:
- The California Stem Cell Initiative and the California Institute for Regenerative Medicine
- Animal researcher security
- Ownership of research data
- Technology transfer
- Changes in state and federal policies relating to UC research, like funding- and security-related restrictions
- NIH policy changes
- Implementing RE-89, which bans accepting tobacco-industry sponsored research funding
- Restructuring at the Office of the President, generally, and within the Office of Research and Graduate Studies, specifically
Policy implications of the DOD’s National Security Science and Engineering Faculty Fellowships program
The Honest Leadership and Open Government Act of 2007

UCORP also received briefings on the California Institute for Quantitative Biosciences (QB3), UCOP’s offices of International Strategy Development, Compliance and Audit, Strategic Publishing, and Health Sciences, and on efforts to increase graduate student support.

Reports and Recommendations
Additionally, the committee commented on these items of Senate business:
- The Information Technology Guidance Committee report, “Creating a UC Cyberinfrastructure”
- A proposed Undergraduate Mission Statement
- The report of the Expanded Joint Ad Hoc Committee on UC’s International Education Program
- The Regents’ Diversity Reports
- Plans to establish an OP Institutional Research Unit
- Revisions to the Health Sciences Code of Conduct
- The Role of Graduate Students in University Instruction
- Proposed amendments to APM sections 335-10-a, 740-11-c, and 350
- Proposed state legislation, California Animal Enterprise Protection Act

UCORP Representation
The Chair, Vice Chair, or another committee member or liaison represented UCORP on the following systemwide bodies during the year: Academic Assembly, Academic Council, Academic Council Special Committee on Lab Issues, Academic Planning Council, Council on Research, Industry-University Cooperative Research Program Steering Committee, and the Technology Transfer Advisory Committee. Throughout the year, UCORP’s representatives provided updates on the activities of these groups.
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