

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY  
ANNUAL REPORT 2000-2001**

**TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:**

The University Committee on Research Policy met nine times during the 2000-2001 academic year. Highlights of the Committee's activities and accomplishments are noted in this report.

**Representation on the Academic Council.** In addition to reviewing MRUs, proposals for new schools, and advising on complex issues presented by the National Labs, in recent years, matters of research policy have become an increasing part of UCORP's agenda. As such, UCORP feels strongly that the time has come for the Committee to be formally represented on the faculty governing board of this major research university. In June, UCORP submitted a request, to the Academic Council Chair, for a Bylaw change that would include its Chair in the membership of the Academic Council. It is both appropriate and timely that UCORP have an equal voice with the other Senate Committees represented on the Council, since its charge is central to the mission of the University of California.

**DOE Lab Contracts.** During the past two years, issues surrounding the DOE Labs occupied much of the Committee's attention. During the 1999-2000 academic year, UCORP began to inform itself about Labs issues in order to participate effectively in the discussions over the renegotiations of the contract that were expected to take place in March/April 2001. UCORP held its May 1999 meeting at the Lawrence Livermore National Lab (LLNL), and its May 2000 meeting at the Lawrence Berkeley National Lab (LBNL). This gave the committee the opportunity to visit some of the Labs' facilities and to have discussions with both management and scientists. In addition, UCORP held a successful videoconference with management and scientists from the Los Alamos National Lab during its April 2000 meeting. UCORP also consulted regularly about Lab issues with the Office of Research at UCOP. With this background, UCORP was hoping to be able to make an in-depth analysis of UC management of the Labs prior to the contract renegotiations. However, in October 2000, the DOE exercised its option to request a three-year extension of the current contract, with small changes, for LANL and LLNL. Because of the considerably shortened time available for discussion, UCORP was not able to assess, in detail, all of the advantages and disadvantages of UC management. While UCORP would have preferred a longer discussion period, the Committee recommended that the Council endorse the extension of these contracts because of the serious recruitment and retention problems at the Labs. The new contract, as expected, included the creation of the new position of Vice President for Laboratory Management. The UCORP Chair served on the selection committee for this search, which concluded successfully with the appointment of John McTague. The contract also included several unexpected provisions that are of serious concern to UCORP, including the right of the DOE to remove from contract work any Lab employee. These concerns were transmitted to the Academic Council.

**UCORP Subcommittee on UC-DOE Relations.** UCORP's support of the contract extension was conditional upon the formation of a Subcommittee that would evaluate the pros and cons of UC management and provide the basis for informed faculty input during the subsequent round of contract negotiations. The objective of the Subcommittee will be to examine the benefits and costs to the University of California and to the nation of UC's management and oversight of the

LLNL, LANL, and LBNL, and evaluate the university's capacities to manage these important national resources in the context of recent changes in UC's relationship with the DOE. The work of the Subcommittee will take place over the next two years. A preliminary report to the Academic Council will be completed by Fall 2002, with a final report and recommendations submitted by Spring 2003. The Subcommittee will also recommend whether there should be a separate Senate Committee to inform the Academic Senate at regular intervals about the Labs. The existence of such a Committee would relieve UCORP from the burden of trying to provide information to the faculty on the Labs, in addition to providing advice and recommendations on a variety of other research issues.

**Visit to the Los Alamos National Lab.** In the place of its April 2001 meeting, UCORP made an unprecedented visit to the Los Alamos National Laboratory in New Mexico. The Committee met formally and informally with both scientists and staff, including those involved in "production" and classified work. Productive discussions focused on the impact of safety and security regulations at the operations level, UC's role in recruitment and retention, the effects of the new rules and regulations contained in the contract extension, and the benefits to Lab personnel of UC's management.

**Multicampus Research Unit (MRU) Programs.** During the 1999-2000 academic year, UCORP established a Subcommittee to discuss possible ways to reinvigorate the Multicampus Research Unit program. The Subcommittee found that the MRU budget allocation had been stagnant for more than 30 years. In addition, some of the old MRU programs are too dependent on the university and not aggressive enough in seeking outside funding. A funding strategy should be found that would not only allow for a regular and consistent way to reward topnotch MRUs but that would also enable the Office of Research to create new ones. Sunsetting some of the old programs would be one way to make funds available. This discussion continued over the year with Office of Research staff and the Vice President-Budget.

**MRU Comparative Reviews.** UCORP reviewed the reports on the comparative fifteen-year review of the Toxic Substances Research and Teaching Program, University of California Energy Institute (UCEI), and the Cancer Research Coordinating Committee (CRCC) and concurred that these three MRUs should be continued. In its review of the five-year report on the California Space Institute (CalSpace), UCORP recommended that this MRU be disestablished, and that a successor MRU be established to foster space research within the university through a competition that would be open to all campuses. Among the reasons for making this recommendation was that, during the past twenty years, CalSpace has had only limited success in establishing and maintaining multicampus programs. UCORP's recommendation was adopted by the Academic Council.

**2002-2003 Research Initiatives.** UCORP made recommendations on the proposed research initiatives for the 2002-2003 Regents Budget. In a discussion about the research emphases, UCORP encouraged the university to have more discourse with Legislators about areas of research that faculty think are both important and relevant. UCORP also suggested that it would be helpful if campus researchers, who are seeking funds, could be informed about the recommendations made on the Initiatives through their Divisional Committees on Research (CORs).

**Proposed New Schools/Programs.** During the year, UCORP reviewed and submitted formal recommendations to the Academic Council Chair on the following proposals/prospectuses:

UCB Institute for Geophysics & Planetary Physics (an MRU)

UCI Institute for Geophysics & Planetary Physics (an MRU)

UCLA Global Film School

UCI School of Law

UCSD Graduate School of Management

UCR School of Law

UCD Proposal to Reconstitute Division of Education

UCD Graduate School of the Environment

UCI School of Information/Computer Science

UCI School of Public Health

UCI School of Design

UCSF School of Advanced Health Studies

**Other Reports.** The Committee also reviewed and wrote opinions on the following reports:

Proposed Revisions to APM 025-Conflict of Commitment

Report from the University Committee on Library

Report from the Task Force on the Administrative Infrastructure Needs in Support of Industry-University Research

**Task Force on Year-Round Operations.** In a letter to the Academic Council Chair, UCORP voiced its concern about the long-term consequences of year-round operations on faculty, and recommended that the Systemwide Academic Senate be involved in a thorough discussion of this issue. Among UCORP's many concerns is how faculty will be able to engage in university government under this arrangement at the departmental, campus and systemwide levels. UCORP strongly urged the Council Chair to establish a Task Force to study the many issues surrounding year-round operations.

**UCORP Representation.** Either the Chair or a member represented UCORP on the following University Committees during the year: University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB), UC Merced Task Force, Council on Research, Industry-University Cooperative Research Program Steering Committee, President's Council on the National Labs, Science and Technology Panel.

**Acknowledgment.** On behalf of the UCORP members, I wish to acknowledge the invaluable contributions made by the following members of the Office of Research that helped to inform UCORP's discussions during the year: past Vice Provost-Research, Robert Shelton; Interim Vice Provost-Research, Larry Coleman; Multicampus Research Director, Carol McClain; and most notably Assoc. Vice Provost for Research and Laboratory Programs, Rulon Linford.

**Respectfully submitted:**

Peter Young, Chair

Henry Abarbanel (SD), Vice Chair

Todd LaPorte (B)

Tu Jarvis (D)

Alexei Maradudin (I)

Richard Gatti (LA)

Max Neiman (R)

Girish Vyas (SF)

Janis Ingham (SB)

Darrell Long (SC)

Betty Marton (Committee Analyst)