Chair David Kay described the purpose of UCACC. The bylaws of the committee offer a broad remit. The committee may advise the president and be asked for advice.

Two key areas have been identified by the chair and vice chair for focus in 2015-16:

1. **Involving stakeholders in the design of systems that are widely used by faculty and that affect faculty and students.**
   
   It is a key tenet of user-centered design that stakeholders should be involved early in the design process; software designers don’t always know how users do their work or how they will use a system. A brief summary of user-centered design can be found at: [http://www.usability.gov/what-and-why/user-centered-design.html](http://www.usability.gov/what-and-why/user-centered-design.html) (link sent to committee members as part agenda materials). The inability of technology to work together in a workflow system is often the source of inefficiency and frustration.

2. **Data management and governance.**
   
   The committee will look into data management compliance at UC. Some campuses have developed guidelines or policies. UCACC should gather campus guidelines and investigate actual practices.

Released in 2013, President Yudof’s [Privacy and Information Security Report](#) included a statement of values and principles that yield a much stronger privacy statement than other universities. Now that cyber-risk has become a bigger issue in the past couple years, it might be time to look again at the policy and determine whether it still makes sense. This committee can have a pro-active voice and develop a new set of principles and definitions for privacy that includes data and information privacy.

Balancing information vs. privacy, monetization, working with third-parties and industry, and notice & consent were other concerns that fall within the realm of this committee. In online education, for example, there is an enormous amount of feedback available from each student action that can be collected.

As UC develops new guidelines, it should be sure to offer resources and assistance to help faculty manage and maintain their data. Funders and publishers are now requiring data management plans, which implicate the university in compliance, but are usually implemented by researchers. Some campuses are actively working on these issues. UCSD
has the Integrated Digital Infrastructure (IDI) initiative to provide services, while UCLA has a Data Governance Task Force co-led by committee vice chair Christine Borgman.

Senate leadership will be consulted on the most effective way to let concerns be heard. Tom Andriola, UCOP’s CIO, will attend subsequent UCACC meetings to talk about issues of concern to the committee.

**Action for next meeting:** Committee members should find out about any data policies on their campuses and investigate data management practices among peers.

II. Travel

*Deborah Neal, Temporary Exec. Asst. – Academic Senate*

Submit any reimbursement requests within 45 days of travel.

Please send any questions about travel to Deborah.Neal@ucop.edu.

III. Member Items: Major Campus or Systemwide Issues

Committee members discussed learning management systems and how decisions are made on the campuses. It’s not entirely clear whether this is an issue for this committee, other than proposing principles.

- UC Irvine has a matrix of instructional cloud computing tools that are under review by that campus: [http://sites.uci.edu/cloud/directory/](http://sites.uci.edu/cloud/directory/).

- UC’s Policy on Ownership of Course Materials is available at: [http://copyright.universityofcalifornia.edu/resources/ownership-course-materials.html](http://copyright.universityofcalifornia.edu/resources/ownership-course-materials.html)

- UC Santa Cruz’ agreement for online courses is online at: [http://academicaffairs.ucsc.edu/online-education/oe-documents/ILTI-UCSC_Online_Education_Course_Agreement.pdf](http://academicaffairs.ucsc.edu/online-education/oe-documents/ILTI-UCSC_Online_Education_Course_Agreement.pdf)

IV. UC Online Education and Cross-Campus Enrollment System

*Mary-Ellen Kreher, Director*

*Ellen Osmundson, Project Coordinator*

**Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ITLI)**

Mary-Ellen Kreher distributed a folder with hard copies of the slide presentation, informational handouts about ILTI and a branded flash drive. ILTI was designed to help students access high-demand courses and support learning across the system. Right now, at the end of its third year, ILTI is exclusively undergraduate courses. Currently 85 students are enrolled cross-campus.

A useful matrix in the handout packet shows credit approvals by campus.
Student experience data is being collected from students, faculty, and teaching assistants. Faculty have appreciated receiving more feedback about how students learn, but engagement can be a challenge. Policy challenges and other factors keep enrollment low. For example, incoming freshman cannot enroll and students have to be enrolled in a certain amount of credits at home campus to enroll cross-campus.

ILTII can help facilitate instructional collaborations where faculty can combine expertise across campuses (e.g., Scandinavian languages).

Campuses have various methods for assigning credit or placement for courses taken extramurally.

**Cross Campus Enrollment Website** ([https://crossenrollcourses.universityofcalifornia.edu/](https://crossenrollcourses.universityofcalifornia.edu/))

Rolled out on Nov. 4, the site is for students who want to find out about and enroll in a course at another UC campus.

Committee members asked how this committee could help. Options included advising on learning management systems and encouraging standardization. UCACC might help to spread best practices, emphasize the educational component, and encourage campus academic senates that might look at time to graduation rate, security concerns, and more.

UCACC members asked about data or metrics for assessing online education, whether there are standard variables, and who evaluates the success or failure. Studies show that students in online courses fare no worse than in face-to-face instruction, and in some cases do better. [Within UC, Institutional Research and Academic Planning (IRAP: [http://www.ucop.edu/institutional-research-academic-planning/](http://www.ucop.edu/institutional-research-academic-planning/)] would most likely be the unit to provide analysis.]

**Cross-campus Enrollment System**
The cross-campus enrollment system will go live next year. It’s being viewed as a hub for registrars and advisors, and will include student information, eligibility, calendar, catalog information, enrollments and grade exchange. Since there is “personally identifiable information” (PII) involved, the system has to meet certain FERPA requirements for access, security, retention and archiving, and notification (if something goes awry). University-wide and campus standards have been followed.

Phase 1 is in development now through October, 2016, with Davis, LA, SB, and SC participating.

Phase 2 will involve all other campuses and will start development next spring.

V. Consultation with the Senate Leadership

*Dan Hare, Senate Chair*
*Jim Chalfant, Senate Vice Chair*

UC is under more scrutiny by the governor and legislature. UC administration and the governor’s staff meet quarterly. Part of the university’s budget agreement with the governor includes:
• Improve ratio of freshman to transfers to 2:1. UC will streamline transfer pathways for certain majors and provide recommendations for those community college students who want to apply to all nine campuses.
• Pathways to degree completion in 3 years (which will mean increased summer enrollment).
• Investigate a common ID system for courses that is used in community colleges and CSUs.
• Enroll more students.
• New retirement plan that would impact faculty hired after July 1, 2016.

Two items will come to the Academic Senate for review in February:
• Regents’ statement on intolerance
• Faculty discipline – ensuring chancellors have appropriate authority

Senate leadership values the input of this committee on issues including ILTI technology, policy and outreach. It is within its scope to request more information about the process of the cross-campus enrollment system, for example. The committee’s charter was re-written two years ago and this is the first year of the re-envisioned UCACC. The committee can let the senate leadership know if the charge should be modified.

VI. California Digital Library (CDL)
Stephen Abrams, Manager – Digital Preservation Technology, CDL
Data sharing/data management services

Stephen Abrams’ presentation focused on the data management services offered by the UC Curation Center at the California Digital Library. CDL’s intention is to complement local solutions in supporting research data management at UC and help UC maintain control over its research outputs. Tools include the DMPTool and the Dash user interface for depositing data into the Merritt repository. Abrams mentioned national and international initiatives with which UC is involved, such as DataONE.

UC3 has done much exploration into what makes scholarly information well curated. An appropriate plan includes stewardship, pro-active management, visibility, re-use, and measurement of impact.

UC3’s estimated cost for full data stewardship is $.065/GB/year. If UC considered systemwide coverage, the cost would be approximately $195K per year for each UC-affiliated faculty member to have storage for 10GB of data.

The UC3 data blog, DataPub, http://datapub.cdlib.org welcomes guest bloggers; committee members contact Stephen Abrams if they would like to contribute.

The discussion after the presentation focused on the cost of storage and the inability of UC3 to offer a one-time, up-front fixed price for a specified term. Allowing only pay-as-you-go makes it “worthless,” according to some. Other services, like Google’s, may be less expensive, but they have service charges for access and other needs that increase the overall cost. If bearing the cost
on their own, faculty will certainly look for the best deal available. This committee may be able to have an impact on the university’s willingness to consider a fixed price or provide a minimal amount of coverage per faculty.

Other concerns included the difficulty of search and discovery for large data sets. There are working groups outside the university that are looking into this.

VII. Strategies for Further Action and Implementation

Topics for additional information-gathering and further discussion:

- ILTI
- Cybersecurity update (Tom Andriola)
- UNIZIN update (Tom Andriola)
- Learning analytics update from ETLG (Educational Technology Leadership Group)
  Chair is Jenn Stringer at UC Berkeley. ETLG is preparing background on course management systems and the monetizing of UC’s data.
- Universal identifiers
- Next-generation instructional technologies – what’s on the horizon?

Potential future actions:

- Draft position statements
- Draft set of values or principles on learning analytics data
- Define online education

Other outcomes:

- Consider holding a meeting on a campus
- List of acronyms at (http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/resources/acroabbr.html)