UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   **ACADEMIC SENATE**

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC COMPUTING AND COMMUNICATIONS
Monday, April 16, 2018

Meeting Minutes

1. Data Stewardship, Governance, and Management
Christine Borgman, UCACC Chair
Günter Waibel, Executive Director, California Digital Library
Stephen Abrams, Associate Director, UC Curation Center (CDL)
Wendy Streitz, Executive Director, Research Policy Analysis and Coordination

- **UC Data Management**

The April 16, 2018, meeting of UCACC began with a presentation on a proposed "UC Data Network (UCDN) from Günter Waibel, the Executive Director of UC's California Digital Library (CDL), and Stephen Abrams, the Associate Director of the UC Curation Center at the CDL. The UCDN is a joint initiative of University Librarians, Chief Information Officers, and Vice Chancellors for Research that would provide a platform for open data publication, preservation, sharing, and reuse of UC research data. The current payment model of research data storage at UC de-incentivizes use. UC has to compete with commercial data storage services offered for free and refute the perception that research data management is not directly aligned with a scholars' primary interests. Data management must be driven not only by mandates from funders, but also by the belief that UC's data should be managed by UC.

Social barriers can be more of an impediment to adoption of data management practices than technical barriers, so much work remains to be done.

Technically, the network would be a combination of existing services, computational analysis, and the DASH/Merritt services provide by the CDL. The VCRs have agreed that each campus will contribute one petabyte of storage. Four campuses will move forward with pilot implementation (UCI, UCR, UCSF, and UCSB), with UCR as the first node on the network. The pilot campuses are those that already have close working relationships between their respective CIO/VCR/UL. Some UCACC members commented that other campuses may have faculty that would be highly interested in the network and would help to make it work.

UCDN is envisioned to be of use to scholars who do not have robust discipline-based repositories, and for those who are currently using commercial services such as FigShare, The primary goal is to get research data into a professional management situation. Universities don't want to end up with a publisher-based model of data stewardship, where scholars provide their work for free, and then their institutions have to buy it back via subscriptions or licensing agreements. The longer term plans for repository systems, what might be called the "post-custodial" repository, focus on tracking datasets rather than managing them.

Other concerns that arose in discussion included:
- Embargo periods and control of one's data
- Lack of faculty time
- Usage tracking
- Storage allocation

- Metadata standards and semantics
- Assistance in using existing data sets
- Funding and where the funds will come from

UCACC members emphasized the importance of engaging with faculty early and often. So far, the UCDN concept has been shared with UCOLASC and UCACC. The CDL generally engages with faculty via the campus libraries. UCACC members offered suggestions for increased involvement of faculty, including inviting faculty who run data repositories into the discussions. The notion of a Health Data Officer and governance body that came out of the Health Data Task Force could be used as a model framework. Director Waibel emphasized that UCDN is a relatively small project; it is not meant to do everything for everyone, or even address big issues. The developers want to engage primarily with faculty who could use such a solution; it is not meant to convert or recruit people who are satisfied with existing solutions. Waibel also emphasized that the coalition of CIOs, VC-Rs, and ULs is a relationship that should be fostered for many reasons.

The UCACC members from the pilot campuses – Irvine, Riverside, UCSF, and UCSB – will serve as liaisons on their campuses as necessary.

- **UC data ownership: ownership vs. governance**

Research Policy Analysis and Coordination (RPAC) Executive Director Wendy Streitz introduced the University's sole "policy" around research data, which for historical reasons is found in the Academic Personnel Manual (APM 020). The statement on UC's ownership rights to all "notebooks" dates back to the 1930s. Director Streitz' office has made several attempts to update the policy, but it has stalled for one reason or another. Streitz said that by law, ownership is clearly with the employer. UC would like to develop a presidential policy focusing on stewardship and use of UC's data, rather than ownership. UCSD and UCLA have guidelines posted on websites that are in line with what the new draft policy would say. In most cases, UC owns research data; but stewardship, sharing, and use lie with the individual creator.

Any new policy would likely address what happens to data when a scholar leaves UC. After a situation at UCSD regarding access to Alzheimer data, concerns about data stewardship have shifted. It used to be that scholars were free to take their data with them, but now external requirements and other involved parties may prevent transfer. In most cases it is the institution that accepts a grant and takes on contractual obligations, not an individual faculty member. The university is expected to act as steward and to maintain the "original record." VCRs can make exceptions.

The next steps for UC data policy will include a consultative process with Academic Senate committees.

- **Health data governance update**

Director Streitz reported that the rollout of the final Health Data Governance Task Force report and initial implementation was delayed by new considerations that arose with the Facebook and Cambridge Analytics scandal. Streitz said the principles in the UC report will take on even more global importance. Specifically:
- The unique responsibility and mission of the university as a public entity
- Patient involvement
- Active stewardship

UCACC members noted that it's not ownership per se that's important, it's the uses of data that need to be governed and carefully managed.

2. Consultation with UCOP's Information Technology Services
Tom Andriola, UC Chief Information Officer
David Rusting, UC Chief Information Security Officer
Yvonne Tevis, Chief of Staff – Information Technology Services

- **Accessible Technology**

ITS Chief of Staff Yvonne Tevis joined the meeting to talk about accessible technology. UC established a policy on accessibility in 2013. Each location has to have a program and must adopt international standards. There are over 9,000 students who are registered as disabled at the ten campuses.

Some recent initiatives include revised procurement contracts with flexible language for complying with accessibility requirements. UCOP's Risk Services is funding a website accessibility initiative that will monitor software and websites for compliance. UC Berkeley is piloting a course content accessibility initiative using software that provides immediate feedback and steps to improve accessibility. This type of software can mean more work for faculty, but it can also have a big impact on students who need it. In general, students are greatly benefited when they are empowered to solve their own problems and without having to go to the administration.

UCACC members discussed the need for guidance for faculty websites. All members of the UC community can get the "Siteimprove" tool to make their websites more accessible if they choose.

UCACC will continue to learn about accessible technology via updates at committee meetings and through the ITLC (Information Technology Leadership Council), where the UCACC Chair has an ex-officio appointment, and through engagement via the local committees.

- **Multifactor Authentication (MFA) rollout update**

Each UC location is working through local implementation of multifactor authentication for faculty and staff. Students are included as employees. The Office of the President just completed its MFA rollout on April 1st and is now working on "remember me" functionality, which will work for one day. In general, the rollout has been fine, with more people wanting to use tokens than initially anticipated.

Rusting said that the use of multi-factor authentication is providing additional security for UC. He will continue to brief UCACC on MFA and related security issues.

- **Information Security Policy (IS-3) update**

Thanks to UCACC's involvement, several clarifying changes were made to the Information Security policy and accompanying FAQ. The final policy will now be reviewed by the Policy Advisory Committee and receive a final review from the Office of General Counsel. It then goes to the Policy Steering Committee and finally to the President's Office for approval. The effective date will likely be July 1, 2018.

- **Cybersecurity – FireEye update**

FireEye continues to be rolled out at all UC locations. In response to concerns by faculty and others, a few campuses have documented best practices for network security to help prevent overreach by the administration or vendors.

- **Data Security and Privacy Procurement Contract Appendix**

Chair Borgman called attention to the Data Security and Privacy appendix to the UC procurement contract,[1] because the terms can have an impact on scholars. "Appendix DS" contains systemwide terms and conditions for procurement contracts. It is required for business contracts with external parties that handle UC data. It is not a policy; it is a contractual tool meant to ensure proper security practices.

The terms in Appendix DS offer many protections of privacy, security, and intellectual property that are of great concern to UC faculty. The discussion focused on how to broaden awareness and application of Appendix DS, for example to alert faculty and UC negotiators how database vendors and publishers may be asserting access to scholars' methods. It may be a topic for systemwide Academic Senate committees to address. Whereas faculty interaction with procurement usually takes place at the departmental level, procurement may have broad effects on policy and should be discussed more broadly.

3. Report on outcomes since last meeting and other updates
Christine Borgman, UCACC Chair
Maryann Martone, UCACC Vice Chair

UCACC meeting minutes from February 6, 2018, were approved pending minor edits from Chair Borgman.

- **Information Security Policy (IS-3)**

UCACC's involvement in the process of approving UC Information Security Policy demonstrated the benefits of faculty involvement. The policy was improved and clarified for faculty users, thanks to UCACC's suggestions.

UCACC Vice Chair Maryann Martone gave a presentation on the faculty review process at the latest Cyber-Risk Governance Committee meeting. Martone reported that the CRGC meeting included some discussion of the GDPR and the uncertainty around what it will mean in the US and for UC. Research data is still an open question.

- **UCACC's IT Governance Memo to Academic Council**

In March, the Academic Council discussed UCACC's IT Governance memo and agreed that Divisions could disseminated it as "best practices," but it was not to be considered a mandate.

- **UCACC's Response to the Proposed Presidential Policy on Open Access for Theses and Dissertations**

UCACC received positive feedback on its response to the proposed Presidential Policy on Open Access for Theses and Dissertations, which mentioned UC's open infrastructure need. The

---

[1] https://www.ucop.edu/procurement-services/_files/appendix-data-security.pdf

overall consensus of the Academic Senate was that the policy was a good idea, but some of the details – especially around embargo periods – still need to be worked out.

4. Open Infrastructure
Maryann Martone, UCACC Vice Chair

Vice Chair Maryann Martone introduced the topic of open infrastructure for data publishing, which involves making data findable, accessible, interoperable, reusable, etc. Martone had introduced the FAIR Principles[2] at a UCACC meeting last year. The concept of open access for articles has become more familiar, but there is now a desire to extend openness to other research outputs.

The FAIR principles for open infrastructures can help to guide institutional decisions about what infrastructure to invest in. The platforms that support and preserve the data are as important as the data itself.

Although not all faculty members care about data management, there are those that do but feel a lack of agency. Some are getting more involved, especially as specific situations arise that might impede researchers ability to do their work. An example is the lack of ability to mine articles in the biomedical sciences due to usage restrictions.

UCOLASC Chair Rich Schneider noted that the California Digital Library and other national and international groups are trying to figure out the best way to move to an open access publishing model. UC is interested in moving the $50-70 million in State-fund, taxpayer dollars that it currently pays to publishers back to academia. UCOLASC has drafted a list of 18 principles, including 3 related to data, that Chair Schneider will share with UCACC.

Action: UCACC will determine whether to endorse UCOLASC's principles (when the committee receives them).

Discussion about open infrastructure included eScholarship, UC's open access repository and publishing program, and the growth of discipline-based preprint servers for scholarly articles, which are generally funded by universities or scholarly associations. Meanwhile, big publishers are trying to maintain control. One recent publisher strategy has been to approach Vice Provosts with the lure of data metrics for measuring success.

Schneider also mentioned OA2020, an international coalition hosted by the Max Planck Digital Library that is committed to transforming the current publishing model. Although the work is primarily on subscriptions, data sometimes comes up. Universities with less resources, in particular, are looking for simple solutions. Publisher bundles and packages that once seemed so attractive soon became untenable. UC has the status and critical mass of scholars to take a leadership role.

Open data infrastructure will be on the UCACC agenda for next year.

---

[2] https://www.nature.com/articles/sdata201618

5. Member/campus issues

UC Berkeley is almost finished with its MFA rollout, which includes faculty and campus administrative staff, but not students. Overall, it has been pretty smooth, with the biggest concerns around using MFA while traveling.

UC Davis is moving forward with FireEye implementation. The Divisional Senate has drafted a "best practices" agreement-type document with the administration to help set expectations around network data collection. The basic principle is to collect only enough data to accomplish a specific goal, use it for stated purposes, don't give access to others, and then delete. The principles are mean to be extendible to any "internet security apparatus" and not just FireEye. UCACC Chair Borgman suggested that the document might cite UC Privacy Principles[3] and the UCLA Data Governance Task Force Report.[4]

UCI's local committee is going to use the UCACC IT Governance memo to discuss Irvine's IT governance structure.

UCLA's local committee will meet in May and will have a new chair next year.

UC Riverside's local committee continues to discuss issues of overlapping interest for computing and libraries.

UCSD's local committee is writing a short position paper for the Divisional Senate on high use computing needs.

UCSB: Emergency preparation (triggered by wildfires last year, when finals were postponed), has taken on a new importance at UC Santa Barbara. The campus assumed that instruction could be done using videoconferencing, but not all classrooms are equipped with cameras. TAs and instructors are often not prepared for online office hours, so some thought is going into how to work with a more virtual teaching and instruction environment.

UCSC has also been talking about professors and remote teaching options (such as teaching remotely from conference locations). The local committee will be conducting a survey of faculty IT needs and issues to help inform and provide context to the new CIO, who was recently hired after a long search. The questions cover all areas, including: data usage, computing needs, security issues, ransomware and viruses. Brant Robertson will send the survey to UCACC when it's ready.

Meeting adjourned: 3:50
Meeting minutes by: Joanne Miller, UCACC Committee Analyst
Attest: Christine Borgman, UCACC Chair

---

[3] https://www.ucop.edu/ethics-compliance-audit-services/_files/compliance/uc-privacy-principles.pdf
[4] https://ucla.app.box.com/s/zvtg5rcd9ojo2by2rtzoum4kv9mdulnr