UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC COMPUTING AND COMMUNICATIONS
http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/committees/ucacc/

Monday, May 22, 2017
Meeting Minutes

Members attending in person	David G. Kay (Chair, UCI), Ken Goldberg (UCB),Matt Bishop (UCD), Florin Rusu (UCM), Michael Shin (UCLA), Miguel Pampaloni (UCSF),Maryann Martone (UCSD), Kwai Ng (CCGA Chair, UCSD), Barbara Knowlton (UCEP Chair, UCLA), Jim Chalfant (Academic Council Chair, UCD), Shane White (Academic Council Vice Chair, UCLA)
Members attending remotely	Christine L. Borgman (Vice Chair, UCLA), Russell Detwiler (UCI), Laura Harris (UCR), Brant Robertson (UCSC)
Members absent	Todd Oakley (UCSB), Eric Bakovic (UCOLASC Chair, UCSD)
Consultants, guests and staff	Tom Andriola (UC Chief Information Officer), David Rusting (UC Chief Information Security Officer), Roslyn Martorano (Systemwide Privacy Manager, via phone), Joanne Miller (Committee Analyst, UCOP)

1. Chair's welcome, introductions, agenda review

February 6, 2017 meeting minutes were approved with minor changes requested by members.

UCACC Vice Chair Chris Borgman informed the committee that UCLA staff reviewed the ETLC Principles after the last meeting and found some legal issues with the document, specifically in the processes and procedures portion. She suggested that UCACC do more follow-up with ETLC in the coming year.

2. Data Governance

Vice Chair Chris Borgman observed that given the hot topic issues coming to UCACC, the committee could not have been reconstituted as an Academic Senate committee at a more opportune time. The area of data governance is one example.

a. UC Health Data

The committee was briefed on a new task force convened by President Napolitano that is charged with developing recommendations for how UC should manage and use the large amount of health data that is generated throughout the system. Outside vendors and organizations are interested in UC's patient data to use for predictive models that have the potential to improve health care and outcomes. Big pharmaceutical companies are very interested in working with UC and other health systems that generate a large amount of data, as are companies like Google and Amazon. It has been difficulty for traditional medical entities to work on very large data projects. Agreements are already underway at various levels of the university, from the system to individual researchers. To avoid conflicts and overlapping agreements, UC needs to sign onto these contracts as a system. Although some data may be available from individual departments or schools, recent large initiatives such as precision medicine and the cancer moonshot have taken place at the system level.

Napolitano's Task Force consists of a Working Group and a Steering Committee with key personnel from the health centers and UCOP. Academic Council Chair Jim Chalfant is on the Working Group and will inform the Working Group and Steering Committee chairs about the work previously done on UC data governance.

Committee members noted that UC should use caution when determining the ways that patient data may be used. Even if patients sign over their rights and the data is anonymized, patients may still feel that their "personal" information has been compromised or that they were somehow taken advantage of. Some committee members expressed concern that anonymity could be compromised when data sets are combined. Committee members agreed that third parties using UC's data need to demonstrate value before the data is handed over; showing that benefits could somehow flow back to the people who provided the data in the first place, or at least benefitted people in need, would be even better.

UCLA's "Charter for Governance of Data Releases," a document that was included in the meeting background, includes suggestions for criteria for agreements such as automatically approving data releases that have minimal risk and "at least some potential" for advancing the mission of UCLA's Health Sciences. The Charter also proposes a Data Release Subcommittee of its Data Strategy and Governance Committee.

UCACC members generally endorsed the UCLA "Charter" and thought that the data request features could be extended even beyond healthcare.

In the interest of keeping UCACC informed about the President's Task Force, members of UCACC who are returning next year agreed to being part of an informal subgroup that could be convened and updated about the progress of the Working Group. Miguel Pampaloni (UCSF), Maryann Martone (incoming vice chair, UCSD), and Chris Borgman (incoming chair, UCLA) expressed interest.

b. **Data retention and records management - specific focus on "personally identifiable information" (PII)**

CIO Tom Andriola is requesting input from UCACC about the most effective way to reach out to faculty to raise awareness of personally identifiable information (PII) that may reside on personal computers and that could pose a risk in the case of a security breach or virus attack. A recent incident involving data on a faculty member's laptop has prompted the university to get more serious about the risks that may be inadvertently created. Andriola asked for suggestions for ways to introduce the topic and for strategies and support mechanisms going forward.

UCACC members suggested the deployment of user-friendly and shareable encryption technology. Most members thought that closer relationships between faculty and IT staff on campus would be appreciated. Many faculty do not sit in front of a computer screen all day and require personalized assistance to deal with issues specific to laptops, tablets, and phones. Faculty may need assistance in understanding their risks and personal responsibilities. Building on the publicity around recent breaches and threats should help to get people involved and interested.

Most faculty members would not want a new policy or additional training, although it might be possible to briefly highlight some best practices for data downloading and security in the existing cybersecurity training module. Andriola and his team would prefer to keep outreach efforts at the local level. Campuses can provide hands-on assistance and records management expertise, since some of the issues are similar to records management procedures. In practice, additional assistance

and outreach will necessitate additional resources if departments choose to increase IT staff. Some campuses are already under-resourced for IT, and it would be hard to get such individual support. In addition to the other ideas, committee members suggested that a well-produced FAQ, with scenarios, would be useful if people could find it.

Action for committee members: Committee members were asked to raise the issue of PII security at their next campus committee meeting (if it hasn't already been discussed). The CIOs recently discussed how to increase PII security and want to keep it a campus issue. Local committees might want to invite their campus CIO (or equivalent) to their next meeting.

3. **IT Governance:** UCACC recommendations to Academic Senate on IT Governance at the campus level and CRGC Recap/update

After the February UCACC meeting at UCLA, Vice Chair Christine Borgman sent a summary of the discussion on IT governance to the Academic Council leadership with the intention of getting the Academic Senate – and the university as whole – to discuss IT governance in a more mission-driven rather than reactive manner.

Vice Chair Borgman reported on the March Cyber-Risk Governing Committee (CRGC) meeting, where she presented on faculty involvement in IT issues. Each of the quarterly CRGC meetings has featured a presentation from a faculty member. Borgman used the discussion from the February UCACC meeting to talk about UC's approaches to IT governance and why faculty need a voice in IT governance decision making. CIO Tom Andriola noted that an important element of CRGC is to provide a broad perspective that comes through the balancing of faculty and IT needs.

The issues are not solely technical. The speaker just before Borgman at CRGC talked about the need for communication between CIOs and CFOs, and the importance of financial officers being involved in order to make the financial trade-off decisions. It's somewhat disappointing that even though CRGC was set up with high-level administrators, the attendance is often delegated.

The committee agreed to edit and re-send the IT governance memo to Academic Senate leadership encouraging more continuous engagement from the faculty. Committee members also thought it was important that computing and IT committees not consist solely of computer science faculty, and that it needed to be communicated to COCs and equivalents. Although some degree of technical understanding is useful, IT committees need to have broader disciplinary composition.

Action: Committee leadership will edit the original draft memo and send a revised version to Academic Senate leadership.

4. **Consultation with the Senate Leadership**

Academic Council Chair Jim Chalfant and Vice Chair Shane White provided an update on Academic Senate operations and current issues before the Senate including:

- o Chair Chalfant addressed the recent State audit of UCOP at the Regents' meeting last week. The hearing on the audit at the state legislature was contentious. The focus of the legislature and media has been on the campus surveys and the reserve funds at the Office of the President.

- o Chalfant noted that the budget presentation at the Regents' meeting was more transparent than usual.

- o The Regents passed a nonresident policy that caps enrollment of out of state freshman at 18 percent systemwide. Campuses that currently enroll more than 18 percent will be allowed to

stay at the higher percentage. Chalfant said that the policy affects campuses unevenly, and that nonresident tuition would help with structural deficits. The policy will be revisited in four years, so campuses under the cap still have same incentives to build up their nonresident student population, which brings in tuition revenue. If the state hampers the university's ability to obtain outside funds, then it needs to restore funding at past levels.

o In the Governor's May budget revise, $50 million is to be withheld from UC until it complies with audit recommendations that can be met by August of next year. UC must also meet a ratio requirement for transfer students to freshman that was part of the previous budget framework agreement and use "activity-based cost-modeling."

o Regarding the IS-3 policy revision, the Academic Senate is sending the message that the policy is written primarily for people in the positions mentioned in the policy, and that IT committees should take it up if they like, but that it's not necessary for all Senate committees to evaluate it. The best way for Divisional Senate IT committees to respond is via the Division (and not through UCACC).

o BOARS will report soon on the "compare favorably" policy implementation. In reaction to a Berkeley pilot to request letters of recommendation for some freshman applicants, BOARS has drafted a compromise policy that allows for a specified percentage of applications to go into an augmented review process if there is a stated reason for needing more information.

o The President has announced the same salary plan as last year. Three Academic Senate committees were in the process of writing to ask her not to implement the same plan as last year when it was announced.

5. Consultation with UCOP – Information Technology Services

1. Systemwide Electronic Information Security Policy (IS-3) Revision

Feedback for the IS-3 revision is due September 4. Chief Information Security Officer David Rusting said that his department will take any and all feedback, including suggestions for a FAQ, or edits to any portions of the policy that implicate faculty. UCACC members should channel comments through their divisional senates.

2. Cybersecurity – faculty and campus concerns

Some faculty have expressed resistance to the required cybersecurity online training, although most people appreciated the shorter time requirement of the "refresher" course. Future versions will be designed to be more relevant to higher education.

After being updated on the latest cybersecurity implementation plans, the Academic Senate's University Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF) expressed concerns about the data that would be generated and maintained. CIO Tom Andriola is working on a thorough response to the committee that will address their concerns, and will send a first draft to UCACC Chair David Kay for review before sending to UCAF.

3. Guidelines or best practices for faculty/researchers when traveling abroad regarding data privacy for content on computers and cell phones.

The committee discussed some of the information available on UCOP and campus websites and the draft FAQ from the Office of General Council on electronic devices and border inspections. Committee members noted there are may be issues not addressed in the FAQ or websites, such as restrictions from institutional review boards (IRBs) and federal sponsors. There would also be

different requirements for computers or devices owned by UC versus those individually owned by the faculty member.

6. FAIR Principles
Maryann Martone, UCSD

UC San Diego member Maryann Martone gave a presentation on the FAIR Principles developed by the "FORCE11" group of scholars, librarians, publishers, and research funders who hope to facilitate knowledge creation and sharing in scholarly communications. Professor Martone is a founding member. The "findable, accessible, interoperable, and re-useable" ("FAIR") guiding principles for scientific data management and scholarship are meant for both humans and machines and stem from the need for new and improved infrastructure, conventions, and evaluation systems to deal with the changing scholarly communication landscape.

Committee members discussed how to get started with implementing the principles. Currently, actions are on an individual or small group scale, such as using OrcIDs as digital identifiers or the promulgation of data management plans. The principles don't require open access scholarship, although they are sometimes interpreted that way. Professor Martone noted that the principles tend to get interpreted in certain ways, such as the use of a landing page standing in for persistent metadata.

There are communities available to help mediate how to become "FAIR." Right now, individuals and institutions can measure their current systems against the guidelines to see how they are doing. An investment of resources in better tools and support are important and needed.

Action: UCACC will endorse the FAIR Principles. UCACC Chair David Kay will send the committee's endorsement to Academic Council.

7. Member/campus issues

UCSC: UC Santa Cruz is conducting a search for a new Vice Chancellor, Information Technology. The campus expects a lot of turnover in addition to Mary Doyle's retirement.

UC Riverside: UC Riverside's committee is spending most of its time on library issues.

UCLA: Nothing new to report.

UCSD: Terry Gaasterland will chair the local committee next year.

UC Davis: The local committee discussed an extension of an Adobe license and may form a new subcommittee to discuss FireEye issues. There will be new chair next year as Matt Bishop rotates off.

UC Merced: The local committee is discussing issues around faculty who are getting stopped at the border with laptops. There have been suggestions for using loaner laptops when traveling abroad. There is an interim Chief Information Security Officer as the campus looks for someone to fill the position permanently.

UC Irvine: The Council on Research Computing and Libraries reviewed and discussed the UCOP Presidential Policy on Electronic Information Security (IS-3) during their last meeting. No specific concerns were raised about the proposed policy. There was agreement that the policy is sufficiently flexible to allow local campuses to develop their own procedures for administering the

policy. Questions raised about the details of local implementation included (1) how 'Units' and 'Unit Heads' as described in the policy will be identified and associated with relevant information systems, and (2) how risks will be assessed and quantified to support risk-based allocation of resources.

UCSF: Biomedical imaging and sharing of data has become a huge issue that needs to be addressed systemwide in a way that protects patient data and doesn't undermine access to healthcare.

UCEP: University Committee on Educational Policy Chair Barbara Knowlton reported that UCEP has been working on ILTI and systemwide online courses. The committee has discussed barriers that students may encounter when enrolling in online courses on other campuses, and has made technical and policy suggestions. UCEP feels that at least one of the barriers to cross-campus enrollment could be addressed with improvements in coordinating registrar information. Chair Knowlton will share UCEP's memo with UCACC for discussion in the next academic year.

8. Issues Under Systemwide Review
Campus committees that discuss the revised Presidential Policy on Electronic Information Security [PDF] will send any comments through their divisional Senates.

9. Executive session

The UCACC Statement of Principles was approved.

Minutes drafted by: Joanne Miller, UCACC Committee Analyst
Attest: David G. Kay, UCACC Chair