I. Welcome and Introductions

David Robinowitz, UCACC Chair

After introductions, Chair David Robinowitz talked about the work of UCACC.

Chair Robinowitz was invited to serve on a Cyber-Risk Working Group, which was convened by UCOP early in the fall in response to a ransomware attack at UCSF. The Academic Senate is represented on the Working Group by the Robinowitz and UCACC Vice Chair Susan Cochran, as well as the Chair and Vice Chair of the Academic Council (Mary Gauvain and Robert Horwitz). Part of the charge of the Working Group is to determine how to effectively communicate with researchers. UCACC may be asked to provide feedback to the draft recommendations of the Cyber-Risk Working Group.

II. Consultation with UCOP’s Information Technology Services

Mark Cianca, Interim Vice President, UC Chief Information Officer
David Rusting, Chief Information Security Officer
Robert Smith, Systemwide IT Policy Director

1. IS-12 update

Revisions to UC’s IT Recovery Policy (Information Security Policy 12), have been reviewed by campus CIOs and other stakeholders. Last year’s UCACC Chair, Anthony Joseph, is one of the revision’s leads. UCACC was provided with a redline version of the policy and opportunity to comment. The policy will be distributed for systemwide review via the usual channels in January, and UCACC will have additional opportunity to comment at that time.

2. IS-3 update

The Electronic Information Security Policy (IS-3) that was revised last year is undergoing a minor update to clarify and streamline the event logging standard. These changes have no impact on faculty or researchers, and have been presented to the systemwide IT Security Committee for approval. The changes are anticipated to take effect in November, 2020.

3. Cyber-Risk Working Group

The Cyber-Risk Working Group was convened as a result of a ransomware incident at UCSF. The parent committee is the Cyber-Risk Governance Committee (CRGC), a high level administrative group responsible for managing cyber security throughout system. The CRGC includes Senate members and representatives from UC Legal (the UC Office of General Counsel).

The Working Group, which includes Vice Chancellors for Research, as well as IT administrators, is charged with developing a plan and providing draft recommendations to President Drake in November. There will then be a review before a final report is issued.

The Working Group created four workstreams:

1. Identify available services, gaps and proposing solutions for high-priority items
2. Identify structural, technical, financial, and cultural challenges and propose plans to address them
3. Working with the Academic Senate to develop and deliver guidance to researchers on appropriate security efforts
4. Proposing a system level research data lifecycle management program to be adapted for campuses
5. Proposing a framework for VCRs to establish an ongoing workgroup of researchers at each location that focuses on managing cyber risk with regular reporting to the CRGC

As the Lead for the third workstream, Chair Robinowitz asked for input from committee members. Vice Chair Susan Cochran, who is also on the Working Group, noted that there needs to be support for faculty along with any added burden, and that a balanced risk management strategy is key. The Working Group is thinking of ways to involve faculty researchers in ongoing input on these potential problems and solutions. Structurally at UC this can be a challenge, as each campus has a different organization and different loci for data management responsibility.

Compelling stories from individuals about data security might help faculty take become more aware of the risks and responsibilities. Hearing that a colleague lost the only copy of a dataset, or that multiple research projects were impacted, could be more powerful than dry data. IT departments do not have the resources for a full-fledged advocacy campaign on behalf of data security. It will take cooperation from all parties, and faculty-driven communication. If UCACC members have any such examples, they are asked to send them to Chief Information Security Office David Rusting.

Committee members talked about responsibility for various security actions, such as backing up data. IT is not always in a position to do this. The IS-3 Policy includes categories of protection levels, from low to high. Level 3 is contractually controlled, while level 4, the highest level, is statutorily controlled. Funding agencies often have requirements for data management that includes back-up.

Storage – and storage management strategies – is another big area in need of attention.

4. Chief Information Officer search update
Mark Cianca has been in the interim-CIO position for a year and was just offered an extension for another year. The search for a new systemwide CIO will begin after January, 2021.

5. Ensuring access for overseas students, particularly in China (new topic)
(Background: https://www.theregister.com/2020/08/11/china_blocking_tls_1_3_esni/)
Some enrolled UC students living in China are unable to get full access to UC materials due China’s blocking of network traffic. Meanwhile, the United States government is blocking students from returning to the US. UC has a sizeable number of students who are currently in China and is working to provide services to students via VPN. UC has issued an RFP to services that offer transnational service. Proofs of concept are currently being conducted by Berkeley and UCSD. UC will have a preferred solution within a month

October is National Cybersecurity Awareness Month and there are many events planned systemwide.
III. Consultation with UCOP’s Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI)
Ellen Osmundson, Program Director
Mary-Ellen Kreher, Director of Course Design and Technical Development

ILTI Directors Ellen Osmundson and Mary-Ellen Kreher joined the meeting to talk about remote proctoring services and online course evaluations.

Most campuses have agreements with ProctorU, which is biggest proctoring service. The others are Examity and Respondus. Zoom is starting to offer remote proctoring and several campuses are looking into that. The biggest proctoring concerns are around privacy, equity, and data security. Proctoring services are able to connect to learning management systems via the Learning Technologies Interoperability standard. Each campus has issued advise to faculty around using remote proctoring services. Some, like Berkeley, have strongly advised alternative forms of assessment.

Committee members asked about the out-sourcing of student data to third party venders and about the potential for UC to create a systemwide or campus-based policy around remote testing. Some faculty are feeling uneasy making decisions about testing and proctoring on their own. The data provided to venders is similar to – or less than – that provided to outsourced Learning Management Systems. Generally only name, email, and course are provided, although students can choose to remain anonymous.

The Educational Technology Leadership Committee (ETLC)\(^1\) is a committee of the Information Technology Leadership Council (ITLC)\(^2\) that is composed of academic technology leaders appointed by senior leadership at the campus level. Part of ETLC’s remit is to create systemwide agreements – for pricing and terms – for IT procurement. One recent success was a systemwide agreement for GradeScope.

In terms of testing and cheating, it has been shown that if students are presented with the campus Codes of Conduct before exams they are less likely to cheat. If a proctoring service feels that a student has cheated, it alerts the faculty member to make the determination.

Director Osmundson presented data on online education efficacy studies, which will be a follow-up item at a future meeting.

IV. Research Information Management Systems (RIMS) Work Group
Pramod Khargonekar, UC Irvine Vice Chancellor for Research and Work Group Co-Chair
Maryann Martone, UCSD Professor, former UCACC Chair, and Work Group Co-Chair

The co-chairs of UC’s Research Information Management Systems (RIMS) Work Group joined the meeting to provide UCACC with an update on the work of that group.

Convened in January 2020 by Provost Michael Brown, the Working Group is charged to conduct a “systemwide review of all RIMS currently being employed by Academic units and elsewhere across the UC.” Research Information Management Systems (RIMS) are used to aggregate data

---

1 https://spaces.ais.ucla.edu/display/ucetlg/Educational+Technology+Leadership+Committee
2 https://www.ucop.edu/information-technology-services/initiatives/itlc/
and generate metrics and statistics for universities and other institutions. They offer sophisticated
evaluation tools, but also present a concern as most are owned by third parties and use UC data.
For example, Symplectic Elements is used by UC libraries as a scholarly information and research
tracking tool. The Academic Senate become concerned about these services a few years ago.³

The first step is to find out who is using them and for what purpose. After conducting an
inventory of the systems, the Working Group will develop a survey about use of the systems and
will produce a report and recommendations. The group has already talked to UC administrators
including Tom Trappler in systemwide Strategic Sourcing and IT Policy Director Robert Smith to
get input. They’ve also talked to Heather Joseph, the Executive Director of the Scholarly
Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (SPARC), who has written about these issues.
Although in-house and open source systems have been developed, the most-used RIMS systems
are owned by big publishers, who already collect a lot of information about faculty. Martone
noted that Elsevier has now established an “International Center for the Study of Research”
(ICSR).

While Google Scholar tracks citations and offers metrics, it is not compatible with other systems.
It also doesn’t include other types of academic work that a more comprehensive analytics tool
would include, or the ability to aggregate information at the department or school level.

V. Consultation with the Senate Leadership

Mary Gauvain, Academic Council Chair
Robert Horwitz, Academic Council Vice Chair

Academic Council Chair Mary Gauvain and Vice Chair Robert Horwitz joined the meeting to
provide an update on the issues facing the Academic Senate.

• Highlights of the Board of Regent’s meeting in September
  o The Board of Regents meets every other month, six times per year. Their Committee on
    Health Services meets in the interim months.
  o Each meeting since March has included a discussion of Covid-19 with Dr. Carrie Byington,
    the Executive Vice President of UC Health.
  o There was a presentation by the Office of the National Laboratories on the Lab Fees
    Research Program (LFRP) that highlighted multicampus involvement and graduate
    students.
  o The Regents will be hearing more about plans to develop UC Health programs.
  o The Regents will continue to discuss the UC budget and the planning and budgetary
  o The Regents’ Special Committee on Basic Needs has been meeting for over a year and a
draft report is now out for review.

• A curtailment proposal was just released from a high-level strategic planning committee
  formed recently by President Drake. The brief document conveyed potential budget actions for
  2020-21 and has been distributed widely. The Senate has less than a month to solicit
  comments. The proposal will be discussed at the next Academic Council meeting on October
  28.

³ UCAP letter to Academic Council, July 12, 2018: https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/_files/committees/ucap/ucap-to-council-re-academic-analytics.pdf and Academic Council letter to President Napolitano and Provost Brown:
https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/_files/reports/rm-jn-mb-rims.pdf
• A Feasibility Study Work Group continues its investigation of a potential replacement for the SAT in undergraduate admissions. This is the outcome of the recent Board of Regents decision to remove the SAT requirement for admission to UC.

• The Academic Council will be focusing attention on the climate crisis and how the faculty can be further involved in thinking about solutions and mitigations. One basis for action is the Climate Crisis Task Force Report from UC San Diego’s Academic Senate.

UCACC asked whether the focus on climate would start with local or global concerns. The UCSD Academic Senate Task Force report offered a range of recommendations to meet climate goals, from reducing travel to clean energy generation plants to academic pursuits. UCSD just established its first new Academic Senate standing committee in years to focus on climate. Systemwide, the thought is to involve all standing committees in addressing issues of climate; to use the inherent strength of Academic Senate committee structure to assemble different viewpoints.

Committee members asked about long-range planning for after the pandemic. Some UCACC members expressed interest in exempting IT employees from any UC curtailment program. Chair Robinowitz offered to bring up the idea in the next meeting of the ITLC (Information Technology Leadership Council). There will be intense interest in how a curtailment would work, and in ensuring that any plan is practical and will yield the needed results.

A long-range topic for the Academic Senate will be the extent to which remote meetings will continue beyond the time of the pandemic. Holding remote meetings is one piece of the fight against climate change.

VI. Member/campus issues – Round Robin

UCACC members talked about their local Senate and campus activities related to academic computing and communication.

UC Berkeley: Berkeley has introduced a new online system for filling out Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment and Outside Activities forms (from APM-025 and others). The new system is proving challenging.

UC Merced: Merced’s local committee is discussing minimum hardware needs for faculty.

UC Riverside: UC Riverside’s local committee is focusing on online learning needs. The campus has made available platforms for creating and uploading instructional videos, including basic editing and auto-captioning features.

UC San Diego: Cloud storage is becoming an issue. Previously it was (or seemed) unlimited. Campuses seem to have different philosophies about storage. Some think it should be provided, while others think faculty should pay. It might be worthwhile for UCACC to discuss campus storage practices at a future meeting, and possibly make recommendations.

UC Santa Barbara: UCSB is using smartphone-based Covid-19 exposure tracking. The campus is only open for modified research activities; there is no in-person instruction. The local IT committee is talking about the TDI (FireEye) audit that was conducted by UCOP-based auditors. There are researchers who want access to that network traffic. Santa Barbara has a decentralized IT structure; the campus runs its own LMS, and is now trying to move to the Cloud. Other topics for
the local committee are backup, accessibility, and curation of research data. UCSB is now limiting storage space on Google and Box.

Some general themes that emerged from the campus reports included:

- Are there ways to better utilize UC’s centralized purchasing power?
- Each location is independent and operates autonomously in decision-making (a Federalist model).
- Online education will not completely go away after the pandemic; sharing of best practices is crucial.
- There is interest in UCACC bringing IT success stories (data back-up, data management) to light.
- There are drastically different levels of IT service and hardware support by campus (and probably school/department).

Meeting adjourned: 3:00pm
Meeting minutes drafted by: Joanne Miller, UCACC Analyst
Attest: David Robinowitz, UCACC Chair
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