UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   **ACADEMIC SENATE**
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC COMPUTING AND COMMUNICATIONS
Friday, December 8, 2023

Meeting Minutes

I. Announcements, UCACC Topics Discussion

○   Research Data Backup System Steering Committee

Chair Paw U gave an update on the Research Data Backup System Steering Committee, which completed an initial RFP and received 11 responses. These will be narrowed down and a second, limited RFP will be sent in February or March to those who make the cut. The idea is that UC will have a list of approved vendors from which researchers would be able to choose. It is not clear where funding would come from. Members had questions about who would be responsible in the case of a data breach.

○   AI Council

UCSF rep Duygu Tosun-Turgut participated in the October meeting of the UC AI Council, which included reports from its subgroups. The subcommittee on risk is working on finalizing a framework for assessing risk and is leaning toward a spectrum, rather than a binary risk-benefit analysis, that will include levels of involvement (e.g., IT systems vs. researchers vs. users). Other subcommittees are researching AI use to better understand the environment and needs of the UC community. There will potentially be a working group on high-impact AI applications, which is especially the case medicine. A subcommittee on training and engagement is planning events and creating materials to distribute, including a website that will provide tools.

Action: Meeting minutes from October 6th were approved pending any comments sent in the next week.

Action: Based on a survey of availability, UCACC will **not** meet in person this year. The next two meetings of the committee will be held via Zoom on Feb. 9th and April 26th, 2024.

II. Consultation with UCOP's Information Technology Services
Van Williams, Vice President, UC Chief Information Officer
Monte Ratzlaff, Cyber-Risk Program Manager

VP Van Williams and Program Manager Monte Ratzlaff joined the meeting to provide updates from the Office of Information Technology Services.

Much of the discussion focused on the loss of free unlimited data storage at some campuses, occurring across Google, Box, and Microsoft. Williams is interested in a systematic path forward for all of UC and framed the issue in the context of UC's need for a standardized way of providing support for research data at UC. The cost for storage will only increase, so UC needs a budget model that will accommodate the need. The group noted that research funding has gone up and wondered if indirect cost recovery could be used to support storage. Increasing capacity and additional support should be tied to increased research dollars. The Research Data Backup System effort is a part of the solution, but focuses solely on backup and not preservation. Responsibility for the research life cycle falls to the VC-Rs, but they do not have budgets for big solutions. Ongoing discussion between

faculty and the administration will be necessary in determining how the university can best support faculty research needs.

Williams said that UC's contract with Google was coming up for renewal and that UC Berkeley had been designated as the lead negotiator. Months of work have already been spent on figuring out the terms of new contract. UC will be in a similar situation with Box soon. All cloud storage providers are going to be charging more. Williams noted that all contracts include data protections, and that these were for storge provision only, not preservation or stewardship. Use cases would be helpful for figuring out how to prevent or anticipate changes in the future. Members noted that the provision of data storage could be framed as an investment, a benefit for recruiting researchers. Other universities offer a designated amount of storage per faculty member.

III. Consultation with UCOP's Office of Ethics Compliance and Audit Services Regarding Artificial Intelligence

Systemwide Deputy Audit Officer Matthew Hicks and General Compliance Manager Jenny Lofthus joined the meeting to talk about their roles on the UC AI Council. Hicks is co-chair of the Subcommittee on Risk, while Lofthus is co-chair of the Subcommittee on Education, Engagement, and Learning (which in a university setting, might more accurately be called the Subcommittee on Training and Awareness).

The UC AI Council came out of President Napolitano's Working Group on Artificial Intelligence. It was formed to assist in the implementation of the "Responsible AI Principles," which were adopted in 2021. Co-chaired by UCSF Professor Alex Bui and UCOP Chief Compliance Officer Alex Bustamante, deliverables from the Council are due to the Board of Regents in 2024.

The AI Council Subcommittee on Risk is developing materials for campuses to help them with how to assess, monitor, and mitigate third party risks. There will also be questions to ask, interpretation of responses, and advice on which campus offices should be consulted.

The Subcommittee on Education, Engagement and Learning is creating general and audience-specific toolkits and training materials. An "AI 101" training module will be available this winter and managers will be asked to take it. Information will include where to find support and additional resources. UC has identified specific areas that will need awareness training, including healthcare, police, HR, and those involved with student experience.

UCACC members asked about including more faculty on the AI Council subcommittees and having faculty co-chairs. They suggested that the Subcommittee on Education, Engagement and Learning be renamed – "training and awareness" might be a less controversial moniker in a university setting. It was noted that at this point, much of the focus is on administrative processes. Members also asked about AI tools that are potentially being introduced under the radar. The AI Council conducted a survey to find out whether campuses had processes in place to identify AI risks. It is acknowledged that much is happening at the campus level and the AI Council is more about high-level guidance. At some point there should be more interactions with faculty concerns, but they also want to respect faculty autonomy.

UCACC members would like to hear about the work of the Subcommittee on Transparency.

IV. Consultation with the Senate Leadership
Academic Council Chair Jim Steintrager and Vice Chair Steven Cheung joined the meeting to provide an update on issues currently facing the Senate.

The Academic Council approved the formation of a Senate AI group and Chair Steintrager is reaching out to systemwide committee chairs for input into the charge and composition. He is interested in aspects of AI that may not be covered by the UC AI Council now, including academic integrity and the use of AI in admissions. The administration would like to be able to communicate with a "community of practice" of those who work closely with AI. Committee members noted that researchers interact with many companies and are sometimes targeted – it is important to recognize the risk of the distributed system.

Steintrager mentioned President Drake's announcement in a recent Regents meeting about centrally funded resources for dealing with campus climate around the situation in the Middle East. He talked about safety, mental health, and educational programming that would be viewpoint neutral on the history of the region, which received pushback primarily from history professors. President Drake has clarified that he didn't mean curriculum or research; he was offering funding for campus programming to help alleviate tensions.

The President is convening a joint admin-faculty work group on educational modalities and UC quality education. This is in response to pressure to increase online education offerings at UC, and potentially approve fully online undergraduate degrees. The Regents and the Provost are enthusiastic about potential online degree programs. The new joint work group will evaluate UC-quality undergraduate experience and what that might look like online. Chair Steintrager noted that he requested the title be "modalities" rather than "online" to broaden the thinking to encompass synchronous, non-synchronous, virtual, etc.

Despite a projected budget shortfall in the state, UC faculty can expect an on-scale salary increase of 4.2% in October. Many faculty were surprised and dismayed by increases in health care costs for next year. Employee contributions to the retirement fund will hold steady for now, while the employer contribution will increase over the next few years from 14 to 18% to bring it up to fully funded. The UC retirement system has had investment challenges this year, with high volatility and essentially flat returns so far. The university has some real estate deals, including one with the Blackstone Group that has a high return, but some see questionable strategies.

V. February AI Congress

CITRIS Executive Director Camille Crittenden, from UC Berkeley, joined the meeting to talk about the planning of the February Congress on Artificial Intelligence. Crittenden is planning the February 29th UC-wide event, "What the Future Holds: A UC Congress on the Impact and Promise of Artificial Intelligence" on behalf of Provost Newman.

The Congress is the second in a series of three congresses held this year. The first was on the future of graduate student education and the last will be on online education. Crittenden went through the meeting's goals, topics, keynote speaker, and panels. The planners hope to raise awareness of the importance of safe, ethical, and non-discriminatory AI usage among UC leadership, faculty, and staff and potentially update recommendations from the 2021 Presidential Working Group Report. Another goal is to identify cutting-edge research in AI in the UC system and ideas on transformative implications and applications. One of the breakout groups will be on teaching and learning.

Members noted that in other areas, the terminology of discrimination and exclusion is being replaced by more positive language of equity and belonging, and wondered if this could happen in AI discussions as well.

VI. Member/campus issues and discussion

UCACC members discussed the relevant topics from their divisional committees and campuses with respect to academic computing and communication.

UC Merced's Senate is working on the reporting structure for its new faculty advisory committee on IT. The chair of the committee will be new UCACC rep. Members of the committee will represent their schools, and will sit on their school's executive committees, which is meant to encompass cross-domain IT issues of teaching, research, operations, etc. The committee will structurally fall under the Committee on Research and the chair will report out to the divisional council once per semester. The Oracle financial transition continues to be an issue, but there is hope that the administration is finally starting to take it seriously. The new Chief Information Officer is convening a joint faculty-admin task force.

UCLA's Committee on Data, Information Technology and Privacy (CDITP) is the newest incarnation of the division's faculty IT committee. The chair sits on nine additional committees due to the pervasiveness of IT across so many areas. UCLA's CIO is planning major technological updates. Some departments at UCLA refusing to use "FireEye," although it was deployed campus-wide. UCLA is dealing with Google storage issues and planning for transitions to the Oracle financial system and a new financial aid system.

UC Berkeley has run out of machine space and does not have enough power for its needs. The campus is shutting down its co-gen plant, which is reducing power for all IT needs. Berkeley has arranged for colocation with NASA Ames. Storage space and power will continue to be issues with the acceleration of high-GPU computer usage. Berkeley would like to craft a data storage/use policy to advise the community on what to store, and so that everyone knows how much storage they get. There is also a need to recognize and accommodate future growth.

UC Riverside, like other campuses, needs to reduce its Google storage footprint. The faculty were told that only a small fraction of their storge would be impacted but pushed back on the CIO regarding cost and potential alternatives. Faculty are asking for a commitment to significantly increase storage capacity.

UC Irvine is interested in finding out whether other UCs or universities have an institutional data policy. The faculty want the administration to be more transparent about use of data that is collected by learning management and other systems. UCI uses a cloud data backup system called "CrashPlan."

UC Santa Cruz's issues include governance, Google, co-location, and data use. There was an issue regarding installation of license plate readers. Last year's wildfires and the potential future risk to the campus made it easier for faculty and the administration to work together on the shift to colocation. The campus storage needs to decrease from 1.7 petabytes to 1.2. UCSC has for many years been supplying Google drive storage to the campus community and recently discovered that 75% of Google storage usage is alumni. They are currently discussing a "cold storage" option.

UC San Franciso: As a result of ransom incidents, UCSF IT is planning for more a more centralized structure. Currently more than 5,000 servers are managed by individuals or departments. Three models have been proposed that are based on core, shared, research, or individual services. Other

topics at UCSF include developing an AI infrastructure and identifying and countering the bias that seems to come with AI algorithms.

UC Santa Barbara's Committee on Information Technology is one of three standing committees of the Committee on Research and Instructional Resources (CRIR). The chair or CRIR has a seat on the divisional executive council. The IT subcommittee is newer and still figuring out its identity, but had some influence in pushing back the Oracle financial implementation by a year. UCSB is also dealing with Google storage and data management issues.

Meeting adjourned 2:35
Meeting minutes draft by: Joanne Miller, UCACC committee analyst
Attest: Kyaw Tha Paw U, UCACC Chair

Meeting participants:
Kyaw Tha Paw U (Chair), Jenson Wong (Vice Chair), John Kubiatowicz (Berkeley), Paul Gershon (Irvine), Matthew Fisher (UCLA), Emily Jane McTavish (Merced), Ilya Brookwell (Riverside), Duygu Tosun-Turgut (San Francisco), Frank Brown (Santa Barbara), Zac Zimmer (Santa Cruz), James Steintrager (Academic Council Chair), Steven Cheung (Academic Council Vice Chair), James Bisley (CCGA Vice Chair), Van Williams (Vice President, UC Chief Information Officer), Monte Ratzlaff (Cyber-Risk Program Manager), Matthew Hicks (Systemwide Deputy Audit Officer), Jenny Lofthus (General Compliance Manager), Camille Crittenden (CITRIS Executive Director, UC Berkeley), Joanne Miller (Committee Analyst)