UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   **ACADEMIC SENATE**

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC COMPUTING AND COMMUNICATIONS
Thursday, February 11, 2021
Meeting Minutes

I. Announcements, agenda review, approval of December meeting minutes
David Robinowitz, UCACC Chair

The committee briefly discussed a request by the Provost for campuses to provide plans for "Confirming the Commencement of Academic Activity" to achieve compliance with federal financial aid regulations. Traditionally the administration has handled this, with input from the faculty. Committee members agreed that it was not universally feasible to ask faculty to take attendance, and endorsed the plan developed by UC Davis, which involves each student logging into their UC Davis portal, reading the Code of Academic Conduct, and acknowledging that they have started academic activity for each of their registered courses. This method has worked for the past few years and seems to satisfy the Department of Education.

ACTION: Meeting minutes from December 17, 2020 were approved.

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

UCOP's systemwide ITS team joined the meeting to update the committee on UC impacts of the national cybersecurity situation, outcomes of the Cyber-Risk Working Group, discussions of the Cyber-Risk Governance Committee, policy updates, and other information technology and security topics.

Solarwinds: As news stories have reported, an update of the Solarwinds software was compromised by hackers. The software is used by corporations and institutions nationwide, including every branch of government and the UC system. The problem was first noted by the FireEye threat detection service, which subsequently alerted the public. Although no further harm has been seen, the notion of a "supply chain" attack is alarming to experts. The attack was sophisticated in nature and clearly carried out by a nation state. As industry grapples with the security breach, UC campuses are following the proper protocols.

UCACC members asked about the impact for IT professionals versus regular users, and whether there are policy or procedural implications around data retention and security. At the moment, the only steps that users should take are the same precautions as before. It is still best practice to perform all updates and software patches. UC continues to monitor its networks. The impact of the widespread cyberattack will likely be felt over months or years.

FireEye: All campuses have a baseline level of perimeter network monitoring provided by FireEye. Some locations have purchased additional services, including FireEye consultation. Campuses also have their own systems that layer on to what is provided by FireEye.

Committee members asked what types of data are being targeted, or at risk, and whether healthcare systems like Epic are vulnerable. Large providers like Epic continually update their security efforts, but the university could hold specific research that could be targets. In the recent national event, the primary objective was espionage, and intelligence-gathering. A recent Reuters article noted that the attack was broad but not deep.

Cyberrisk Working Group: After the recent UCSF ransomware attack, President Napolitano convened a workgroup to develop ideas for how to better protect UC's research data. UCACC learned about the report at the last meeting. The core recommendations were:

- o Establish location-based research data protection workgroups
- o Develop awareness campaigns for faculty
- o Provide a scalable back-up service for all research data across the institution, especially for data that does not already have back-up solution. This is envisioned as a frictionless, concierge-style service.

ITS is working with VP for Research & Innovation Theresa Maldonado on guidance to circulate to VC-Rs. Once the research data workgroups come together – with a wide-range of stakeholders from faculty and administration – the second awareness campaign will follow. CIOs at each campus will be engaged to develop a RFP/RFI for a data management solution that can be managed locally.

IS-12 - IT Recovery Policy Revision: The Data Recovery policy is currently out for systemwide review. Early feedback has been relatively minimal editorial suggestions. The policy was well-vetted before being circulated widely. UCACC members' comments were also relatively minor, including clarification on a testing timeframe for critical systems and a request for more clarity around roles. UCACC members also asked whether the policy was linked to a new proposed policy on research data, which is also out for systemwide review. IS-12 could potentially apply to a situation where a researcher leaves UC, as well as to a cyberattack.

III. Academic Senate Leadership Update
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 information on the current issues of concern in the Academic Senate.

The Board of Regents met in January and discussed the results of the "Feasibility Working Group," which was convened after UC suspended use of the SAT/ACT for freshman admission. The working group determined that it would not be feasible for UC to develop its own test for admissions, but it might be possible to adapt an existing test. One such test is the Smarter Balanced assessment, used in California schools. Also at the Regents' meeting, it was reported that campuses have the capacity to administer 120,000-200,000 vaccines per week, but are only receiving around 30,000 doses.

The recently released Governor's Budget provides some additional funding for UC, but there is some worry about the extent of interference into academic matters. The state is providing funding for an increase in online courses and also getting very specific about transfer admissions. There are specific line items, which are for worthwhile things, but results in UC priorities being set by the legislature. UC has constitutional autonomy and should not directed in academic matters by the government.

The Academic Council has spent time discussing the impacts of Covid-19 in both the short and long term, including how to support faculty and concerns about advancement. Council sent a joint UCFW-UCAADE letter to President Drake that lays out the concerns and offers suggestions. One idea is to give faculty who have been teaching an extra sabbatical credit. While not a lot, it could help faculty get back time to do research, for example. Departments would have to compensate for the (temporary) loss of those individuals.

A new bill by state Senator Scott Weiner relates to UC Health and attempts to affiliate with Catholic hospitals. This was a big issue two years ago, when UCSF proposed a large affiliation with Dignity Health that ended up not being approved.

Campuses are starting to plan for fall instruction, potentially keeping some hybrid options. A big issue is whether there will be a vaccine mandate. Committee members asked about faculty involvement in these decisions, and noted the importance keeping faculty involved. Questions came up about whether faculty members needed to be on site for hybrid classes, and whether there were any rules or academic literature on the subject.

Vice Chair Horwitz briefly noted the Zoom censorship/academic freedom issue, and reported that there has been correspondence between the Academic Council, the Provost and Zoom. There are also remote instruction issues within the university around recording and posting of lectures.

IV. Presidential Policy on UC Research Data and Tangible Research Materials
Agnes Balla, Research Policy Manager, UCOP Office of Research & Innovation

UCOP Research Policy Manager Agnes Balla jointed UCACC to discuss the proposed policy on UC Research Data and Tangible Research Materials, which is currently undergoing formal systemwide review. The policy calls upon campus leadership and researchers to work in partnership to manage, retain, preserve, protect, access and share data. UCACC has previously discussed data preservation and the need for a UC data ownership policy.

Balla introduced the proposed policy, and noted that UCOP's Office of Research has been working on it for two years, including a major revision after consultation with Academic Senate committees and others. Some specific procedural elements were removed from the policy and put into guidelines. Compliance with data management mandates will be discipline-, funder- and campus-based. The intent is for the policy one that all members of the UC community can support and stand behind.

UCACC members asked about how the policy and its requirements would be communicated to the faculty, and whether resources for compliance would be provided. The notion of UC ownership of faculty data is not new – it is currently enshrined in "Reg. 4" – although some faculty may not be aware of the specifics. The policy will not necessarily change current practices. UC's California Digital Library is prepared with alternative date storage solutions and communication of best practices. (Although communication is always a challenge at UC.)

UCACC members asked about what happens in cases of collaborations with researchers at other universities, and suggested coordinating this policy with the recent IT-Recovery policy revision, which is about data back-up, and with other policies that deal with data security, etc. Members proposed that one solution will not fit all situations, and suggested that the guidance – possibly in the form of a FAQ – follow the IRB model of distinguishing circumstances.

On the campuses, there is confusion about UC claiming ownership of all data. UC has policies around patents and copyright that should be reviewed in relation to this policy.[1]

V. Systemwide Items Under Review

- Proposed Revisions to Presidential Policy, Business and Finance Bulletin, IS-12: IT Recovery

  ACTION: UCACC will send a response to this policy revision by the February 17th deadline.

- Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) Review with Update

  UCACC members briefly discussed the review, but will not send comments.

- Academic Planning Council Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations

  Comments around this report included whether salary scales take into effect the cost of living. It is not clear who benefits by doing away with off-scale salaries. There is potential residual benefits to retention counter offers, in that it can alert the administration that higher salaries are to be expected. At some campuses, faculty are involved in off-scale decisions and it is uses effectivly.

  ACTION: UCACC will send a response by the February 17th deadline.

- Presidential Policy on UC Research Data and Tangible Research Materials - Comments due March 23, 2021

---

[1] UC's Intellectual Property Policies can be found here: https://www.ucop.edu/research-policy-analysis-coordination/policies-guidance/intellectual-property-ex/

ACTION: Chair Robinowitz will draft a brief response, based on the earlier discussion, for committee review.

VI. Member/campus issues – Round Robin
Members provided updates on relevant academic computing and communication topics from their campus.

UC Davis: The campus committee is discussing the implementation of Duo for students and networking issues.

UC Irvine: The Irvine Committee on Research, Computing, and Libraries (CORCL) was asked to review the revised IS-12 policy. The committee was not familiar with many of the terms and wanted a better understanding of the roles such as CREs (Cyber-Responsible Executives) and more faculty involvement. The Irvine committee was also concerned about testing of systems.

UCLA: A new VC for IT is creating new structure for provision of IT services that would be centrally managed. This is in contrast to the current federated structure that has grown organically to meet local needs. Senate committees are giving feedback on the "hub-and-spoke" proposal, which can provide more security, but that some feel will hinder innovation. Faculty are concerned that the plan somehow imagines monetizing UCLA's data. The transition to the new model was put on hold as it is further debated.

UC Merced: UC Merced is trying to balance faculty independence with IT security needs. During the pandemic and remote instruction there has been a huge expansion of technology adoption by faculty. Many are not part of the central domain or campus license, and have unknown security. This has also meant that students potentially have to deal with multiple different programs to complete their coursework. Although institutionally-sanctioned software and services are safer, if the requirements are too onerous then people will find their own solutions. The Faculty Committee on IT at Merced is getting involved in institutional decisions around purchasing and discussing how to share and communicate with faculty.

UC Riverside: UCR is transitioning from a hosted CMS to Canvas. It is currently in a pilot stage, and going well. There have been discussions around fall planning, and there is confusion about what is meant by "hybrid." Faculty have expressed preference for having *either* remote or in-person, but not a combination.

UC San Diego: San Diego is having student visa issues; in particular, those coming from China are apparently having a hard time. A transition to a new, hosted database for financial systems has caused chaos that coincided with the onset of the Covid-19 pandemic. The higher levels of the administration are still championing the change while staff are quitting. The local committee reviewed the ILTI Review (under Systemwide Review Items) and noted that attendance in asynchronous (and synchronous) remote courses is dropping.

UC San Francisco: Many employees and those in the UCSF community are now vaccinated against Covid-19. The hope is that that will enable more in-person instruction and practice. UCSF has already made adaptations to enable clinical and pre-clinical education to continue. There is some privacy concerns around people getting vaccinated where they work, as more in the UC community are now in the system's electronic medical records.

UC Santa Barbara: UCSB's committee is also having discussions about vaccines and campus reopening. The campus is advantaged in that county distributions of the Covid-19 vaccine have gone to the university to distribute. UCSB anticipates some online instructions in the fall.

UC Santa Cruz: The local committee is discussing how faculty can convey to IT administrators what software and services are needed for research and teaching. UCSC currently uses a centralized IT structure. Computer labs on the campus are being transitioned into multi-use rooms.

During the committee update, a question arose about whether any campuses have successful mechanisms for gathering faculty feedback about technology, including software licenses. Some reported that units (such as departments) might do surveys, but that is more complex campus-wide. A future topic for UCACC might be translating faculty needs to IT needs.

ACTION: UCACC reps are asked to find out how their IT leadership solicits input about technology licensing or purchasing from faculty.

VII. Executive Session: Wrap up, next steps
No minutes were taken during Executive Session.

\-
Meeting minutes drafted by: Joanne Miller, UCACC Committee Analyst
Attest: David Robinowitz, UCACC Chair

\-
Meeting participants:
Members: David Robinowitz (Chair, UCSF), Susan Cochran, (Vice Chair and UCLA), Matt Bishop (Davis), Nader Bagherzadeh (Irvine), Emily Jane McTavish (Merced), Manu Sridharan (Riverside), Avi Yagil (UCSD), Jenson Wong (UCSF), James Frew (UCSB), Brent Haddad (UCSC), Andrea Kasko (CCGA representative), Daniel Potter (UCEP representative), Mimi (Derjung) Tarn (UCOLASC Representative), Mary Gauvain (Academic Council Chair), Robert Horwitz (Academic Council Vice Chair)

Consultants, Guests, Staff: Mark Cianca (Interim Vice President, UC Chief Information Officer), David Rusting (Chief Information Security Officer), Robert Smith (Systemwide IT Policy Officer), Agnes Balla (Research Policy Manager, UCOP) Joanne Miller (Committee Analyst)