

## UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC COMPUTING AND COMMUNICATIONS

Monday, April 25, 2016

**Meeting Minutes****I. Agenda Review, Announcements, Approval of past meeting minutes***David G. Kay, UCACC Chair*

- Action item: Approval of meeting minutes from Nov. 16, 2015 (revised) and Feb. 1, 2016

No comments on the meeting minutes. Minutes approved.

The Cyber-Risk Governance Committee is expanding to include more and broader Senate representation, with representatives drawn from UCACC (chair and vice chair) and possibly UCAF and/or UCFW. The CRGC's technical Advisory Board will include three Senate members with relevant technical expertise and three members from outside UC. The Advisory Board meets with the Committee every other meeting, for a total of two meetings per year.

One UCACC member noted that the negative publicity around UC's cybersecurity actions has had positive outcomes. At least one campus has seen increased communication between faculty and administration.

**II. Member Items: Major Campus or Systemwide Issues**

- Opportunity for UCACC members to discuss campus or systemwide issues related to academic computing and communications, including online education and activities of the campus computing committees.

*Santa Cruz:* The campus is changing its course management system and expecting to piggy-back on the UC Davis contract. This is a good topic to bring up with the chair and vice chair of ETLG (Educational Technology Leadership Group), who will join the meeting later in the day. Two-thirds of campuses will be using Canvas, and for the most part have been negotiating separately. Santa Cruz's Information Technology Committee is now discussing data governance – rights and usage – for UC's data.

Not all campuses have designated Senate committees that are focused on IT. Berkeley has a joint (administration/faculty) committee. Irvine and Riverside have combined computing and library committees. UCSD has a committee on academic technology. Santa Cruz has a dedicated committee that meets every week.

**Action:** Committee Analyst Joanne Miller will send a chart of the campuses' faculty IT committees.

**III. Consultation with UCOP – Information Technology Services**

- *Tom Andriola, UC Chief Information Officer*
- *David Rusting, Chief Information Security Officer*
- *Rachel Nosowsky, Deputy General Counsel, UC Office of General Counsel*
  - UC Cybersecurity Update - FireEye
  - Update on Systemwide Electronic Information Security Policy (IS-3)

- UC Cyber-Infrastructure Vision
- Cyber-Risk Governance Committee update

### **UC Cyber-Infrastructure Vision**

CIO Tom Andriola presented slides and informed UCACC about the cyberinfrastructure conference that took place in March, 2015, at UCLA. The event brought together Vice Chancellors of Research, CIOs, and University Librarians to think broadly about the capabilities and needs of cyberinfrastructure at the university. All disciplines were considered in panel discussions over the course of the day. The goal was to identify common themes and determine how to work more collaboratively across campuses. The resulting action plan starts with the formation of a UC Research Cyberinfrastructure Alliance to create a framework for systemwide services. The alliance would be self-governing, campus-led, and include faculty members. The action plan also includes development of a concierge or mediator service that serves as an exchange for sharing cyberinfrastructure services.

Right now, a group is working on governance, location, and a specific model to follow. Additional funds are being sought in order to implement the alliance and exchange.

### **UC Cybersecurity Update - FireEye**

FireEye is the company that was selected to replace Fidelis, which was chosen to deploy threat detection software on UC's network. UC's medical centers spearheaded the effort for the new contract, which followed an extensive RFP process. The contract is open to all of UC so that all campuses can take advantage of the tools.

CIO Andriola showed slides that had been presented to Academic Council and other groups to describe the "layers" of protection offered by FireEye. The UC Office of General Council conducted an analysis of the technology to determine whether it was in compliance with UC's Electronic Communications Policy (ECP), including the standards of "least perusal of content" and general notification. A preview of the memo from OGC regarding the analysis was included in the meeting's background materials. The final version, along with a framing cover letter, is forthcoming.

Campuses will decide how much of the FireEye suite to implement locally. The only requirement from UCOP is to have a threat detection layer in place. Faculty are concerned about where, how, and for how long the data is stored. Chief Information Security Officer David Rusting distributed a draft chart with information about these concerns at each FireEye level, but committee members agreed that more clarification was still needed. There will need to be much discussion and shared information at the local level between IT officials and faculty. Divisional committees should take the initiative to approach their "Cyber-Risk Responsible Executive" (campus member of the Cyber-Risk Governance Committee) for updates.

### **IS-3 policy update**

After consulting with UCACC in February, the group working on revising the Electronic Information Security Policy is developing glossary and making the draft more clear. The revised draft will be distributed to UCACC as soon as it is ready. It is expected to be ready for a full systemwide review in the fall. They have hired a professional writer who will also do abstracting and web writing to help when it's time to organize sections of the policy for specific audiences.

#### **IV. Consultation with the Senate Leadership**

*Dan Hare, Senate Chair*

*Jim Chalfant, Senate Vice Chair*

President Napolitano's [Retirement Options](#) proposal was approved at the last Regents' meeting. The final plan was a better deal for faculty than the options proposed by the Retirement Options Task Force report. The next step will be implementation.

The Regents' [Statement Against Intolerance](#) was also approved. The final version included an amendment that was suggested by the University Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF). Academic Council Chair Hare sent the proposed amendment – that helped to distinguish anti-Zionism from anti-Semitism – to the work group in advance of the full committee meeting, giving the members a chance to consider the wording change. Chair Hare noted the value of “working behind the scenes” for productive and congenial outcomes.

Transfer Pathways for the top 21 majors by enrollment are now completed and on a [systemwide website](#). The site includes lists of Community College coursework that would be expected from UC transfer students in specific majors. It is seen as especially useful for life sciences, since there is an average of eight life science majors per campus with different specialties, but with the same general requirements. It's also beneficial for campuses that are interested in increasing the number of transfer students by giving these majors more exposure. The next steps are to examine articulation gaps.

As requested by the governor, College Level Examination Program (CLEP) exam reviews are supposed to begin this month. Some colleges and universities use the tests for alternative credits. Subject matter experts on the campuses are planning to review the tests to see if they are suitable for UC adoption, but there has been a glitch in the process as the College Board will not to allow UC faculty to look at the exams without a College Board representative in the room. If UC faculty cannot review the tests then UC may not consider them.

The California State Auditor's Report was released March 29 [[Fact Sheet](#); [Summary](#); [Full Report](#)], focusing on UC's admittance of non-California residents. The report says that UC displaced California residents and admitted nonresidents with lower qualifications. It says the faculty (via BOARS) lowered requirements when it endorsed “compare favorably” standards. The auditor says that UC should find money elsewhere in the budget via “savings,” redirecting set-asides (e.g., agricultural experiment stations, observatories, Scripps Institute) directly to undergraduate education, and being more aggressive in imposing Working Smarter cost savings. The report says that UC was too quick to abandon furloughs, and should enroll more students without providing faculty salary increases. One thing UC does not seem to be able to show is how admitting nonresident students helped to increase resident admittance. (Apparently campuses are working on finding that data now). Chair Hare praised UC's State Government Relations office for its part in producing UC's [rebuttal report](#) and working with state legislators before the report's hearing. The 3-hour [hearing](#) on April 6 included Nathan Brostom (Executive Vice President and CFO) and Stephen Handel (Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Admissions) defending UC's practices. There will be faculty op-ed pieces soon.

President Napolitano has requested more information from the Joint Committee on Faculty Discipline (Report [here](#)). Some of the President's questions were considered by the Committee but there was not enough time before the deadline to address them. One of the outstanding issues is the number of negotiated settlements. Data gathered so far shows that most disciplinary activity takes place in Title IX and chancellors' offices, and that most cases never get to the faculty (P&T) process.

UCACC Chair David Kay asked Chair Hare about UCACC's request to amend Senate Regulation 542. It prohibits access to course materials by students on the waiting list. Chair Hare said that additional corroboration and justification is needed from other campuses to be sure this change warrants the full Senate review process that a regulation change entails. Chair Kay will poll committee members to find out the extent of students that are unable to obtain course materials and email. Instructors can generally add students' email addresses on an individual basis.

## **V. Educational Technology Leadership Group and Learning analytics**

- *Israel Fletes, ETLG Chair, Director of Educational Technology and Computing, UC Riverside*
- *Jenn Stringer, ETLG Vice Chair, Associate CIO, Academic Engagement, Educational Technology Services, UC Berkeley*
- Request for review: University of California Learning Data Privacy Principles and Practices

The Chair and Vice Chair of ETLG (Educational Technology Leadership Group) joined the UCACC meeting to talk about the group's Data Privacy and Principles document. Not ready for endorsement yet, the draft is being circulated for review and discussion. After obtaining feedback from UCACC and other groups, ETLG will finalize the document and seek endorsement. The principles are based on the groundwork laid by the Privacy and Information Security Initiative (PISI). The proposed practices align with those principles:

1. Ownership
2. Ethical use
3. Transparency (about how data is being used)
4. Freedom of expression (retaining the right to communicate and engage with others)
5. Protection
6. Access and control

With more and more learning activity happening in the cloud, data management has become a larger issue in academic institutions. UC licenses its course technology through vendors, and there is currently no direct control of what the vendors can do with the data collected. Students also need to be informed about how their data is being used. Some data is kept locally, and that UC (and others) can evaluate data to help with student outcomes and increase understanding of how students learn.

The purpose of the document is to convey principles and recommended practices to vendors. The draft document should be circulated widely, to any campus groups that deal with online learning as well as academic departments and procurement offices. Individuals are buying or licensing tools on their own; not all purchases go through procurement. UCACC members should share the draft document with their campus committees

Next steps are for ETLG to share with other groups, combine feedback, and then bring back to UCACC.

**Action:** Committee Analyst Joanne Miller will investigate how to appoint an ETLG representative to UCACC. Miller will also send the list of ETLG members to UCACC to facilitate communication.

## **VI. PISI Implementation**

*Roslyn Martorano, Systemwide Privacy Manager*

- Implementation of campus Privacy and Information Security Boards

Systemwide Privacy Manager Roslyn Martorano joined the meeting via phone to provide an update and answer any questions about implementation of the [Privacy and Information Security Initiative \(PISI\)](#).

There were four main recommendations from the 2013 Privacy and Security Report:

1. Adopt statement of privacy principles – The statement was endorsed by the Senate and the Regents and is [publicly posted](#).
2. Establish campus boards to advise chancellors on privacy and information security – These are still trying to get off the ground in some locations. UCLA already had a strong committee, and others were envisioned to work like UCLA. Now some campuses have free-standing groups (Berkeley, LA), while others are part of existing group such as a subcommittee within Risk Management. The main struggle has been getting academic participation.
3. Create a Systemwide Board for Information Privacy and Information Security – This was postponed. Former President Yudof suggested implementing other recommendations first, then revisiting.
4. Designate a privacy official in every location – Every campus has a privacy officer. Some locations have an additional HIPAA officer. The privacy officers meet together on a regular basis.

To move forward with establishing PISI boards on each campus, local academic senate leadership will have to be engaged. A faculty member who has a true interest would be more likely to participate. The Cyber-Risk Governance Committee functions in a similar way as a systemwide Board for Information Privacy and Security might operate, but it is not equivalent.

UCACC members on campuses without PISI boards are encouraged to reach out to campus Privacy Officials to start a conversation about establishing a board:

<http://www.ucop.edu/ethics-compliance-audit-services/compliance/privacy/campus-privacy-officials.html>

Members noted that the recent cybersecurity issues had not accelerated discussions about privacy and information security on campuses. Privacy officials and information security officers work together frequently. Manager Martorano noted that work was getting done, but not on setting strategic directions.

## **VII. Open Educational Resources**

*Chikako Takeshita (UC Riverside)*

UCACC member Chikako Takeshita is one of three UC faculty participants on the California OER Council. Takeshita presented slides on the work and accomplishments of the California Open Educational Resources Council in identifying courses, evaluating e-textbooks, and promoting the adoption of free and open textbooks in California higher education. The California State University uses an open access repository called MERLOT for course resources, and has developed the “[cool4ed](#)” website as the public face of the California Open Online Library for Education for all higher education sectors. Faculty can use the website to find free and open textbooks. Many of these are developed by [OpenStax](#) and include texts for foundational courses.

## **VIII. Next Steps, Strategies and planning for 2016-17**

Looking to the next academic year, David Kay and Chris Borgman will continue as chair and vice chair of the committee. Many of the topics of concern to UCACC this year will continue in 2016-17, including data governance and encouraging best practices for unified contracting in the area of education technology. The committee will continue to have updates on ILTI and cross-campus enrollment.

Committee members drafted and endorsed a “**Statement on Transparency and Campus-level Autonomy and Governance**” to be shared among campus committees and departments:

UCACC strongly supports transparency in the nature and extent of IT security measures and recognition and respect for campus-level autonomy and governance on these issues.

*Meeting adjourned at 3:35*

*Notes prepared by: Joanne Miller, committee analyst*

*Attest: David Kay, UCACC Chair*