UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC COMPUTING AND COMMUNICATIONS
Monday, November 7, 2016

Members attending in person	David G. Kay (Chair, UCI), Christine Borgman (Vice Chair, UCLA), Ken Goldberg (UCB), Michael Shin (UCLA), Florin Rusu (UCM), Maryann Martone (UCSD), Todd Oakley (UCSB), Kwai Ng (CCGA Chair, UCSD), Jim Chalfant (Academic Council Chair, UCD), Shane White (Academic Council Vice Chair, UCLA)
Members attending remotely	Matt Davis (UCD), Laura Harris (UCR), Brant Robertson (UCSC)
Members absent	Miguel Pampaloni (UCSF), Barbara Knowlton (UCEP Chair, UCLA), 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), Jenn Stringer (ETLC Chair, UCB), Jim Williamson (ETLC member, UCLA), Joanne Miller (Committee Analyst, UCOP)

Meeting Minutes

I.   Chair's welcome, introductions, agenda review
Chair David Kay provided a brief overview of the committee for the benefit of new members. Meeting minutes from April 25, 2016 were approved.

II.   Confirm and ratify UCACC Statement of Principles
Committee members agreed in concept with the UCACC Statement of Principles and had suggestions for minor structural and word choice edits. While the Principles are not official policy, members believed they would be useful as endorsed recommendations to reference.

Chair Kay will edit the document and add citations. Next steps will be to post the Principles to the UCACC website, and request that UC CIO Tom Andriola circulate the document to campus chief information officers.

Action: Chair Kay will send a revised draft to committee members via email, with the final draft to be approved at the February meeting.

III.   Member/campus issues
UCSD: UC San Diego's IT committee has been discussing faculty profile systems and whether the campus should be involved in promoting ORCID IDs (persistent digital identifiers). The

Senate committee and campus-wide groups will investigate campus use of ORCID, which is supported by UC San Diego's University Librarian and the library community.

UCLA: UCLA's Committee on Instruction and Technology is talking about online courses, including pedagogy, faculty time and credit, data governance, authentication and more. The impact of online courses varies by field, and apparently the rules for establishing online courses vary by campus. The University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) and the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) provide faculty input on online courses. Members wondered whether a systemwide policy on online courses exists within UC.

Berkeley: Network monitoring has been the primary focus at Berkeley. Faculty are trying to re-establishing the Academic Senate's computing committee.

Riverside: UC Riverside has been discussing security and privacy issues, including concerns about email, which was recently switched to Gmail.

UCSC: Several Academic Senate committees reviewed ETLC's "Learning Data Privacy Principles and Practices" and offered feedback in a letter sent to UCACC Chair Kay. In addition to these discussions, the computing committee has been focusing on the migration of software applications and services to the cloud.

IV.   Data Governance

UCACC Vice Chair Christine Borgman provided context for the UCLA Data Governance Report and the Learning Data Privacy Principles. In 2000, UCLA established an Information Technology Planning Board and in 2005 spun off the Privacy and Data Protection Board. For more than 10 years UCLA has viewed privacy and data protection as an important set of issues.

Briefing on Data Governance Report
- *UCACC Vice Chair Christine Borgman*

UCLA's Data Governance Task Force, a joint Academic Senate-Administration committee co-chaired by Borgman and UCLA Chief Privacy Officer Kent Wada, was composed of members from the faculty and administration. Data governance is an emerging concern that is beginning to garner more attention at UC and elsewhere. The Task Force anticipated that the report would be used as a template that could be adopted systemwide by UC as well as by other universities.

Borgman expressed concern about support for implementation of the PISI (Privacy and Information Security Initiative) Report and over the loss of institutional memory at OP as members of the administration who were involved in the initiative leave UC. Although one of the three PISI recommendations endorsed by President Yudof and approved by the Board of Regents was to get Privacy and Data Protection boards established on each campus, joint committees like UCLA's Information Technology Planning Board exist only on a few campuses.

The scope of the UCLA Report includes faculty and student records data such as the information stored on ID cards used for meals, building access, library services, and registration. Faculty records might include analytics and evaluations, among others. Data used and generated for

scholarly research is also a concern of the university, but lies outside the scope of the Task Force. Other universities are using their students' data for causes such as automated decision-making and tracking, but UC has long held a strong privacy stance against such uses of data.

The concern about student records data is not just what UC collects but also what third parties collect. The FTC's Fair Information Practice Principles (FIPPs) – guidelines that represent widely accepted concepts concerning fair information practice in an electronic environment – apply to student data, but notice and consent is not enough. Clarity on any potential usage of student and faculty is also necessary.

The primary concern about faculty records is what can be done with them. For example, there is a lot of data about where authors publish and what is published. Large publishers have been acquiring data-collection start-ups and developing proprietary algorithms for using the data they collect.

UCACC's concerns include what roles the academic senate should play in data governance, how to build on existing campus governance structures, and how the data governance issues intersect with related initiatives such as privacy of learning data. UCACC can play a role by helping to determine workable governance processes. The committee discussed the need to educate faculty about why they should be interested in privacy.

The committee approved the UCLA Data Governance Task Force Report and agreed that it was an excellent model for keeping faculty appropriately represented. In consultation with Jim Chalfant and Shane White, UCACC will distribute the report to Division Chairs.

ETLC Report on Learning Data Privacy Principles and Recommended Practices
- *Jenn Stringer, ETLC Chair and Associate CIO, Academic Engagement, Educational Technology Services, UC Berkeley*
- *Jim Williamson, ETLC member and Director, Campus Educational Technology Systems & Administration, UCLA*
Request for endorsement: "University of California Learning Data Privacy Principles and Practices"

The Learning Data Privacy Principles and Practices document was drafted by the Educational Technology Leadership Committee to provide guidance for the data generated by tracking and monitoring practices of learning management and student information systems. ETLC, a systemwide group of UC's academic technology leaders, based the document on current discussions within the higher education community such as the Leiden Manifesto for research metrics and the Asilomar Convention for Learning Research in Higher Education. The focus of the ETLC document is the problem of third party vendors that use the student data that they collect for commercial purposes or other ways that are not approved by the university.

Committee discussion centered on privacy awareness within the university community. Many faculty and students are either not aware of the amount of data that is being collected or think that it's not a problem. Some committee members thought an information and outreach effort

would be worthwhile. Resources and staffing for dealing with privacy issues varies by campus. Only Berkeley and UCLA have dedicated privacy officials.

UCACC members applauded the work of ETLC in crafting the Learning Data Privacy Principles and Practices and agreed that it move forward in partnership with the Academic Senate. ETLC members have already met with campus committees and groups to discuss the Principles and Practices, and are seeking guidance on next steps.

Action: Chair Kay and Vice Chair Borgman will work with Academic Council Chair Jim Chalfant on the process for disseminating the ETLC Learning Data Privacy Principles and Practices. UCACC committee members will get in touch with their campus ETLC representatives so that divisional senate committees can be informed.

V. Implementing PISI Report Principles
- *Roslyn Martorano, Systemwide Privacy Manager*

The committee discussed implementation of the Privacy and Information Security Initiative (PISI), which was reviewed by the Board of Regents in July, 2013. UC's Systemwide Privacy Manager Roslyn Martorano provided context and background about PISI and UC's privacy program, including a slide presentation that included a memorable image of the overwhelming number of regulatory agencies that touch on some aspect of the university.

Suggestions regarding privacy from committee members included elevating the visibility of Privacy Officers and developing examples of privacy scenarios to show why folks should be concerned. The PISI Report was brought to the Board of Regents in July, 2013, and the faculty and administration should work on the assumption that it was approved.

Some committee members requested that Martorano write a short article before she leaves about why the faculty should care about privacy.

VI. Consultation with UCOP – Information Technology Services
- *Tom Andriola, UC Chief Information Officer*
- *David Rusting, Chief Information Security Officer*

Update on Systemwide Electronic Information Security Policy (IS-3)
The IS-3 policy is meant to function as guidelines and a framework for making local decisions about data security, and is therefore written to be flexible and even include ambiguities. The revision uses the protection level classifications developed by UC Berkeley (see the Protection Level Guides website). Committee members had questions about the classification levels and their utility. Some members questioned the wisdom of defining protection levels as opposed to leaving it up to individual locations. Classifications can make things permanent when that may not be the intention. Also, if the intention is to offer local control, then the policy should state more clearly the situations when classification needs to be determined.

Committee members noted that while the policy may like to focus solely on security, it is in fact not separable from privacy. In the past, UC tried to revise the security and privacy policies into

one combined policy, but that proved impossible. Nevertheless, it may be worthwhile to acknowledge one while talking about the other, such as in an introductory statement that clearly says that this policy is not the final word on privacy.

Cyber-Risk Update
The cyber-risk update from CIO Tom Andriola focused on UC's approach to balancing the need to protect against the necessary openness of the university. UC is trying to build a sustainable program that can adapt over time to changes in the environment. CIO Andriola consults regularly with the Board of Regents, the Cyber-Risk Governance Committee, campus IT leaders and others to make sure that UC is unified and focused in the right areas.

The committee discussed how UC might take a more mission-driven and pro-active approach to security, such as by implementing educational activities within the university so that technology users have the proper knowledge to apply best practices to their work. We also recommended that systems be designed first for mission concerns and second for risk concerns, based on balancing tests to be developed.

VII.   Senate Leadership Update and Consultation
Jim Chalfant, Academic Council Chair
Shane White, Academic Council Vice Chair
Academic Council Chair Jim Chalfant offered input on what UCACC can do with the documents that the committee approved during the meeting.
- The ETLC Learning Data Privacy Principles can be shared with the Academic Council with a message on the importance of having faculty involved in data governance.
- The UCLA Data Governance Task Force Report could be provided to Divisional chairs with the message that it is a good model that divisions might want to adopt and/or adapt.
- If desired, Chalfant can distribute UCACC Principles to the Academic Council when the document is ready. UCACC is also free to post documents on the Resources section of its website.

If UCACC wants to write a short paper or article describing why faculty should care about data privacy, it could be published in the Senate Source newsletter, on the Academic Senate website, or possibly on the UCOP security website.

Chair Chalfant has talked with a representative of President Napolitano's office and with COO Rachael Nava regarding how UC might clarify statements about investigations and audits within UC policies. Chalfant will work with UCACC committee members as necessary to draft a memo that addresses the constraints on inspections of electronic communications.

General updates:
- November Regents – The Board of Regents is continuing work on revising its Bylaws and Policies. All Standing Orders are becoming either Bylaws or Policies, which means that shared governance is now ingrained as a Bylaw.
- A request that faculty register their travel (for insurance purposes is being proposed to mitigate risk, so that the university knows who is where if an emergency arises. This is

offered through a vendor called iJet. UCACC advised that any contract with a third party should include a prohibition on aggregating or selling UC's information.

- "International Thinking Day" – Chancellors have proposed an event related to the increasing "internationalization" of the university's work. The event would probably take place in March.

VIII. Additional business and next steps

In response to a request from the UC Berkeley member, UCACC affirmed that it respects the UC Berkeley DIVCO decision to reinstate its Academic Senate computing committee and welcomes its input in the future.

The February UCLA meeting will take place at **UCLA**.

Meeting adjourned: 3:55
Meeting minutes drafted by: Joanne Miller, UCACC committee analyst
Attest: David G. Kay, UCACC Chair