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This is to confirm the meeting of the Executive Council on Monday, May 13, 2013 at 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. in Room 220 2nd Floor, University Office Building.
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EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING
MINUTES
MARCH 25, 2013

Present:
Bahman Anvari, BCOE Exec Committee       James Baldwin, PRP
Gregory Beran, Academic Computing          Ward Beyermann, Educational Policy
Jan Blacher, Planning & Budget             Sarjeet Gill, Academic Personnel
David Glidden, Preparatory Education       Piotr Gorecki, Secretary/Parliamentarian
Irving Hendrick, Faculty Welfare           Mariam Lam, Committees
Bronwyn Leebaw, Division Vice-Chair        Bahram Mobasher, Jr Assembly
Leonard Nunney, Research                   Connie Nugent, Graduate Council
Ameae Walker, SoM Executive Committee      Jose Wudka, Division Chair
Rami Zwick, SoBA Executive Committee

Absent:
Byron Adams, CoDEO                        Jennifer Hughes, CHASS Exec Committee
Richard Luben, Sr Assembly Representative  Mindy Marks, Undergraduate Admissions
Melanie Sperling, GSOE Exec Committee      Gillian Wilson, CNAS Executive Committee

APPROVAL OF AGENDA & MINUTES:
The agenda for March 25 and the minutes for March 11 were approved as written.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR:
Campus Safety Task Force – Chair Wudka reports that the Administration has convened a
task force to examine campus safety. While the reporting of on-campus incidents is
relatively new, with implementation of the Clery Act in 2002, the high number of recent
events has prompted the need to examine what is happening on and around the campus.
There are indications that the campus really is safe, but that the issues (which are
concentrated in one area) give the perception that UCR is unsafe. After some discussion, the
Executive Council requested that in addition to a report of the findings of the Task Force,
Chair Wudka also obtain data comparing the recent spate of crime to crime trends in previous
years.

New Chancellor – The Search for a new Chancellor for the Riverside campus is actively
underway with the next meeting of the Faculty Advisory Committee scheduled for April 5.
The Faculty Advisory Committee is preparing to advise the President on the selection of
UCR’s next Chancellor and though not involved in the actual Chancellor selection process, it
is the subcommittee who will initially vet all candidates and help narrow a short list. Chair
Wudka reminded the Executive Council of the link provided on the Academic Senate
webpage to submit any comments or concerns they may have regarding the search or to
nominate potential candidates.
Smoke/Tobacco Free UCR – By 2014, UC will ban smoking and chewing tobacco on all campuses, including parking lots and housing, as part of its commitment to cut tobacco use and exposure to secondhand smoke. The sale and advertising of tobacco products also will be prohibited. With UC preparing to go smoke-free in 18 months, faculty and staff looking to quit or reduce their tobacco use can take advantage of the many resources which will be offered system-wide and campus-wide. At UCR, a wellness coordinator will provide one-on-one consultation to help assess “readiness to quit” and offer resources. The UC-sponsored medical plan also has tools such as personal coaching, prescription medications or other resources to help individuals become smoke-free. UC has already barred smoking at its five medical centers. The remaining campuses do not allow smoking inside buildings or with 25 feet of buildings. A steering committee with broad representation from throughout the campus will help UCR prepare for the new policy.

Health Care Facilitators – It was announced that the short term funding for the three campus Health Care Facilitators will end on May 31, and in response the campus is preparing to implement a new benefits service delivery model. Effective June 1, 2013, responsibility for retirement processing, inquiries and counseling will be transferred to the UC Retirement Administration Service Center (RASC) in Oakland. Detailed information regarding this change will be available via the Human Resources website under Retirement Services and will be widely announced to the campus. Faculty and Staff planning to retire from UC Riverside on July 1 are encouraged to contact Human Resources as soon as possible to get a May appointment.

As part of the new delivery model, disability processing services will be provided via online resources and in-person financial planning will no longer be offered; however, general online information and guidance on seeking a financial planner can be obtained via the Work/Life section of the Human Resources website under Financial Planning. Fidelity will continue to offer in-person counseling on all UC Retirement Savings plans through their guidance counselors.

Chair Hendrick, Faculty Welfare, will contact campus Administrators to ask why Riverside has opted to not fund the positions at the local level. The Committee on Faculty Welfare was led to believe that we would continue to fund at least one of the two cut positions for another few years as “transition” years.

School of Medicine Update – Chair Wudka announced that the School of Medicine has cleared the first hurdle and received a 15 million budget provision from the Educational Subcommittee of the State Legislature. The bill is now in appropriations. In addition, at the campus level, the School has received Senate confirmation that per Standing Order of the Regents 105.2, the approval of courses will be held within the School of Medicine and not be the authority of the Committee on Courses. The School has also submitted a request for a pass/no pass honors grading system. The request is being reviewed by relevant standing committees and is expected to soon be presented to the Executive Council.

Discussion of Senate Bill 520 & SB 547 – There has been the introduction of two pieces of legislature introduced to address online education in the State of California; SB547 introduced by Senator Block and SB 520 introduced by Senator Steinberg. There was not
any consultation with the Office of the President and/or the Academic Senate in advance of announcement of either Bill or in drafting either Bill. Senate Bill 520 aims to create a California Virtual Campus which will sponsor the creation of courses and other online initiatives. As written, it will significantly weaken the authority of the Senate and will in-fact delegate the authority of the UC Senate concerning approval of courses to a group of faculty associated with the California Virtual Campus. The faculty is made up of interested parties which include representatives from California K-12 Education, the State Department of Education, the California Technology Assistance Program, the California Community Colleges and the Cal State Colleges. It is unclear whether or not private companies will be included. The idea is to create a diverse and highly skilled work force and offer courses that will be available to public higher entities in California. In particular, in our case, the aim is to offer courses that will satisfy the IGETC transfer criteria for students coming from Community Colleges to CSUs and UCs. Both bills have specific instructions to assure that copyright rights are protected. There is no request for additional funding for SB520, nor is there an indication on how this is to be paid for.

After considerable discussion, the Executive Council determined it will draft a forcefully worded statement to be shared with the Chancellor and ask that our Administration consider a joint Riverside response.

**Composite Rate Benefit** – The proposed composite rate benefit plan has enormous implications for any faculty who work from grants and who are paid summer salary from grants. There are currently two scenarios – J and K, both of which include 3 different rate categories. The concern is that faculty will now have to pay one of the benefit rates for summer salary but summer salary is still not considered covered compensation to count towards base building for retirement calculations. There too will be imbalances between different types of grants and between the various units on campus. The Senate position is that benefits charged to grants should be billed on actual costs rather than a composite rate, and that neither should be included in summer salary. Chair Wudka will draft a Riverside Division response to ask the Administration to adopt as a campus response.

**PROPOSAL FOR NEW ACADEMIC SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS** – Chair Mariam Lam, Committee on Committees – The Committee on Committees has submitted a request to create a new standing committee of the Riverside Division, the Committee on Memorial Resolutions. In order to appoint members effective immediately, CoC has also asked that the Executive Council approve the new bylaw in lieu of submitting for approval at the next Division meeting (which is longer than 30 days away). After a short discussion, the Executive Council passed a motion to accept the new bylaw as proposed. The motion passed with 16 voting yes, none voting against and no abstentions.

**IMPACTED COURSES** – Chair Ward Beyermann, CEP - CEP Chair Beyermann asked the Executive Council for advice in determining a priority enrollment policy. After considerable discussion, the Executive Council advised that CEP develop a policy which would give the departments the ability to deal with priority registration issues as they see fit. The consensus was that the Senate should not develop policy to fix administrative resource issues.
CHASS FELLOWSHIP POLICY – Chair Jennifer Hughes, CHASS Executive Committee, Chair Irving Hendrick, Faculty Welfare, Chair Leonard Nunney, Research – Due to time constraints discussion of the new CHASS Fellowship Policy is tabled to a future meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Cindy Palmer
Executive Director,
Office of the Academic Senate
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING
MINUTES
APRIL 22, 2013

Present:
Bahman Anvari, BCOE Exec Committee  James Baldwin, PRP
Ward Beyermann, Educational Policy  Sarjeet Gill, Academic Personnel
David Glidden, Preparatory Education  Irving Hendrick, Faculty Welfare
Mariam Lam, Committees  Bronwyn Leebaw, Division Vice-Chair
Richard Luben, Sr Assembly Representative  Mindy Marks, Undergraduate Admissions
Connie Nugent, Graduate Council  Leonard Nunney, Research
Melanie Sperling, GSOE Exec Committee  Ameae Walker, SoM Executive Committee
Jose Wudka, Division Chair

Absent:
Byron Adams, CoDEO  Gregory Beran, Academic Computing
Jan Blacher, Planning & Budget  Piotr Gorecki, Secretary/Parliamentarian
Jennifer Hughes, CHASS Exec Committee  Bahram Mobasher, Jr Assembly
Gillian Wilson, CNAS Executive Committee  Rami Zwick, SoBA Executive Committee

APPROVAL OF AGENDA & MINUTES:
The agenda for March 25 and the minutes for March 11 were approved as written.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR:
Composite Rate Benefit Update
Chair Wudka shared scenario “L” as the newest schedule of rates for Composite Benefits. Plan L has a 35% charge for faculty who have grants and earn summer salary, with 20% of that 35% being earmarked for the retirement plan. The Systemwide Senate is lobbying forcefully to convince the Administration that the plan is not well thought out, and would have a detrimental impact on faculty research. Campus administration has indicated that the Senate’s position on the composite rate benefit proposal would be held in greater regard than is the position of the Council of Executive Vice Chancellors. Chair Wudka will be meeting with Chancellor Conoley to discuss alternatives and impact.

Senate Bill 520
SB547 introduced by Senator Block and SB 520 introduced by Senator Steinberg are both moving forward despite opposition from all educating bodies within California. Chair Wudka has been hesitant to publish the Riverside position because there was a hope that the bills would be withdrawn, which unfortunately did not happen. Although Senator Steinberg made changes to SB 520, the Senate is still opposed to this legislation, especially because the bill statutorily mandates collaboration with private, for profit organizations. There is also some prescription of how programs should be evaluated. The companion bill, SB 547 by Senator Block, while less
proscriptive is still of great concern because it commands that the University of California adhere to the mandates of the legislature. Typical legislation “requests” that the University of California follow suit with the CSU directives, whereas this bill specifically states what the UC and CSU “will do.”

Budget Planning Update
Chair Wudka reports that individual organizational budget presentations are scheduled for April 26th and 29th. Senate participation includes representatives from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budget, and Chair Wudka who is a member of the Chancellor’s Budget Advisory Committee.

All UC Online Education Meeting
Several representatives from Riverside attended the “University of California All-Campus Working Meeting Innovative Learning Technology Initiative” on Saturday, April 13 at UC Irvine. Although the forum included presentations of some existing online programs, there was not a lot of substantive material presented or generated. Discussion included the role of UCOE which continues to remain unclear. There is the possibility that UCOE will become the organizational group tasked with creating the translating software for all campuses so that students can cross register efficiently.

There is a follow up meeting scheduled for April 25 to be followed by a face-to-face meeting in May. The May meeting will include discussion of the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI), which has been created to manage the 10 million dollar fund, budgeted for online education.

There was also discussion of a second request for proposals regarding online courses. The initial request for proposals was sent to each campus via campus Deans’ but many Deans did not distribute it timely. The new request will be transmitted through campus EVC’s and Senate offices. It is anticipated that the RFP will be received in late May for one week of comments and released in June. Decisions will be made in July and in August work on the first courses will begin.

University Club
Chair Wudka presented one of the possible plans for renovating the Barn and surrounding area, including creation of a University Club. Unfortunately the plan does not seem that it will meet the needs of faculty. Chair Wudka asked the Executive Council to consider whether or not the Senate wants to become involved in the Barn planning, and if so, which committee would like to take the lead. There was considerable discussion about the need for a place for faculty to host guests as well as for faculty meeting space. It was determined that the Committee on Resources Planning will seek to become in the Barn renovations and creation of a University Club.

SoM PETITION TO USE A PASS/FAIL GRADING SYSTEM
The School of Medicine submitted a petition to receive authorization to use the Pass / Fail grading for SoM medical classes (which use the MDCL course designation) in place of the Satisfactory/No Credit grading scheme used by the campus. Approval of the petition rests
with the Committee on Education Policy and the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction, both of which have indicated agreement. Council received and endorsed the petition with the understanding that the new grading scheme will be used only for the above-mentioned courses. The new grading scheme will be announced at the May 28 Division meeting.

**FINAL REVIEW OF APM 430**

APM 430, which was initially considered in the fall, is now being circulated for final input before implementation. The proposal is to develop a new category of visiting scholar appointment, intended for graduate student and similar visitors. Most committees asked to comment did so without substantive input. The Committee on Research (CoR) however, noticed that desirable candidates for the Visiting Scholar title may not have an appropriate terminal degree and suggested that after the term “terminal degree” the phrase “or have experience” be added.

**SR 478 IGETC FOR STEM MAJORS**

The Integrated General Education Transfer Curriculum or “IGETC” was created to facilitate the student transfer process. Unfortunately it immediately encountered difficulty for students in the STEM fields because of the sequential nature of courses in the sciences. The implications of IGETC also impacted a student’s ability to conform to the credit requirements for maintenance of financial aid. The result was that many colleges are not accepting the IGETC program for students in the STEM majors.

Recently Academic Council reviewed a BOARS proposal to provide a modified IGETC admissions plan aimed at students intending to transfer into STEM majors. The proposal tries to improve the success of such transfers by decreasing the original IGETC requirement so that the students can take lower division math and science course sequences at the community colleges.

Chair Wudka reported that committee reviewers were generally supportive of the change, though several points and issues were raised.

- The clause excluding remedial English composition courses should be restored: there is no justification for this deletion and it can severely impact the possibilities of success for students who transfer under this program
- CNAS supports the changes contingent on the understanding that the college can opt out in order to insure higher admission standards (current interpretation of SR414)
- UA requests a clarification on the campus flexibility in setting the time required for program completion after transferring to a UC campus. The proposed policy allows one full year, while the UCR colleges that accept the policy allow 1 quarter
- There appears to be a typographical error in section D.2.b, which should presumably read “A transfer student intending to major in a science, engineering, or mathematics program that recognizes IGETC as satisfying the B/GE requirements …” since it’s the program, not the student, that recognizes IGETC.
- CHASS expressed concern about the possible impact this policy will have in increasing enrollment numbers when current resources are already strained. In addition, CEP noted that the effectiveness of the program will depend heavily on appropriate advising at the community college level, recognizing this lies outside the UC direct sphere of influence
REVIEW OF APM 600
Several committees considered proposed revisions to multiple sections of the APM 600 series which are intended to create consistency and facilitate application to UC Path. The systemwide review follows a limited Management Review in which UCAP and UCFW reviewed an earlier draft and suggested revisions.

The new APM section includes some codification of additional remuneration for teaching online courses.

UPDATE FROM SENATE COMMITTEE CHAIRS
Committee on Research – Len Nunney, Chair
Chair Nunney apologized for and explained the programming complications with Omnibus applications. All bugs have been corrected and the deadline was extended for an additional 2 week period.

Academic Assembly – Richard Luben, Sr Assembly Rep
Representative Luben announced that there was a meeting of the Academic Assembly, and while the agenda was mostly routine business, there was an announcement of a likely additional increase to the retirement contributions. The planned progression was that the final 1.5% increase would occur on July 1, 2013, however it now seems that there will be an addition 1.5 increase on July 1, 2014. There is also discussion of including the cost of benefits when determining total compensation of faculty (rather than just looking at salary).

Committee on Committees – Mariam Lam, Chair
Chair Lam asked that committees who select its own system-wide rep, consider the issue of diversity and representation when making those appointments.

DISCUSSION OF ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT
Guests: James Sandoval, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs
        William Kidder, Assistant EVC
        Bob Daly, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Strategic Academic Research & Analysis

The meeting was adjourned at 3:06 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Cindy Palmer
Executive Director,
Office of the Academic Senate
April 18, 2013

To: Jose Wudka, Chair
   Riverside Division of the Academic Senate

From: Thomas Morton, Chair
       Committee on Academic Freedom

Re: Privacy and Information Security Initiative Steering Committee Report

At its meeting on April 9, 2013, UCR’s Committee on Academic Freedom (CAF) considered the January, 2013, Privacy and Information Security Initiative Steering Committee Report to the President [of UC]. The sense of CAF is to concur with the January Report, specifically to create a standing administrative/faculty/student committee at UCR that will address issues related to privacy. The makeup of the UCR committee need not be as large as the UCLA committee described in the report. CAF suggests that it consist of 6 UCR faculty members chosen by the Committee on Committees, plus the Chair of the Academic Senate, an ASUCR member, a graduate student member, and 6 representatives of the administration: designees of the University Librarian, the Office of Campus Counsel, the University Registrar, the Office of Human Resources, the Institutional Review Board, and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Computing and Communications.
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Privacy, Information Security, and the University of California

Privacy is fundamental to the University. It plays an important role in upholding human dignity and in sustaining a strong and vibrant society. Respecting privacy is an essential part of what it means to be a good citizen, whether as an individual or as an institution. Ensuring such privacy is one of the many values and obligations of the University of California.

Academic and intellectual freedoms are values of the academy that help further the mission of the University. These freedoms are most vibrant where individuals have autonomy: where their inquiry is free because it is given adequate space for experimentation and their ability to speak and participate in discourse within the academy is possible without intimidation. Privacy is a condition that makes living out these values possible.

Privacy is also a basis for an ethical and respectful workplace.

Privacy, together with information security, underpins the University’s ability to be a good steward of the information entrusted to it by its 235,000 students and 185,000 employees, and by its extended community of patients, alumni, donors, volunteers and many others; and obligations in both areas continue to proliferate even as the transparency required of public institutions remains an important cornerstone of the University.

How privacy is balanced against the many rights, values, and desires of our society is among the most challenging issues of our time.

The Charge

In June of 2010, UC President Mark Yudof convened the University of California Privacy and Information Security Steering Committee to perform a comprehensive review of the University’s current privacy and information security policy framework and to make recommendations about how the University should address near-term policy issues and longer-term governance issues. The specific charge to the Committee was to make recommendations for:

1. An overarching privacy framework that enables UC to meet statutory and regulatory obligations in a manner respectful of individual privacy;
2. Governance, implementation, and accountability structures across the University with respect to privacy and information security;
3. A formal, ongoing process through which the University can examine and, where necessary, address through policy vehicles the technical and societal changes that have an impact on University policy and practice in the areas of privacy and information security; and
4. Specific actions or phases needed to implement the proposed framework as University policy.

Approach and Deliverables

In examining the issues of privacy and information security in today’s world and in the context of the constellation of values and obligations of the University of California, the Steering Committee reviewed relevant core concepts and principles and consulted with constituents and experts. In addition to President Yudof’s charge, the committee developed a series of principles that guided its work.
One of the Committee’s early challenges was to distinguish the intertwined concepts of autonomy privacy, information privacy, and information security from one another, name them and define them:

- **Autonomy privacy** is an individual’s ability to conduct activities without concern of or actual observation.
- **Information privacy** is the appropriate protection, use, and dissemination of information about individuals.
- **Information security** is the protection of information resources from unauthorized access, which could compromise their confidentiality, integrity, and availability.

The University’s long experience with privacy, when viewed through the lens of these new definitions, reveals gaps, silos, and challenges in its approach to addressing privacy. An integrated view is required across autonomy privacy, information privacy, and information security; across the University’s operating model of distributing stewardship and accountability; and across individual expectations that typically evolve from a different viewpoint than do University policies and at a different pace than do technology and social norms. The recommendations in this report speak to strategic action; but a key component for addressing operational integration was put in place in March 2012 with the hiring of a new Systemwide position, the UC Chief Information Security and Privacy Officer (see Appendix B).

A primary goal of this report is to propose an integrated approach to privacy and information security. However, information security programs have greater maturity within the University. For example, whereas existing UC policy already requires the designation of an information security officer and implementation of an information security program, there is no equivalent for privacy. The apparent greater focus on privacy in this report is reflective of the relative states of privacy and information security at UC at present.

The Committee entered this initiative with an expected focus on UC’s privacy policies. It emerged with a more holistic, integrated view of privacy. The recommendations presented here, therefore, not only are responsive to the President’s charge; but also drive toward a unified privacy model, led by the University’s mission and values, against which existing guidance for decision-making, policy, and practice in the area of privacy at the University of California can and should be aligned over time.

**Recommendations**

Ultimately, the Steering Committee arrived at four recommendations it believes define an overarching privacy framework that will pave the way for an integrated approach to privacy and information security for the University of California.

**RECOMMENDATION 1: UC Statement of Privacy Values, UC Privacy Principles, and Privacy Balancing Process.** The University shall formally adopt the proposed UC Statement of Privacy Values, Privacy Principles, and Privacy Balancing Process.

The UC Privacy Values, Principles, and Balancing Process are foundational elements integral to any privacy program. By explicitly articulating these elements outside the boundaries of any specific policy, functional area, or regulation, the intent is to create a unifying set of privacy expectations across the entire University community and provide a basis for achieving a common approach to privacy-related decisions – yet allow the flexibility that recognizes the University as a vast, complex organization with significantly varying needs and obligations that will change over time. This approach parallels the model of the UC Statement of Ethical Values and Standards of Ethical Conduct.
1. The **UC Statement of Privacy Values** declares privacy – of both autonomy and information – as an important value of the University, as this is not explicitly done elsewhere; and clarifies that privacy is one of many values and obligations of the University.

2. The **UC Privacy Principles** define a set of privacy principles for the University that are derived from, and give concrete guidance about, the Statement of Privacy Values.

3. The **Privacy Balancing Process** provides a mechanism for adjudicating between competing values, obligations, and interests, whether as a tool in making policy or to guide decision-making in specific situations, and even in a changing context.

**RECOMMENDATION 2: Campus Privacy and Information Security Boards.** Each Chancellor shall form a joint Academic Senate–Administration board to advise him or her, or a designee, on privacy and information security; set strategic direction for autonomy privacy, information privacy, and information security; champion the UC Privacy Values, Principles, and Balancing Process; and monitor compliance and assess risk and effectiveness of campus privacy and information security programs.

**RECOMMENDATION 3: Systemwide Board for Privacy and Information Security.** The President shall form a joint Academic Senate–Administration board systemwide to advise him or her, or a designee, on privacy and information security; set strategic direction for autonomy privacy, information privacy, and information security; steward the UC Privacy Values, Principles, and Balancing Process; and monitor their effective implementation by campus privacy and information security boards.

Privacy and information security governance responsibilities need to exist at both the campus and systemwide levels and can be split into those dealing with the setting of strategic direction for privacy and information security and those related to risk, compliance, and effectiveness of the privacy and information security programs. Meaningful execution of these responsibilities requires senior-level decision-making authority and appropriate administrative and academic representation for a unified approach to autonomy privacy, information privacy, and information security.

**RECOMMENDATION 4: Campus Privacy Official.** Each Chancellor should be charged with designating a privacy official to be responsible for the collaborative development, implementation, and administration of a unified privacy program for the campus. The privacy official shall work closely with the campus's privacy and information security board.

A successful campus privacy program requires knowledgeable privacy leadership and an engaged campus community: the scope of privacy encompassed by the overarching privacy framework defined in this report is much larger than what is generally in place on campuses today. Designated privacy officials should be at a level able to effect organizational change within the University context of shared governance, mission, and values; and complex information technology infrastructure and operations. The privacy official will work with and be guided by the campus's privacy and information security board on the vision, strategies, and methodologies of the campus privacy program; and collaborate with the UC Chief Information Security and Privacy Officer for systemwide alignment.

Infusing understanding and use of the UC privacy values and principles across the community in routine academic and administrative operations is fundamental to meeting the challenge of shifting expectations, new laws, and emerging technologies. A key responsibility of the campus privacy official will be to address this need.
Proposed Implementation Schedule

Full adoption and implementation of the UC Statement of Privacy Values, UC Privacy Principles, Privacy Balancing Process, campus and systemwide boards, and designation of campus privacy officials will require four to five years to achieve a steady state. Recommendations for prioritizing the order and timing of key activities are summarized below.

Stakeholder Communications

2013-14
- Adopt the UC Privacy Values, Principles, and Balancing Process
- Begin formation of boards
- Designate campus privacy officials

Privacy Framework & Program Implementation

2014-15
- Begin promotion and use of the UC Privacy Values, Principles, and Balancing Process
- Build out campus privacy programs
- Collect metrics

Governance & Management

2015 and beyond
- Define strategic programs
- Establish privacy reviews
- Review and share balancing cases
**Background**

Privacy is fundamental to the University. It plays an important role in upholding human dignity and in sustaining a strong and vibrant society. Respecting privacy is an essential part of what it means to be a good citizen, whether as an individual or as an institution.

Academic and intellectual freedoms are values of the academy that help further the mission of the University. These freedoms are most vibrant where individuals have autonomy: where their inquiry is free because it is given adequate space for experimentation and where their ability to speak and to participate in discourse within the academy is possible without intimidation. Privacy is a condition that makes living out these values possible.

Privacy is also a basis for an ethical and respectful workplace, one that is as aligned with the culture and expectations of the millennial generation and beyond, as it is with today's workforce. Such a workplace becomes a competitive advantage for the University.

Privacy, together with information security, underpins the University's ability to be a good steward of the information entrusted to it by its 235,000 students and 185,000 employees, and by its extended community of patients, alumni, donors, volunteers, and many others.

Protecting privacy, however, is challenging—for many reasons. It is a complex and subtle concept that makes definition elusive. The “consumerization” of technology drives expectations of “anytime, anywhere” access to bank accounts, medical test results, personal data files, course materials, and professors; and speaks to work/life balance. The ubiquity of cellphone cameras exemplifies and underscores a shift in the ability of individuals to affect one another’s privacy. Social media paradigms create vast virtual communities that intersect with “real” life in unexpected ways, many of them privacy related. Information such as browsing histories, IP addresses, and location information are routinely captured and may be correlated, contributing to a more comprehensive and invasive view of an individual's activity. The management and curation of “big data” introduces a new class of “information” requiring privacy considerations. Investigators—and their funding agencies and publishers—may consider data collected in the course of their research to be confidential, at least for a limited period of time, whether or not they are about individuals.

Information security, which protects both information and infrastructure, has become a formidable task, as a wide variety of devices—including those that are personally owned—access University systems and services. Privacy and information security legislation is proliferating and is anticipated to continue to add to the University's obligations, as are regulations about the collection, management, curation, and release of research data. The transparency required of public institutions can be in tension with the privacy of records about individuals and about research. How privacy is balanced against the many rights, values, and desires of our society is among the most challenging issues of our time.

In light of this situation and its rapidly changing context, in June of 2010, UC President Mark Yudof convened the University of California Privacy and Information Security Steering Committee to perform a comprehensive review of the University's current privacy and information security policy framework and to make recommendations about how the University should address near-term policy issues and longer-term governance issues. This goal was an overarching privacy framework that appropriately balances University values of individual privacy and academic freedom with other institutional obligations, including data protection.

The University of California has a rich foundation of principles and standards related to diversity, community, and ethics that guide the actions of a variety of constituents, including faculty, staff, students, partners, and collaborators. In addressing its charge, the Steering Committee leveraged
elements of the University’s culture, including its principles of community and investment in developing students who are informed and engaged citizens. Employing this foundation and providing leadership in privacy and information security, therefore, addresses President Yudof’s charge of protecting the values of both the University and its constituents.

**Approach and Deliverables of the Steering Committee**

In examining the issues of privacy and information security in the context of the University of California, the Steering Committee reviewed relevant core concepts and principles and consulted with constituents and experts. A Working Group was formed to support the Steering Committee’s efforts by framing key issues and options for Committee discussion and turning those deliberations into concrete form.

The Steering Committee was guided by the following principles in considering its charge:

- We must maximally enable the mission of the University by supporting the values of academic and intellectual freedom.
- We must be good stewards of the information entrusted to the University.
- We must ensure that the University has access to information resources for legitimate business purposes.
- We must have a University community with clear expectations of privacy—both privileges and obligations of individuals and of the institution.
- We must make decisions within an institutional context.
- We must acknowledge the distributed nature of information stewardship at UC, where responsibility for privacy and information security resides at every level.

The Steering Committee’s deliverables comprise a set of recommendations responding to the four specific components of its charge:\footnote{The full charge can be found in Appendix A on page 27.}

1. An overarching privacy framework that enables UC to meet statutory and regulatory obligations in a manner respectful of individual privacy;\footnote{All recommendations and definitions (page 9)}

2. Governance, implementation, and accountability structures across the University with respect to privacy and information security;\footnote{Recommendations 2, 3, and 4}

3. A formal, ongoing process through which the University can examine and, where necessary, address through policy vehicles the technical and societal changes that have an impact on University policy and practice in the areas of privacy and information security; and\footnote{All recommendations}

4. Specific actions or phases needed to implement the proposed framework as University policy.\footnote{Section III, Proposed Implementation Schedule}

The recommendations distill an expansive and nuanced examination of privacy frameworks employed in this country and internationally, of privacy models in use at other institutions as well as those articulated by leading privacy scholars, of the UC environment with respect to privacy, and of the
Defining Privacy and Information Security

In developing its recommendations, the Committee identified a critical need to develop a common vocabulary to avoid confusion arising from differing interpretations of everyday words such as “privacy” or “governance”. Most crucial was the need to distinguish the intertwined concepts of autonomy privacy, information privacy, and information security from one another, and where necessary, make a decision about what definition to use. The Glossary on page 43 provides definitions of various terms as used in this report, but a more comprehensive definition of the three key terms follows.

Privacy is about the individual. In the context of this report, it is also about the agreement (“terms and conditions”) between the University and the individual that defines how privacy of that individual is handled.

Privacy comprises:

1. **Autonomy privacy**: an individual’s ability to conduct activities without concern of or actual observation; and
2. **Information privacy**: the appropriate protection, use, and dissemination of information about individuals.

Autonomy privacy is an underpinning of academic freedom and is related to concepts such as the First Amendment’s freedom of association, anonymity, and the monitoring of behavior; for example, by identifying with whom an individual corresponds or by building a profile of an individual through data mining. Autonomy privacy also encompasses records created by the individual such as research data, working drafts of research findings, communications of ideas, and opinions. It goes beyond the scope of (electronic) information and into the physical world when we speak of direct observation of individuals.
*Information privacy* is about an individual’s interest in controlling or significantly influencing the handling of information about him or herself,\(^2\) whether it is an academic, medical, financial, or other record.

*Information security* supports the protection of information resources from unauthorized access, which could compromise their confidentiality, integrity, and availability. Information resources include both infrastructure (such as computers and networks) and information (whether or not it is related to individuals). Information security supports, and is essential to, autonomy and information privacy.

These concepts are not as clear and independent as their definitions may suggest. The diagram below generally depicts the domains covered by autonomy privacy, information privacy, and information security, and the overlaps among them.

\(^2\) Definition based from Clark, R. (see Source 1 on page 42).
Observations

The University’s long experience with privacy, when viewed through the lens of the new definitions presented in this report, reveals gaps, silos, and challenges in its approach to addressing privacy. This background has informed both the recommendations in this report and recognizes some of the related operational efforts under way.

A survey of privacy models identified those that spoke only to information privacy or, even more narrowly, to compliance with statutory or regulatory requirements—the traditional realm of the privacy officer—and not to autonomy privacy. Both forms of privacy are addressed in individual UC policies but have not been integrated into a policy framework; this report is intended to provide that framework. A key component for addressing operational integration is the UC Chief Information Security and Privacy Officer position hired in March 2012 (see Appendix B on page 30).

Another challenge is to promote convergence of the expectations of individuals with those of the University, which operates amid myriad legal and regulatory requirements, management demands, and operational issues. An individual, for example, may be willing to accept loss of personal information on a smartphone, whereas that phone may also contain information that the University is obligated to protect. These expectations are not easily reconciled under the University’s existing policies. Individuals’ expectations are based on different assumptions and constraints than are University policies. Technology, social norms, and policy evolve at differential rates.

The many UC policies related to privacy and information security were crafted at different times, and roles and responsibilities fall under different policy and organizational jurisdictions. Policy and organizational intersections create tensions rather than the integration necessary to address the full spectrum of present-day and future privacy concerns. This situation is compounded by the growth in privacy obligations, prevailing standards for due diligence that now expect proactive practices to prevent privacy breaches rather than reactive efforts if and when they occur, and in the number and variety of University partners to which the institutional commitment to privacy should extend. Consequently, a project to review the University’s information security policies for consistency and alignment is being defined and will track the framework proposed in this report.

Although the campuses, medical centers, and national labs of UC are unified in their missions of teaching, research, and public service, they operate in a culture of relative autonomy. UC’s operating model distributes stewardship and accountability across the organization, as evidenced by the number of privacy-related policies (see Appendix C on page 31) and the many campus offices that have stewardship of specific data (e.g., registrars, controllers, human resources, libraries, archives, and medical centers). The distributed nature of UC challenges the ability to look holistically at privacy and information security, and the recommendations in this report acknowledge this context in an effort to move the institution forward.
II RECOMMENDATIONS
As its initial and overarching recommendation, the Steering Committee proposes the adoption of a UC Statement of Privacy Values, UC Privacy Principles, and Privacy Balancing Process, foundational elements integral to any privacy program. These elements may be expressed or implied in existing policy but have not been articulated in a consistent form that applies uniformly Universitywide.

1. The **UC Statement of Privacy Values** declares privacy—of both autonomy and information—as an important value of the University, as this is not explicitly done elsewhere; and clarifies that privacy is one of many values and obligations of the University. Such a statement is a peer to the UC Statement of Ethical Values, Principles of Community, and Diversity Statement.

2. The **UC Privacy Principles** define a set of principles for the University that are derived from, and give concrete guidance about, the Statement of Privacy Values. These principles are a peer to the UC Standards of Ethical Conduct.

3. The **Privacy Balancing Process** provides a mechanism for adjudicating between competing values, obligations and interests, whether as a tool in policy-making or to guide decision-making in specific situations, and even in a changing context.

By explicitly articulating these foundational elements outside the boundaries of any specific policy, functional area, or regulation, the intent is to create a unifying set of privacy expectations across the entire University community and provide a basis for achieving a common approach to privacy-related decisions – yet allow the flexibility that recognizes the University as a vast, complex organization with significantly varying needs and obligations that will change over time.

---

3 [http://www.ucop.edu/ucophome/coordrev/policy/Stmt_Stmt_Ethics.pdf](http://www.ucop.edu/ucophome/coordrev/policy/Stmt_Stmt_Ethics.pdf)

4 [http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/diversity/principles_community.html](http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/diversity/principles_community.html)

5 [http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/diversity/diversity.html](http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/diversity/diversity.html)

6 [http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/compaudit/ethicalconduct.html](http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/compaudit/ethicalconduct.html)
1. UC Statement of Privacy Values

Overview

The UC Statement of Privacy Values first declares privacy as an important value of the University of California. It then defines what the two forms of privacy are, and explains that they must be balanced with one another and with other values and obligations of the University. To give context, the values of academic and intellectual freedom are highlighted as fundamental to an educational and research institution; and the values of transparency and accountability are highlighted as fundamental to a public institution. Finally, a summary of elements that the University strives to balance appropriately is given.

The UC Statement of Privacy Values

The University of California respects the privacy of individuals. Privacy plays an important role in human dignity and is necessary for an ethical and respectful workplace. The right to privacy is declared in the California Constitution.

Privacy consists of (1) an individual's ability to conduct activities without concern of or actual observation and (2) the appropriate protection, use, and release of information about individuals.

The University must balance its respect for both types of privacy with its other values and with legal, policy, and administrative obligations.

Academic and intellectual freedoms are values of the academy that help further the mission of the University. These freedoms are most vibrant where individuals have autonomy: where inquiry is free because it is given adequate space for experimentation and the ability to speak and participate in discourse within the academy is possible without intimidation.

Transparency and accountability are values that form the cornerstone of public trust. Access to information concerning the conduct of business in a public university and an individual's access to information concerning him/herself is a right of every citizen as stated in the California Constitution.

Thus, the University continually strives for an appropriate balance between:

- ensuring an appropriate level of privacy through its policies and practices, even as interpretations of privacy change over time;
- nurturing an environment of openness and creativity for teaching and research;
- being an attractive place to work;
- honoring its obligation as a public institution to remain transparent, accountable, and operationally effective and efficient; and
- safeguarding information about individuals and assets for which it is a steward.
2. UC Privacy Principles

The proposed UC Privacy Principles are derived from the UC Statement of Privacy Values and from established privacy principles, such as the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Guidelines on the Protection of Privacy and Transborder Flows of Personal Data\(^7\) and the Federal Trade Commission's (FTC) Fair Information Privacy Practice Principles.\(^8\) The UC Privacy Principles are intended to guide policies and practice in conjunction with well-understood information security objectives of protecting the confidentiality, integrity, and availability of information resources. The UC Privacy Principles consist of principles that address both autonomy privacy and information privacy, as follows:

**Autonomy Privacy Principles**

Members of the University community are expected to uphold autonomy privacy, which is the ability of an individual to exercise a substantial degree of control over one’s expressions, associations, and general conduct without unreasonable oversight, interference, or negative consequences. In the University setting, autonomy privacy is closely associated with the concepts of academic freedom, free speech, and community. The following proposed autonomy principles are intended to capture our culture of openness, transparency, ethical behavior, and respect for others:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Free inquiry</td>
<td>The University is guided by First Amendment principles and is committed to encouraging its members to exercise free discourse without fear of reprisal or intimidation, subject to the privacy and safety of other individuals or University resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for individual privacy</td>
<td>The University is committed to respecting the privacy of individuals, including their interactions with others, and expects University members to esteem each other’s privacy and well-being.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveillance</td>
<td>The University is guided by Fourth Amendment principles regarding surveillance of persons or places, whether in person on campus or electronically, and is committed to balancing the need for the safety of individuals and property with the individuals’ reasonable expectation of privacy in a particular location.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^7\) [http://www.oecd.org/document/18/0,3343,en_2649_34255_1815186_1_1_1_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/document/18/0,3343,en_2649_34255_1815186_1_1_1_1,00.html)

### Information Privacy Principles

The University is committed to providing individuals with a reasonable degree of control over the collection, use, and disclosure of information about themselves. The following principles provide guidance to the University for incorporating information privacy into its policies and practices:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Privacy by design</td>
<td>The University is committed to building privacy protections that embody the additional principles stated below into its business processes and information systems associated with the collection, use, and disclosure of information about individuals and about confidential information for which individuals are responsible. Business processes and information systems initiatives, revisions, or upgrades will be evaluated for consistency with the UC Privacy Principles and compliance with associated policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency and notice</td>
<td>The University demonstrates its commitment to transparency by giving individuals reasonable advance notice of its information policies and practices for collecting, using, disclosing, retaining, and disposing of information about individuals. The University expects its members to collect, use, disclose, and retain only the minimum amount of information about individuals as necessary for the specified purpose and to appropriately dispose of such information in accordance with the University's records-retention schedules. The University expects its members who collect information about individuals to publish privacy notices that clearly inform individuals about the purposes (how information will be used or disclosed as permitted or required by law) and the scope of information collected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>Prior to collecting, using, disclosing, or retaining information about individuals, the University expects its members to provide individuals, whenever possible, with the ability to choose whether to and by what means to provide their information. However, when the information about the individual is necessary to deliver a service or benefit or to participate in an activity, the individual may be required to provide the information in order to receive the service or benefit or to participate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information review and correction</td>
<td>Unless prohibited by law, the University is committed to providing individuals with a way to review the information about themselves that they have provided or permitted to be collected, as well as a procedure to request the correction of inaccuracies and one to perform the correction if appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information protection</td>
<td>The University demonstrates its commitment to protecting information about individuals under its stewardship by providing appropriate employee training and by implementing privacy and information security controls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>The University expects every individual to be aware of and accountable for complying with these principles and actively supporting the University’s commitment to respect the privacy of individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The University demonstrates its commitment to these principles by investigating reported violations of information privacy principles and policies and, as appropriate, taking corrective measures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Privacy Balancing Process

The Privacy Balancing Process is intended as a tool to guide policy-making and decision-making when competing privacy interests, University values, or obligations exist and for which no statutory provision, common law, or University policy is directly applicable. The balancing process is derived from the UC Privacy Statement, applies the UC Privacy Principles, and rests on the acknowledgement that protecting autonomy privacy depends both on protecting information privacy and on ensuring information security.

The balancing process is intended to achieve consistency in privacy-related decisions. The process will be employed by governance bodies (described subsequently) in such a way that a cumulative body of institutional knowledge will inform policy development and routine practices of campus privacy officials and other UC managers. The process is applicable both to information that the University maintains about individuals (information privacy); as well as to their speech and behavior that is conducted on University premises, that uses University resources, or that is made in their role as a University representative (autonomy privacy).

A balancing decision depends on the specifics of each case, weighing multiple interests and impacts. The relative weights of many factors are analyzed to determine whether the proposed course of action is sufficiently compelling to justify the impacts. For example, proposals to monitor or to collect information about the activities of individuals must articulate a significant University or individual need for such activity. Such a “significant interest” stance gives reasonable deference to the privacy of individuals without unduly constraining institutional operational needs.

The balancing process analysis may result in a conclusion that one party's interest or position carries the most weight. For example, a University's policy to require individuals to identify themselves before entering certain campus buildings is approved because the University's obligation to protect the physical safety of individuals on campus outweighs an individual's privacy interest in anonymity. The balancing process could also result in striking a balance between the different interests, finding an acceptable middle ground that gives deference to each interest. The balancing process allows the University to remain flexible in light of changes in laws, societal norms, technological change, individual expectations, and University needs.

Privacy Balancing Analysis Factors

The balancing process must expressly consider the parties’ interests, benefits, burdens, and consequences associated with the proposed action. Each analysis will differ depending on the action and the interests involved. A “party” in such an analysis may be, or represent, an individual, a community, or the University; with the recognition that parties may overlap or that a party may have multiple roles.

Some potential factors that are helpful to privacy analysis are given below. This list is not intended to be prescriptive; it is intended to illustrate how a balancing analysis would be conducted.

- What are the benefits to each party in successfully asserting privacy interests or a specific policy stance? What are the burdens, impacts, and risk to each party if the proposed action is not taken?
- What alternative approaches, or reasonable privacy protections, might be used in conjunction with the proposed action to make it less intrusive?
- What are the costs, whether in dollars, time, effectiveness, or other metrics?
• What actions have been taken (or could be taken) by each party to protect their own interests?
• What new technologies or processes might mitigate the privacy concerns, now or in the foreseeable future?

Building Consistency into the Process

The balancing process is inherently subjective. The analysis is based on the facts of each situation, the factors selected to weigh the parties’ interests, and the outcome of similar cases. It is more flexible than rules-based decision-making and expressly allows the full circumstances of the parties to be considered. The cost of such flexibility, however, is that similar cases may not be treated in the same way or result in the same outcome. To address this aspect of the balancing process, the University should adopt a case review process whereby the analysis and rationale supporting the University’s balancing decisions are reviewed periodically. In addition, a mechanism should be developed for particularly well-reasoned decisions to be shared among campuses and recommended as guidelines for similar situations, without disclosing information of the individuals involved in the matter.
Campus Privacy and Information Security Boards

RECOMMENDATION 2: Campus Privacy and Information Security Boards. Each Chancellor shall form a joint Academic Senate–Administration board to advise him or her, or a designee, on privacy and information security; set strategic direction for autonomy privacy, information privacy, and information security; champion the UC Privacy Values, Principles, and Balancing Process; and monitor compliance and assess risk and effectiveness of campus privacy and information security programs.

High-level campus privacy and information security boards with Academic Senate, administrative, and student representation should be formed on every campus to bring domain expertise and critical viewpoints to local governance, sending a clear message that UC is serious about protecting the privacy of its students, academic and staff employees, patients, and the public.

Campus Board Responsibilities

Setting strategic direction
- Setting strategic direction in the areas of privacy and information security for the campus; considering issues in these areas and their impact on the campus and the communities it serves
- Staying current on new developments in privacy and information security, including related technology developments
- Recommending issues for systemwide consideration as appropriate

Risk, compliance, and effectiveness
- Application of the privacy balancing process to resolve competing interests
- Assembling, reviewing, and approving the sharing of balancing analyses among campuses
- Ensuring that the campus privacy program delivers fair and consistent decisions
- Ensuring that the campus privacy and information security programs have sufficient visibility and executive support
- Monitoring campus compliance with UC Privacy Values and Principles
- Assessing the effectiveness of the campus privacy and information security programs
- Reporting annually for transparency

Campus Board Structure

Campus boards should reflect a wide range of expertise.
- Academic representatives should be appointed for terms of sufficient length to provide for continuity and to build cohesiveness and institutional memory. A formal link to the Academic Senate is required and a robust feedback loop with the Senate is part of the role.
- Administrative representatives must include the designated privacy official and information security officer and a link with the Campus Ethics, Compliance, and Risk Committee.

9 The UCLA Board on Privacy and Data Protection (see page 35 in Appendix D) is an example of how such a body may be structured and function. Several other campuses have or are in the process of forming similar committees, though often structured as subcommittees of the local Campus Ethics, Compliance and Risk Committee.

10 See “Building Consistency into the Process” on page 19.
A privacy and information security approach with transparent strategic objectives will help to foster a culture that respects privacy at the University and aligns with the University's mission, vision, and values. A systemwide board would provide a consistent approach to managing issues and conflicts, cohesive policies and practices, and a decision-making framework that is logical, repeatable, and structured. It would also lead to decisions that define and clarify expectations that align with the University's mission and its privacy values and principles.

**Systemwide Board Responsibilities**

**Setting strategic direction**
- Setting strategic direction in the areas of privacy and information security, considering issues in these areas and their impact on the University and the communities it serves
- Approving changes to the UC Privacy Values, Principles, and Balancing Process as necessary to keep them aligned with legislation, best practices, new technology, emerging risks, and other critical privacy drivers within the context of the strategic directions

**Risk, compliance, and effectiveness**
- Ensuring the timely and responsive implementation of the UC Privacy Values, Principles, and Balancing Process across the University
- Monitoring the ongoing effectiveness of implementation by campus privacy and information security boards
- Reporting annually for transparency

**Systemwide Board Structure**

The Systemwide board should reflect a broad range of expertise and include broad campus representation.

- **Academic:** Senior Academic Senate leadership.
- **Administrative:** Provost and Senior Vice President, Academic Affairs; Senior Vice President and Chief Compliance and Audit Officer; Chief Information Officer and Associate Vice President, Information Technology Services; Systemwide Chief Information Security and Privacy Officer.
- **Representation from the campuses.**
RECOMMENDATION 4: Campus Privacy Official. Each Chancellor shall designate a privacy official to be responsible for the collaborative development, implementation, and administration of a unified privacy program for the campus. The privacy official shall work closely with the campus’s privacy and information security board.

The scope of privacy encompassed by the overarching privacy framework defined in this report is much larger than what is generally in place on campuses today. A successful campus privacy program requires knowledgeable privacy leadership and an engaged campus community. Each Chancellor should designate a privacy official with responsibility for the development and administration of a unified campus privacy program. The privacy official should be at a level able to effect organizational change within the University context of shared governance, mission, and values; and complex information technology infrastructure and operations.

The privacy official shall work closely with the campus’s privacy and information security board on the vision, strategies, and methodologies of the campus privacy program; and collaborate with the campus’s information security officer and other functional experts, and the UC Chief Information Security and Privacy Officer for systemwide alignment.

A campus privacy program encompasses viewpoints and expectations from the campus community and the legal and technological landscapes and addresses both autonomy and information privacy in:

- Identifying and managing privacy risks;
- Developing privacy policies and practices;
- Maintaining integrity over campus practices and decisions that impact privacy;
- Fostering privacy by design;
- Properly handling privacy breaches;
- Resolving conflicting privacy interests and ensuring the application of the balancing principles where appropriate; and
- Actively exploring technologies and methods that can help to protect privacy.

Infusing understanding and use of the UC privacy values and principles across the community in routine academic and administrative operations is fundamental to meeting the challenge of shifting expectations, new laws, and emerging technologies. A key responsibility of the campus privacy official will be addressing this need, whether in clarifying the boundaries of personal privacy, which is at the heart of the complex and vexing issue of the commingling of University information with personal information, or in promulgating the expectation that University privacy and information security principles extend to relationships with partners and collaborators.

Business and Finance Bulletin IS-3 defines a policy basis for a UC information security program that includes identification of an individual to perform the function of Information Security Officer (ISO) “designated on each campus to be responsible for its Program. Responsibility for compliance with this bulletin will rest with a number of individuals, and the ISO must facilitate this compliance through collaborative relationships with academic and administrative officials, consistent with campus governance structure and policy compliance strategies.” Organizational strategies to implement the ISO function will vary by campus. This is also true for privacy officials. For example, a medical center will likely have its own privacy official, with coordination between like roles.
III PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE
Overview

Full adoption and implementation of the UC Statement of Privacy Values, UC Privacy Principles, Privacy Balancing Process, campus and systemwide boards, and designation of campus privacy officials will require four to five years to achieve a steady state. Recommendations for prioritizing the order and timing of key activities are summarized below.

Year 1: Stakeholder Communications

The first year of implementation focuses on stakeholder communications to announce and promote the University’s commitment to privacy; describe the UC Statement of Privacy Values, Privacy Principles, and Balancing Process; form the campus and systemwide boards; and designate campus privacy officials. Because the overarching privacy framework defined by the four recommendations proposed in this report is unique in the industry, it is expected to generate a high level of interest from other universities and from the privacy press.

During the first year, campuses will benefit from support to help them define and organize their privacy programs and maintain the anticipated level of consistency and quality. Coordination from the UC system should occur, along with privacy official training and education and consistent systemwide messaging.

Years 2-3: Privacy Program Implementation

The next two years cover the majority of initial implementation activities. The communications program should shift from announcement and explanation to expectations and how internal processes are changing. Policy alignment should be significantly underway. Privacy officials and campus and
systemwide boards should have completed their training and have some experience using the balancing process. Governance boards should be planning for initial program reviews and defining the metrics that guide and determine success. At the end of this initial implementation, policy and process will be visible at the campus; privacy officials will be in place; and boards will be setting directions and working with campus operations to integrate privacy into operational practices.

**Years 4-5: Sustainable Privacy and Information Security Governance and Management**

By year four, the privacy officials will be working closely with campus operations to implement privacy policy and best practices. Operational units with significant privacy risks will have established their own privacy liaison roles. These individuals will be working closely with the privacy officials and program staff. The boards will be actively engaged. Campus discourse about privacy and how to engage in balancing analysis will be active and influential in major campus decisions. Privacy practices will be shared across campuses, and UC best-practice recommendations will be emerging. By year five, privacy will be ingrained as part of the UC way of life.
Appendix A. Steering Committee Charge

1111 Franklin Street
Oakland, California 94607-5200
Phone: (510) 987-9074
Fax: (510) 987-9086
http://www.ucop.edu

June 30, 2010

Dear

I am convening the University of California Privacy and Information Security Steering Committee to perform a comprehensive review of the University’s current privacy and information security policy framework and to make recommendations about how the University should address related near-term policy issues and longer-term governance issues.

I am writing to invite you to become a member of the Steering Committee, which will be chaired by UC Santa Barbara Executive Vice Chancellor Gene Lucas, with support from Senior Vice President Sheryl Vacca and Associate Vice President David Ernst. Senior Vice President Vacca and Associate Vice President Ernst will appoint a working group to support the Steering Committee with issue analysis and document preparation. Their office staffs will handle logistics for both groups. I enclose a copy of the proposed membership list for your information.

A pressing reason for this review is the University’s immediate need to ensure the privacy of confidential information in our care. The University is obligated by law and as a steward of the public trust to protect confidential information, such as patient medical records, employee personal information, and research participant data. At times, technical methods for protecting data, such as scanning or filtering e-mail, conflict with University principles expressed in the Electronic Communications Policy (ECP), such as the affirmation that the University does not monitor electronic communications without the holder’s consent. Given this conflict and our obligations, the University must develop and issue clear guidance about data protection and legal compliance in the context of individual privacy and freedom of expression. I enclose a background statement that provides additional discussion of these issues.

The Steering Committee will shape the scope and direction of its work, including revising membership, refining key objectives, and establishing short- and long-term timelines. The Steering Committee will also review core concepts and principles, consult broadly with constituents and experts, and, within eighteen months, provide me with a set of recommendations. Specifically, the charge to the Committee is to make recommendations for:

- an overarching privacy framework that enables UC to meet statutory and regulatory obligations in a manner respectful of individual privacy;
- specific actions or phases needed to implement this framework as University policy;
- governance, implementation, and accountability structures across the University with respect to privacy and information security; and
- a formal ongoing process through which the University can examine and, where necessary, address through policy vehicles, the technical and societal changes that have an impact on University policy and practice in the areas of privacy and information security.

Privacy principles touch the heart of the academic enterprise, and the University must address business needs within that context. Therefore, I have sought individuals for the Steering Committee who will represent both academic and business perspectives. Members will be responsible for broadly
communicating with and receiving input from their peer groups and constituents about the Steering Committee’s goals, process, and recommendations.

I appreciate your willingness to participate in this important endeavor. Executive Vice Chancellor Lucas will be in touch with you over the summer to schedule the first meeting of the Committee this fall.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Mark G. Yudof
President

Enclosures

cc: Chancellors
    Senior Vice President and Chief Compliance and Audit Officer Vacca
    Associate Vice President and Chief Information Officer Ernst
    Executive Vice Chancellor Lucas

Problem Statement

The University of California urgently needs to create an overarching privacy and information security policy framework that appropriately balances University values of individual privacy and academic freedom with other institutional obligations, including data protection.

The University of California Electronic Communications Policy (ECP) is the primary University policy governing principles of individual privacy, or civil liberties. Importantly, the ECP establishes that the University of California does not monitor the content of electronic communications, thereby affirming the institution’s commitment to academic freedom, freedom of expression, and freedom from censorship. Other University policies also address such privacy issues as data protection, records management, information security, compliance with the California Public Records Act, etc. As a result, University guidance on privacy is not integrated into a unifying framework that is clear and accessible to every member of the University community, thus enabling compliance with both University principles and state and federal law. The result of this fragmented approach is insufficient guidance when policies conflict, divergent practices across the system, and a complicated policy environment that does not readily adapt to address emerging issues and evolving institutional needs.

The world has changed in many ways since the ECP was issued nearly ten years ago. A primary change has been that massive amounts of confidential data—including personal health information, Social Security numbers, and financial account information—are now created, transmitted, and stored in electronic form. At the same time, the number and scope of data breaches have grown and are a major concern. Key ECP concepts, such as the provision for incidental personal use of University electronic communications resources, at times conflict with such institutional obligations as the protection of confidential data, or business management and accountability.

This changing context calls for a thoughtful consideration of emerging issues. A critical issue at present is the University’s need to protect confidential data from inappropriate access or use. In many instances this is a legal obligation; in others it simply reflects the University’s responsibility as a good steward of sensitive data. Proposed data protection measures, however, may involve the monitoring of electronic
communications and transactions and hence conflict with the privacy provisions of the ECP. This puts
University organizations in a difficult position. They urgently need clear guidance now so they may meet
legal and stewardship obligations without violating University privacy principles.

Perhaps more importantly, the University needs a policy framework that over time provides for review of
key issues as well as policy revision where necessary to address the evolution and intersection of
technology, law, and culture in the University environment. To this end, President Yudof has established a
systemwide University of California Privacy and Information Security Steering Committee to provide a
formal structure and process for discussion of evolving privacy and information security issues and
development of systemwide policies and guidance.

Definitions of Privacy in the University Context

The term privacy is used in two distinct though related senses. One refers to civil liberties, the other to
data protection and systems security. Both types of privacy are important to the University but there is
inherent tension between them. Information security is necessary to protect privacy, but some information
security measures intrude upon privacy.

- **Civil Liberties Sense**: This sense involves protecting the privacy of individuals and their right to
  be free from “big brother,” surveillance, and monitoring. This type of privacy underpins
  University values of academic freedom and freedom of speech. It reflects human behavior with
  respect to the ethical collection, use, sharing, protection, and retention of personal information.

- **Data Protection and Systems Security Sense**: This sense involves protecting confidential data
  about individuals from unauthorized disclosure as well as protecting systems and network
  infrastructure and services for reliability and integrity. Security encompasses systems, processes,
  and procedures governing the confidentiality, integrity, and availability of information assets.

Purpose of UC Privacy and Information Security Initiative

Through the UC Privacy and Information Security Initiative, the University will review existing privacy
and information security policies; develop a new overarching policy framework to address privacy and
information security in the modern legal, technology, and social context; and provide clear updated
guidance to assist the University community in meeting legal obligations to safeguard “protected” data
while at the same time abiding by deeply held principles of privacy.

This review will be conducted on a broadly consultative, systemwide basis, drawing from expertise within
the University academic community and outside the University system as well. The review is expected to
result in recommendations for policy and, as necessary, changes in governance and accountability for
privacy and information security policy implementation. To the degree possible, these recommendations
will seek to resolve or minimize conflict between University privacy principles and data protection
obligations and, ultimately, position the University to continue to fulfill its most important
responsibility—adherence to principles of academic freedom.
Appendix B. UC Chief Information Security and Privacy Officer

David J. Ernst
CIO and Associate Vice President
University of California Office of the President

November 8, 2011

Subject: Appointment of UC Chief Information Security and Privacy Officer

Dear Colleagues:

I am pleased to announce the appointment of Cheryl Walton Washington to the position of Chief Information Security and Privacy Officer at the University of California Office of the President. Cheryl has over twenty year experience working in higher education and currently is the Chief Information Security Officer for the California State University (CSU) system. She will assume her UC position in March 2012 in order to transition from several major projects she currently is leading for CSU. This fall and early winter, Cheryl will spend some time getting to know UC colleagues and learning about the university’s information security and privacy position and establishing goals so that she will be ready to hit the ground running in March.

The Chief Information Security and Privacy Officer is a new position that, for the first time, will provide a systemwide coordinating function for information security and privacy in support of campus needs in these areas. Cheryl will be responsible for collaborating with campus counterparts to establish and maintain a universitywide information security and privacy program to safeguard and manage information security assets and personal or protected information. She also will serve as the Information Security Officer for UCOP, and will direct information security within the UCOP Information Technology Services department. She reports to me and also has a dotted line reporting relationship to Chief Compliance Officer Sheryl Vacca. On behalf of SVP Vacca, she will coordinate with the Systemwide Health Sciences Privacy Liaison on information security and privacy initiatives that impact health sciences and the medical centers.

Cheryl is very excited about returning to UC in this new and critical role. Early in her career, she held IT positions at UCB and UCOP. At CSU, she has had experience addressing information security from the perspective of a campus, as Information Security Officer for CSU East Bay campus and, currently, from the perspective of the system, as systemwide ISO. In her present role, Cheryl works closely with academic, business, information security, and IT leadership teams to develop and implement CSU’s information security vision and strategy as well as to address privacy issues. She holds certifications as an information privacy professional, information security manager, and information system auditor. I am sure you will enjoy working with her. Please join me in welcoming Cheryl to UC.

Best,

David
Appendix C. Existing Systemwide Policies Related to Privacy and Information Security

### General documents
- Faculty Code of Conduct, Student Conduct Code
- Statement of Ethical Values, Diversity Statement, Principles of Community

### Academic Personnel Manual

| APM-110 | Academic Freedom | Autonomy privacy |
| APM-160 | Maintenance of, Access to, and Opportunity to Request Amendment of Academic Personnel Records | Information privacy |

### Presidential policy

| ECP<sup>12</sup> | Electronic Communications Policy | Autonomy privacy: Academic freedom, subpoenas, search warrants |

### Business and Finance Bulletins: Information Systems

| IS-2 | Inventory, Classification, and Release of University Electronic Information | Information privacy, information security: Release and disclosure requirements, risk assessment |
| IS-3<sup>13</sup> | Electronic Information Security | Information security program elements, CA Information Practices Act/breach notification |
| IS-10 | Systems Development Standards | Information security |
| IS-11 | Identity and Access Management | Information security |

---

<sup>12</sup> The ECP, since its formal adoption in 1998 (and through the UC Email Policy prior to that), has served as the University's de facto privacy policy, articulating governing principles for individual privacy. The ECP establishes that UC does not monitor the content of electronic communications except under limited circumstances, thereby affirming the institution's commitment to academic freedom, freedom of expression and freedom from censorship.

<sup>13</sup> IS-3, adopted in 1998, essentially defines an information security program for the University. It articulates guidelines for achieving appropriate protection of University electronic information resources and the identification of roles and responsibilities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business and Finance Bulletins: Records Management and Privacy Series</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RMP-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMP-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMP-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMP-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMP-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business and Finance Bulletins: Business Affairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUS-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS-80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other domain-specific policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIPAA policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FERPA policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policies implementing other specific laws and regulations, such as ADA, GLBA and Red Flags Policies on human subjects research, personnel, sexual harassment and whistleblower cases

---

14 The Records Management Program, established in 1963 by UC President Clark Kerr, includes the Records Management and Privacy (RMP) policy series that articulate the policy, regulations and general principles for appropriately managing, accessing and preserving administrative records throughout their life cycle and provides schedules for their final disposition.
Appendix D. Existing Campus Privacy and/or Information Security Committees

UC Davis Information Privacy and Security Subcommittee Charter

A. Subcommittee Composition

The Information Privacy and Security Committee members are appointed by the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor and shall include the following members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-chairs</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus Information Technology Security Coordinator</td>
<td>Campus Information Technology Security Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Chief Compliance Officer</td>
<td>Chief Compliance Officer – General Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manager of IT Audit, Internal Audit Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An academic unit representative from Senior Advisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A representative from the Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A representative of the Deans Technology Council, on behalf of the DTC and Technology Infrastructure Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A representative from the Coordinating Council of the Domain Conveners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campus Counsel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Campus Information Technology Security Coordinator and campus Chief Compliance Officer will co-chair the Subcommittee. The Subcommittee will meet every other month or more frequently, as required. A majority of voting members must be present to conduct a meeting. The subcommittee may conduct business outside of regularly scheduled meetings when the co-chairs of the subcommittee deem it necessary. Subcommittee members will act broadly in the interest of the campus and on behalf of the organization from which they are drawn. There is an expectation that subcommittee members will consult and share information with their organization and others, where appropriate.

The Subcommittee will form workgroups to address privacy issues as needed.

B. Purpose

The Information Privacy and Security Subcommittee meets regularly to evaluate campus policies regarding information privacy and cybersafety and risks associated with threats to cybersafety and related potential invasions or breaches of personal privacy information. The Information Privacy and Security Subcommittee will recommend strategies for minimizing risks and improving compliance with campus and systemwide information privacy and cybersafety policies and procedures.

C. Responsibilities

The Subcommittee:

1. Reviews information privacy and cybersafety policies and standards as well as cybersafety surveys, analysis of survey responses, and risk assessments prepared by Information and Educational Technology (IET) and the results of privacy and cybersafety related audits performed by Internal Audit Services (IAS) and/or external auditors.
2. Recommends revisions and improvements to campus information privacy and cybersafety policies and standards.
3. Develops, guides and monitors campus transition plans to the broad use of common security solutions with input from the campus community.
4. Based on information provided by IET, IAS and external auditors and in consultation with the campus community, evaluates cybersafety risks to the campus and develops recommended strategies for mitigating those risks.
5. Reviews campus compliance with systemwide privacy and security policies and, where needed, develops recommended strategies for compliance improvement.
7. Serves as a resource for privacy and security related initiatives managed through campus-wide security services.
8. In the event of a suspected or alleged breach of state or federal privacy laws, serves as a resource to assist campus administrators in investigating, evaluating and responding to the alleged or suspected breach.
9. Maintains awareness of current privacy and security issues within higher education.

D. Reporting

The Subcommittee reports to the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor and the Campus Ethics and Compliance Risk Committee (CECRC). On an annual basis, the Subcommittee provides a written report to the CECRC addressing privacy and cybersafety risks to the campus, the severity of those risks and recommendations for mitigating those risks. Reports shall be made on a more frequent basis when deemed necessary by the Subcommittee or requested by the CECRC.
UCLA Board on Privacy and Data Protection

A. Purpose and Charge

The Board is charged with articulating institutional positions on privacy and data protection reflecting the campus's values and cultural expectations to guide policy development and decision-making. It is the campus nexus for considering initiatives, proposals and stances that must balance privacy, data protection and the campus's other values and obligations (e.g., openness, accessibility, emerging technology trends, legal obligations, and individual expectations).

B. Authority

Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost

C. Membership

Privacy is essential to academic freedom and to the conduct of teaching and research. The Board is therefore organized in structure and process to reflect the faculty voice and the Academic Senate must play a vital role in the governance of privacy and data protection for the academy.

The Board maintains a balanced number of faculty and administration, plus one graduate and one undergraduate student representative. Faculty appointments should ensure social, cultural, technical and management aspects of privacy and data protection. Administrative appointments should have direct involvement with institutional management of privacy matters.

Members are recommended by the Board's Executive Committee, in consultation with the full Board, and require a majority vote to be confirmed. The Executive Committee is responsible for managing the recommendation process.

Voting Membership

Faculty

- Faculty members equal to the number of administrative voting members (staggered three-year terms).
- The Chair-Elect of the Academic Senate shall be included and counted as one of these members. [Under discussion]

Students

- One undergraduate student designated by the Undergraduate Students Association Council (one year term)
- One graduate student designated by the Graduate Students Association (one year term)

Administration

1. University Librarian
2. Vice Provost, Information Technology
3. Designee from the Office of the Campus Counsel
4. Chief Compliance Officer of the Medical Center
5. University Registrar
6. Director, Office of the Human Research Protection Program
7. Designee from Campus Human Resources
Non-Voting Membership

1. UCLA Chief Privacy Officer
2. UCLA Chief Information Security Officer
3. Designee of the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost
4. Designee from Audit & Advisory Services

D. Executive Structure

- **Faculty Chair (two-year term):** The Chair must be a voting faculty Board member, ladder faculty and appointed by both the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost and the Academic Senate.
- **Administration Vice Chair (two-year term):** The Vice Chair must be a voting administrative Board member.
- **Executive Committee:** The Executive Committee comprises the Chair, Vice Chair and UCLA Chief Privacy Officer. It acts on behalf of the Board to ensure responsiveness with regard to operations and agendas.

E. Representation to Oversight Committee

The Chair and/or the Vice Provost, Information Technology represent the Board on interactions with the Oversight Committee on Audit, IT Governance, Compliance and Accountability as appropriate to the topic.

F. Meetings

Meetings are generally held at least once per academic quarter.

Meetings are open to UCLA visitors with prior notice unless called otherwise by the Chair. Non-UCLA visitors attend at the discretion of the Chair. All visitors will be introduced.

*Closed sessions.* In consultation with legal counsel, the Board may go into closed session for certain agenda items at the direction of the Chair, with only voting members present. The attendance of non-voting or other individuals during such sessions is at the direction of the Chair. Student members may be excluded from closed sessions where deemed appropriate by the Chair.

G. Web site

The Board will maintain a web site for publishing meeting materials, meeting summaries and any relevant documentation used by the Board. Materials will be assumed open to the campus and public unless declared confidential, privileged or otherwise limited by the Chair or legal counsel.

Some topics previously addressed

- Development of a campus privacy statement
- Implications of the UC Electronic Communications Policy, records retention, e-discovery, information requests from law enforcement, application of CALEA
- Privacy implications of the UC Climate Assessment on Learning, Living and Working
- Research involving network traffic
- Illegal file sharing: articulating a campus position on lawsuits and network traffic monitoring
- Implications of security: external assessment, network instrumentation, future threats
- Data protection: policies, Task Force Report on use of SSNs at California Universities
UC San Diego Information Data Security and Privacy Council

The UCSD Information Data Security and Privacy Council\(^5\) (ISPC) is advisory to the UCSD Chief Ethics and Compliance Officer, who chairs the UCSD Compliance, Audit, Risk, and Ethics Committee (CARE). The ISPC is needed to achieve a cohesive organizational structure aligning responsibility, authority and accountability for effective enterprise computer security and information privacy. Because state and federal privacy rules are complex, potential privacy and security breaches need to be evaluated promptly to avoid fines and to determine whether the facts about the breach meet the criteria for external notifications to consumers and government agencies.

A separate UC San Diego Health Sciences Privacy / Security Advisory Board has been established which will report to this Council. This Board will perform similar activities to those outlined in this Charter for the Health Sciences enterprise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Interim Chief Information Security and Privacy Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Chief Information Security Officer, Health Sciences; and Medical Center Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Scripps Institution of Oceanography Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resource Management &amp; Planning Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chief Human Resources, Safety &amp; Risk Management Officer, UCSD Medical Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Administrative Computing &amp; Telecommunications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School of Medicine Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Research Affairs Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chief Compliance and Privacy Officer, Health Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• External &amp; Business Affairs Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Administrative Computing &amp; Telecommunications (consultant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Affairs Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• UCSD General Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student Affairs Representative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some topics previously discussed

Notification evaluation in potential breach situations

INITIATIVE PARTICIPANTS
## Steering Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Glenn E. (Gene) Lucas, Santa Barbara</td>
<td>Executive Vice Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemwide Representation and Support</td>
<td>Sheryl Vacca, Office of the President</td>
<td>Senior Vice President and Chief Compliance and Audit Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Ernst, Office of the President [−12/2012]</td>
<td>Associate Vice President, Information Technology Services and Chief Information Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 faculty members designated by the UC Academic Senate</td>
<td>Matthew Franklin, Davis</td>
<td>Professor of Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rafail Ostrovsky, Los Angeles</td>
<td>Professor of Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 privacy expert</td>
<td>Christine Borgman, Los Angeles [6/2011−]</td>
<td>Professor and Presidential Chair, Information Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chancellor for Research</td>
<td>Charles Louis, Riverside</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chancellor for Administration</td>
<td>John Meyer, Davis</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor, Administrative and Resource Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs</td>
<td>Harry LeGrande, Berkeley</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus IT Representative</td>
<td>James Davis, Los Angeles</td>
<td>Vice Provost, IT and Chief Academic Technology Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UCLA Board on Privacy and Data Protection</td>
<td>Chair, UCLA Board on Privacy and Data Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Center CIO</td>
<td>Mike Minear, Davis Health Services</td>
<td>Chief Information Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Librarian</td>
<td>Karen Butter, San Francisco</td>
<td>University Librarian/Assistant Vice Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Center Privacy Officer</td>
<td>Lee Giddings, San Diego Health Sciences</td>
<td>Medical Director, Compliance and Privacy Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Counsel</td>
<td>Charles Robinson, Office of the President</td>
<td>Vice President and General Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Academic Senate</td>
<td>Daniel Simmons, Systemwide Academic Senate [−6/2011]</td>
<td>Academic Senate Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Powell, Systemwide Academic Senate [1/2012–]</td>
<td>Academic Senate Vice Chair; Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Term Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCOP Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Lawrence Pitts, O&amp;P</td>
<td>7/2012–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aimée Dorr, O&amp;P</td>
<td>7/2012–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCOP Business Operations</td>
<td>Nathan Brostrom, O&amp;P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s Compliance Committee</td>
<td>Peter Taylor, O&amp;P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Lynn Tierney, O&amp;P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemwide Policy Director for Information Management and Technology</td>
<td>Stephen Lau, O&amp;P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemwide Privacy Officer</td>
<td>Russell Opland, O&amp;P</td>
<td>6/2011–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Undergraduate Student</td>
<td>Olutwatobi Afolayan, Riverside</td>
<td>6/2011–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joshua Van Gelder, Santa Cruz</td>
<td>9/2011–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Graduate Student</td>
<td>Jessica Smith, Berkeley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of University of California Staff Assemblies</td>
<td>Brian Gresham, Merced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Group Chair</td>
<td>Kent Wada, Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Kent Wada, Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Academic Senate Faculty Designate</td>
<td>David Steigmann, Berkeley</td>
<td>[9/2011–]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology Policy and UC Electronic Communications Policy</td>
<td>Karen Eft, Berkeley</td>
<td>[–4/2011]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology Security</td>
<td>Jon Good, Office of the President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Center Privacy</td>
<td>Martha (Marti) Arvin, UCLA Health System and David Geffen School of Medicine</td>
<td>[6/2011–]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemwide Privacy Officer</td>
<td>Russell Opland, Office of the President</td>
<td>[–6/2011]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records Management Policies</td>
<td>Meta Clow, Santa Barbara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphics design and project support</td>
<td>Kelly Arruda, Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Glossary**

**Autonomy privacy**  An individual’s ability to conduct activities without concern of or actual observation

**“Big Data”**  Large aggregated data sets of information, which may include transactional information online such as web logs, social media information or searches

**Campus**  Any UC location (e.g., campus, medical center, Office of the President) or Lawrence Berkeley National Lab

**Campus Privacy Program**  A coordination of activities necessary to develop a unified culture of privacy consistent with the UC Statement of Privacy Values and Principles

**Electronic Communications Policy**  The UC Electronic Communications Policy (ECP) establishes principles, rules and procedures applying to all members of the University community to specifically address issues particular to the use of electronic communications

**FERPA**  The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act is a Federal law that protects the privacy of student education records

**Governance**  Oversees the principles and program, ensures compliance and provides high-level strategic direction (the “what”)

**HIPAA**  The Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996, is a Federal law that, among other things, protects the privacy of individually identifiable health information

**Incidental personal use**  A general concept, but as defined specifically by the ECP, the use of University resources for non-University activities, where “use does not: (i) interfere with the University’s operation of electronic communications resources; (ii) interfere with the user’s employment or other obligations to the University, or (iii) burden the University with noticeable incremental costs”

**Information privacy**  The appropriate protection, use and dissemination of information about individuals. Information privacy protects data about people

**Information security**  Supports the protection of information resources from unauthorized access, which could compromise the confidentiality, integrity, and availability of those resources. Information security protects data and infrastructure

**IS-3**  UC Business and Finance Bulletin IS-3, Electronic Information Security

**Management**  Directs and facilitates implementation of the campus privacy or information security program (the “how”)

**Operations**  Each unit must implement the program as appropriate, in accordance with management directives (drives toward the “what” with the “how”)

**Privacy Balancing Process**  A tool that applies the UC Privacy Values and Principles to adjudicate between competing values, obligations and interests of the University, intended for use by privacy boards, privacy officials and others both in making policy and to guide case-specific decision-making

**Privacy by design**  In general, the philosophy of embedding privacy proactively; making it the default

**Records and information management**  Policy, regulations and general principles for appropriately managing, accessing and preserving administrative records throughout their lifecycle and schedules for their final disposition

**UC Privacy Principles**  Principles derived from the UC Statement of Privacy Values and intended to be used to guide policies and practice

**UC Statement of Privacy Values**  Declares privacy—of both autonomy and information—as an important value of the University and clarifies that privacy is one of many values and obligations of the University
April 12, 2013

ROBERT POWELL, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

Re: Proposal to Adopt an Earlier Application Opening Date

Dear Bob,

The Systemwide Strategic Admissions Taskforce (SSAT) is recommending that UC move up the opening of the Undergraduate Application from October 1 to August 1, beginning in fall 2014 for the fall 2015 application cycle. The SSAT believes the earlier opening will enhance UC’s ability to compete with other highly selective competitors that use The Common Application, which is available on August 1. The earlier opening will also give prospective UC students more time to complete their application.

The Office of Admissions is considering the implications of the change, particularly as it relates to earlier deadlines for submitting materials to UCOP for inclusion in the application. BOARS has been asked to consider how an earlier opening might impact the timeline for faculty decisions about changes or updates to programs and majors, which are currently required by September 1, but would be required by July 15 under the new schedule.

It is BOARS’ belief that an earlier deadline is unlikely to affect faculty or divisions, who will have made decisions about major and program changes before the beginning of summer. As such, BOARS supports the proposal to open the Undergraduate Application to students on August 1, beginning in 2014. However, we feel the proposal warrants notice to Senate divisions as an information item and perhaps closer consideration by campus committees that might be affected by the earlier deadline for submitting material to UCOP. A UCOP discussion paper on the proposal is attached for reference.

Sincerely,

George Johnson
BOARS Chair

cc: BOARS
Senate Director Winnacker
Discussion Paper: August 1 Opening of the Undergraduate Application

Since 2003, the University of California has maintained the same schedule for its systemwide online application for undergraduate admission. The application is made available for students to begin filling out on October 1, while their ability to submit the application has been restricted to November 1 through 30.

Over the past few years, the University’s academic preparation partners – including high school counselors – have asked us to open the application for undergraduate admission earlier to accommodate summer outreach programs and the rising seniors these programs serve. In addition, UC campuses have launched ambitious local campaigns to increase the application, admission, and enrollment of international and out-of-state students. Many of these high-achieving students are applying to other selective institutions that use The Common Application, which is available in August.

In 2012, the Systemwide Strategic Admissions Taskforce (SSAT) – a committee comprised of Vice Chancellors for Student Affairs, Assistant/Associate Vice Chancellors for Enrollment Management and Admissions Directors from across the UC campuses—recommended to Vice President of Student Affairs Judy Sakaki that UC open the application for undergraduate admissions in late summer rather than at the beginning of October. This discussion paper explores the benefits and challenges that this change presents as well as the necessary steps to implement.

Early Opening

Conversations between UCOP Admissions, SSAT, and the UC campus Admissions Directors have focused on moving the October 1 opening of the application to August 1. Students would still be able to submit their application during the November timeframe only, although they could begin completing the demographic, academic history, and personal statement sections. Table 1 below summarizes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: UC Admissions Application, Current Timeframe and Early Opening Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open for Students to Begin</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Opening Option</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Benefits and Challenges of Early Opening Option

The earlier opening of the application would have two primary benefits.

First, this change has the potential to benefit campuses. The new date conforms to the opening date of applications for admission at other highly selective universities using the Common Application and will provide students with more time to complete their applications before submitting. By starting an application with the University, these students may become more emotionally invested in UC as an
option. Campuses will be able to use the live application during their summer and fall outreach activities and Counselor Conferences in the fall to remind students of deadlines and share marketing information.

Second, an earlier opening benefits students by affording applicants more time to work with counselors to properly prepare to fill out the application. It takes some of the stress out of the October/November period when counselors and students are busy with a myriad of tasks.

**Challenges**

While it is presumed that UC academic outreach staff will take advantage of earlier access to the application, this may need to be verified. Earlier access will most certainly be perceived as an advantage to the already advantaged, and a boon to the independent counseling community. The extent to which all of this additional time improves the completeness and accuracy of the application itself is an open question. Certainly UC will be positioned more favorably against The Common Application. And we know that increasingly, many more high schools are opening in August. It is unclear whether having the application open earlier will impact applicant behavior (i.e., over 60% submitting on the last 3 days in November).

Furthermore, the early application opening will have an internal impact for UC campuses and UCOP Admissions.

- **DEVELOPMENT & TESTING:** A primary consideration for UC is the impact such a change would have on the development and testing schedule. Normally, initial development begins in April after all requests for changes to the application have been received in March. But the IT team is also focused on processing fall application decisions, referral, waitlists, and other processes during the spring. Real development and testing occurs in the summer months after fall processing is near completion. Under the new schedule, finalization of changes to the application would be required in February, before campuses have had a chance to complete the review of the current records and development would occur shortly thereafter.

- **CAMPUS TESTING:** Campus participation in testing is critical and this generally occurs in August and September. Under the new schedule, campuses will need to test in June and July, when staff availability is questionable.

- **MAJORS/PROGRAMS:** Campuses (faculty) will need to make decisions on majors, new offerings and setting the openings/closures in the fall earlier. The annual list of changes to majors and programs offered on the application will be needed no later than July 15. The previous deadline was September 1.

- **ARTICULATION:** Doorways course lists and ASSIST data used in the application will be less complete in the earlier months of the opening.

- **COSTS:** Staffing for the Help Desk ramps up when the application opens. Opening earlier will add approximately $50,000 to the Application Processing budget.

- **COMMUNICATIONS:** Opening in August changes the annual update cycle for Admissions and Communications for all public facing URLs and the production of the *Apply Online* guide.
May 2, 2013

To: Jose Wudka, Chair
    Riverside Division

From: David Glidden, Chair
      Preparatory Education

Re: Proposal to Adopt an Earlier Application Opening Deadline

The Committee on Preparatory Education has no objections to the proposal to adopt an earlier application opening deadline.
April 25, 2013

To: Jose Wudka, Chair
   Riverside Division, Academic Senate

From: Mindy Marks, Chair
       Undergraduate Admissions Committee

Re: Proposal to Adopt an Earlier Application Opening Deadline

The Undergraduate Admissions Committee reviewed and discussed the BOARS proposal to move up the opening of the Undergraduate Application from October 1 to August 1, beginning in fall 2014 and no objections were voiced to oppose the action. The Committee supports the proposal to adopt an earlier application opening deadline.
April 23, 2013

To: Bahman Anvari, BCOE Executive Committee
    Jenifer Hughes, CHASS Executive Committee
    Melanie Sperling, GSOE Executive Committee
    Ameae Walker, SoM Executive Committee
    Gillian Wilson, CNAS Executive Committee
    Rami Zwick, SoBA Executive Committee

From: Jose Wudka, Chair
       Riverside Division

Re: Systemwide Review of Proposed Revised Academic Personnel Manual (APM) Section 241, Faculty Administrators (Positions Less than 100%)

Enclosed is a proposal to revise APM 241 at the request of the Academic Planning Council. The proposed revisions will bring APM - 241 into conformance with Regents Policy and with the Compendium of Universitywide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, and Research Units.

The current version of APM - 241 is at variance with Regents Policy 2307 in its specification of how systemwide Multicampus Research Unit (MRU) directors are chosen: the former invests the authority to appoint MRU directors with campus Chancellors; the latter invests appointment authority with the President of the University. The Compendium conforms to Regents Policy.

Please discuss with your committee and submit your response by May 8, 2013.

Enclosure
April 23, 2013

To: Sarjeet Gill, Chair
   Committee on Academic Personnel

   Connie Nugent, Chair
   Graduate Council

   Leonard Nunney, Chair
   Committee on Research

   Ziv Ran, Chair
   Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction

From: Jose Wudka, Chair
   Riverside Division

Re: Systemwide Review of Proposed Revised Academic Personnel Manual (APM) Section 241, Faculty Administrators (Positions Less than 100%)

Enclosed is a proposal to revise APM 241 at the request of the Academic Planning Council. The proposed revisions will bring APM - 241 into conformance with Regents Policy and with the Compendium of Universitywide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, and Research Units.

The current version of APM - 241 is at variance with Regents Policy 2307 in its specification of how systemwide Multicampus Research Unit (MRU) directors are chosen: the former invests the authority to appoint MRU directors with campus Chancellors; the latter invests appointment authority with the President of the University. The Compendium conforms to Regents Policy.

Please discuss with your committee and submit your response by May 8, 2013.

Enclosure
April 15, 2013

COUNCIL OF VICE CHANCELLORS
LABORATORY DIRECTOR ALIVISATOS
ACADEMIC COUNCIL CHAIR POWELL
ANR VICE PRESIDENT ALLEN-DIAZ

Section 241, Faculty Administrators (Positions Less Than 100%)

Dear Colleagues:

Attached for Systemwide Review are proposed revisions to Section 241 of the Academic Personnel Manual (APM - 241), Faculty Administrators (Positions Less Than 100%). Proposed revisions are responsive to the Academic Planning Council’s request to bring APM - 241 into conformance with Regents Policy and with the Compendium of Universitywide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, and Research Units. The Academic Planning Council is a Joint Senate-Administration-Student coordinating body that guides Universitywide strategic academic planning. A membership list is attached to this letter.

The current version of APM - 241 is at variance with Regents Policy 2307 in its specification of how systemwide Multicampus Research Unit (MRU) directors are chosen: the former invests the authority to appoint MRU directors with campus Chancellors; the latter invests appointment authority with the President of the University. The Compendium conforms to Regents Policy. The Academic Planning Council members believe that the appropriate means of bringing all three documents into alignment is to revise the APM to conform to Regents Policy 2307.

Systemwide Review is a public review distributed to the Chancellors and Executive Vice Chancellors requesting that they inform the general University community, affected employees and unions about policy proposals. Systemwide Review usually includes a mandatory, three-month full Senate review.

Employees should be afforded the opportunity to review and comment on the draft policy, available online at: http://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel/academic-personnel-policy/policies-under-review/index.html. Also attached is a model communication which may be used to inform non-exclusively represented employees affected by these proposals.
April 15, 2013
Page 2

This letter and attachments anticipate that you will begin Systemwide Review of the proposed draft and submit comments no later than **July 15, 2013**. Please send comments on the proposed policy to ADV-VPCARLSON-SA@ucop.edu. Questions may be directed to Janet Lockwood at Janet.Lockwood@ucop.edu or (510) 987-9499.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Susan Carlson
Vice Provost
Academic Personnel

Attachments: Proposed Revised APM - 241, Faculty Administrators (Positions Less Than 100%)
Academic Planning Council Membership List
Model Communication

cc: President Yudof
Chancellors
Provost Dorr
Executive Vice President Brostrom
Senior Vice President Vacca
Vice President Beckwith
Vice President Duckett
Vice Provosts – Academic Personnel
Academic Personnel Directors
Executive Director Fox
Executive Director Rodrigues
Executive Director Tanaka
Executive Director Winnacker
Director Chester
Interim Chief of Staff to Provost Greenspan
Deputy Compliance Officer Hilliard
Senior Counsel Van Houten
Manager Lockwood
Planning Analyst Landes
Human Resources Policy Analyst Bello
Senior Administrative Analyst Rupert
241-4 **Definition and Policy**

A faculty member (as defined in APM - 110-4(15)), who is appointed to assume administrative responsibility in addition to, or in partial replacement of, his or her faculty responsibilities is considered a Faculty Administrator. In this case, scholarly activity is expected to continue at a proportionate level that would allow for normal progression in the faculty member’s series.

Faculty may be appointed to administrative service positions (less than 100%) in the following titles:

a. College Provost  
b. Vice Provost, Associate Vice Provost  
c. Associate Vice Chancellor, Associate Dean  
d. Department Chair, Department Vice Chair (See APM - 245, Department Chairs)  
e. Director, Associate Director  
f. Faculty Assistant to the Dean or Vice Chancellor or Chancellor, Academic Assistant to the Vice Chancellor or Chancellor  
g. Interim or Acting appointment in the titles listed above

Chancellors may designate additional eligible titles as appropriate.

241-10 **Criteria for Appointment**

The appointment process and criteria for appointment of a Faculty Administrator shall be developed by each campus.

241-14 **Eligibility**

a. Faculty Administrators or Acting and Interim Faculty Administrators appointed at less than 100% time are subject to APM - 241.

b. Faculty Administrators or Acting and Interim Faculty Administrators appointed at 100% time are subject to APM - 246, Faculty Administrators (100% Time).

241-16 **Restrictions**

Faculty Administrators are subject to all Academic Personnel policies (APM).
Faculty Administrators with concurrent appointments that are covered by the Health Sciences Compensation Plan are subject to APM - 670, Health Sciences Compensation Plan.

241-17 Terms of Service

Subject to APM - 241-20, Faculty Administrators shall be appointed for a period of up to five years, subject to reappointment.

241-18 Salary

Faculty Administrators are normally compensated with stipends and/or additional summer compensation, when appropriate. Stipends shall be paid in accordance with APM - 633, Stipends/Academic Appointees. Stipend ranges shall be developed by each campus.

241-20 Conditions of Employment

A Faculty Administrator serves at the discretion of the Chancellor. The Chancellor may terminate the appointment at any time, with or without cause.

Termination of a Faculty Administrator appointment does not terminate the underlying faculty appointment.

A Faculty Administrator may engage in outside activities as defined by and in accordance with APM - 025, Conflict of Commitment and Outside Activities of Faculty Members, and, if a Faculty Administrator has a concurrent Health Sciences Compensation Plan appointment, in accordance with APM - 670, Health Sciences Compensation Plan and Guidelines on Occasional Outside Professional Activities by Health Sciences Compensation Plan Participants

241-24 Authority

a. The Chancellor has authority to appoint and reappoint Faculty Administrators, including those serving in an Interim or Acting capacity, and to approve administrative compensation up to the established Indexed Compensation
Level (ICL)\(^1\) in accordance with campus procedures. The Chancellor may redelegate authority to a designee for implementing APM - 241(see APM - 100-6-d).

b. The Director of an Organized Research Unit (ORU) is appointed by the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee after a nomination procedure agreed to by the Chancellor and the Academic Senate. The founding Director of an ORU may be specified in the proposal to establish the ORU. When a new Director is appointed for an existing Unit, the ORU Advisory Committee should be solicited for nominations.

c. The Director of a Multi-campus Research Unit (MRU) is appointed by the President Chancellor or his/her designee after consultation with the appropriate Division Academic Senate and with the advice of a Search Committee appointed by the Vice President of Research and Graduate Studies Chancellor of Research or his/her equivalent. Nominations for membership on the Search Committee are solicited by the Vice President of Research and Graduate Studies Chancellor of Research or his/her equivalent from the Chair of the Academic Division Senate and the Chancellors. Normally, at least one member of the MRU Advisory or Executive Committee serves on the Search Committee.

\(^1\) As stated in Regents Standing Order 100.3(b).
Review Procedures

The administrative review procedures outlined in this section are separate and distinct from the formal academic review procedures governing the underlying faculty appointment as described in APM - 210, Review and Appraisal Committees, and APM - 220, Professor Series.

The President or Chancellor, as appropriate, shall conduct a review for each Faculty Administrator no later than once every five years to determine whether reappointment to another term is warranted.

The President or each campus, as appropriate, shall develop criteria and procedures for conducting Faculty Administrator reviews.
May 2, 2013

To: Jose Wudka, Chair
Riverside Division of the Academic Senate

From: Sarjeet Gill, Chair
Committee on Academic Personnel

Re: Systemwide Review of Proposed Revised Academic Personnel Manual (APM) Section 241, Faculty Administrators (Positions Less than 100%)

On May 1, 2013, CAP voted unanimously to approve the proposed changes to APM Section 241 and has no further recommendations (+9-0-0).
May 3, 2013

To: Jose Wudka, Chair
    Riverside Division

From: Connie Nugent, Chair
    Graduate Council

Re: Systemwide Review of Proposed Revised Academic Personnel Manual (APM) Section 241, Faculty Administrators (Positions less than 100%)

The Graduate Council circulated the proposal via email and had no comments.
May 9, 2013

To: Jose Wudka, Chair
Riverside Division

Fr: Len Nunney, Chair
Committee on Research

(APM) Section 241, Faculty Administrators (Positions less than 100%)

The Committee on Research (COR) discussed this proposal and agrees that the spirit of
the changes regarding the appointment of MRU directors seems fine. COR had only one
concern with a specific point: the change seems to have set up a logical problem between
the new 241-24c (appointment by the President) and the old 241-10 (which says
appointment issues are developed on each campus). We would recommend a wording
change to 241-10 to resolve this conflict – something along the lines of adding
“…..except in the case of an MRU director where they shall be developed systemwide”,
or perhaps a reference to 241-24c.
May 3, 2013

To: Jose Wudka, Chair
    Riverside Division

Fr: Ziv Ran, Chair
    Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction

    (APM) Section 241, Faculty Administrators (Positions Less than 100%)

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction has considered but has no comments to offer regarding the proposed changes to APM 241.
May 8, 2013

To: Jose Wudka  
Chair of the Academic Senate  
University of California, Riverside

From: Bahman Anvari  
Chair of the Faculty  
Bourns College of Engineering  
University of California, Riverside

Section 241, Faculty Administrators (Positions Less than 100%)

BCOE executive committee has reviewed the proposed Revised Academic Manual (APM) section 241, and supports the revisions.
May 8, 2013

To: Jose Wudka, Chair Riverside Division

From: Melanie Sperling, Chair, GSOE Executive Committee

Re: Systemwide Review of Proposed Revised Academic Personnel Manual (APM) Section 241, Faculty Administrators (Positions less than 100%)

The GSOE Executive Committee circulated the above referenced document and responded unanimously with no objections to the document.
TO: Jose Wudka, Chair,  
Riverside Division
FROM: Gillian Wilson, Chair, Executive Committee  
College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences

Since there was no scheduled meeting of the CNAS Executive Committee before comments were due, members were asked to comment on the proposed revisions to APM241 by email (with no response conveying approval)  
Three members responded in favor of the proposal, concurring that authority to appoint Multicampus Research Unit Directors should lie with the President of the University rather than with campus Chancellors. No comments were received from members opposed to the revisions.

Gillian Wilson  
Professor  
Department of Physics and Astronomy  
University of California Riverside  
900 University Avenue  
Riverside, CA 92521

gillianw@ucr.edu  
Tel: (951) 827 6274  
Fax: (951) 827 4529
Dear Cynthia:

SoBA EC discussed (online) the proposal to revise APM 241 and we have no objections or comments.

Sincerely,

Rami Zwick
SoBA Chair of the faculty
To: Jose Wudka

From: Ameae Walker, Chair SOM Exec Committee

Re: Systemwide Review of Proposed Revised Academic Personnel Manual (APM) Section 241, Faculty Administrators (Positions Less than 100%)

The SOM Executive Committee has considered the proposal to revise APM 241 and has no concerns with the proposal.
February 22, 2013

To: Bahman Anvari, BCOE Executive Committee
    Jenifer Hughes, CHASS Executive Committee
    Melanie Sperling, GSOE Executive Committee
    Ameae Walker, SoM Executive Committee
    Gillian Wilson, CNAS Executive Committee
    Rami Zwick, SoBA Executive Committee

    Ward Beyermann, Chair, Committee on Educational Policy
    Connie Nugent, Chair, Graduate Council

From: Jose Wudka, Chair
       Riverside Division

RE: Proposed Changes to Appendix 6.6.4 to the Bylaws and Regulations of the Riverside of the University of California Academic Senate

Please find attached a proposal which presents changes to Appendix 6.6.4

Please respond with your approval or suggested modifications by Friday, March 22, 2013.
To be adopted:

Proposed Change to Appendix 6.6.4 to the Bylaws and Regulations of the Riverside Division of the University of California Academic Senate

PRESENT:

6.4.4 III. Academic Integrity Committees
1. Review Stage 2, College/School Academic Integrity Committees for Cases Involving Undergraduate Students

An Academic Integrity Committee will be established in each of School or College to:
* hear cases referred by SCAIP that are sufficiently complex to require additional review
* hear serious and repeated violations of academic misconduct upon referral from an instructor or SCAIP
* consider appeals of decisions and/or sanctions imposed by SCAIP

The Academic Senate’s Committee on Committees will appoint four to six faculty members from each of BCOE, CNAS, and SOBA, and six from CHASS to the undergraduate Academic Integrity Committees for each college/school to serve one-year terms, effective September 1-August 31. Each committee should include faculty who are available to participate in hearings during the summer months.

PROPOSED:

6.4.4 III. Academic Integrity Committees
1. Review Stage 2, College/School Academic Integrity Committees for Cases Involving Undergraduate Students

An Academic Integrity Committee will be established in each of School or College to:
* hear cases referred by SCAIP that are sufficiently complex to require additional review
* hear serious and repeated violations of academic misconduct upon referral from an instructor or SCAIP
* consider appeals of decisions and/or sanctions imposed by SCAIP

The Academic Senate’s Committee on Committees will appoint four to six faculty members to the undergraduate Academic Integrity Committees for each college and one to three faculty members to the undergraduate Academic Integrity Committees for each school with an undergraduate curriculum to serve one-year terms, effective September 1-August 31. Each committee should include faculty who are available to participate in hearings during the summer months.
In addition, SCAIP will solicit and review applications from interested undergraduate and graduate students and make recommendations to the Associated Students of UCR and Graduate Student Association regarding students to be appointed to serve on each college/school committee for one-year terms, effective September 1-August 31. The final endorsement of student members will rest with the Committee on Committees.

Students are not eligible to serve if they have been suspended or are on academic or disciplinary probation, have been evicted from University Housing for reasons related to conduct, or have a case pending before SCAIP. (Am 20 February 07)

In all cases an effort will be made to appoint members who represent the disciplinary diversity within each college/school, whenever possible.

Staff support to the committees will be provided by the office of the Vice Provost for Administrative Resolution, the office of the AVC/Dean of Students, and SCAIP.

JUSTIFICATION:
Even though GSOE has an undergraduate curriculum, they had no representation on the Academic Integrity Committee. Also, the existing bylaw would have to be changed whenever new colleges and schools are formed or when a unit with just a graduate program adopts an undergraduate curriculum.

The original policy and this revision were developed by Committee on Educational Policy in consultation with the Assistant Vice Chancellor & Dean of Students and Director of Student Conduct.
APPROVALS:
Approved by the Executive Committee of BCOE: March 22, 2013
Approved by the Executive Committee of CHASS: February 27, 2013
Approved by the Executive Committee of CNAS: February 26, 2013
Approved by the Executive Committee of the GSOE: March 22, 2013
Approved by the Executive Committee of SoBA: March 8, 2013
Approved by Graduate Council: April 4, 2013
Approved by the Committee on Educational Policy: November 29, 2012
The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording to be consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: January 2, 2012
Received by the Executive Council
March 6, 2013

To: Bahman Anvari, BCOE Executive Committee
    Jenifer Hughes, CHASS Executive Committee
    Melanie Sperling, GSOE Executive Committee
    Ameae Walker, SoM Executive Committee
    Gillian Wilson, CNAS Executive Committee
    Rami Zwick, SoBA Executive Committee
    Thomas Perring, Faculty Director, University Honors
    Ward Beyermann, Chair, Committee on Educational Policy

From: Jose Wudka, Chair
      Riverside Division

RE: Proposed Riverside Division Regulation on Fulfillment of Prerequisites and Course Overlap for Honors Courses and Corresponding Non-Honors Courses

Please find attached a proposal from the Chair of the Committee on Courses.

Approval or suggested modifications are requested by Friday, April 5, 2013.
To be received and placed on file:

Proposed Riverside Division Regulation on Fulfillment of Prerequisites and Course Overlap for Honors Courses and Corresponding Non-Honors Courses

**PRESENT**

**PROPOSED**

R8. Prerequisite Equivalence and Overlap Equivalence for Honors and Corresponding Non-Honors Courses

R8.1. For purposes of fulfilling prerequisites for other courses and for issues of overlap with other courses, Honors courses and corresponding non-Honors courses are equivalent.

**JUSTIFICATION:**

During the 2011-12 academic year, the Committee on Courses and the Registrar’s Office worked together to identify steps or situations where the course approval process might be streamlined or accelerated. Attention was focused on concurrent approval procedures because some savings of effort seemed possible there. Concurrent approval situations arise when creation of a new course or a change in an existing course generates a need for changes in other courses. One common example is when the new or changed course is a prerequisite to other courses. Another common example is when the new or changed course requires a credit statement, i.e., the new or changed course overlaps some other existing course to the extent that credit cannot be allowed for both the new or changed course and the other existing course. In either of these situations, current procedures require that course proposals for change in the other affected courses be submitted concurrently with the course proposal for the new or changed course. The requirement for concurrent approval can magnify a small job, perhaps a relatively simple change in one course, into a big job, due to the other courses that must be changed along with this course.

The Committee on Courses and the Registrar’s Office focused in particular on the workload arising from concurrent approval requirements that typically arise with proposals for new Honors courses. Creation of an Honors version of an existing course often leads to many concurrent approval requirements because if the regular course serves as a prerequisite to some other courses, then programs will generally want the Honors version of the course to also serve as prerequisite to those other courses. Furthermore, students are generally not allowed to receive credit for taking both a non-Honors course and the Honors version of the same course. Programs or departments sometimes become discouraged about proposing Honors courses because of the workload involved with generating proposals for the required concurrent changes in other courses.
Several potential alternative approaches for reducing the concurrent approval workload connected with proposal of new Honors courses were developed and sent out for review by, and comment from, several Senate committees and the University Honors Program. By March, 2012, the Committee on Educational Policy, the CNAS Executive Committee, the CHASS Executive Committee, the BCOE Executive Committee, the GSOE Executive Committee, the SoBA Executive Committee, the Biomedical Sciences Executive Committee and University Honors had all responded in favor of the approach of creating a blanket Senate policy that declares Honors courses and the corresponding non-Honors courses to be equivalent with regard to fulfilling prerequisites and course overlap. This policy would allow departments or programs to simply update the Section Registration Controls in the Student Information System and would eliminate the need for concurrent course change proposals altogether. While favoring this approach, the Committee on Educational Policy, the CNAS Executive Committee and the CHASS Executive Committee all suggested that systems should be developed for notifying departments or programs about the need to update their Section Registration Controls in SIS and for updating CRAMS and the General Catalog on these matters for new Honors courses.

=======================================================================

Approvals

Submitted and approved by the Committee on Courses: October 15, 2012

The Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction finds the wording To be consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: November 2, 2012

University Honors Program: No response

BCOE Executive Committee: No response

CHASS Executive Committee: No response

CNAS Executive Committee: March 12, 2013

GSoE Executive Committee: No response

SoBA Executive Committee: March 29, 2013

SoM Executive Committee: March 13, 2013

University Honors Program: No response

Committee on Educational Policy: April 3, 2013

Received by the Executive Council:
Chair of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate
Report to the Riverside Division
May 28, 2013

To Be Adopted:

**Proposed Committee on Faculty Honors & Scholarly Awards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.11 Distinguished Teaching (En 5 Oct 67)</td>
<td>8.11 Faculty Honors &amp; Scholarly Awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.13 Faculty Research Lecturer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.27 Distinguished Campus Service (En 20 Nov 2007)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.11.1 This committee consists of five members appointed from among previous recipients of Distinguished Teaching Awards. (Am 20 Mar 74)

8.13.1 This committee consists of five members of the Division appointed from among previous Faculty Research Lecturers.

8.27.1 This committee consists of five members of the Division and will be composed of previous recipients of the award selected by the Academic Senate Committee on Committees with due diligence to maintaining diversity of membership. Each year, the newly selected recipients of the award become eligible to serve on the committee. For the first five years of the committee’s existence, the membership can include non-recipients of the award.

8.27.2 This committee nominates annually for election by the Division at its spring meeting, one or more members of the ladder rank faculty at UCR to receive this award, which is designed to recognize exceptional effort and achievement in service to the UCR Campus. (Am 30 Nov. 2010)

8.11.2 This committee nominates annually for election by the Division, one or more members of the Division to receive a

8.11.3 Each year, the newly selected recipients of each award will become eligible to serve on the committee.

8.11.4 This committee nominates annually for election by the Division at its spring meeting:

(i) one or more members of the ladder rank faculty at UCR to receive the Distinguished Campus Service Award, which is designed to recognize exceptional effort and achievement in service to the UCR Campus;
Distinguished Teaching Award. These awards are presented in connection with the Commencement ceremonies. The committee receives suggestions, evaluates qualifications, and selects individuals for nomination on the basis of consideration of information from all sources.

8.13.2 It is the duty of this committee to nominate for election by the Division any member of the Division who has made a distinguished record in research to deliver a lecture upon a topic of his/her selection. This nomination for the succeeding academic year shall be made no later than the final meeting of the Division in the spring term.

Statement of Purpose and Effect:

(i) Because of redundancies of effort, decreasing the faculty number of committee participants will not harm the thoroughness of the review or overwhelm the participating faculty;
(ii) The proposed changes will not result in a watering down of the criteria;
(iii) This move brings us into better alignment with the practices on other campuses;
(iv) The proposed changes will simplify staff performance and make the operations of the Senate more efficient.

Approvals

Bylaw will be effective upon approval

Approved by the Committee on Distinguished Teaching: May 1, 2013
Approved by the Committee on Distinguished Service: did not approve
Approved by the Faculty Research Lecturer Committee: did not approve
Approved by the Committee on Faculty Welfare: May 3, 2013
Approved by Committee on Committees: April 25, 2013

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: May 3, 2013

Received by Executive Council:
April 29, 2013

To: Jose Wudka, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Irving Hendrick, Chair
       Committee on Faculty Welfare

Re: Proposals to Merge Standing Committees of the Riverside Division

Believing that there is no good reason to have more Academic Senate Committees than are needed, the Committee on Faculty Welfare concurs with the proposals to merge the Committee on Distinguished Teaching with the Committee on Distinguished Campus Service and the Faculty Research Lecturer, thereby creating a new standing committee to be known as the “Committee on Faculty Honors and Scholarly Awards.”

Similarly, we support the proposal to form a new standing “Committee on Library, Information Technology and Scholarly Communication” by merging the existing Committee on Academic Computing and Information Technology with the Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication.
May 9, 2013

To: Jose Wudka  
Chair, Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Irving G. Hendrick  
Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare

Re: Additional Comments on Proposed New Committees:  
1. Faculty Honors & Scholarly Awards  
2. Library, Information Technology & Scholarly Communication

The Committee on Faculty Welfare has had no issues arise over the past year that would enable us to make a well informed recommendation concerning the optimum manner of organizing responsibilities assigned to the two proposed new committees. We do hold to the principle that University shared governance is best exercised when the faculty Senate is organized to achieve its mission in the most effective and efficient manner possible. While we value effectiveness more highly than efficiency, we hold there should be enough—but no more than enough—committees to do the necessary work in an effective manner.

We offered support for the proposals identified above because they appeared to be consistent with this principle, assuming as we did that they were arrived at after appropriate consultation with directly relevant existing committees and after considering available empirical evidence. If this was not the case, our support position weakens from what was represented to you originally. Records of committee work load, frequency of meetings, and staff resources available to assist committee efforts all factor into a wise organizational decision. If disagreements exist, a bit more consultation and consideration may be in order.

There is the possibility that the case for combining one pair of committees into a single new committee may be stronger than the other case. We would guess that the issue regarding faculty honors and awards is simply a matter of work load. We have no special source of information to make a call, but there would seem to be no inherent conceptual problem that we can see.

Most of what follows from here is my own view and does not involve consultation with the committee.

The proposal regarding library, information technology, and scholarly communication...
would seem to reflect a more than a decade old trend to represent in contemporary terms the work of libraries and librarians. From this perspective, the proposed new committee on Library, Information Technology & Scholarly Communication seems logical. We know that over the past decade the concept of library work has been expanded to include information technology and scholarly communication. The recent open access discussion and the expansion of on-line journals help to illustrate that. Much information used by scholars is found on the web. Indeed, even the computer software design side of computer science known as “informatics” is often organized in library schools or information schools, and housed in library buildings. As for “computing and communications” as a stand-alone committee, I know from my system-wide Senate experience in 2011-12 that the University Committee on Computing and Communications had been essentially inactive for several years up to that time, but I have no information about what our divisional committee of a similar name has been doing. If the work has been modest, it should not be burdensome to fold it into a committee with a broader mission. Increasing the size and expertise of the new committee to reflect its broader mission is always an option.
April 25, 2013

To: Jose Wudka, Chair
   Riverside Division

From: Mariam Lam, Chair
       Committee on Committees

Re: Proposal to Merge the Committee on Distinguished Teaching with the Committee on Distinguished Campus Service and the Faculty Research Lecturer Committees

Dear Jose:

Our committee has met and reviewed the proposed changes for the combining of the Distinguished Teaching with the Committee on Distinguished Campus Service and the Faculty Research Lecturer committees.

While we understand there are concerns about prioritizing scholarship over teaching or vice versa in different cases, we feel there will be enough members representing each area of expertise to ensure fairness in dividing up subcommittee work on particular awards, and do not deem this diversity to be an impediment in what will become a much more efficient senate committee formation. As always, the new committee is allowed to develop its own procedures for carrying out its responsibilities, including forming subcommittees for each of the awards to provide the initial review and recommendation of candidates before the entire committee selects the winners. Indeed, the combining of the committees ensures that each of the committees will have more adequate and appropriate staffing to assist in the current Chairs’ and committees’ work as effectively as possible.

We also want to point out that other campuses have a similar joint award committee:

UCI: http://www.senate.ucla.edu/Committees/SHA/index.asp
UCSD: http://senate.ucsd.edu/committees/csa.htm
UCSB: https://senate.ucsb.edu/~councils.and.committees/index.cfm
UCB: http://academic-senate.berkeley.edu/committees/fac

UCLA, UCSC, UCM have their Committee on Teaching (or equivalent) deal with the teaching awards; their Committee on Research (or equivalent) deal with the research awards; and their Committee on Committees apparently deals with other awards. Only UCD has separate committees for each award (http://academicsenate.ucdavis.edu/committee.cfm) as we currently
do. It should also be noted that each of these campuses has a larger Senate staff than does Riverside.

Therefore, we approve of the change, and have no questions or concerns at this time.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Mariam Lam, Chair
Committee on Committees
May 1, 2013

To: Jose Wudka  
   Chair, Riverside Division

From: Jodie Holt  
   Chair, Distinguished Teaching Committee

Re: Proposal for a new Committee on Faculty Honors and Scholarly Awards

The Distinguished Teaching Committee reviewed and discussed the proposal. Overall the proposal to combine the functions of three committees into one Committee on Faculty Honors and Scholarly Awards is reasonable and will result in greater efficiency. However, the Committee is concerned that this change will result in a rather large workload for the members of the new committee. To make this change workable, the Committee would like to suggest that the new committee be allowed to develop its own procedures for carrying out its responsibilities. These could include, for example, forming subcommittees for each of the awards to provide the initial review and recommendation of candidates before the entire committee selects the winners.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to give feedback.
May 6, 2013

To: Jose Wudka  
Chair, Riverside Division

From: Giles Waines  
Chair, Distinguished Campus Service Committee

Re: Proposal for a new Committee on Faculty Honors and Scholarly Awards

The Distinguished Campus Service Committee reviewed, discussed, and unanimously voted against supporting the proposal for a new Committee on Faculty Honors and Scholarly Awards. Evidently the same proposal was made several years ago and was voted down. Committee members hold the opinion that the best people to understand the Distinguished Campus Service Award are those who have previously received the award. A new committee, with only one or two members who have previously received the award, might be over ruled by other members of the new committee who do not have experience with the Distinguished Campus Service Award. Another concern by the Committee is that it might be possible for the new committee to be more easily influenced by campus or Academic Senate politics. The Committee questions if the new committee might save Academic Senate Office staff work and time, but that was not thought to be the case by the Committee. The system works well as it is presently, if so, why fix it?
May 3, 2013

To: Jose Wudka
Chair, Academic Senate

From: Brian Federici
Chair, Faculty Research Lecturer Committee
Distinguished Professor, Entomology, Microbiology, and Molecular Genetics

Re: Proposal to merge the Committee on Distinguished Teaching with the Committee on Distinguished Campus Service and The Faculty Research Lecturer

On behalf of the Faculty Research Lecturer Committee, I write to provide you with our opinion on the above proposal. All Committee members have reviewed the proposal, and the comments below summarize the opinions of all members. At the outset, I note that we find the proposal poorly written and without specific justification, and thus without merit. The proposal consists of four brief assertions, each lacking a foundation. Two of the statements, (i) and (ii), are questionable assertions about what the change would not do, and the two purportedly positive statements are incorrect (iii) or dubious (iv). We are all baffled by the proposal, and find it surprising that it came in a format ready for approval without any prior vetting. This is not what we expect from the Academic Senate. For the more detailed reasons provided below, we are unanimously opposed to this proposal.

Our opinions are provided by responding to each of the four putative justifications for merging the award committees.

Statement of Purpose and Effect:

(i) **Because of redundancies of effort, decreasing the faculty number of committee participants will not harm the thoroughness of the review or overwhelm the participating faculty.**

Our Response. This statement is flawed in numerous ways. For example, where are the redundancies of effort? This apparently means redundancies among the different award committees. However, the awards are for very different faculty activities, so how does this result in redundancies? Does this mean that by reducing the number of committee members some faculty members will have dual responsibilities, such as reviewing files for both the Teaching Award and Research Lecturer Award? If that is so, why not suggest reducing each of the award committees by one member (even though we don't agree with such an action – our point here is just to show a relevant lack of logic). Regarding the statement that “decreasing the faculty number of committee participants will not harm the thoroughness of the review…” we find this baseless. No evidence or data are provided to support the statement, for example, studies from other UC campuses where a similar reduction has been made with no effect. The same can be said for the following statement that the smaller committee will not “…overwhelm the participating faculty...” Rather than being a well thought out statement based on specific facts – something we would expect from an academic – the entire statement lacks substance.

Furthermore, what is the advantage of reducing the number of participating faculty on awards committees from 15 to 9 when, on average, each member presumably would have three times as many files to review. Of course, the omnibus committee could be disaggregated into three subcommittees to reduce the average workload, but what then is the point of moving to a single committee? We think that with a larger number of files to be reviewed by each member the reviews are likely to be less thorough. Even more
important, there is no reason to believe that faculty who are outstanding researchers will be best equipped to make judgments for Distinguished Teaching awards or Distinguished Service awards, nor that those who are outstanding teachers or who excel at service will be best equipped to make judgments regarding outstanding research accomplishments. In fact, this could have the perverse effect of making the selection decisions more onerous for members of the committee. There may be a handful of faculty members on campus who excel at all three areas (research, teaching, and service), but such individuals are rare. More realistically, there is benefit in both specialization and exploitation of acknowledged expertise.

(ii) The proposed changes will not result in a watering down of the criteria.

Our response. Again, this is a statement for which no support is provided. Moreover, we find this statement irrelevant - the criteria are explicitly stated in the charges to the committees. The question is whether the execution of the charges would be improved upon or worsened by the proposed change. It is our opinion that there will be a watering down of award criteria because there will be fewer faculty to handle what in the future will be an increasing number of nominees for these awards as the campus continues to grow. Thus, the prestige of each of the awards would be diminished. Over the past three years, for example, the FRL Committee has seen an increase in the number of nominees. This will likely continue in the future, as for the first time this year we had nominees from the Bourns College of Engineering.

(iii) This move brings us into better alignment with the practices on other campuses.

Our response: This statement is simply incorrect. We consider it further evidence of the lack of thought and effort put into this poorly thought out initiative. A quick perusal of UC campus websites shows that six other campuses (UCB, UCD, UCLA, UCSB, UCSC, and UCSF) have separate committees for the different awards, while only three (UCI, UCM, and UCSD) have a combined committee. In any event, we do not see why conforming to practice at other campuses is more important than respecting the tradition at UCR.

(iv) The proposed changes will simplify staff performance and make the operations of the Senate more efficient.

Our response. We fail to see why this would have any significant effect on staff performance or Senate efficiency. The total number of files to be processed would be unaffected, and it is likely that the workload for all parties would remain the same, or even increase per capita. In fact, this is the first we’ve heard that Senate operations need to be more efficient, and that staff performance needs to be simplified. Again, no specifics are provided to document either claim. We know that to make electronic files at least some documents have to be scanned. But no data are provided with respect to how many documents need to be scanned or how much staff time this takes. Or, for example, how many staff hours per year are devoted to work for the FRL Committee. Without such data, it is simply impossible for us to accept these claims.

For the sake of the argument, let’s say the claims have a factual basis. If we knew where greater efficiency is needed and staff efforts need to be simplified, we could very likely provide solutions that would not require merging the committees. For example, let’s take document scanning. If this is taking too much time, we can simply make it a requirement that all documents must be submitted electronically, including letters of nomination, nominee CV’s, and the letters of reference from extramural referees. We assume that most of the latter are already submitted as pdf files. This would mean that most of the staff work would involve organizing and uploading of electronic files onto iLearn. We had eleven nominees this year and requested approximately 100 letters from referees. If it took one hour to upload each nominee’s file, and 15 minutes to upload each reference letter, that would come to 36 hours, which amounts to about a total time of one week. We realize there is other work involved with any committee, such as emails to the chair and committee members, but the bulk of the work deals with the files. If we add in lunch and coffee breaks, a proportionate amount of sick leave and vacation time, the total amount of time by a single staff member for FRL Committee activities yearly would likely total approximately two weeks.
Any serious proposal to merge the Senate award committees should include the type of analysis provided above to show what the current staff burdens are under the existing structure, and how, with appropriate data, merging the committees will simplify staff performance and improve Senate efficiency.

In regard to the reference letters, we will also note that several of the nominators requested more than 10 letters from referees for their nominee (we had one that requested 18 reference letters). As a result, the FRL Committee decided for future years to limit the number of reference letters requested to a maximum of 10 (as the response rate is typically over 70%, and the Committee has found this a sufficient number to make informed decisions about each candidate).

Another change we made with respect to reference letters is that the letter sent to referees state that it will be kept on file and used for a period of three years. This would eliminate the need for staff to contact referees yearly seeking permission to use the letter again (with or without modification). We recommend this change be made provided it is consistent with UC policies for maintaining confidentiality.

In summary, the Faculty Research Lecturer Committee, for the reasons given above, is adamantly opposed to the proposal to merge the Senate award committees. The key question is whether it would improve the process and produce better outcomes. We think not. In fact we think the proposed change risks diluting the prestige of the awards. However, even if it did not, we find no compelling reason for the change. On the contrary, we think the present structure works very well and is highly efficient, and thus should be maintained and protected.¹

cc: Faculty Research Lecturer Committee Members
Norman Ellstrand, Professor, Botany and Plant Sciences
Christopher Reed, Distinguished Professor of Chemistry
R. Robert Russell, Distinguished Professor of Economics
Chandra Varma, Distinguished Professor of Physics

¹During the mid-1990’s, I (BF) chaired the UCR Academic Senate’s Committee on Distinguished Teaching. From my recollection of the review process, the workload for faculty and staff was similar to that of the FRL today. At the time, the files were still paper, and thus there were no pdf files to upload, or the need to scan and upload reference letters. Instead, committee members visited and read the files in the Senate office. Even then, however, I never thought the workload of for the staff or committee members was burdensome or made the process inefficient.
To Be Adopted:

Proposed Committee on Library, Information Technology & Scholarly Communication

**Present**

8.9 Academic Computing and Information Technology (En 6 Oct 70) (Am 5 Feb 98)

8.16 Library and Scholarly Communication

8.9.1 This committee consists of at least seven members, including the Associate Vice Chancellor Computing and Communications or his/her representative and University Librarian of the Riverside campus as ex-officio members. (AM 5 Feb 98). Neither ex officio may serve as Chair. The Chair normally also serves on the University Committee on Information Technology and Telecommunications Policy. (AM 19 Nov 81)(AM 2 Feb 98)

**Proposed**

8.9 Library, Information Technology & Scholarly Communication En 6 Oct 70) (Am 5 Feb 98)

8.9.1 This committee consists of at least nine members, including a Chair and Vice Chair appointed by Committee on Committees. The Associate Vice Chancellor for Computing and Communications (or his/her representative) and the University Librarian of the Riverside Campus will serve as ex officio non-voting members. Neither ex officio member may serve as Chair. The Vice Chair of the committee normally serves on the University Committee on Computing and Communications. The Chair will normally serve on the University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communications. (AM 19 Nov 81)(AM 2 Feb 98) (AM 9 Jan 73)

8.16.1 This Committee consists of seven members of the Division, including the University Librarian of the Riverside Campus, ex officio. The Chair normally also serves on the University Library Committee. (AM 9 Jan 73)

8.9.2 This committee shall advise the Division and the Chancellor on all matters relating to academic computing and information technology, including instructional technology. (Am 9 Feb 89) (AM 5 Feb 98)

8.9.2.1 Advise the Division, Chancellor and President on all matters relating to academic computing and information technology; administration of the library; and matters concerning scholarly communications at Riverside in accordance with the Standing Orders of the Regents. (Am 9 Feb 89) (AM 5 Feb 98) (Am 30 May 06)
8.16.2.1 Advise the President and the Chancellor regarding the administration of the library and matters concerning scholarly communication at Riverside in accordance with the Standing Orders of the Regents and perform such other duties relative to the library as may be referred by proper authority. (Am 30 May 06)

8.9.3.1 Review Faculty and student use of the campus Computing and Communications unit for instruction and research;

8.9.3.2 Recommend ways to improve the functioning of the campus Computing and Communications unit to meet Faculty and student needs; (Am 5 Feb 98)

8.9.3.3 Participate in long range planning for computer and information technology use and development;

8.9.3.4 Recommend ways to improve education in the use of the computer and information; (Am 5 Feb 98)

8.9.3.5 Solicit and rank requests for grants for supporting and expanding the use of computing and information technology in research and instruction; (En 9 Feb 89) (Am 3 Feb 00) (Am 21 Feb 2012)

8.9.3.6 Assess the state of campus instructional technology support and readiness to meet future needs; (En 5 Feb 98)

8.9.3.7 Recommend ways to improve education in the use of computers, information, and campus instructional technology; (Am 5 Feb 98)

8.9.3.8 Participate in long range planning for instructional technology;

8.9.2.2 Review use of and recommend ways to improve the functioning of the campus Computing and Communications, and University Library units to meet Faculty and student needs; (Am 5 Feb 98)

8.9.2.3 Recommend ways to improve education in the use of computers, information, and campus instructional technology; (Am 5 Feb 98)

8.9.2.4 Assess the state of campus instructional technology support and participate in long range planning to meet future needs; the committee may also initiate studies and generate recommendations to the division and the administration on the better use of campus library and technology resources.

8.9.2.5 When funds are available Subject to fund availability, this committee will solicit and rank requests for grants for supporting and expanding the use of computing and information technology in research and instruction; (En 9 Feb 89) (Am 3 Feb 00) (Am 21 Feb 2012)
8.16.2.2 Participate with the librarian in matters relating to the library budget, the formulation of library policies, the allocation of space, and the apportionment of funds.

8.16.2.3 Provide liaison between the faculty and the library administration in all matters of library policy;

8.16.2.4 Prepare and submit to the Division an annual report on financial problems, allocations of space, facilities for research, and any other matters within its jurisdiction.

8.16.2.5 Participate in an advisory capacity in the appointment of the librarian.

8.9.2.6 Participate with the librarian in matters relating to the library budget, the formulation of library policies, the allocation of space, and the apportionment of funds; and serve as a liaison between the faculty and library administration.

8.9.2.7 Prepare and submit to the Division an annual report on the library’s effectiveness in meeting the campus needs, its financial situation, allocations of space, facilities for research, and any other matters within its jurisdiction.

8.9.2.8 Participate in an advisory capacity in the appointment of the librarian.

8.9.4 This committee shall consult with the Divisional committees on Planning and Budget, Courses, and Educational Policy, and with other Senate and administrative committees, whenever appropriate to its tasks.

Statement of Purpose and Effect:
Within the separate committees is a wide area of overlap in all technology-assisted instructional matters, neither are overly busy committees, and the proposed new structure will improve the efficiency of both groups (now combined) without imposing unreasonable burdens on their members.

In addition, combining these two committees will allow for staff time and expertise to be used more efficiently. In past years the solution to staff shortages was to reduce the amount of support provided to committees which met infrequently. The result has been the loss of historical memory and consistency, and an increased workload for the faculty who sit on these committees. The new structure will allow the senate to assign staff support to this committee so that the level of service is equitable to other standing senate committees.

Of consideration is the desire to maintain campus representation on systemwide committees. Per Bylaw 325, the campus is allowed to designate a “corresponding” divisional committee without establishing a separate standing committee for that purpose. To that end, these bylaws have been written to assure continual Riverside representation on systemwide committees by designating the role of the Chair and Vice Chair as members of the UCCC (University Committee on Computing and Communications) and UCOLASC (University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communications).
A minor point of housekeeping is to correct the current bylaw reference to a UC committee which no longer exists (University Committee on Information Technology and Telecommunications Policy).

Approvals

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Bylaw is effective upon approval

--------------------------------------------------------

Approved by the Committee on Academic Computing & Info Tech: did not approve
Approved by the Committee on Library & Scholarly Communications: did not approve
Approved by the Committee on Faculty Welfare: May 3, 2013
Approved by Committee on Committees: April 25, 2013

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: May 3, 2013

Received by Executive Council:
May 3, 2013

To: Jose Wudka, Chair
Riverside Division

From: Mariam Lam, Chair
Committee on Committees

Re: Proposal to Merge the Committee on Academic Computing and Information Technology with the Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication

Dear Jose:

Our committee has met and reviewed the proposed changes for the combining of the Academic Computing and Information Technology with the Library and Scholarly Communication committees. We approve of the change for the following reasons.

While there has been some speculation that combining the committees would diminish the individual work of the two committees in question, we find that the combination would actually add the technology and computing concerns to the charge of the library and scholarly communication issues, and make for better staffing of both committees, two committees that will become more important in the years ahead as they share concerns regarding the issues of on-line education, open access and uses of technology. These are all of great interest, or should be, to the libraries and academic computing and information technology centers on campus, so it would seem to be in our best interest to have one strong, collective voice that has weighed the issues together, rather than less assertive disparate voices with regard to both divisional and systemwide interests. In the case of academic computing, the change will increase the committee’s activity by combining its efforts with a related committee that is somewhat more active.

The combination of these committees will also reduce the burden on committee members (combined committees will allow for assignment of staff support which will reduce the administrative burden of the committee, especially the chairs).

There also seems to be some misinformation circulating that this process is intended to legislate particular committees out of existence. While UCCC has only met once this year and has been cited as a somewhat dysfunctional committee by the Chair of the divisional Committee on Library and Scholarly Communications, this legislation to combine committees does not discontinue or diminish any work affiliated with either committee. This does not change any divisional representation at the Systemwide level, such as on UCOLASC.

We also want to point out that 5 campuses already function with a combined committee;
The following campuses either do not have a Computing committee or have a combined Computing and Library committee:

UC Berkeley - Computing & Communications committee has been temporarily suspended by the Division, pending development of a new charge and structure;
UC Irvine - Council on Research, Computing, and Libraries;
UC Merced - No Computing committee;
UC San Francisco - No Computing committee;
UC Santa Barbara - Committee on Library, Information, and Instructional Resources

Further, it has been clear for a while, that there is some significant overlap between the Academic Computing committee and Library when it comes to the provision of IT services to students. Much of what that committee was trying to do (provision of computers, software, computer rooms) was also being done in parallel by members of the staff in the library.

We also remind the combined committee that they can add text to the proposed merged bylaw if they need to assure that no functions are being lost. They can also suggest an alternate name, if they do not feel the merged committee name befits all the important work of that committee.

Finally, we reiterate that this proposed committee combination originated from the Senate office as a whole to try to provide the best support to our committees - that losing staff support to a committee was resulting in less work being done by the committee, in loss of consistency or institutional memory (faculty membership varies from year to year and having dedicated staff support allowed consistency and institutional memory), and in more work for the committees themselves (without staff support, the chair and members will have to coordinate meetings, distribute discussion material, record minutes, write their annual report and record attendance).

In conclusion, we approve of the change, and have no additional questions or concerns at this time. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Mariam Lam, Chair
Committee on Committees
May 9, 2013

To: Jose Wudka, Chair
Riverside Division, Academic Senate

Fr: Gregory Beran, Chair
Committee on Academic Computing and Information Technology

Re: 18 April 2013 Proposal to Merge the Committee on Academic Computing & Information Technology with the Committee on Library & Scholarly Communication

The Committee on Academic Computing and Information Technology has reviewed this proposal and opposed it with a vote of 5 against, 2 in favor, and 1 neutral. Several members were strongly opposed to the proposal.

The committee recognizes the staffing issues faced by the Senate, and there are certainly some areas of overlap between the two committees. The libraries face a number of technology-related issues (open-access publishing, providing computer resources to users, etc), and of course the university librarian sits on both committees as an ex-officio member. Regardless of the outcome of this proposal, we do believe that there should be closer cooperation between the two committees on these issues of common interest.

However, many other issues handled by the two committees are very different and likely attract different faculty members to serve. For instance, the library deals with library budgetary issues, while the Academic Computing committee address issues of both research and instructional computing. In recent years, for example, we have taken a significant role in advising the administration on how student technology fee money should be sent, and this year we ran a new, $200,000 grant program for innovative uses of technology in teaching. Having a committee whose members have significant technological expertise is critical to performing these duties effectively.

Given the number of major issues facing the libraries now and in the near future, there was also serious concern that important issues like the campus research computing environment would receive less attention on the merged committee. Proposed by-law 8.9.1 indicates that the chair of the new committee would focus on library issues while the vice-chair would focus on computing issues, suggesting an implicit downgrading of the importance of the computing issues.
Although the committee as a whole does not support this merger, if it does indeed occur, we request that the new committee name (by-law 8.9) be changed from “Library, Information Technology, and Scholarly Communication” to “Library, Academic Computing, and Scholarly Communication.” The phrase “academic computing” conveys a much broader sense of the important research, teaching, and campus information technology issues our committee handles.

Finally, several committee members were upset by the manner in which the proposal came about: We had no advanced warning that this change was being considered, we were not given the opportunity to work together with the Senate Chair and the Library committee on the proposal, and we were given very little time to respond to a major change in our committee's function. In the future, we hope that major changes like this will be pursued in a more cooperative fashion with the committees involved.
May 2, 2013

To: Jose Wudka, Chair
Riverside Division, Academic Senate

Fr: Joseph Morse, Chair
Committee on Library and Scholarly Communications

Re: April 18, 2013 Proposal to Merge the Committee on Academic Computing & Information Technology with the Committee on Library & Scholarly Communication

The Library and Scholarly Communication Committee has reviewed this proposal and has serious concerns and are strongly opposed.

We see these two committee as having quite different purposes and it seems likely that faculty interested in serving on the two committees would seldom overlap. Also, the library system at UCR faces serious fiscal constraints at present and is likely to continue to face such constraints in the future. We believe it is critical that a faculty Senate committee is available to provide strong support and counsel.

This is a time of considerable transition for libraries both at UCR, Systemwide within the UC, and nationally. There is a great deal of change that is likely to occur with the push towards open access, online courses, digital textbooks, etc. It is unclear how open access will be implemented and given the rapid changes libraries face at UCR, this seems like the wrong time to merge the committees, in particular with our hiring a new University Librarian in 2013.

This proposal was discussed at the April 26, 2013 UCOLASC (University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication) meeting and that committee thought it made very little sense – this was their strong consensus (with no voiced support of this change).

At the Systemwide level, UCOLASC is very active (3 meetings in Oakland per year, taking up a full day each; substantial additional online activity) and this is likely to continue for the near future with all of the changes that libraries face. UCOLASC is a quite functional committee whereas the Systemwide UCCC (University Committee on Computing and Communications) is considered by most to be dysfunctional and only recently has become somewhat active following a failed proposal considered by the Assembly last year to do away with this committee.