UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, ACADEMIC SENATE

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO   SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC COMPUTING
AND COMMUNICATIONS (UCACC)
Christine L. Borgman, Chair
christine.borgman@ucla.edu

ACADEMIC SENATE
University of California
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607

March 15, 2018

TO: Shane White, Academic Council Chair, and Robert May, Academic Council Vice Chair

FROM: Christine L. Borgman, UCACC Chair

RE: **UCACC Recommendations to Academic Senate on IT Governance at the Campus Level**

Overview

The University Committee on Academic Computing and Communications (UCACC) has a broad
remit to advise the Senate and the University administration on matters related to academic
computing and communications. The committee has successfully engaged systemwide leadership
of both the Senate and the administration in its discussions. The UCACC Chair and Vice Chair
meet regularly with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Senate, and with UC CIO Tom Andriola.
UCACC now has two seats on the Cyber Risk Governance Committee (UCACC Chair and Vice
Chair), plus the Senate has a third standing seat at CRGC. Other Senate members are on the
advisory board to the CRGC and attend alternate meetings of that body. Since UCACC was
inaugurated in 2015, we have made substantial progress in expanding communication between the
Senate and IT leadership at the systemwide level.

While continuing to address cyber risk, teaching and learning, privacy, data governance, and other
continuing technology issues, the committee has turned its attention to IT governance at the
campus level. In regular reports from UCACC members, it became apparent that faculty
engagement with campus IT governance varies widely. An appendix to this memo summarizes
the current IT governance models at each campus.

This memo summarizes our discussions over the course of 2016-17 and 2017-18 and makes
recommendations for Senate engagement in joint governance of information technology strategy,
planning, policy, and implementation at the campus level. We request that the Academic Council
endorse these recommendations and disseminate them to Divisional Senates.

General Concerns for IT Governance

Frequent shifts in IT policy and practice, including the increase in cyber risk, pose many challenges for IT governance. Standing committees that meet a few times per year have the benefit of deliberative processes, informed decision making, consensus building, and institutional memory, but these processes can be slow and tend to favor generic over specific expertise. Specialized task forces, working groups, and advisory committees to address pressing issues such as cyber-attacks and online courses have proliferated in the last several years. While these committees may be effective individually, the overall structure risks duplicating effort, conflicting decisions, and lack of integration with larger IT planning and policy efforts. At least half a dozen systemwide and campus committees now focus on online teaching, instructional technology, educational technology, and IT accessibility, for example. The cumulative effect of small, seemingly isolated policy decisions decreases the overall productivity and negatively impacts the faculty.

The Senate and IT leadership must work together to balance rapid action in response to IT crises with thoughtful, deliberative decision-making on critical issues that affect the mission of the university. IT issues concern all stakeholders in the UC system, given the integration of technology into teaching, research, healthcare, and public service. UCACC seeks operational approaches to governance that address the missions of the university most effectively.

While some campuses have active Senate-led committees on IT management, policy, or strategy, other campuses have minimal Senate involvement in governing information technology. In other cases, academic computing issues get short shrift because concerns are scattered across multiple committees, none of which devote sufficient attention to take substantive action.

Cyber risk generally, and the FireEye software implementation in particular, are of immediate concern to faculty, given the complex interactions between privacy, surveillance, and security. Privacy and data governance are also areas in which UCACC has encountered a range of concerns by Senate faculty. The UCOP Privacy and Information Security Initiative (PISI) ("UCOP Privacy and Information Security Initiative," 2013) was successful at appointing Chief Privacy Officers at all campuses, for example, but their degree of involvement with Divisional Senates varies widely.

UCACC has encouraged its members to work directly with campus administrators to obtain more information, and to pursue more substantive joint governance of academic computing and communications.

Recommendations to UC Divisional Senates

As technology plays an increasingly influential role in the university, Senate and administrative relationships in governance are crucial, including Senate representation in IT governance at the campus and systemwide levels. Governance is a two-way street. Faculty must make their presence

known to administrators and demonstrate commitment. Divisional Senates and standing committees should reach out to campus IT leadership, including privacy or information security officers, to include them in discussions with faculty. Conversely, IT leadership should reach out to Senate leadership to identify appropriate models for joint governance at their campuses, and to maintain continuing relationships with individual faculty and governing bodies.

No single model for IT governance will be suitable for all UC campuses. Rather, we recommend that Divisional Senates focus on how to manage new challenges in IT infrastructure and technology using these criteria:

- Establish standing boards or committees for IT governance that balance representation by Senate faculty and university leaders with the goal of building robust communication channels and institutional memory. Appointing a chair from the Academic Senate is preferable. The faculty chair of the IT committee should have either a seat on the Executive Council or another direct line of communication with the Division Chair.

- When broad deliberation of urgent problems cannot be accomplished in a timely manner, consider appointing ad hoc committees or task forces with specialized expertise. To avoid duplicating effort and lack of communication, establish reporting lines to Senate and Administration bodies as part of their charge.

- Build partnerships between Senate faculty and IT staff at every level of the university to promote communication and trust that reflects the mutual concerns of stakeholders.

- Focus governance mechanisms on *how* to implement information technologies rather than on *what* technologies to implement, thus increasing stakeholder involvement.

- Focus governance of IT planning and implementation on continuous, mission-driven engagement rather than on reviews late in an implementation cycle.

References

UCLA Board on Privacy and Data Protection. (2017). [2017]. Retrieved October 30, 2017, from http://privacyboard.ucla.edu/
UCLA Data Governance Task Force. (2016). *UCLA Data Governance Task Force Final Report and Recommendations* (pp. 1–41).
UCLA Information Technology Planning Board. (2017). Retrieved October 30, 2017, from http://www.itpb.ucla.edu/
UCOP Privacy and Information Security Initiative. (2013). Retrieved November 18, 2016, from http://ucop.edu/privacy-initiative/