UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE

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

CHAIR, ACADEMIC SENATE
RIVERSIDE DIVISION
UNIVERSITY OFFICE BUILDING, RM 225

DYLAN RODRIGUEZ
PROFESSOR OF ETHNIC STUDIES
RIVERSIDE, CA 92521-0217
TEL: (951) 827-6193
EMAIL: DYLAN.RODRIGUEZ@UCR.EDU

June 28, 2017

Jim Chalfant, Chair, Academic Council
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200

RE: (Systemwide Review) Draft Revised Presidential Policy on Electronic Information Security (IS-3)

Dear Jim,

Relevant committees from the UCR Division of the Academic Senate, along with its Executive Council, discussed the Draft Revised Presidential Policy IS-3. Some significant concerns were expressed in the review.

The Committee on Library and Information Technology (LIT) expressed strong concern that it was not afforded adequate time to more thoroughly review the draft policy. It nonetheless raised several serious issues for consideration. The length of the document is onerous, and the content of the policy is inaccessible to a general faculty readership. The committee suggests the need for a document that is composed of sections directed toward particular groups of constituents/readers. Regarding matters directly affecting faculty, a number of problems were raised: section 1.2.1 does not define "serious violations;" the implementation of financial liability for failures of compliance are not defined; and more generally, the document reads as a legal one rather than a faculty-directed one. It requires thorough revision/rewriting.

Executive Council discussed the draft policy and echoed the concern about the short timeline for review, while anticipating that an opportunity for more substantive review on a future draft will possible produce a greater range and depth of comments than was provided in this round of consultation. Council supports the Committee on LIT's evaluative comments and preliminary suggestions.

The Committee on Faculty Welfare did not add anything substantial, and the Committee on Research chose not to offer an opinion.

Sincerely yours,

Dylan Rodríguez
Professor of Ethnic Studies and Chair of the Riverside Division

CC: Hilary Baxter, Executive Director of the Academic Senate
        Cherysa Cortez, Executive Director of UCR Academic Senate Office

June 14, 2017

To: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair
        Riverside Division

From: Leonard Nunney
        Committee on Library and Information Technology

Re: [Systemwide Review] Proposed Revised Policy: Draft Revised Presidential Policy
        on Electronic Information Security (IS-3)

The Committee on Library and Information Technology reviewed the [Systemwide Review] Proposed Revised Policy: Draft Revised Presidential Policy on Electronic Information Security (IS-3) at their June 6, 2017 meeting. We would have liked more time to deliberate on this policy document; however, some concerns were immediately apparent.

Our most obvious concern is the length of the document. It is positively encyclopedic and yet presented in a form that makes it very difficult (if not impossible) for faculty to identify pertinent information. Faculty appear to be defined under the very non-specific terms of "Unit Head" and "Workforce Manager", both of which appear to encompass a huge range of positions (in addition to faculty) that have very different perspectives and responsibilities.

We would suggest preparing a document with sections focused on different groups rather than attempting (and largely failing) to have complete generality. For example, it would be more effective if the policy clearly distinguishes faculty from the various levels of administrator, and those faculty with sensitive data (i.e. P3 and P4 information) from those who do not (i.e. only P1 and P2 information).

A number of very important issues potentially affecting faculty are glossed over. For example, it is noted in section 1.2.1 that there may be sanctions against faculty and student for "serious violations" of the policy, but the actions that constitute "serious violation" never appear to be defined. Moreover, it is stated that a Unit will bear the cost of a "significant failure to comply" (section 1.2.2). Does this mean the faculty grants or faculty individually are financially liable for any problems that occur regarding a

laboratory or office computer? Again, this issue is never expanded beyond the simple statement of potential liability.

In summary, this Policy is written as a legal document rather than a document that faculty can refer to in order to understand best practices. As such, it should be substantially revised and rewritten.

UCRIVERSIDE | Academic Senate

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

June 13, 2017

To: Dylan Rodriguez
               Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Victor Lippit, Chair
               Committee on Faculty Welfare

Re: Draft Revised Presidential Policy on Electronic Information Security (IS-3)

The Committee on Faculty Welfare considered the draft Presidential Policy on Electronic Information Security, but does not have any substantial comments to add.

June 1, 2017

To: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair
        Riverside Division

From: Richard Arnott, Chair
        Committee on Research

RE: Systemwide Review: [Proposed Revised Policy] Draft Revised Presidential Policy on Electronic Information Security (IS-3)

The Committee on Research reviewed the revised proposal and has chosen not to opine.