


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.