EXECUTIVE COUNCIL
Davis Division of the Academic Senate
Thursday, June 16, 2016
1:10 PM to 3:00 PM
1003 Kemper Hall

Agenda Items

REVISED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:10-2:00</td>
<td>Acting Chancellor Ralph Hexter Update</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00-2:05</td>
<td>Meeting Summary Review/Approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:05-2:25</td>
<td>Chair’s Update</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Special Committee on Search Waivers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fall Undergraduate Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• UC Davis Priority Registration Criteria and Procedure (posted on whiteboard)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Academic Integrity Workgroup Update</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pilot #2 Prerequisite Checking Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:25-2:35</td>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics Update</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Special Committee on Athletics Report Recommendations Follow-up (posted on whiteboard)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 2016 Athletics Performance Report – response from Undergraduate Council and Committee on Admissions and Enrollment (posted on whiteboard)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:35-2:45</td>
<td>Admissions and Enrollment Report – Rena Zieve</td>
<td>2-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Academic Senate Involvement in Transfer Admissions (posted on whiteboard)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45-2:55</td>
<td>CERJ Update – John Hunt</td>
<td>11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Privacy of Student Evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Proposed Revisions to Davis Division Regulation 538</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:55-3:00</td>
<td>New Business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consent Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Letter from COR: Research Core Facilities Program</td>
<td>13-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Response from CIT: BigFix Proposal</td>
<td>15-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Response from CIT: Email For Life</td>
<td>22-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Letter from CIT: Transition to Canvas</td>
<td>26-27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: If unable to attend, please secure an alternate from your committee or organization and notify the Academic Senate Chair of your absence and the alternate’s name.
June 3, 2016

André Knoesen, Chair  
Davis Division of the Academic Senate

Re: Departmental Input on Transfers Admissions

Dear Chair Knoesen,

In 2015-2016, the Committee on Admissions and Enrollment culminated a two year long review of transfer admissions and discussed possible options on how to increase departmental involvement in this process. By comparison to the holistic review procedures established in 2012 for freshman applicants, the transfer admissions process is far less refined. The more elaborate procedure for reviewing freshman applications is natural. However, selectivity at the transfer level is increasing, which calls for a corresponding increase in attention to how these students are selected.

As a result of these discussions, the Committee has drafted the enclosed outline identifying how departments could provide direct input during the transfer admissions process as well as proposing a possible standardization of the selective major review process. The Committee welcomes your input on this document and the next steps the committee should take in the consultation process.

Sincerely,

Rena Zieve, Chair  
Committee on Admissions and Enrollment

Enclosure: Outline of Departmental Input in Transfer Admissions

Cc: Edwin Arevalo, Executive Director, Davis Division of the Academic Senate
Over the past two years, the Academic Senate Committee on Admissions and Enrollment (CAE) has explored transfer admissions procedures. By comparison to the holistic review procedures established in 2012 for freshman applicants, the transfer admissions process is far less refined. The more elaborate procedure for reviewing freshman applications is natural. Predicting how well freshman applicants will succeed at Davis is much more difficult than assessing the chance of success for students who have already completed two years of college. In addition, the campus as a whole has more selective admissions at the freshman level; in 2015 we accepted 53% of transfer applicants but only 38% of freshman applicants. However, selectivity at the transfer level is increasing, which calls for a corresponding increase in attention to how these students are selected.

A first difficulty in even discussing admissions issues is that several units lack official policies. Current transfer admissions practices also vary widely among colleges. We summarize the current situation and later make recommendations for adopting a more uniform framework for admissions policies. In all cases, Undergraduate Admissions (UA) evaluates whether an applicant satisfies certain general coursework and GPA requirements for transfer eligibility, according to UC-wide and UC Davis campus rules. College or departments may impose additional requirements through Selective Major Review, as follows.

**College of Biological Sciences:**
The College of Biological Sciences (CBS) carries out Selective Major Review, requiring that students complete certain classes with sufficiently high grades before transfer. College-level staff verify that applicants meet the college criteria. Students who meet the college, campus, and systemwide requirements are then admitted based on highest overall GPA, independent of their planned major with CBS.

**College of Engineering:**
All departments in the College of Engineering (COE) also have Selective Major Review, but the exact requirements vary among majors and the selection major is carried out at the department level. The entire college also requires a minimum GPA of 3.1 for transfer eligibility, as opposed to the general campus minimum of 2.8 for community college transfers. Each major in COE has a separate admissions target, which is filled by its applicants with highest overall GPA who also meet the selective major, UC Davis campus, and overall UC eligibility requirements.

**College of Letters and Science (L&S) and the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (CA&ES):**
The College of Letters and Science (L&S) and the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (CA&ES) follow policy initially approved by the faculty in the College of Letters and Science in May 1984 and revised in July 1997. Under this policy, a major may only impose academic selective review criteria for admission or place a cap on enrollment if it lacks sufficient resources for the total workload created by its students. Hence a few majors in each college carry out Selective Major Review, but the vast majority do not. For those majors, the department reviews for selective major
criteria. After identifying the pool of transfer applicants who meet campus and UC requirements, as well as selective major requirements if applicable, students are ranked for admission by overall GPA. CA&ES has a single college-wide admissions target, while L&S has a target for each of its three divisions. Within the college or division, an applicant's proposed major usually is not considered at this stage, whether or not that major has Selective Major Review. The one exception is Computer Science, which does have a separate enrollment target from the rest of the Division of Mathematics and Physical Sciences.

CAE notes that there are two distinct reasons for a major to restrict its admissions. The first is resource-based, where a major cannot serve all the students who request it because of limitations in faculty, teaching assistants, lab space, etc. The second is academically motivated, where transfer students without appropriate preparation are unlikely to succeed in the major and graduate in the normative two years. Present admissions policies sometimes conflate the two. For example, in L&S, a department with resource limitations on its number of majors sets academic requirements to restrict its influx of transfer students but may or may not have an explicit numerical cap, while a department without resource limitations has no recourse against accepting students who have not completed core lower division courses in the major or whose performance in those courses bodes ill for their success in the major. The following policy is intended to enable any department with specific concerns about transfer student preparation to have a say in the standards of transfer admission to its program, through a coherent, campus-wide practice. Given the increasing emphasis on eliminating obstacles to completing a degree in a timely manner, it seems logical to create clear, major-specific expectations for transfer students that will foster their success at UC Davis.

Academic considerations clearly fall within the purview of the Academic Senate. By contrast, resource issues are coupled to external factors, from budget realities to campus enrollment targets determined by UCOP to the goal of enrolling a broadly comprehensive and diverse student population. Available resources partly determine how students are distributed among departments, but department-level input on the chance for success of its admitted students is also important. For departments that opt to use Selective Major Review, the selection criteria indicate the desired qualifications, which should be taken into account when enrollment targets are set.

The specific recommendations of CAE are based on these guiding principles.

A) Problems of resource limitation should be addressed through numerical enrollment targets rather than Selective Major requirements for lower-division courses and GPA. Problems of academic preparation should be addressed through Selective Major requirements.

B) Any required academic preparation of transfer students should aim at ensuring student success and removing impediments to graduation within two years. Academic departments should have the primary voice in establishing appropriate academic requirements for their transfer applicants.
C) If a department wishes to participate in Selective Major Review, then either that department or its division or college must provide much of the extra labor through staff who will be trained by UA. These staff must be able to do the review on a short timeline and to meet the critical, inflexible deadlines that allow UA time to evaluate the transfer applications for the campus and UC requirements.

D) Selective Major requirements should be kept as straightforward as possible, so that community college students know exactly what is expected of them. Ideally the Selective Major criteria for a given major will be a list of lower division courses that should be completed before transfer; optional performance benchmarks for highest-priority consideration, such as minimum grades in individual courses, grade-point averages in groups of courses, or overall GPA in transferable coursework; and encouragement that higher grades will make the application stronger.

E) If possible, the process of setting campus enrollment targets should not become more complicated. However, the campuswide decisions on enrollment targets for the colleges and divisions should take Selective Major criteria into consideration, particularly as related to depth of pool assessments for various units.

CAE makes the following recommendations:

1. Any major, with approval from its division or college, should be able to institute course requirements for transfer admission through Selective Major Review. Both the unit's faculty committee (Faculty Executive Committee for CBS, COE, and CA&ES; Faculty Steering Committee for L&S divisions) and the academic dean of the unit should approve the request. The following restrictions should apply.

   a) The major, or its division or college, must be willing to provide staff who will be trained by UA and who can carry out the work of evaluating the applicants within the short time frame required. The Selective Major Review must meet critical UA deadlines to allow ample time to complete the campus and UC eligibility review and meet the notification time frame.

   b) No major may include in Selective Major Review any course not included in that major's requirements for graduation.

   c) No major that is part of a UC-wide Transfer Pathway may include in Selective Major Review any course not included in the Transfer Pathway.

   d) Selective Major Review should not include strict requirements for minimum grades. Desired grades can instead be incorporated into the ranking of otherwise eligible students. Appendix A gives an example.

   e) Majors opting for Selective Major Review should use the least restrictive requirements consistent with student success at UC Davis.
2. In implementing Selective Major Review, departments must waive specific course requirements for students who are unable to take a class because their college does not offer it.

3. With approval from the academic dean of the division or college, any major that participates in Selective Major Review should be allowed to use grades in the courses required for transfer for all or part of the admissions ranking, rather than using only the overall transfer GPA. Any ranking scheme must be designed so that it does not penalize applicants who are unable to take a class because their college does not offer it.

4. To send a clear message to potential transfer students on how to prepare for admission, additional selection criteria, such as completion of further “recommended” courses or general rigor of the student's coursework, should not be considered in the admissions process.

5. Any major with Selective Major Review for transfer admissions should also articulate a policy for on-campus transfers into the major. There should be coherent treatment of external and internal transfers. Careful examination of internal transfer issues by Undergraduate Council may be helpful.

6. Undergraduate Admissions should provide the Committee on Admissions and Enrollment regular summaries of the impact of Selective Major Review on diversity. This should initially occur every two years, but the Committee on Admissions and Enrollment can request a change in timing. For each unit carrying out Selective Major Review, the percentages of underrepresented minorities, first-generation college students, low-income students, and women among admitted transfer students should be compared to their representation among the transfer applicants. If there are significant differences, CAE should work with the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (AAD) to explore why they arise and to search for ways of ensuring access to UC Davis for all Californians. CAE and AAD should also bring the data to the attention of the affected departments.

7. If available resources limit the number of students an individual department can teach, then the enrollment caps should be used to control the number of entering students, independent of whether the department participates in Selective Major Review. At the request of an individual department or of the faculty committee for a college or division (Faculty Executive Committee for CBS, COE, and CA&ES; Faculty Steering Committee for L&S divisions), the academic dean of a college or division should be able to subdivide the unit’s overall enrollment target by placing a cap on admits to that department. Keeping the decision to subdivide with the deans avoids complicating the current process of setting enrollment targets for different units at the campus level.
Appendix A

One college with Selective Major Review presently requires an overall transfer GPA of at least 2.8; courses equivalent to Math 17ABC or 21AB with average GPA of at least 2.5; courses equivalent to Chemistry 2ABC with average GPA of at least 2.5; and courses equivalent to Biological Sciences 2ABC with average GPA of at least 2.5.

One possible translation of the above criteria to the form proposed here would be to place all applicants who meet these requirements in a “priority admission” pool. As long as this pool is large enough to meet the enrollment targets, the admissions results are identical to those of the current practice. If the priority admission pool is too small to meet the enrollment targets, then additional students may need to be selected from among those who did not meet all of the priority admission requirements. The choice between dropping below enrollment targets and admitting less qualified students can be negotiated with Undergraduate Admissions and Budget and Institutional Analysis. A mismatch between the size of the priority admission pool and the enrollment targets indicates a possible need for revision of the enrollment targets in future years.
Appendix B: Committee on Admissions and Enrollment – Relevant Terms and Definitions

Admission by Major:
The process of admitting by major is determined by established major enrollment targets (e.g., there are some areas in the College of Engineering that have enrollment targets set at the freshman and transfer level by a specific major).

Impacted Major:
Historically, impacted major has implied an imbalance between enrollments in and resources of a program. Declaring a major impacted restricts admissions helping to alleviate the strain on the program.

A declaration of impacted status is connected with a change, typically through additional courses to be completed and/or a higher minimum GPA, in the major requirements. An impacted major does not necessarily have admission by major.

According to CERJ advice rendered in February 2012 regarding impacted majors, declarations of impacted majors have been the province of the college and should be reported to the Undergraduate Council.

Selective Admissions:
UC Davis is a selective campus given that we receive far more freshman and transfer levels applications than respective available enrollment spaces. Selective Admissions is a process to select freshman and transfer applicants to determine who will receive an admission offer. Determination is made after applicant reviews and evaluations, and after Undergraduate Admissions analysis to determine the number of freshman and transfer admit offers to be made that will yield the campus desired enrollment targets. Enrollment targets may be established by college, discipline, department and major, thus admission will follow that pattern.

Selective Admissions Criteria or Selective Criteria or Selective Major Requirements:
Additional criteria (i.e. higher GPA and/or additional coursework) required by certain majors to be eligible for transfer. Currently, selective admissions criteria can only be implemented for majors that have been declared impacted.
https://www.ucdavis.edu/admissions/undergraduate/transfer/selective-major-requirements

Selective Major:
The majors that require an applicant to complete additional coursework and/or earn a higher GPA to be eligible for transfer. E.g.
Selective Major Review (SMR)\(^1\) or Selective Review:
An online review process for transfer applications whereby the academic department or college initially reviews transfer applications for completion of specific major criteria (selective criteria) such as lower division major course work or course series completion, technical course GPA, course or series grades and/or grade-point average. The department provides their recommendation for admission consideration (Yes, No or Maybe) depending on whether the applicant has met the established lower division selective major criteria, as well as provides comments and/or lists missing course work and/or academic deficiencies. Once the SMR is reviewed, the file is given a final evaluation review by Undergraduate Admissions to determine if the “Yes” Recommended applicant meets UC admission eligibility requirements and any other campus imposed requirements such as overall grade-point average minimum. Undergraduate Admissions also checks to ensure that many applications marked “No” includes comments as to missing course work and/or academic deficiencies.

\(^1\) Selective Review should not be confused with Holistic Review, which is a freshman UC Comprehensive Review process which utilizes 14 faculty approved academic and non-academic criteria to complete an assessment through a Holistic Review (HR) methodology. Comprehensive Review is defined by the Board of Admissions & Relations with Schools (BOARS), as “the process by which students [applicants] are evaluated for admission using multiple measures of achievement and promise while considering the context in which each student has demonstrated academic accomplishment.”
Appendix C: Committee on Admissions and Enrollment Relevant Terms and Definitions - Research on Impacted Major

1. Definition: In 2009, the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) wrote a white paper on impacted majors at UC. According to the report, “a simple definition of an impacted major is a situation where resources are insufficient to handle the total workload. Total workload is the product of the number of students times the work required for each student.”

2. How Majors Gain Impacted Status at UC Davis: According to guidelines approved at the L&S Assembly 5/15/84 and revised July 1997, the following represents guidelines for impacted majors to attain impacted status within the College of Letters and Science (L&S) at UC Davis. Other Colleges likely have their own procedures for establishing and disestablishing impacted majors.

The Department or Program Committee may request a major to be declared impacted. It is then the L&S Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) in consultation with the Dean that declares a major to be impacted. Once impacted status has been approved, the Department or Program Committee, in consultation with the Director of Admissions, develops criteria for admission to the major and the campus adequate to insure that the enrollment targets will be met. These criteria will be promptly reported to the L&S Faculty Executive Committee. Criteria for evaluating petitions for transfer into the major by UCD students will also be proposed by the Department or Program Committee for Executive Committee approval. The Department or Program Committees administering impacted majors must report annually to the L&S Faculty Executive Committee on the operations of the major, including the effect of admissions criteria on student affirmative action, and any suggestions for change in admissions criteria. According to the guidelines approved by the L&S Assembly, “Any restrictions on entry into a major will be removed as soon as it is no longer impacted, as determined by the Executive Committee in consultation with the Dean.”

3. According to CERJ advice rendered in February 2012 regarding impacted majors, declarations of impacted majors should be reported to the Undergraduate Council, given its broad charge to “establish policy for undergraduate education. (http://academicsenate.ucdavis.edu /committees/committee-list/cerj/advice/2011-2012/Impacted%20Majors.pdf)
PROPOSED REVISION OF DAVIS DIVISION REGULATION 538:  
Examinations  
June 16, 2016

Submitted by the Committee on Courses of Instruction

Rationale: We propose to remove any restrictions on the use of take-home exams in on-line (including hybrid) courses. The stated rationale for the current regulation, which requires that all examinations in on-line courses be proctored, is “to ensure that the person taking the examination is the student receiving credit,” but this is not logical, as there is no way to verify that any take-home exam is completed by the student enrolled in a course, whether that course is face-to-face, hybrid, or online. Moreover, this is also a potential concern for in-person exams unless proof of identification is always required, and it certainly applies to all assignments completed by students outside of class, such as papers and projects, which often constitute a significant portion of a student’s grade. Thus, unless we require that, in all courses (not just online), some minimum percentage of the grade must be based on in-person proctored exams at which each student must present proof of identification, we cannot eliminate the possibility that some students’ final grades will be based primarily on work that is not their own. We believe it should be left to the discretion of the individual instructor to decide how to address those concerns, and if take-home exams are considered a viable option for face-to-face courses, they should also be considered as such for on-line and hybrid courses. Our proposed revisions also remove some ambiguities in the current regulation (does the term “on-line course” include hybrid courses, and does the term “proctoring” include on-line proctoring?), as well as references to dead days, which will no longer be included in our academic calendar as of fall quarter, 2016.

Proposed Revision: Deletions are indicated by strikeout; additions are in **bold type**.

538. Examinations
(A) Except under certain specified circumstances, Senate Regulation (SR) 772 requires that final examinations be given in all undergraduate courses. Final examinations may be given in graduate courses. (Am. 4/26/82)
(B) At the instructor’s option, a final examination in any course other than an on-line course may be wholly or in part of the take-home type. All examinations for on-line courses must be proctored to ensure that the person taking the examination is the student receiving credit. In accordance with SR 772(A), in undergraduate courses, the writing time of a take-home final examination and an in-class final examination together may not exceed three hours. (Am. 5/4/04)  (Am. 9/1/2015)
(C) In each course for which a final examination is required, each student shall have the right to take a final examination (or, when the instructor has so opted, to submit a take-home examination) at the time and on the date published in the Class Search Tool. For on-line courses, the University Registrar will offer to the instructor of each on-line class the option to have the final in any of the TBA slots or at a time on dead day to be negotiated between the University Registrar and the instructor. **Additional options for administration of final exams in on-line courses include the use of testing centers, on-line proctoring services, and take-home examinations.** Students shall be notified of the time and place of the final on or before the first day of instruction. (Am. 5/4/04) (Am. 9/1/2015)
(D) In each course (other than in an on-line course) for which a midterm examination is required, each student shall have the right to take a midterm examination (or, when the instructor has so
opted, to submit a take-home examination) during one of the scheduled meetings of the class published in the Class Search Tool. (Am. 4/26/82; 5/4/04)

(E) Holding a final or midterm examination (or setting a deadline for submission of a take-home examination) at a time not specified in (C) or (D) requires the mutual consent of the instructor and all students involved in the change (other than in an on-line course). Any student who does not consent in writing to the different time must be permitted to take an examination (and/or submit a take-home examination) at the officially scheduled time. A student who consents in writing to the change of examination time waives the right cited in (C) or (D). (Am. 3/13/95 and effective 9/1/95; 5/4/04)

(F) Any departures from the published examination schedule should be carried out so as not to disadvantage students who are unable to accept the alternative examination schedule. An in-class final examination may not be rescheduled for a date earlier than the first day of final week. The due date for a take-home final examination may not be rescheduled for a date earlier than the first day of finals week. In the case of on-line courses, the published examination schedule is that announced no later than the first day of class in accordance with 538(C), and finals may be scheduled or rescheduled to occur on dead day. (Am. 10/26/87 and effective 9/1/88) (Am. 3/13/95 and effective 9/1/95; 5/4/04)
June 10, 2016

Harris Lewin, Vice Chancellor for Research  
UC Davis

Dear Harris,

I am writing at the request of the Academic Senate Committee on Research, of which I am chair, to urge you and other UC Davis leadership to continue the excellent progress that has been made on the Research Core Advisory Committee and Research Core Facilities Program. In fact, COR sees strong reasons why the work of, and funding for, that program should be expanded.

Under the leadership of Klaus Van Benthem and Julie Auger, the Program is off to an excellent start. COR notes the following accomplishments:

- They have created an entire program and infrastructure which serves to make valuable resources even more available for faculty and students and make professionalization of the management of those resources a priority.
- They have engaged with UC faculty, Academic Senate, and COR on every step of the process, not only by keeping us informed but also by engaging in true discussion and where necessary, accommodation to any concerns from the faculty.
- They have created a designation for a Core Facility to be a facility of excellence, and the definition of this designation was not an easy task. Now that it is in place and the first round of facilities has been fully evaluated, the level of professionalism, equitable access, staffing, recharge rate transparency, planning, and user training that the excellent facilities offer can serve as a model for other aspiring Core Facilities. In many cases, the Program can help transfer best practices from an excellent Core to an aspiring Core.
- The Program has undertaken review of its first set of funding for Core Facilities.
- They have initiated a web presence and many other resources that the entire campus community can use to improve professionalism and efficiency at any shared use facility.

In reviews of extant cores and those requesting funding, we have all been made aware of how important these resources are to the campus community, and how much service is being done at them. We see how these Cores need to maintain service, equipment, and staff, invest in modernized facilities, and invest in updating services to remain competitive and offer cutting-edge capacity. While they have some sort of recharge, for multiple reasons often recharge for service per se cannot pay for all aspects of a Core Facility. For example, they must keep recharges competitive with other institutions in order to maintain business. In addition, when expanding into new technologies, it would be inappropriate to pad recharge rates for old services in order to acquire equipment and train personnel on its use. Clearly, with much better programmatic oversight, which is now in place, as well as strategic investment, UCD’s Core Facilities can become very strong and efficient.
I cannot overemphasize how important the research faculty feel it is that Core Facilities offer the services and research opportunities that they do, and that the Program has been so deliberate and inclusive of faculty recommendations. I congratulate you and the team on this excellent first year and COR looks forward to a second year of success.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Janet Foley, Chair
Academic Senate Committee on Research
Professor, Veterinary Medicine and Epidemiology

Cc: André Knoesen, Chair, Davis Division of the Academic Senate
    Acting Chancellor Ralph Hexter
    Acting Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor Ken Burtis
    Edwin Arevalo, Executive Director, Davis Division of the Academic Senate
June 13, 2016

Mark Thonen, Project Manager
Office of the CIO

RE: Proposal for Campuswide Implementation of Big Fix

Dear Mark:

The proposed “Campuswide Implementation of BigFix” was forwarded to the Committee on Information Technology (CIT). They recommended 8 changes to the proposal (see attached).

One key recommendation is that the Academic Senate should have membership on the BigFix governance advisory group mentioned in Item 5 of the proposal. The Division strongly concurs with this recommendation.

So long as CIT’s recommendations are accepted, the Davis Division supports the proposal for the implementation of BigFix.

Sincerely,

André Knoesen
Chair, Academic Senate
Professor: Electrical and Computer Engineering

Attachments: CIT Response to BigFix Proposal

c: Matt Bishop, Chair, Committee on Information Technology
    Edwin M. Arevalo, Executive Director, Davis Division of the Academic Senate
André Knoesen, Chair
Academic Senate

Dear André:

The members of the Committee on Information Technology have reviewed the document “Campuswide Implementation of BigFix” that Mr. Thonen sent to the Academic Senate for consultation. We have 8 suggestions, listed following this letter.

We believe that the composition of the BigFix governance advisory group mentioned in the second bullet of item 5 is critical in determining whether the Academic Senate should support this. In particular, if the Senate has membership and influence on the panel, then the members of the Committee would recommend supporting this after the changes below are made.

1. In line 2 of item 1, “and to and to” to “and to” to eliminate the redundancy.

2. In item 2, lines 4-5, change “Using BigFix more broadly will help UC Davis secure its information assets and comply with laws and regulations pertaining to the protection of personal and health information” to “Using BigFix more broadly will help UC Davis administrators, faculty, researchers, and staff secure their information assets and comply with laws and regulations pertaining to the protection of personal and health information”. This changes the impersonal “UC Davis” to emphasize that security is everyone’s concern.

3. Change the first bullet in item 3 from “BigFix allows the campus to respond quickly in the event of a cyberattack, to identify and protect computers that may be vulnerable, and to repair compromised computers” to “BigFix allows campus security officials to respond quickly in the event of a cyberattack, to identify and protect computers that may be vulnerable, and to repair compromised computers”. Again, it eliminates the impersonal.

4. Change item 5, bullet 1, to the following:

   “Will use of the system be mandatory for faculty? BigFix is being adopted as a standard for user system protection at UC Davis, and should be installed on all campus owned and managed desktops and laptops, unless an exception has been approved. Faculty may request an exception by submitting a request to the UC Davis Information Security Office. The reasons include that the faculty member will maintain the computer in compliance with all UC and campus policies and applicable regulations, that the installation of BigFix could compromise the integrity of research, and that BigFix will not run on the endpoint. As an alternative, faculty members may allow the installation of BigFix for reporting purposes only. Additional information about exceptions, including more examples of reasons for those exceptions, can be found in the IT Service Catalog: http://itcatalog.ucdavis.edu/service/bigfix.
Mobile devices, tablets, and servers (e.g. HPC clusters) are not included in the current plans. As noted above, the UCDHS is excluded from the plan.

5. Add the following to the second paragraph of bullet 5 in item 5, “If at all feasible, the owner of the computer will be consulted before software is installed, removed, enabled, or disabled. If not feasible, the owner of the system will be informed of the action and the reason for the action as soon as possible.” This acknowledges the concern of faculty that software incompatible with what is on their system will be installed, while acknowledging that under some circumstances immediate action may be needed to protect the campus and other computers on campus. It also assures faculty that they will be informed whenever a change to software is made on the systems they manage or use.

6. In item 5, bullet 5, paragraph 3, change “can be reported” to “will be reported to the manager of the system on a monthly basis.” This simply assures that the actions taken by BigFix will be reported regularly (as opposed to “can be reported”, which means they may or may not be reported).

7. In item 5, bullet 5, paragraph 5, add “BigFix will not be used to install any software that carries out any of these tasks without the consent of the system manager and without informing the users.” This assures people that monitoring software will not be installed surreptitiously on their systems.

8. To item 5, bullet 6, sub-bullet 1, append “but the implementation of any centralized solution like BigFix makes exercising those rights easier.” This simply acknowledges that centralization (even at the organizational unit level) makes control possible remotely, and hence easier.

We hope this is helpful.

Sincerely,

Matt Bishop, Chair
Subject: UC Davis has selected and purchased BigFix as a campuswide endpoint protection tool to help improve UC Davis’ information security posture and improve IT efficiency. The Provost has directed that BigFix should be installed on every campus owned and managed laptop and desktop as soon as possible.

1. **Background:** BigFix is software that can remotely manage computers. IT professionals use it to identify security vulnerabilities and respond to cyberattacks, and to remotely update and patch vulnerable or old systems and applications. The campus has provided money for 30,000 licenses, including licenses already used on more than 16,000 desktop and laptop computers on campus.

   BigFix is widely used by other University of California campuses, including Berkeley, San Francisco, Irvine, and Santa Cruz.

2. **Why should we do this?** UC Davis is steward of a vast amount of electronic data, including personal and health information. Faculty, staff, students, and postdocs at UC Davis also produce and maintain highly valuable original research data with the expectation that this information will be archived as described in the original research proposals. Using BigFix more broadly will help UC Davis secure its information assets and comply with laws and regulations pertaining to the protection of personal and health information. This requirement applies to the main UC Davis campus; the UC Davis Health System is not included, as they already use tools for health care environments that provide the same functionality as BigFix.

3. **Benefits:**
   - BigFix allows the campus to respond quickly in the event of a cyberattack, to identify and protect computers that may be vulnerable, and to repair compromised computers.
   - For faculty who manage their own computers:
     - BigFix will automatically keep the operating system and much of the application software up to date, without the faculty member needing to manage these updates.
     - Protected computers will comply with cybersecurity requirements.
   - BigFix will enable IT support personnel to improve the service they provide to faculty and staff. Managed systems usually have fewer problems, and IT staff will be able to service more computers more quickly, reducing unproductive time for computer users.
   - BigFix can be used to enable computer users to select and install available licensed software on their own, eliminating the need for an IT service call.
4. **Overall Impact:**

- The overall impact is to improve the campus IT security posture and mitigate the risk associated with cyberattacks, such as lost data, lost productivity, liability, and damage to the university's reputation.

5. **Faculty Impact Analysis:**

   o **Will use of the system be mandatory for faculty?** BigFix is being adopted as a standard for user system protection at UC Davis, and should be installed on all campus owned and managed desktops and laptops, unless an exemption has been approved. Faculty may request an exception by submitting a request to the UC Davis Information Security Office. Additional information about exceptions can be found in the IT Service Catalog: [http://itcatalog.ucdavis.edu/service/bigfix](http://itcatalog.ucdavis.edu/service/bigfix).

   Mobile devices, tablets, and servers (e.g. HPC clusters) are not included in the current plans. As noted above, the UCDHS is excluded from the plan.

   o **How will the use of BigFix be governed?**

      Now that BigFix has been adopted as a campuswide tool, it is necessary to provide more transparency and formality to the governance process. In consultation with Academic Senate representatives and technical stakeholders, standards and procedures pertaining to the use of BigFix will be developed including what can and cannot be done with BigFix, consultation prior to taking actions with BigFix, and reporting on administrator activities. A BigFix governance advisory group will be convened in March 2016.

   o **Will there be any costs incurred by faculty for using the system?** No. The cost of BigFix licenses is centrally funded, and there will be no additional charge for IT support for BigFix.

   o **To what extent will the system make demands on faculty time or impose unexpected obligations?** The initial installation of BigFix should take several minutes. Faculty can work with their department IT administrator, or choose a self-service website to install the BigFix software on appropriate laptop and desktop computers.

   o **What impacts or considerations are involved concerning privacy and security?**

      Installation of BigFix will improve the university’s ability to protect the privacy and security of information assets, such as personal and health information, sensitive and confidential information, and highly valuable original research.
Campuswide Implementation of BigFix

Installing the BigFix agent on a computer allows the administrators of BigFix to perform any administrative functions on that computer. Activities that IT administrators currently perform in person, can be performed remotely by a BigFix administrator, for example, installing security patches, updating configuration files or registries, and installing or removing software.

The BigFix service has campus administrators and local IT staff who are designated BigFix administrators for their subset of computers. This delegated administration model is similar to the way other enterprise services (such as Active Directory) are currently run. As with the campus Active Directory service, BigFix service administrators do not perform actions on computers for which they are not responsible. As an added safeguard, all administrator actions performed in BigFix are logged and can be reported.

BigFix does not make changes or install additional software or files on computers unless an administrator directs it to. Patches go through multiple quality assurance processes. They are tested by software companies (e.g. Microsoft, Apple, Adobe), then they are tested and repackaged by IBM for distribution using BigFix. Additional quality assurance steps are taken by UC Davis BigFix administrators to test patches on small groups of computers before wide distribution. Local IT staff determine when to use BigFix to apply the patches, and BigFix reports back on the success or failure of an attempted patch. This methodology is in place and working well for the thousands of UC Davis computers that already run BigFix.

BigFix does not monitor network traffic or user activities on the computer. It does not allow administrators to view or collect other data such as email, research, or student data.

BigFix does allow administrators and select professionals in the Information Security Office to monitor configurations of computers, including the patch level of operating systems and software packages, and security settings (e.g., if a local firewall is enabled). This allows them to assess compliance with campus policies, such as the UC Davis Cyber-Safety Program (PPM 310-22) that help protect our privacy and security. BigFix also allows IT and Information Security professionals to be more proactive during security incidents, by helping them quickly determine our vulnerability to specific exploits.

- **What are the regulatory requirements, including HIPAA, FERPA, FISMA and/or ITAR?** Various regulations have requirements related to information security and privacy. BigFix will help UC Davis identify risks, vulnerabilities and compliance problems, mitigate issues, meet reporting requirements, and respond to audits as needed.
- **What are the impacts on intellectual property and copyrights?** Use of BigFix does not alter any previously established agreements between faculty and UC Davis.
  - **Who owns the material stored/shared?** Implementation of BigFix does not change the existing ownership of any faculty data.
  - **Do these services adequately protect Intellectual Property, including copyrights, patent rights, and/or trademark rights?** BigFix will not create any new opportunity for IP to be exposed or alter any previously established agreements or rights over IP.
Campuswide Implementation of BigFix

- **How long is the service active?** Licenses are for a three-year term. See below, "How long will this technology last?"
- **What are the downsides?**
  - Some departments have already invested in other software that performs a similar function to BigFix. Department leadership, with input from IT professional and security experts, will need to determine whether to maintain their current software in addition to BigFix, or transition out of their legacy endpoint management solution.
- **How long will this technology last?** BigFix is a mature, industry-leading product for desktop and laptop protection. It has been in the market (under different names) as an enterprise level tool since 2002. In 2011, BigFix was acquired by IBM. Software companies are constantly investing in and evolving their products to remain current with other technology changes. We expect the technology to receive regular upgrades. BigFix will remain active until replaced or no longer offered by the vendor.
- **Is it inter-operable with similar services?**
  - BigFix can co-exist with other protection software, so departments would have time to fully transition from a legacy solution to BigFix, if desired.
  - BigFix can interface with other campus software. For example, an interface has been developed between the Service Now Asset Management module and BigFix, allowing the campus to better track and manage its physical inventory of computer equipment.
- **Has a copy of any applicable contracts been shared with CIT?**
  - BigFix is licensed under the UCOP level agreement with IBM.
- **Who should be contacted for service support?** Contact IT Express at ithelp@ucdavis.edu or (530) 754-4357
- **Where can more information, including this analysis, be found via a website?** Additional information can be found in the IT Service Catalog: [http://itcatalog.ucdavis.edu/service/bigfix](http://itcatalog.ucdavis.edu/service/bigfix).

6. **When will this system, service, or change be available?** BigFix is available now.

7. **When will this be in effect?** The requirement to manage campus computers with BigFix went into effect as of January 1, 2016. The campus wants to install as many new licenses as possible by the end of March 2016 in order to apply for an energy rebate available through PG&E.
June 13, 2016

Mark Thonen, Project Manager
Office of the CIO

RE: Service Change: Email for Life

Dear Mark:

The proposed “Service Change: Email for Life” was forwarded to the Committee on Information Technology (CIT). They believe the proposed changes are reasonable.

The Davis Division supports the proposal.

Sincerely,

André Knoesen
Chair, Academic Senate
Professor: Electrical and Computer Engineering

Attachments: CIT Response to Email for Life Proposal

c: Matt Bishop, Chair, Committee on Information Technology
   Edwin M. Arevalo, Executive Director, Davis Division of the Academic Senate
André Knoesen, Chair  
Academic Senate

Dear André:

The committee on Information Technology believes that deactivating faculty and staff email passwords after two years of inactivity is reasonable, given that staff and faculty can reactivate their account if desired. The exemption for emeriti faculty is appropriate.

Sincerely,

Matt Bishop, Chair
Service Change: Email for Life

**Subject:** EIT proposes to close access to abandoned accounts by invalidating the CAS password for select former employees meeting the criteria outlined below. A more formal project to establish sustainable email for life policies and practices will be undertaken by IET over the next 1-2 years.

1. **Background:** IET is responding to an internal audit on our account and access management practices. Currently, when an individual separates from university employment (staff and faculty) for any reason, their CAS credentials remain active such that they, or potentially others, can access their @ucdavis.edu email account. Users are encouraged to forward this email to an external account. While many users never use their CAS credentials, the opportunity for use persists.

2. **Why should we do this?** Closing unused accounts will reduce our exposure to potential unauthorized access. By invalidating the password, we are not destroying the account. If the user wishes to reactivate the account at a later date, the user can either reset their password or contact IT Express.

   The criteria for an account having the password invalidated is:
   
   - User is no longer an active university employee (emeriti faculty are considered active)
   - User has not accessed their Google apps account in the past 2 years

   We expect to invalidate approximately 55,000 unused accounts with this change.

3. **Benefits:**
   
   - Reduces exposure from unused accounts
   - Provides a method for users to reactivate their account

4. **Overall Impact:**
   
   - Staff and faculty will see NO changes to existing services. Former faculty may need to contact IT Express at ithelp@ucdavis.edu to reactivate an account.

5. **Faculty Impact Analysis:**
   
   - Will use of the system be mandatory for faculty? No. However, if faculty do not use their account within 2 years, IET will disable the account password.
   
   - Will there be any costs incurred by faculty for using the system? No. Impacts former faculty only and they are not charged for the email services.
Service Change: Email for Life

- **To what extent will the system make demands on faculty time or impose unexpected obligations?** None for current or emeriti faculty. Former faculty may need to spend time resetting or reestablishing account access, if they have not accessed their account in the past 2 years.

- **What impacts or considerations are involved concerning privacy and security?** No changes for current or emeriti faculty concerning privacy and security.
  - Regulatory requirements, including HIPAA, FERPA, FISMA and/or ITAR? None

- **What are the impacts on intellectual property and copyrights?**
  - Who owns the material stored/shared? No changes.
  - Intellectual Property, including copyrights, patent rights, and/or trademark rights? No impact.

- **What is the anticipated service longevity and availability?** IET will be undertaking a project to establish sustainable email for life policies and practices. This will determine the long-term availability for former faculty.

- **What are the downsides?** Former faculty may lose access to their @ucdavis.edu email account, unless they take extra steps to reestablish access.

- **Is it inter-operable with similar services?** There will be no changes to existing interoperability.

- **Has a copy of any applicable contracts been shared with CIT?** There are no contractual agreements associated with this change.

- **Who should be contacted for service support?** Service support is provided by IT Express: ithelp@ucdavis.edu.

- **Where can more information, including this analysis, be found via a web site?** Additional information can be found in the IT Service Catalog: http://itcatalog.ucdavis.edu.

6. **When will this service be available?** IET would like to invalidate passwords for the identified accounts by Feb. 17, 2016.
May 31, 2016

André Knoesen, Chair
Academic Senate

Dear André:

The Committee on Information Technology believes it is critical to gather information on the time faculty spend learning to use Canvas, and moving their classes from SmartSite to Canvas. Doing so will enable us to estimate the work load on teaching faculty if, and when, Canvas is replaced with another learning management system. Perhaps more importantly, the data we gather will allow us to calibrate support for the transition as it proceeds, and communicate any issues to the UC Davis Canvas group.

We have discussed this with David Levin, and he has said he will work on developing a method for measuring this effort. However, we are concerned that the method will not be in place before faculty begin to use Canvas this summer or fall.

We therefore propose the following course of action. Provide a link for faculty on Canvas to a database or data collection system where they would enter the following information:

- Course name:
- Time to learn Canvas:
- Time to transfer information or set up course in Canvas:
- Time to make adjustments after course is set up:
- Scoring: (1 to 10, with 1 for easy to use to 10 for difficult to use)
- Comments:

Also, put the following text on the Canvas page that faculty see when they log in:

“The Academic Senate Committee on Information Technology is trying to determine how much effort is required to transition from SmartSite to Canvas. To help us do this, please keep track of the time you spend learning to use Canvas, the time spent transferring any content from SmartSite to Canvas, and the time needed to make adjustments after the course is set up. Click on the link below to enter that information. Please do not worry about being exact; we’re trying to get a best estimate. We will correlate the results, delete the names, and use this information to determine how best to support the transition of all faculty to Canvas. Thank you.”

and below this text, the link to the data entry system (perhaps https://ucdavis.qualtrics.com if that would be suitable).
Sincerely,

Matt Bishop, Chair

C: Giacomo Bonanno
James G. Fadel
Michael J. Kleeman
Jeremy Lea
Vladimir Yarov-Yarovoy