BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor Santa Barbara, California 93106-2035 Telephone: (805) 893-2126 Facsimile: (805) 893-7712

Mark Yudof, President University of California 1111 Franklin Street Oakland, CA 94607-5200

June 17, 2013

Dear President Yudof:

Thank you for meeting with us to review the recommendations of the Privacy and Information Security initiative's Steering Committee. The input you provided is consistent with feedback we have received in presenting these recommendations to the Council of Chancellors, Council of Executive Vice Chancellors, Council of Vice Chancellors Administration, the Academic Council, and the IT Leadership Council among others. We have reorganized the original four recommendations to reflect this feedback and are asking for your endorsement and action as described below.

Recommendation 1 of the report speaks University adoption of the Statement of Privacy Values, Privacy Principles, and Privacy Balancing Test. These are the most basic conceptual building blocks underlying the University's ability to fluently manage privacy issues. With strong support from many quarters, this Recommendation remains foundational. We are asking that you initiate the action needed to have these items adopted by the University (similar to the Statement of Ethical Values and Standards of Ethical Conduct).

Recommendation 4 of the report speaks to a requirement for each campus to designate a privacy official: an operational point person to make privacy "visible"; to begin incorporating the Privacy Statement, Principles, and Balancing Test into the fabric of campus life; and to coordinate with peers systemwide. This designation does not require the creation of a new position, though the simple act of highlighting privacy likely will quickly reveal an unmet need. We are asking that you initiate the action needed to have each Chancellor designate a privacy official for his or her campus.

Recommendation 3 of the report describes a model for governance through campus privacy and information security boards. However, allowing the University to gain experience with the implementation of the Recommendations above will inform campus planning for achieving the goals articulated in the Steering Committee's report; campuses will need flexibility, appropriately leveraging what they already have in place. We are asking that this overarching need be identified in communicating to the Chancellors as a longer-term goal.

Finally, Recommendation 4 speaks to the creation of a systemwide privacy and information security board. Any definition of need and how to address it should await further experience. No action is requested for this Recommendation.

We believe this set of actions aligns with what we have heard. Please let us know if you have questions or we can help in any way. We would like to add this as an agenda item for the Regents meeting in July for their information.

Sincerely,

Iwcan

Gene Lucas UCSB Executive Vice Chancellor Steering Committee Chair

Sheryl Vacca SVP/Chief Compliance and Ethics Officer

## UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

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

July 2, 2013

## SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT VACCA EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLOR LUCAS

Dear Sheryl and Gene:

Thank you for your letter of June 17 summarizing our discussion of the recommendations of the Privacy and Information Security Steering Committee's January 2013 report. I am deeply appreciative of the Committee's thoughtful and innovative approach to developing a framework to guide University policy making and decision making in matters that affect information privacy, autonomy privacy, and information security.

I fully endorse Recommendation 1, recommending adoption of the UC Statement of Privacy Values, the UC Privacy Principles, and the Privacy Balancing Process. These statements reflect core values of the University of California and will be strong guideposts in helping UC navigate increasingly complex tensions between access to information, individuals' expectation of privacy, and University obligations. I plan on adopting these principles through the systemwide policy approval process.

I also concur with Recommendation 4, that each campus designate a privacy official who will begin to broadly socialize privacy concepts and the privacy balancing process on campus. When I communicate this request to the Chancellors, I will assure them that a new FTE is not required, but that the role may be assigned to an individual with particular experience in the area or related responsibilities. With a slight modification in recognition of campus need for flexibility, I also endorse Recommendation 2, that campuses develop a governance model for these issues, and recommend that they include privacy and information security in the ongoing discussions of an existing campus advisory board reflecting academic and administrative perspectives.

I understand that you will be presenting these recommendations at the Regents Committee on Compliance and Audit in July, and I look forward to participating in that discussion and expressing my support for the Committee's work. I applaud the Committee for these forward-thinking steps to create a framework to address one of the most complex and rapidly evolving issues of our times.

With best wishes I am,

Sincerely yours,

Mark G. Yudof President