

HARVARD UNIVERSITY



FAS Standing Committee on IT Meeting Minutes

February 12, 2014 | Wednesday | 12:00 pm to 1:30 pm | Barker Center, Plimpton Room

Attending

Co-chairs

Anne Margulies
Eric Jacobsen

Members

Jim Waldo
Howard Georgi
David Malan
Jay Harris
Harry Lewis
Daniel Smail
Henry Leitner
Gabriele Fariello
Ingrid Monson
Kelly O'Neill
Peter Bol
Doug Finkbeiner
Katie Vale (ex officio)

Guests

Leslie Kirwan
Bob Doyle
Mike Lichten
Celia Kent
Maryellen Fitzgibbon
Sharalee Field

Staff

Valerie Beilenson

I. Video Pain Points Update

- a. There is a new [website](#) listing all of the different FAS lecture capture options
- b. Work underway on fixed capture pilots to be located in Boylston 104, Harvard Hall 102 & Harvard Hall 103
- c. [Results from a December 2013 survey of 106 undergraduates](#) on their video usage are available. Basic takeaways:
 - i. For a typical course with lecture videos, students review about 43% of the lecture videos captured
 - ii. For the lecture videos that were reviewed, students watch about 67% of the video out of its entirety.
 - iii. The primary reasons for watching lecture videos was “to catch up on lectures [students] couldn’t attend in person” and “to review the sections of lecture that they found most difficult to understand”
 - iv. In terms of content of the videos the majority of students ranked “Presenter and Presentation (slides) with audio” very useful
- d. Work on a university-wide system for lecture capture processing & asset management is underway—the products being considered all have analytics, built-in video annotation tools and the ability to speed up video. The complete update that was presented to the CIOs in January is available [here](#).

II. Barron Committee Update

- a. The committee will continue meeting through the end of February at which time a draft will be released with a designated discussion period following. David Barron can come to meet with this committee once the report and recommendations are out.

III. Classroom Renovations

- a. The complete presentation from the Office of Physical Resources & Planning is available [here](#)
- b. Financial context: Out of the \$200M that FAS will spend in FY15 for capital expenses, only \$26M is allocated to programmatic projects like classroom renovations. Last year FAS was asked to trim 15% from its budget. Therefore renovations need to be done in a phased way, making cost-effective choices.
- c. It is often difficult to find faculty champions for projects, which tend to take from 18 months to 2 years to go from conceptualization to completion
- d. It is impossible to generalize preferences across the faculty—e.g. blackboard vs. whiteboard debate
- e. It is useful to try new technologies in a few places and get robust feedback before implementing more widely
- f. How is it decided which classrooms will get renovated?
 - i. Faculty champions (e.g. Melissa Franklin and the SciBox room)
 - ii. Input from Divisional Deans (e.g. Peter Marsden and the basement of WJH)
 - iii. Fix things that are broken
 - iv. Priority can be given to renovations that come with external funding
- g. The Registrar’s office controls only a fraction of section rooms; departments control a lot of these spaces (for FAS classrooms there are 81 controlling entities for scheduling)
- h. Kelly O’Neill: Faculty, especially those in the humanities, may need more help becoming fluent in how to use the technologies that do exist in classrooms. Timing is also

important—it is hard to design your class to take advantage of the technology if you do not know until the last minute where you will be teaching.

- i. This committee can help provide the faculty voice for classroom renovations on a regular and on-going basis

###