

HARVARD UNIVERSITY



Information Technology

FAS Standing Committee on IT Meeting Minutes

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

Attendees:

Gabriele Fariello
Douglas Finkbeiner
Eric Jacobsen (*co-chair*)
Henry Leitner
Rob Lue
David Malan
Anne Margulies (*co-chair*)
Kelly O'Neill
Dan Smail
Katie Vale (*ex officio*)
Jim Waldo
Stephanie Gumble (*staff*)

Barron Committee Recap:

- The Electronic Communications Policy Task Force issued its [report](#) and proposed policy last month. David Barron did a remarkable job leading the committee. Every meeting was very well-attended, and the faculty members were deeply engaged. The Corporation adopted the policy on March 31.
- The policy:
 - Is University-wide and covers students, faculty, and staff.
 - Emphasizes the importance of privacy for an academic community – the policy raises the bar and forces us to think much more carefully about how we go about keeping information private.
 - Underscores the importance of legitimate university purposes for accessing someone's data. Cases include issues of public safety, business continuity, legal obligation, and academic integrity. There is a very high level of authorization needed for access. Authorizers are School dean, VP for HR, General Counsel, and in cases when the former groups cannot be reached, the UCIO.
 - Calls for a reasonable attempt to grant notice to the person whose data is being accessed.
 - Calls for the minimization of access to make sure that the minimal amount of information is exposed.
 - Requires the tracking and maintenance of records for requests for access and anytime that access is provided.
 - Calls for the appointment of an oversight committee, consisting mainly of faculty, to review records and suggest policy changes as necessary.
- An implementation committee, chaired by University CIO, is set to begin work and will focus on:
 - Developing the minimization protocols;
 - Developing an IT code of conduct;

- Developing a system to audit requests and track occasions when authorization for access were granted;
 - Training IT workforce on code of conduct.
- There is a lot of work ahead to clarify this policy and ensure that it is well-understood by all. This will be a focus of the implementation committee.
- Although news of this policy hasn't gotten much attention from our peers, we are setting a new standard for privacy.
- Send any comments on policy to Anne (anne_margulies@harvard.edu) or to Greg Morrisett (greg@eecs.harvard.edu).

Pain Points Update: (See complete list [here](#).)

Conversation focused on the following:

- Video:
 - Issue remains of having FAS classrooms on two different systems – Matterhorn and Echo 360.
 - Choosing a system is a tough decision. We have invested a lot in Matterhorn.
 - Katie will set up follow up meeting with Henry.
- Course iSites
 - Transitioning off of iSites over next two years. We're piloting Canvas this year and are considering whether or not we will use it for administrative sites. We have a product manager to help us consider that. This is a good opportunity to clean house.
- Room/Event Registration
 - Improvements to be rolled out in fall. There will be a feedback mechanism on EMS.
 - A number of other Schools are using EMS. We are now on a master contract. Next thing is whether we can consolidate the different instances.
 - An outstanding challenge is who is authorized to schedule each room.

Planning for Meeting with Dean Smith

- This year we have focused on pain points, Barron committee, and classroom planning.
- Since we have had especially lively conversations on classroom planning, we should consider what recommendations will be important for our committee to give to Dean Smith. This committee voice is really important. Mike would like a go-to committee because there has been no process. Everything has been ad hoc. Faculty input hasn't been sought at the right times.
- In terms of classroom planning, the Yard should not be neglected as we begin to think about SEAS and Allston. We should think about Sever, too.
- SciBox has been really successful, according to Melissa Franklin. We can get data. There are new configurations. It is morphing each day.
- Currently, there is a lack of software for scheduling time. Right now, an assistant lets people know of conflicts, but this doesn't account for thematic overlaps, such as when multiple

departments teach on the same topic or themes. There's also a space implication – hot spots to avoid, cool spots to migrate into. Seems like there should be a tool for a simple software interface.

- SEAS is working on developing something now to show room conflicts, avoid core requirement conflict. It's a quick fix until they can fix EMS. Gabriele would be happy to include committee members in the conversation.
- A current challenge is that everyone wants use of the Science Center lecture halls. We have classes of 50 in rooms that accommodate 450. Some people do need room for demonstrations, but not all.
- Question about whether or not this committee should serve as the advisory group – are we one of many or are we the advisory group on classrooms? The logical committee may have been the Standing Committee on Pedagogical Improvement, but it was disbanded.
- Should we have one person responsible for signing off on architectural drawings? There are too many mistakes that happen in the final stages of the project. Screens block blackboards, for instance. The last mile is important. Once you start building out, you find out things that have to be done differently so there should be some focus on the last mile.
- Some recent examples: Pierce 301 was out of control very early and run by project managers. Widener Studio turned out so well because faculty weighed in often and throughout the course of the project. Faculty signoff is extremely rare, but we often get blamed.
- Classroom design is not just about IT infrastructure. There's space planning, AV, then the question of how you teach in the space.
- We should have an annual summit and include other committees – FAS SCIT, planning committee, facilities, and the Education Policy Committee.
- We should create a checklist that includes general principles and standards and options by discipline. We also need a checklist of things not to do. We can we crowd source the lists (maybe with a Google doc). We need input from AcTS or Bok Center who is squarely on the pedagogy side since faculty members don't have planning and AV expertise. We should also involve key faculty to fine tune options. We should find more people from the humanities to weigh in since this committee doesn't have a lot of humanities faculty.
- We should use our joint meeting with EPC to validate universal truths and think through options by discipline.
- Learning spaces summary should eventually include universal truths/general principles, guidance for the planning office, and a process for designated faculty member signing off on details of the design.
- We'll come up with an outline and circulate draft within two weeks.