LMIS Committee Minutes, November 20, 2018

Committee members present: Jane Carlin, Kate Cohn, Andrew Gomez, Sue Hannaford, Quentin Hubbard, Janet Marcavage, Lori Ricigliano, Adam Smith, Lisa Wood

Meeting called by chair Sue Hannaford at 4:01PM

Hannaford began by noting former LMIS member Ann Gleason's departure from the university. Cohn mentioned possible replacements and also noted she would try and find out about a potential new member.

Hannaford then solicited committee feedback on the submitted minutes for September 26 and October 23—both were approved.

Hannaford then drew the attention of the committee to feedback LMIS had received regarding the "Best Practices for Managing Sensitive Documents" draft. The feedback under discussion was received from members of the FAC, ASC, PSC, SAA, Registrar, Title IX, and the Data Standards Committee.

Cohn, who solicited feedback on the document from several of these committees, noted that one of the most common questions was whether the sensitive materials document was a set of guidelines or policy. Wood asserted that it would be more likely to be a set of guidelines but also noted that aspects of the draft are likely reflected in parts of the faculty code. Wood concluded by commenting that it is important to remind faculty about the importance of protecting student confidentiality and other sensitive materials.

Hannaford commented that working with the university's lawyer would be important for clarifying any potential legal issues.

Cohn commented that some feedback (particularly from the FAC) wondered about what the guidelines would mean if there was no enforcement in place.

Hannaford remarked that it would be helpful if other committees began to draft processes regarding sensitive materials that reflect their particular practices and materials. She noted that the ASC had already proposed drafting a set of procedures for their committee work.

Wood commented on the concerns over the storage of sensitive materials given that individuals often store material on the cloud and various devices.

Gomez noted that another important issue going forward is sorting out how Google Suite factors into some of these policies, given the university's recent adoption of some Google applications. He questioned whether Google Drive would complement or replace some of the functions of the university's share drive. Carlin noted that the sheer range of applications being used by different committees and university departments requires a discussion over building a more cohesive approach.

Cohn used the example of the FAC using Moodle once they designed a safe approach for the review of files. She noted that the recent adoption of Canvas did not change this process but drew attention to the potential confusion going forward. Hannaford clarified that Technology Services have requested that Canvas be used for course materials while other documents could be stored in Google Drive.

Gomez commented on how the sensitive document draft must be part of a broader discussion about other forms of internet and data privacy (such as the use of proper passwords). He also noted that we needed greater clarification about the relative safety of different systems (such as Google Drive vs. the university share drive). Smith affirmed that password protection is a particular vulnerability given that few people know the requirements for creating a strong password.

Cohn noted that it would be important to have a rollout regarding campus use of Google.

Pivoting in another direction, Wood reflected on how different faculty members and committees craft letters. Do they use boilerplates? Is there a unique letter? Moreover, who owns work that is collaboratively created in something like Google Drive?

Hannaford then mentioned that she had previously spoken to committee member Jeremy Cucco about a potential demo of our new Google Suite system. Cohn remarked that a demo would allow us to break down the different processes and understand how it might shape our work on the sensitive documents draft.

Wood noted we could then examine what this might look like for different processes and different types of documents (giving the example of disciplinary letters). Smith added that his concern is over locking data and documents so that they cannot be modified. Wood and Smith then had an exchange over how long documents like disciplinary letters are kept. Cohn noted that Student Conduct has rules in place about these types of issues.

Carlin noted that given the recent feedback on the sensitive documents draft, it would be worthwhile to begin incorporating some of these comments into the draft document. She also noted that she would be willing to begin to isolate some of the more pertinent comments and suggestions made in the feedback.

Cohn mentioned that another common question regarding the feedback was whether or not the sensitive document practices related to staff as well. Hannaford responded that given our charge from the Faculty Senate, the document was intended for faculty. She also noted a hesitancy about having faculty design practices that would apply to staff.

A discussion then ensued about practices and systems that may be of use going forward. Wood mentioned the possibility of suggesting that faculty tag documents that should be deleted at a certain point. Gomez noted that there is a color-coding system in macOS but Smith also noted that this would likely be a very different process on other operating systems. Carlin and Cohn then mentioned some of the differences between systems like Sharepoint and Soundnet in regards to file storage. Marcavage commented that while Moodle can serve as a standalone

platform for hosting sensitive documents, many of those documents are still downloaded to individual hard drives.

Another discussion then ensued on the future relationship between Google and the university. In particular, Gomez and Hubbard commented on the future of our e-mail system and the storage limitations of Outlook and GMail. Hannaford concluded by noting that some of our discussions regarding the sensitive documents draft will be hard to continue until we have a full picture of how Google applications will be used on campus.

Cohn then commented that LMIS should also wait to hear back from other committees that have been solicited before revising the draft document.

The meeting concluded with Carlin providing a series of updates regarding the library. She began by noting the recent update she provided via facultycoms. She noted that the library will continue to be in touch with faculty in regards to high-cost serials and other electronic packages that may be cut in lieu of rising costs. She then provided an update on faculty use of Kanopy (a streaming service) given that an increasing number of faculty continue to be interested in bringing streaming content into the classroom. Ricigliano noted that other streaming services have sometimes presented problems with firewalls when played in certain classrooms. Carlin noted that the library will continue to work with faculty regarding how to better incorporate streaming material into courses.

Meeting adjourned at 4:59pm.

Minutes taken by Andrew Gomez.