LMIS Committee Minutes, Oct. 9, 2018

In attendance: Chair Sue Hannaford, Jeremy Cucco, Ann Gleason, Andrew Gomez, Janet Marcavage, Adam Smith (minute taker)
Not present: Jane Carlin, Kate Cohn, Lisa Wood

Sue: Calls the meeting to order at 16:00.

Minutes from Sept. 11 are approved.

Sue: Senate has counter-offer with regard to Best Practices document (see below), with regard to whose responsibility it is to contact other committees. (The LMIS committee feels that the Senate has more authority to direct other committees, and would like it to take the lead in this.) The IRB committee has contacted us—they want to consult with us about BP document. We'll be getting input from them, as they've been charged by Senate to incorporate document. Today's agenda: are we happy with questions that other committees should ask themselves? We should decide on timeline, and get volunteers to liaise with different committees.

Andrew: Questions about timing on BP document.

(Document is read.)

Ann: Do we want "other feedback" in addition to the three questions we're asking the other committees?

Adam: Is the BP document binding, or is it just guidelines?

Whole table debates language about "suggestions" vs. "standards & practices", etc.

(Some minor editing of document.)

When do we ask for feedback deadline? December 1st?

(Minor wordsmithing commences.)

Adam: Should we approach contacting other committees by using our own past committee assignments?

(Crosstalk about trying to figure out who chairs each committee.)

Sue: Moving on to a preview of the next meeting, a postmortem of the changes in the library, how they were effected, and the role that faculty plays.

(Generalized grousing about Blackboard/Moodle/Canvas. Concerns focused on the amount of time to adapt to a change, and the corresponding adverse effects on students and faculty.)

Morphing into general talk about adoption of new technologies, what is the process? How is faculty involved?

Talk about handling classroom reservations. Q&A with Jeremy & Ann.

Sue: How can we incorporate faculty feedback better? How can we communicate better?

Jeremy: Points out that LMIS doesn't have much purview over the library changes. They were ordered by the highest executive levels.

Andrew & Sue: Point out that some faculty have felt bypassed by library decisions. Jeremy expresses concern, but questions if LMIS is the proper forum for these matters.

Meeting is adjourned at 17:00.

Background: Questions About the Best Practices Document

Last year the LMIS Committee developed a document "Standards and Best Practices for Handling Sensitive and Confidential Documents". This draft document attempts to inform about risk, get faculty to examine

their own exposure, and provide helpful advice. As a follow-up to our work, the current LMIS Committee felt it would be appropriate to gather information on how standing faculty committees manage sensitive and confidential documents.

We have asked that the other committees examine the LMIS document and provide responses to the following questions, preferably by December 1st.

1. Within the Committee, have you discussed how you handle and manage confidential information?

2. Do you or are you planning to have documentation associated with your Committee processes and procedures that address handling and management of confidential information? If so please share it with us.

3. As you review the LMIS document, what parts of the guidelines and best practices are helpful? Unclear? Do you have suggestions for improving the document?

4. Can you comment on how you might apply the guidelines within the framework of your Committee work?