

## LMIS Minutes, February 15, 2019

Committee Members Present: Jane Carlin, Kate Cohn, Andrew Gomez, Sue Hannaford, David Latimer, Janet Marcavage, Kaity Peake, Adam Smith

Meeting called by chair David Latimer at 8:04AM

The meeting began with a discussion about the draft minutes from the February 1<sup>st</sup> LMIS meeting. Carlin suggested adding a note about her request to discuss the issue of streaming media in a future meeting. Hannaford noted that she would invite additional changes in the next 48 hours and finalize the minutes afterwards.

Cohn mentioned the possibility of moving future drafts of meeting minutes to the committee's shared Google Drive folder. Latimer approved and suggested that suggested changes be made via track changes and that the minute taker could then finalize the minutes.

Latimer moved to approve the February 1<sup>st</sup> minutes, pending any last-minute suggestions. The motion was approved.

Latimer then noted that Peake would be providing a Google Suite tutorial at the next LMIS session and that any potential questions should be sent to her before the committee's March 1<sup>st</sup> meeting.

A general discussion then ensued about how the Google Suite factored into the committee's draft document regarding the storage of sensitive materials. Latimer raised the question posed by one faculty member about whether or not individual files could be password protected. Hannaford raised a point about sensitive file types that should or should not be kept in a university Google Drive (FERPA, HIPAA, etc.). Marcavage wondered whether all faculty have access to the new Google Suite, as she herself had issues accessing the new system. Cohn then noted the difficulty of having faculty members begin to transition from using their personal Gmail/Google Drive account to using their university Google Drives for university file storage. Cohn suggested that a helpful tutorial may involve an explanation of how to transfer files from a personal Google Drive to a university Google Drive.

Latimer then turned the discussion to the sensitive documents draft and next steps regarding its finalization and distribution. Smith noted that the file's font may pose readability issues. Latimer also noted that there should be some explanation on accessing the "stafffiles" server—Peake mentioned that she would look for an existing resource. Latimer then mentioned that some of the language in the document regarding applications like SoundNet could be changed to more broadly reflect best practices on collaborative work. Gomez noted that going forward, the distinction between the university share drive and the university's Google Drive were unclear. He questioned whether one would be preferable over the other regarding specific document types or procedures.

Latimer suggested removing the draft language about computer encryption given that all new computers issued by the university should be encrypted. Peake noted that she would follow up with committee member Cucco on this point.

Hannaford mentioned that the draft document should likely foreground using Google Drive since it is likely the easiest storage system. On a related point, Carlin questioned whether the draft document's recommendation of SoundNet is still accurate—committee member Cucco needed to be consulted on this point.

Latimer then reaffirmed that the draft document should be split into two documents: one with a timeless set of general best practices and a second document that goes through specific processes and file types in detail.

Carlin noted that going forward, one consideration should be to have resources available for departments and committees looking for guidance on changing their file storage procedures.

Latimer asserted that he would work on creating a new draft of the sensitive documents file in line with the recommendation of splitting the file in two. Latimer suggested moving over all aspects of the draft to Google Docs to avoid formatting issues, particularly regarding tables.

Carlin suggested that we be clear that the sensitive documents draft does not contain an exhaustive list of file types and processes, but is a starting point for thinking about best practices.

Hannaford noted that she wanted to keep the table in the sensitive documents draft and that it might be useful to reference it in the new best practices document.

Meeting adjourned at 8:55am.

Minutes taken by Andrew Gomez.