LMIS Minutes, May 3, 2019

Committee Members Present: Jane Carlin, Kate Cohn, Jeremy Cucco, Andrew Gomez, Sue Hannaford, Quentin Hubbard, Janet Marcavage, David Latimer, Kaity Peake, Lori Ricigliano, Adam Smith

Meeting called by chair Latimer at 8:01am

The meeting began with a discussion regarding the April 5th and April 19th minutes. Committee members Ricigliano and Carlin suggested small changes for the April 5th minutes regarding phrasing and spelling. Latimer suggested that given the technical nature of the April 19th meeting, that committee members take a last look at the minutes to confirm approval. A motion was made and seconded to approve both sets of minutes pending any final suggestions due by the end of the afternoon on May 3rd.

Cohn, reiterating a point made earlier in the semester, reminded the committee about the facultycoms process and that e-mails forwarded to the facultycoms e-mail are first vetted by Jimmy McMichael (Provost's Office) before being sent out. She suggested that some members of the campus community continue to be unclear on the process.

Latimer then turned the committee's attention to the drafts for guidelines when dealing with sensitive materials. Latimer noted that we would move forward to approve the two documents: the prose document and the tabular document with a series of categories and guidelines. Latimer first asked us to review the prose document and to confirm the changes that Cucco made on the draft. Cucco noted that he made several small edits but also removed any references to technology that may soon be outdated.

A general discussion soon ensued on encryption. Peake noted an existing resource that explains various facets of data encryption on the Technology Services website.

Hannaford soon asked for clarification on the tabular document and its final form. Cucco mentioned that the table format might make it easier for some to read and also noted that the color of the document might need to be addressed for accommodation purposes. Hannaford mentioned a preference for the table style of the document while Smith and Gomez preferred a list-style format. Hannaford soon suggested a compromise of creating a set of categories that appeared as "boxes" in the document. Latimer volunteered to make this change.

Latimer soon asked the group if the share drive language was clear with the group largely agreeing but noting that it might be helpful to include a link on how to access the stafffiles directory.

Hannaford then raised a broader suggestion about the university's process for paper shredding and the possibility of making periodic notes to remind the campus community about campus-wide pick-ups. A general discussion soon followed about the processes involved for the removal of these materials. Cohn raised a potential concern about all of the shred bins being connected via a universal key and noted that she would follow up with Deanna Kass and other administrative staff to clarify this issue and potential security concerns. Cucco noted he would do the same. Gomez then asked about personal shredders and Cucco noted that he has generally discouraged them for reasons of security and quality.

Hannaford noted the university's shift regarding SoundNet. Cucco reiterated that while SoundNet is not yet gone, the university has begun to transition away from it. He mentioned that he plans to work closely with specific departments that use SoundNet.

Smith asked about the stability of links in the sensitive documents draft. Cucco noted that they should stay the same, even after the website redesign, but that this can be something he revisits later on.

A general discussion soon followed on the sensitive document files and next steps. Carlin asked for clarification on whether submitting the documents to the Faculty Senate would be the next step. Latimer confirmed that it would be. Hannaford suggested the importance of getting the documents out quickly so that faculty can start thinking about their practices involving sensitive documents. Cohn mentioned the possibility of being in touch with Alison Tracy Hale about this, assuming she is still the LMIS liaison. Latimer also mentioned the possibility of a brief presentation to the faculty senate next fall explaining the draft.

Hannaford later mentioned that it might be helpful to include the sensitive documents files as some part of the new faculty orientation. Cucco mentioned one possibility of providing new faculty with external hard drives that contain a series of essential documents —this would include the sensitive document guidelines. Marcavage also mentioned the possibility of creating a shared Google Drive for the new faculty orientation.

Hannaford then moved to approving the sensitive documents drafts. The motion was seconded by Latimer. Latimer noted that he will move towards making final formatting changes and preparing the committee's end-of-year report.

Cucco mentioned that his office can review the document periodically (perhaps once a year).

A discussion followed on potential places where the sensitive document guidelines could be posted or distributed. Cohn mentioned the possibility of providing them to department chairs as well as reiterating the point about including them as resources for new faculty. Carlin also mentioned the possibility of including the guidelines in Provost e-mails regarding FERPA. Finally, Ricigliano suggested the possibility of Cucco including links to the guidelines in his facultycoms newsletter.

Latimer then moved to discussing self-charges for the upcoming academic year. Carlin noted that she could provide background information regarding the library before next fall. Cucco suggested the possibility of discussing printing and print waste on campus as this has been an issue that his office has been working on. He noted some possibilities going forward such as creating a PIN for printing. Hannaford and Smith expressed some reticence about how printing might be tracked. Carlin also asserted that the existing system is problematic because the card readers frequently malfunction. Cucco noted that he was looking into alternative solutions moving forward but emphasized the cost of replacing the 36 card readers. Latimer also mentioned the possibility of including the Makerspace for next year's discussions. Lastly, Smith mentioned the possibility of talking about the disparities in machine usage (Mac v. PC) and how this influences our technology budget. Cohn noted the importance of bringing in Julie Cristoph for these discussions. Cucco noted the pricing disparities between Apple and Windows-based machines and the rising costs of Apple computers.

Meeting adjourned at 8:59am

Minutes taken by Andrew Gomez