Technology Planning & Policy Committee  
December 12, 2013  
Minutes

Present:  Chris Carter, Evette Castillo Clark, Maria Grazia de Angelis-Nelson, Beth Dobkin, Laurie Edwards, Peter Greco, Lance Hourany, Pat Kreitz, Zhan Li, Pete Michell, Michael Nathanson, Julia Odom, Sheila Pallotta, Dennis Rice, Jeff Sigman, Chris Sindt, Gregg Thomson, Maria Tuite, Ed Tywoniak, Michael Viola and Larry Nuti

Absent with Notice:  Keith Ogawa

I. Announcements  
Peter welcomed the group and shared that there were a few handouts available.

II. Approvals & Membership Update  
A. The Committee was asked if there were any comments or corrections to the minutes from the September 12, 2013 meeting. Hearing none, a motion was made to approve them as submitted. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

B. Two new members were introduced to the committee. Maria Tuite, ASSMC, is the new student representative and Evette Castillo Clark, Dean of Students, replaces Scott Kier.

III. Subcommittee Reports  
A. There were no proposals to review or approve in Administrative Technology Subcommittee.

B. Jeff Sigman reported that the ETG held their last meeting in November. There were three items on the agenda, the Hybrid Janterm Project, a Google Apps presentation by Dennis Rice, and a grant request from a faculty member.

Hybrid Janterm Project – The College is considering offering hybrid courses in January term 2015. The subcommittee discussed what that would mean for Saint Mary’s College and how it would be an experiment. Beth added that she received correspondence from Barry Eckhouse who wanted to make sure that this group was aware of the hybrid proposal. They are putting together a Faculty Development portfolio to come up with a process to build a small cohort of faculty interested in teaching hybrid classes. They will hold online discussions in real time. There will be discussions before January term to provide support and instruction on how to use the software. Barry has offered to take lead of this project. Among the advantages for students are flexibility in place and an enhanced technology pedagogy, which is embedded in our Tech Strategic Plan.
Expanded Google Apps - There was discussion about how they should be published. There were pros and cons on both sides. The majority of faculty are supportive of moving forward, even if it is behind SMCnet. Some faculty members on campus are using Google Apps through private accounts. Some thought that students might be more comfortable publishing behind SMCnet.

Grant Requests – There was a grant for a faculty member which affects disability services. We don’t have a strong presence for faculty and staff disability like we do for students.

C. The ITIS spent time on a new process, IT Process and Procedure. It is time to get our security act together. Peter shared that Dennis has done a lot of planning and research towards this initiative.

Another topic was items for review. Maintenance projects won’t come to this group. They’re "keeping the lights on" work that IT Services is expected to do on a routine basis. There will thus be fewer proposals coming through the ITIS.

IV. Google Apps Expansion Considerations

Peter introduced Dennis Rice (IT security Officer) saying that he has done a lot of research on the Google Apps expansion and asked him to share what he presented to the ETG.

Dennis reported that our agreement with Google provides us with certain apps, Core Services, which are protected for FERPA. However there are quite a few other apps that are controllable from our panel, but which are not protected. The contract places the responsibility for protection on the institution. Consumer apps are not backed up. We must ask whether their value for teaching and learning outweigh the risks. There is a higher level of risk in making these apps available. If it is worth it, which apps should we make available?

Dennis conducted an informal survey of what other higher Ed institutions do. He found the following:

- There were 31 sites with Google. 58% (18) of the only offer the Core Apps. USC tells people they can use consumer apps with their own accounts. When in the USC domain a user can move between apps within the domain.
- Six permit access with security warnings and six have no warnings.
- One institution had an opt-in process (Brandeis).

The TLT group met and Dennis presented this informal survey to them. That group recommended offering a limited set of apps. They divided the apps into useful tools with low risk and those with useful value but have a higher level of risk (Picasa, YouTube, GooglePlus and Blogger) We can limit what is put up on these apps to our domain. IT Services likes having some level of control. Dennis quoted from a memo he had received from Jeff Sigman, as follows: "The Committee was in favor of the extended apps, but was not sure how they should be implemented". The ETG generally approved offering Google Consumer Apps, but limiting access to the SMC domain.

Dennis asked for a decision from this Committee.
A discussion followed Dennis’ presentation. Some of the issues raised included:

- Whether they could be limited to the domain. We would be concerned if it fell into educational records. If the apps are behind SMCnet it becomes shades of grey. The actual use of these apps would probably expose us less than the Core apps, but there are privacy issues that could easily be violated.

- The need for control over the high risk apps. Opt-in is one of the controls that are on the table. We don't think the ETG took a position on this. Peter was thinking of making them available and then working on protection thinking that a discussion would take us there. Where the opt-in has the most effectiveness is where a faculty is using an app and students are posting work, knowing that it is part of their educational records. Those apps which are not Core can be data mined by Google and used in whatever way they do business. The opt-in tells the user that they are voluntarily entering a different environment in terms of student educational records. The underlying problem arises when a faculty wants to use an App but a student doesn't want to opt-in. Then the use of that app can't be a requirement of that course.

- Campus conduct and violation monitoring. Does it elevate our responsibility for knowing what is happening?

- Our institutional goal of creating digital literacy for our students. We have to get the students acquainted with technology. Depending on our goal we will take appropriate risk. We need to educate faculty about the risks and responsibilities.

Beth called the TPPC to order, stating that a recommendation was made to include four apps, GooglePlus, Picasa, YouTube and Blogger, risky but useful, as well as the low risk items. She asked if the members were ready to vote. With the majority replying affirmatively, she called for a vote to recommend to the Cabinet the addition of these four apps plus low risk, and Books. There were 16 votes in favor of expanding the Google Apps, one no and two abstentions.

The Cabinet may send it back to the TPPC after discussion.

V. Technology Use Policy Update
Deferred to next meeting agenda.

VI. IT security Policy and Procedure
Deferred to next meeting agenda.

VII. Strategic Plan Update
Deferred to next meeting agenda.

VIII. Project Portfolio Update
Deferred to next meeting agenda.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30.

Handouts
Minutes - September 12, 2013
Tech Use Policy, revised fall of 2013
IT Project Portfolio Timeline - December 12, 2013
SMC IT Strategic Progress - December 12, 2013

Respectfully submitted,
Kim Sullivan
Assistant to Peter Greco, CTO