Presentation at the meeting:

David Kahle presented the draft report of the Data Intensive Studies Center’s sub-committee for Support Services explaining the committee’s vision for how the services structure for Tufts faculty and students who are or may be using data intensive studies for research or teaching. The four general principles are that:

1. DISC has something for everyone – it should be a community good, something that anyone at Tufts could use
2. The process of going from acquiring data to drawing meaningful understanding and conclusions is a long journey and is best down through partnerships
3. Sustainable value of DISC is best achieved through aligning existing resources and services, rather than making isolated investments
4. Data is input, not an outcome – focus on outcomes and design services to support these

The challenge is to create a distributed network of services not just a center.

The Service Sub-Committee’s draft recommendations center around:

- **People**
  - Align current major service providers
  - Clear roles and responsibilities
  - Plan for a complement of staff who have deep knowledge in various fields
- **Services**
  - Orchestrate services around life cycles:
    - Research – conception to grant to implementation to dissemination to archiving
    - Data – identification, acquisition, storage, access, archiving
- **Places**
  - layer physical and virtual touch points:
    - DISCovery Hub (center)
    - DISCovery Labs (on each campus – model is Data Lab on Medford Campus)
    - DISCovery Portal – kind of like Access Tufts but for DISC research/teaching
    - Local DISCovery – bring DISC to classrooms
- **Resources**

Discussion:

We spent the remaining time mostly discussing avenues to get faculty feedback on DISC and on IT issues in general, and how faculty can bring concerns to the Tufts administration and IT groups. Modes may vary widely by department and school. Robert Ford from Engineering made the point that staff support is crucial – and that person should be rewarded rather than harmed – i.e., it is considered to be part of
their job and they are compensated for it, rather than having it be a distraction from their main work. Anne Poncet-Montange from Romance Languages noted they are 60 faculty, with a large number of lecturers who focus on teaching not research, so their needs may differ. The Romance Language tenured and tenure-track faculty should be made aware of the new opportunities that DISC provides for their research and should have a conversation about Digital Humanities as a department. We discussed the following approaches:

- **Revival of the Faculty Technology Liaison Program (FTLP)** - Barbara Parmenter (UEP) felt this had been a useful program for disseminating information to IT groups and to a more limited extent hearing faculty concerns and feedback in a general way. The AS&E Work/Life Liaison program was modeled on FTLP (Barbara had made the suggestion to the Work/Life Committee based on her FTLP experience) and this has been successful in that regard. Note the Work/Life Committee drives the Liaison meeting agenda. The previous FTLP meetings were driven by Educational Technology. Both models seemed to work but we should discuss if we want to revive this. There is a Work/Life Liaison meeting once per semester – similar to the FTLP program when it was running.

- **A special gathering of select interested faculty from across fields**, similar to the Digital Humanities gathering in Spring 2017 (we might consider having separate gatherings for research and teaching) – the aim is to foster discussion and collaboration across fields, to introduce people to each other, and to go deep into needs, ideas, opportunities.

- **Visits to individual department meetings** and/or having special department workshops

- **Having a general workshop open to any faculty** – suggestion was to include that in the University Teaching Symposium

This discussion will continue but the general feeling seemed to be that a combination of methods might be useful, taking into account the goals (e.g., information dissemination; fostering creative collaborations; expression of faculty concerns/suggestions) and departments (e.g., in a large department, a department specific gathering might be useful).

**Informal after meeting discussions:**

Plearn Aroonchote, David Kahle, and Barbara Parmenter discussed how Plearn, the TCU Senate undergraduate representative, could convey information to students (e.g., about DISC) and get student feedback. She and David will talk re good communication methods, but Plearn noted that she could use social media (e.g., the Tufts Student Facebook group) to help convey information.

Anne Poncet-Montange, Paul Bergen, and Barbara Parmenter talked about the planned Canvas conversion for Arts & Sciences planned to be in place for 2018-19 academic year. Paul will be meeting with people in the Dean’s office to solidify the timeline – announcements to come after the beginning of the spring 2018 semester. Anne and Barbara registered concerns about the time needed to make the move of both courses and project sites. Paul referred us to the [Tufts Canvas site](#) for more information re timeline and updates.