
Accordiacs meeting

18 March 2009



Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Agenda

- 12:30-12:40 Agenda and Introductions
- 12:40-1:25 “What are the key central academic technology services we as Accordiacs should work on together?”
 - 10 min Outcomes from the ACCORD retreat (Vijay)
 - 20 min Brainstorming ideas in groups
 - 15 min Reporting out, each group
- 1:25-1:55 From the Institute Task Forces:
 - 10 min Education Task Force --- Curricular Support (Cec)
 - 10 min IT Task Force (Steve)
 - 10 min Q&A and provide inputs to the Task Forces
- 2:00-2:30 Round-robin updates (all)



Outcomes from the ACCORD Retreat

- Goal 1: Measure and assess the value of educational technology services to faculty and the community.
 - Identify key services
 - Propose a measurement and reporting framework
 - What are meaningful measures?
 - How do we collect them? (Ivy+ ?)
 - How do we use them?
- Goal 2: Develop documents that articulate and clarify roles, expectations and processes for members.
 - Look at ITAG, IT Partners; look at outside organizations for possible models
- Goal 3: Develop mechanisms to help academic computing service providers identify and evaluate opportunities for new services.
 - Identify examples of ad hoc occurrence i.e. bibliographic software
 - Develop mechanisms to measure, monitor, and assess key academic computing services



Charge to all task forces

1. Review and analyze current practices and expenditures
 2. Identify activities/operations closely connected with core mission and those which may be less strongly aligned with our mission.
 3. Identify opportunities for efficiency and cost reduction (no cost shifting):
 - alternative ways of fulfilling our mission that could be as effective as current practices but with lower costs.
 - synergies among existing units for cost reductions and service improvements.
 - Explore new processes for assessing the quality and effectiveness of our programs and activities on an ongoing basis
 4. Identify and estimate costs/benefits of proposed operational changes, and prioritize proposed changes in terms of optimal outcomes for the Institute.
 5. Acknowledging that operational changes may require significant change across the Institute, identify paths to implementation that preserve our community's mission, values, and culture.
 6. Explore opportunities to promote 21st century practices at MIT with regard to environmental impact and sustainability.
-



Timeline

- Preliminary recommendations due early June
- Refinement of key recommendations by next October



Education task force

Faculty

Cynthia Barnhart, Eng
Mary Boyce, MechE
Vladimir Bulovic, EECS
Kai von Fintel, SHASS, Linguistics
Dennis Freeman, EECS
Steve Graves, Sloan
Eric Grimson, EECS
Dan Hastings, DUE
Steve Hall, Aero
Mark Jarzombek, Arch
Young S. Lee, Physics
Caroline Ross, Mat'l Science
Hazel Sive, Science, Biology
Janet Sonenberg, Music&Theater
Gigliola Staffilani, Math

Philip Thompson, Urban Studies
Matthew Wilson, Brain & Cog
JoAnne Yates, Sloan

Staff

Arne Abramson, Facilities
Sheren Aram, HST
Mark Damian, IS&T
Cecilia d'Oliveira, OCW
Douglas Pfeiffer, Provost Office
Stephanie (Richardson) Toews-Moeling, Finance
Stuart Schmill, Admissions
Karen Yegian, Urban Studies

Students

Nicole Bucala, U, Political Science
Stephen Woodrow, G, ESD



Education task force approach

- Bi-weekly meetings of full group
- 4 sub-groups meeting weekly
 - Undergraduate education
 - Graduation education
 - Faculty and academic structure
 - Pipeline and curricular support
- Harvesting Idea Bank
 - <http://ideabank.mit.edu>
- Each sub-group to generate 3-5 ideas by May for discussion with wider group



Suggested heuristics

- Using our physical plant more will increase efficiency
- Reduction of high end outliers will drive down mean costs
- Elimination of redundancy is desirable
- Modularity generally increases efficiency and effectiveness
- Adding technology to education generally does not reduce cost; fundamental redesign is needed



Questions / observations

- What is the cost model for education at MIT?
 - Would a significant increase in class size save money?
 - Would a reduction in grad students save money?
 - Could we provide 4 years of education in 3 and save money?
 - Can we reduce duplication in classes offered?
 - e.g. *why are there so many statistics classes across MIT?*
 - Standard teaching load is highly variable across schools
 - Should we eliminate marginal/weaker grad programs?
 - Should there be a minimum class size?
 - Can we enhance revenues through professional education?
 - Would more extensive summer program save money?
 - Would a single admissions system save money?
 - Would use of OCW/distance education help us to deliver knowledge faster and more effectively?
 - Would online registration save money?
 - How can we reduce wasteful use of resources (paper printing)?
-



IT@MIT task force

Faculty

Peter Donaldson, Literature
Edward Farhi, Physics
Frans Kaashoek, EECS
Thomas Malone, Sloan
Mitchel Resnick, Media Lab

Students

Michael Bennie, UG, EECS
Emilio Nanni, Grad, EECSStaff

Staff

Donna Behmer, Sloan
John Costanza, CSAIL
Wilson D'Souza, IS&T
Joseph Flynn, Lincoln
Steven Gass, Libraries
Christopher Hill, EAPS
Marc Jones, SHASS
Allison Parisi, Budget, Finance, Trs.
Taeminn Song, IS&T
Jane White, HR
Carol Wood, OSP



IT@MIT task force approach

- Weekly 2 hour meetings
- 3 sub-groups
 - Student Experience (a.k.a. Education)
 - Research
 - Administration
- Harvest Idea Bank
 - <http://ideabank.mit.edu>
- Approach to cost savings
 - Standardization
 - Sourcing
 - Limiting



Challenges

- Overlap with other task forces
- Leveraging work already being done by DLC's
- Timeline



Institute-wide planning task force

- <http://web.mit.edu/instituteplanning>

