On May 30, 2019, the MIT Schwarzman College of Computing (SCoC) Task Force convened a workshop in conjunction with the publication of preliminary reports from five Task Force Working Groups (Social Implications and Responsibilities of Computing, Organizational Structure, Faculty Appointments, Curricula and Degrees, and Computing Infrastructure). A portion of the day was devoted to lunch table discussions of the preliminary findings from the working groups. After lunch, the full group reassembled, and each table reported on its discussion (summarized briefly below).

**THEMES AND TOPICS AFFIRMED DURING REPORT OUTS**

- The Common Ground (from Organizational Structure report) could be the entire structure SCoC:
  - Would enable MIT faculty to feed directly into the SCoC.
  - Requires full buy-in from MIT’s president and provost.
  - Could help engage the rest of MIT in teaching computing-related subjects.

- Habits of mind concept (from Social Implications and Responsibilities of Computing report) has far-reaching implications for both curriculum and research.

- Societal implications and responsibilities of computing must be integrated into the curriculum (i.e., not an add-on or separate component)—business as usual won’t work, but transforming the curriculum will be very challenging.

- Innovative research in societal implications and responsibilities of computing will draw an organic critical mass of interest and activity, especially among students.

- Incentives are essential to integrating ethics into the curriculum (e.g., the existing communications requirement).

- Every community within MIT must be included in the work of the SCoC, and it must remain a work in progress for an extended period of time—neither status quo nor “band aids” are satisfactory conditions.

- Resource deployment—would like to see a slightly more centralized deployment of computing resources without a loss of entrepreneurial culture.

- The need to invest in shared computing infrastructure resources predates the creation of the SCoC—such investments will require new approaches to governance and funding.

- Learn from internal MIT expertise in areas such as law/legal issues and bilingual teaching as well as programs that are working (e.g., ORC, IMES).

- Cluster area incubation and Faculty Fellows program should be high priorities.

- Think of research incubators as gateways to cluster hires.

- Faculty rights and responsibilities must be written down to be effective.

- Partnerships with between the SCoC and DLCs should be prioritized over service roles/relationships.
• Solving teaching load disparities shouldn’t fall solely on the shoulders of new faculty—creating flavors of classes that are oversubscribed could help, especially for non-EECS students who want to engage in computing).
• Interconnections between Single-Community Faculty (SCF) and Multi-Community Faculty (MCF) are critical and require continual attention.
• Prioritize reciprocity—i.e., how can existing MIT units support the SCoC.
• Work on coordinating existing computing activity across MIT even as the SCoC gets up and running.
• Committing to green computing and transparent allocation of resources are essential.
• Widespread support for promoting inclusivity within the SCoC and across MIT.
• The evolution of EECS must be determined by EECS but must also be coordinated with the mission of the SCoC and MIT as a whole.

CONCERNS NOTED DURING REPORT OUTS

• Two key objectives exist in tension—maintaining current excellence in electrical engineering/computer science and creating a revolutionary structure for the SCoC.
• Creative tension will also exist between establishing a sense of identity and belonging for the SCoC and signaling that the SCoC is for and of the entire Institute.
• Proliferation of 6N degrees is not sustainable.
• Computation should remain distinct from computer science.
• Don’t kick the can down the road on solving existing questions related to EECS.
• Let EECS figure out EECS.
• Make better use of the entire MIT community in fulfilling the mission of the SCoC—e.g., make connections to SHASS explicit in the area of societal implications and responsibilities.
• If the structure of the SCoC is fragmented, academic standards could suffer in some areas.
• Consider the pace of implementation carefully.
• Don’t reinvent the wheel if existing resources can meet certain needs and goals of the SCoC.
• The effort to more fully integrate ethics into the curriculum should apply to MIT as a whole and not be limited to computer science.
• Societal implications should be integrated into all new research across MIT as a given.
• Think even more boldly in the area of incubators—establish finite time horizons but allow those to vary according to the scope of individual proposals.
• Within clusters, think about the balance between the methodological and the substantive and ensure diverse representation across disciplines.
• Take the boldest ideas of the working groups as the starting point for the SCoC.
• Take risks and be cognizant that we are building a new MIT—and talk and listen broadly across the MIT community.
• Beware of any structures that make faculty too transient—transience will manifest as second-class citizenship.
• If some faculty are re-evaluated every three years, they always will feel like junior faculty.
• Must establish clarity in the organizational chart of the SCoC (the new structure should make the job of the SCoC dean easier, not more complicated)—work out organizational structure and appointments first then revisit other objectives and options.
• Keeping structure simple will energize and galvanize the MIT community.
• Overall governance model needs more attention.
• The proposed matrix structure could pose challenges for graduate students, especially in admissions and advising.
• Must commit sufficient space and other resources to teaching staff (MIT will have to compete with industry to lure staff to the SCoC).
• Consider giving an advisory board the role of fostering connections among the SCoC and the rest of MIT.
• Be mindful that MIT is embedded in a larger ecosystem and that PhDs must be able to find roles in the academic world after they graduate.
• Give more thought about how to measure the success of the SCoC over time.
• Historically, MIT hasn’t intentionally engaged with the rest of academia in a big way—the launch of the SCoC may be an opportunity to think harder about how the Institute connects with other academic communities around the world.
• If MIT succeeds in creating a template for the world, donors will feel compelled by our vision for the SCoC.

QUESTIONS RAISED DURING REPORT OUTS

• How will the SCoC’s designation as a “college” rather than a “school” matter?
• Will the MIT administration establish a process for revisiting the decisions made during the early days of the SCoC?
• What is the soul of the SCoC (i.e., why will someone want to be a part of it)?
• How will the SCoC train students to be policy leaders?
• Can the SCoC be a place where MIT trains students with degrees in other fields to go out and change the world with computing?
• When and how will questions such as staff/nonfaculty needs, labs/space be addressed? Labs have produced great successes even while constraining resource allocation.
• Will the SCoC have the opportunity to grow academic degrees organically?
• What existing MIT activities will be dropped, if any, in connection with the launch of the SCoC?
• How can the SCoC stimulate creativity without overloading faculty members?
• How will the SCoC adjudicate different-but-equal subjects and advising among disciplinary flavors in multifaceted areas such as machine learning?