



COURTESY OF FOLEY HOAG

Michael B. Keating

to resident deans' communications with student advisees (presumably those concerned about involvement in the misconduct investigation) and with reporters for *The Harvard Crimson* (and, it turns out, *The Boston Globe*) covering the story.

Among the details Keating uncovered:

- Beyond conducting searches of accounts maintained by Harvard University Information Technology (HUIT) and by an outside vendor (where some resident deans' accounts resided), HUIT "archived" or made copies of all the resident deans' administrative accounts for possible review at a later date.
- During the review of "metadata" for the 17 resident deans' accounts, HUIT and the outside vendor, respectively, scanned 14,000 and 17,000 e-mail accounts' information, in all—including, it is now known, faculty and staff members' and students'.
- The searches were apparently conducted within the interpretation by Harvard's Office of the General Counsel (OGC) of some, but not all, of existing University e-mail privacy policies (some of which, it became clear after the fact, overlap, are inconsistent, or leave gaps).

Responding to the report, Faust said in a statement that she was "reassured" by Keating's conclusion that the individuals who undertook the searches acted in good faith and in a manner they believed to be consistent with policy and with "a guiding responsibility for safeguarding student confidentiality and the integrity of the Ad Board process." She continued: "Unfortunately, the detailed factual account... deepens my already substantial concerns about troubling failures of both policy and execution. The findings strengthen my view that we need much clearer, better, and more widely understood policies and protocols in place...."

Corporation member William F. Lee said in an accompanying statement that Keating's "detailed account...makes it even clearer than before that there is much work



Judith Grant Long

"Like most city planners, I'm a city planner and something else," says Judith Grant Long, M.D.S. '95, Ph.D. '02, RI '12, associate professor of urban planning at the Graduate School of Design. The "something else" involves sports and finance: once Canada's third-ranked junior squash player, she later studied economics in college. Afterward, while working as a consultant, she realized that local governments often oversubsidize developers pushing big sports stadiums. She came to Harvard for a design-studies master's, and met Christopher Long '82, M.B.A. '87, while waiting for friends at Harvst. (The couple recently celebrated their tenth anniversary there; they live in Concord with their two daughters.) Grant Long joined the GSD in 2005. Her first book, *Public-Private Partnerships for Major League Sports Facilities*, argues that big stadiums almost always cost taxpayers dearly: Hamilton County, Ohio, for example, recently sold a hospital to cover debt payments on a Bengals stadium. But stadiums may confer other benefits, she says, in particular as redevelopment projects or sources of civic pride. Her current research on the Olympics shows that hosts almost never recoup their investment, either, but often have other motives for seeking the Games: "The classic example is Beijing in 2008, announcing its arrival as a sort-of-free-market economy." For smaller cities, Grant Long says less-expensive soccer stadiums, which can be used by students and professional players alike, are among the best sports-facility investments. Otherwise, she advises, build parks and recreation areas that serve both kids and adults. "I'd like to take the focus off the big leagues," she says, and encourage "sports, at the local level, that are multigenerational!"