

Welcome, everybody. Thanks for coming out on this glorious first day of spring. I'm Judy Singer. I'm the Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity. And we organize these events for faculty as a way of helping faculty understand how to navigate their intellectual presence in the world and think about what kind of imprint that they want to have on the world and how we can help get that out.

I'm going to begin today with something I do whenever I teach, which is from today's New York Times. And I don't know if you read the Metro section of New York Times, but if you did you would have caught this little piece-- "A Less Wholesome Job That a Librarian Didn't Have."

"Mistaken identity [AUDIO OUT] occupational hazard for people who are mentioned, even fleetingly, on the internet. Still, considered Peter Agree's shock when he searched the web for references to his mother. The references I turned up were to, quote, 'Rose Agree, geriatric porn star,' said Mr. Agree, editor in chief for the University of Pennsylvania press. 'Wikipedia had a biographical entry for this person. And to my horror, it fused elements of my mother's biography, including her having been a librarian on Long Island.'"

It's actually-- it's a wonderful piece. It turns out that there's a geriatric porn star whose name is Agree. And in Wikipedia, and in a whole bunch of other pieces, his grandmother-- a librarian-- got fused with this porn star. And he then spent the whole period of time-- and it obviously made the New York Times today.

I don't know how many of you are geriatric porn stars or aspire to be, but typically we think that the Harvard faculty has different kinds of aspirations. And today what we're going to do is learn about how to manage your online presence so that this doesn't happen to you or to your mother.

So, without further ado, I'm going to introduce Perry Hewitt who is the Chief Digital Officer for Harvard. And I think I refer to Perry as the czar of all things digital. She's trying to bring Harvard into the 21st century in ways that I think are very creative. And hopefully you all can help be a part of that. So, Perry.

**PERRY HEWITT:** Thank you so much. It has never been more important to think about how to manage your online presence whether you're a geriatric porn star not. I think it's super important to think about where you. My job has been a lot thinking about Harvard's institutional brand. And I joke

that I never want to make the mistake of thinking I hit a triple when I was born on third base. I get that Harvard already had a pretty good brand presence well before I got here-- 375 years.

But what I really work to do is to think about how does the institution present itself-- how do we appear in social, how do we appear in mobile, And the ways people consume information today. So what I've done is pulled together some brief slides to say, here are the kinds of things we think about when we think about the Institution, and then give you very much more sort of tactical and practical tips for how you might extend this to think about yourselves.

And obviously there are a lot of ways in which the institutional brand and the individual brand overlap. We're working with the provost's office-- with Judy Singer and Amy Brand-- on faculty finding technology and thinking about, how does that fit into how we represent Harvard online. How much should-- Harvard owns certain topic and subject areas and individual faculty and what's the Venn diagram of overlap there. So, you know, how do people find you is a really big question.

So there was this old view of the web. So I-- I'm really old on the internet. So I started doing commercial internet projects around 1995, '96, which is very new compared to the smart people who were dreaming it up. But, you know, old school for people who were thinking about the commercial web. And the old way of thinking about things, right, was that you go to a website, you go to a homepage. And part of our thinking behind the homepage redesign the last year was to bring a lot more content to the home page because it's sort of a specious battle to think about who appears on the homepage when so much of how we find people or topics occurs elsewhere.

So this is sort of an old school model, thinking about if I'm looking for-- I arbitrarily picked on Sarah Richardson because I saw her name in signing up for this event-- but you would go to the Harvard homepage and then you would click on the word faculty, which actually a ton, a ton of people click on. Hey, Misiek.

**MISIEK**

[INAUDIBLE]

**PISKORSKI:**

**PERRY HEWITT:**

Good. Which a ton of people click on on the home page. And then you can search in the faculty directory to find out where she is. Then you get a very-- if I may say so-- unhelpful page, which gives you a lot of Harvard-ese acronyms of FAS/SOM/-- you know, I think there's

some abbreviation for the history of science. And then you get an email address, but you don't get her bio. You don't get all kinds of interesting and relevant information.

If you're thinking more broadly and want to know more about history of science at Harvard, well, you can go to harvard.edu and search for history of science. And you'll get the name of the department. And then that could lead you down a rabbit hole to try and find. You go to the department site, then you go to the faculty site, and then you finally find Sarah Richardson on the faculty listing page. But first you have to decide she's like actual faculty, tenured faculty, weekend faculty. Like nine different ways you could call faculty apparently.

But what people actually do is they go to the Google. Right? You know, no matter what. They might they put quotes around her name. Or they might not. But either way, they go to the Google in their task bar, and then eventually they're going to get to her bio. So knowing that this is the first experience of you and your brand, it's important to think about search as maybe the first linchpin of the two pronged approach of search and social.

So what does search look like today? This is a Pew internet slide from a while ago, but it talks about what's the change-- you know, search has actually changed very little in the last-- what is it? 10 years on the web. So it's gone from 85% of online activity to 91% of online activity. So it's still a very, very dominant way to access information on the web.

And the Google has won, pretty much. I mean Bing has done big marketing campaigns and it does-- it has gotten certain platforms and certainly geniuses have worked to develop the technology-- Professor King. But however, Google has still pretty significant sets of market share. So it's something you have to think about when optimizing your own stuff.

So I decided to take a look at search refers to the Harvard Gazette. Google is number two. You'll see the internet relic StumbleUpon is number one. I'll talk more about it in terms of social. And what are they searching for? This is super interesting to me. So if you're trying to think of how people are finding you, are they finding you via IQSS or causal inference. Are they looking for an Arizona State senator with the same name? The important thing is to figure out what are the terms they're looking for when they come to your bio page, your own personal site.

And he said the number one category there's not provided. That's because of a privacy change that Google made a little while ago. So if you're not logged into Google when you do a search, they do not report the terms that were searched on for you. So that is really just

kryptonite for marketers. That's killing us. Because it's really hard to know what you're optimizing for if that data isn't there. So they're looking at some workarounds on that.

And I also just took a quick look at what do people search for once they get on the site. And the answer is pretty much Jeremy Lin and Lady Gaga, so in terms of search behavior, so--

But what are search engines like? What may be actually applicable or useful to you in this presentation? So Google uses about 200 signals. They do not publish this list, very helpfully. There are a ton of SEO people will sell you terrible snake oil. And the good news is you don't have to use them. They have some good tips and tricks, but most of them are publicly available online to understand how to optimize your content.

They use about 200 signals. Inbound and outbound links-- it's really important to think about any website you present for yourself, your project, your grant application, whatever it is they want public on the internet that people to find and associate with you, that you think about it as an airport terminal and not as a desert island. That is the metaphor I hope you'll leave with today. Like lots of things coming in, lots of things coming out.

So Harvard is a brand that's a lot about control. Right? We're all about how does the brand look. When I first came, we had no official videos on YouTube. We sort of broke the mold with that. Now we have a lot of stuff on YouTube. A lot of individual professors and centers, I hasten to add, did have things on YouTube. But as an institution, we hadn't really taken the stance to say, we're going to give up that control. We know YouTube's going to run ads against it. We know that it could be embedded into sites whose philosophies we agree with, most notably I saw one of our green videos embedded in a very anti climate change website little while ago. I saw that from the traffic being driven to our site from this very sort of far right climate change site.

So we know that we're giving up a lot of control when we do that, but what we get in return is influence. So that same thinking about your website-- you know, there was a lot of reservation even, because that one I came about linking out to third party sites. Linking out to the Center for Astrophysics, or you know, the idea was we need to keep them on, we need to keep them reading where we are.

Think about your website that exact same way. It's an airport terminal. How can people get to the content that may interest them, that may not be solely on your site, through your site to increase not only people who find it useful-- to please humans-- but also please the machine,

Google, which will please more humans by sending more to your site.

Think about the quality and quantity of searchable content. It breaks my heart. I have friends who are academics who will email me from prestigious institutions, say, oh, I got this guy and for \$2,000 he put together this great website. And it'll be like a flash monstrosity of, you know, here's my interest, you know, women's studies, friend, and they'll all pop up and go away. But it doesn't tell the search engine anything. As beautiful as it is, that's still a control mindset of here's this beautiful representation of what I, as a senior faculty member, I'm an expert on-- and the internet can't read what you're putting out there. So think of open formats and not closed formats when you think about that.

Recency is huge. So, again, updating your site, even if it's a Tumblr blog or, you know, these tools are not expensive or prohibitive. And you buy your domain and refer to them. Keeping a site recent will really drive more people to your online presence.

Location content-- I found this-- I did a little bit of research for this presentation. And increasingly location content is being indexed by search engines. So if you add things that point to location, if you're adding pointers on a map, that can improve your ranking a little bit. And social content and social authority. And, you know, Misiek Piskorski from the business school is here. And he's an expert on these topics, and how they may be influencing things like search engine rankings as well as your presence within the social sphere.

So social today. I absolutely love this picture because this is a kid looking at Facebook. So is Facebook about connection? Or is Facebook about narcissism? I'm a heavy user, and I can tell you straight up, it's a little of both. But we are increasingly capturing more of our pictures or videos just as the campus-- some of our photographers have been with us for 17 years. And they're amazed by how much the kids are looking down rather than looking out when they walk around the yard. And I'm a technologist and I love this stuff, but it sort of breaks my heart when they come back with some of these pictures.

So this is a tweet from Misiek. We were talking about search and social don't always get along. Right? There's kind of a war between them. So Google runs Google search. And, you know, Apple has a lot of assets that aren't Google-able. And Twitter is not owned by Google. So how Google indexes tweets always changes back and forth. And this tweet is actually just talking about how 90% of people-- or 10% of the people produce 90% of the content on Twitter. But search is an issue that plays out here too.

So this is the same chart I showed you earlier. I just think it's arresting to think about-- that's 2005, which I think is the year that YouTube launched. But think about how much social network site use has increased between 2005 and 2012, up to 66%. Still a lot less than search as an online activity. But it's huge in terms of growth trajectory and then how people access and find information.

Minutes of use of social networking sites. I think when I first came here someone said to me, what's your Myspace strategy? I said wait. So, turned out to be a good strategy. And even the MLA's on it, right? I'm starting to see more and more tweets and comments [INAUDIBLE] and I was, how do you cite a tweet? How do you do-- and just when I saw the MLA was on this, I thought this was worth including.

People share content across their myriad platforms so it's really hard to know where you invest time and energy. And some content you create on your own. I just love this tweet. I brought this to Australia where people were crazy about Jeremy Lin inexplicably. But, you know, Harvard is taking-- look at the order of these things-- Facebook, then the White House, now basketball. I'm sure teaching and learning is in there somewhere.

But people create presences and content on social. And a lot of content they curate. And this is big trend on the web. So if you're thinking about yourself as-- I mean, academics are thinkers and leaders and scholars and publishers. But one thing they are increasingly, like the rest of us, are curators. It's a totally overused and overhyped dumb word. But the truth is, a lot of what people are looking for is help me get to the smartest things around my topic. And I see that in terms of managing your online reputation. That's one of the things that faculty can Excel at, especially Harvard faculty where the breadth of things that cross your desk or the ideas that cross your department are so large that simply aggregating them and delivering them shows a lot of value.

I just put this in because the trend of Pinterest to me, and the whole idea of the visual web growing, is just so amazing in terms of how quickly it's delivering more content to different sites. So this month-- last month in February, Pinterest actually referred more traffics to sites, to people than Twitter did, which is kind of amazing to think about. So when people click on a Pinterest picture, it drives back to a site. And it drove more than Twitter.

So it's just-- this may not be completely germane to what you do day to day, but to me it's a fascinating trend not only to the web of curation, the visual web, and how quickly things can

rise up that might catch you by surprise. Don't know-- how many of you are on Pinterest in this room? So, yeah, some one, two, three. It's a really pretty new 2011 thing. But the speed to which those things can grow and drive traffic is just interesting to observe.

So these are the refers leading to the Gazette-- so, to the point of Pinterest driving more traffic-- January 1 to March 17, 2012. So I just called out the number of social refers on there. So for-- you could argue that our refers now are much more intentional. It's much fewer people just stumbling upon the Harvard Gazette and many more people who are actually being driven there through social traffic.

And then I compare that back to the same period in 2010 just to see how much less. If you go back and forth, more social, less social. So this is why your presence on social media matters. Right? It's because it drives traffic to places you want them to go. The Harvard Gazette is not a hub of social activity, but it has quadrupled traffic from 2009 to 2012 in part because, I think, of its participation in the social web which allows you to drive a lot more traffic, which is I assume a goal for many of you.

So there's sort of this cooptition relationship between social and search. The search engines don't want to always index the rival social sites. Social drives a lot of traffic. So the search engines can't ignore them entirely. But there are two sort of pillars you have to think about when you think about managing your online reputation. But I want to be really tactical about what you can do, because that's why you're here.

So there are two schools of thought, if I go back to that control and influence. Weeding is about control. I want to find that one video of me back when I was a Crimson Hexagon at South by Southwest, clearly taken at an after party, in which I'm talking about the social web. I would love to pull that off the internet. I'm not going to bother to find it or to pull that video. Instead I'm going to make I have a lot more current and recent and interesting videos about thing I'm working on today. So it's the difference between weeding and planting grass.

And it's a direction I'm really trying to steer Mass Hall and folks thinking the university about online brand in terms of how we face-- you're always going to have social noise, positive and negative, about your brand. So let's focus less on the things we want to pull out. The people who say, you know, Piskorski's an expert in gardening and not in social. Let's not worry about that guy. Let's just publish a lot more about expertise and social, and worry a lot less about that. So it's less about control, more about influence. Less about weeding, more about planting

grass.

And planting grass are the tactical things you can do in order to push your brand, your expertise, and your content out there. One is really obvious, but it's own your name, you know, domain and social properties. So, you know, I've tried-- I'm lucky with the name Perry Hewitt and being an early adopter. I've had pretty good luck. For the Joe Smith's out there, it's a little bit tougher.

But trying to own your name, you know, both your domain name-- which you can refer, you can buy for \$7.99. If you just go to whois.net, you can buy your name or a version of your name. And then you can refer it to anything you want. You can refer it to your Harvard bio page if you can't be bothered-- you know, if you have a department bio page-- to set up a Tumblr account if you have a million other things going on. Or you can set up a Tumblr account. You can set up an about.met page. And I'm happy to send the list of tools as a follow up to this to anyone who's interested.

Err toward open. I just went to a talk at the Berkman Center with Alec Toward from O'Reilly Media. It was so interesting talking about the impact of open data and open government. And we don't talk a lot about Open University, but there are a million different initiatives from Dataverse to things going on in the FAS that really make us think about how we deliver content that is open and earlier.

And I put even draft ideas. You know, this is an industry that focuses on the published, peer reviewed journal article. But what are the ways in which your thought leadership can get out there early-- to Amy's point earlier of not only the areas what you're known for having published in, but your areas of expertise. And the web is an ideal way to push and publish that out.

And optimize those things for search and social. It breaks my heart when I search for a Harvard faculty member or a department and you don't get that Google snippet below it. Jared Spool coined the term back in like 2003, called the scent of information. And there's so many things that deliver that scent that make a link seem more clickable. One of those things is the snippet of text underneath a Google search result.

And another way is, you know, so often-- my team manages the university Facebook page. And we love to highlight things like from the astrophysics center or from the athletic studies. There all these fascinating things going on all the time, the art museum. And it breaks my



heart when I'll go to a department or an individual faculty page and you pull in the thing into Facebook and you know, got 1.7 million followers. So even if only 5% see a given post, that's a pretty good ROI.

And I'm pulling the page and the information below it'll be blank because there's no metadata on that page. Metadata is a really boring unsexy word for all the information about your article that needs to appear to be pulled into social sites. That stuff is really important. And we see if we pull in things that have a generic image and no metadata, versus a human face and rich metadata, or an arresting abstract science image, oddly enough, will really drive click throughs. And the metadata, you know, the difference is exponential.

Make use of common tools to grow. And this is the list I'll follow up with-- that's whether you start a Twitter, an about.me, Tumblr, Google Plus-- and to prune so there are things you can pull out our de-emphasized by managing those tools aggressively.

The next one which I'll show you is Google Dashboard, Me on the Web. A shockingly few number of people know about this, and even fewer use it, which it's pretty easy to go in. I think it's [google.com/dashboard](http://google.com/dashboard), but if you just Google "Google Dashboard" you'll get it. But manage your online reputation right there. And it's a really good tool. And you can set up alerts to see what other kinds of things are being-- you know, every time somebody says Alissa Goodman online, is it about you? Is this something you want to have posted? Is it something early that you didn't know was out there? It's really helpful.

But there's the third bullet down. You can see it says remove unwanted content. And you can absolutely pull things that are not right or correct from the things that are indexed from Google. If you have more serious problem, something bigger that you want to do, there are specialized firms that you can work with. And I'll include a few of those names in there. But this is for the generic like, oh, this presentation isn't exactly what I want it.

So other friends of mine who are academics really struggle with the fact that they automate a lot of the faculty profiles. And sometimes recency is the only metric for what they pull in. Just like I published a giant monograph on Topic X four months ago. And they're pulling in three dumb book reviews that just happened to go to press this month. Like how do I adjust that?

So, when we have faculty tools internally, we'll look at ways to make sure that things are featured that are things that are most important to you as a scholar. But in the same way, you can toggle things up and down within Google.

Going back, the last one is manage privacy settings, which again is publicly available and shockingly underutilized. I think the breakpoint is around the age of 30. People under 30, because they have so many painful mistakes on their record having grown up in this environment, are much more aggressive about managing their privacy settings. But you can absolutely manage sort of who sees who.

And I'm pretty careful with it within my job. So I don't want someone very junior on my team posting something ill advised to my page which my boss then sees, right? I don't care about it necessarily. But I don't want to expose it to somebody else. So avoiding that friends of friends problem of who can see what you post to third parties. All this stuff it's tedious to do, but it's relatively quick. And it's a great way to manage your online reputation through a site that has 850 million users and is increasingly indexed when people do search.

LinkedIn, another one. They're increasingly improving the amount of data they collect about you, and your ways to customize it. Some tags on LinkedIn are huge. I think you get-- how many, Misiek? 50 tags? It's a--

**MISIEK** [INAUDIBLE]

**PISKORSKI:**

**PERRY HEWITT:** Yeah, you can--

**MISIEK** [INAUDIBLE]

**PISKORSKI:**

**PERRY HEWITT:** Yeah, you get an astronomical amount of tags. I logged in the other day for something, like add tags. And I thought, oh, four more. And they said, you have 48 to go. It's astonishing. So that's again an easy internet hack to fix your search results. What are the things you are an expert in? Sorry.

**SPEAKER 1:** [INAUDIBLE]

**PERRY HEWITT:** OK. So if you go to LinkedIn you can have a profile. And one of the things I would urge you to do right when you get your profile is set up a vanity URL. And they let you do that. I think they let anybody do that, right? So you can it on-- I think mine is just Hewitt. And so when you send someone your profile, you can say [linkedin.com/user/hewitt](https://www.linkedin.com/user/hewitt). You don't have to say, you know, send some long unintelligible string. So that's a good thing.

And then you log in and it'll say update your profile, top right. Or edit your profile. And there are ways you can add tags, which again are metadata. So they're short terms that say something about you. So for me, it might say internet addict, dog walker, mother, traveler, whatever those things are that describe me. And then I can put them in my LinkedIn profile.

And then when people are searching are LinkedIn-- and this is, I think, less relevant to faculty and publishers, but it's another good way to have a free footprint on the web. It's not like your job hopping or looking around in the marketing world on LinkedIn, but it's another good way to be indexed well by search.

All right. Well, that's all I have for presentation. We want to move to Q&A? All right. So thought I'd just kick it off with a question for the panelists. So, you know, what is your online reputation to you? I was actually having breakfast with somebody very senior within News Corp, who was doing a lot of interesting stuff with video. There's-- and they said Fox has 200 million Facebook fans. And we're re-defining what a franchise is. For us now, a franchise is what someone types into Google to find us, rather than a product or program. So it made me think, you know, what's a reputation. So want to start, Misiek?

**MISIEK**  
**PISKORSKI:**

Sure. So I've resigned to no reputation, quite honestly. And I mean it slightly tongue in cheek, but slightly seriously. I mean, I'm maybe in a slightly unusual situation that I research. You know, I always have the excuse of oh, I've done this and it's research. Right? So I play online games and I tell people it's research.

But more seriously, so what's reputation. So I'm actually thinking of this in sort of very transparent terms. I'm actually-- my approach towards this is that it's less about me trying to portray the persona that I am. That's my official HBS page conveys that, and conveys that very unsuccessfully. So much so that you can't even find my email address because people are so concerned about spam at HBS that they wouldn't even let me post my email address.

But I'm actually sort of very much thinking about this in a sort of-- and you already alluded to this-- in this sort of, if you like, inbound marketing role. So a lot of what people are thinking about and what are more traditional schools are thinking about is how do we take content that we have and push it out. And so that this is typical outbound marketing.

I actually am sort of more thinking about managing my reputation in a way that makes me A, findable and 2, accessible. And that's actually how I meant like I'm actually resigned my

reputation in a way. So I actually try to come across as slightly goofy online. I actually try just to play around, be slightly playful, say things sometimes that might be conceived by some of my senior colleagues as slightly outrageous, but they sort of, do it like, oh, he's Polish. So I also carefully cultivated.

So-- and what I found actually when you do that, amazing things happen. Really amazing things happen. And sort of Twitter has been very helpful, but so has Facebook. In many ways what I've found is that people have reached out to me. Very, very unexpected people have reached out to me to say, that's really interesting. Why would you ever say that? That doesn't seem to make a lot of sense.

And the people sort of who congratulate you, that's sort of like, usually those conversations don't go very far. But people who sort of say, you know, well, that just makes no sense, this seems wrong, actually leads to very interesting conversations.

And in some situations, actually, I had two situations where I actually got research data sets from companies as a consequence of that. Right? So I have actually sort of started leveraging a lot of what I'm doing to actually get input for data. And since a lot of what I do is social science data, you know, and social science data is usually quite difficult to get.

This has actually sort of opened doors to many research sites where basically the order was people would reach out to me, we'd have a conversation. We'd disagree about something. Then we'd find out all it was, we were just making different assumptions about the world, some of which would be testable. And I said, well let's test it. Do you actually have these data? Let's actually look at them.

And so that's sort of been my strategy, is being open, being accessible, being very easily foundable and very easy accessible by people. So that's my online reputation for you, for what it's worth.

**GARY:**

Thanks. Thanks, Perry, for arranging this, and everybody else involved. So I learned Twitter from Perry. Perry was at Crimson Hexagon which is a company that I helped form. And I signed up for Twitter. And my first follower was a friend from graduate school. And so I thought, OK, I got this.

And my second follower was Britney Spears. Don't ask. I haven't the slightest idea. So then I realized I didn't get it. But I don't think I'm going to get it.

But one way of thinking about it is that our job as academics is the creation, dissemination, and preservation of knowledge. I think of it as, that's the purpose of the university. And what this session is about is the dissemination of knowledge, and finding, and things like that. But it's basically-- it's not about creation of knowledge. It's not about preservation. Actually preservation of stuff is actually a very big issue.

But it's about the dissemination of knowledge, and new ways of disseminating knowledge. It used to be that we would just write things, and they become books or articles. And they'd be published, I don't know, three or four years after we wrote them, usually. And now actually we can distribute much faster. And I think that's really interesting.

And so I think of it as part of our job. I mean, I think like what do you mean you don't have-- it's the equivalent either Twitter account or whatever company you feel like signing up to support. Because that's basically what it is. You sort of have to. I mean, I think that's-- I think of that as our job.

Whether you want to feel goofy, or crazy, or stuffy I mean, that's up to you. Although the rules of the game seem to be that you distribute your knowledge and people actually want to know that you're actually a human being.

And so you do have to add some aspect of something. And so, if you feel comfortable with that, you'll share too much. Otherwise, you actually need to add some aspects of you as a person, but you don't have to tell them everything about yourself.

So I think like a really important point is that like when you go-- like this is junior faculty around the table, including Joe. And a really important point is that the transition from like a graduate student to a faculty member, I think is you become a public figure. And that's a really strange thing, because you don't think that you're becoming a public figure. You just think you're just getting a job. Right? But actually it's a job where you become a public figure.

What is a public figure? A public figure is a place where you're there, you're saying things, and you're communicating to people that you don't know. And then they can say anything they feel like about you. And you don't even get to know about it very often. You don't have any control over it. And if they can say something to hurt you such that it benefits them, they probably will.

So you really have to-- I mean, that's a really important thing. So that means it's not only like pushing yourself out there, you're a Harvard professor, people will find you. So it's actually

managing it in an interesting way. And you sort of have to think about it the same way do about celebrities, even though we're not-- most of us work on technical issues and we're very happy to be able to do that. But actually thousands and thousands of people out there are really interested, maybe hundreds of thousands.

And so you have to really think about it, the way we think about celebrities. You know when a friend meets some celebrity, you know what they say to you? They make some judgment about them as a person. They say, what a jerk. Or they say, you know, he was sort of a regular guy. And actually, that's really important. I mean, it's important to me anyway.

And so when you deal with people out there, deal with them that way. So like my rule is whenever I get email, I respond to it. I don't care what it is, who it is, unless it's really like somebody who's nuts and not my colleague. You know, I try to respond to every email. All right, that's-- so maybe that's a little crazy. But you just try to be a an adult, like somebody who has a persona that you'd want to actually speak to.

Reporters are interesting because if they're going to interview you about your work, their job of a reporter I think of as sort of like a soccer player. Where you fake right, go left. Right? They don't-- their job is not to convey you in the best possible light. They don't care about you, particularly. Their goal is to-- they have an angle, or they're going to try to find an angle. And if you come out well or bad, that's just not relevant. Right?

So when you're talking to a reporter, it's really important that you be careful about what you say. I mean, a lot of you have experience with this. But it's not a minor thing. Some are really nice and honest and et cetera. But you know, for example, it's against the rules of most journalism to actually share with you what they're going to write before they write it. You can imagine if that was a rule in academia.

So, anyway, so on the transmission of knowledge or distribution of knowledge, I think of it as there aren't a set of rules, they're constantly changing. And I think it's our job to stay up at the cutting edge of research. And it's also our job to stay at the cutting edge of distribution.

And so, it used to be that great advice to junior faculty was like, every time you write a paper make a Xerox copy of it, like maybe 50 Xerox copies of it, and put it in the mail to all the important people. Right? Or what I used to tell people, even today when they write a book, give up all the royalties. You're not going to make any money on the book. OK? Instead get

from the publisher 100 free copies and send a copy to everybody who could possibly write a tenure letter for you. It's still a pretty good piece of advice actually.

But that's not most of the distribution. That's not most of the way that you're going to get to be known. I mean, it used to be you would get reprints and you'd buy the reprints. That's sort of ridiculous these days. But a real piece of advice is when you write an article and you get this copyright notice which signs away all of your work to the publisher so they can make a lot of money, write in it that you the author-- in fact, write the following sentence-- the author may put a copy of the PDF of this article, the final published PDF, on the author's website. And the publisher must provide a PDF to the author. Just literally write that on there. OK? Don't make a big deal about it. Just write it on there, sign it, and send it back. OK?

So what happen-- I've done this for 15 years. OK? So what happens is vast majority of times it's some assistant that takes it and files it in a drawer. Occasionally, they come back and they say, sorry, this is against our policies. Do the following. I promise. Just say, well, sorry, this is my rule. I've always done this. And they'll say well, we can't publish it. And you just say, OK. I promise you, the bluff works 100% of the time. OK?

And they always back down. They will sometimes say, this is not our policy and so what we're going to do-- after you push them-- is they'll say, we're not agreeing to this. But we'll write you a separate letter that lets you do it. Fine. So there's no precedent. I mean, who cares? This is some made up rules.

So a couple of other-- I think that's actually a really important thing. There's Dash, which is a university effort to capture the last non-published version of your papers and put them on a website. And I think that's really important. But I want the published version on my website. I want the version that people can site to page 2264 that it's actually the correct page. And so if you just write that, then you can get that.

**PERRY HEWITT:** Can we do better than PDF in the future? Can we get an open, scan-able format? That's the only thing--

**GARY:** Sure. I said PDF because I thought that was better than the previous one. So whatever you tell me to do next, that's what I'm doing. If anybody doesn't have a website, or even if they do, there's one project that-- another thing Perry and I are working on is OpenScholar, which was developed at IQSS. And you can all have a website, a free website.

And anybody that has a cool new aspect of their website is being-- it's being programmed into the OpenScholar platform. And you can get it, too. And so you'll always be up to date. So you can go to scholar.harvard.edu and you can all get a website. If you need any help with that, I mean you should just email us.

The basic story is that if you want your own website, you'll pay between \$5,000 and \$25,000 to get somebody to sort of set it up. Now all you need is the last-- is just the veneer of the look and feel. And you can make it look and feel-- as your website-- totally unique, not like anybody else's website.

But the underlying structure is the same. Because we all have a list of our publications, and we have our CV, and we have our classes. And you know what, all of our websites structurally are the same. So we came up with one system that provides all that. So anyway, that's free. So you should all do that.

One other important thing is make stuff available. Right? So not only the stuff that you write, not only your thoughts on things, and Twitter or Facebook, whatever it is, but your data that's associated with your publications and articles. So another service that we provide is called Dataverse, which you can go to [dvn.iq.harvard.edu](http://dvn.iq.harvard.edu).

And that-- Dataverse is the universe of data. And so you can put your data on there, but instead of you taking the data and sending it to this archive, what Dataverse will do is we'll give you on your website-- whether it's OpenScholar or something else-- an extra page that looks exactly like the look and feel of your website. But actually it's not actually on your page. Nobody will ever know that. It's actually in the archive.

And so you'll get an enormous array of services that are provided that help you get more visibility for the data you provide, both web visibility and actually academic citations. Both of these are tuned so you get more academic citations. OpenScholar, you put your publications in there and it sends the citation out to Google Scholar and ISI and Retpack and all the different indices. So you'll literally get cited more, which is very highly correlated with salary, by the way.

**PERRY HEWITT:** And in both of those, you're getting the power of the harvard.edu domain.

**GARY:** Yes. Yes, that's true.

**PERRY HEWITT:** You know. So anything we do to aggregate the institutional brand and the aggregate data



that's housed there will improve the SEO for your stuff.

**GARY:** Yeah. And I think that's right. So anyway those are some suggestions.

**PERRY HEWITT:** Great.

**SPEAKER 3:** What was the original question?

**PERRY HEWITT:** Make it up. Managing your online reputation. What do you do? Is it worth doing? What-- tips and tricks.

**GARY:** Tell us about the universe.

**SPEAKER 3:** Tell us about the universe.

**PERRY HEWITT:** Are the stars going to be out tonight?

**SPEAKER 3:** My advantage in being fourth is that I had the list here of things that I should be sure to mention, and everybody has almost all of them. So I'll only mention the ones that weren't mentioned. But can I ask a question first? Can I just like ask a few questions actually to figure out who's in the audience?

So how many people here have a well-maintained website?

**PERRY HEWITT:** That's pretty good.

**SPEAKER 3:** Like a third, a half. OK. How many people have a not well-maintained web site? A few. OK. And how many people have no website? A few confessors. OK, how many people use Twitter? A couple. Facebook? LinkedIn? You know what clout.com is? Raise your hand, Gary.

**PERRY HEWITT:** It's out of Stanford. We don't like it.

**GARY:** Clout's terrible.

**PERRY HEWITT:** Yeah.

**SPEAKER 3:** Clout's terrible.

**PERRY HEWITT:** Oh, you think it's terrible, too? I think it's terrible.

**GARY:** No, no. It's actually dishonest.

**PERRY HEWITT:** Great.

**SPEAKER 3:** It's evil. Anyway, Clout is an aggregator for all those things that will tell you how quote, unquote influential you are on the web, but it's quite wrong. There's another one called reputation.com, which is even worse because they charge you money.

But anyway. OK. That gives me an idea. So I'll just tell you a little story about my own online persona. There isn't one. There are several. And so that's just a point that I don't think has come up before is sort of where the divide is between not only like different academic fields you might work in, but also your personal life and your private life.

And I had something happen to me on Sunday, which was not bad, but was very amusing. On Facebook, there's a group called Astronomers. And I have been involved in a very active conversation. I put a post on the group the other day about NSF proposals being returned without review for tiny technical errors. And I'd never gotten such a response on Facebook. There over 40 comments that occurred within a few days, which for those of you who don't use Facebook, is a lot. If it's not gee, I had a baby, which will get you about 90 comments automatically. OK.

But anyway, so on my phone, Facebook was stuck in this group. And I never put personal stuff in that group. OK? It's a professional conversation. But I was out biking, and I took a picture of my daughter because she was amusingly looking at MIT, where I was an undergraduate, and asked me what it was.

She's not very good at geography. She's 14. She well knows what MIT was. She just didn't know what building she was looking. But I thought this was very funny.

And so I took a picture with my phone of her from the back, and I put on the post, you know, here's Abby because my friends know who Abby is. The Astronomers mostly don't know who Abby is. There's like 1,000 of them, by the way, that I accidentally sent this to.

You know, here's Abby looking at MIT and asking me what it is, question mark, exclamation point. I got five comments within 10 minutes from astronomers who I sort of know, all nerdy comments about MIT and school for tools, and some of them knew me, and they thought oh, isn't that funny that your daughter doesn't know who MIT is.

But this was like a really weird, because it was this crossover between my professional-- and astronomy is a very small field. There's only about 10,000 professional astronomers in the world, and so I do know a fair fraction of them. And I knew the names, at least, of the people who wrote back.

But I felt very weird about having done that. And so the only-- not the only, but one thing that I want to add to this conversation is that you have to kind of decide in advance what tools you're going to use for what kind of online presence. And luckily that wasn't a picture of my kitten or something like that. So it was sort of OK.

But I did, I also had to make a choice that comes to my next point, which is adding or subtracting, or reading or growing. And so I had to decide like do I put another post that says oops, that was an accident. Or do I just leave it alone? And so for a while I was just leaving it alone. But then there like six more comments.

So I finally put a comment Monday morning that said, I'm glad you're all enjoying this so much, but just for the record, this was a mistake. I meant to-- I didn't need to put it in. And you know so I figured it was enough friendly comment that I should do that.

But other times, it's like what Perry was saying, where if there's a bunch of negative information but then there's a pile of positive information about you or about something you did, it's not worth responding to the negative information. It's just almost never worth it. It's too much effort. It's too much effort to find it. It's too much effort to respond to it.

And so it's funny because when you say-- I told my husband, who Gary knows, that I was coming to this panel today to talk about managing your online reputation. And he works with a bunch of lawyers. And so he immediately started thinking about these companies that will clean up your reputation and how not to mess up your reputation in the first place, and all the kind of negative aspects of this.

Where I hope that what we're mostly talking about is the positive aspects, about openly sharing information and data, and sort of this whole concept of micro publications that people haven't talked about, that Amy knows a lot about. But I'm not really sure what that means. But some people actually count a tweet as a publication. And they're interested in sort of citation metrics-- which I know Judy hates, as do I-- that include things like how many times you tweet about what or the other thing.

But the future will look different. OK? And the sort of standard article that you used to order reprints of or books are really-- they're still going to be there but there's going to be a lot of other stuff. Just to give you one example, I work in astronomy data visualization-- what people call sort of e-science and science education. And in science education, I have almost no publications.

But I made a bunch of WorldWide Telescope tours. For those of you who don't know what WorldWide Telescope is, go check it out. OK? But one of the tours that I've made has been viewed 7 million times. OK? I will never, in all the papers I write, come anything close to something with that many zeros. OK? Never. OK.

And so, in terms of my online reputation, right, if somebody's a kid interested in astronomy, they're going to think, oh, yeah, she's that one who made that tour. Right? And no professional astronomer's going to give a hoot about that. And so it's sad, but it's true.

But anyway, so it's sort of hard to figure out how to divide these different personalities. And I think that's all I wanted to say. Oh, the last thing I wanted to say is just a comment about what Perry showed about privacy. And you said it's really easy to manage privacy.

I have to tell you that I'm somebody's who's supposed to know all about this. And whenever you sign up for a new service, and it says, you know, connect with Facebook because it's a good, easy way to log into things, there are like 18 different little things it's like, that you give permission for Facebook to do. And you really do want to connect with that service, and so sometimes it's just like fine, OK, click.

And I know that some day I'm going to regret that. And so I actually don't understand the vagaries of all the different permission that you're giving it.

**PERRY HEWITT:** As a topic overall, it's hugely complex. Great. Shall we open it up for questions, anyone here.

**MISIEK**  
**PISKORSKI:** Conspicuous by its absence were students in this conversation. I feel like it's our obligation to bring them into this, because as much as we are scholars, we're also teachers. And-- you can't hear me? Sorry. Yes, as much as we are scholars, we're also teachers.

So I think a couple of interesting things are how do you manage A, the sort of distinction between you as a professor and you as a person when your students A, might follow you on Twitter too, might actually befriend you on Facebook. And 2, whether it is actually opportunities to introduce some of these tools into the teaching process.

And I've actually, in my experience, found that both are actually sort of worth paying attention to. A lot of our students go on to do wonderful things, so actually understanding what our students do afterwards, after they graduate from here, is quite phenomenal. And you-- so you would never discover that our students-- I mean, we get sort of some updates, but you'd never know that there are such-- doing such amazing things.

It also really helps students understand a lot of what you're doing in advance, before they take a class or after they take a class. Particularly after they've taken a class, there's just this interest that they continue in the class, and the sort of level conversations engagement is phenomenal.

And it sort of actually rubs on-- I mean the benefit of the current students is that the current students see that. And they go like, oh the graduates are still in touch with this person, so this person must be doing something. So I better pay more attention. I better go sort of the extra mile and find out what is this class is about and what we're learning because it's clearly it's sort of leaving a lasting impact.

So I actually now see students talking about my class, even like before they take it, because they're sort of talking to the graduates of my class because they've seen me talking to graduates. It's just a really sort of interesting and empowering experience, where it's almost like OK, well, I don't have to teach because graduates can teach you what I'm going to teach you, so like I can go to Bermuda. But, no hasn't happened yet.

So that's the first thing. And the second thing is also, and it's also sort of how close you allow students to sort of understand your personal life. And I think, you know, the tenor that I've heard so far from you guys is one of sort of divide and separate. And I think they're might be a little sort of a generational gap that's just beginning.

I think some of our-- at least I feel much more comfortable sharing details of my life with my students in a sense that it's already-- we already come across to them as sort of withdrawn and far away. And this kind of allows them to look into our lives and really see us as human beings without actually having to spend a tremendous amount of time with us.

**SPEAKER 3:**

I think there's two important distinctions, though. Twitter-- so my personal system is that I keep Twitter for professional things and Facebook for personal things, except for this Astronomers group that I told yo about. And the reason I choose to do that is because Twitter goes to the

entire world, whereas Facebook goes to your friends.

And I actually have a rule on Facebook that I will not friend anybody who I wouldn't want to go out to dinner with. OK? And that's just my rule. And I have plenty of former graduate students of our department, and some former undergraduates, who I'm friends with on Facebook. But I'm friends with them because I'm friends with them, not because I want to keep up with them professionally.

**GARY:** Actually. Actually. So I have something in between. I do the same thing as you do, but in addition I have a Facebook group for alumni of my classes. And then, over the years, you know, I get opportunities for jobs and things like that that I'll post. And they'll keep in contact with each other. They'll co-author papers and things, which is actually a terrific thing.

**MISIEK  
PISKORSKI:** Right. And I think where I am on the spectrum is I will friend any student who wants to friend me. I will never friend them. But then I have a privacy control. It's like, this is student safe, there's certain things that students are-- it's OK to see. And there's certain things that I don't want them to see, so I--

**PERRY HEWITT:** I get to see those things, though, right?

**MISIEK  
PISKORSKI:** Yes, you do get to see. You're on the homies list. So it's really interesting. And, again, it's sort of interesting-- I keep waiting for me to say something that will sort of-- I'll regret in the future. But it's sort of hasn't happened. And I think like the minute people find that you're actually quite transparent, and you lead transparent lives, really, this whole separation doesn't really make much of a difference. And it really helps students to relate to you much more easily.

**PERRY HEWITT:** For me, there's so much a connection around ideas. I actually met you on Twitter, because I had just come to Harvard. And there was a research thing that announced from your department that said, or your studies said, people with profile pictures-- Facebook post profile pictures with faces-- do much better than abstract pictures.

And so I said, who is this guy? Then I said, oh my gosh, he's at Harvard. And then I went to his bio-- his boring bio page on HBS-- and it didn't have a profile picture. So I wrote him, and said, hey jerk. Like eat your own dog food. What's going on? And then I made you take me out to breakfast here.