Meeting Minutes from
SENATE COMMITTEE – Education Services and Information Technology (SCEDIT)
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT STONY BROOK
Date: February 24, 2023
Time: 3:00 pm – 4:00 pm
Location: Zoom Meeting
In Attendance: Keri Hollander, Scott Campbell, John Shackelford, Henry Joseph, Fumio Aoki, Moises Eisenberg, Thomas Wilson, Erez Zadok, Cynthia Davidson, Victoria Pilato, Lenore Lamanna

Meeting called to order at 3:02 pm, Adjourned at 4:06 pm

The meeting this month falls during Winter Break for most school systems so attendance will be lighter than normal.

Confirming that everyone on the committee has read access to the committee Google Shared Drive called Senate_SCITED.

The co-chairs are managers with read/write access, all committee members have read access to everything in the shared drive.

The proposed meeting schedule for the semester is as follows:
02/24/2023, 03/31/2023, 04/28/2023, 05/26/2023

Educational Services

Brightspace
Starting with Educational Services, Rose and Diana are not in this meeting so perhaps some of the other members of the committee can speak to the roll out of Brightspace.

Several members said things are going well, it's just a matter of everyone getting used to the new Learning Management System. Using Respondus for online exams is performing the same as when using Blackboard. Understanding this system's quirks through experience. The university has purchased Level 1 support from SUNY which gives extended hours till 11pm on weekdays and slightly shorter hours on the weekends, maybe till 10pm. That support has been pretty good so far.

Praise for Rose Tirotta-Esposito and Diana Voss for doing a great job during this transition and to the LMS admins Saskya Barresi and Mark Carroll who are extremely responsive. A few courses ran into an issue where the course content was transferred over and some links were too long and got truncated.

Anthology
No real updates or issues. Anthology needs a local admin piece so we could add the same two questions to every review.

ChatGPT

Cynthia Davidson had brought up the impact of ChatGPT in education, in her case for writing. A brief summary of the universities discussions on this topic since Cynthia raised this issue in December 2022 has been detailed in our shared drive here:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/180Y3U_glap7yhhx6_w29-Pnqegcc9FpEyPTNBS0zDBA/edit?usp=sharing

Trying to learn what the application can do and if it can do anything that is valuable for our students and our education. We don't want students to use this as a crutch, a cheat, or passing off content as their own writing. The university has approached this topic with an open mind. We already have policies on academic dishonesty but there may be more we need to learn about it before making any knee jerk reactions.

Students already do peer review of their work, ChatGPT can paraphrase what you have written so it can be like peer review. It will also ask questions to clarify what it’s seen.

Try to have Wanda Moore to meet with us about plagiarism and doing your own work might include using artificial intelligence and passing it off as your own work. Jennifer Adams, Rose Tirrotta-Esposito might be useful on this as well.

This will need a lot of discussion, right now if we have a student who is having trouble expressing themselves they may go to the writing center for help and there they may have someone help figure out a good way of saying something. Often they will say you thank you so much can I use that in my paper, we usually say yes if it helps you. So if students describe what they are trying to write and ChatGPT or something else comes up with better wording.

Concerns about using these same tools for programming. The stakes aren’t the same, you can’t depend on this AI as an authority in any field.

Discussion about using AI to detect AI used to create “original work” for plagiarism. You can see this as a leapfrogging adversarial process going forward.

Information Technology

West Campus CIO search, the initial roster of applicants that was presented to the committee was interviewed and narrowed down to three people who were submitted upwards to the President's office. That committee was finished on February 12, 2023. Charlie McMahon had indicated he expected a candidate to be named in March of this year.

John Shackelford brought up the IT procurement process for purchasing printers. John described an exhaustive back and forth process with Toshiba to replace a simple desktop laser printer. Finally Toshiba recommended two suggestions, one for $1,100 and one for $1,200. Both of these were to replace something that today would cost $250. What kind of oversight is being done by the campus or is Toshiba running wild? The suggestions seem extremely oversized and overpriced for the usage case of 4 people.

What kind of oversight does DoIT or the University Senate have in the spirit of shared governance on this process?

Henry Joseph explained this is a SUNY mandate to all SUNY campuses for managed print that took over several years to form:
https://www.suny.edu/sunypp/documents.cfm?doc_id=890

The idea is to get the campus as a whole to use MFPs instead of individual printers so many people in your area can make use of that printer. This is a longer term multi step process and this contract will dictate what's needed. The idea is to reduce the carbon footprint of the university and reduce duplication of purchase.

John raised the idea that these large MFPs are expensive and may not be contributing to a smaller carbon footprint versus a few properly sized laser printers.

Observation: To be more environmentally soundly where we have the tools so we never print a document in the first place. Perhaps having an initiative to transition to a more electronic form by providing better scanning facilities and OCR technology campus wide.

DoIT ordered 64 MFPs to replace our campus fleet. All those devices have a free scan to email function. Anyone can print to those printers with secure release. This has worked well for students, the challenge is to get faculty and staff to use these.