

# MINUTES OF THE UGC MEETING 2/12/24

1. Acceptance of Minutes
2. Need for a member of UGC to be on the GEAC as a representative
3. Proposed by-law to cut A & S representation on Senate Committees from 6 members to 2 members
  - a. Brenda mentioned this to Hanna, who consequently wrote to Richard Larson
    - i. His response was that the committee misunderstood its charge and that this would not happen
    - ii. He then proceeded to thank the By Law committee members for their service at the CAS Senate Meeting today (2/12/24)
  - b. Madeline received a similar notice from a member of ARC (Administrative Review Committee) on Jan 31, 2024 (see addendum for context)
    - i. It was stated that this revision subcommittee has no faculty from A&S on it; the only West Campus faculty member is from Business.
    - ii. It was also mentioned that this was to be raised at a Senate meeting
    - iii. Madeline shared the concern with the rest of ARC; and contacted Richard Larson
      1. Response from Richard Stein:
        - a. "The full proposal has been in the hands of Senators since December and this specific item was highlighted in our December meeting as a point of discussion for a future meeting. I am under the impression that the Committee Chairs were made aware of this proposal prior to the meeting, but I do not know the specifics ..."In either case, the point of the ByLaws Working Group raising this to the full Senate is to garner conversation and discuss how we as a whole want to see the future of the Senate. I anticipate all of the chairs voicing their concerns and expressing the interests of their committees will help foster a productive conversation about the "base" make-up of representation on their committees. Further, this will give appropriate insight to the working group to develop a sustainable approach towards committee engagement and future recruitment efforts on all the standing committees and the vital work they perform across the University."
        - b. I was never contacted as Co Chair of ARC - nor was my Co-Chair
  - c. Christine Pitocco stated that she is on the Revision committee and knew nothing about this proposal.
4. GEAC progress report
  - a. The SBCs seem to line up fairly well with the SUNY requirements
  - b. It was decided that for the time being multiple designations will be allowed for certain courses in order to still allow students to meet expected graduation target dates.
  - c. We need to design or create a TECH course or benchmark to fulfill that need. It should concentrate on the future needs of our students in this field
  - d. Hanna asked for input from the committee members
5. Turn-it-in discussion
  - a. Shelley explained that as it stands now, a request can be made to see the original document cited as a "plagiarism" match, both within the university and from other universities
    - i. This was brought to Legal Counsel and decided that at this time the requests would be bundled but not answered by anything other than a bounce-back statement (this is under consideration at this time)

- ii. A discussion of the need for this ensued and indicated that by consensus it was not something that we want to have happen (Doc 1 = new submission; Doc 2 = document cited as the source of the repetition)
  - 1. Infringement of the rights of the Doc 2 writer
  - 2. Little reason for obtaining the Doc 2 when the percentage match was already indicated
  - 3. Professors should be able to evaluate the extent and purpose of the duplicate material
  - 4. Is the repetition the result of a limited way to express something?
  - 5. Should the writer of the Doc 2 need to give permission ?
  - 6. Is the repetition the result of a comparison with something else that the Doc 1 writer has written?
  - 7. Cannot yet identify AI
- 6. Discussion of AI
  - a. The above led to a discussion of the use of AI by faculty and students alike
  - b. The danger (?) of having this technology in the hands of so few companies
    - i. Does it affect the job of teaching by separating all that we do into specific categories? (e.g. research,draft-writing, etc.)
  - c. AI is here to stay
    - i. Positive usage in what might be repetitive documents (e.g. rec letters, etc.)
    - ii. AI ability to generate ideas to use in original preparation of writing
    - iii. Does it clash with the purposes of education (university) with careers (e.g., business usage)
      - 1. Education - how do I do this and enhance my knowledge and performance?
      - 2. Business - how do I do my job more effectively and efficiently?
    - iv. We need to determine how to USE AI rather than ban its use
    - v. Faculty needs instruction in how to integrate AI effectively into the classroom.
    - vi. Students need to be instructed in the best ways to use AI without losing the creativity of the individual
- 7. The AI discussion led to the conclusion that the new TECH requirement should be reflective of the needs presented by this technical advancement (which will only improve with time)
  - a. All members were asked to send ideas for the TECH requirement to Hanna

**Addendum:**

Content of the notice related to #3 above:

OLD 1. The following committees shall include a base membership of:  
 two faculty members from each of the electoral divisions of Arts and Sciences  
 two faculty members from Engineering and Applied Sciences  
 two faculty members from Health Sciences  
 one library faculty member  
 one professional employee

PROPOSED Article 15 6.a. Base Committee Composition. The standing committees shall include a base membership of (except where stated differently within the Committees' charge):

- two academic faculty members from Arts & Sciences (Electoral Division - there shall be

one representative from a STEM area, and one representative from a Non-STEM area)

- two academic faculty members from Engineering and Applied Sciences (Electoral Division)

- two academic faculty members from Health Sciences (Electoral Division)

- one academic faculty member from University Libraries

- two professional faculty members from PEG (Electoral Division)

- one academic or professional faculty (professionals who perform some instruction) member from either the Graduate School, or Continuing, Professional, and Executive Education School, and

- one member from any unaffiliated academic college or school.