

SCEDIT Meeting Minutes 2025-02-14

Attending: Scott Campbell, Victoria Pilato, Cynthia Davidson, Moises Eisenberg, Shyam Sharma, Matt Reuter, Keri Hollander, Simeon Ananou, Will Farr, Rose Tirotta-Esposito, Diana Voss, Alaa Abd-El-Hafez

The meeting began on February 14, 2025, at 2:56 PM.

Subcommittee Reports

AJC subcommittee charges are drafted and shared with the subcommittee members last month, and they had a discussion sharing constructive commentary. Finalized objectives to be shared with the SCEDIT co-chairs before the next meeting (March 28) so that members can vote on it.

AI Advisory Subcommittee: Several movements were happening across campus to provide students, departments, and programs with better guidelines about the boundaries of using AI in academic work. Among these is the Graduate School's statement on AI use and the Program in Writing and Rhetoric's policy statement. The Graduate School has requested that departments share their policies on the use of AI by graduate students. SCEDIT member expressed hope that other departments would review this statement, since much AI usage revolves around writing and research. A SCEDIT member offered approval for the statement but stated that defining AI in each instance may be required. Several members pointed out that the greatest impact of AI on academics occurred since 2022 and primarily involves ChatGPT usage. A member discussed their view of AI tools in the classroom and personal accountability for learning. Another member shared a course policy they created for their students regarding the use of AI, encouraging them to disclose their use of AI tools. It was suggested that there is a need for courses that teach self-regulation when using AI tools. A member described their SBU 101 class, which focuses on AI and self-regulation, noting that some faculty members are already offering similar courses.

The AI Advisory subcommittee tabled last month's proposal to create a stand/statement on DoIT's implementation of new technological tools that impact teaching and learning until we learn more about the Digital Governance Framework. The subcommittee was taking a longer view of the issue raised last month regarding NotebookLM and similar rollouts, as the current leadership was already consulting SCEDIT. DoIT affirmed this but stated that the slippery issue is when AI is suddenly inserted into apps and programs that the university already uses (such as Zoom). A pilot was offered to SCEDIT next month regarding this situation. It was predicted that almost every product we use will have an AI component in the next six months.

Accessibility Measures and Challenges

CELT discussed the Accessibility Town Hall, which was held on Feb. 7, 2025, emphasizing that it's not a one-time event. Mentioned were the ongoing efforts to make materials accessible and the creation of an FAQ to address common questions. They referred to an accessibility PDF remediation pilot that will be implemented, and the team's research on tools to help faculty make their documentation more accessible. The team acknowledged the challenges in making all materials accessible, especially with the upcoming deadline of April 20th, 2026. Concerns about the lack of resources for TAs in the School of Nursing were raised; It was suggested that new resources could be created to address this issue. The conversation ended with a discussion about the procurement process for software and the need for additional documentation to ensure accessibility. Discussion followed about deadlines (the current deadline for resolving all accessibility issues is April 26, 2026).

Gemini in Google Workspace

CIO presented an introduction of Gemini, a tool similar to Microsoft's Co-Pilot, in Google Workspace. It was explained that while Gemini is similar to Co-Pilot, it is a tool provided by Google and is part of our contract. The potential impact of these tools on teaching and learning, as well as the need for a balanced approach in their introduction, was highlighted. A member suggested the need for a best practice approach to tool use, the CIO mentioning that they are working on this. A member inquired about data sovereignty, and it was clarified that Stony Brook data remains under the university's purview and does not enter the public domain. Diana then announced the upcoming launch of a team of subject matter experts to help with tool inquiries, which has not yet been formally announced.

Data Storage in Google

DoIT described the challenges faced by Stony Brook University due to the lack of a policy for handling accounts of individuals who have separated from the institution. The increased consumption of Google services, which has tripled over the past year, leading to potential risks such as data loss, audit issues, and legal complications, was highlighted. A retention policy for data of separated individuals, suggesting a 3-year retention for faculty, staff, and graduate students, and a 1-year retention for undergraduate students, was proposed, as well as a quota system, with 50GB for undergraduates, 50GB for graduates, and 350GB for staff and faculty. SCEDIT members offered some suggestions for additional considerations, such as a grace period for data transition after account separation. It was suggested that this issue be presented to the larger Senate before implementation, to inform the community of its impending arrival.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:07 PM.