

## **Academic Senate Meeting Minutes**

### **QV Academic Senate – Monday, 27 April 2:00 pm via Teams**

---

Attendance: Matt Hall, Elkin Espitia-Loaiza, Rosalie Witt, Lisa Adase, Brian Clinton, Denise Walsh, Phil Lemieux, Tamara Greer, Beth Alves, Pauline Clifford, Erin Pagano, Jon Andersen, Kudzai Zvoma, Jakob Spjut, Jayne Battye, Ling-chuan Chu, John Lewis, Erica Michalski, Sara Van Orden, Deneuve Bastien, Brian Kaufman, Norly Germain, Brian Donahue-Lynch, Melissa Pillion, Christine Stockwell

Matt Hall called the meeting to order at 2:02 pm.

#### **Approval of March 30, 2026 Minutes**

Erin Pagano motioned to approve; seconded by Brian Kaufman. Approved unanimously.

#### **Election for new VP**

No volunteers.

#### **Curriculum Congress Updates**

Brian Kaufman discussed the April Curriculum Congress newsletter, including the most recent proposal review approvals. Brian is also running for re-election.

#### **College Senate Updates**

Erin Pagano reported on the April 24<sup>th</sup> meeting. The Senate had a presentation from the Interim Head of Human Resources where she answered questions regarding the number of interim appointments at the administrative level. Senate members also questioned why system-level appointments get filled quicker than campus appointments.

New College Senate officers were elected: Roberta Prior, President; Allan Ballinger, VP of Faculty; Felisha Guirand-Fleurimond; VP of Staff

Seeking feedback for College Senate, Erin shared a draft systemwide Generative AI Policy Statement, as well as Generative AI Policy Intersections document, that were developed by the CSCU Office of Compliance. (Both distributed ahead of time with the meeting materials.)

Prior to the meeting, Brian Donahue-Lynch provided his edits on both documents, which provided a starting point for discussion.

Comments:

The tone of the documents were written through the lens of privacy and security. The tone was one of enforcement and monitoring.

Policy reads as reactionary and written from an IT perspective. The policy needs to include more faculty, staff, and student input.

The policy sounds like it tries to control rather than encourage ethical use. People should be agents of the policy, not policed by it.

Faculty need training, instruction, and tools on how to assess if their students are using AI.

There should be a College Senate subcommittee focusing on AI.

In the “Intersections” document, AI is referenced intersecting with NECHE Standard 1.07; however, AI is not referenced in NECHE. The document is trying to inject AI into the NECHE standard as opposed to writing a new policy that introduces AI.

Students can utilize websites to disguise AI use, such as the sub-Reddit r/cheatonlineproctor

First, the draft policy does some good work towards bringing people into a share understanding of what emerging AI practices at CT State currently violate established policies and ethical conduct. For example, having AI generate letters of recommendations and resolutions without acknowledgement and allowing students to use AI to generate work without acknowledgement violate policy. Second, the policy should acknowledge and be informed by research showing potential harm of AI in education, including the erosion of reading, undermining of ability to make ethical judgements, flattening of language and thinking, and cognitive decline (MIT, Carnegie Melon). Third, being cautious about harmful effects of AI in education is not the same as being anti-technology. Fourth, most of AI literacy is just literacy and good critical thinking. We should concentrate on teaching raw skills because the most effective AI users are those who are strongest in their disciplines.

## **Learning in Retirement Update**

Matt gave an update on the possible return of Learning in Retirement to the Danielson campus. While no contracts have been signed, three stipulations will be in place if/when

they return: (1) We will not provide administrative support; (2) They will not be given Banner IDs; (3) We do not hold money for them.

Matt will get clarification of where we are in the process of having the group return.

### **Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) Survey**

Jakob encouraged all faculty to take the survey, “Factors Influencing Assignment Design & Assessment Practices”, sponsored by Writing Across the Curriculum.

### **Open Discussion**

Matt will ask the Union for clarification regarding the new contract language that states faculty cannot be assigned physically outside a 25-mile radius from the home campus. Are these drivable miles or “as the crow flies”?

CT State should establish testing centers, which would require online students to take exams in person.

The next meeting is scheduled for Monday, May 18 at 2:00 pm on Teams.

A motion was made to adjourn at 3:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Matt Hall