# SCEDIT Meeting Minutes -Senate Copy

2024-09-20 3 pm - 4 pm ET

Attending:
Victoria Pilato, Cynthia Davidson, Shyam Sharma, Diana Voss, Matt Reuter, Rose Tirotta-Esposito, Keri Hollander, Scott Campbell, Simeon Ananou, Alaa Abd-El-Hafez, Caterina Reed, Yersson Gaona

At 3 pm on Sept. 20, Cynthia Davidson shared and the committee reviewed the meeting agenda. Matt Reuter moved to pass the minutes of the April 19, 2024 and Sept. 6, 2024 meetings, Victoria Pilato seconded.

Cynthia introduced former SCEDIT co-chairs, Keri Hollander and Scott Campbell.

The history of the SCEDIT Committee was summarized and presented to the members by the former chairs how it was initially two provostial ad hoc committees (Educational Services and Information Technology) that were brought together and merged by the former chairs (Meg Schedel and Keri Hollander), in part because of the numerous shared goals of the two committees as well as the fact that many members served on both. The subsequent chairs would report every year to the University Senate president, with for many years the presidents encouraging the committee to continue as it was without updating the by-laws. Using CAPRA as a model, the merged SCEDIT committee split meeting times between issues related to educational services and those relating to IT. Last year, with Richard Larson as Senate president, the by-laws were updated with the intention of the committee becoming a Standing Committee of the University Senate (officially). During the previous election cycle this past Spring, 2024, members needed to be elected for the first time in the general Senate elections on SOLAR.

Some projects that SCEDIT has worked on during the past year include digital governance and AI on campus. Simeon and Rose were praised as "excellent cognates" for the committee during these discussions. It was shared that in many ways, this committee is meant to serve them (DoIT, CELT) and act as a bridge to the University Senate. The former chairs hoped to get another professional line and another library line. (Since Victoria is listed as a Health Science member but works for Libraries, it was suggested that another library line would allow her to move to Libraries, opening up membership for 2 Health Sciences faculty.) The SCEDIT shared Google Drive was shared where all the committee documentation (minutes, agendas, reports) are kept.

During a coordinating council meeting, the former chairs started conversations about the new by-laws and the need to transition the committee to a Standing committee. One goal is to create a professional non-voting member to represent HSC, which has traditionally been

underrepresented in the committee. A chart was shared that showed the membership from the prior year and discussed the manner in which several previous active members of the committee could be reinstated (through appointment or election) to fill slots if some adjustments were made to the membership makeup. (For example, Doug Swesty could fill an open slot in natural sciences, while Moshe Eisenberg and Lenore Lamana could fill slots from HSC if the adjustment were made to move Victoria to a Libraries slot). Appointments done in conjunction with the Uni Senate president can be made without changing the by-laws; however, another professional non-voting position requires a change to by-laws. Joseph Balsamo, John Shackleford, and Fumio Aoki were mentioned as potential candidates for the additional professional slot.

It was suggested that whoever is appointed to these open positions needs to be faculty. In response, it was agreed upon but clarified that this is not the case for a new professional non-voting seat. According to Richard Stein, faculty categorization is noted in SOLAR--how you are defined in PeopleSoft indicates who is a faculty line. (This may not include adjunct faculty, but we are uncertain of this).

Concerns were raised about how the committee's identity/credibility might suffer if too many members are appointed rather than voted in. It was suggested that a mechanism could be written into the by-laws to ensure the former chairs remain on the committee in a non-voting capacity to assist the new chairs in transitioning the committee. In other words, the seated outgoing chair serves as an advisor to the new chair(s).
Would this work retroactively this year? It was suggested that we check with Brenda and Rich Stein about how to proceed with possibly changing the by-laws to do this.

It was asked whether it would be best to hold off filling the empty slots until the next Senate election or if we should appoint (given Simeon's previous concern about committee credibility). The response was that we could just appoint for the current calendar year. A member echoed this and described his previous experience with similar situations in Arts and Sciences standing committees.

Questions asked about open spots:
If we go forward and ask the Senate President to help us fill the faculty slots that are the voting membership, how should we proceed about the non-voting members (since many former members were non-voting)? Should we re-invite some of these people to come back in as non-voting members, or should we only invite people in on an ad hoc basis, as topics come up and we think this person should be able to add something to the conversation?

After discussion, it was decided to bring people in when we want to engage with their expertise rather than, at the current time, reinviting all the prior membership to every meeting.

Former chairs, Keri and Scott, were thanked for all they've done for the committee, with years of exemplary service and leadership.

Simeon stated that in the prior year, he had met with Keri, Scott, and Rose to discuss various important projects such as the crafting of the strategic plan for the university and digital IT governance.

Cynthia wrapped up the discussion of membership by stating that she and Victoria would ask the Senate President (Brenda Anderson) and the committee Senate liaison (Rich Larson) about filling the slots that are currently open with appointed members. Also they would inquire the Senate President about how to potentially change the by-laws for a new professional position as well as codifying the past chairs as an advisory role for new chairs. It was stated that this advisory role is a great idea as the work may benefit from institutional memory.

It was suggested that the chairs also send an email update to the former members of the committee, explaining their status and the committee's current status, because former members have been asking for information.

Pre-meeting planning between the cognates and the chairs was suggested to continue as it had with the past chairs. There was some consideration of whether this would be a "shadow exec" but it was also considered that this planning outside of the committee is a good timesaving preparation technique and it does not need to be formal or formalized.

Because we were running out of time, we did not get to the final agenda point which was planning the committee's future projects and focal points, so we agreed that a Google doc would be created and shared for members to speak on future projects before the next meeting. Several current and potential projects were populated on the document that are also reflected in this Sept. 20 meeting agenda (AI advisory, digital governance).

We discussed future meeting times, including setting the Oct.18 and Nov. 15 meetings for 3rd Friday of the month and deciding what to do about the December/early January meeting based on later discussions. Simeon will discuss digital governance plans to the committee during the Oct. 18 meeting, and we will invite Scott and Keri to the Oct. 18 meeting as well.

The meeting was adjourned by Universal Accord at 4:05 PM.