

**THE COLLEGE OF STATEN ISLAND
CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK**

Minutes 188th Meeting of the Faculty Senate
Thursday, April 30, 2026 from 2:30 to 4:21 pm in 1P-119.

Faculty Senate Members in Attendance:

Jane Alexander, Neo Antoniadis, John Arena, Comfort Asanbe, Banu Aslanertik, Alan Benimoff, Paolo Cappellari, Vandana Chaudhry, Andrew Colbeck, David Curcio, Deborah DeSimone, Valkiria Duran-Narucki, Aris Efting, Gene Fellner, Kenneth Gold, Susan Holak, Nathalia Holtzman, Eric Ivison, Emma Johnson, Wilma Jones, Anatoly Kuklov, Catherine Lavender, Rob Lovering, Timothy Lynch, Alan Lyons, Lisa Manne, Dan McCloskey, Christine McEvelly, Steven Monte, Halil Ege Ozen, Jonathan Peters, Carles Solà Belda, Sarolta Takács, John Verzani, Simone Wegge, Siona Wilson, John Wing, Mark Zdziarski.

Faculty Senate Members via Zoom:

Alfred Levine, Catherine Paradiso.

Guests in Attendance:

Michael Anderson, Damien Andrade, Anita Bulan, Stefan Charles-Pierre, Jessica Collura, Jonathan Cope, Brian Cortijo, John Dixon, Aleks Dudek, Jennifer Durando, Emmanuel Esperance, Katrina Fama, Stephen Ferst, Maya Gorda, Ruta Gordon, Hernán Green, Orit Gruber, Qiao-Sheng Hu, Jeremiah Jerkiewicz, Michael James Lawless, Michael Lederhandler, Michael Mandiberg, Jane Marcus-Delgado, Susan Massara, Tara Mastroilli, Christina Mesa, Dimitrios Pavlidis, Michael Plishchin, Laxmi Ramasubramanian, Lisa Roe, Michael Romano, Terri Sangiorgio, Donna Scimeca, Suzy Shepardson, Jessica Stein, Amy Stempler, Nelli Tournaki, Dana Trimbolli, Brenda Valentin, George Wang, Rhoda Wilson, Leora Yetnikoff.

Faculty Senate Members not in Attendance:

Zaghloul Ahmed, Paul Archibald, Valerie Forrestal, Ismael Garcia-Colón, Rosane Gertner, Yumei Huo, Carlo Lancelotti, Philippe Marius, Mark Aaron Polger, Sarah Pollack (sabbatical), Allen Tesdall, Madonna Shaker, Cindy Wong.

Meeting called to order at 2:30 pm by Chair Deborah DeSimone.

I. Approval of the agenda as amended.

Motion moved, seconded, and passed unanimously.

II. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of the Faculty Senate on March 19, 2026

Motion moved, seconded, and passed unanimously.

III. Executive Committee Report, Dr. Deborah DeSimone (Appendix A)

IV. Interim Provost's Report, Dr. Nathalia Holtzman

Dr. Holtzman began by responding to Dr. DeSimone's report. She expressed enthusiasm for the upcoming Committee of the Whole and stated that she looked forward to hearing what faculty discuss. She said she would be present or absent as appropriate, depending on what would make faculty most comfortable, and asked that Dr. DeSimone and the coordination team could share relevant outcomes with her.

Dr. Holtzman also noted that although the President had offered his conference room for the meeting, the elevator in 1A, however, was not working because it was undergoing repair. She advised anyone needing accommodation to inform the appropriate people, as there was no alternative elevator option in that building.

Dr. Holtzman then addressed concerns about cameras and recording policies. The interim provost said she appreciated that faculty who brought these concerns to her also provided sample policies and models from other CUNY institutions. She stated that this helped her act without needing to reinvent the wheel.

Dr. Holtzman then explained the workflow for selecting the valedictorian and salutatorian. The process began by identifying students with a 4.0 GPA, but because that pool was not large enough, it was expanded to include students with a 3.95 GPA. The list was reviewed for diversity across majors and disciplines. Student Affairs checked for behavioral or pending concerns, and deans and chairs were consulted to confirm that the students would be appropriate candidates. Students were then invited by email to apply and submit a draft speech and cover-letter-style information about themselves. A committee composed of faculty and staff from across campus reviewed the applications and unanimously selected four candidates for in-person interviews. Those interviews were held in Dr. Holtzman's office and lasted approximately 25 minutes each. She noted that students were told from the beginning that the speeches would be recorded. The committee asked questions about the students' campus engagement, future goals, how CSI contributed to those goals, and what they would tell incoming freshmen. After the interviews, the committee unanimously selected a valedictorian and salutatorian. One finalist had a 4.0 GPA and the other had a 3.95 GPA, which helped distinguish the roles. Anita Bulan, the new director of communications, the Writing Center, and Dr. Holtzman herself offered support in helping the selected students to finalize their speeches. Dr. Holtzman stated that the selected students were contacted the day after the interview and students who were not selected were to receive letters recognizing that being chosen as finalists was itself an honor.

Dr. Holtzman also highlighted the Undergraduate Research Conference, noting that 154 students were making presentations right outside the meeting room. She praised faculty for mentoring students and helping them complete their posters. She also referenced other creative and scholarly activities from the past month, including the Brooklyn film/print festival, student art, and campus theater productions.

Dr. Holtzman thanked faculty and staff who participated in searches and noted that the last ECP-level search interview had taken place that Monday. She then discussed future faculty hiring, stating that the administration was working to move forward with 10 faculty lines for Fall 2027, pending the budget. She emphasized that, unless a department specifically requested and justified a lecturer line, the lines would be professorial. Dr. Holtzman concluded by noting ongoing budget discussions, optimism about summer enrollment and fall projections, appreciation for admitted students' day, and a reminder about registrar workshops on grading.

V. Resolution (Appendix B)

Dr. DeSimone introduced the resolution after the Faculty Senate had voted to amend the agenda so the item could be discussed immediately after the interim provost's report. She explained that the resolution concerned president Lynch's decision to require student commencement speeches to be pre-recorded rather than delivered live. Because the resolution could not be pulled up electronically due to technical difficulties, she asked Dr. Ege Ozen to come forward and read it aloud from the printed copies that had been distributed. After the resolution was read, Dr. DeSimone opened the floor for discussion. Several faculty and students spoke strongly in support of the resolution, emphasizing academic freedom, free speech, trust in students, the symbolic importance of live commencement speeches, and the broader national context of attacks on higher education. Speakers argued that pre-recording student speeches suggested distrust of students and undermined CSI's educational mission. After the discussion, the Faculty Senate voted on the resolution.

Motion moved, seconded, and passed (29 votes in favor, 2 no votes, 4 abstentions)

VI. University Faculty Senate Report (Dr. John Verzani)

Dr. Verzani delivered the University Faculty Senate report. He noted that the next UFS plenary would take place the following Tuesday, May 5. At the previous plenary, the university CFO provided an update on the state budget and indicated uncertainty about when the budget would be passed. He reported that UFS had pending resolutions, including one related to commencement speeches and another concerning video recording in classrooms. He stated that those resolutions had been circulated to senators. He also said UFS had provided feedback on the university's tenure, certificate of continuous employment, and promotion guidelines, which had been sent to the university's provost. He expected the Faculty Personnel Policy Committee or a similar body to work on implementing those guidelines at the campus level.

Dr. Verzani also conveyed that UFS was giving feedback on proposed changes to the university's digital assets policy, which covers email access, computer-facility use, and related issues. Some of the proposed changes related to AI training. He added that the Freedom of Expression Committee had been dormant during the semester, but he expected a draft to circulate soon.

Dr. Verzani discussed body-worn cameras and referenced an FAQ, noting that some retention and access policies were not consistent with worst-case fears. He said he had spoken with the head of Public Safety and the COO about a proposed CUNY Alert policy following an incident at Hunter College. He also mentioned discussion of a university-wide firearms policy, noting that policies currently vary by campus. He referenced an Inspector General's report from the previous November that highlighted an incident at CSI and the need for better policies.

Dr. Verzani also informed the Faculty Senate of OneRF, stating that a task force was being formed, though he was unsure whether that had been publicly announced. He then turned to CUNY's E-permit policy. Dr. Verzani explained that there had been hope that E-permits could be restricted by modality, but he was told that this would not be allowed. He explained that because the university has attested to the equivalency of courses regardless of modality, modality cannot be used as a basis for restricting E-permits. However, departments may be able to restrict certain major courses from being taken through E-permit by creating a list of courses that cannot be approved. He noted that more details would be needed and that departments should consider which courses might need such restrictions.

A discussion followed about whether online courses could be treated differently for residency or E-permit purposes. Dr. Verzani reiterated that modality could not be used as the basis for restriction. Interim provost Holtzman added that she would verify the rules with the central office. Another question raised concerns about AI in classrooms, particularly outside corporate influence and funding for AI initiatives. Dr. Verzani responded that University Faculty Senate had intersected with AI primarily through the academic integrity policy, which allows faculty to place restrictions on AI use on their syllabi. He also noted that the university had provided significant funding for AI initiatives and that a PSC forum had recently presented a more critical view of AI. UFS was planning a conference for the following September that would likely focus more on AI criticism and ways to prevent overreach.

VII. Consent Agenda

DEGREE CHANGES

UNDERGRADUATE – N/A

GRADUATE – N/A

NEW COURSES

UNDERGRADUATE

1. Department of Computer Science
 - a. New Gen Ed Course: CSC 121 Exploring Generative AI
 - b. New course: CSC 124 Exploring Generative AI Laboratory
2. Department of Accounting & Finance
 - a. New course: FNC 316 Data Science for Finance I

GRADUATE – N/A

CHANGES IN EXISTING COURSES

UNDERGRADUATE

1. Department of Media Culture
 - a. Change in existing course CIN 211 Cinematography
 - b. Change in existing course: CIN 210 Film Theory
 - c. Change in existing course: CIN 212 Documentary Video
 - d. Change in existing course: COM 450 Senior Seminar in Communication
2. Department of Engineering and Environmental Science
 - a. Change in existing course: ELE 342 Electrical and Electric Circuits II

GRADUATE

3. Department of Educational Studies and Department of Curriculum & Instruction
 - a. Change in existing course: EDD 609 Child Cognitive Development and Learning
 - b. Change in existing course: EDD 602 Studies in Urban and Metropolitan Education
 - c. Change in existing course: EDE 603 Teaching and Learning Mathematics In Elementary Education
 - d. Change in existing course: EDE 602 Teaching and Learning Reading in Elementary Education
 - e. Change in existing course: EDE 621 Creative Arts Integration in Childhood Education
 - f. Change in existing course: EDE 622 Integrating Social Studies & the Arts with English Language Arts in Elementary Education
 - g. Change in existing course: EDE 625 STEM Methodology: Integrating Mathematics & Computational Thinking into Science Education
 - h. Change in existing course: EDE 650 Advanced Study in Reading

Motion moved, seconded, and passed unanimously.

VIII. Reports of the Committees of the Faculty Senate

- a. Academic Freedom Committee (Appendices C and D)

Dr. Michael Mandiberg reported on the Academic Freedom Committee's activities during the semester. The committee met with the campus PSC and the University Faculty Senate's Academic Freedom Committee to learn about and advocate for academic freedom. The committee focused on four major issues: FOIL requests, classroom recordings, attacks on faculty, and the valedictorian speech.

Regarding FOIL requests, Dr. Mandiberg explained that some CUNY faculty had syllabi requested by outside groups through freedom-of-information requests, which were then used to create inflammatory media about the instructors. He stated that CSI would notify faculty if such a request occurred. CSI would search email servers and Dropbox accounts, and if the syllabus were found there, it would be redacted for personal information such as phone numbers and addresses before being released. If the syllabus was not in email, Dropbox, or the department's possession, it would not be sent. He noted that there was still no clarity about whether Brightspace, the CUNY Academic Commons, or Zoom recordings and transcripts could be subject to FOIL.

On unauthorized classroom recordings, Dr. Mandiberg reported that CSI does not currently have a policy on student recordings when they are not related to accessibility accommodations. CUNY also does not have a system-wide policy, though some campuses do. He referenced a recent Queens College Faculty Senate resolution stating that photographs and audio or video recordings of classes may not be made without written permission from the instructor. He noted that UFS was considering a similar resolution. He also stated that faculty may prohibit recording through academic policy and may explicitly forbid it in their syllabi.

Regarding attacks on faculty, Dr. Mandiberg expressed concern about media-driven attacks that have occurred in Texas, Oklahoma, and New York, as well as their relationship to CUNY actions involving the "fired four". The committee wanted the administration to confirm that it would defend academic freedom if outside agitation or threats targeted CSI faculty.

Finally, Dr. Mandiberg stated that the committee supported UFS-level advocacy related to student commencement speeches and the valedictorian speech issue, though he did not belabor the point because the Faculty Senate had already voted on the resolution.

b. Academic Technology Committee (Appendices E and F)

Dr. Dimitrios Pavlidis reported on the committee's involvement in AI discussions. He noted that an AI Task Force had created a website intended to collect information and serve as a resource for faculty, staff, and students. The website was under the CLTPD banner. He explained that the committee was discussing AI use policies, though nothing had been finalized. One model being considered was a "traffic light" framework: red light, yellow light, and green light. Under this model, departments would identify which AI tools or uses are prohibited, restricted, or expected in specific courses. The speaker emphasized that because AI tools are increasingly used in industry, departments should discuss appropriate use within their own courses and disciplines.

Dr. Pavlidis also noted that adjunct faculty should not be expected to carry the main responsibility for developing these policies because such work may fall outside their employment scope. The goal was to create transparency and give departments resources to make informed decisions about AI use. He further reported that there was a CUNY-wide AI council or task force focused largely on AI use cases. The committee would continue monitoring developments and updating faculty as new information became available.

Finally, Dr. Pavlidis informed the Faculty Senate that the Academic Technology Committee and CLTPD had launched a student survey on AI use. A soft pilot was conducted with incoming freshmen before the start of the semester, and another survey was planned for the summer. The purpose was to gather data on students' AI exposure and use, while balancing concerns about pedagogy with recognition that AI is increasingly present in professional fields.

- IX. Old Business
- X. New Business
- XI. Adjournment

Respectfully submitted,

Sarolta A. Takács, Secretary

Appendix A

GREETINGS

FSXC met with the interim-Provost and Deans on Tuesday 2/10 and discussed a number of issues, many of which Dr. Holtzman will mention in her remarks.

Three interrelated issues were the main focus of our discussion: building a culture that values service as well as scholarship; the indisputable need to hire more faculty and staff; and the real threat of faculty burnout.

Dr. Holtzman, Dr. Ramasubramanian (Associate Provost for Faculty Success) and the FSXC are looking at the demographics of our faculty to better understand who, when, how, and possibly why individuals remain within a particular rank for more than the national or CUNY average.

If service is a cause, we hope this demographic data can inform the conversation the chairs and, hopefully, the departments, are having regarding service's weight in the tenure & promotion process. There are many subtleties regarding service, including personal choice, departmental needs, the language in our contract, that we are just beginning to explore in regard to tenure and promotion. We will bring more data on this issue to the chairs and to you later in the semester.

All of this relates to our desperate need for faculty lines, for if program development is expected of new hires, that must be considered at the time of tenure and promotion. So too should program coordination, particularly since the rationale for new lines must clarify how this position will address recruitment, retention, and the department's disciplinary needs. Recruitment & Retention is often the responsibility of program coordinators.

You see the conundrum – we want to develop a culture in which service is valued and encouraged –but we flirt with the real danger of faculty burnout.

The faculty are being asked to do more and more service than ever before. Particularly in the areas of recruitment and retention. This includes participating in open houses, admitted student days, phone banks, high school visits, and other recruitment and retention events. And let's not forget the ever-increasing number of BrightSpace trainings, now up to 5 with the possibility of a 6th in Constructive Dialog Training to be added. We acknowledge the need for these trainings. We also know that our participation in recruitment & retention events is critical to the health of the college. We also know that this participation eats away at our ability to enliven our teaching, conduct our research, and provide the quality advisement our students deserve.

Remember, we are a top heavy faculty, (147 professors, 97 associate professors, 22 Assistant professors, 1 clinical professor, and 67 lecturers) and our governance limits by rank participation in critical departmental posts – specifically, on the appointments committee and as chair.

There are no easy answers – but we hope the data will inform the questions we continue to ask and bring some clarity to the issues at hand so we can finesse this conundrum facing us.

We did discuss other issues, particularly those raised in December:

1. Land Acknowledgement –we will *partner* with Snug Harbor Cultural Center to make sure that our land acknowledgement is meaningful to the few Lenape still living on the island.

2. Consent Agenda –was discussed at length and will remain but...we will slow down the pace and remind people of the rules. We acknowledge that the consent agenda has its drawbacks and will explore ways to overcome those.
3. FSXC is scheduled to meet with the chairs of all 3 curricular committees to consider our curriculum – as a whole.
4. Book Banning: The issue of academic freedom and the attacks on it has been a constant for the FSXC. The attacks are ubiquitous, but in this political climate, faculty are afraid to sign resolutions or petitions. I'd like to ask Gene Fellner to read his letter in support of Summer Boismier, the middle school teacher who lost her teaching license. We were asked by faculty not to make this a resolution but something for individuals to consider whether you feel comfortable and would like to sign or not.

Have a wonderful rest of the evening,
Deborah De Simone
Chair, Faculty Senate

Appendix B

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, prior to CSI's 2025 Commencement Exercises, CSI President Timothy Lynch determined that student graduation speakers would be required to pre-record their speeches to be broadcast over a stadium monitor, and

WHEREAS, President Lynch has repeatedly and publicly stated that it is his determination that this practice will be repeated at the 2026 Commencement Exercises, as well as in subsequent years, and

WHEREAS, President Lynch's new rule for student graduation speakers is both unprecedented and unnecessary, and

WHEREAS, the President's new rule betrays an unwarranted distrust of our student speakers and thereby debases and demeans them, as well as the entire campus community, and

WHEREAS, the delivery of a live, in-person address by all speakers (unless unforeseen circumstances preclude in-person attendance) is fundamental to the value and power such speeches on ceremonial occasions, and

WHEREAS, an ad hoc committee of the College Council presented President Lynch with a memorandum that not only urged reconsideration of the President's misguided decision but also offered far more reasonable ways to satisfy the President's unwarranted concern that student speakers might "go off script," and President Lynch dismissed these concerns, and

WHEREAS, President Lynch's decision disregards the fundamental values associated with the rights to freedom of speech and academic freedom and creates a chilling effect on clearly protected speech by all students, faculty and staff of the CSI community, and

WHEREAS, President Lynch's order conflicts with the College of Staten Island's General Educational Goals, which include cultivating "Social Responsibility and Civic Engagement," defined as "civic knowledge and engagement, both local and global; principled participation in activities of personal and public concern; [and] engagement with global issues, including the role of the United States in the world,"

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT, the College of Staten Island Faculty Senate hereby strenuously objects to the President's determination to ban in-person student addresses at commencement and demands that the President reverse his unilateral decision to fundamentally alter traditional commencement practices.

Appendix C

Academic Freedom Committee

April 2026 Report

The Academic Freedom Committee would like to report on our work this semester. We have met with the campus PSC, and the UFS Academic Freedom Committee to learn more about and advocate for Academic Freedom around four main issues.

- 1) **FOIL requests.** We have learned that some CUNY faculty have had outside groups make FOIL requests for their syllabi. These were then used to create inflammatory media about that instructor. We have confirmed that CSI will notify faculty, search the email servers and Dropbox account based on the FOIL request. If your syllabus is in your email or in your CUNY Dropbox they will redact personal information (phone numbers and addresses) and then deliver it to the requester. We do not have clarity on whether Brightspace, CUNY Academic Commons or Zoom recordings/transcripts can be FOILED.
- 2) **Unauthorized Classroom Recordings:** CSI does not have a policy on students recording classroom instruction/interactions, when not done for accessibility purposes. CUNY does not have a system wide policy, though a number of campuses have explicitly forbade this. Queens College Faculty Senate recently voted on a resolution (<https://www.qc.cuny.edu/cetll/photography-recording-policy/>). The full text is included below. The UFS AFC is expected to vote on a similar resolution at their May meeting. Recording in classrooms can be prohibited by academic policy. Faculty can explicitly forbid it on our syllabus.
- 3) **Attacks on faculty.** Concern about the kind of media driven attacks that have taken place in Texas and other places, and their relationship to CUNY's actions with the Fired Four. What would happen if that happens here? We would like to see the administration confirm they will stand up for academic freedom in the face of outside agitation or threats to faculty.
- 4) **Pre-recorded Valedictorian speeches.** CSI is, to our knowledge, the only CUNY campus to take this measure. (CUNY Law has canceled student speeches entirely). We have supported UFS level efforts to advocate for student speech.

Queens College Classroom Photography and Recording Policy

Neither photographs nor recordings (audio or video) of all or parts of classes at Queens College may be made without written permission from the course instructor(s).

The Office of Student Affairs and the Office of Special Services may provide for the recording of classes on behalf of a student receiving disability accommodations, missing class due to religious beliefs, or experiencing extended absence due to medical or other exigent circumstances.

The Queens College Classroom Photography and Recording Policy applies to both students and visitors. Students and visitors are not authorized to copy, download, or disseminate authorized recordings and

photographs to others. Students in violation of this policy *may be* subject to disciplinary action, and visitors in violation of this policy are subject to removal from the classroom and/or campus.

Adopted at Queens College Academic Senate Meeting, February 5, 2026

Appendix D

Academic Freedom Perspective on Student Recordings of the Classroom

Preamble

The issue of students recording classes came before the Academic Freedom Committee when a professor objected to their student recording a class because of the sensitive nature of some students' contributions. The student who wanted to record the class wanted to do so because of an accessibility issue. The rule and the law are clear that if a student needs a recording of a class because of an accessibility issue, they must be allowed to record the class. Nevertheless, the faculty member had a valid concern about the other students revealing sensitive information which would then be recorded.

Therefore, the Academic Freedom Committee recommends that when a student needs a classroom recorded for accessibility issues, that the Office of Accessibility assign the student a recorder, just as they would assign a student a note-taker, who is responsible for recording only the relevant parts of the lecture/discussion and ensures that no students are recorded.

The Academic Freedom Committee subsequently looked into wider issues (apart from accessibility) when students wish to record a class. The following is a brief overview of the relevant perspectives.

American Association of University Professors (AAUP)

- 1) The AAUP recognizes that students have the right to record the class and distribute that recording for non-commercial reasons.
- 2) The AAUP is most concerned about students distributing the recording to "political players" who then harass the faculty member.
- 3) Copyright is not applicable to "extemporaneous utterances" in the classroom but is applicable to a formal lecture, syllabi, power-point presentations, etc.

AAUP Recommendation: Faculty should be central in the institutions' policies regarding electronic communication.

BMCC Legal Affairs Office

BMCC's Attorney is looking into this issue. Her initial response (which may change later) is:

- 1) Faculty can legally limit taping in classrooms and that the wire-tapping law (which allows anyone to tape a conversation secretly) does not apply to classes.
- 2) However, classrooms are considered public spaces.
- 3) The Henderson Rules, which state that academic freedom must be guarded and that the academic space must be protected for students and professors to be able to express their views without external pressures or interference, may be relevant. Thus, it may be that recording in the classroom could be considered a type of interference that would stifle intellectual discourse and academic freedom.

Other Universities

1) Colgate University found the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) relevant. It states that any live or recorded classroom activity that depicts students or that allows for the identification of a student is protected under the federal student privacy law. In such situations, individuals who are not University officials and are not registered for a specific class may not view class recordings or live sessions. If a recording includes only the instructor, it is not a student record and FERPA does not limit its use.

2) University of California Santa Cruz deemed that students may record the class and share the recording with other students who are enrolled in that class. UCSC also states that faculty may include language in their syllabi regarding expectations that students not share classroom recordings with anyone not enrolled in the course.

In the higher education discussion

Concern for the privacy of students is a significant theme where various professors institute a complete ban of electronic recordings in their classrooms.

“What Happens in the Classroom No Longer Stays in the Classroom,” Becky Supiano, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, July 19, 2018.

The article features a professor, L.D. Burnett, who updates her classroom electronics policy regularly. She forbids photography, audio or video recordings, or live streaming of any sort. She says that the policy is “not about protecting her from students. It’s about protecting students’ classroom experience from the dark side of the internet.” Also, for some students protection of privacy is crucial: They might be in an abusive relationship or has a protective order in place.

“Why I Won’t Let My Classes Be Recorded,” John Villasenor, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 10, 2020.

An interactive classroom should be outside of digital surveillance. The exchange of ideas should not be recorded and kept on the school server. Although the classroom is public, there are nuanced levels of privacy. The classroom is not as private as your living room, but not as public as a televised debate. Recording could push students to be more circumspect in what they are willing to discuss, eroding trust. Once the recordings are made, they possibly last for a long time, available years or decades into the future, and can be used to discredit individuals who spoke the words many years in the past.

“Academic Ethics: Privacy in the Classroom,” by Philip A. Pecorino. QCC, CUNY, Fall 2006. (full cite?)

The purpose of the article was to argue for no automatic recordings in classrooms. However there is a section on the classroom as private space. The author defines three kinds of privacy: physical, social, and psychological. Inserting the camera into the setting erodes the sense of trust that creates honesty in their interactions.

Various relevant legal cases

A 2018 case in Federal Circuit Appeals Court found that even parents of an autistic student cannot record his school day because it would have no practical benefit to his education, according to the 1st Circuit, in *Pollack v. Regional School Unit 75*, case number 17-1700.

The 2007 Federal District Court case, *Plock v. Board of Education of Freeport School District*, case number 145,545F, in which the Court decided that ““A classroom in a public school is not the private property of any teacher. A classroom is a public space...”” (qtd. in *The Wrightslaw Way*, October, 2019).

Bottom Line

The College and the individual faculty member have the right to make policy regarding students recording of the classroom.

The Academic Freedom Committee recommends that BMCC announce to our faculty that they have the right to determine classroom policy regarding students recording of the classroom.

Appendix E

Draft Report on the State of Artificial Intelligence at the College of Staten Island

Academic Technology Committee of CSI

Preface

This review analyzes the use of artificial intelligence in the classroom as well as its presence at the College of Staten Island overall. It breaks down the information gathered into four sections: Student Use, Faculty Experience, CSI Initiatives, and CUNY-Wide Initiatives. For this draft report, the latter two sections are omitted.

The first two sections discuss perceived beneficial and detrimental uses as well as future efforts that will be done by the committee to gather more accurate data. The latter two sections discuss initiatives and resources within CSI and CUNY at large regarding the integration and usage of AI.

The information gathered comes from several sources: the extensive material already gathered by the CSI Library [1], discussion with students and faculty, news articles, and survey data.

Regarding policy, best practice remains to have guidelines on artificial intelligence cemented within a department's/course's syllabus.

Student Use

The use of generative AI within academia has been increasing rapidly. A 2025 survey by the Higher Education Policy Institute of the UK found that the use of generative AI by college students has increased from 53% last year to 88% this year [2]. This is further supported by a 2024 survey by the Digital Education Council, where they found that 86% of students used generative AI with 24% using it daily and 54% using it weekly [3]. Those surveyed placed ChatGPT and other genAI tools as their primary use of artificial intelligence. A comprehensive list of AI tools and their uses in academia can be found on the CSI Library website [4].

With the widespread adoption of AI tools by students, we have striven to determine and document productive uses of this technology as well as problematic uses of this technology. We define productive uses as those that benefit the student learning experience while also preserving the pedagogy of faculty. Examples of directly productive academic uses of these AI tools include accessibility tools such as transcription of videos or Zoom meetings and automation of repetitive tasks such as data entry and organization.

The most flagrant of problematic uses of genAI is likely the substitution of one's own work with that of a computer's. By submitting work not done by themselves, students cheat themselves out of academic growth and partake in academic dishonesty not unlike plagiarism. Managing this AI problem is the new challenge facing faculty since ChatGPT released back in 2022, with possible solutions, and their drawbacks, discussed in section 2.

A note before continuing, there are also several ethical considerations regarding genAI that students and faculty should be aware of. Biased input, scraped work, harvested personal information, and financial inequity are all major issues that the use of AI [5]. While the first issue will continue to exist forever due to the fallibility of humanity, the remaining three issues are dependent on the AI model used. The College of Staten Island provides all students and faculty access to Microsoft Copilot which claims to be better behaved regarding those three issues [6].

In addition to the information gathered from the referenced global surveys, the Academic Technology Committee and other interested parties are working to devise an AI survey for our own students.

Faculty Experiences

To say that AI use has infiltrated every facet of our lives would be an understatement. In academia, nearly two-thirds of faculty see artificial intelligence significantly transforming their roles as instructors [7]. From the same source, just over half of faculty believe that current student assessment in the new age of AI is lacking.

We have devised and discussed options for faculty below, giving comment on viability and effectiveness.

In-class Assignments: By focusing on in-class work, where students can be monitored to prevent use of AI and other aids, faculty can be sure that a student's work is their own.

Benefits: AI access is constrained and faculty members can actively observe a student working on their assignments. This can include confiscation of electronic devices, even including calculators given the recent developments of AI-integrated calculators.

Drawbacks: Time-consuming process to commit hours of in-class time. While justifiable for exams, if every assignment required in-class time, then either there would be less assignments in a class or less material covered during class time. Additionally, some work requires several iterations, such as working on a written assignment.

Oral Assignments: Students verbally explain concepts and walk through solutions, showing competency without any other aids. Faculty again can be sure that a student's work is their own.

Benefits: Students are unable to use any external aids, effectively eliminate the risk of AI use.

Drawbacks: Even more time consuming than the previous suggestion. Only in small class sizes would this be feasible during class time, unless students are grouped up to give presentations. If done outside of class time, during club hours or otherwise, this will now consume a faculty member's time that would otherwise be used for other work obligations. Especially problematic for large class sizes.

Process-based/Scaffolding Grading: Students are graded for every step they take towards completing an assignment [8]. Faculty members could

additionally track changes to written work using built-in tools in Word or similar word processors.

Benefits: Grades are focused more on the whole learning process rather than just the final output.

Drawbacks: Unless also monitored using previously mentioned methods, grading on process is still at risk of AI use. Tracking changes is useful when dealing with sloppy copying, however it can be effectively trivialized through simply retyping the generated work within Word.

Localized Data: Students must base their work on material and data that only exists at a local level. This could be data gathered during the class and personal experiences, discussions, or interviews.

Benefits: Data can only be gathered through attending and actively participating in the course.

Drawbacks: AI is sophisticated enough that it can be trained on the data or information with proper prompting.

AI-Integration: Courses can be built with AI tool use in mind. The level and amount of AI use in a course would be at the discretion of the instructor or the department as a whole.

Benefits: Accepting the use of AI is accepting its role in the modern workplace. Nearly three quarters of both faculty and students want colleges to provide training in AI use as well as offer courses that involve AI literacy [3].

Drawbacks: The presence of AI can be a fundamental detriment to the pedagogy of a course. Accepting it might result in the learning objectives of the course being unachievable as students seek to offload their work.

Beyond the usage of AI by students, adoption of AI use in a personal or professional capacity by faculty has been surveyed at 84%, and with those that use it in both capacities surveyed at 61% [9].

References

- [1] C. Boyle, “CSI Library: Generative AI for faculty: Start here: What is ai?,” Start Here: What is AI? - Generative AI for Faculty - CSI Library at CUNY College of Staten Island Library, <https://library.csi.cuny.edu/ai> (accessed 2025).
- [2] “1 February 2025 student generative AI survey 2025 Josh Freeman February 2025,” Higher Education Policy Institute - Student Generative AI Survey 2025, <https://www.hepi.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2025/02/HEPI-Kortext-Student-Generative-AI-Survey-2025.pdf> (accessed 2025).
- [3] Digital Education Council, “What students want: Key results from DEC Global AI Student Survey 2024,” Digital Education Council, <https://www.digitaleducationcouncil.com/post/what-students-want-key-results-from-dec-global-ai-student-survey-2024> (accessed 2025).
- [4] C. Boyle, “CSI Library: Generative AI for faculty: Ai tools for education,” AI Tools for Education - Generative AI for Faculty - CSI Library at CUNY College of Staten Island Library, <https://library.csi.cuny.edu/ai/tools> (accessed Dec. 16, 2025).
- [5] C. Boyle, “CSI Library: Generative AI for faculty: Ethical considerations,” Ethical Considerations - Generative AI for Faculty - CSI Library at CUNY College of Staten Island Library, <https://library.csi.cuny.edu/ai/ethics> (accessed 2025).
- [6] DHB-Msft, “Data, privacy, and security for Microsoft 365 copilot,” Microsoft Learn, <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/copilot/microsoft-365/microsoft-365-copilot-privacy> (accessed 2025).
- [7] Digital Education Council, “What faculty want: Key results from the Global AI Faculty Survey 2025,” Digital Education Council, <https://www.digitaleducationcouncil.com/post/what-faculty-want-key-results-from-the-global-ai-faculty-survey-2025> (accessed 2025).
- [8] “Scaffolding and Sequencing Writing Assignments,” The Writing Center at CU Denver — CU Anschutz, [https://clas.ucdenver.edu/writing-center/sites/default/files/attached-files/scaffolding assignments.pdf](https://clas.ucdenver.edu/writing-center/sites/default/files/attached-files/scaffolding%20assignments.pdf) (accessed 2025).
- [9] “Ellucian’s AI survey of Higher Education Professionals reveals surge in AI adoption despite concerns around privacy and bias,” Ellucian, <https://www.ellucian.com/newsroom/ellucians-ai-survey-higher-education-professionals-reveals-surge-ai-adoption-despite> (accessed 2025).

Appendix F

AI Use Policy - Traffic Light Model College of Staten Island

The use of Artificial Intelligence in both academia and industry has been greatly increasing over the past few years. This document discusses the "Red Light, Yellow Light, Green Light" traffic light model. This model allows for a general solution to a very field-specific problem. While not one-size-fits-all, each course would have its AI Use Policy designed and voted on by the faculty of that department. Cross-listed courses should have approval from all departments involved. The AI Use Policy should not be the sole responsibility of the professor of the course as expecting adjunct professors to effectively craft policy is outside the scope of their employment. The approved policy should be written into the course's syllabus for easy reference by the students.

Violation of any AI Use Policy falls under violation of CUNY's Academic Integrity Policy, specifically under Section 1: "Cheating" [1]. AI use threatens a student's learning as well as a professor's pedagogy and must only be used when sanctioned by the professor and the department. The inclusion of AI tools in a course should be determined when considering the students' current fundamental knowledge and skills, the expected learning outcomes of the course, and the current relevancy of skills in industry. As a gentle guide, students earlier in their academic journey should have less access to AI tools to facilitate growth of their own skills.

This document does not discuss ways to monitor students on AI use and is only meant to be a reference on what the traffic light model of AI use in academia is.

Traffic Light Model

In general, the traffic light model breaks down AI use into one of three categories:

Red Light: AI Use is prohibited. Its use would undermine the skill being assessed.

Yellow Light: AI Use is restricted. Its use may aid the process, but cannot replace the work done by the student.

The AI tool should be cited or referenced in the assignment.

Green Light: AI Use is permitted or required. Its use is legitimate however the student is still responsible for the output.

The AI tool should be cited or referenced in the assignment.

AI tools are not all created equal nor are they applicable for every possible use-case. Many of the general AI tools such as ChatGPT, Copilot, and Claude have a wide array of capabilities, however field-specific AI tools should be cataloged by the departments to keep the policy current. As a quick acknowledgment, the College of Staten Island provides a premium subscription for Microsoft Copilot to every .edu email address within network.

Below is a list of use-cases for AI. This is a non-exhaustive list and may include types of work that is not relevant to any one specific course. Non-relevant use-cases should be excluded from the course's AI policy so as not to confuse the student.

- Brainstorming & Outlining
- Summarization
- Writing & Revisions (Including Emails)
- Presentation Slides & Revisions
- Data Analysis
- Coding & Debugging
- Notetaking & Transcription
- Tutoring
- Image Generation
- Grading (Faculty should be Transparent)

References

[1] The City University of New York, “Academic Integrity Policy,” CUNY. [Online].
<https://www.cuny.edu/about/administration/offices/legal-affairs/policies-resources/academic-integrity-policy/> [Accessed: Feb. 27, 2026].