

**UNITED UNIVERSITY PROFESSIONS  
LABOR MANAGEMENT MEETING  
March 10th, 12.30 pm Remote via Zoom**

I. Update on Professional Performance Programs and Evaluations

*We will receive an update on these numbers soon from HR – there is not much change since last month. The HR member who compiles the information is currently out of office.*

II. Discussion about AI

UUP Chapter President shared information about the new legislation that for AI protections – the law states that:

The new expanded law provides that use of AI shall not:

- affect existing collective bargaining rights or representation;
- result in an employee's discharge, displacement or loss of position; this includes partial displacement such as a reduction in the hours of non-overtime work, wages, or employment benefits; and
- permit the transfer of duties and functions currently performed by UUP members to an AI system.
- alter the rights, benefits or privileges of SUNY employees, including but not limited to terms and conditions of employment, civil service status, and collective bargaining unit membership status

UUP Chapter President then asked about AI plans for Brockport – requesting information about any introduction of AI and whether use would be

- Is use voluntary or directed?
- What existing work would be impacted?
- How much does it cost?
- Who is responsible when the application doesn't work as planned?
- Given new labor protections for state employees in the law, what is the long-term objective of bringing on this application?

*Campus administration shared that currently the only AI implementation planned is related to advising. It is a system that will be integrated into the advising portals (Banner and Degree Works) to assist students/advisors with course selection that fulfills degree requirements; and also flag students who are "off-track."*

*Use of this application will be voluntary – though it seems it will be embedded into the advising portals – it aims to assist with advising but not replace the role of the advisor.*

*Campus administration estimated the cost at \$80,000*

*With respect to responsibility if any errors result from AI – campus administration indicated that they did not feel this would be an issue as the AI platform was really just providing guidance and information.*

### III. Follow up discussion about e-mails sent using employees names

UUP Chapter President shared that members were appreciative of the assurance that the incident whereby e-mails were sent out on behalf of advisors without their knowledge was an error and would not be repeated. Further, members were glad to receive notifications about the error. That said, members asked about other systems on campus that might send out e-mails on behalf of employees without their direct involvement. Specifically, a number of members expressed concern that the new system used by search committees may send out rejection letters to unqualified candidates in the name of the search chair even though at that stage there has been no contact between the search committee and the applicant. Is it possible to change this option so that in the initial stages e-mails come from HR and only later in the process after search committee members have met candidates that communication come from the search chair?

Additionally, are there other systems on campus that auto generate e-mails on behalf of employees?

*Campus administration said that they will explore options with the new portal used by search committees and that it should not be an issue to make the requested change. HR will look into the concern.*

*Campus administration said they were unaware of any other systems that generate e-mails automatically.*

### IV. Discussion about faculty/staff safety concerns

UUP Chapter President raised concerns about staff safety in the face of student behavior concerns. The issue was prompted by a specific circumstance wherein a member felt unsafe, but the broad question is important for all members. Specifically UUP asked what process were in place, and whether there was any “pro-active” processes to remove students.

Campus administrators provided information regarding the specific member concerns.

*Campus administration also provided helpful information regarding the broad issue – importantly, members should contact campus police directly at 2222 if they feel their safety is threatened. That number is quicker than 911 which would have to channel a call to campus police. Campus police also have a mechanism to remove students from classes in extreme circumstances if they feel student behavior is sufficiently concerning to warrant such. That said, the campus seeks to balance faculty/staff safety and students rights so in less severe cases campus police should be notified and would assist, as should faculty/staff supervisors, office of*

*student conduct and possibly bias reporting process (dependent on the nature of any behavior concern). Relevant parties work together to resolve concerns. Campus police also let us know they can help faculty/staff obtain orders of protection, and also assist with enforcement of such if they are notified. They have a few on record in their department.*

#### V. Further discussion about Emergency Plans

UUP Chapter President followed up on last months discussion about emergency plans – more specifically, while members are heartened that this is an awareness/educative exercise, there were still concerns about members being designated to lock doors or perform other task per an “emergency plan.” While members appreciate the education and importance of the issue, they are uncomfortable with designating peers to undertake tasks, worried that employees may not be present to perform tasks, concerned about lock of ability to secure doors without keys, locate colleagues etc.

*Campus administrators acknowledged these concerns and recognized them as challenges. They reiterated that the purpose of the planning is primarily education/awareness and that departments need not be compelled to assign tasks to specific individuals. For example stating – the colleague “closest to the door” could be listed as responsible for locking it. Campus administrators are also aware of the limitations related to tracking all employees whereabouts at any given time and also securing all doors. These are the kinds of issues that the exercise is useful for, in that it raises awareness of potential weaknesses.*