

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

MEETING DATE: Tuesday, February 4, 2025, 12:45pm-2:30pm by Zoom

APPROVED MINUTES

Members Present: Gretchen Reeve, Kim Greer, Jenny O, Cathy Sandeen, Christina Chin-Newman, Maureen Scharberg, Sara McDaniel, Ryan Heryford, Michael Rowley, Paul Carpenter, Tristan Garcia, Michelle Rippy, Murray Horne, Kathleen Wong(Lau),

Guests: Mark Robinson, Greg Jennings, Kyzyl Fenno-Smith, Julie Mielke, Mary Kendall, Julie Glass, Linda Ivey, Chris Chamberlain, Keri O'Neal, Erik Helgren, Mitch Watnik, Danika LeDuc, Kathryn Hayes

Absent: none

[Land Acknowledgement](#) [short version]

1. Approval of the agenda

- a. Rippy motioned. Garcia seconded. No comments or questions. No objections or abstentions.

2. Approval of [1/21/25](#) minutes

- a. No comments or questions. No objections or abstentions.

3. Reports (please be as brief as possible this week):

- a. [Report](#) of the Chair
 - Chair O summarized items in the report.
- b. Report of the President
 - i. President Sandeen shared that today the system office announced a major AI initiative. There has been a press release, and soon will be sending out an email from the CO. One thing it includes is that the system will be paying for some AI platforms.
 - ii. Reminded us that budget update email was sent out last week.
- c. Report of the Provost
 - i. Announced [final Robinson Hall office moves](#).
 - ii. Regarding scheduling, asked all Deans when preparing annual schedule to work in the "order" of tenure-track faculty, then FERPing faculty. Load into schedule. Pause. Look at what other courses and sections we need. Then work to assign Lecturers. This is not *only* loading tenure-track faculty but starting with them.
 - iii. Other question was does everyone need to be assigned 12 units each semester? Reassignments are being taken into consideration, not every tenure-track faculty member needs to be assigned a 12-12 teaching, based on reassigned time they currently have.
 - iv. We stopped the workload reduction program for pre-tenure faculty in years 3-5. Academic Affairs is working on a form, which will be shared with COBRA and

- e. CRSCA Subcommittee for CRSCA Grant Proposal Reviews**

- i. Two (2) faculty from each of CEAS, CLASS, CBE, CSCI that do not plan on submitting a proposal to the 2025-26 RSCA Support Grant call for proposals.
 - 1. Tenure/tenure-track, lecturer, library, counselor, and coach faculty members are eligible to serve
- ii. [As of 1/31, CRSCA is still in need of faculty volunteers from all colleges.]
- iii. Chair O noted that CRSCA still needs faculty from all colleges, encouraged everyone who is not applying for a CRSCA grant to consider volunteering.

f. Focused Program Review Taskforce

- i. ExCom input on [BEC call](#) for self-nominations to be considered by ExCom
 - 1. 2 faculty per college (lecturers eligible?)
 - 2. 1 CAPR faculty designee
- ii. Chair O noted that this is sort of a follow-up task force to the Low Degree Conferring Task Force last year. This Task Force will look at programs that are conferring degrees at a frequency lower than some yet-to-be-determined threshold. Task Force needs to be seated to discuss what the criteria will be.
- iii. Chair O posed question - should eligibility be tenure-track faculty only or lecturers also?
 - 1. Reevy would like to see Lecturers eligible to serve, as they will be affected and many have been involved and around for a long time.
 - 2. Chin-Newman - On UCL, there is a designated seat for Lecturers. On Standing Committees, there is some specific eligibility for Lecturers like appointed at least half time, or have at least a three year appointment. We would set some criteria for Lecturers, like length of service.
 - 3. Chair O posed question to President and Provost.
 - a. President noted we don't need to exclude lecturers, but we need someone who is very involved on campus and has been for a considerable amount of time.
 - b. Provost agreed. And think about the balance of tenure-track and lecturers. These discussions will be about future of programs. Recommend a majority of tenure-track faculty.
 - 4. Chair O asked - is anyone opposed to making lecturers eligible to serve?
 - a. No objections.
 - 5. Chair O asked for suggestions for how to characterize eligibility.
 - a. Reevy said if we use lecturer electorate it would be annual appointment, half-time or more. If we use three-year appointment, they would have been here for at least six years.
 - b. Chair O suggested: "Tenure & tenure-track faculty and lecturers with an annual appointment of halftime or greater"
 - c. Garcia suggested adding - service for at least three years.
 - d. LeDuc (Guest) - Because this is self-nomination, followed by an election, I don't think we need to close it off with eligibility. Not sure what the demand will be to be on the task force. Putting on more and more restrictions, people who are eligible may simply not try.

- e. Horne - Should it be a three-year appointed person? I think it would make sense for it to be a person with a least a three-year contract. This would indicate they have had consistent work at East Bay for six years.
- f. Reevy - Not sure how many people will be interested. Having criteria as three-year appointment might be better. Use a category that exists rather than creating some new category like one-year appointment and been here for three years. Leaning toward three-year appointment, or making it all lecturers.
- g. Chin-Newman - Do we also want representation from different colleges? Quite a different situation if lecturers are only running against each other or against other faculty candidates more broadly.
- h. Chair O - Elections after nominations, Ex Com could have time to discuss and decide some number of Lecturers across some number of colleges.
- i. Chin-Newman - Is it Ex Com that appoints to the Task Force or all of Senate? In the past, Ex Com could decide. Ex Com often does appointments, but if it's something considered high stakes, might be better for Senate or University faculty to elect.
- j. Chair O - Could we do a call for nominations with a deadline, then if there are contested seats we could run an election?
 - i. No objections.
 - ii. M Rowley - Is that Ex Com election, Senate election, or University faculty voting?
 - 1. Chin-Newman recommended Senate over Ex Com as it has college representation and more than just faculty representation.
 - 2. Chair O and Senate Coordinator agreed this could go on the last Senate meeting for Feb.
 - 3. Chin-Newman noted we could also do an online ballot.
 - 4. Provost Greer noted a faster timeline would be better, if an online ballot is a possibility.
 - iii. M Rowley suggested: Nominations now till next ExCom. Confirm what we can then. Vote on contested seats over the next week (Senate, online vote).
 - 1. Chair O restated. No objections.
- 6. LeDuc - Where did we land on Lecture eligibility? And what does contested mean? More than two per college?
 - a. Chair O - "12-12 contract (three-year appointment)"
 - b. Chair O - More than two in a college, yes we would run an election.

- iv. Heryford - Is this committee still reviewing those identified as LDC-identified programs? And if so, can there be a privileging of faculty representation for faculty in those programs.
 - 1. Provost - Program review will be larger than just LDC programs. Not all programs in our portfolio. So we do not need to just focus on those in terms of representation.
 - 2. President - Revise “following the Chancellor’s directive” to “as a follow-up to last year’s Chancellor’s directive”. At this point, we do not even have the new list we will be looking at. But faculty know if they are in a program with low enrollment, and they can self-nominate. This is a general review, not a defense of your program.
- v. Carpenter - Since there are some fiscal elements, should there also be a COBRA rep?
 - 1. Chair O - Was planning to ask CAPR to name a designee. Are President and Provost amenable to a COBRA designee as well?
 - a. Provost and President - Yes.
 - b. President - This will be a very focused review over just a month or so. So we are looking for people who can devote a lot of time during this narrow window. We may have to make decisions, as we face potential big budget concerns. We want to do that with input, but we can’t kick the can down the road much longer, if we do then Provost and I will need to make unilateral decisions. More people on committee will be more difficult to schedule.
 - c. Chair O - Proposed adding note that bulk of committee’s work will occur in March.
 - d. Provost - We were thinking we would need to complete this work by beginning to mid April.
 - e. Chair O - Revised to “March and early April”.
- vi. Chin-Newman - Back to nominees, can we do two-step process? Round one in the first week, then round two in the second week? Allows people to see who is already nominating and what gaps there may be.
 - 1. Chair O - Asked Senate Coordinator if we could do this two-step process.
 - 2. Senate Coordinator - We could do that with five days per round.
 - 3. Chair O - If we initiated tomorrow, deadline would be in 10 days.
 - 4. M Rowley - Could be deadline of 2/18, noon, to get prior to Ex Com.
- vii. Horne - To be transparent with the workload, would be good to know the specific deliverable. Is it a recommendation to President and Provost for programs to close?
 - 1. President - That would be one of the possible recommendations. We are a mid size CSU with some of the greatest number of programs.
- viii. Chair O summarized comments so far.
- ix. Chin-Newman - Could we add a total number of people on the committee? And specify if library is included. Let’s include the charge of the committee like “The committee is consulting with developing internal guidelines for our own low conferring programs, beyond those initiated from the CSU system.”

- x. Reevy - Do we want to say at least one Lecturer? Or just make them eligible?
 - 1. Chin-Newman - Maybe we don't want a designated seat. Could be proportional representation for the seats based on college size.
 - 2. Chair O - Checked with Ex Com - good with proportional representation and one lecturer seat?
 - a. M Rowley - Can we say this is the goal but we need to convene the committee after the deadline regardless?
 - b. Chair O - Anyone against this plan? No objections.
- g. Chair O - Is anyone opposed to Officers and Mark creating the final version of this based on the discussion here and pushing it out tomorrow? No objections.

5. New Business (start ~1:20p):

- a. [24-25 FAC 5](#): Interpretation of "Lecturer Electorate" to Include Coaches, Librarians, and Counselors
 - i. Chair O introduced.
 - ii. Reevy - History was that temporary coaches, temporary librarians, and temporary counselors were in the lecturer electorate, but some of those people were not included one year. They are faculty, so it seems they should have the ability to be enfranchised in Senate.
 - iii. Reevy noted she will make one minor, non-substantive edit before it goes to Senate.
 - iv. Chair O - This could be used in the future for someone to lean on to justify voting and representation ability.
 - v. No objections or abstentions to move to Senate agenda.
- b. [24-25 FAC 6](#): Process for Electing CSUEB Member of ASCSU Lecturer Electorate
 - i. Chair O introduced. This creates a process to enact the latest ASCSU constitution amendment, creating seats for Lecturers on ASCSU.
 - ii. Reevy - In Senate, this should get a "Recommend waiving first reading" so timeline can be adhered to.
 - iii. No objections to Ex Com recommending waiving first reading next week.
 - iv. No objections or abstentions to move to Senate agenda.
- c. [24-25 FAC 7](#): Policy for Distributing Assigned Time for Exceptional Levels of Service to Students
 - i. Chair O introduced - only change is to update the timeline dates for this academic year. Also were asked to recommend Senate waive first reading.
 - ii. No objections to Ex Com recommending waiving first reading next week.
 - iii. No objections or abstentions to move to Senate agenda.
- d. Chair O checked for any opposition to present the remaining business items as a bundle. None.
- e. [24-25 CAPR 10/CIC 27](#): Revision Proposal Certificate in GIS and Remote Sensing
- f. [24-25 CAPR 15/CIC 34](#): Degree Revision Proposal Accountancy MS
- g. [24-25 CAPR 16/CIC 35](#): Concentration Revision Business Administration MBA General

Business Concentration One Year Intensive

- h. [24-25 CAPR 17/CIC 36](#): Concentration Revision Proposal for the English BA English Language and Literacies Concentration
- i. [24-25 CAPR 18/CIC 37](#): Degree Revision Mathematics MS
- j. [24-25 CAPR 19/CIC 38](#): Degree Revision Sociology BA (Online)
- k. [24-25 CAPR 20/CIC 39](#): Degree Revision Statistics MS and New Concentration, Statistics MS Biostatistics Concentration
 - i. Chair O - These were all non-controversial approvals by CAPR and CIC. Are there any questions on any individual documents? None.
 - ii. No objections to moving this set along as a bundle for next week.
- l. Chair O checked for any opposition to present the remaining business items as a bundle. None.
- m. [24-25 CIC 40](#): Action Items from WS (Dec)
- n. [24-25 CIC 41](#): Action Items from GEOC (1/30/25)
 - i. Chair O - Representative of typical curricular paperwork. Approved by CIC in either the writing subcommittee or GEOC. Are there any questions on any individual documents? None.
 - ii. No objections to moving this set along as a bundle for next week.

6. **Information (start ~1:45p):**

- a. [24-25 COBRA 7](#): Reassigned time
 - i. Chair O introduced - This is an update to 23-24 COBRA 11 which is recommendations for reassigned time priorities. Response to continued budget challenges and the CO review of reassigned time.
 - ii. Carpenter - One area work in progress is classifying reassigned time. Our lexicon at East Bay is not well-aligned with how reassigned time is categorized at the system level. We may be able to address this with data collected through the form the Provost is developing.
 - iii. No objections or abstentions to move to Senate agenda.
- b. [24-25 FAC 8](#): Resolution in Support of Sonoma State
 - i. Chair O - Resolves call for a freeze of actions at Sonoma State, call for President and CO to engage in dialogue with community members, call for East Bay to join in efforts to “nullify plan to eviscerate gem of CA”.
 - ii. M Rowley - Should this be a business item?
 - 1. Chin-Newman - agreed, should be business item.
 - 2. Chair O - Anyone opposed to making this a Business Item on Senate agenda? No objections or abstentions.
- c. [Minutes from University-wide forum](#) (Jan 31, 3p)
 - i. Chair O - We just wanted to share this as an information item since we said any feedback received would be sent to Senators to help inform their voting decisions on Feb 11.
 - ii. No objections or abstentions to move to Senate agenda.

7. Discussion (start ~1:50p):

- a. **Senate Chair: Request from CIC Chair Rowley to conduct an online ExCom vote to approve eight (8) CAPR/CIC documents for 2/11 Senate**
 - i. Goal: ExCom approves/disapproves the use of online voting
 - ii. 1 Department name change, 1 concentration discontinuance, 2 concentration revisions, 2 department mergers, 2 degree revisions - all already approved by CAPR or, where relevant, CAPR and CIC
 - iii. Chair O - Lots of pressure for CIC to get documents through by March 1st. Only eight documents left in backlog. Chair AJ Rowley would like Ex Com to pre-emptively approve (or do an online Ex Com vote) to place these items on the Senate agenda for next week. AJ Rowley none of these are controversial, all are typical paperwork. Would people be comfortable doing an online vote? Or could motion to approve now.
 - iv. Garcia motioned to approve to move these eight items to the Senate agenda for next week. Horne seconded.
 1. Reevy clarified - we cannot see these documents right now, right?
 - a. Chair O - Correct.
 2. Alexander - There are two department merger documents coming just from CAPR, which are a little different. But these are both faculty driven efforts (e.g. AGES). They are adding AGES programs to Dept of History and Global Cultures and the Department of Earth, Environmental, Sustainability Sciences. They were not controversial in CAPR, among the chairs, or in curriculog. Just wanted to clarify this piece was slightly different than the others.
 3. Chin-Newman - Thank you to CAPR Chair Alexander for highlighting those differences. Could we have an email go to Ex Com earlier than the whole Senate on Friday so people can at least scan the titles and get a sense of what is going on.
 - v. Chair O - Is anyone opposed to me following up with an email to Ex Com members with a breakdown of each item, asking for opposition votes only. No objections.
- b. **Senate Officers: Senate feedback on 24-25 BEC 6 (Standing Rules Senate midyear revisions)**
 - i. Goal: Decide if ExCom wants to make any revisions to BEC 6 (we are currently between first and second reading).
 - ii. Note, a few revisions for item #3 in the cover sheet after input from Senator Lee in Senate on 1/28.
 - iii. M Rowley summarized changes based on Senator Lee's comments in Senate.
 - iv. No objections or abstentions for moving this forward to Senate as the version for Second Reading.
- c. **Open discussion (start ~2p): College reorganization models pros, cons, and other thoughts about the remaining eight models**

- i. Goal: Gather feedback to inform Senators' voting choices on February 11 (to determine which model(s) the Senate will endorse to the President).
 1. [College Reorganization Data document](#) prepared by Rafael Hernandez, Deputy Provost
 2. [Minutes from University-wide forum](#) (Jan 31, 3p)
 3. One [response](#) on feedback form [as of 2/4, 2:11p]
- ii. M Rowley - Robust discussion in the town hall about should we put forward one model recommendation or multiple? And, how should we decide. Could see what the results are and use a threshold, like if X% recommend one model, we only put forward that one.
 1. Chair O clarified that this is a recommendation and President is not bound to one of the models we put forward necessarily.
 2. Garcia - Recommend sharing top three. Against ranked choice voting.
 3. M Rowley - Could also share all the results for all models.
 4. Chair O - Given no strong opinions shared here, could highlight top three vote getters, but share the entire data set.
 5. Chin-Newman - Difficult to predict ahead of time if there will be a big gap between second and third, or third and fourth, for instance.
- iii. Chin-Newman - Recommend sharing positives and negatives for the highest recommended models.
 1. Chair O - Could look at qualitative data gathered so far in order to include pros and cons for each recommended model.

8. **Academic Senate [2/11/25](#) draft agenda (2:20 PM time certain)**

- a. Senate Coordinator introduced.
- b. Chair O - Where to put Senate vote on reorg models? Anyone opposed to moving open discussion up in Senate agenda after approval of minutes.
 - i. Garcia - As a CIC member, I would like to take care of business items first before the discussion.
 - ii. Garcia - Move to keep Discussion where it is and do vote at end of discussion.
 - iii. Chin-Newman - Could do an online vote for some things on the agenda. Prefer not to vote after 2:30 in case people need to leave.
 - iv. Scharberg - Recommend a time certain for the discussion and for the vote.
 - v. Chair O - Any objections to a time certain? None.
 - vi. Chair O - What time? Suggesting 1:30 for discussion, 1:55 vote.
 1. Garcia - Suggesting more than 25 minutes for discussion.
 2. Chair O - A little concerned about getting through the business items.
 3. Chin-Newman - We have done things where we have a town hall during the U-Hour, and then started the meeting.
 4. M Rowley - Noted we did have a 1hr15m town hall on Friday to discuss reorg. Recommended 25 minutes, with the option of someone to make a motion to extend the discussion time from the floor.
 5. Chair O - Proposed this. No objections.
 6. Chair O - Back to time certain suggestions - 1:30 and 1:55.
 - a. No objections.

- c. M Rowley - Remove FAC 2, which died on the table in last meeting.
- d. Chin-Newman - Move up the two FAC items with “recommend waive first reading” to the new D.

9. Adjournment