CAL STATE EAST BAY | ACADEMIC SENATE

Academic Senate
http://www.csueastbay.edu/senate
510-885-3671

Information Technology Committee

TO: The Academic Senate

FROM: Kenneth Curr, Chair, Information Technology Committee **SUBJECT:**

Information Technology Committee Agenda

MEETING DATE: Monday, October 19, 2026, 2:00pm – 4:00pm

Join Meeting: https://csueb.zoom.us/j/83293513052
Meeting ID: 832 9351 3052

As part of our continuing commitment to an environment where equity, diversity and racial/social justice may thrive, when we experience examples of racial narratives, racism, whiteness or misogyny in our meetings, or as we conduct our business, we will speak up. This means we can interrupt the meeting and draw the issue to one another's attention. We will do this kindly, with care and in good faith. Further, as we engage interruptions we will take an intersectional approach, reflecting the fact that white supremacy, racism and misogyny operate in tandem with interlocking systems of oppression of colonialism, class, cis-heteropatriarchy, and ableism, among others.

Draft Agenda with Minutes

1. **Land Acknowledgment** (short version)
2. **Approval of the Agenda** Faith motioned; Surendra seconded; approved by acclimation
3. **Approval of the Minutes** deferred; will approve next meeting
    a. 10/5/26 Meeting Minutes
4. **Standing Reports:**
    a. Report of the Chair:

        We do have a student member and will need to approve him next time. A topic to address in the future, after talking with Benjamin (chair of Academic Senate), is the policies & procedures for ITC, which seem to be at odds with Academic Senate by-laws. We also still need a member from the College of Health (trying to find someone but no volunteers yet). Benjamin is concerned about the size of this committee, too large, too many members. We need to think about reasons for or against.

        Faculty have raised concerns that when you do a course copy in Canvas, it breaks down. Gene response: This seems to be because MS is broken in Canvas. Also possible, any third party linked sources will not transfer in course copy. Any kind of app that is a one-off will need assistance to move into a new course. Anything that is native in Canvas should not break.

        Academic Senate is putting together a special task force that is involving AI. Benjamin would like to see ITC involved but he is unsure how ITC would like to do so: lead, participate, or operate in the background. We can discuss this more in a future meeting. There seems to be a discrepancy between some of the standing committees and closed

meetings. Mostly, the default position is that meetings are open, however, there may be special cases for closed. So far, ITC should be open for all to attend. Again, does ITC have to be this big? IT affects all colleges and all departments. Questions about the history of ITAC and ITC and staff involvement? Why 7 faculty from colleges? ITC needs to update its policies and procedures to be serviceable, hopefully by January.

b. Report of the Chief Information Officer (Gene)

Not much happening of SFBRN, preparing for the latter half of the semester. Discussion about refreshes for computers and such, increase cadence from 7 to 5 years to make it uniform across the three campuses. Also, improving the website and ticketing system to be more responsive.

c. Report of the Presidential Appointee (Dan)

AI governance is advancing; East Bay is offering up trainings to other campus. Dan is on a committee about what kind of tools in AI we are activating. Actually, Dan is currently in 3 different AI groups. Dan is wondering if the AI subcommittee should be merged with the AI task force? Perhaps, something to consider.

d. Report of the Subcommittees (Dan)

The AI governance policy is in progress to be put on the website. He is waiting on Sweety for that.

5. Business Items:

a. Review the Committee's Responsibilities and By-law charges

i. Purpose and Mission of the ITC

Section 1. Some duplication between the first and second paragraph. Make clearer by removing some portion of the first paragraph. Suggestion that we add "AI use" in there.

ii. Responsibilities of the ITC

Section 2. Concern raised about who is a stakeholder? An interested or affected party? 'Affected parties' seems preferred. Alternative suggestion: campus community members. What is meant by a legitimate channel? Consider what is the proper pathway as stated in Academic Senate bylaws, can check with Benjamin. Can combine bullets one and two to be more concise. Doesn't make clear how dissents will be handled and how feedback will be responded to. What is the point of the Guiding Principles section? How narrow do principles have to be? They tend to be more broad by definition. Add something about the committees will be open to all CSUEB community members and the notes will be stored on the committee website. Should we add something here about timelines? Maybe vague and specific at the same time, recognizing the challenge of limited time for committee work. What does heading Agility mean? Unsure, suggest removing it. Actually, in reviewing other standing committees P&Ps and they don't seem to have Guiding Principles. Our suggestion is to remove all of Guiding Principles section.
Section 3. We are an advisory, consulting committee. We receive and share information. We are the place for discussion. #4 add "staff" and "advising" to wording. What is the scope of technology? What fits in its purview? May need to define what technology is in the context of ITC. If we expand technology to include HR or accreditation, then we will need to include more membership representation. We do need to set some boundaries. Technology: teaching and learning systems; research and computing; cybersecurity as it related to access for faculty, staff, and students (Gene says it is useful to have feedback from the representatives on this committee) (Dawna: where should these conversations should be happening? With the deans? With department chairs?); data privacy [pause to discuss purpose of committee: also, Jeffra says she thinks of this group as a funnel, as in if an 'technological' issue becomes a critical campus issue, where is the faculty voice? Where is representative action happening on behalf of the committee? This is a purpose for ITC. Earl: Also, when is something CIC or FAC or ITC? Special projects, like AI in the

classroom for CIC, versus day to day, like MS for everyone, is for ITC?]; accreditation, a little unsure but WASC has quite a bit on technology in it; HR [no, not part of technology]; procurement, P2P is very challenging [what is the boundary here? We would need a staff representative then. Feedback from ITC could be useful in cases like P2P]; AI issues; communication (yes) & infrastructure (yes), infrastructure as integration (like shared storage, networking, data management, online & hybrid courses); accessibility (do we need a representative?).

iii. When to Delegate to higher authority
Deferred to next meeting

iv. Review of current by-laws
Deferred to next meeting

b. Should we update 25–26 ITC 1/FAC 6

Deferred to next meeting.

c. Other topics?

Surendra raised concerns about ITS services now as part of SFBRN. How ITS services that are available to faculty and campus community are changing with a centralization? When he went to catalog, it didn't give him an option he was used to seeing (communications category). How are services changing and can we expect the same level of service and access, like BayCloud? Gene: service catalog is still evolving and instead suggest using regular workticket form. Dawna: we have SFBRN and what technology services are we sharing across SFBRN and how does it affect this group? Gene: For example, the academic technology group that is separate from ITS (our online campus). The local unit will also investigate AI and academic technology. East Bay has been more centralized and so splitting software, work tickets, etc. is challenging. At other campuses (Sonoma & SF), they are very separate, longstanding history. For example, setting up a server like Surendra asked, Academic Technology (AT) would be responsible but they would contact ITS for support and advice and AT would manage it. All the procedures are still being normalized.

Jeffra raised the issue of student emails being fixed and settled. Gene: targeting winter break for changing to MS to make mass communication very clear. Ironing out methodology. Allowing read only access gmail. Systemic issues related to @csueastbay.edu student emails will be fixed with the cutover, which is the migration to MS outlook. Jeffra also mentioned an accidental login into gmail account last week and discovered about 10 new email from Google forms. Gene is unsure of the cause of this but can investigate.

6. Adjournment at 3:54pm