

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

MEETING DATE: Tuesday, February 18, 2025, 12:45pm-2:30pm by Zoom

### APPROVED MINUTES

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

**Guests:** Mark Robinson, Julie Glass, Mary Kendall, Ana Garcia-Nevarez, Rick Rader, Erik Helgren, Julie Mielke

**Absent:** none

[Land Acknowledgement](#) [short version]

#### 1. Approval of the agenda

- a. Heryford motioned to approve. McDaniel seconded. Approved by unanimous consent.

#### 2. Approval of [2/4/25](#) minutes

- a. Garcia motioned to approve. Reeve seconded. Approved by unanimous consent.

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

- a. [Report](#) of the Chair
  - i. Chair O summarized.
- b. Report of the President
  - i. Thanked Ex Com and Senate for finalizing the reorg recommendation. These will be included in the set of other recommendations and information I have received. Commit to Feb 28 decision date which will allow time to elect Senators.
  - ii. New Block Party event - first one is this Thursday during U-Hour. Entertainment including a dancing group from Oakland - TURF Inc - that performed at the SuperBowl halftime show (12:15-12:30). Also, there will be an unveiling of our new mascot!
  - iii. Daily uncertainty about how Executive Orders will affect Universities. Cabinet and especially UDO are taking lead monitoring things. Will not be sending out a message every time an Executive Order comes out, as this will exhaust us, and many are immediately challenged and blocked in courts. Federal research dollars and federal student financial aid are extremely important to us and our community. State Attorney General and CO are also keeping tabs on things.
  - iv. Provost Search update. Semifinalists have been identified and are being interviewed. Search is proceeding well, on the timeline we set out.
- c. Report of the Provost
  - i. Updates on how Executive Orders are affecting federal grants. A few CSUs have received "stop work" notices. We have not. We assume that we may. Dr. Khan, General Counsel, and CO have developed a process should we receive a stop

work notice. We would immediately begin working on an appeal. Dr. Khan is holding office hours every Friday 1-2p. We have been instructed to be careful what we put in email, so she is making herself available for questions and answers.

- ii. Shared with Senate Officers a draft reassigned time form. COBRA and FAC are welcome to review and provide feedback.
- iii. Chairs meeting. Fanny Yeung will be giving us an update on WASC - campus visit in a few weeks. Silvina Ituarte will be talking about emergency procedures in the classroom. Kevin Brown will be providing an update on 22 4+1 programs coming through the curriculum process.
- d. Report of the Statewide Academic Senators
  - i. Heryford - Interim meetings are happening now. FAC met on Friday. Constructed survey evaluating CO's Other Conduct of Concern policy, right now only for ASCSU Senators to respond. Long Beach Sat Mar 15 faculty conference. Chairs training session from CO. Developing procedures around faculty members passing away. Looking for input on course numbering to CalGETC. Get in touch with Paul Carpenter or Ryan Heryford if you have input on any of these items.
  - ii. Carpenter - Ex Com discussed Sonoma, Trump's EOs, AI. Likely will be more conversation during upcoming Plenary Sessions. Growing tensions between CCs, CSUs, UCs around ownership of aspects of the curriculum. Senators asked to be more collaborative and less argumentative. Big focus on AP African American Studies exam and if this would address a GE requirement. ADT legislation and allowing STEM degrees to go up to 66 units. Teacher ed and retention focus. Trying to get funding for ASSIST - the platform that dictates course articulations.
  - iii. Garcia - Advisors use TES, not ASSIST. Who is using ASSIST?
    - 1. Carpenter - Articulation offices are using this because this is where the information is stored.

#### 4. Appointments (start ~1:05p):

- a. **Senate Vacancies:**
  - i. [Spring '25 appointments](#)
  - ii. Reevy - reminded us we need to confirm two seats listed in the document.
  - iii. Chair O - Any objections to confirming Kim Geron at DELO designee to UTP and Ryan Moruzzi as FDEC member from CSCI? None. Approved by unanimous consent.
- b. **Senate Elections/Nominations:**
  - i. [Spring '25 University-wide elections for Senators](#) - ballot open 2/7-2/21
  - ii. [Spring '25 University-wide elections for at-large positions on Standing Committees](#) - ballot open 2/18-3/4
- c. **[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 2/14, CRSCA is still in need of faculty volunteers from all colleges.]
  - iii. Chin-Newman suggested we send this out as a stand-alone email.

**d. Confirms seats for Focused Program Review Advisory Taskforce ([24-25 BEC 8](#))**

- i. ExCom confirm uncontested seats
- ii. Plan Senate elections via email for contested seats
- iii. Focused Program Review Advisory Task Force - [Nominees](#)
- iv. Chair O suggested confirming CEAS, CSCI, and LIB seats and run an election for CLASS and CBE seats.
- v. Ex Com confirmed CEAS, CSCI, and LIB seats by unanimous consent.
- vi. Officers will review who is Lecturer, COBRA rep, and CAPR rep, and then send additional names to Senate for an online vote this week.

**e. CSUEB Appointee to the [Academic Council on International Programs \(ACIP\)](#)**

- i. Chair O introduced. Dr. Wong's term is about to end, and this letter is soliciting self nominations. ACIP assists international programs. If you are interested or know someone who is, reach out to Mark via the Senate Office email with a statement of interest and CV by Thurs 2/27 5p.

**5. New Business:**

- a. [24-25 CIC 48](#): GE Framework
  - i. Chair O introduced.
- b. [24-25 CIC 49](#): Action Items from GEOC (2/13/25) (will need only 1 reading in Senate)
  - i. Chair O introduced.
- c. [24-25 CIC 50](#): Addendum to Syllabus Policy regarding Generative AI
  - i. Chair O introduced.
  - ii. M Rowley - I believe the default statement is not reasonable, which states you cannot use AI, since you cannot even Google search anything without using AI now. At least the "no use" version states that you cannot use it for "assignments, activities and homework". This is more appropriately limited.
  - iii. Chin-Newman - Historically syllabus policies are CIC and FAC. This is on FAC's agenda for tomorrow. They may make revisions.
    1. Chair O - Will check in with Chair Austin.
  - iv. Garcia - Participated in subcommittee that drafted policy. Wanted to give faculty flexibility. From CO's announcement, a few additional websites were linked. We will likely be adding it to this policy. This language was drafted using other university policies. And wanted to make sure students are made aware of ethical implications of using AI.

- v. Scharberg - Like the policy, but wondering is it just limited to writing assignments. Does it apply to other assignments like writing code, graphic design, etc. Does it only apply to written text generative AI.
- vi. Carpenter - Things are so fluid, I'm not sure how any policy right now is going to help up. Also unclear how you would determine the policy was violated. Could this create more problems for us. As the use of GenAI could be interpreted in many ways.
- vii. President Sandeen - A new faculty learning community is being formed. The leader of that presented and is going to try to address these issues in more depth. This might factor into the timing of a specific policy.
- viii. Chair O summarized that it seems CIC 50 is not ready to go to Senate. No objections. Chair O will send comments to CIC.
- d. 24-25 CIC 20: Curricular Timeline (updated by CIC; will appear in Senate in second reading)
  - i. Chair O - with the latest changes to standing rules, documents may be revised while they are postponed. CIC has made edits here. Chair O summarized - mostly changes for clarity and organization.
  - ii. M Rowley - Why 2/3rds and not consensus?
    - 1. Garcia - We did not discuss in CIC. Perhaps unrealistic to have 100% approval.
    - 2. Chair O asked Garcia to talk with AJ Rowley and prepare a response to this question.
    - 3. Chin-Newman - This was discussed last year a bit and considered consensus.
  - iii. Chin-Newman - Been thinking about the policy. It may not only affect CIC policies but also some CAPR policies. Would CAPR endorse this document as well?
    - a. Chair O will reach out to CAPR Chair.
  - iv. Reevy - Concerns about 2/3rds number, since that would be a very small number of people if quorum was barely achieved.
  - v. Reevy - Believe some should always go through Senate, like suspension of a program. Some inconsistency between what the narrative says and what the table says. Some places the narrative makes it sound like it always requires Senate approval. But then in table it has the NA with the \*\*\*. It is a dense document but it is very important. Had to study for a long time. Also had uncertainty about how this would affect CAPR's involvement. Apologized for bringing up concerns without a solution.
  - vi. Chair O - We can push these questions and comments back to CIC and ask if they will be ready by Friday to go out to Senate.

- vii. Watnik (GUEST) - Document will be in front of CAPR on Thursday this week. Will make sure that it is discussed. The  $\frac{2}{3}$  majority comes from the precedent that was set during semester conversation. In the past, when one person can object and send it to Senate, one person usually will do so based on the belief that all documents should go through Senate, nullifying the purpose of the document. The timeline for approvals has always been tight because even if Senate approves by Mar 1 deadline, this is still a problem for schedulers because the schedule is already done before that date. Creates a lot of problems. The request was to move the deadline to Feb 1, but then this meant it had to go through CIC by mid-November. Large strain on subcommittees and committee itself. This would then make deadlines for faculty earlier than Sept 15, potentially in Aug before duty days even begin. The compromise was to not bump up deadline to Feb 1 but put in this option to bypass Senate with 2/3rds approval from CIC. Ultimately Senate's decision because CIC is asking for delegation of authority to CIC and CAPR in certain instances.
- viii. Garcia - If the problem is the 2/3rd approval, what number would the group recommend? We wanted to get this approved this year.
  - 1. Chair O - Noted that simply an explanation for 2/3rd may be enough.
- ix. Chin-Newman - Recommend sharing feedback with CAPR Chair as well and we can see what happens during the CAPR meeting on Thursday. If they make changes, CIC could approve via email, and it could still make it to Senate on Tuesday.
- x. Reevy - Please emphasize to them that the narrative and the table need to say the same thing. Also some unclear elements of when it is an information item versus an approval for Senate.
- xi. Chair O - We could send these comments to CIC with the Friday deadline for revisions. Or could say we recommend they postpone. Is anyone against pushing the comments to CIC and CAPR, and note the Friday deadline, and if not prepared by then, recommend they motion to postpone again.
  - 1. No objections.

## 6. Information:

- a. [24-25 BSO 5](#): Senate Recommendation on College Reorganization
  - i. Chair O introduced. Model A was the highest ranked model. Rather than Officers writing a justification, used all input gathered so far and a generative AI model to draft the justification and rationale. Models C and B were the second and third highest ranked. All data from the vote is provided.

## 7. Discussion:

- a. **Senate Officers:** AI committee/task force discussion
  - i. Goal: Decide if ExCom feels that a task force is needed and if so, the charge, structure, and timeline for it

- ii. List of [current Senate group AI-related conversations and initiatives](#)
- iii. Chair O - Linked document was compiled from Standing Committee Chairs and ITAC Chair - everything going on regarding AI.
- iv. President Sandeen - Requested this information after the CO announced the new initiative. Grateful for this inventory document. Perhaps we could have a task force or maybe something with more definition and marketing around what they are doing. Students today are looking for programs that teach them about AI in their programs. Would like to find ways to amplify what we are doing to the public more, as well as understand what we are doing.
- v. M Rowley - There is a lot happening and many of these groups are producing deliverables. Fear that a number of policies will arrive at Senate from different areas/groups that will be in conflict.
- vi. Garcia - A committee or task force would be beneficial. Each group right now is doing something different. Could pull from different subcommittees specific people. Grr (LIB) and Roger (Online Campus) have been very involved. We (CIC) wanted to produce a designated website for students and/or faculty with resources and guidance. Task force would be useful. Things are changing very rapidly, genAI is being used in more and more ways. Creating a shared information hub may be useful.
- vii. Heryford - Is there any sense as to what conversations ASI has been having? Faculty have received a lot of feedback from students about the systemwide announcement, with markedly divergent opinions. This is related to how students are feeling about their educational environment. Gathering student input on this would be very important moving forward.
  - 1. Chair O - If we decide to convene a task force, would be good to include a student rep.
- viii. Chin-Newman - There are additional nonSenate items that could be added to the list. Like the faculty learning community and the four mini AI working groups. Director of Faculty Development could be on the task force. ITAC has a proposal to become a Standing Committee, which means ITAC could be charged with this in the future.
- ix. UDO - Whatever the charge of the Task Force is, we should consider how scholars who do research in under-resourced communities have used genAI to locate and access communities that have traditionally been hard to access. We should think about how genAI can assist faculty in their development but keep an equity lens and empower people to do their work.
- x. Provost Greer - Unsure about the format it needs to take, but given the breadth of people's interest, there should be ways to bring in bigger broader parts of the campus to have conversations. Great to include ASI or an ASI rep, but would be interested in what a lot of different students in different majors are thinking about and what their feedback would be.
- xi. Chair O - Officers will use conversation to draft a charge to this group and then create different possibilities how the group would look for Ex Com to choose from. No objections.

- b. **Senate Officers:** Resolution to recognize Julie Stein and her work at Cal State East Bay
    - i. Goal: Decide if ExCom would like to pursue this resolution
    - ii. Scharberg - Propose that Senate develop a resolution to acknowledge the tireless work Julie Stein has done with assessment. She is retiring in June this year. Led to an award for Excellence in Assessment. Would be nice for Senate to recognize her contributions.
    - iii. Chair O - Chair and Vice Chair are happy to draft, but wanted to make sure Ex Com was comfortable with this. Comments, questions, objections?
      - 1. Reevy - Great idea.
    - iv. Chair O - Will draft and bring to next Ex Com for consideration.
  - c. **Senate Officers:** Reducing Senate teaching conflicts
    - i. Goal: Brainstorm and if possible, identify solution(s) to reduce the incidences of teaching conflicts for Senate positions
    - ii. Chair O - Noted that there have been a number of vacancies and teaching conflicts. Has created a lot of work for Senate Office, Chair, and college Deans.
    - iii. M Rowley - Thank you to CSCI Deans for the quick great work for filling CSCI vacancies.
    - iv. Chin-Newman - Wednesday afternoon generally has fewer teaching conflicts. Time Modules Task Force was discussed to assess how teaching time modules are working since semester conversion. Agree that it is a problem and is complex. Changing Senate meetings would be a big change. Tues and Thurs are primary teaching days, so changing day time would be disruptive but may have a big effect.
    - v. Chair O - Could Senate push something out to faculty asking them to tell deans and chairs not to schedule them during Senate?
    - vi. Garcia - Comes down to leadership's collaboration on this. Communication needs to happen. Deans are crucial in communicating the importance and benefit of filling vacancies. If we change day/time, we would need to look at scheduling data to make an informed decision about this. Departments may have different practices with scheduling - do faculty pick their days/times or are they assigned?
    - vii. Horne - As a Chair, would be nice to know if a faculty member is considering running. The annual schedule deadline is before Senate elections. If someone gets elected to a position, it becomes harder to move them around with the reduced schedule - fewer sections, more lecturer budget, etc.
    - viii. Chair O - Senate officers can communicate to faculty that if they are planning to run for Senate, communicate with department chair.
8. **Academic Senate 2/25/25 draft agenda (2:20 PM time certain)**
- a. Juleen Lam report - Project REBOUND
  - b. Victoria Morris report - HR
  - c. Chair O - Should these come as reports or discussion?
    - i. Chin-Newman - Can go in Discussion with a time certain.
    - ii. Chair O - Asked them for 10m presentation and 10m Q&A.
  - d. M Rowley - Add Focused Program Review Advisory Task Force and ACIP.

e. Approved by unanimous consent.

9. Adjournment