

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Baesu, Eklund, Gorman, Gruverman, Leiter, Lewis, Pierobon, Reimer, Shrader, Tschetter, Vakilzadian, VanderPlas

Absent: Bearnes

Date: Tuesday, February 24, 2026

Location: 203 Alexander Building

Note: These are not verbatim minutes. They are a summary of the discussions at the Executive Committee meeting as corrected by those participating.

1.0 Call (*Shrader*)

Shrader called the meeting to order at 2:56 after having difficulty with the Zoom connection which was resolved with the help of VanderPlas.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 EM 40

Shrader reported that he sent Chief of Staff Gonzales an email about EM 40 but had not heard back from him. Griffin explained that Gonzales was in Africa on a trip with a group of alumni, noting that he had arranged and agreed to accompany the group well before he accepted the position of Chief of Staff.

3.0 Approval of February 17, 2024 Minutes

Shrader asked if there were any further revisions to the minutes. The Executive Committee discussed some of the revisions suggested by Interim Chancellor Ankerson and EVC Button. Shrader then asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Tschetter moved and Eklund seconded, approving the minutes. Motion approved by the Executive Committee.

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Report on Metrics Subcommittee Meeting

Shrader reported that the subcommittee met yesterday. Lewis stated that there was good discussion with most of the members wanting to know how the system metrics will be used, particularly since the metrics themselves are not very informative. She stated that the subcommittee is drafting a letter to be sent to President Gold, Interim Provost Jackson, and Interim Chancellor Ankerson. She stated that the letter will include a number of questions, such as what is the purpose of the metrics, who will collect the data, and what are the desired impacts from having these metrics. She noted that the subcommittee will be meeting again to continue working on the draft letter. She pointed out that she has run an analysis of the metrics against the AAUP standards.

VanderPlas reported that she had shared the metrics used for eliminating departments last semester as well as the system's draft metrics with her students in Statistics and they had

definite concerns with the accuracy of the metrics and how they were used. Gorman pointed out that it needs to be in the record that the faculty are very concerned with the inaccuracies of the metrics.

4.2 Draft Letter to President Gold on EM 40, EM 46, and the AI Institute

Shrader reported that he sent a letter to President Gold after receiving feedback, primarily from Gorman and Reimer, raising concerns about the changes to EM 40, EM 46, and the AI Institute. He noted that he only received a standard reply from the President's office thanking him for contacting the President. Shrader stated that he is unsure whether President Gold or Interim Provost Jackson will respond, but as of yet, no response has been received. The Executive Committee agreed that the Committee should meet with President Gold again.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Issues on the Horizon

The Executive Committee had a brief discussion about the upcoming elections for the Board of Regents. It was noted that there are two Regents' positions that will need to be filled. The Committee then discussed the need for a faculty representative on the Board of Regents, and the question was raised how many universities have a faculty member on their governing Board. The Committee then discussed what it would take to get a faculty representative on the Board. Gorman pointed out that it would probably take a state statute and Leiter stated that he would look into this.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:51 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Tuesday, March 3, 2026, immediately following the Faculty Senate meeting. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Ann Tschetter, Secretary.