

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING: AGENDA

Tuesday, September 8, 2026, 2:00 pm – 4:00 pm

Zoom: <https://csulb.zoom.us/j/84515621435> (Meeting ID: 845 1562 1435)

N. Hultgren, B. Katz, C. Warren, B. Behzad, V. Gray, K. Perkins, B. Trimble, S. Asgari, H. Macías, C. Scott-Hayward, S. Collins, C. Ryan, S. Estrada, S. Apel, D. Green, P. Hung, K. Scissum Gunn, A. Kinsey

1. Called to Order – 2:00 pm
2. Approval of Agenda- moved by BK, seconded and approved.
3. Additional Introductions- none.
4. Approval of Minutes - moved by KP, seconded and approved.
 1. [Meeting of September 1, 2026](#)
6. Special Orders
 1. Report: AVP, Enrollment Services Donna Green - no report.
 2. Report: VP Scott Apel - no report.
7. Unfinished Business
 1. [Review of Patent Policy draft and Intellectual Property and Copyright Policy draft](#), continued feedback from the University Counsel will be available soon and will be shared with EC at that time.
 2. [Selection of faculty member to serve on the Search Committee for the Vice President of Information Technology and CIO](#) – NH presented the nominees to the EC for review. Gabriella Hancock selected unanimously. AK will send a letter informing GH.
8. New Business
 1. Review of amendments for the [Academic Senate Meeting of Thursday, September 10, 2026](#) – NH presented possible amendments to the EC to proposals on the agenda for the next senate.
 2. Selection of an Academic Senate Executive Committee member to keep the speaker's list at the September 10, 2026, Academic Senate meeting – BK will handle document revision due to CW's absence. Virginia Gray will manage the speakers list
 3. Retreat topic selection discussion- Discussion on possible topics ensued. BK - ideally more than about work. BT voiced concern that jobs are the main focus of success. VG suggested a book as reference: Beyond the Skills Gap. BB suggested continuing the discussion on AI, possibly student success in the context of AI. BT suggested publicizing the sub-topics to facilitate discussion.

CW agrees mixing of students, staff, administrator, faculty at each table ideal and likes the multiple areas of the SS Framework be covered. Topics for tables could include: Era of AI, career readiness, earnings test, teaching and learning, social mobility, student experience, belonging, holistic development, community, affordability and access, international, and alumni engagement, or possibly defining campus metrics for student success.

4. [FPPC referral on draft Hiring Policies revisions](#) – NH presented the policy referral form to go to FPPC chair Barbara LeMaster. Reviewed communication to FPPC chair BL for referral of hiring policy back to FPPC. Issues discussed involved the scope of the policy, as well as the voice of faculty.
 5. [Review of SPOT Task Force Charge draft](#) – NH presented draft to EC, and inquired if EC believes ready to be on the Senate floor. PFH questioned whether it was a task force or a standing committee. NH offered time limits usually accompany a task force. CW offered some language implied a committee more than task force. KP added the term limits imply a long-standing committee and the end result is ambiguous in the charge. The next step will be the charge going to the senate floor. The possibility of a question bank was also discussed for SPOT items.
 6. [Request from Pei-Fang relating to GVAR Policy Interpretation and Exceptions](#) (For reference: [PS 26-02](#)) NH presented PFH's request regarding the GVAR policy. PFH has been contacted by a Dean and two ADs about course designation, and enrollment caps. There is no WI in the current policy. BK offered the cap is addressed in the policy. Questions remain about the possibility of lists of courses and how departments might agree on what GVAR courses count toward majors. 2.4.1 defines GVAR courses. Given WI doesn't exist those courses will need to be switched to GVAR. Programs designating courses to satisfy GVAR may create bespoke courses or designate certain courses from outside their program. Departments can have the latitude to suggest GVAR courses throughout campus.
 7. [Draft Policy: Evaluation of Lecturers](#) – NH presented the draft policy to EC. Specifics of the policy were discussed by EC. BT felt clarity is needed in this policy. VG stated this policy is needed. Worries were offered that a policy could make evaluations more harsh or difficult. BT suggested the variety of lecturers demands idiosyncratic evaluations. Contractual issues should not appear in the policy, according to BK. Guests will visit next week for feedback.
 8. [Committee on Athletics Annual Report](#)
 9. [University Library Annual Report](#)
9. Announcements and Information
 1. University Awards Email – coming very soon, with new online submission system!
 10. Reminder
 1. Second Academic Senate Meeting of the Academic Year, Thursday, September 10, 2026, from 2:00 pm to 4:00 pm in PSY-150 and on Zoom

2. Academic Senate Retreat, October 29, 2026, 2:00 pm to 5:00 pm in the Anatol Center

11. Adjourned - 3:58 pm