



MINUTES
Curriculum and Educational Policy Council (CEPC)
California State University, Long Beach

Meeting 4 – AY2022-2023
Wednesday, October 12th, 2022
Meeting held online (Zoom)

Members Present: Danny Paskin (Chair), Craig Macaulay (Vice Chair), Jeff Bentley (Secretary), Jody Cormack, Donna Green, Laura Forrest, Henry O’Lawrence, Betina Hsieh, Babette Benken, Diane Hayashino, Jermie Arnold, Jeet Joshee, Tom Tredway, Praveen Shankar, Anita Fitzgerald, Pamela Lewis, Chris Swarat, Tracy Gilmore, Michael Eisenstadt, Itxaso Rodriguez, Ga-Young Kelly Suh

Guests Present: Robert Moushon, Dina Perrone, Soyeon Kim, Mariah Proctor, Karen Kleinfelder, Ken Brown, Ga-Young Kelly Suh, Aubry Mintz, Don Haviland, Shimbe Shim, Ruth Piker, Jake Olson

1. Meeting called to order at 2:04pm
2. M|S|P – Approval of agenda
3. M|S|P – Approval of minutes from September 28th, 2022 meeting
4. CEPC welcomes new members Michael Eisenstadt, Itxaso Rodriguez, and Ga-Young Kelly Suh (alternate)
5. There were no announcements
6. M|S|P – Proposed degree title change from Bachelor of Arts (BA) in Art, Option in Art History to (standalone) Bachelor of Arts in Art History – Second Reading
7. M|S|P – Proposed new option in Animation within current Bachelor of Fine Arts in Arts – Second Reading
8. M|S|P – Proposed degree name change from Master of Science in Counseling, Option in Student Development in Higher to Master of Science in Counseling, Student Development in Higher Education – Second Reading
 - a. Haviland responds to a question from last meeting regarding the new name of the program.



-
9. M|S|P – Proposed degree elevation from Master of Arts in Education, Option in Early Childhood Education to (standalone) Master of Arts in Early Childhood Education – Second Reading
 - a. This degree elevation more accurately reflects the content of the program, which did not share many courses with other areas of education.
 - b. Benkin asks for clarification on the number of units allowed per semester, Piker clarifies.

 10. Proposed degree elevation from Master of Science in Counseling, Option in School Counseling to (standalone) Master of Science in School Counseling – First Reading
 - a. Olson shares context on the proposal. This is a move to a 60-unit program due in part to high demand and strong placement records for previous students.

 11. Revision of existing Policy on Master’s Degrees – First Reading
 - a. Cormack and Perrone introduce the policy. This is a centralized policy integrating a number of previously disparate policies on Master’s degrees at CSULB. New elements include the Graduate Admission Appeals process, additional information regarding Transfer Credit, the GPA Requirements for program GPA, appealing disqualification, academic load, Advancing to Candidacy, the financial aid implications of concurrent degrees, as well as Graduate Credit Earned as a Senior.
 - b. Paskin asks Perrone and Cormack which parts of this policy are allowed to be modified by CEPC and which are set (and unalterable) by Title V or other external constraints. Cormack clarifies that admissions, GPA, and culminating activities generally cannot be changed much. Perrone will input comments accordingly.
 - c. Forrest questions Section 2.3.1., can students appeal for any other reason than a technical error? Perrone replies yes, Cormack elaborates. Forrest requests language change to highlight this.

 12. New proposed Policy on Master’s Level Program Culminating Activities – Second Reading



-
- a. Shankar asks how a “designated body” is decided for each program, in the case of approving a Thesis Committee (Section 2.3). Perrone clarifies that this is usually program of College-specific, not bound by a detailed University policy.
 - b. Arnold asks if language should be changed in Section 2.3.c for programs or Colleges that do not have an oral defense. Perrone notes that GSAC confers that *every* thesis should have an oral defense component, based on language in Title V stating that “normally” an oral defense is required.
 - i. CEPC discussed GSAC’s recommendation that every thesis has an oral defense component.
 - ii. Shankar agrees that oral defense should be required, but it has been difficult to manage in some situations (e.g., many students needing one, meeting College-level deadlines, etc.).
 - iii. Forrest expresses concern that bypassing an oral defense may threaten the integrity of the program and has historical importance.
 - iv. Benken brings up different ways program approach this issue, to provide context.
 - v. Lewis questions performance anxiety, Cormack and Forrest respond.
 - vi. Cormack reminds the council that the oral defense is required for the thesis only, not other culminating activities (e.g., comprehensive exam, performance).
 - vii. Cormack offers alternative language to include alternatives if specified by the discipline of the program. Paskin offers updated language, Hsieh provides constructive feedback. Perrone assists in language wording and placement.
 - viii. Shankar asks if language referring to oral defense be updated to reflect the new language (i.e., a discipline-specific alternative arrangement). Hsieh elaborates on the meaning of “participating” in an oral defense, suggesting it may include providing questions ahead of time to the Chair in the case of not being able to be present live for the defense. Paskin offers updated language. Cormack speaks against the proposed amended language. Hsieh withdraws amendment.



-
- c. Shankar recommends language update to the responsibilities of the College Dean.
 - d. Shankar questions Section 1.b under the Responsibilities of the Academic Unit, Cormack responds and both offer language to clarify.
 - e. Shankar asks which positions are included in the term “faculty member”, Perrone clarifies that it includes all types of faculty (e.g., tenured, tenure-track, lecturer, etc.).
 - f. Perrone makes assorted structural and terminological language edit suggestions throughout.
 - g. Rodriguez asks about the difference between a project as opposed to a thesis. Cormack clarifies that a project may be completed by a group, whereas a thesis is an individual project, and a project does not need to be published in the ProQuest Thesis and Dissertations database. Projects may vary in content as well (e.g., performance, directed research, etc.). Benken, Hsieh, and Perrone add further clarifying details.
 - h. O’Lawrence asks about timely graduation with a project, Cormack responds. This policy allows for more flexibility in completing a culminating project and counting for graduation, whereas a thesis must follow strict deadlines.

13. Meeting adjourned at 4:05pm.

Meeting minutes draft submitted by Jeff Bentley (Secretary, Fall 2022).