



**California State University, Long Beach
Curriculum and Educational Policies Council**

**Minutes – AY2024-25 – Meeting 4
Wednesday, October 9th, 2024, 2:00-4:00 PM
Zoom: <https://csulb.zoom.us/j/87893439081>
Meeting ID: 878 9343 9081**

Attendees: Craig Macaulay, Jeff Bentley, Chloe Pascual, Henry O'Lawrence, Danny Paskin, Christine Scott-Hayward, Amanda Fisher, Kirsten Sumpter, Pei-Fang Hung, Chris Swarat, Ann Kim, Robert Moushon, Dennis Laurie, Jermie Arnold, Donna Green, Michael Eisenstadt, Itxaso Rodriguez Ordonez, Laura Forrest, Kelly Leah Stewart, Praveen Shankar, Seung-hoon Jeong, Tanya Piloyan, Babette Benken, Tiffanye Vargas, Kerry Johnson, Lori Brown, Samuel Addington, Daria Graham, Maureen Torrez, Sharon Olson

1. Call to order at 2:04 pm. Approval of the agenda- Approved
2. Approval of minutes from September 25th, 2024 meeting- Minutes approved
3. Announcements
 - a. Jeff is starting a shared OneDrive to share CEPC proposals with members to comment on
 - b. We welcome new member Sharon Olson from Center for International Education
 - c. Next meeting of CEPC is a in-person meeting in LIB-201. Please plan on attending
 - d. Academic Senate will have first reading tomorrow of policy on Masters culminating activities led by Dina Perrone.
 - i. Comment that 5 policies about Masters degrees at CSULB, including some old, short policies will be condensed into 2 policies
 - ii. There are additional significant changes to the policies being discussed in Senate
4. Consent Calendar of AY2023-24 Annual Reports from our reporting committees:
 - a. Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement Committee (GWAR)
 - b. International Education Committee (IEC)
 - c. Members are asked to review newly submitted reports from GWARC and IEC to discuss at next CEPC meeting



-
5. Review of new proposed revision to Policy 12-12, **Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR)** – (Second Reading) (Time Certain: 2:15) Kerry Johnson, Lori Brown
- a. Bentley described an overview of changes made to policy last year by CEPC. Major change was reducing courseload from 4 to 2 writing courses.
 - b. Members can make new proposals or amendments live on the OneDrive document that we will vote on.
 - c. Question: Where does policy go after CEPC? Answer: Senate, then must be implemented by GWAR-C and Departments. Associate Deans typically work with Chairs to implement policies. In CEPC we always need to find the balance between discussing policy and implementation.
 - d. §2.5 Two proposals have been made to revise this section.
 - e. Proposal 1
 - i. Revise naming conventions in the policy. University Writing Requirement Support Modules (UWRSM)
 - ii. A University Writing Center Coordinator to manage the modules.
 - iii. Students must complete at least 2 UWRSM during the completion of their WI course. Modules can be assigned to the entire class or based on student needs.
 1. Question: What does "mechanics" mean in Grammar and mechanics tutorials list? Proposal to add "writing mechanics." Lori Brown answered: The terms are clear to writing experts. Mechanics are things like punctuation and proper use of syntax. Grammar means things like subject and verb agreement. Friendly amendment to explain mechanics in a parenthetical statement to clarify this term.
 2. Question: How will we know which UWRSM students will have completed? Will the University Writing Center Coordinator keep



track of this information? Answer: Instructors will record if students complete the UWRSM and evaluate if they learned the material or not. These modules will be used in the upper-division WI course, not in the lower division writing course.

3. Comment that a badge could be earned by completing UWRSM. Should this wait for implementation?
4. Comment that use of the UWRSM should be up to the Instructor, not policy. More important is whether or not the modules should be required. Opinion that the modules should not be required, but available as a resource to be used as the Instructor sees fit.
5. Comment that writing intensive courses already have many requirements and we do not need additional requirements. It is too onerous for students. UWRSM should not be a required part of the class if it is not part of a grade for the course because how would you manage a student who did not complete a module but completed the other coursework, an Incomplete? This is not best for students.
6. Comment that when students take the WI course would determine how useful the UWRSM would be. If UWRSM are available for any course, then they would be most useful. We should not make the WI courses more onerous. A requirement to take additional modules before retaking a WI course would be onerous for Department Chairs, who would need to track this.
7. Question: If UWRSM are available for all faculty then should they be available through the Writing Center, not in a GVAR policy? Support for this idea and if they are not required then should they perhaps be removed from the GVAR policy? Lori Brown answered: the modules were proposed because there are currently many students who can not move directly to a Writing Intensive course without additional writing courses. After students take the



English portfolio course they tend to do well in the WI courses. With the GPE (GWAR placement exam) being removed, we need a way to serve students who need help with their writing. We can not neglect these students who need more assistance as an equity issue. UWRSM were intended to be in the lower division course, not the WI course. Currently GWAR manages the GPE testing and evaluates if students can directly move into a WI or need to take a portfolio course. We need some kind of safety net to assist students who need help with writing. We will see decreases in the quality of student writing assessments if we do not have this support. Staff in the writing center are already at capacity and these modules will fulfill a need to assist students to improve their writing.

8. Comment: An example of a module that is currently in use and like what was originally proposed is data literacy. It is automatically graded and takes a student about 30 minutes to complete. The data literacy module provides relief for instructors and a valuable teaching tool that improves the student's research skills.
9. Proposal §2.5.5 All UWRC eligible students are encouraged to complete 2 UWRSM modules before the completion of the WI course. Changing "during" to "before" follows the spirit of the modules as a lower division writing support but how do we track that? How would we track this if it's not part of a course?
Suggestion: Taking these 2 UWRSM modules could be part of a 300-level course, not necessarily the WI. This would give departments more flexibility.
10. Comment: Students could use this writing support at lower division and upper division. What's most equitable is that all students should need to do these writing modules. Not necessarily run by faculty, but could be an asynchronous course, run in collaboration with ATI. You could be required to take it within two



years of entering CSULB to earn a badge. Something like the Beach Mentor badge. It's a disservice to students if we do not require these writing modules.

11. Comment: We need to consider student workload. Faculty may not see much increase in workload if modules are required. How would transfer students be required to complete these modules? This one-size fits all policy is not good for all WI courses across campus.
12. Comment: These UWRSM modules that are asynchronous and automatically graded will focus on grammar deficits instead of teaching good writing. UWRSM is not a panacea for poor writing. Writing is developed by revision and working with Instructors, critical feedback. Mandating these modules would be a student burden and is not the right context for learning how to write well. It would be more appropriate to require the UWRSM modules in lower division since they will focus on basic skills.
13. Comment by Donna Green: We should not have a standalone requirement or make the UWRSM a pre-req that would result in a hold put on enrollment. The UWRSM should be part of a course. Comment that perhaps UWRSM should be in the first-year experience course that is being considered. Response: Unfortunately, the first-year course isn't organized yet so the GWAR policy can not refer to it.
14. Comment: We use a Financial Literacy module to assess students so it can be used to determine what help students need, and it is not part of a course. The UWRSM could be used like the Advising Modules.
15. Comment: There seems to be agreement that no student should graduate without being able to speak well or write well. We have many obstacles to making that happen. We are admitting too many



students to CSULB who are not prepared for college level speaking and writing. If we raise admission standards then we can focus on teaching our subject areas. We could propose an admissions exam to require better writing. Response: the state legislature required us to remove the GPE exam. Response: We can argue and work against this legislation.

- iv. Proposal to table voting on §2.5 since there seems to be lack of consensus
 - v. Proposal to vote on proposed §2.5.1 that 2 modules be required during WI course so that we move forward on the GVAR policy. Comment: do we accept the friendly amendment to allow students to take the modules before the WI course? Response: No, that should be a separate proposal. Vote on §2.5.1. In favor: 7; Against: 13; Abstentions: 0.
 - vi. Comment that modules will need to be maintained and updated by the University. Uncontroversial to request the modules but whether they are required or not is important.
 - f. Proposal 2 will be discussed next meeting.
 - i. Do not require modules, make them available for all faculty to use in any course.
 - g. Additional proposals on the GVAR policy are welcomed for next CEPC meeting. Please consider this meeting's discussion so we efficiently discuss the policy.
6. New proposed **Doctor of Public Health (DPH)** degree program – (Second Reading) (Time Certain: 3:15) Kamiar Alaei, Loucine Huckabay, Tiffanye Vargas, Monica Lounsbury
- a. Kamiar Alaei presented an overview of how the DPH program proposal has been revised to address CEPC questions during last meeting.
 - i. The MPH degree that is a preferred pre-requisite for admission to the DPH needs to be from an accredited institution and that is now specified in the policy. Other relevant, equivalent degrees used for application have now been added to the policy. There are 6 foundational courses that students lacking in a MPH or equivalent degree can be required to take by the



CSULB Admissions Committee and Health Science Department. Added that completion of individual foundational courses can be considered for each applicant

- ii. GRE is not a requirement for DPH or MPH, similar to other institutions
 - iii. Leadership is a part of every course in the program. A leadership course is an elective, but leadership skills will be developed holistically
 - iv. Students must take two elective courses
 - v. Credit for prior learning. These can be transfer credits or through prior learning experience (up to 6 units). Proposal now includes language on how standardized exams can be used to assess prior learning.
- b. Comment: Proposal should state that the program will follow CSULB's "policy" on credit for prior learning, not "guidelines" on prior learning. Comment: these 6 units must be assigned to specific courses so consider which courses should be used for this.
- c. Discussion of GRE, GPA, and TOEFL admissions requirements
- i. Comment: some of the responses presented aren't effectively addressing the committee's questions. Should we allow more flexibility and allow for submission of a GRE score to compensate for a low GPA? Answer: if applicants are from foreign countries then they must take the TOEFL exam and pass it at 90 points. GRE score could be valuable, but a GPA of 3.0 from an accredited school is important for applicants to have to succeed in this program. A student deficient in these ways would not be accepted. If we do not have sufficient applicants, then we might use GRE in the future to determine successful applicants. The potential for standard exams to discriminate is why the Department wants to use a more holistic approach for admissions.
 - ii. Comment: CEPC shouldn't require a Department to use GRE
 - iii. Comment: Grad school admissions across the country point out that GRE lacks prediction power for success in grad school. This program proposal is in line with what is being proposed around the country. Response: the suggestion could be removed
 - iv. Comment: is TOEFL of 90 a reasonable score? Response: Yes
- d. Comment: We should vote on the program proposal.
- e. Question about the budget and the ability of CSULB to support this program. Answer: this is differential tuition so it gives more money to the University and should support this program.



-
- f. Question: Will TOEFL only be required when students have not received education in English? Response: Yes. Comment: This is an admissions question, not necessary for the program proposal.
- g. Question: Do the required courses have any prerequisites that incoming students may not have taken? Response: No, they are the foundation courses and do not have pre-requisites.
- h. Discussion of Staffing and Compensation
- i. Question: Will assigned time be provided to Dissertation Chairs the semester you are advising the students or afterwards? Response: Assigned time will be given at the completion of the dissertation to encourage the student and faculty to work together to finish the program. Dean Lounsbury commented: HHS is restructuring so supervision work will be part of teaching load. Question: Will HSC 798 be classified as S-2/S36? Response: Yes.
 - ii. Question: If a Dissertation Chair only has 1 student at a time then can the faculty accumulate S factor and get course release after a certain number of years? Response: Yes, the S factor units can be banked.
 - iii. Question: How do the other committee members who are not the Dissertation Chair receive assigned time? Response: It will be less assigned time, a proportion of what is allocated to the chair. Response: Perhaps you should provide more detail on this assigned time. Response: perhaps 1/3 of 1 unit of assigned time will be earned by non-Chair dissertation committee members.
- i. URC advised Bentley that CEPC can comment on resources available for quality and staff of a program. URC is also working with the DPH proposers about S-factor.
7. Vote on approving the DPH degree proposal. In favor: 18; Against: 0; Abstentions: 0
8. Question: Can we receive a report from URC about resource and staffing so CEPC doesn't need to address these issues with new programs? Response: CEPC needs to ask these questions to address questions about how students would be able to navigate the curriculum. For the DPH proposal we needed to ask more questions than we typically do for a proposal. Response: This is why we coordinated with URC about these questions and this was relevant to CEPC. In the future we could table these proposals and ask for URC's decision. The DPH proposers mentioned they needed to ask for more faculty to staff the program and this was worrisome. Response: URC also frequently moves into discussions of curriculum content. Response: we needed to probe the proposal to ensure the degree would be able to succeed. Response: elaborations made by the proposers while



in CEPC will save them time and energy later in Senate. It would take too long if proposals went through URC first and then came to CEPC.

9. Bentley reiterated that additional GVAR module proposals are welcome for next time. Please add these directly to the OneDrive document.
10. Question: Where is CSULB with planning the first year experience class? Could we include the writing modules in that course? Response: Will be addressed at the next CEP meeting.
11. Comment: These discussions about writing have been going on for a long time at CSULB. Should we admit students who have difficulty writing and how do we support those students once they are here?
12. Adjournment time 4:02

Next meeting: October 23rd, 2024 (in LIB201)