



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

Agenda – AY2023-24 – Meeting 15
Wednesday, May 8th, 2024, 2:15-4:00 PM
Zoom: <https://csulb.zoom.us/j/87893439081>
Meeting ID: 878 9343 9081

1. Approval of the agenda - Approved
2. Approval of minutes from April 24th, 2024 Meeting
3. Announcements
 - a. Recognition of outgoing CEPC members
 - b. Approval of GE Supplement #97 – Consent Calendar
4. Review of proposed revisions to **Policy 12-12, Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement** – (Second Reading) (Time Certain: 2:30pm)
 - a. The CSU system with 1101 did not add composition into critical thinking.
 - b. GPA requirement will still be C- (C for us) for core classes.
 - c. Kerry Johnson. GVAR knows about what happened with critical thinking and CalGETC.
 - d. Still a strong desire to have the upper div writing course, with inclusion of theses and any other course or experience with a large amount of writing.
 - e. Jeff removed reference to W category, and removed reference to the critical thinking course.
 - f. §2.3
 - g. Discussion of whether the upper division writing course has to be in English.
 - h. Question: If a transfer student has started GVAR at home campus, which campus requirements do they have to satisfy?
 - i. If someone completed GVAR at another CSU, we would accept that.
 - j. §2.6: 2/3 of grade must be from writing, and COE does not have any courses that would satisfy that requirement.
 - k. If we don't add an additional course, we can just look at course caps.
 - l. §2.3.1.3: Motion to remove the second WI course. 1st WI course would then have to serve as GVAR requirement.



-
- m. Comment: Agree that students are not graduating with adequate writing skills, but if our current writing classes are not fixing it, another class will not fix it.
 - n. Comment in opposition to amendment: We need to give the opportunity for writing where we can.
 - o. Question: Do we actually have data on whether the earlier courses are helping with writing? Are students who get to senior year without being proficient writers better than they would have been without the first course they took, and would another course help them even more?
 - p. Comment: Adding another upper division writing course will add units.
 - q. Recommendation to keep second WI course but not require it to be in the major.
 - r. CNSM is not in favor of a second upper division course.
 - s. Lori: GWAR discussed that the req of having the second WI in the major seems to be the major sticking point. We will be eliminating the GPE and portfolio courses; are there any proposals to replace them?
 - t. Comment: Do those people advocating for eliminating the second WI course want to say that their students are graduating with writing skills sufficient to graduate?
Response: I agree with the existence of the issue, but do not think this extra course will fix anything with professors who are not trained to help people with writing. Response: there will be some support for training in the modules.
 - u. Vote: In favor of removing second WI course requirement: 11 in favor, 6 opposed, motion passes.
 - v. Motion: remaining WI course be *in* the major.
 - w. Comment: WI courses can already be in the major as written, and the change would force them to create courses.
 - x. Proposal withdrawn.
 - y. §2.6.2: Course cap. Proposed change 22 to 35.
 - z. Comment: Financially, it would cost \$2 million to cap at 22.
 - aa. Challenge to budget numbers, and proposal to either keep 22 or remove the cap at all. Response: We don't want anyone to have to teach WI courses with 70 students.
 - bb. Comment in favor of 22 cap, as the CLA WIs are averaging 26 students, so the impact financially is not that high.
 - cc. Comment: 35 students at 5,000 words is A LOT. You also have to critique students to develop their writing.



-
- dd. Question about what it is like to teach WI with 35 students.
- ee. 8 in favor, 9 opposed.
5. New proposed **Mathematics Instructional Specialist (MIS) Certificate** – (Second Reading) (Time Certain: 3:40pm)
- a. Shuhua An: We did not require teaching experience, because there is a critical need for teachers who are specialized in teaching math, and we are already limiting who can apply based on course requirements.
 - b. Comment from CNSM in favor of requiring teaching experience. Every student in our program will have met and surpassed the course requirements.
 - i. Proposed experience form Math Dept:
 1. Experience teaching K-8 mathematics which may be demonstrated by any one of the following:
 2. At least 2 years of experience teaching middle school mathematics or K-5 with a demonstrated focus in mathematics instruction
 3. Experience as a K-8 mathematics specialist
 4. Other equivalent K-8 mathematics teaching experience
 - c. 7 in favor 9 abstention 0 no votes. Motion probably passes? Check with Pei Fang.
6. Adjournment

Thank you for your contributions this semester, and have a wonderful summer!