



---

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

**Minutes – AY2024-25 – Meeting 11**  
**Wednesday, February 26<sup>th</sup>, 2025, 2:00-4:00 PM**  
**Zoom: <https://csulb.zoom.us/j/87893439081>**  
**Meeting ID: 878 9343 9081**

Attendance: Jeff Bentley, Jermie Arnold, Kelly Leah Stewart, Christine Scott-Hayward, Kirsten Sumpter, Pei-Fang Hung, Manny Pulido, Robert Moushon, Ali Rezaei, Judy Prince, Hailu Xu, Tanya Piloyan, Laura Forrest, Samuel Addington, Chloe Pascual, Michael Eisenstadt, Dennis Laurie, Craig Macaulay, Sharon Olson, Donna Green, Amanda Fisher, Chris Swarat, Michael Eisenstadt, Kirsten Sumpter

1. Agenda approved.
2. Minutes from February 12<sup>th</sup>, 2025 meeting – Approved.
3. Announcements
  - a. AAC needs a liaison from CEPC. Meets 2-4pm on 2/27, 3/13, 4/17, 5/8.
4. Revision of PS 11-09 **Grade Appeals Procedure** – (First Reading) (Time Certain: TBD if needed)
  - a. There has been feedback about how long it takes for students to appeal their grades. The process can take almost nine months. Recommendation to make it a shorter timeline (~6 months).
  - b. Students are concerned about the length of time. Professors are concerned about clarifying that faculty do not meet over winter and summer break.
  - c. Pei-Fang Hung: This is a recommendation.
  - d. Donna Green: This process is long and sometimes the student is already in the next class because the GA process stretches into the next semester.
  - e. Pei-Fang Hung: Presentation on clarity of the current Grade Appeals process
  - f. Reviewed checklist students use to decide "Do I apply for a grade appeal?" Sometimes this checklist can be confusing.
  - g. Question: This is a proposal to provide this checklist to the students or does this already exist? Answer: The checklist already exists.
  - h. Question: What does capricious mean in "Definition of arbitrary"? Answer: There is no definition of capricious in the current document.
  - i. Follow-up: It seems duplicative here, used as a synonym of arbitrary.



- 
- j. Need to decide if we want to define these terms in the policy itself for the Grade Appeals Committee and for students to decide if they will pursue a grade appeal.
  - k. P-F Hung has created a Grade Appeals Form; there wasn't one before then.
  - l. There is currently a preliminary informal phase, followed by a formal process.
  - m. Pei-Fang recommends amending the form.
  - n. Academic Senate has received request from ASI to open grade appeals process in order to standardize the appeal process, define the actions that constitute a valid grade appeal, include safeguards for neglectful actions, and require ASI Judiciary to track grade appeal data and report to ASI and AS.
  - o. Question: how many are there? Answer: 2-3 per semester get through the different levels. We don't know how many are initiated.
  - p. Comment from Laura, formerly having been a chair of the GAC for many years. in favor of suggestions for uniformity from college to college. Variability from college to college can set students back.
  - q. Comment: There would be budget issues to convening grade appeals during summer.
  - r. Everyone should solicit feedback from interested parties in time for next meeting. Reach out to chairs, get help contacting department and college GACs. Don't want to do with without being in contact with people most affected.
  - s. Suggestion: Maybe CEPC/Jeff should reach out directly to chairs.
5. Senate has seen a presentation of the original WAC program and what came out of our council. Senate wants more feedback from our constituents. There is a letter in the Canvas page from Neil with 8 questions about what we sent to AS.
- a. Both versions of the GEAR policy have been sent to Senate. The one that went through us CEPC, and the one as we originally received it.
  - b. Senate is sending it back to CEPC.
  - c. Question: Why was the original one sent to Senate at all when we spent 18 months on it? Answer: Goal was to be transparent.
  - d. Comment, echoed in chat, that this letter is insulting.
  - e. Comment: This looks like a request form context, and we should advocate for our version, and explain why the original version isn't flexible enough.
  - f. Comment: Even the members of CEPC who disagreed with where we ended up on this can't say this process wasn't fair.



- 
- g. Question: Why would we break precedent to have them look at this alternative policy?
  - h. Comment: We should deny this request. Senate can review the policy as we sent it and make amendments. Motion.
    - i. Discussion: We should, as we deny it, reiterate our defense of it.
    - ii. Clarification that nothing is stopping Senate from taking the CEPC version and making their own amendments. We have already done the work on this. It is time for Senate to do their own work.
    - iii. Discussion of exactly how strongly worded and formal our response to Senate should be.
    - iv. Motion withdrawn in light of Jeff speaking less formally to Neil about our concerns.
  - i. CEPC is the policy writing body. This is all about process, not the substance of the policy.
  - j. Your senators if you want to speak to them about this.  
[https://www.csulb.edu/sites/default/files/2025/documents/AS%20ROSTER%202024-25\\_4.pdf](https://www.csulb.edu/sites/default/files/2025/documents/AS%20ROSTER%202024-25_4.pdf)
6. Adjournment 3:38pm

**Next meeting: March 12<sup>th</sup>, 2025 in LIB201**