



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

Minutes – AY2026-27 – Meeting 1
Wednesday, August 26th, 2026, 2:00-4:00 PM
Zoom: <https://csulb.zoom.us/j/85806555081>
Meeting ID: 858 0655 5081

Attendance: Craig Macaulay (Chair), Chloe Pascual (Vice Chair), Robert Mejia (Recording Secretary), Danny Paskin, Lora Stevens, Lisa Fish, Sharon Olson, Monica Kabutey, Kirsten Sumpter, Ryan Fischer, Robert Moushon, Amanda Fisher, Pei-Fang Hung, Nat Hansuvadha, Ehsan Madadi, Ann Kim, Susan Bloom, Chris Swarat, Mariya Mileva, Mehran Rahmani, Laura Forrest, Donna Green, Daria Graham.

1. Approval of the agenda

- a. Approved.

2. Approval of minutes from the May 13th, 2026, meeting

- a. Approved.

3. Announcements

- a. Craig Macaulay: Welcomed new and returning members.

4. Search for a recording secretary redux (and conclusion?)

- a. Robert Mejia: Volunteered, and the nomination was moved and seconded. Voting results: Yes 18, No 0, Abstained 4. The motion passed and Robert was elected.

5. 2025-2026 Year-End Reports (consent calendar item) – GWARC (waiting on others)

- a. No discussion, passed as a consent item



6. 1st Reading – Syllabi & SCO policy (11-07)

- a. Craig Macaulay: Summarized faculty senate request and discussed CEPC procedures for opening policies.
- b. Procedure: 1st Reading Opened.
- c. Member: Suggested that we review and discuss before making recommendations.
- d. Member: Suggested that the policy's 10pt font standard should be upgraded to 12pt font.
 - a. Member: Noted that ADA compliance is 12pt font.
- e. Member: Question about whether the Faculty Senate request is only about AI or whether we have the discretion to consider other aspects of the document.
 - a. Member: CEPC has rights to consider the whole document.
- f. Member: Suggested that we look at AI policy language from CSULB and the CSU system that can be adapted. This also may be a good time to update the existing SCO policy to better resonate with current needs.
- g. Member: [Presented four considerations]:
 - a. AI Policy: Faculty Senate has sample language on the senate website. We may consider making these statements mandatory. <https://www.csulb.edu/academic-senate/shared-governance-resources>.
 - b. Assessment Review: There are SCOs that have not been updated for decades. We may consider including language—in section three—about how often departments ought to review their standard course outlines.
 - c. Departmental Submission: There is language about how the department needs to submit their course syllabi to the library archives. We need to consider whether this aligns with current archival needs.
 - d. Job Skills: We may consider including language about helping students better understand the skills that they will acquire in the course. Requiring this in the syllabus will help students to better advocate for themselves in terms of job readiness and would align with university interests in articulating job readiness.



-
- h. Member: The existing Archival Policy states that departments need to keep their syllabus archived for five-years—few are compliant. <https://www.csulb.edu/university-library/welcome-to-special-collections-and-university-archives/csulb-university-archives>.
- i. Member: We can help students with employment or pursue a graduate education by aligning our existing course objectives with skill-based outcomes. We need faculty input to consider how best to do this in the policy.
- j. Member: We need to save our syllabi because students who transfer from CSULB to other universities will need them to receive appropriate credit from their university.
- a. Member: Alums need this as well if they go for licensure, credentials, etc.
- k. Member: Whatever changes we make to SCOs should not be mandated to be incorporated immediately; it would be difficult if every department updates every SCO at the same time.
- l. Member: We should ask the committee members to craft individual language for amendments for consideration. The document is way out of date. Some colleges require that faculty submit their syllabus to a shared online folder so that colleagues can access prior syllabus.
- m. Member: I noticed there are some antiquated items, such as handing out paper copies and other items.
- a. Question: When the library accepts copies, does the library hold onto it in perpetuity?
- b. Member: Yes, we have copies from the 1940s. Around 2010, we began pushing towards electronic collection. Jody Cormack was very helpful with getting compliance, which is much higher than it used to be. As noted in the policy we have several recommendations such as file naming policy for submission. (<https://www.csulb.edu/university-library/welcome-to-special-collections-and-university-archives/csulb-university-archives>).

7. General Discussion:

- a. Member: Suggested ASI needs to be present for these discussions as well, and Chair Macaulay agreed.



-
- b. Member: Since there was a suggestion about talking to departments, we should find out who in our department is the point person for collecting syllabus as they may have thoughts on the syllabi collection process.
8. **Adjournment:**
- a. Meeting adjourned at 3:02PM

Next meeting: September 9, 2026: 2-4 PM

Additional info:

CEPC website (has schedule, agendas, minutes, etc.) –

<https://www.csulb.edu/academic-senate/curriculum-and-educational-policies-council-cepc>

CEPC Canvas (where all docs will be shared) - <https://csulb.instructure.com/courses/58033>