



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

Meeting 10 – AY2021-2022
Wednesday, March 9th, 2022
Meeting held online (Zoom)

Members Present: Danny Paskin (Chair), Jeff Bentley (Secretary), Jody Cormack, Rene Treviño, Jeet Joshee, Laura Forrest, Perla Ayala, Panadda Marayong, Donna Green, Betina Hsieh, Betsy Cooper, Sandra Arevalo, Jermie Arnold, Josh Chesler, Diane Hayashino, Leilani Madrigal, Tom Tredway, Henry O’Lawrence, Robert Moushon

Guests Present: Neil Hultgren, Dina Perrone, Anne D’Zmura, Brooke Winder, Colleen Dungan, Dan O’Connor, Matthew Reimers, Sherry Span, Dave Whitney, Kerry Johnson, Sandra Pérez, Enrico Tapavicza

1. Meeting called to order at 2:05pm
2. M/S/P – Approval of agenda as amended
3. M/S/P – Approval of minutes from February 23rd, 2022 meeting
4. Announcements from Chair Paskin:
 - a. Academic Senate is currently working through second readings of discontinuances and elevations of proposals already discussed in CEPC, as well as the CPIE name change GEEC charge.
5. New proposed Bachelor of Science in Dance Science – First Reading
 - a. Cooper briefly reviews the proposal. This proposal builds on a previously existing Option in Dance Science in the Bachelor of Arts in Dance. This is designed for students generally seeking to improve the health and well-being of dancers, including enhancing performance and reducing injuries.
 - b. Chesler asks if this would count as demonstrating subject matter competence for a dance credential, and if the degree change would impact students seeking credentialing. Cooper and Dungan reply.
 - c. Bentley asks about the impact of this program on enrollments in the B.A. in Dance. Cooper responds and alleviates concerns.



-
6. New proposed Bachelor of Arts in Psychology Cohort Program – First Reading
 - a. Whitney reviews the justifications for, and details of, the proposal.
 - b. Green requests the proposal team consult with the Financial Aid Office.

 7. M/S/P – Revision of Honors Program policy – Second Reading
 - a. Bentley comments on minor grammatical edit, Trevino and Tredway offer solution. Chesler asks for clarification, Pérez responds, and edits are revised.
 - b. Forrest questions the part of Section 2.2 specifying the difference between Honors courses and non-Honors courses. Chesler, Johnson, Pérez, and Trevino offer comments for edits.
 - c. Chesler, Forrest, Johnson, Marayong, Pérez, Trevino, and others made further edits for syntax and clarity throughout. A bulk of these edits focused on the composition of the Honors Council.

 8. New proposed policy on Credit for Prior Learning – Second Reading
 - a. Marayong asks for clarification on the role of Credit for Prior Learning in graduate programs. Joshee and O’Lawrence reply.
 - b. Joshee, O’Lawrence, and Moushon revise reference to the relevant policy from the Chancellor’s Office for appropriateness. The title of the policy is revised.
 - c. Marayong requests more specific reference to credit in undergraduate versus graduate programs, since the required credit total may vary between undergraduate and graduate programs. Forrest supports this clarification, highlighting that most graduate programs have only 30 units. Perrone notes that graduate programs are also only allowed to let a certain number of units count from outside the major.
 - d. Chesler asks if this policy is relevant only to students enrolled in degrees. Joshee confirms that credits for prior learning can only be gained for students matriculated in a program at CSULB. Revisions are made for clarity.
 - e. Marayong asks about the process through which evidence of prior learning is evaluated and approved/denied for credit; is it individual or by committee? Marayong points out inconsistencies in the policy draft. Forrest clarifies that such decisions were previously made by individual faculty members. Joshee comments



that informal practices do exist to help faculty make such decisions in the case of armed forces service.

9. Presentation by Academic Senate Chair Hultgren on AB 928

- a. California Assembly Bill 928, the *Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act of 2021*, was signed into law by Governor Newsom in October 2021. This was presented as a way of reducing barriers for transfer students. The Academic Senate of the CSU (ASCSU) voiced concerns with the content of the AB 928.
- b. AB 928 requires the establishment of a singular lower division general education pathway from California Community Colleges (CCC) to CSU (California State University) and UC (University of California) campuses. This GE pathway must be established by May 31st, 2023 by the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS), which is composed of Senate officers from the CSU, UC, and CCC systems. If no pathway is developed by Faculty, campus Administrators will develop it by December 31st, 2023.
- c. The pathway decided on (by ICAS or Administrators) must not lengthen the time to degree or include more units than is required by the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC). Differences from IGETC and our CSULB GE curriculum are discussed, specifically, CSULB GE curriculum requires 6 or 7 more units than IGETC. There are further differences, such as requirements for foreign language or number of social science courses.
- d. Feedback is requested from CEPC members, which will be delivered to the Academic Senate of the CSU (ASCSU). Specifically, which requirements do we believe should be part of the singular general education lower division pathway. CSULB may need to remove six units from our current GE pattern, which ones? Feedback can be delivered through two means:
 - i. The “AB 928 Feedback to the ASCSU” survey is linked on the CSULB Academic Senate webpage.
 - ii. Written responses can also be delivered to a shared dropbox (see Academic Senate webpage).
- e. Questions ensued.

10. Meeting adjourned at 4:09pm.

Meeting minutes draft submitted by Jeff Bentley (Secretary, AY2021-2022).