



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

Meeting 11 – AY2021-2022
Wednesday, March 23rd, 2022
Meeting held online (Zoom)

Members Present: Danny Paskin (Chair), Jeff Bentley (Secretary), Jody Cormack, Rene Treviño, Jeet Joshee, Perla Ayala, Panadda Marayong, Betina Hsieh, Betsy Cooper, Diane Hayashino, Josh Chesler, Tom Tredway, Henry O’Lawrence, Shamim Mizra, Destiny Islas

Guests Present: Robert Moushon, Dan O’Connor, Brooke Winder, Colleen Dunagan, Dina Perrone, Brooke Winder, Matthew Reimers, Sherry Span, Dave Whitney

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 March 9th, 2022 meeting
4. M/S/P – New proposed Bachelor of Science in Dance Science – Second Reading
5. New proposed Bachelor of Arts in Psychology Cohort Program – Second Reading
 - a. Bentley asked about faculty qualifications for online modality. Whitney elaborates that these courses have been taught in this modality (online) previously, even before the pandemic. Joshee notes that CPIE also works with CSULB ITS to provide instructional training for the online modality.
 - b. Hsieh asks for clarification on course scheduling issues. Whitney clarifies.
 - c. Chesler asks if enrollment is restricted only to those in the cohort. Whitney confirms these courses are only for those in the cohort. Reimers clarifies that no stateside student will be allowed to enter this cohort.
6. Announcements from Chair Paskin:
 - a. Academic Senate is currently working through both first and second readings of proposals already discussed in CEPC, as well as the CPIE name change.



-
- b. Academic Senate will be reviewing list of members for GEEC.
 - c. Provost and Academic Senate are discussing changing PS 09-06 on Probation and Disqualification. Specifically, the Provost advocates for updating terminology. CEPC will discuss changes in the future, and will be provided with a draft of revised terminology. It is proposed to replace the *Academic Probation 1* and *Academic Probation 2* with *Academic Notice* and *Academic Warning*, respectively. Hsieh and Chesler ask for clarification, Cormack and Paskin reply. CEPC asked for a copy of Provost and Academic Senate Chair's presentation in Open Forum earlier in the day. Chair Paskin will ask Senate Chair Hultgren about it.
7. Input from CEPC to Senate Executive Committee on proposed changes to CEPC charge (i.e., adding new members)
- a. An ad-hoc committee of Academic Advisors requested a seat on CEPC. This was brought to the Academic Senate (AS). The AS asked CEPC to discuss three options:
 - i. Option 1: Two voting general Staff Members elected by Staff Council
 - ii. Option 2: One voting general Staff Member and one voting Staff Advisor, both elected by Staff Council
 - iii. Option 3: One voting Staff Advisor elected by Staff Council, and the Director of Academic Programs as a voting member
 - b. Cooper expresses support for adding Staff Advisors, and asks for clarification on the third option offered by the AS (i.e., third option should have a Staff Advisor, not a general Staff Member). Hsieh offers similar support, and reinforces the importance of adding Staff Advisors rather than general Staff Members. Cormack and Chesler agrees and elaborates.
 - c. Chesler suggests Option 4: One Staff Member who is curriculum-aligned, one Staff Advisor, and the Director of Academic Programs (three voting members in total).
 - d. Tredway encourages the inclusion of individual advisors at the Department-level into the term "advising bodies on campus". Cooper agrees.
 - e. 13 CEPC members were supportive of adding Staff Advisors in an informal poll. 1 CEPC member was against. Bentley launched an informal ranking poll, which revealed strongest support by CEPC for Option 4 (9 out of 12 ranked it as their first choice), followed by roughly equal support for Option 2 (1 ranked it first, 6



ranked it second) and Option 3 (2 ranked it first, 4 ranked it second). There was little support for Option 1 (10 ranked it fourth).

8. Revision of PS 16-17 Policy on Certificates – First Reading

- a. The criteria for allowing certificates has changed, yet our policy has not. Cormack provides other elaboration.
- b. Chesler asks for clarification on the term “standalone program”. Chesler also asks about overlap between certificates and other credit fulfillments. Cormack replies and clarifies that “standalone” is a term relevant to financial aid only.
- c. Marayong supports updating this policy and asks about other forms of credential aside from certificates (i.e., micro-credentialing). Hsieh builds on that question and asks for clarity. Cormack clarifies and responds. Discussion ensued.
- d. Joshee comments on the need for clarification between Academic Certificates and Certificates completed not for credit. Joshee also describes the potential design of a ‘stackable’ certificate and subsequent enrollment in a for-credit program.
- e. Tredway supports revision of the process evaluating and supporting non-credit Certificates. Joshee agrees and comments.

9. New proposed policy on Credit for Prior Learning – Second Reading

- a. O’Lawrence and Marayong comment on drafted language in the Introduction regarding the structure of the committee evaluating the credit equivalency of the prior learning experience.
 - i. Joshee comments that this committee may differ in structure across Colleges.
 - ii. Cormack advocates against a committee for evaluating credit equivalency, and instead suggests aligning with the original language specifying that one single faculty member makes the determination.
 - iii. Cooper specifies that the policy should clarify how a faculty member is chosen for the role of evaluating credit equivalency. Hsieh provides an example of the process from the College of Education.
 - iv. Paskin suggests that the evaluator should be designated by the Department Chair
 - v. Marayong asks if the evaluator evaluates *all* courses in the College or only those that fall in their expertise. Joshee and Cormack suggest that latter.



Paskin alters policy language to include “case by case” designation of an evaluator.

vi. Chesler asks how to regulate if a student is attempting to get credit from different Colleges for the same experience. Cormack and Joshee reply.

b. Cooper asks if Staff Advisors should be included in determining the credit equivalency of prior experiences. Cormack responds.

10. Meeting adjourned at 4:01pm.

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