



California State University, Long Beach
Curriculum and Educational Policies Council
Agenda – 2019-20 Meeting 10
Wednesday, March 25, 2020, 2-4 PM

Via Zoom:

Meeting ID: **278 521 9491**

Direct link: <https://csulb.zoom.us/j/2785219491>

Via phone: 1 669 900 6833 (and then enter the meeting ID listed above)

Attending: Chloe Pascual (Secretary), Danny Paskin (Chair), Abby Bradecich, Kevin Valenzuela, Babette Benken, Betina Hsieh, Betsy, Chris, Chris Forestiere, Craig Macaulay, Gary Griswold, Henry O'Lawrence, James Saucedo, Jeffrey Bentley, Jody Cormack, Laura Forrest, Neil, Panadda Marayong, Raquelle Hafen, Robert Moushon, Ryan Masao, Jermie Arnold, Ehsan Barjasteh

1. Agenda Approved
2. Minutes from 2019-20 Meeting 9, from Feb. 26, 2020 approved
3. Announcements
 - a. Senate approved both of the degree elevations that we had recommended in CEPC.
 - b. Email from the chair of the Senate on credit/no credit options for the rest of the semester.
 - i. Jody: This has been brought up since we transitioned to alt modes. CO has been looking at this issue. Not that simple.
 - ii. Two options include:
 1. If there are courses that have both a letter grade and a c/nc option, then students will be able to go back in (move deadline) and decide their option again. Probably fairly easy to do.
 2. Add a c/nc option to courses that currently don't have it. Need senate approval, dept. approvals, go through thousands of courses and change it. Waiting to see what numbers look like. More difficult option.
 - iii. This is more of an announcement, as we don't really get to decide. Just on our radar.



-
- iv. Betsy: There is a strong interest in her college.
 - v. Neil: Senate Exec met yesterday. Would be surprised if there was any kind of vote or decision.
 - vi. Jody: We actually need to make a vote on this very quickly for enrollment services.
 - vii. Danny: If we need to, we can bring this up in our next meeting.
 4. Ryan: Due to the amount of discussion in the first two policies, I would like to make a motion that we table agenda items 4 and 5 (Revising current Policy on Cheating and Plagiarism AND Revising current Policy on Final Course Grades, Grading Procedures and Final Assessment) and first take items 6 & 7 (Revising current Policy on Accessibility and Faculty Responsibility for the Selection of Instructional Materials AND Graduate Theses and Projects) under consideration.
 - a. Jody, we aren't ready to move on to 6 & 7.
 - b. Neil: Is there a lot that ASI is concerned about in Plagiarism policy?
 - c. Neil: Changes that is being proposed sounds pretty drastic: will go into next year. This won't be made into policy immediately: Has to go to Senate.
 - d. Babette: Why are we lumping 4 and 5 together? Let's not go backwards. Let's keep talking.
 - e. Craig: Let's finish stuff that we are close to completing.
 - f. Motion fails: 2 y, 15 n, 2 a
 5. Revising current Policy on Cheating and Plagiarism (PS 08-02) – Second Reading
 - a. Received no amendments ahead of time.
 - b. Laura: Change "still believes" to "believes".
 - c. Babette: Move SAI form submission up to the step above.
 - d. Craig, just merge, don't move Review by AIC down.
 - e. Chris: No, we should have them as two different steps, because they are different actions.
 - f. Jeff: Do we need to be more specific about "If student disagrees" as to what they are disagreeing to? That plagiarism has occurred, or the Faculty's action?
 - g. Jody: Would make it clearer that academic Integrity does occur first.



-
- h. Danny will check with Patience on whether the Academic Integrity form or the Student Conduct Incident Reporting Form.
 - i. Jody: Student goes to AIC if they don't agree that they cheated.
 - j. Laura: "If student maintains that they did not cheat or plagiarize." Student can't dispute faculty's actions.
 - k. Craig: The problem is the flowchart now doesn't make sense. Having the student action first before the faculty has made an assessment makes no sense either - there's nothing to disagree with at that point. Label arrow "Faculty believes student cheated."
 - l. Policy:
 - i. Lines 1-18:
 1. Ryan: Preamble on the 77-14 version clarified the difference between the two forms of action:
http://web.csulb.edu/divisions/aa/grad_undergrad/senate/policy/academic/defunct/documents/77-14PolicyonCheatingandPlagiarism.pdf
 2. Craig: There is good language here, but we need a motion for what specifically to add where, to avoid redundancy. What is the rationale for needing the separation of the two forms of action?
 3. Ryan: It is two different processes. Even if Student Conduct decides that you aren't at fault, that doesn't make a difference for academic action.
 4. Draft version from Ryan:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1BcwxCWlba2ScuqNuGOlbkSrpEhEA19epYStD-bS_fBs/edit
 5. Chris: Old policy has both faculty action, (what we are currently looking at) and the student office of ethical conduct (not what we are currently looking at).
 6. Ryan: We do have that. It is under disciplinary action.
 7. Chris: The old policy looks at conduct of the committee, whereas we are just looking at the results.
 8. Ryan will work on a motion.



ii. Section 3.0

1. Ryan: Suggestion about order of definition of cheating and plagiarism.

iii. Section 4.x

1. Al's comment about subsequent registration being affected by accusation. Laura proposes new languages. Chris says student should bring it up to professor. This is just the consequence of these accusations, which faculty do not make lightly.
2. Jody: Realistically, it can be difficult to get committees to meet before next semester. If students get an F, they do get a hold on registration. Is there a way to get committees to meet in a timely fashion? On breaks? Students generally register in April, before they get their final grades, but will be dropped if they get an F.
3. Neil and Jody: might be Senate Exec, needs to make sure that committee meets (Zoom?) over summer?
4. Chris: Student isn't stopped from enrolling. Key is to stop them from being dropped if such an action is in progress.
5. Danny: We all agree that something needs to be done, but we need to figure out what we *can* do. Seems like we agree in principle with Laura and Alan.
6. Under 5 get failing grades in a year.

iv. Section 4.3 – 4.4

1. 120 days after assignment is way too long. Maybe 10 business days to 30 days.
2. Some people think 40 instructional days to be parallel to grade appeals.
3. Will this make it impossible, if discovery of one cheating instance makes us discover another cheating instance, to do a process for the old one?



-
4. Could we add a statement that says, "30 days...unless an additional infraction is found"?

6. Adjournment

Next CEPC meeting: April 8, 2pm-4pm

LOCATION TBA (online)

These minutes are not approved. Respectfully submitted, by Chloé Pascual.