California State University, Long Beach
Curriculum and Educational Policies Council
Minutes – 2018-19 Meeting 13
Wednesday, April 10, 2019, 2-4 PM
AS-119 (Anatol Center)

Members in attendance: Mehrdad Aliasgari, Jermie Arnold, Jennifer Asenas, Jeffery Bentley, Abby Bradecich, Chris Brazier, Terrence Graham, Neil Hultgren, Emely Lopez, Craig Macaulay (Vice Chair), Panadda (Nim) Marayong, Jung Mee Mun, Henry O'Lawrence, Chloé Pascual (Secretary), Danny Paskin (Chair), Nancy Quam-Wickham.

Guests: Juan M. Benitéz (CIE)

1.   Meeting begins at 2:04pm

2.   Agenda approved.

3.   Minutes from 2018-19 Meeting 12, from March 27, 2019

4.   Announcements

    a. 3 more CEPC meetings.

    b. Officially as of April 9, CEPC is done with GE and GR. Docs turned in to AS:

        i.   Clean Policy draft

        ii. Policy draft with votes

        iii. Policy draft with track changes

        iv. Policy comparison with ad hoc document

5.   First Reading of Policy on Service Learning (Time Certain: 2:10pm)

    a. Ad hoc committee: Jennifer Asenas, Nancy Quam-Wickham, Laura Forrest, Juan Benitéz put together the draft policy.

    b. We don't currently have a policy.

    c. Ad hoc committee has been referring to 2012 GE Capstone Policy.

    d. Referenced workload considerations from CBA.

    e. Terrence Graham: Are there boundaries to the policy definition of community, or can it be anywhere in the world? Dr. Benitez: Anywhere in the world.

f. Craig: Line 69: §3.0: Requirements seem very specific to require both oral and written reflection. Dr. Benitéz: Debate, debriefing with oral reflection and formal writing are central to service learning.

g. Neil: We will have a new GE policy soon, so the reference to the 2012 document will be out of date soon. Chris Brazier: There will no longer be designations of capstone classes in 2019 policy, so start at line 24, remove reference to 2012 policy and capstone classes.

h. Terrence: We need a campus definition of service learning.

i. Mehrdad: So there will be recertification of classes designated service learning with this new policy? Response: Enrollment Services does have a service learning attribute (code?) but there is no protocol that formalizes it, and there are many courses that have that SL attribute but have not been certified.

j. Dr. Benitéz: We need to assess which classes that have sl attribute are indeed service learning.

k. Nancy Quam-Wickham: Line 84: We may need a clear designation that any course that is sl has to be recertified.

l. Dr. Benitéz: Anything that isn't required for course credit is different from SL. If class requires those hours, it falls under SL. Currently, about a 3rd of what would be SL classes get around going through Dr. Benitéz's office by making hours optional or giving some other option for the credit.

m. Dr. Benitéz: My assumption is that this would null and void any classes that call themselves service learning but aren't really.

n. Consensus: Make this crystal clear in policy.

o. Chris, Craig: Formalized process for certifying non-GE SL courses. Enrollment Services has to have list.

p. Current (informal) process: If you don't have an affiliation agreement from your partner, you don't get that designation.

q. Jeff: Line 76: sustainable and reciprocal seem like two different concepts.

r. Dr. Benitéz: The process for a site is not easy. So some faculty have students sign hold harmless agreements. This is a state-wide issue, and there are questions whether such agreements would even be enforceable.

s. Line 62: Remove reference to GEGC as an approving body.

6. First Reading of Policy on Establishment and Dissolution of Departments and Programs

   a. Neil: This came to CEPC on Mar 12, 2018. Tasked by Norbert with revisiting department procedures because it was hard to understand the earlier policy. Had no policy on developing or dissolving programs rather than departments. Jessica Neil and Renée revised to make clearer and include program info. Program here means: academic unit smaller than a department. Also used to describe majors, minors etc, which can get confusing. Definition here came from people who are in charge of programs.

      i. Jermie: Line 30: tenure change to tenure or tenure-track?

      ii. Nancy: Line 33 and 41: change to institutions, not universities.

      iii. Chris: what is an institution of "Higher standing?" Neil: from previous policy.

      iv. Nim: §3.0 References to § 3.0 don't seem to actually correspond to § 3.0.

      v. Mehrdad: Line 116 in §7.1: "as specified in §7.2" §7.2 refers back to §7.1. There is a recursive loop. Get rid of "As specified in §7.1"

      vi. Chris: should lecture faculty be included and we use the same voting policy we use for department chairs?

      vii. Nim: §7.1a: Voting language is confusing. It sounds like only joint appointment faculty gets to vote. Neil: Line 53 §4.0 we tried to answer that. Nim: It's still not clear. Chris: Only those who are solely or jointly a part of the department vote. Nim: But the joint and sole appointments from the new department wouldn't vote no, and others would be affected (by, say, losing some faculty to the new department.) Neil will try to tweak language. Perhaps language referring to depts. that would lose faculty to new dept. Nim: Old policy referenced ratio of time for appointments and how that counts.

      viii. Nancy: Is this a policy that is being written for CLA and its problems, or do we need this? Henry: We need this, or people will take advantage of not having a policy to refer to.

      ix. Craig: §6.0 Initial distribution and review. Administratively, distribution to all of these groups simultaneously will be difficult. Neil: CEP is there to a break a tie, and we want the councils and parts of the university where there could be ramifications to have a chance to make comments. Craig: maybe go department, college, university, level by level.

        x.   Henry: If we give the college the total power and not allow the university to get involved, then the college can easily have power over the non-tenured faculty. Craig and Nancy: We would need an appeal process to solve that problem.

      xi.   Mehrdad: Is there any process for schools or colleges?

           1.   Response: Schools are big departments. College creation is probably beyond the scope of what we were asked to do by the Senate.

     xii.   Nim: Should title be Establishment, Transfer, and Dissolution of Departments and Programs?

    xiii.   Q for Ad-hoc: Update document soon? Response: We'll try.

           1.   Chloé will send draft minutes to Neil ASAP.

7.   First Reading of (revised) Graduate Studies Advisory Committee (GSAC) Charge

    a.   Terrence: The GSSI Grad student success initiative launched with a study looking at grad student experiences across campus. There was an effort to integrate that ad hoc study into our governance structure.

    b.   Chris: There used to be a graduate council that was dissolved. Duties were folded into this council. But it may be something separate that we are not really taking care of.

    c.   Terrence: This has been very ad-hoc and not necessarily representative, and there is a feeling that grad students have been kind of an afterthought.

    d.   Mehrdad: Includes doctoral students as well? Terrence: Yes, and credential students.

    e.   Mehrdad: Is there one faculty member per college as representatives? Response: Yes, plus many others.

    f.   Danny: Is the specified group of people the right size?

    g.   Nim: Can we talk about graduate data and analysis and how they would be a part of the initiative?

    h.   Should we weight faculty representation by how many grad students a college has?

    i.   Is this weighted away from faculty control?

     j.   Maybe for the last meeting of the semester if we get to 2nd reading, we will invite relevant parties.

8.   Adjournment

These minutes have not been approved. Respectfully submitted, Chloé Pascual, Secretary
Next CEPC meeting: April 10, 2pm at AS-119 (Anatol Center)

Next CEPC meeting: April 24, 2pm at AS-119 (Anatol Center)