



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

Meeting 6 – AY2021-2022
Wednesday, December 8th, 2021
Meeting held online (Zoom)

Members Present: Danny Paskin (Chair), Craig Macaulay (Vice Chair), Jeff Bentley (Secretary), Jody Cormack, Betsy Cooper, Diane Hayashino, Donna Green, Jermie Arnold, Tom Tredway, Rene Treviño, Henry O’Lawrence, Leilani Madrigal, Sandra Arevalo, Shamim Mirza, Josh Chesler, Kelli Sanderson, Perla Ayala, Joe Kalman, Enrico Tapavicza

Guests Present: Adam Kahn, Nielan Barnes, Sharlene Sayegh, Robert Moushon, Kerry Johnson,

1. Meeting called to order at 2:03pm
2. M/S/P – Approval of agenda
3. M/S/P – Approval of minutes from November 11th, 2021 meeting
4. Announcements from Chair Paskin:
 - a. CEPC Meeting in Spring 2022 will take place online
 - b. Next CEPC is December 8th, 2021
5. M/S/P – Approval of GE Supplement 92
6. Revision of Charge for new General Education Evaluation Committee (GEEC) – First Reading
 - a. In contrast to GEGC, which determines the fitness of individual courses for designation to General Education (GE) status, the GEEC oversees the assessment, evaluation, and review of the GE program as a whole.
 - b. Cormack explains GEEC will provide a specific focus on GE program review, alleviating the high workload of Program Assessment and Review Council (PARC).



-
- c. Paskin clarifies that GEEC is directly subordinate to the Institutional and Program Assessment Council (IPAC), and as such indirectly reports to PARC, rather than CEPC.
 - d. Johnson notes GEEC membership does not allot space for a GEGC member or an IPAC member; CEPC and Sayegh will return to this issue during the second reading.
 - e. Barnes comments GEEC membership seem to replicate that of IPAC, which may be burdensome for members participating in both; CEPC will reach out to such potential members and gather their thoughts on double appointment.
 - f. Barnes suggests CEPC consider the addition of a clause allowing Deans to appoint members to GEEC if not enough members volunteer to fill all membership roles.
7. M/S/P – Charge for the Institutional Assessment and Program Review (unanimous), as revised through discussion:
- a. Paskin asks members if they are interested in alternative membership approach where in 14 *interested* faculty (tenured, tenure-track, lecturer, or librarian) are included in the membership, with no more than four from one single college (this was recommended by the Nominating Committee of the Academic Senate). The original approach specified four members from College of Liberal Arts, two from each of the other Colleges, and one from the University Library, all elected by their respective bodies.
 - i. Cormack speaks in favor of it in terms of bring in motivated members who will actively participate in IPAC
 - ii. Barnes supports the spirit of the alternative, but notes it has been difficult to find motivated and proactive members on PARC as it is. Barnes is also concerned about workload issues for members from poorly represented Colleges, and buy-in from poorly represented Colleges as well.
 - iii. Macaulay questions the process of election to the committee, and the importance of ensuring opportunity to participate.
 - iv. Kahn highlights the importance of maintaining a balanced representation from Colleges, which may be more certain in the original option. Ayala also supports the benefits of balance inherent in the original option.



-
- v. Sayegh notes there may be people interested in participating in assessment (via IPAC) but have avoided PARC due to the existing workload, and more people may be interested in IPAC due to the potential for a more reasonable workload.
 - vi. The original option will be retained by vote of 13 (in favor) to 4 (in favor of the alternative option).
- b. Paskin explains the addition of a clause reminding Colleges to conduct their election for members to IPAC *prior* to the IPAC organizational meeting near the end of the Spring semester.
 - c. Barnes brings attention to the term length of Lecturer Faculty; clarifications are made in the document after discussion from Cormack, Chesler, Mirza, Barnes, Sayegh, Macaulay, and Paskin, to limit Lecturer Faculty to one year terms.
 - d. Macaulay offers the following alternative approach to Lecturer Faculty participation, building off a comment by Mirza,, Chesler and Sayegh offer support and elaboration: “Lecturers will serve 1 year terms, with the option to renew that up to two times for a total of no more than three years, the decision to renew shall be made prior to the nomination process for the following year. Students will serve one-year terms.” It is retained in the document pending review by Academic Senate Executive Committee. An alternative clause is as follows: “Lecturers shall serve 3 year terms depending on their contract length.”
 - e. Barnes proposes text allowing IPAC to request College Deans appoint members to serve on IPAC in the event of vacancies among membership. Cormack notes that an ‘appointment’ to a service position is unprecedented, and may not be well received by faculty, others agree (Cooper, Bentley, Arnold, Ayala, and more). Arnold and Bentley recommend Deans be able to “nominate” rather than “appoint” potential members. A majority vote against retaining this text resulted in its removal.
 - f. Barnes, Sayegh, and Paskin (citing an out-of-meeting response from Jeet Joshee) discuss the retention of the Dean of the College of Professional and International Education (CPIE) (or designee) on IPAC due to the number of CPIE programs reviewed by IPAC.
 - g. Kahn questions the qualifications required for membership on IPAC Steering Committee member; Paskin, Sayegh, and Barnes offer clarification.



-
- h. Cormack notes IPAC still functions as a unified body despite the assignment of members to sub-committees; this builds on a concern brought up by Kahn.
 - i. Kahn questions the procedure if there are member eligible for the Institutional Assessment Sub-Committee from a particular College (i.e., no member from the College has previously served on the Program Assessment Sub-Committee).
 - i. Cormack suggests Colleges should be responsible for electing members to IPAC with requisite experience for both sub-committees.
 - ii. Sayegh suggests a training module developed for a member appointed to the Institutional Assessment Sub-Committee who does not meet the prerequisite.
 - iii. Barnes suggests including explicit requirement of completion of the appropriate member training module in the Faculty/Staff Learning Community for Assessment.
8. Meeting adjourned at 3:59pm.

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