



California State University, Long Beach
Curriculum and Educational Policies Council

Minutes

Prepared by Jennifer Asenas

Meeting 10, 2017-18

BH-302

Wednesday, 11 April, 2018, 2-4 PM

Attendance: Jermie Arnold, Jennifer Asenas, Chris Brazier, Catherine Cummins, Jordan Doering, Terrence Graham, Neil Hultgren, Craig Macaulay, Lilie Meltzer, Henry O'Lawrence, Jessica Pandya, Jessica Robinson, Norbert Schürer, Marshall Thomas, Dan O'Connor.

1. Approval of the agenda: **M/S/A**
2. Approval of the minutes from the March 14 meeting. **M/S/A**
3. Announcements:
4. Proposed Minor in Social Justice from the Departments of Philosophy and Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies (Associate Dean Dan O'Connor, College of Liberal Arts)
 - a. Overview O'Connor: This minor is faculty driven and addresses the following needs: (1) Student demand: In response to Atlas questions, students report a desire a course of study related to social justice (2) CSU Chancellor's Task Force on Ethnic Studies: This minor would be a way to encourage students inside and outside the Liberal Arts to explore courses in Ethnic Studies (3) Low-Enrolled Majors: This minor is a way to both increase the number of students taking classes in low-enrolled majors and meet student interest to study concepts using an interdisciplinary approach that may be outside of their comfort zone. Additionally, most of courses are existing GE requirements. None of the courses have prerequisites.
 - i. **Comment:** This looks like it could be one of our GE themes.
 - ii. **Question:** Is there a residency requirement? And can some of the classes be taken via study abroad? **Answer:** There are no residency requirements and it would be great to fulfill some of the courses through study abroad.



-
- iii. **Question:** The minor seems to be housed in the college. Is that a new model? **Answer:** The goal of this minor is to expose students to lower-enrolled programs while not overburdening the administration of those departments. We have many CLA prefixes for other courses (e.g. alternative spring break e.g.). The minor will include CLA 220: What is Social Justice. Advising will be done through ATLAS and the administration will be done through the college.
- iv. **Question:** CLA classes present administrative challenges. Wouldn't it be easier to cross-list courses or put it in one of the departments? **Answer:** We considered a number of models, but because it is the Associate Dean who clears all of it, the responsibility for the administration for the CLA classes will stay with the college. All of the other classes for the minor will be administered by their respective departments.
- v. **Question:** People have strong feelings about the term "social justice." Would it be smarter to use less loaded language? **Answer:** The word choice was intentional. We talked about it during the college curriculum process. We are committed to using "social justice."
- vi. **Question:** Is there any precedent for having a minor that is in a college and not in a department? **Answer:** Yes, Environmental Science and Policy is in two colleges. But administratively we run it through GEOG.
- vii. **Question:** Is it the Associate Dean assigns the teaching for C/LA 220? **Answer:** Yes.
- viii. **Comment:** There are courses listed that do have "hidden" pre-requisites, like GEOG 464. **Response:** There are a couple that do, but we tried to cleanse most of those out. The Pre-requisites for the listed classes are the "golden 4."
- ix. **Comment:** We see this as a "living" minor. Religious Studies is planning to propose a course.
- x. **Question:** Has Sociology responded to this? **Answer:** Yes, some would like a larger presence in this minor.
- xi. **Comment:** This minor has yet to be approved, but I've seen this minor advertised already. **Answer:** We are advertising CLA 220:



What is Social Justice?, which has been approved. It is possible that we are a little ahead of ourselves with advertising, though.

xii. Move to waive the first reading: **M/S/A**

xiii. Move to approve with minor suggestions. **M/S/A**

5. Revision and revisiting of the current policy on Departmentalization Procedures (AS 95-19)

a. **Hultgren**: What in the policy needs clarification?

b. **Question**: Are we simply making the current policy more readable or are we clarifying or creating new content?

i. **Hultgren response**: There are some steps that are unclear.

ii. **Comment**: There are terms that need clarification. What are the differences between departments, schools, and programs?

c. **Schürer**: The reason it has come up is because for the first time in living memory, the university is moving to dissolve a department. There was a lot of concern about how that process went. Revisiting this policy will give CEPC an opportunity to strengthen faculty input in the process. Perhaps we can invite Misty Jaffe and Rene Treviño, who have dealing with this policy, to identify particular areas of concern.

Comment: I was told that the problem is not with the Dean, but the Provost's office. **Response**: It is correct that the ultimate authority lies with the Provost. The policy helps inform the Provost's decision-making. The policy offers a process through which many voices are heard. That eventually happened, but only because people made a stink.

d. **Question**: Concerning CEPC and implementation – the policy states that the AS Chair gets the compelling reasons for the Provost. Is that how it is supposed to work? Does CEPC hear about what's going on at that point?
Response: Assoc. Dean O'Connor: If all parties are in the agreement, then there is no need to come to the council.

e. **Comment**: It would seem like CEPC should be informed.

f. **Assoc. Dean O'Connor**: I believe that the Dean attempted to follow the exact process of what the policy states. But as is, the policy is about how to create, not dissolve a department. Maybe we need a separate policy on how to dissolve a department. There are minors and all sorts of things that are on the books, but nobody in them because nobody knows how to



get rid of them. Also, this process can be unwieldy with the number of days for certain steps. It would be very easy to undermine these steps exercising a delaying process.

1. **Response:** But some delay in the process is important. I wouldn't want a department one month and the next it is gone.
 2. **Response:** It should be a cumbersome process. Within a year, that seems reasonable.
 3. **Response:** There are some spots where there is no time, and there should be.
 4. **Response:** Regardless – it should all come to CEPC.
- g. **Question:** Is initiation of this policy a part of this? Can anyone initiate the dissolution process? You could really have a disgruntled faculty member or a group of faculty members initiate the process. Perhaps it needs a flowchart.
- h. **Comment Assoc. Dean O'Connor:** I would add that there is little discussion of faculty rights or how to manage faculty. What are lecturer rights and faculty rights in this process (e.g. voting rights)?
- i. **Question:** In section 6.3 it says initiation is submitted to the council of any college. Are they called faculty councils or college councils? Are there other councils in colleges? **Response:** I believe there are faculty councils.
- j. **Comment:** Perhaps we should get some details from those involved to see where the policy broke down and why we're talking about it so that we can be specific.
- k. **Comment:** There should be a section in which we develop definitions for important terms (e.g. Programs).
- l. **Comment:** We should also consider adding something about the impact dissolution has on employment and the different impacts for tenure line faculty and lecture faculty.
- m. **Question:** Can there be a single department that has separate majors?
Answer: Yes, RGRLL has separate majors that are housed in the same department.
6. Continued discussion of and preparations for the creation of a new General Education Policy



-
- a. **Hultgren:** Our next meetings will be GE related, but we probably won't get to policy. There will be student meetings about GE on April 24. The GE forums were fairly well attended. We had two note-takers, so we have a record of what was discussed.
 - b. **Schürer:** The meetings began with brief introductions, but the meetings were not us talking. They were mostly us listening.

A. Review of handout from recent GE Forums

a. **Question:** Is the GWAR going away?

- i. **Schürer:** We've been hearing that rumor for 2 years.
- ii. **Hultgren:** If you have evidence that it is going away, we'd like to see it.
- iii. **Comment:** People seemed to think after EO 665 and EO1100, the GWAR was next, but we haven't seen any action.
- iv. **Schürer:** If it goes away, then it gives us more freedom to dictate what we think is good writing instruction.
- v. **Hultgren:** Johnson, Jody Cormack, Piker, Hultgren, and Schürer will review and attempt to synthesize the notes from the faculty and student forums on GE. It is unclear right now where things are going to go. In the past, we have had sub-committees to write policy and then bring it to the council. We would like to try to get AS a policy in the Fall.

b. **Question:** Once the feedback is synthesized, who will decide which direction to take the GE policy? **Answer:** The group would synthesize the feedback received, but would not author policy.

- i. **Schürer:** The campus responses seem to favor a revised version of our current policy with concentrations. I understand the Provost is working on a position paper. There may be position papers coming out of faculty council. I don't know how we'll deal with the 989 comments. But it is CEPC that drafts the policy.



ii. **Hultgren:** We are waiting to hear about from GEGC about what is and isn't working with GE. I believe they are currently working on document, but we don't know what their time frame is.

iii. **Question:** How will we deal with the GE survey's qualitative data. How many didn't participate?

1. **Schürer response:** Of the 1,150 completed surveys, 989 contained written feedback. We could break it up by question.

2. **Hultgren Question:** is that something CEPC wants to be involved with?

3. **Pandya Response:** CEPC should read it.

4. **Question:** Isn't there software we can use?

iv. **Hultgren:** Procedural recommendations for how to proceed are welcome.

1. **Response:** What is written in procedure is that CEPC takes the lead with help from GEGC and AS Executive.

2. **Response:** We can wait until elections and have special sessions in May.

B. Potential timelines moving forward

a. The timeline is in flux because we need to hear back. But we will, mostly likely, not be writing policy at the next meeting.

7. Adjournment: @ 3:38.