1. Approval of the agenda **M/ S/ A**

2. Approval of the minutes from the April 11 meeting **M/ S/ A**

3. Announcements
   a. Normally, our next meeting is when we elect officers for the following year. If you will not be serving on CEPC next year and know who your replacement is, please send Neil her or his name.
   b. The GE coordinator position is open. It is for tenured and tenure track faculty.

4. Second reading: proposed Certificate in Geography and Security in the Department of Geography (Professor Paul Laris, Chair, Department of Geography; Professor Unna Lassiter, Department of Geography)
   a. **Overview:** The department decided on a certificate because it would be more flexible. Other small changes include: (1) clarity about units and (2) course lettering.
   b. **Suggestion:** replace “that” with “and” in 2h.
   c. Motion to approve the Certificate and to recommend it to the Senate. **M/ S/ A**

5. Discussion of policy and procedure for Catastrophic or “special” withdrawals (Dr. Kerry Johnson, Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Studies)
a. **Background:** The need to clarify this policy emerged from a special committee that was established to review a large number of catastrophic or “special” withdrawals (WE). The review revealed a number of issues:

1. University is receiving too many withdrawals for anxiety;
2. The policy needs to allow for situations in which a student can withdraw from one class rather than all classes. For example, if a student breaks an ankle, he or she may not be able to complete a dance course, but could finish other classes. However, a WE requires you to withdraw from the entire semester;
3. Multiple requests for WEs may be coming through to keep financial aid intact;
4. We should not be giving retroactive WEs;
5. We need a better review process for medical records. Associate Deans should not be reviewing and making decisions on a student’s medical records;
6. This is a policy about grades and grading. Some of the issues may resolve themselves if some of the process were automated. But where do the appeals go after that? Some ideas were to have it go through the Dean of Students. Perhaps cases requiring review could go to the academic appeals committee.

i. **Comment:** The fourth bullet in situation A is challenging: “There is no question regarding the catastrophic reason.” How would that be decided? **Response:** Maybe bringing it to an appeals committee. How much medical documentation would the committee receive? Maybe CAPS and DSS could weigh in.

ii. **Question:** How many requests for CWs do you receive in a year? **Response:** We received 150 of them last year. Last semester we didn’t get that many. If all the criteria now are in place, then the Registrar signs off on it.

iii. **Question:** what does it mean that all the documentation is in place? **Response:** The policy requires certain documentation.

iv. **Comment:** Perhaps medical documentation go through DSS and then DSS can notify different departments. **Response:** But they have to have a diagnosis to go through DSS. Students can also go through CAPS.

v. **Committee Member Bradecich who serves on CAPS:** We can help students with CWs and recommend a student get treatment. However, a student does not have to demonstrate that she or he has received treatment to return to school the next semester.
vi. **Comment:** Should there be some point at which there is a recommendation that the student needs to take a leave and not just return? How catastrophic is it, if the student is ready to come back next semester?

vii. **Question:** What about a pregnant student who needs to leave before the end of the semester? In that situation, would an incomplete be more appropriate? Perhaps some clarity in the policy on that or similar issues would be helpful. **Response:** Any pregnant student or about to become a parent should have some rights with DSS and title IX.

viii. **Question:** A CW doesn’t count toward the 18 withdrawal units a student is allowed, does it? **Response:** That’s correct. We also seen CW requests where it seems the number of WEs seems to be a factor.

ix. **Comment:** It would be helpful to streamline the forms to make the process more coherent.

x. **Question:** It seems like they can only do this in the last three weeks, but shouldn’t you be able to take a catastrophic withdrawal at any time? **Response:** You can get a WE at any time. Students want the WE because they don’t want it to affect their financial aid or have maxed out the 18 units of standard withdrawals.

xi. **Comment:** Perhaps if you see repeated requests for WE, there should be medical documentation or approval required for the student to be reinstated.

xii. **Comment:** Really, faculty have no business looking at medical records. But DSS could help, but do they only deal with chronic conditions? I think we need a better picture of who deals with medical documentation on campus.

xiii. **Question:** How are students getting retroactive WEs? **Response:** Most of these appeals are coming from DSS. As a committee, we said no to retroactive appeals in the future. The committee was seeing that there were particular reasons coming to us and patterns that we were not comfortable with.

xiv. **Schürer:** Are we talking about AS 1203 and adopting a new policy? **Response:** Revising the Policy on Final Course Grades,
Grading Procedures, and Final Assessments, Policy Statement 12-03 may be necessary.

xv. **Comment:** Who decides catastrophic? **Response:** That word was used to discourage the number of WEs.

xvi. **Comment:** When faculty are faced with one of these forms, no one really knows what to do. How do you assess the situation? You don’t want to look at doctor’s notes. **Response:** We recognize that, but the CO policy does say the instructor. It is also another reason for why we want to automate, which would also check to see if there are red flags.

xvii. **Paskin Comment presented by Hultgren:** Is there a concern with the electronic submission of medical documentation? What if it gets lost? **Response:** Susan Lee is really strict and conscientious about FERPA. She’s built these things at other places.

xviii. **Comment:** The policy says you can withdraw from one course, but the forms indicate you must withdraw from all classes, so there are some differences between the forms and the policies.

xix. **Comment:** Automating this process would also save someone who has really had a catastrophic event to come to campus to get signatures.

xx. **Comment:** Situation B sounds fine in theory. If we were going to adopt something, under what conditions would they approve or deny? **Response:** They look for substitutions for GE or articulation agreements, etc. We haven’t discussed this with the appeals committee. It might make sense for them to weigh in.

xxi. **Johnson:** How would you like to proceed with input? **Response:** Revise senate Policy Statement 12-03. And then, in conversation with you, we can think of the procedure in tandem with the AS policy. So when Senate Exec decides us to start working with this, then we will, too. This will get added to CEPC’s docket.

xxii. **Question:** Would the academic appeals committee have emergency meetings to address these requests? **Johnson:** We regularly meet and could have special meetings.

6. Revision and revisiting of the current policy on Departmentalization Procedures (AS 95-19) (Professor Misty Jaffe, Chair, Department of Linguistics and College of
Liberal Arts Faculty Council; Professor Rene Treviño, Department of English, and Secretary, College of Liberal Arts Faculty Council)

a. **Overview**: In general, it is in need of a line by line revision.

i. **Treviño**: It is unclear whether this policy applies to a program or not. But if you look at 3.2, it doesn't apply to programs. In 3.1 says it does. There should there be a separate policy for that.

ii. **Jaffe**: The definitions of programs are incredibly diverse. Another critical issue is that we also do not have clear conditions for the formation of a program at an administrative level. We have policy on a curricular level, but not on an administrative level. There needs to be a separate policy on programs.

iii. **Comment**: Yes, we have both degree programs and programs.

iv. **Comment**: And there is also a distinction between an academic unit and academic area.

v. **Jaffe**: Another area in need of work is Section 4: Initiation This is murky. We need to be very clear that the college council and the dean are the initiators of a new department or program. If it could be initiated by faculty, it would allow faculty from outside the department that would be included in a hypothetical or future unit to initiate the process. This doesn't seem like a good thing. Also, how many faculty would be needed and what happens with departments that have two different majors?

vi. **Treviño**: Another issue is in 5.0, do there need to be additional safeguards? If the proposal is nonviable, should it get to that point? Are there safeguards to assess the viability of the proposal before it ever goes up to 5.0? Also, CEPC should be a part of the process. There should be a consultation process that goes beyond what is specified here.

vii. **Jaffe**: Also in 5.0, we set some criteria for what kinds of things ought to go into each of those sections. One example would be, program evaluation. Perhaps a requirement to include the most recent program evaluation? And if there is an ongoing program evaluation. Wait to get a preliminary report - that the full range of institutional evaluation materials should be accounted for and assessed.
viii. **Comment:** Line 58 refers to fiscal impact so URC should be consulted. FPCC might look at it because it is also a personnel issue. We don’t know if it would need to go to PARC.

ix. **Treviño:** Another issue is: should a first proposal be closed before another gets on the table? What happened was CLA faculty were having to juggle multiple votes, issues, interests. Should we make it a requirement that only one proposal is considered at a time?

x. **Comment:** 6.0 might be better named Process rather than Consultation. **Response:** Yes, there should have been some level of consultation before that. And what does it mean – a meeting, formal meeting, in writing? And for those who have a stake in it, where does the proposal go next and how long it might take?

xi. **Comment:** It says that implementation must be made effective at the subsequent academic year. Time should be built in for consultation.

xii. **Jaffe:** In the process described, when there is disagreement, how do we move forward if a new solution should come up, what happens next? Do we have to start the process anew? Should you have another vote? That wasn't specified. A final solution could be negotiated without consultation. But this policy, as it stands, would not have allowed that to happen. And there needs to be clarification of the role of CEPC. What bodies and councils on the campus ought to be thinking about the impact of these kinds of changes, whether in the creation of dissolution process?

xiii. **Jaffe:** Last line doesn’t make much sense.

xiv. **Question:** What happened? Why are we talking about this now? **Jaffe response:** There was a proposal to dissolve a department and create a standalone program and move some faculty to another department. Going through the process brought up a lot of elements that hadn't been considered before and needed clarification. Voting became a major issue. Who can vote? What do votes represent? How do you look out for and treat all faculty fairly in this process?

xv. **Comment:** We need a clear definition of faculty. It specifies .5 WTU and a three-year contract, which would include lecturers, but lecturers are treated differently in different departments.
xvi. **Question:** Does anybody veto power in this process? If we must have complete agreement from faculty, the dean, and faculty council, should there be veto power in each part of that triad?  
**Comment:** Council was uncertain about this.

xvii. **Jaffe:** A principle that came up is whether or not in this process we have the right to force a department to take faculty members. The parallel is joint appointments. The Provost can move a faculty member to another department, but as a matter of principle, if a department says they don’t want a person in the joint appointment, the person doesn’t get the joint appointment. Also, could we be creating units that are incredibly vulnerable? Do programs have the same rights as a department? We addressed that in MOU, but it speaks to the need for the program policy that is protecting programs from being dissolved without an equally rigorous process.

7. Proposal for the name change of the Joint PhD with Claremont Graduate University from a “PhD in Engineering and Industrial Applied Mathematics” to a “PhD in Engineering and Computational Mathematics with Specialization in (one of the Engineering majors, i.e., Aerospace Engineering, Biomedical Engineering, Chemical Engineering, Civil Engineering, Electrical Engineering, Mechanical Engineering)” (Dean Forouzan Golshani, College of Engineering; Dr. Hamid Rahai, Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Programs, College of Engineering)

   a. **Overview:** The proposal is an attempt to unify the participating universities: Claremont and CSULB. The name change helps us attract suitable applicants and produce a degree that will be better recognized by employers. Program was approved in 1990. The Mathematics department didn’t like “applied” so we added “industrial.” But we have moved to more computation. It’s 99% computational math right now. All dissertations have elements of computation and mathematics included. So, it is more appropriate if we changed the title to what it is. Also, before the name change, it was unclear what kind of engineering. Claremont has already approved this name change.

   i. **Question:** If you’re just changing the name of the degree program, the information starting in A is irrelevant. And where does this go forward? Does it go to the Chancellor’s office? Response: Jody said if it is just a name change and then to Academic Senate.
She also requested that we include the information you’re referring to.

ii. **Question:** Have you talked to the Math department? **Response:** We searched if it is offered in CSU. Computational math isn’t offered. **Response:** So you didn’t talk to them. **Response:** They have a program in applied, but nothing in computational. **Comment:** I think it would be appropriate to consult with the Math department.

iii. **Question:** Is the title actually PhD and computational mathematics and then the specialization is noted in the transcripts? **Response:** Yes.

8. **Continued discussion of and preparations for the creation of a new General Education Policy**

   A. **Update on 4/24/18 Associated Students, Inc. GE Forum (Jordan Doering, Chief Academic Officer, Associated Students, Inc.)**

      a. **Doering:** A lot of students mirrored what professors were concerned with. Students want some type of University 100 system, whether that be a class or group that gets together. They’re interested in ethnic studies, social justice, etc. and believe most GE should be outside of their major.

      b. **Schürer:** Students recognize disciplinary differences. If you take environmental classes in POSC, ESP, they talk about it differently.

      c. **Hultgren:** They were interested in integrative, in-major, writing intensive courses.

      d. **Doering:** They also think that it is good to force students to go outside college and major for GE.

   B. **Continued discussion of timelines**

      a. **Hultgren:** Not yet been a meeting where we would start to synthesize what has gone on at the town hall, forums, and in the surveys. We’re still trying to figure out should we have a meeting with all involved councils and their full membership. Should there be a smaller executive council meeting? There will be continued discussion of GE in the fall.
b. **Question**: Is there a plan to have a synthesis meeting to plan future meeting? **Response**: We’re still working on that.

9. **Adjournment @ 3:36**