


Memorandum

Date: December 2, 2002

Code: AA 2002-54

Reply Requested by: January 13, 2003

To: Presidents

From: David S. Spence 
Executive Vice Chancellor
and Chief Academic Officer

Subject: REQUEST FOR UPDATE OF ACADEMIC PLANS

Attached is the agenda item on Academic Planning and Program Review that was submitted to the Board of Trustees at its March 12-13, 2002 meeting. The resolution approving the Academic Plans is on page 6 of the agenda item. The academic plans are included as Attachment A to the agenda item.

We are requesting that the academic plans be updated to cover the years 2003-04 through 2007-2008. Campuses that have plans for significant building or renovation of facilities in the next decade, or other needs for planning beyond five years, may submit a plan extending up to ten years. **Plans are due in draft form by January 13, 2003.** Final plans may be requested on a campus-by-campus basis after comments on the draft plan have been provided. Trustee action is planned for March 2003.

The July 1997 revision of the process for reviewing and approving new degree programs retains the traditional process for updating Academic Plans as one alternative and includes "fast-track" and "pilot program" alternatives as well. **Fast-track proposals for implementation of programs not already projected on the campus academic plan should arrive by January 6, 2003.** No additional materials concerning fast-track programs need be incorporated in the campus Plan update.

The July 1997 revision also provides that for a traditionally-tracked projected program (excluding "foundation" liberal arts and sciences undergraduate programs), if an implementation proposal is not submitted within five years of the date originally projected for implementation, the projection is automatically removed from the Plan unless we receive a request to retain it. One projected programs (MS, Earth Systems Science and Policy, Monterey Bay) was added to the Academic Plan in 1997, with an originally projected implementation date of 2002 or earlier, and an implementation proposal has not been received for it. In accordance with the July 1997 revision of the new-program review and approval process, the projection will remain on the Academic Plan only if (1) a request to retain the projection is included with the campus's proposed update or (2) an implementation proposal is submitted by January 13, 2003.

Guidelines for preparing the draft plans for the period beginning 2003-04 are the same as in previous years:

I. Format

The plans will continue to have the format shown in Attachment A of the Trustees' agenda item. The schedule of program reviews in the final column should be updated; newly accredited and newly unaccredited programs should be indicated.

II. Proposals for Newly Projecting Programs on an Academic Plan

A summary statement (one or two pages) should accompany each newly proposed projection or request for renewal of a projection on the attached list. The summary statement should include the reason the program is being proposed and the anticipated student demand. There should be an indication of the kind of resource assessment used by the campus in the course of deciding to place the program on the academic plan. If additional resources will be required, the summary should indicate the extent of university commitment to allocate them and evidence that decision-making curriculum committees were aware of the sources of resource support when they endorsed the proposal. If the program is an occupational or professional one, the statement should summarize evidence of the need for graduates with the specific educational background. If the new degree program is now offered as an option, the summary should include a brief rationale for the conversion. If the new degree program is not commonly offered as a bachelor's or master's degree, the summary should provide a compelling academic rationale explaining how the proposed subject area constitutes a coherent, integrated degree major that has potential value to students. If the proposal does not appear to conform to the Trustee policy calling for "broadly based programs," an explanation should be provided. A full degree proposal will not be needed until the year prior to degree implementation.

We would appreciate your including in the summary statement how the newly proposed projection fits with the campus strategic plan.

In some areas (e.g., Engineering), program development is limited or guided by system or CPEC policy. "Guidelines for Breadth in New Bachelor's Degree Majors" (EP&R 85-13), "Definitions of Graduate Level Instruction" (EP&R 82-39), and "Recommendations of the Advisory Committee to Study Graduate Education in the CSU" (AAP 91-04) should also be consulted in the preparation of summary statements for new programs. Questions about these policies may be directed to Dr. Jolayne Service.

III. Summary Review of Trustee and System Policies Governing Academic Planning

A. Trustee Guidelines

The following is a summary of academic planning policies that were adopted by the Board of Trustees and that have guided CSU planning since the 1960s:

- Curricula are to reflect the needs of students and of the state.
- The foundation program for all campuses in the system consists of the liberal arts and sciences, business administration and teaching. (The Board defined specific subject areas which would be regarded as the "Broad Foundation Program." The list was updated in 1979 by the Project Team on Academic Programs and reprinted on page 33 of *Academic Program and Resource Planning in The California State University*, 1980.)
- Programs in applied fields and professions other than those above are to be allocated within the system on the basis of (1) needs of the state, (2) needs of the campus service area, and (3) identification of employment opportunities.
- "All universities cannot be all things to all people." Curricula in the applied fields and professions are therefore to be located in a systemwide pattern which will achieve an equitable and educationally sound distribution of programs throughout the state.
- While all universities may wish to offer the same programs, the trustees exercise great selectivity in the final approval of new curricula.
- Specialized, high cost programs are to be allocated on the basis of review and study of the individual subject area.

Subsequent policies adopted by the board include the following:

- Degree programs are to be broadly based and of high academic quality.
- Unnecessary proliferation of degrees and terminology is to be avoided.
- Formal reviews of existing curricula are to be conducted by each campus.

B. Questions to be considered (in *Academic Program and Resource Planning*, July 1980, page 41)

The traditional criteria for reviewing the academic plans are listed below. They generally center around need, demand, and the ability to establish programs of high quality. These considerations will continue to pertain, along with considerations about the appropriateness of new curricula to campus missions.

For the Academic Master Plan of each campus:

- Are the anticipated resources of the campus (primarily existing faculty positions, since new faculty positions may not necessarily accompany total campus enrollment growth) sufficient to initiate and sustain all of the programs offered and projected? If not, does the campus plan to reassign faculty positions from existing programs or to reduce the number of programs?
- Is there a campus commitment to devoting resources to the development of new programs rather than to existing programs?

For each program projected on the Academic Master Plan:

- Does this program fill an unmet need in terms of (a) student demand or (b) statewide or regional manpower needs? If not, is there a compelling rationale for the program?
- Is the new program the most efficient way of meeting the need identified, or are there other alternatives?
- Are expectations about student enrollment realistic when compared with experience at other campuses?
- Do programs exist on the campus or at nearby campuses from which the projected program would draw students? If so, have plans been made for the resulting enrollment declines in existing programs?
- If the program is one that will prepare students for a specific occupation or profession, are there current surpluses of individuals in the region or in the state so trained? If so, are there indications that the need will increase? If surpluses are expected to persist, what is the rationale for investing campus and state resources?
- If the program is one that is designed to provide professional upgrading of individuals who are already employed, are there openings at the higher professional levels?
- Will failure to implement this program require the campus to alter other plans? Is the program needed to complement other programs in an instructional area?

C. Additional Academic Planning Guidelines Suggested by the Division of Academic Affairs, the Committee on Academic Planning and Program Review, and/or the Committee to Study Graduate Education in the CSU:

- New master's degree programs should be projected only when the sponsoring department is well established and has achieved a level of quality that has been affirmed by a program review or, in subjects for which national accreditation is available, by a visiting team. Attention should be given to the impact the proposed master's degree will have upon the corresponding bachelor's degree and other instructional activities of the department.
- New master's degree programs should be initiated only if (1) they have the enrollment potential to support the offering of at least four graduate-level courses each year, (2) there is evidence of the proposing department's capacity to support the level of research required for a graduate program, and (3) sufficient graduate-level coursework can be offered to permit a student's program to include 70% graduate-level coursework.

- Resource investments/reallocations in support of new programs should be sufficient to demonstrate the campus's commitment to the success of those programs. It is rare that a coherent degree major can be designed by merely "repackaging" existing courses in an effort to reduce costs. If new programs cannot be well supported, the campus should seriously consider whether they should be initiated at all.
- The Academic Plan should be more than a list of new programs. It should represent the collective opinion of campus constituencies about which desired new programs best serve the long-term interests and development of the campus as a whole and which most contribute to advancement toward the campus' goals.
- New bachelor's degrees should be as enduring as possible in content and title (see EP&R 85-13).

The January (or earlier) draft should be sent to:

Dr. Jolayne Service, Dean
Academic Program Planning
Office of the Chancellor
401 Golden Shore, 6th Floor
Long Beach, California 90802-4210

Questions may be addressed to Dr. Service, by telephone at (562) 951-4723 or by electronic mail to jo@calstate.edu.

cc: Provosts/Vice Presidents, Academic Affairs (with attachment)
Associate Vice Presidents, Academic Programs (with attachment)
Associate Vice Presidents/Deans of Graduate Studies (with attachment)
Chairs, Campus Academic Senates (with attachment)

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Academic Planning and Program Review

Presentation By

David S. Spence
Executive Vice Chancellor
and Chief Academic Officer

Summary

This annual report on academic planning and program review is in accord with Board of Trustees policy established in 1963. While academic planning at each university involves the planning and development of new programs, it also includes the regular review of existing programs, which can lead to program consolidation and discontinuation.

The five-year curricular plans for each campus have been updated to cover the years 2002-03 through 2006-07 (a few campuses have curriculum development and review processes that require longer planning time frames). These campus academic plans are in Attachment A to this agenda item. This is the fifth year that the planning approval process adopted by the Board in July 1997 is in effect; programs that are taking advantage of the alternatives to the traditional process are noted. Summaries of academic program review activities for each campus appear in Attachment B. In 2000-01, three campuses received visits by teams from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC); summaries of the teams' reports are included as Attachment C. The attachments have been distributed separately.

The proposed resolution would approve the updated campus academic plans and specify the conditions under which projected programs may be implemented.

Background

This item summarizes the California State University academic planning process over the past year and submits the campus academic plans for the next five years (up to ten years for campuses that require a longer planning time frame). While academic planning at each university involves the planning and development of new programs, it also includes the regular review of existing programs. This sometimes leads to program consolidation and discontinuation. Program consolidation and discontinuation is likely to be an increasingly active concern of the campuses over the next several years as a result of Cornerstones recommendations, opportunities for

increased collaboration through technology, a more concerted effort by the campuses to focus their program offerings in accord with their missions, and budgetary constraints.

Six academic planning topics (and a proposed resolution) are addressed in this item:

1. Campus Academic Plans (Attachment A)
2. Implementation of Revised Process for Review and Approval of Academic Programs
3. Review of Existing Degree Programs (Attachment B)
4. Reduction of Total Units Required for a Bachelor's Degree
5. Program Discontinuations
6. Summary of WASC Visiting Team Reports (Attachment C)

1. Campus Academic Plans (Attachment A)

Each year, campuses update and submit to the Board of Trustees the academic plans guiding program, faculty, and facility development. These plans list the existing degree programs offered, the proposed new programs, and the dates for review of existing programs. They are the product of extensive consultation and review at each campus.

The academic plans are reviewed annually by the Office of the Chancellor before their submission to the trustees. This review is grounded in a body of trustee and state policy which has been developed over the last three decades. The Board of Trustees authorizes the inclusion of these proposed programs on the academic master plan. Consequently, the "proposed" columns of the academic plans in Attachment A represent only "planning authorization." If and when a campus decides to pursue implementation of a new program (other than a pilot program), a detailed degree proposal must be submitted to the chancellor before the planned implementation date. The trustees have delegated to the chancellor the authority to approve implementation of degree programs that have been authorized. In most cases, the concurrence of the California Postsecondary Education Commission must also be sought before a degree program can be established. Not all projected programs are eventually implemented; campuses request occasionally that projected programs be removed from their academic plans. Five previously projected programs have been removed this year.

With the arrival of its first complement of faculty, California State University, Channel Islands has reorganized the curricula it is planning. Nearly all the fields of study represented in the new projections were incorporated in some form in the previously projected array of programs, but the program titles and the scope of individual programs have been modified.

In addition to the programs under consideration for the Channel Islands campus, fourteen new bachelor's and master's degree programs have been proposed for addition to campus academic plans. Six of those represent conversions to full degree programs of well-established options, concentrations, or other opportunities for specialization. Two are bachelor's degree programs in fields in which the campuses already offer master's degrees, on a self-support basis, through special sessions. Three are closely related to existing programs in the computing field, for which demand remains strong. Several are master's or bachelor's degree programs especially designed to serve teachers or prospective teachers. Most of the newly requested programs can be initiated in existing facilities. The programs for which "planning authorization" is requested are listed below.

Bakersfield	MA, Economics
Channel Islands	BA, Anthropology
	MS, Bioinformatics
	BA and BS, Chemistry
	BA, Economics
	BA, English
	BA, Fine Arts
	BA, History
	BA, Psychology
Chico	BA, Music Industry and Technology
Dominguez Hills	BS, Quality Assurance
Hayward	Master of Social Work
Maritime Academy	BS, Global Studies and Maritime Affairs
Northridge	BA, Public Sector Management
Pomona	BS, Computer Engineering
	BS, Integrated Earth Studies
San Bernardino	MA, Child Development
	BS, Information Systems
	MA, Spanish
	Master of Public Health
San Luis Obispo	MS, Agribusiness
	BS, Software Engineering

Also included in the academic plans are proposed joint doctoral programs that have been granted permission to negotiate. In the past year, programs receiving permission to negotiate include two EdDs in Educational Leadership, one being developed by Cal Poly San Luis Obispo and UC Santa Barbara and one by San José State and UC Santa Cruz; a doctoral degree in Public Policy/Higher Education, being developed by CSU Sacramento and the University of Southern California; a PhD in Social Work, being developed by San Diego State and the University of Southern California; and a Doctor of Audiology, a PhD in Hearing Science, and a PhD in Earth Sciences (with emphasis in Geophysics) being developed by San Diego State and UC San Diego.

2. Implementation of Revised Process for Review and Approval of Academic Programs

In July 1997, the Board adopted revised procedures for the review and approval of new degree programs. In addition to the long-established process described above, campuses have two new alternative processes for establishing programs: the "fast track" and the pilot program.

The fast track combines the program projection and program implementation phases of the traditional process for proposed programs that meet certain criteria. Three of the newly projected programs on the updated academic plans are on the fast track and have been proceeding through campus and system proposal review processes.

The pilot program process allows campuses, under certain conditions, to implement a limited number of programs without prior review and approval by the Chancellor or the California Postsecondary Education Commission. A pilot program may admit students for no more than five years, unless converted to regular-program status; conversion requires a thorough program evaluation, review and comment by the Chancellor's Office and the California Postsecondary Education Commission, and approval by the Board and the Chancellor. The following new pilot programs have been established and acknowledged: an MS in Geology and a BA with a major in Photography at CSU Sacramento, an MS in Global Logistics and a BA with a major in Translation and Interpretation Studies at CSU Long Beach, and an MS in Management and Information Technology at CSU Monterey Bay.

The alternative processes are congruent with the Cornerstones recommendations, which have called for "streamlin[ing] the process governing program development and program approval, minimizing standardization and maximizing institutional flexibility."

The revised procedures also specify that projected programs be removed from campus academic plans if an implementation proposal is not developed within five years or by the

date originally projected for implementation (whichever is later), unless a new justification is submitted. This provision does not apply to “foundation” liberal arts and science programs. No existing projections were subject to automatic removal from the academic plans this year.

3. *Review of Existing Degree Programs (Attachment B)*

In 1971, the Board of Trustees adopted policy requiring that each campus review every academic program on a regular basis. Since that time, summaries of campus program reviews have been provided annually to the board. The summaries appear as Attachment B to this item. For the future, we are considering streamlining such campus reporting on existing programs and other reporting related to accountability.

In the early 1990s, several campuses were unable to use external reviewers in the program review process because of budget difficulties. Campuses are again employing external reviewers on a regular basis, some from other CSU campuses and some from outside the system. A few campuses have recently revised their program review processes, often better to coordinate reviews with campus strategic planning initiatives. Several campuses have also substituted, for one cycle of traditional program review, the intensive development of outcomes assessment processes. In general, the campus review processes are as rigorous in determining areas for improvement as in recognizing program strengths.

4. *Reduction of Total Units Required for a Bachelor's Degree*

In July 2000, the Board amended Title 5 to reduce the minimum total units required for a bachelor's degree to 120 semester units (180 quarter units). A campus may establish a higher unit requirement for certain majors to ensure that students have achieved the knowledge and skills ordinarily expected of graduates in those fields, but the campus must establish and maintain a monitoring system to ensure that justification is provided for all program requirements that extend the baccalaureate unit requirement beyond 120 units. As indicated in the July 2000 agenda item, it was understood that baccalaureate unit requirements are to be reviewed on campuses by the faculty in the course of regularly scheduled program reviews, which are ordinarily conducted on a staggered schedule over a five-year period.

Many campuses have already made significant progress in implementing the letter and spirit of the Title 5 amendments. Their activity is noted in Attachment B, along with other information on program review processes.

5. *Program Discontinuations*

Campuses have informed the chancellor of the discontinuation of the following degree major programs since the last report on academic planning and program review.

Fresno	MA, Geography Bachelor of Vocational Education
Northridge	BS, Business Education MS, Taxation
Pomona	BA, Humanities
Sacramento	MA, French MA, German

The Cornerstones plan encourages each university to “make special efforts to ensure that programs and courses are strengthened, added, retained, and eliminated according to explicit criteria and procedures.... [that are] designed to ensure that programs are continually responsive to ... societal needs and the needs of an increasingly diverse student population, changes in disciplines, and campus priorities.” We note that there has already been substantial consolidation of options or concentrations within existing degree programs on some campuses.

6. *Summary of WASC Visiting Team Report (Attachment C)*

The Board of Trustees adopted a resolution in January 1991 that requires information on recent campus accreditation visits to be included in the annual agenda item on academic planning and program review. Summaries of the results and recommendations resulting from visits by teams from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges during 2000-01 can be found in Attachment C.

Recommended Action

The proposed resolution refers to the campus academic plans in Attachment A. The following resolution is recommended for adoption:

RESOLVED, by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the amended projections on the Academic Plans for the California State University (as contained in Attachment A to Agenda Item 2 of the March 12-13, 2002, meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy), be approved and accepted as the basis for necessary facility planning; and be it further

RESOLVED, that those degree programs included in the Academic Plans are authorized for implementation, at approximately the dates indicated, subject in each instance to the chancellor's determination of need and feasibility, and provided that financial support, qualified faculty, facilities, and information resources sufficient to establish and maintain the programs will be available; and be it further

RESOLVED, that degree programs not included in the Academic Plans are authorized for implementation only as pilot programs, subject in each instance to conformity with current procedures for establishing pilot programs.