

# Memorandum

**Date:** November 15, 2005

**Code:** AA-2005-45

<b>Reply requested by: January 23, 2006</b>
-------------------------------------------------

**To:** CSU Presidents

**From:** Keith O. Boyum *KOB*  
Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs

**Subject: REQUEST FOR UPDATE OF ACADEMIC PLANS**

The agenda item on Academic Planning and Program Review that was submitted to the Board of Trustees at its March 15-16, 2005 meeting is available on the Web at <http://www.calstate.edu/BOT/agendas/Mar05/EdPol.pdf>, pages 33-157. The resolution approving the academic plans is on page 41 of the PDF document (page 9 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 2006-2007 through 2010-2011. Campuses that anticipate 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 23, 2006. Trustee action is planned for March 2006.

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 13, 2006.** 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.

Guidelines for preparing the draft plans for the period beginning 2006-2007 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 projections mentioned above. 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 program implementation 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.

Please note that we may be forwarding the summary statements to the California Postsecondary Education Commission and members of the Intersegmental Program Review Council (which includes representatives of the California State University, University of California, California Community Colleges, and Association of Independent California Colleges and University) for discussion. Concerns that arise about a projected program will be conveyed to the campus, so as to better to inform eventual development of the program implementation proposal.

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. Copies of these documents will shortly be available at <http://www.calstate.edu/APP/>.

### 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 that would be regarded as the "Broad Foundation Program." The list was updated in 1979 by the Project Team on Academic Programs; it includes undergraduate programs in Anthropology, Art, Biology, Chemistry, Economics, English, Foreign Languages, Geography, Geology, History, Mathematics, Music, Philosophy, Physics, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology, Speech/Communication, and Theatre Arts/Drama. Societal need and student demand are not "the preeminent criteria" for offering baccalaureate programs in these disciplines.)
- 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 (from *Academic Program and Resource Planning*, July 1980)

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 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 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 23<sup>rd</sup> draft should be sent to:

Dr. Jolayne Service, Dean  
Academic Program Planning  
Office of the Chancellor  
401 Golden Shore, 6<sup>th</sup> 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](mailto:jo@calstate.edu).

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