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Academic Master Plan
Curricular Processing Deadlines

(General Catalog, Graduate Bulletin, and IVC Bulletin)

Curricular Proposals
To ensure that the deadline for final catalog copy can be met, a schedule of deadlines for submission of curricular proposals into CurricUNET for university-wide processing has been established. The deadlines rotate each year with each college (with the exception of Business Administration, Education, Engineering, Health and Human Services, Imperial Valley Campus) moving forward to the next deadline date for the following year. The deadlines for submission of proposals for consideration for inclusion in future catalogs and bulletins are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017-2018</th>
<th>2018-2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 8, 2016</td>
<td>February 6, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Letters</td>
<td>Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 15, 2016</td>
<td>February 13, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>Professional Studies and Fine Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 22, 2016</td>
<td>February 20, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Studies and Fine Arts</td>
<td>Arts and Letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 29, 2016</td>
<td>February 27, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Human Services</td>
<td>Health and Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVC</td>
<td>IVC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Studies</td>
<td>Undergraduate Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019-2020</th>
<th>2020-2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 5, 2018</td>
<td>February 4, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Studies and Fine Arts</td>
<td>Arts and Letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 12, 2018</td>
<td>February 11, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Letters</td>
<td>Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 19, 2018</td>
<td>February 18, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>Professional Studies and Fine Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 26, 2018</td>
<td>February 25, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Human Services</td>
<td>Health and Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVC</td>
<td>IVC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Studies</td>
<td>Undergraduate Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is the responsibility of the dean of each college to set deadlines within the college that will allow time for the college review and ensure that the deadline can be met for submission of proposals for the university-wide review.

Even if all goes well with a proposal, at least a year will elapse between the time a proposal is submitted and its appearance in the catalog. New courses may not be offered until they have appeared in the catalog.

Minor catalog changes which are of an editorial rather than substantive nature require only the approval of Curriculum Services. All other changes require preparation of a formal proposal to be submitted through the appropriate channels via CurricUNET.
Academic Master Plan

The deadline dates outlined above are for new courses, changes in courses, minors, emphases, concentrations, credentials, etc., and new degree programs that are included on the Academic Master Plan for San Diego State University.

Degree programs which do not appear on the San Diego State Academic Master Plan must be submitted to Curriculum Services no later than March 1 each year for consideration by the Academic Policy and Planning Committee and the Academic Resources and Planning Committee for inclusion on the master plan.

Proposals approved by the campus for consideration for inclusion in the master plan are forwarded to the Chancellor's Office in June or October each year and are forwarded to the Board of Trustees in January for action in March.

The format to use in submitting a request to include a new degree on the Academic Master Plan for San Diego State University is included on page 71.
Policies and Procedures

Course Classification System
How to Change a C/S Number
496 and 499 Courses – Use of
Topics and General Studies Courses
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Credit/No Credit Courses – Graduate
Course Prerequisites
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900 Level Courses
Special Sessions – Definition/Courses
X-01 through X-79, X-397, and X-997 Level Courses
General Education Courses – Frequency of Offerings
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The Minor, Policy
Centers, Institutes, and Similar Entities, Policy on
The SDSU Curriculum Guide has been compiled to assist you in preparing curricular proposals for processing for consideration for inclusion in the General Catalog, the Imperial Valley Campus Bulletin, and the Graduate Bulletin. Also included are instructions on how to submit proposals for new certificate programs, for a degree to be placed in the Academic Master Plan, and for topics courses and General Studies courses to be included in the SDSU Class Schedule and in the College of Extended Studies catalogs. Special attention should be given to the following information:

CurricUNET
CurricUNET is to be used to submit all proposals for new courses, modification of existing courses (course change, deactivation, or reinstatement), and changes to existing programs such as majors, minors, emphases, concentrations, etc. A list of questions that need to be answered for new programs is included elsewhere in this guide. For program discontinuation, refer to the policy statement on page 160.

CurricUNET is available on the SDSU website at http://www-rohan.sdsu.edu/~acserv/

Course Classification System
In accordance with the Chancellor's Office guidelines affecting faculty staffing, each course offered at the university is assigned a classification code known as the C/S classification. A course is designated C1–C21 or S23, S24, S25, S36, or S48 to describe the mode of instruction (e.g., lecture, laboratory, activity, seminar), the approximate number of students to be enrolled and the workload credit (weighted teaching units) to be assigned to the instructor responsible for the course.

A detailed description of the California State University Course Classification System and the revised policy on supervision courses begins on page 140. The chart should be reviewed when preparing proposals for new courses or modifications to existing ones, with attention to the effect the proposed additions or changes will have upon departmental staffing, facilities and the accommodations of students.

In February 1992, an amendment was made to the Faculty Workload Policy (EP&R 76–36). Essentially, the change allows us to base the use of supervision codes on student contact hours rather than discipline and course level.

Special attention should also be given to the selection of the C/S classification for a course since the information provided on the course proposal forms is transferred to the computerized course catalog file and is used in determining the weighted teaching units for the academic planning data base reports.

How to Change a C/S Number
Departments wishing to initiate a C/S number change for a particular course can do so by submitting a modification proposal via CurricUNET.

Use of 496 and 499 Courses
Policy adopted by the Senate, November 6, 1984; Revised May 13, 1986

The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee formulated the following statement to clarify the unique attributes of courses numbered 496 and 499. All departments across the campus should interpret these courses in a similar manner and offer their curricular presentations under the appropriate rubric.

A 499 number signifies a well-defined, one-of-a-kind special study usually on a topic or in an area not covered by a regular, titled catalog course. It may be offered only with the consent of the instructor and is intended only for an individual student who has demonstrated ability to work independently and who is clearly qualified to work at an advanced level in the discipline. The instructor is expected to meet with the student regularly and by schedule to plan, monitor, and direct progress. Standard grading procedures must apply as in all other university courses. The maximum credit applicable toward a bachelor's degree is nine units. A 499 number should not be used in the following circumstances: to offer lower division coursework; to extend internships; to award academic credit in place of pay; for work experience; for class-sized groups.

The 496 number designates defined, selected topics not specifically treated in regular catalog courses. It may thus be used either as an experimental precursor to a new course proposal or as a vehicle to explore current interests through a standard course format, including syllabus, texts or bibliography, explicit procedure or methodology, and an appropriate student population. Unlike the 499 course, the topics course should be subjected to a reasonable departmental review for need, relevance, and substance, since it must pass a series of reviews before being included in the Class Schedule.
Topics Courses  (296, 496, 596, 696, Latin American Studies 580, Psychology 796, 886) and General Studies Courses

The Undergraduate Topics Committee (a subcommittee of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee) and the Graduate Topics Committee (a subcommittee of the Graduate Curriculum Committee) are responsible for reviewing proposals for all topics and General Studies courses to be offered during the regular academic year, in extension, and in special sessions (i.e., summer term sessions). A detailed description of the policies and procedures appears on page 42.

Credit/No Credit Courses – Undergraduate  
Policy adopted by the Senate, April 1977

Only those courses designated in the General Catalog as being offered for credit/no credit only will be approved for implementation.

Credit / No Credit Courses – Graduate  
Policy adopted by the Graduate Council, October 1977

Only those courses designated in the Graduate Bulletin as being offered for credit/no credit only will be approved for implementation.

In addition, specified sections of graduate level topics courses may be offered for credit/no credit provided the following statement is included in the course description in the Graduate Bulletin: “Specified sections of this course may be offered for credit/no credit. Refer to the Class Schedule.”

Course Prerequisites  
Policy adopted by the Senate, December 5, 1978

1. The policy on course prerequisites is as follows:
   a. Prerequisites for each course are stated in the course description.
   b. Students must satisfy course prerequisites (or their equivalent) prior to beginning the course to which they are prerequisite. Faculty have the authority to enforce prerequisites listed in the catalog, to evaluate equivalent preparation, and to require proof that such prerequisites/preparation have been completed. Faculty may, during the first week of classes, request students without the prerequisites or equivalent preparation to take formal action to drop the course. Failure to comply will result in a failing grade.

2. In light of this prerequisite policy, each department shall review all of its courses and submit proposals to reaffirm or modify or delete existing prerequisites, or add new ones as appropriate. The following guidelines shall be used to review prerequisites:
   a. Departments are expected to clarify upon what basis the consent of the instructor is to be given, if such consent is a course prerequisite.
   b. Departments are reminded that upper division and senior standing are determined solely on the basis of total number of units completed. Such standing is not a guarantee that prior coursework has been completed in the discipline.
   c. Departments must devise systems for monitoring the enforcement of their own prerequisites. Some departments currently require that their students sign a statement indicating where and when prerequisites were completed and the grade received. Departments may also indicate in the catalog and class schedule that proof of completion of prerequisites is required and may require students to submit a grade report, transcript, test score, or other verification that prerequisites have been satisfied. In addition, completion of selected tests can be verified by the computer during the registration process.
   d. Departments are urged to use the terms “strongly recommended” or “recommended” where appropriate.
Syllabus Design
Policy adopted by the Senate, April 27, 2004; Revised April 8, 2014

Senate Policy on syllabi requires that all course syllabi include a description of expected student learning outcomes and that departments retain and make accessible the most recent versions of course syllabi.

1. Course Syllabi: The syllabus for each course shall describe the course’s purpose, scope and student learning outcomes. In addition, each syllabus shall include office hours and contact information for the instructor, refer to the current procedure for accommodating students with disabilities (refer to Student Disability Services), and describe the course design, required materials, schedule, and grading policies, which may vary by section. A syllabus shall not bind the instructor to specific details, and the instructor shall retain the right to adjust the course design. Major departures from the syllabus, however, especially with regard to student learning outcomes, major assignment due dates and exam dates, and grading policies, shall be made only for compelling reasons.

2. Instructors shall provide students with access to their course syllabus at or before the first class meeting. In addition, instructors shall post their syllabus on the official and available course site of the SDSU Blackboard learning management system as well as any other course web site routinely accessed by the course students. Any major changes to the course syllabus shall be announced in class, communicated to all students electronically, and incorporated into an updated and posted version of the syllabus.

3. Departments shall, by the end of each semester, upload that semester’s course syllabi in an accessible electronic format to the SDSU Syllabus Collection. Faculty may elect to complete and provide to their department a completed course information template (available from the SDSU Syllabus Collection) in lieu of the official course syllabus.

A detailed description of course syllabi production begins on page 54.

500 Level Course Proposal Justification

Departments planning to submit requests for new courses at the 500 level or requests to change the level of a course to 500 should be aware of the policy of the Graduate Curriculum Committee in regard to these courses.

1. For academic units that do not offer a master’s degree, written statements from the department whose graduate students will use the courses in question should be attached to the curricular proposal forms. Included should be an indication of how the course will contribute to the students’ graduate program, the number of graduate students likely to be involved, requirements for special handling of graduate students and similar issues.

2. For academic units that do offer a master’s degree, information concerning how the course or courses under consideration will provide a graduate experience for graduate students should be included in the curricular proposal. For example, what does the department view as the role of the course on a master’s degree program? Will graduate students enrolled in the course be identified and required to conduct themselves in a manner somewhat different from undergraduates?

900 Level Courses
Policy adopted by the Graduate Council, March 7, 1991

Courses numbered at the 900 level, except 997, are reserved for graduate courses in certain professional curricula as part of advanced certificate, credential, and licensure programs and are specifically intended for students admitted to the university with postbaccalaureate classified standing. Courses numbered at the 900 level are not applicable to other graduate programs.

Special Sessions - Definition and Courses

Definition: Special sessions offered by San Diego State University consist of the Summer Sessions and at other special times as determined by the Dean of the College of Extended Studies and the Provost.

Courses: The development and administration of academic courses and programs as part of special sessions follow the same curricular and faculty approval procedures currently in force for resident programs at San Diego State University. With the exception of the X-01 through X-79 and X-397 numbered series which may be used for certificate programs only and must be approved by the respective units, courses offered may be selected from those included in the General Catalog and Graduate Bulletin. Topics courses (296, 496, 596, 696, Latin American Studies 580, Psychology 796, 886) and General Studies 250, 350, and 550 are subject to the same review process as those offered during the regular academic year.
Policies and Procedures

X-01 through X-79, X-397, and X-997 Level Courses

Courses numbered X-01 through X-79, X-397, and X-997 are professional development units offered only through Extension to meet specific academic needs of community groups. Courses at the X-01 through X-79 and X-397 levels are not acceptable for degree programs. All courses numbered X-01 through X-79 and X-397 will be processed according to the procedures established for the review and approval of new professional development courses through the College of Extended Studies. See the College of Extended Studies website for more information about course proposals at http://www.neverstoplearning.org.

General Education Courses – Frequency of Offerings
Policy adopted by the Senate, May 1983; Revised November 1998

All General Education courses shall be taught at least once every three years at any San Diego State University campus. Any course not taught during this time shall be dropped from the General Education program.

Time Limit on Completion of Requirements for the Major
Policy adopted by the Senate, December 10, 1985

As authorized by Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Section 40401, departments may require that specific baccalaureate degree requirements be met within as few as seven years of the date of the degree. Such requirements will consist of advanced courses and examinations in areas of knowledge changing so rapidly that information may be obsolete after seven years. Proposals to identify degree requirements subject to the seven-year restriction must be approved in accordance with curricular approval processes at the department, college, and university levels. Departments who wish to specify ways a student can verify recency of specific baccalaureate degree requirements may do so by use of a course change form or program change form. Justification for the change must be included on the form. Such requirements will be clearly identified in the General Catalog, and departments will be responsible for keeping Curriculum Services informed of appropriate ways for students to certify recency of subject matter. In instances in which a student is required to repeat a course taken more than seven years previously, only the last grade will be used in computation of grade point average. Students may repeat courses only if they earned grades lower than a C (CSU Executive Order No. 1037).

Course Scheduling Guidelines for Short-Term, One-Unit Graduate Courses
Policy adopted by the Graduate Council, March 21, 1985

All graduate courses need to be scheduled with class sessions throughout the semester so that students will have ample opportunity to conduct course library work, research, and other course requirements. Normally, all graduate courses will follow this type of scheduling. However, it is recognized that certain forms of intensive short-term courses for one unit may have educational value at the graduate level and the following guidelines should be followed by departments wishing to offer such a course.

All short-term, one-unit graduate courses must carry notification to the students as to the required coursework to be completed prior to the first class meeting and must have at least a one-week interval between class sessions during which time assignments are to be completed and at least two weeks after the last class meeting for completion of final course projects.

Course Scheduling Guidelines for Short-Term Undergraduate Courses

Regardless of the length of the term, all courses need to meet certain conditions to ensure lasting learning.

All courses should not only meet the required number of hours, but should also offer the student an opportunity to prepare, to study, and to cogitate for the required hours, as stated in the General Catalog.¹

¹ One unit or credit hour represents 50 minutes of lecture or recitation combined with two hours of preparation per week throughout one semester of 15 weeks. Two hours of activity (as in exercise and nutritional sciences) or three hours of laboratory (as in the sciences) are considered equivalent to one hour of lecture.

Courses offered in terms that are less than 15 weeks will be adjusted to contain the same contract and preparation time as courses offered over a 15 week semester.

In scheduling a short-term or weekend course (during the regular academic year and summer term sessions), the sessions should not meet on two or three consecutive days. Lasting assimilation of the experience can be facilitated by a special format; for example, a paper and a meeting scheduled after a main presentation on a following weekend, or a course offered on a Friday followed, a week or more later, by a full Saturday session. Short-term or weekend courses may be offered as deemed appropriate by the department.
Computer Courses – Graduate
Policy adopted by the Graduate Council, March 21, 1985

Education in computer techniques has dramatically changed. Instruction once offered exclusively at the college level is now found in secondary schools. Therefore, it is not appropriate to offer graduate credit to introduce students to computer use or to certain elementary applications, which should now be considered remedial at the graduate level. In order to adjust curriculum policies accordingly, the Graduate Council adopted the following policy:

Introductory courses in programming and using computers (i.e., those without prerequisites) are considered remedial for graduate students and will not be approved at the 600 level or above.

Statistical workshops that introduce students to analytical software packages or computer languages are also considered remedial for graduate students and are not suitable for graduate credit at the 600 level or above.

Departments wishing to offer introductory computer courses of this nature should do so at the undergraduate level and as prerequisites for graduate coursework or admission or offer such courses through the College of Extended Studies.

Unused Courses (Undergraduate)
Policy adopted by the Senate, May 1973; Revised May 1986 and February 2006

Each year Curriculum Services shall identify the courses not offered during the past two years and shall inform each department or school that failure to offer the courses within the next academic year shall subject the courses to deletion from the catalog. A course not offered during the third year shall be deleted.

Reinstatement of Deleted Undergraduate Courses
Policy adopted by the Senate, May 1986

For a period of up to three years after the deletion of an undergraduate course by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, that same course (same course number, title, credit, units, prerequisite(s), catalog description) may be reinstated.

The academic department or program shall forward to the dean of the college a completed course reinstatement form. If the dean approves the request, the form shall be forwarded to Curriculum Services for inclusion in the next General Catalog. However, a reinstated course may be listed in the Class Schedule and taught prior to the publication of that catalog.

The department or program must teach the reinstated course within two semesters of the submission of the course reinstatement form. Failure to do so will result in a second deletion of the course from the curriculum. Courses deleted under these circumstances can be put back into the curriculum only by going through the process for the approval of new courses.

Graduate Course Deletion Policy (600- and 700-level courses)
Policy adopted by the Graduate Council, November 19, 1987; Revised November 1998

Each year Curriculum Services shall identify those courses which have not been offered during the past two-year period and shall inform each department that failure to offer the courses within the next academic year will subject them to deletion from the Graduate Bulletin. Courses not taught during the third year will be deleted from the Graduate Bulletin unless the department provides a written reply satisfactory to the Graduate Curriculum Committee showing that there are compelling reasons why the course should not be deleted and providing a plan for the reinstatement of the course in the department’s regular program.

For a period of up to three years after the deletion of a graduate-level course, that same course (same course number, title, credit units, prerequisite(s), and bulletin description) may be reinstated by the following process:

1. The academic department or program will forward to the dean of the college a completed course reinstatement form.
2. If the college dean concurs with the department request, the form will be sent to Curriculum Services for review by the Dean of the Division of Graduate Affairs.
3. If the Dean of the Division of Graduate Affairs approves the request, the course will be included in the next Graduate Bulletin. However, a reinstated course may be included in the Class Schedule and taught prior to the publication of the Graduate Bulletin.

Failure of the department or program to teach the reinstated course within three semesters of the submission of the course reinstatement form will result in a second deletion of the course from the curriculum. Courses deleted in this way can be returned to the curriculum only by going through the same process as required for new courses.
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Offering of Courses Rejected by the Curriculum Committee – Undergraduate
Policy adopted by the Senate, April 1977

Courses rejected by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee may not be offered under special topics numbers or otherwise included in the Class Schedule unless specifically authorized by the Provost, who shall report the action to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee.

Offering of Courses Rejected by the Curriculum Committee – Graduate

Graduate-level courses rejected by the Graduate Council may not be offered under special topics numbers or otherwise included in the Class Schedule unless approval is granted by the Dean of the Division of Graduate Affairs.

The Minor
Policy adopted by the Senate, December 1975; Revised May 1986

The minor serves an important educational purpose and is offered at SDSU in over sixty different fields of study. It is intended to provide students with the opportunity to develop a degree of competence in a field beyond the area of their major course of study. Like the major, the minor offers an integrated and coherent pattern of coursework organized around the principal areas of interest or subfields of academic disciplines and interdisciplinary areas. It combines lower and upper division coursework in proportions appropriate to the various disciplines. The specific regulations concerning the minor are as follows:

1. The minor shall consist of 15–24 units, the specific number to be determined by the academic departments and programs, and approved through the normal university curricular process. Minors which require considerable lower division preparation before students can begin upper division work will tend to include more units than minors where this is not the case.

2. Normally, 12 units of coursework in the minor will be upper division units. A minimum of six upper division units must be completed at SDSU. In minors where the number of requisite lower division units makes it impossible to take 12 upper division units without exceeding a total of 22 to 24 units, the required upper division coursework may be reduced to six units with the approval of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee.

3. The minor is intended to provide students with a coherent pattern of coursework which will enable them to develop a degree of competence in a limited field of study. Departments and programs offering minors must, therefore, indicate the specific subject areas to which individual courses relate rather than permit a merely random selection of courses from a department or program.

4. The subject areas in which programs in the minor are offered should be such that the limited number of units required in a minor is sufficient to enable a student to achieve a reasonable degree of competence in the area. The degree of competence achieved will be considerably less than that required by a major, but should nevertheless constitute a worthwhile educational objective.

5. Courses taken in satisfaction of a minor may be used to meet requirements in General Education. In addition, courses taken to satisfy the preparation for the major requirements may be used as a part of a minor. However, no course may be used to satisfy the requirements for both a major and a minor.

6. The minimum grade point average for awarding a minor at the time of graduation is 2.0 (C) or better in all units applicable toward the minor, including those accepted by transfer from another institution.

Policy on Centers, Institutes, and Similar Entities

The establishment of centers, institutes, and similar entities at San Diego State University supports and enhances the teaching, research, and service missions of the institution. In a complex environment, the activities conducted by these types of organizational units are important to the development of new initiatives. These units also serve to bring together students, faculty, and community members with common interests.

The term bureau shall not be used to describe these types of organizations.

Centers shall have the ability to sponsor academic programs, continuing education programs and/or conference/workshops and to prepare academic curriculum to be reviewed through the normal academic internal procedures of the College and University.

The term Institutes shall be applied to those organizational units that primarily conduct research and are involved in public service activities.
Similar Entities are affiliated with the University and are formed to offer non-credit instruction (with or without Extended Studies depending on what is appropriate), information or other services beyond the campus community, to public or private agencies or individuals. Such entities often facilitate the conduct and dissemination of research, perform public service, or provide special training.

The objective of this policy is to promote the orderly development of these units through a written policy consistent with CSU Executive Order No. 751. This policy requires that an approval process take place which acknowledges the responsibilities of individuals and colleges in the operation of these units. The policy also provides for the timely notification of other colleges prior to the establishment of new units.

Centers established as a response to research grant projects require approval by the dean as part of the grant submission process. Such centers shall be established if the grant is funded and will be reviewed at the termination of the funding cycle to determine if the center has the capability to continue to meet the mission of the academic program. Centers unable to persist in the support of the academic mission should be terminated or converted to an institute status to conduct the research activities it was designed to support.

The Approval Process

1. All centers and institutes shall be college-based. With the approval of the Council of Deans, similar entities may be either college-based or Research Foundation-based.
2. There will be notification to the Council of Deans of the establishment of the unit prior to approval by the college dean(s).
3. Requests to establish such organizations must be approved by the sponsoring college dean(s) and by the Provost.
4. All resources necessary to establish or carry out the mission of the unit are the responsibility of the sponsoring College(s).
5. A change to the title of a center or institute requires the approval of the Academic Deans Council.
6. Deletion of a center or institute requires the approval of the Academic Deans Council.

Community Advisory Boards for Units

In those cases where the unit establishes an Advisory Board that includes community members, special consideration should be given to the responsibility to maintain contact with community members in a manner consistent with the overall development goals of the University.

The Dean of the College will be involved in the selection of advisory board members and will consult with the Provost to avoid potential conflicts with other development activities. When appropriate, University Advancement will be consulted with when selecting board members.

SDSU Research Foundation

The SDSU Research Foundation is requested to follow a similar procedure in the establishment of such units. In this case, the Vice President for Research shall bring forward proposals to the Council of Deans for approval of such units.

Annual Reporting Requirements

On an annual basis and coincident with the preparation of the University Catalog, college deans shall report all active centers, institutes, and similar entities for inclusion into all appropriate University publications.

As part of the annual reporting process, some positive action (recommendation) must be taken to continue the center, institute, or similar entity for the next year. Where the sponsorship of academic programs is involved, a recommendation to discontinue and the plan for transferring program responsibilities is subject to approval by the Provost.

A report must also be submitted if a center, institute, or similar entity is being deleted.

Beginning in 2007/08, all approved centers, institutes, and similar entities will be placed on a five-year review schedule. The review will consist of an evaluation of center, institute, or similar entity activity and accomplishment. Following each review, a decision will be made whether to continue the respective center, institute, or similar entity for an additional five years.
Review Schedule

The deadlines rotate each year with each college on a five year review schedule.

- Health and Human Services: February 16, 2015
- Professional Studies and Fine Arts: February 16, 2015
- Sciences: February 15, 2016
- Imperial Valley Campus: February 15, 2016
- Arts and Letters: February 13, 2017
- Business Administration: February 13, 2017
- Education: February 12, 2018
- Engineering: February 12, 2018

Attached is a copy of the form to use for the review (please limit to two pages). The review should be signed by the College Dean(s) and forwarded to Dr. Kathy LaMaster, Associate Vice President, Academic Affairs at lamaster@mail.sdsu.edu.

The form is available on line at:
http://www-rohan.sdsu.edu/~acserv/files/CIR_Proposal.doc
SDSU Centers and Institutes Review Proposal

College Dean(s): __________________________ Date: __________________

☐ I recommend continuance
☐ I recommend discontinuance

Provost approval: __________________________ Date: __________________

Name of Center or Institute: __________________________

Director or Co-Director(s): __________________________

E-mail address: __________________________

Web site: __________________________

1. Accomplishments:

2. How does the center or institute contribute to fulfillment of mission of the CSU and the campus?
3. Financial status:

4. Principal rationale(s) for continuance or discontinuance of center or institute:
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General Information

Ordinarily, proposals for curricular change are initiated by departments, although any member of the university community (faculty member, student, or administrator) may begin the process.

In most instances, a proposal pertains to a program of instruction within a particular college. If that is the case, the proposal is submitted to the respective college curriculum committee or other advisory body which screens curricular proposals to examine the proposal and make a recommendation. It is then forwarded to the Dean of the college.

Whenever a department other than the one in which the proposal was initiated has a legitimate concern with the subject of the proposal, concurrence by that department should be obtained before the proposal is submitted. The college screening committee bears a major responsibility to make sure that potential interdepartmental conflicts are resolved as early in the process as possible. The department which initiates the proposal can facilitate matters by negotiating directly with other concerned departments in the process of writing the proposal. The sooner this is done, the better.

In some cases, the possible conflicts referred to above involve more than one college. Preliminary negotiations between departments and between colleges are highly recommended. Final responsibility, however, rests with the Graduate Council for graduate level proposals or the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee for undergraduate proposals and with the Senate.

It is only prudent to be aware that over many years, the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee has been extremely reluctant to approve proposals to which there are strong and unresolved objections by any department or college. In some instances of such conflict, the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee has acted to resolve the matter. In other instances, the problem has been resolved by the Senate.

Submission deadlines for proposals are scheduled in February each year in order to prevent the bunching of proposals and thus to arrange, on a more rational basis, the work of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, the Graduate Council, etc. There is a regular system of rotation among the colleges so that the first shall be last and vice versa (at least eventually).

After receiving a curricular proposal, Curriculum Services is responsible for the proposal until its final disposition. If it is approved, Curriculum Services has the responsibility for placing it in the catalog in the form in which it has been finally approved. Each proposal is given an initial perusal keeping the following in mind:

1. Is the language clear and grammatical?
2. If the proposal is for a new degree, is the degree on the Master Plan?
3. Are the justifications advanced for the proposal persuasive and in accord with university policy?
4. Is the form of the proposal consistent with present catalog material?

Certain formulas recur in the catalog, e.g., “Maximum credit six units.” If the proposal reads: “This course may be repeated with new content up to a maximum of six units credit,” Curriculum Services will replace the sentence with the standard phrase without consulting the department which initiated the proposal. Curriculum Services’ editorial discretion includes the practice of eliminating from proposed course descriptions such phrases as “A study of . . . .”, “Analysis of . . . .”, etc. In general, unnecessary articles (both definite and indefinite) will be removed from course descriptions whenever this can be done without changing meaning. More drastic changes will be made only upon consultation with those who initiated the proposal.

All submitted proposals are available to view in CurricUNET.

General Education proposals are sent to the General Education Committee for review; proposals dealing with graduate level programs will be forwarded to the Graduate Curriculum Committee for approval then forwarded to the Graduate Council for action. Upper division courses (500-599) acceptable for advanced degrees are reviewed by both the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and Graduate Curriculum Committee.

Ordinarily, proposals dealing exclusively with the graduate program need no further processing and will be incorporated into the San Diego State University program of instruction. There is one important exception to this. Proposals for new degree programs which require off-campus approval will be submitted to the Committees on Academic Policy and Planning and Academic Resources and Planning for their evaluation and recommendation. These programs also need approval of the Senate, the President, and the Chancellor’s Office.
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Reports outlining curricular proposals once approved by the Deans are forwarded to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. However, if the proposal is for a new degree program, a new minor, or a new option, emphasis or concentration, the proposal will be reported to the Committees on Academic Policy and Planning and Academic Resources and Planning for their evaluation and recommendation. Only then will such a proposal be forwarded to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. Some proposals for new degree programs, new minors, and new options, emphases or concentrations, must be forwarded to the Chancellor’s Office for approval after being approved locally. Instructions from the Chancellor’s Office are included in this Guide.

Executive Order No. 1071 delegates authority to the President of San Diego State University to approve options, concentrations, special emphases, and minors in designated academic subject categories. A list of areas which can and cannot be approved locally is included in the appendix of this booklet.

For many undergraduate curricular proposals, approval by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee is the final step toward their being incorporated into the San Diego State University program of instruction. All such proposals are included in the committee’s regular Information report to the Senate. If, however, four members of the committee so request, a given proposal will be submitted to the Senate as an “action” item. Ordinarily, proposals pertaining to individual courses and minor revisions of existing programs are part of the information report and proposed new degree programs, minors, options, etc., as well as revisions of graduation requirements, are incorporated in the report intended by the committee for action by the Senate.

Role of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
Policy adopted by the Senate, May 8, 1979 and revised May 17, 1994

1. Undergraduate proposals reviewed by the Deans, and Undergraduate Council (when appropriate) will be forwarded by the Office of the Provost to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. This committee shall be composed of the Provost, Curriculum Services, the Dean of the Division of Undergraduate Studies, one representative from each college and the Imperial Valley Campus selected by the Committee on Committees, and two students named in accordance with procedures approved by the Associated Students Council.

2. The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee shall be responsible for the review of undergraduate curricula to include additions, deletions, and changes in curricula, giving special consideration to those items which are of an interdisciplinary and/or university-wide interest. The committee shall report all approved changes to the Senate. Ordinarily, approval by the committee shall be the final step at the local level required for including any undergraduate curriculum proposal in the San Diego State University General Catalog, except for approval of the use of courses in the graduate program. Proposals for new programs and deletion of programs shall be forwarded to the Senate as action items. Also, if as many as four members of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee so request, a proposal shall be placed on the agenda of the Senate for final action.

3. Any individual, department, Dean, or college curriculum committee may request the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee to review any decision on any curriculum proposal. The committee may agree to review the matter and inform all interested parties of the decision to review and of the date set for the review, or the committee may decide not to review and promptly inform the appellant of its decision.

Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Guidelines for Evaluating New Course Proposals

The following guidelines are used by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee to evaluate course proposals:

Course Prerequisites and Description
1. Does the course title accurately and concisely reflect the course description?
2. Is the course description clear?
3. Are the number of units appropriate to the course content and mode of instruction?
4. Do the required prerequisites logically relate to the proposed course? What purpose do they serve?
5. Does it duplicate any existing course(s) presently in the catalog?

Course Justification
1. Does the course warrant academic credit?
2. Does the need for the course seem sufficient given resources required?
3. Do the course objectives address the stated need for the course?
4. Do the course objectives reflect the level of the course, as indicated by the proposed course number?
5. Do the suggested texts validate the proposed level of the course? Relate to the course content?
6. Does the course content articulate with the mission of the university?
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Facilities / Resources
1. Are unusual resources required? Are they available?
2. Did the Dean indicate that additional resources will be needed to offer the course? Does this seem realistic?
3. Does the staffing formula seem appropriate?
4. Is the mode of instruction congruent with the course objectives (i.e., lectures, activity, laboratory)?

Course Outline
1. Does the course outline articulate with the course objectives?
2. Does the course outline articulate with the course description?

Grading
1. The grading weight, class activities, etc., must indicate a degree of rigor appropriate to the course level.
2. The decision to include attendance and/or participation as part of the grading criteria for a class is the prerogative of the instructor. When included, this policy must be explicitly stated in the syllabus and provided to the students during the first week of classes.
3. It is the position of the committee that class attendance is not by itself a sufficient condition for determining course grades. Any percentage of the course grade awarded for class attendance and participation should be consistent with the methods used to achieve the specific course learning objectives.

Film Courses
The policy of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee in reviewing film courses is as follows:
1. If the viewing of films within the course is less than 40 percent of the total class time, the course will be classified under the lecture mode of instruction.
2. If the viewing of films within the course is more than 40 percent of the total class time, the course will be classified under the lecture/activity mode of instruction.

Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Policy on Determining the Appropriate Level of Credit for Courses Using Computers (November 1989)
It is not possible (or at least not practical) to devise simple, objective criteria that the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee can use to determine accurately the appropriate level for a course using computers. The decision depends in part on the sophistication of the computer tools used and their integration with the subject area of the department offering the course.

When the instructional focus in a course is a substantive problem, such as the analysis of sociological data, in which the solution is aided by the application of computer tools, such as statistical software, then the course level will be determined primarily by the nature of the problem and the instructional rigor. In such a case, a minor part of the course, approximately ten percent, could be spent on the mechanics and syntax of using the computer tool and this would not affect the committee's decision about the appropriate course level.

Examples in which course material on the mechanics of a computer tool could be included as a small component without affecting the course level include the following:
1. A course in design in which a CAD (computer-assisted design) software package is used to prepare student projects.
2. A course in research methodology and reporting in which an integrated software package (including word processing, spreadsheet, database, and graphics modules are included) is used for practice projects.
3. A course in accounting in which a spreadsheet package is used to do homework assignments.
4. A course in language skills in which students must master the specific commands needed to use a computerized drill and practice program.

At the other end of the spectrum, when an extended period, approximately 50 percent of a course, is devoted to the mechanics and syntax of one or more computer tools, such as commands of an operating system, a word processing program, or a spreadsheet program, then the course should not be acceptable toward a degree program. In general, course material that focuses for an extended period on which button to press (e.g., half or more of the instructional time) should not be offered for credit toward graduation.

Among courses in computer programming, a basic introduction to a first programming language should normally be offered at the lower division level. Programming courses introducing one or more additional languages to students who have already learned a first language should be offered at a course level commensurate with the rigor of the proposed material; that is, such courses may be appropriate at the upper division or graduate level if the requirements are sufficiently rigorous.
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Procedures for Processing Undergraduate Curriculum Change Proposals
Policy adopted by the Senate, January 9, 1970

I. Initiation

Proposals for changes in the curriculum may originate from individuals, departments, deans, college curriculum committees, or the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. Curriculum Services will provide assistance in the preparation of proposals so that all proposals will be in correct form and all technical problems will be settled at the outset.

II. College Review

Each college shall develop and follow procedures for review of curricular proposals. Review should be concerned with the academic merit of the proposal and its relationship to the academic program of other departments and the college as a whole.

III. Approval by Dean of College

Every curricular proposal must be submitted to the Dean of the college concerned for approval or disapproval. The Dean should announce a decision within ten school days. The Dean's approval shall be based on his/her determination that the proposal is consistent with plans for the long-run development of the college, that all budget needs of the proposal (teaching positions, space, equipment, supplies, staff, etc.) have been considered carefully, and that the Dean is prepared to give the needs of the program high priority in the college's budget.

IV. Curriculum Services

Curricular proposals shall be reviewed by Curriculum Services. Here proposals are reviewed for proper format, content, and elements which possibly conflict with existing policy, regulations, administrative code, or other agencies within the university. Proposals may be returned to the college for further revision. When the final proposal is acceptable to the college, the department, and Curriculum Services, the curriculum proposal shall be forwarded by Curriculum Services to the following groups for review:

A. Requests for new degree programs which are not in the Academic Master Plan shall be sent to the Committees on Academic Policy and Planning and Academic Resources and Planning for consideration for inclusion on the Academic Master Plan.

B. The proposals will be sent to all Deans listed below: Dean, College of Arts and Letters; Dean, College of Professional Studies and Fine Arts; Dean, College of Sciences; Dean, College of Business Administration; Dean, College of Education; Dean, College of Engineering; Dean, College of Health and Human Services; Dean, Imperial Valley Campus; Dean, College of Extended Studies; Dean of the Division of Undergraduate Studies; and the Dean of the Division of Graduate Affairs.

*C. Deans of colleges shall review solely for impact on the program of their colleges and for budget implications. The Deans will have a period of time set by Curriculum Services to object to any proposal. If no written objection is received, the proposal will be considered approved. If any Dean objects to any proposal, Curriculum Services may seek the advice of others and after hearing the advice shall decide whether the proposal is approved, disapproved, or returned to the recommending source for revisions.

**C. Proposals for new degrees, minors, emphases, options, and concentrations shall be sent to the Committee for Academic Policy and Planning for consideration for impact on the Master Plan and to the Committee on Academic Resources and Planning for comments regarding the budget impact of the proposal.
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D. Proposals for unit name changes shall be reviewed by the following bodies and individuals, in order:
   1. The originating department or program (if applicable).
   2. The academic planning committee(s) of the college(s) in question.
   3. The relevant college Dean(s).
   4. The Provost.
   5. The Committee on Academic Policy and Planning.
   6. The Senate (which shall receive AP&P's recommendation as an information item).

* Review shall proceed concurrently.
** Review shall proceed concurrently with sections B.1 through B.4.

Conditions of Cross-Listed Courses
Policy adopted by the Senate, April 6, 2010

1.0 Cross-listed courses are defined as courses that are offered by two or more academic units, have identical course elements (title, description, units, mode of instruction; prerequisites and number, unless one of the academic units has already used that number for another course then the next closest number should be used) except the course prefix which reflects the academic department or program; are interchangeable for degree requirements; cannot be repeated for degree credit under separate prefixes; may be scheduled with the same instructor, room, and meeting pattern; may be scheduled with all, some, or one of the course prefixes.

2.0 Process for approving a cross-listed course
   2.1 If the course is an approved course in the catalog and additional department(s) want to cross-list the course, the cover page with approval signatures from each department/college requesting the cross-listing is required. Attach each department/college cover page with approval signatures to your on-line proposal using the Attach Files menu option in CurricUNET.
   2.2 If the course has never been taught, approval for a new cross-listed course shall follow the campus curriculum guidelines associated with a new course proposal.
   2.3 Cross-listing of a course can be ended with signatures by any participating department chair and college dean using the process described in 2.1.

3.0 Criteria
   3.1 A cross-listed course shall have the same title, number unless one of the academic units has already used that number for another course, prerequisites, description, unit value, and grading method in its description as listed in every unit.
   3.2 Catalog and course schedule listings shall indicate that the course is cross-listed. Materials presented to students, such as syllabi and course descriptions, shall also indicate that the course is cross-listed.
   3.3 The academic units shall agree that students may take the course under any of its listings to fulfill an academic unit's requirements.

If a collaborative course is acceptable for General Education, the following General Education policies apply. A student shall not receive more than 12 units of GE credit from any one academic unit, including collaborative courses listed therein. A student shall not receive more than 7 units of GE credit in sections II, III, and IV combined from any one academic unit, including collaborative courses offered therein. Courses in a student's major unit or collaborative courses listed therein may not be used in Section IV (Explorations of Human Experience).

Experimental topics courses, General Studies 250, 350, and variable titled and variable unit courses are not eligible to be considered as cross-listed courses.

Catalog and course schedule listings must indicate that the course is a cross-listed course that is listed in more than one department.

The participating departments must agree on cross-listed course content.

Students may take the course under any of its listings to fulfill any one department's requirements.

No more than 20% of the courses in any department or program may be cross-listed courses.
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Policy for Establishing New Impacted Programs and for Changing Admission Criteria of Existing Impacted Programs
Policy adopted by Enrollment Services, October 2006

Each November, the Chancellor’s Office forwards a coded memorandum to CSU campuses requesting the identification of undergraduate enrollment programs proposed for impaction and proposed supplemental admission criteria changes for existing impacted programs. This information is due to the Chancellor’s Office on April 30 and is published by the CSU in August of the subsequent year. This timeline complies with the CSU Board of Trustees’ enrollment management policy calling for the CSU to notify prospective applicants and the public about supplemental admission criteria twelve months prior to the term in which the supplemental admission criteria take effect.

The Associate Vice President and Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs are charged with overseeing and implementing the impaction policy. Each December, the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs notifies academic departments that if they propose to impact a non-impacted program, or if they propose any changes to admission criteria for existing impacted programs, they need to contact Dr. Sandra Cook, Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management, and together provide the required program data to support the proposed changes. In this regard, Executive Order No. 563: Impacted Programs and Campuses (Undergraduate) requires campuses to supply historical data for each academic area and class level for which the impaction designation is requested.

Requests for new impacted programs, or changes to admission criteria for current impacted programs, along with the supporting documentation, are due to Dr. Sandra Cook, Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management no later than March 15. Approved requests will be included in the final submission to the Chancellor’s Office on April 30. Curriculum Services will receive from Enrollment Services a copy of approved changes for publication in the General Catalog.

Please note that admission criteria for existing impacted programs should not be changed unless absolutely necessary in order to ensure that our students have the opportunity to graduate in four years. This is particularly true for the required grade point average.

Impaction changes timeline summary:

December Departments notified that proposed new programs or any changes to admission criteria for current impacted programs are due March 15.

December-March Departments that wish to forward proposals may work with the Director of Institutional Research and Analytical Studies to complete required Program Data sheets.

March 15 Departments submit proposed changes to Dr. Sandra Cook, Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management.

April 30 The Associate Vice President and Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs review all proposed changes and forward approved changes to the Chancellor’s Office and to SDSU Curriculum Services.
### 2016/17 Proposed Changes in Admission Criteria for Current Impacted Majors (Emphases)

### Proposed New Impacted Majors (Emphases)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major/Emphasis</th>
<th>Proposed Admission Criteria Changes</th>
<th>Justification [1]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[1] Quantitative reason (s).
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Flow Chart for Undergraduate Curricular Proposals

(Revised July 2015)

(Includes Proposals for New Basic Credential Programs and Revisions to Existing Basic Credential Programs)

Department
College Curriculum Committee
Dean of College
Curriculum Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Programs</th>
<th>Deletion of Existing Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‡ Academic Policy and Planning Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‡ Academic Resources and Planning Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Curriculum Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>† Graduation Curriculum Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Deans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>† Graduate Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o California Commission on Teacher Credentialing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>† Chancellor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>† Board of Trustees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Courses, Certificates, and Changes in Existing Programs</th>
<th>Deletion of Existing Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ General Education Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Writing Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Curriculum Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Graduate Curriculum Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Deans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Graduate Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate (information item)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o California Commission on Teacher Credentialing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‡ Review concurrently.
O Credential programs only.
+ When appropriate.
v Review upper division courses acceptable for advanced degrees.
Flow Chart for Graduate Curricular Proposals

(Revised July 2015)

(Includes Proposals for Advanced Credential Programs)

Department
College Curriculum Committee
Dean of College

New Programs
Deletion of Existing Programs
Graduate Curriculum Committee
‡ Academic Policy and Planning Committee
‡ Academic Resources and Planning Committee
Academic Deans
Graduate Council
Senate (action item)
President
(Necessary Off-Campus Approval)

Concentrations, Certificates, Credentials, New Courses; and Changes in Existing Programs and Courses
Graduate Curriculum Committee
‡ Academic Policy and Planning Committee
‡ Academic Resources and Planning Committee
Academic Deans
Graduate Council
Senate (when requested)

‡ Review concurrently.
Flow Chart for Academic Master Plan Proposals
New Degrees

(Procedure approved by Academic Policy and Planning Committee, April 24, 1981)

Department
College Curriculum Committee
Dean of College
Curriculum Services
‡ Academic Policy and Planning Committee
‡ Academic Resources and Planning Committee
Senate (information item)
President
Chancellor
Trustees

NOTE:

Procedure applies only to request for inclusion of a new degree in the Academic Master Plan. Request for implementation of degree must be submitted separately and follow established university procedures for review of new programs.

‡ Review concurrently.
Procedure for Processing Curricular Proposals from Imperial Valley Campus

Curricular Procedures
New Degree Programs
Procedure for Processing Curricular Proposals from Imperial Valley Campus

(Policy adopted by the Senate, November 8, 1977, April 17, 1990, and May 11, 1999; Revised April 26, 2001)

Curricular Procedures

Curricular proposals for new courses, new minors, new emphases, topics courses, and changes in courses, programs, and degrees offered at the IVC may be initiated either by the IVC or by academic departments of the San Diego campus; however, in either case such initiations shall be approved both by the IVC and by the relevant San Diego campus department and college before university review and approval.

Furthermore, San Diego campus departments and their colleges shall by committees and periodic review share with the IVC the responsibility for the quality of IVC programs and courses.

With consultative approval of the relevant academic departments and the chairs of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Council of the San Diego campus, the IVC may make minor substitutions in approved programs to fit local needs and faculty availability.

(Note: 500-level courses offered at IVC are acceptable for a graduate degree only with prior approval of the graduate adviser.)

Procedures for Submitting Proposals for Implementation of New Degree Major Programs from Imperial Valley Campus that are Currently Offered on the Main Campus

(Revised March 1985 and June 2003)

A campus, in accordance with its approved academic master plan, submits detailed proposals for new degree major programs to the Division of Academic Plans and Programs in the Chancellor’s Office for review and approval in the academic year preceding projected implementation. Approval of any degree major program is subject to campus assurances that financial support, qualified faculty, physical facilities, and library holdings sufficient to establish and maintain the program will be available within current budgetary support levels. The proposal must follow the format below, and copies will be sent to the Office of the Chancellor by the Provost at San Diego State University once the proposal has been approved by the university-wide screening committees, the Senate, and the President.

1. Definition of the Proposed Degree Major Program

   a. The full and exact designation (degree terminology) for the proposed degree major program, and academic year of intended implementation.

   b. Name of the division or other unit of the campus which would offer the proposed degree major program, i.e., IVC.

   c. Name, title and rank of the individual(s) primarily responsible for drafting the proposed degree major program.

   d. Objectives of the proposed degree major program.

   e. Total number of units required for the major. List of all courses, by catalog number, title, and units of credit, to be specifically required for a major under the proposed degree program. Identify those new courses which are

      (1) needed to initiate the program, and

      (2) needed during the first two years after implementation. Include proposed catalog description of all new courses.

   f. List of elective courses, by catalog number, title, and units of credit, which can be used to satisfy requirements for the major. Identify those new courses which are

      (1) needed to initiate the program, and

      (2) needed during the first two years after implementation. Include proposed catalog description of all new courses.
Procedure for Processing Curricular Proposals from Imperial Valley Campus

g. If any formal options, concentrations or emphases are planned under the proposed major, explain fully.

h. Course prerequisites and other criteria for admission of students to the proposed degree major program and for their continuation in it.

i. Does program differ from main campus program? If so, in what way?

j. For undergraduate programs: Provisions for articulation of the proposed major with community college programs. Please indicate what articulation agreements have been made with what colleges and what additional agreements are contemplated.

k. If main campus program is impacted, how will transfer to main campus be handled?

(Note: Where applicable, establishment of a master’s degree program should be preceded by national professional accreditation of the corresponding bachelor’s degree major program.)

2. Need for the Proposed Degree Major Program

a. List of other curricula currently offered by the campus which are closely related to the proposed program. Enrollment figures during the past three years in specified courses or programs closely related to the proposed degree major program.

b. Results of a formal survey in the geographical area to be served indicating demand for individuals who have earned the proposed degree and evidence of serious student interest in majoring in the proposed program.

c. For graduate programs, the number of declared undergraduate majors and the degree production over the preceding three years for the corresponding baccalaureate programs.

d. Professional uses of the proposed degree major program.

e. The expected number of majors in the year of initiation and three years and five years thereafter. The expected number of graduates in the year of initiation and three years and five years thereafter.

(Note: This degree major program will be subject to program review evaluation within five years after implementation.)

3. Existing Support Resources for the Proposed Degree Major Program

a. Faculty members, with rank, appointment status, highest degree earned, date and field of highest degree, and professional experience (including publications if the proposal is for a graduate degree), who would teach in the proposed program. Include faculty vita in an appendix.

(Note: For proposed graduate degree programs, a minimum of five full-time faculty members with the terminal professional degree should be on the program staff.)

b. Space and facilities that would be used in support of the proposed program. Show how this space is currently used and what alternate arrangements, if any, will be made for the current occupants.

c. Library resources to support the program, specified by subject areas, volume count, periodical holdings, etc.

d. Equipment and other specialized materials currently available.
4. Additional Support Resources Required

(Note: If additional support resources will be needed to implement and maintain the program, a statement by the responsible administrator(s) should be attached to the proposal assuring that such resources will be provided.)

a. The amount of additional lecture and/or laboratory space required to initiate and sustain the program over the next five years. Indicate any additional special facilities that will be required. If the space is under construction, what is the projected occupancy date? If the space is planned, indicate campus-wide priority of the facility, capital outlay program priority, and projected date of occupancy.

b. Additional library resources needed. Indicate the commitment of the campus to purchase or borrow through interlibrary loan these additional resources.

c. Additional equipment or specialized materials will be:
   (1) needed to implement the program, and
   (2) needed during the first two years after initiation. Indicate source of funds and priority to secure these resource needs.

5. Abstract of the Proposal and Proposed Catalog Description

Attach an abstract of the foregoing proposal, not to exceed two pages, and a complete proposed catalog description, including admission and degree requirements.
Credential Program Procedures

Proposals of Intent to Offer New Credentials

New Credentials

Revisions of Existing Credential Programs

Single Subject Waiver Programs
Proposals of Intent to Offer New Credentials
A letter of intent as well as any supporting documents required by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing should be forwarded by the dean of the college concerned to the Provost for review. Once approved, the request will be sent over the President's signature to the Commission.

New Credentials
Proposals for implementation of new credential programs are to be processed by local screening committees as outlined on pages 27-29 of the Curriculum Guide before being forwarded to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. The proposal submitted for local review should follow the format outlined on pages 78-90 of the Curriculum Guide for new degree major programs. In addition, one copy of the document prepared for the commission should be forwarded to Curriculum Services for use by the university-wide curricular review committees.

Revision of Existing Credential Programs
Proposals to revise an existing credential program are to be submitted to Curriculum Services via CurricUNET for university-wide processing.
All local review must be completed before the proposal is submitted to the Commission for review.
Once a revision to an existing credential has been approved by the local screening committees, it is the responsibility of the department initiating the proposal to forward the formal request plus a cover memo to the Provost for review and forwarding to the Commission.

Single Subject Waiver Programs
The policy and procedures for securing approval for single subject teaching credentials as outlined in Title 5, California Code of Regulations, is as follows:

80085. Programs of Academic Preparation.
In accordance with the requirements of Sections 44310, 44311, and 44312 of the Education Code, the Commission shall evaluate a subject matter program submitted to it as adequate and appropriate for the purpose of waiving the respective subject matter examination, and shall grant such subject matter program waiver status upon fulfillment of the general requirements as specified in Section 80085.1 and the specific requirements as specified in Section 80086, by the institution requesting approval of such programs of academic preparation.
In addition to fulfilling the requirements of Section 80085.1 and Section 80086, the following requirements shall be addressed by programs seeking Commission approval:

(a) The head of the institution shall submit a written statement assuring that the Dean or Director of Teacher Education was consulted as to the appropriateness of the proposed coursework during the institutional review of the submitted program(s).

(b) For purposes of clarification, an institution shall submit a matrix which indicates the relationship of each course, in the required 2/3, to the subjects listed in Title 5 Regulations Section 80086.
80085.1. Programs of Academic Preparation; General Requirement.

To receive Commission approval, programs of academic preparation, other than foreign languages and mathematics, must contain a basic core of courses (a minimum of 30 semester units, or their quarter unit equivalent), not less than 2/3 of the total, which relate directly to those subjects “commonly taught” in the public schools. A listing and catalog description of courses clearly identifying which of the courses constitutes the 2/3 basic core must be provided. The remaining third (a minimum of 15 semester units or their quarter unit equivalent) shall include courses that provide breadth and perspective to supplement the essential basic core.

Institutions shall have the flexibility to define their program (both the required 2/3 core and remaining 1/3) in terms of specifically required coursework or in terms of electives within each area.

Institutions shall have the flexibility to determine whether their programs offer a specific course or courses for each subject “commonly taught,” or provide a course or courses offering multiple coverage across subjects “commonly taught,” as listed in Title 5 Regulations, Section 80086.

Programs of mathematics shall consist of a minimum of 30 semester units, or their quarter unit equivalent, plus 15 units of closely related subjects.

Programs of academic preparation for foreign languages shall consist of a minimum of 30 upper division semester units or their equivalent. This regulation is not intended to inhibit or unnecessarily restrict college or university curricula.

80086. Programs of Academic Preparation; Specific Requirements.

(a) Agriculture: To include required courses in, or directly related to, ornamental horticulture, agriculture mechanics, animal science, plant science, forestry/horticulture, farm management/agriculture economics;

(b) Art: To include required courses in, or directly related to, art (general), crafts, ceramics, painting/drawing, art history, design;

(c) Business: To include required courses in, or directly related to, office services and related technologies (courses or demonstrated proficiency) accounting/computer literacy, economics and consumer business education, marketing/distribution;

(d) English: To include required courses in, or directly related to, composition, literature, linguistics;

(e) Government: To include required courses in, or directly related to, U.S. government/civics, introduction to law, emerging nations, comparative political systems;

(f) Health Science: To include required courses in, or directly related to, personal health, family health, community health, drug use and abuse, accident prevention and safety;

(g) History: To include required courses in, or directly related to, U.S. history, world history, history of Western civilization, history of California, history of modern Europe, history of the non-Western world;

(h) Home Economics: To include required courses in, or directly related to, consumer education, food and nutrition, family living and parenthood education, child development and guidance, housing and home management, clothing and textiles;

(i) Industrial and Technology Education: To include required courses in, or directly related to, construction, electronics, energy and power, manufacturing, visual communications, and related technologies;

(j) Languages: To include required courses in, or directly related to, language, culture, linguistics, literature;

(k) Life Science: To include required courses in, or directly related to, biology, physiology, ecology, zoology, botany, marine biology;

(l) Mathematics: To include required courses in, or directly related to, first and second year algebra (or demonstrated proficiency); first and second year calculus, geometry, statistics, probability, computer programming, history of mathematics, number theory;

(m) Music: To include required courses in, or directly related to the theoretical and historical background of music, instrumental, vocal;

(n) Physical Education: To include required courses in, or directly related to, dance, basic movement, sports and games, aquatics, gymnastics;

(o) Physical Science: To include required courses in, or directly related to, chemistry, physics, earth science;

(p) Social Science: To include required courses in, or directly related to U.S. history, history of California, U.S. government, world history, world geography.
80087. Institutional Procedures and Standards.

The responsible head of the institution, following regular review by procedures appropriate to the institution, in consultation with the Dean or Director of Teacher Education, shall report to the Commission the subject matter programs of academic preparation the institution has selected as meeting the general and specific requirements cited in Sections 80085, 80085.1, and 80086.

80088. Approval of Programs of Academic Preparation.

(a) The institution shall submit seven (7) copies of the program of academic preparation and the letter from the responsible head of the institution, as cited in Section 80085 and Section 80087;

(b) Commission staff will review the proposed program of academic preparation in terms of the general requirements, as stipulated in Section 80085.1;

(c) The Commission shall appoint panels to review the programs of academic preparation for each of the statutory single subjects, in terms of the specific requirements as stipulated in Section 80086, and breadth and perspective to supplement the essential core. The panels shall also evaluate each program in terms of its adequacy and appropriateness as a waiver from the subject matter examination in terms of the requirements of Section 80085.1. Each panel shall be comprised of a minimum of three members, representing at least one each of the following: secondary teachers of the subject, college/university teachers of the subject, and supplemented by one public school specialist in curriculum or school administration;

(d) Candidates initially enrolled in a subject matter program after June 30, 1984 shall be so enrolled in a Commission approved program that meets the requirements described in Title 5 Regulation Sections 80085.1 and 80086;

(e) Subject matter programs approved under regulations that existed on March 31, 1982 shall retain their approved status until June 30, 1984;

(f) Candidates initially enrolled prior to June 1, 1984 in a Commission approved single subject matter waiver program approved under regulations that existed on March 31, 1982, shall have until June 30, 1988 to complete such program, or equivalent program, and apply for the appropriate single subject credential.

(Includes revisions through August 26, 1989.)
Distance Education Policy

Topics Courses
(296, 496, 596, 696,
Latin American Studies 580,
Psychology 796, 886)
Distance Education Policy
Policy adopted by Senate, April 6, 2000; Revised April 7, 2009, Revised May 6, 2014

Hybrid, Online, and Intercampus Classes: Definitions and scheduling

1.0 Hybrid, online, and intercampus classes involve a formal educational process in which student and instructor are not necessarily in the same physical location, but interact in a synchronous or asynchronous manner through technology. Classes in which 20% to 50% of the scheduled sessions are conducted through this process are defined as hybrid. Classes in which greater than 50% of the scheduled sessions are conducted through this process are defined as online. Classes in which the instructor is located on one SDSU campus and interacts with students on another SDSU campus shall be defined as intercampus; such intercampus classes shall be arranged through consultations between the instructor and the appropriate personnel on each campus. For all three class modes, any required synchronous interactions (e.g., weekly sessions, aperiodic examinations, capstone presentations) shall be clearly established in the official schedule of classes with respect to specific dates, days, times, and locations as appropriate.

2.0 The following guidelines shall apply to new hybrid and online classes.

2.1 The initial offering of a given course by a given instructor in hybrid and online modality shall be established through consultations between the instructor of record, the department chair, the college curriculum committee, and the associate dean of the college. An example “Initial Offering of Hybrid or Online Class” form to facilitate such consultations may be found in the Curriculum Guide. Each college shall establish and disseminate specific policies, expectations, and timelines for the submission and approval of such hybrid/online courses and instructors. Proposed hybrid/online course instructors pairings that have not been previously approved through the college’s established process may be removed from the schedule of classes by the Dean’s office.

2.2 Hybrid and online classes shall be so identified in the official schedule of classes, which shall notify students of any required participation in synchronous class activities beyond those session times indicated in the schedule of classes.

2.3 The schedule of classes shall notify students of any software and hardware required for participation in class meetings taking place when the student and instructor will not be in the same physical location.

2.4 Ownership of materials, faculty compensation, copyright issues and the use of revenue derived from the creation and production of hybrid and online classes, including software, or other media products shall be in accordance with the policy on Intellectual Property.

2.5 Regardless of the modality in which they are offered, classes should be consistent in terms of purpose, scope, quality, assessment and expected learning outcomes with other classes bearing the same department code, number, and course title. Courses shall meet all the standards set forth in the Curriculum Guide regardless of their modality.

2.6 Students enrolled in hybrid and online classes shall not be denied access to advisement, grievances, or other key academic rights and services, nor shall they be excused from the academic responsibilities expected of all students.
Example “Establishment Of Hybrid Or Online Class” Form

Instructor: _______________________
Course: _______________________
Modality:  Hybrid   Online
Semester: _______________________
Maximum Enrollment: _______________________

Please provide a one-page statement that overviews how, within the proposed modality, the instructor will (a) promote mastery of the course learning outcomes, (b) provide the opportunity for synchronous instructor-student interactions, and (c) ensure academic integrity with respect to high-stakes assessments (i.e., exams, etc.).

Please attach a draft syllabus for the instructor’s course in the proposed modality. Instructors are encouraged to assess and refine their syllabus and broader course using the Quality Online Learning and Teaching Rubric (attached).

Please identify any one-time resources or support necessary for the instructor to develop the above course in the stated modality:
____________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________

Please check the appropriate items below:

- Instructor has previously taught this course in a face-to-face modality
- Instructor has previously taught this course in a hybrid modality
- Instructor has previously taught this course in an online modality
- Instructor has previously taught other courses in the requested modality
  - Please list other courses: _____________________________________________________________
- Instructor has never taught in the requested modality
- Course has been previously taught by other instructors in a face-to-face modality
  - Please list recent instructors: _____________________________
- Course has been previously taught by other instructors in a hybrid modality
  - Please list recent instructors: _____________________________
- Course has been previously taught by other instructors in an online modality
  - Please list recent instructors: _____________________________
- Course has not been previously taught in the requested modality

Instructor: ______________________________ Date: ________________
Department Chair: ________________________ Date: ________________
Chair, College Curr. Comm: ________________ Date: ________________
Associate Dean: __________________________ Date: ________________
Learning Mode Categories and Values

Fully-Online
A01 = Section is taught exclusively online and can be accessed at any time from any location, with no on-campus or face-to-face meetings. In addition to learning mode code we use DE footnote. AB386

S02 = Section is taught online at a specifically scheduled time and web location. Students must sign into a virtual classroom, web site, or chat room at a specified time, no on-campus or face-to-face meetings. In addition to learning mode code we schedule meeting times and days into the section record and use DE footnote and department numeric footnote to give additional details. AB386

S10&A10 = Synchronous & Asynchronous hybrid. Synchronous instructional course section can be offered anywhere (no campus meetings) with asynchronous instructional course section can be offered anywhere (no campus meetings). The synchronous segment should always be in the first resource row for S10/A10 sections and include meeting times and days. AB386

Online, Up To 3 Campus Meetings
A03 = Section is taught online and can be accessed at any time from any location, with up to three special face-to-face meetings scheduled on-campus for class orientation, midterms, finals, etc. (per Federal Distance Education guidelines and definitions). In addition to learning mode code we use DE footnote and department numeric footnote to notify students of special meeting dates, times, and locations. Federal Distance Education

S04 = Section is taught online at a specifically scheduled time and web location with up to three special face-to-face meetings scheduled on-campus for class orientation, midterms, finals, etc. (per Federal Distance Education guidelines and definitions). In addition to learning mode code we schedule meeting times and days into the section record and use DE footnote and department numeric footnote to give additional details and to notify students of special meeting dates, times, and locations. Federal Distance Education

S11&A11 = Synchronous & Asynchronous hybrid. Synchronous instructional course section (orientation, mid-term, final campus meetings allowed) with asynchronous instructional course section (orientation, mid-term, final campus meetings allowed). The synchronous segment should always be in the first resource row for S11/A11 sections and include meeting times and days. Federal Distance Education

Hybrid, Online and Face-To-Face
A05 = Hybrid/blended. One segment of the section taught face-to-face in the classroom, another taught exclusively online. All resource rows are coded with learning mode A05. The face-to-face segment should always be in the first resource row and include meeting times and days. In addition to learning mode code we use BL footnote and department numeric footnote to give additional details.

S06 = Hybrid/blended. Section has both a face-to-face (live instructor) component and a synchronous online (simultaneous remote broadcast) component with students either physically attending the live instructor component or, instead, receiving the simultaneous broadcast. All resource rows are coded with learning mode S06. The face-to-face segment should always be in the first resource row and include meeting times and days. In addition to learning mode code we use BL footnote and department numeric footnote to give additional details.

Face-To-Face
F09 = Section is taught on campus, in a classroom, face-to-face.
SDSU Topics Courses (296, 496, 596, 696, Latin American Studies 580, Psychology 796, 886)
General Studies Courses

Policies and Procedures

The Undergraduate Topics Committee, which is a subcommittee of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, is responsible for the review and approval of all courses numbered 296, 496, or 596, Latin American Studies 580, Psychology 796, 886, and General Studies courses offered for academic credit during the regular academic year, special sessions (i.e., summer term sessions), and in Extension. In addition, all 500-level and 696 courses are reviewed by the Graduate Topics Committee. Policy regarding 696 topics courses was approved by Graduate Council on March 21, 1985.

On February 4, 2016, the university curriculum committees and Graduate Council approved a policy requiring a syllabus for all topics course proposals.

In September 1988, the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee approved the following procedure for review of topics courses:
1. The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee delegates full authority for the approval of undergraduate topics courses to the Undergraduate Topics Subcommittee.
2. The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee will act on undergraduate topics only upon petition of a member of the topics subcommittee.
3. The Undergraduate Topics Subcommittee will provide the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee with a complete list of their actions by the end of each semester.

In order to allow adequate time for the university-wide review of proposed topics courses (296, 496, 596, 696, Latin American Studies 580, Psychology 796, 886) and General Studies courses, proposals must be submitted to Curriculum Services according to the deadline set for receipt of class schedule forms. Courses offered in summer term sessions, and Extension are submitted to the College of Extended Studies for forwarding to Curriculum Services. The proposal forms (including course outlines and syllabus) should be forwarded with the approval of the appropriate college curricular review committee and the dean of the college.

When reviewing topics courses, the college curricular review committee should pay particular attention to the following:
1. Is level of course appropriate, i.e., lower division, upper division acceptable for graduate credit?
2. Are appropriate prerequisites listed?
3. Is course description clear and brief?
4. Is mode of instruction appropriate, i.e., breakdown into lecture, lab, activity?
5. Is grading method appropriate?
6. For short-term courses, will students have adequate time for out-of-class preparation and study, i.e., is time frame for course appropriate?

General Studies Courses were created to provide a means for departments to offer innovative and/or interdisciplinary undergraduate courses which do not fit into the existing curricular framework. These courses differ from topics courses in that they may be interdisciplinary, may utilize variable credit, and/or may incorporate real departures from usual teaching and learning techniques. Under certain circumstances, General Studies 250 and 350 may be used to propose courses for General Education credit on a temporary basis.

General Studies courses may be offered for a maximum of four semesters (subject to review by the Committee each semester). Since approval by the Committee is only temporary, it is anticipated that if a course proves successful, the department would initiate the usual procedures for obtaining curricular committee approval for a permanent new course. Also, Committee approval in no way guarantees approval of course load for the faculty member. This must still be arranged by the department and the college.

According to Senate policy, proposals for experimental and interdisciplinary limited-duration courses will go through the same procedural steps as regular undergraduate curricular proposals with the following exceptions:
1. Proposals will not be constrained by catalog and committee deadlines for regular course proposals; they will be dealt with on demand and must be completely processed during one semester for implementation for the next semester.
2. The process will normally conclude with the work of the Undergraduate Topics Committee, which will make an information report to the Senate annually.
Topics Courses (296, 496, 596, 696, Latin American Studies 580, Psychology 796, 886) are defined as “those courses which treat unspecified topics within a discipline, e.g., Business Administration 496: Selected Topics in Business Administration.” (Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, Sixth Report to Senate, November 1979.)

With regard to regular university topics courses, any department or college which has received approval through the normal curricular channels to offer courses under the numbers 296, 496, 596, 696, Latin American Studies 580, Psychology 796, 886, may do so subject to the following conditions:

1. Proposals require the approval of:
   - Department
   - College Curriculum Committee
   - College Dean
   - Undergraduate Topics Committee
   - Graduate Topics Committee (500-level and 696 courses only)

2. A syllabus is required (per university curriculum committees and Graduate Council, February 4, 2016).

3. Such courses may be offered no more than four semesters with the same title and content. (However, if a proposal has been submitted to the college or university curricular committees to create a permanent course, departments will be granted an extension beyond the four semesters to allow time for processing of the request for inclusion in the catalog.)

4. No more than nine units of 296, 496, 596 courses shall be applicable toward a bachelor’s degree.

5. Such courses may be applicable toward preparation for the major only with the approval of the department chair.

6. No more than six units of 696 courses shall be applicable toward a master’s degree.

7. Only those proposals submitted to Curriculum Services in time for inclusion in the Class Schedule will be approved.

8. Specified courses may be offered on a credit/no credit basis under the following conditions:
   a. Requests to offer these courses for Cr/NC must be indicated on proposal.
   b. Separate sections of the same course may not have different grading systems.
Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement

Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement Procedures
Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement


Proficiency in Writing
San Diego State University students shall demonstrate proficiency in writing skills as a requirement for graduation. Such skills shall incorporate basic rules of good writing, subject to the argument, format, logical development, demonstration of evidence, and style appropriate to various disciplines. Furthermore, departments and schools should insist upon effective expression in their courses and should stress the need for improving substandard writing.

Certification of Writing Proficiency: All students shall take the Writing Placement Assessment in the semester in which they achieve 60 units or, for students who transfer to SDSU with 60 or more units, in their first semester at SDSU, to determine their ability to write clearly and logically.

1. Students demonstrating writing proficiency on the Writing Placement Assessment shall meet the Certification of the graduation writing assessment requirement, unless their majors, schools, or colleges require satisfactory completion of an upper division writing course. (If such a course is required, demonstrating competency on the Writing Placement Assessment shall serve as the prerequisite.) Completion of the course with a minimum grade of C or Cr shall be certification of proficiency for the student.

2. Students demonstrating basic writing competency on the Writing Placement Assessment shall enroll in an upper division writing course. Completion of an approved writing course with a minimum grade of C or Cr shall mean the student has met the certification of the graduation writing assessment requirement.

3. Students unable to demonstrate basic writing competence on the Upper Division Writing Assessment shall complete an approved basic writing course with a minimum grade of C or Cr before enrolling in an upper division writing course. Completion of an approved upper division course with a minimum grade of C or Cr shall mean the student has met the certification of the graduation writing assessment requirement.

Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement Procedures
Student Learning Outcomes and Guidelines for “W” Courses Fulfilling the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement

1. In order to prepare students to write in and for a specific discipline, they will practice writing that includes the following components:
   a. Disciplinary means of argumentation and exposition.
   b. Disciplinary ways of reasoning, analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating.
   c. Disciplinary formats, genres, and conventions.
   d. Disciplinary vocabulary and prose style.

2. In addition, students will
   • Write with an awareness of general or specific audiences outside of their major disciplines (for example, ability to convey information or perspectives relevant to a discipline or to an audience beyond it).
   • Demonstrate an understanding of the rhetorical situation-purpose, context, and audience.
   • Apply writing processes effectively (i.e., research, prewriting, drafting, revision, and editing).
   • Actively read texts using a variety of reading strategies such as annotation, visual organizers, questioning, and discussion.
   • Produce a minimum of 2,000 words of writing per credit unit.

Students in “W” courses who are still working to master standard written English will find help and support for their particular needs in these classes.

The University Writing Committee (Dean of Undergraduate Studies, chair) wishes to support departments in their creation or adaptation of writing courses and will be offering both general advisory sessions and ongoing assistance on a consultative basis.
**Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement**

**Existing Courses:** Departments must submit the writing requirement proposal with college approval to Curriculum Services for university-wide processing.

**New Courses:** The same course template will be completed and the appropriate proposal type for a writing course must be selected in the cover sheet. New course proposals follow the regular university curriculum process. All writing course proposals are submitted for consideration to the University Writing Committee after approval at the college level and review by the academic deans.

Whenever possible, departments should use course numbers already established in other departments to designate an upper division writing course. The “W” suffix should be used for all such courses.

**Basic Prerequisite Statement for All Upper Division “W” Courses**

Satisfies Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement for students who have completed 60 units, completed the Writing Placement Assessment with a score of 8 or higher (or earned a C or higher in RWS 280 or 281, or LING 281 if score on WPA was 7 or lower); and completed the General Education requirement in Composition and Critical Thinking. **Proof of completion of prerequisites required:** Test scores or verification of exemption; copy of transcript.
General Education

Seven Essential Capacities Developed

General Education Program Capacities and Goals

Guidelines for Submitting a Proposal for a Course in General Education

Required Language Explaining Place of the Course in General Education

Communication and Critical Thinking

Foundations

Explorations

Timeline for Implementing the Revised Program and Assessing General Education

SDSU General Education Committee Structure
General Education

General Education profoundly influences undergraduates by providing the breadth of knowledge necessary for meaningful work, life-long learning, socially responsible citizenship, and intellectual development. This 49-unit program, which comprises over one third of an undergraduate's course of study, places specialized disciplines into a wider world, enabling students to integrate knowledge and to make connections among fields of inquiry.

The General Education program at SDSU prepares students to succeed in an increasingly complex and rapidly changing world. Our students will live and work in the context of globalization, scientific and technological innovation, cross-cultural encounters, environmental challenges, and unforeseen shifts in economic and political power. Through this program, students will acquire knowledge of human cultures and the physical and natural world that will enable them to engage significant questions, both contemporary and enduring.

To put their breadth of knowledge to work, students gain intellectual and practical skills such as inquiry and analysis, creative and critical thinking, written and oral communication, scientific and quantitative literacy, and technological-information proficiencies. Students practice these skills in progressively challenging venues, mastering learning outcomes from a series of courses drawn from the following four sections: I) Communication and Critical Thinking; II) Foundations of Learning; III) American Institutions; and IV) Explorations of Human Experience. In order to acquire the skills required for advanced coursework within and across disciplines, student should complete the four sections sequentially.

The General Education program at San Diego State University is evolving. A standing committee of faculty and students reviews the program continually and encourages the development of new courses, concepts, and learning experiences.

Seven Essential Capacities Developed through General Education

In addition to mastering the specialized disciplinary knowledge typically associated with undergraduate majors, well-educated individuals acquire general abilities, habits of mind, or capacities that significantly enhance their intellectual and professional lives. Students come to understand how arguments—whether in journal articles, laboratory reports, lyrics, or manifestos—are constructed and evaluated; and they are able to craft persuasive cases in a wide variety of contexts. Students become familiar with the ways scholars—whether physicists or literary critics—theorize; and they are able to apply different kinds of theoretical models to real-world conditions. Students come to realize that most significant phenomena—from endangered species to British novels—cannot be understood in isolation because they are inevitably situated in complex webs or networks of interrelated phenomena; and they are able to locate concepts, ideas, texts, and events within these broader contexts. Students recognize the value of engaging diverse and opposing principles, perspectives, and people to achieve political, intellectual, artistic, and social ends; and they grow competent in the sorts of negotiations such engagement requires. Students come to appreciate that local and global perspectives on subjects as diverse as policing, safe drinking water, and artistic trends are inevitably connected; and they can bring the two perspectives together. Students come to see that diverse concepts—from principles of harmony to supply and demand—apply to multiple phenomena; and they are skilled in identifying the relevance of such concepts across traditional boundaries. Finally, students come to understand the intricate causal relationships between actions—whether giving a dowry or exploring space—and their effects; and they develop the ability to evaluate consequences in meaningful and responsible ways.

In order to develop these abilities in all our students, San Diego State University's General Education program will emphasize the following seven essential capacities:

1. Construct, analyze, and communicate arguments;
2. Apply theoretical models to the real world;
3. Contextualize phenomena;
4. Negotiate differences;
5. Integrate global and local perspectives;
6. Illustrate relevance of concepts across boundaries;
7. Evaluate consequences of actions.

It is important to note that although these essential capacities inform General Education, they are by no means its exclusive property. In fact, these fundamental abilities are to be further strengthened through students’ major coursework. More specific goals of the various areas of General Education articulate directly with the seven essential capacities, in many cases manifesting the general abilities characterized-in rather abstract terms-by the capacities.
Communication and Critical Thinking

Communication and Critical Thinking are essential skills that underlie all university education. Focusing particularly on argument, courses in this area of General Education help students understand the general function of writing, speaking, visual texts, and thinking within the context of the university at large, rather than within specific disciplines. In addition to featuring the basic rules and conventions governing composition and presentation, Communication and Critical Thinking courses establish intellectual frameworks and analytical tools that help students explore, construct, critique, and integrate sophisticated texts.

Goals in Communication and Critical Thinking:

• Goal 1: Craft well-reasoned arguments for specific audiences.
• Goal 2: Analyze a variety of texts commonly encountered in the academic setting.
• Goal 3: Situate discourse within social, generic, cultural, and historic contexts.
• Goal 4: Assess the relative strengths of arguments and supporting evidence.

Foundations of Learning

Foundations of Learning courses follow and build upon Communication and Critical Thinking courses and are offered by individual departments and interdisciplinary areas in the Natural Sciences and Quantitative Reasoning, Social and Behavioral Sciences, and Humanities and Fine Arts. Foundations of Learning courses in the Natural Sciences and Quantitative Reasoning are divided into four categories: 1. Physical Sciences, 2. Life Sciences, 3. Laboratory, and 4. Mathematics and Quantitative Reasoning. Those in the Humanities and Fine Arts are divided into five categories: 1. Literature, 2. Art, Classics, Dance, Drama, Humanities, and Music, 3. History, 4. Philosophy and Religious Studies, and 5. Foreign Language. Foundations of Learning courses introduce students to the basic concepts, theories, and approaches offered by disciplinary and interdisciplinary areas of study. They provide the foundation to understand and approach problems in the academy, and in local and global real-world environments. Consistent with class size and learning goals, they cultivate skills in reading, writing, communication, computation, information-gathering, and use of technology. Where appropriate, courses intended as preparation for a major may also be designated as Foundations courses. Only lower division courses are designated as Foundations of Learning courses.

Explorations of Human Experience

Explorations of Human Experience courses are upper division courses which allow concentrated or thematic study. In Explorations of Human Experience there are three areas of study – Natural Sciences and Quantitative Reasoning, Social and Behavioral Sciences, and Humanities and Fine Arts. Among these areas are courses designated as cultural diversity courses. “Explorations of Human Experience” courses take the goals and skills of “Foundations of Learning” courses to a more advanced level. This may find expression in one or more of the following pedagogical elements: greater interdisciplinary, more complex and in-depth theory, deeper investigation of local problems, and wider awareness of global challenges. More extensive reading, written analysis involving complex comparisons well-developed arguments, considerable bibliography, and use of technology are appropriate in many explorations courses. Courses narrowly centered within one aspect of a discipline are more suited to major study than general education, which encourages students to relate their learning across the range of their educational experience. Explorations of Human Experience courses are upper division and cannot be used to fulfill this requirement if taken before students reach junior standing (passing 60 units).

Areas of Study In Foundations of Learning and Explorations of Human Experience

A. NATURAL SCIENCES AND QUANTITATIVE REASONING

Natural Sciences

Natural Sciences use the scientific process to study nature and represent an approach to the study of the universe and its natural laws and phenomena. Students achieve basic scientific literacy and thereby understand the scientific process including the value of observation, hypothesis testing, and experiments in the advance of science. Thus students require a general understanding of fundamental concepts and knowledge accumulated by the natural sciences. From that understanding, students develop an ability to reason about and follow new developments in the natural sciences, and to think in a scientifically informed manner about social and political issues that involve science and technology.

Goals for GE Courses in the Natural Sciences

• Goal 1: Explain basic concepts and theories of the natural sciences.
• Goal 2: Use logic and scientific methods to analyze the natural world and solve problems.
• Goal 3: Argue from multiple perspectives about issues in natural science that have personal and global relevance.
• Goal 4: Use technology in laboratory and field situations to connect concepts and theories with real-world phenomena.

Quantitative Reasoning

Quantitative reasoning refers to a range of academic capacities that includes learning from data, communicating quantitatively, analyzing evidence and assertions, and employing quantitative intuition. While quantitative reasoning is essential to sciences, other disciplines require the ability to use and comprehend quantitative language. To do this, students require the ability to analyze and interpret data in both scientific and social contexts. By possessing this set of mathematical and problem solving skills, students will be able to engage effectively in quantitative situations arising in life and work.
Goals for GE Courses in Quantitative Reasoning

• Goal 1: Apply appropriate computational skills and use basic mathematical concepts to analyze problems in natural and social sciences.
• Goal 2: Use methods of quantitative reasoning to solve and communicate answers to real-world problems.

B. SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

The Social and Behavioral Sciences focus on human behavior, cognition, and organization from anthropological, economic, geographic, linguistic, political, psychological and sociological perspectives. Students gain an understanding of society and culture, as well as individual and social interaction processes. Disciplines within the Social and Behavioral Sciences employ the scientific method and utilize both quantitative and qualitative techniques to analyze the diversity and complexity of human experience. Through interdisciplinary learning, students explore the relationships between human societies and the physical environment.

Goals for GE Courses in the Social and Behavioral Sciences

• Goal 1: Explore and recognize basic terms, concepts, and domains of the social and behavioral sciences.
• Goal 2: Comprehend diverse theories and methods of the social and behavioral sciences.
• Goal 3: Identify human behavioral patterns across space and time and discuss their interrelatedness and distinctiveness.
• Goal 4: Enhance understanding of the social world through the application of conceptual frameworks from the social and behavioral sciences to first-hand engagement with contemporary issues.

C. HUMANITIES AND FINE ARTS

The Humanities and Fine Arts encompass works of the imagination, such as art, literature, film, drama, dance, and music, and related scholarship. Students better understand human problems, responsibilities, and possibilities in changing historical contexts and diverse cultures, and in relation to the natural environment. Students acquire new languages and familiarize themselves with related cultures. They gain the ability to recognize and assess various aesthetic principles, belief systems, and constructions of identity. Students acquire capacities for reflection, critique, communication, cultural understanding, creativity, and problem solving in an increasingly globalized world.

Goals for GE Courses in the Humanities and Fine Arts

• Goal 1: Analyze written, visual, or performed texts in the humanities and fine arts with sensitivity to their diverse cultural contexts and historical moments.
• Goal 2: Develop a familiarity with various aesthetic and other value systems and the ways they are communicated across time and cultures.
• Goal 3: Argue from multiple perspectives about issues in the humanities that have personal and global relevance.
• Goal 4: Demonstrate the ability to approach complex problems and ask complex questions drawing upon knowledge of the humanities.

Guidelines for Submitting a Proposal that includes General Education

1. Qualifications relevant to goals, capacities and areas of general education:

Briefly state how your course fits into the level of Foundations or Explorations.

• Identify the area of study of general education to which your course applies (e.g. Natural Science and Quantitative Reasoning, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Humanities and the Fine Arts) and describe how the goals for that section are addressed by your course. Provide specific examples of the coursework that best apply to each goal.

• Identify three of the capacities for general education that are developed extensively in your course, providing specific examples of the coursework that best apply to each capacity and how you will assess student learning.

• What forms of communication and information literacy will students learn in the course? State the approximate amount and kind of written work required, and how students will be required to access and evaluate sources of information.

• Does the design of this course for General Education differ from how the course would be designed for majors? If so, how? If not, why does it serve both audiences?

• If the course is being proposed to satisfy cultural diversity indicate how its content emphasizes non-dominant perspectives, cultures, views, and traditions.

2. Course syllabus to include the general education program description, student learning outcomes, required readings and work, grading standards, and evaluation procedures.

You may call the Office of the Dean, Division of Undergraduate Studies, the Chair of the Committee on General Education, or Curriculum Services for assistance.
Required Language Explaining Place of the Course in General Education

Program

All courses in the General Education Program are required to include the relevant following paragraphs on their syllabi. These paragraphs serve to communicate the student learning outcomes of the General Education Program to both students and professors. Courses in Communication and Critical Thinking will put the first paragraph on their syllabi; courses in Foundations will use the first paragraph under that heading and a second paragraph relating to the area of Foundations that the course is in; Explorations classes will use the first paragraph here under that heading and the second paragraph that pertains to the area of Explorations that the class is in.

Communication and Critical Thinking

This course is one of three courses that you will take in the General Education area of Communication and Critical Thinking. Upon completing this area of our General Education program, you will be able to: 1) craft well-reasoned arguments for specific audiences; 2) analyze a variety of texts commonly encountered in the academic setting; 3) situate discourse within social, generic, cultural, and historic contexts; and 4) assess the relative strengths of arguments and supporting evidence.

Foundations

This course is one of nine courses that you will take in General Education Foundations. Foundations courses cultivate skills in reading, writing, research, communication, computation, information literacy, and use of technology. They furthermore introduce you to basic concepts, theories and approaches in a variety of disciplines in order to provide the intellectual breadth necessary to help you integrate the more specialized knowledge gathered in your major area of study into a broader world picture.

This course is one of three Foundations courses that you will take in the area of Natural Sciences and Quantitative Reasoning. Upon completing Natural Science Foundations courses in physical sciences, life sciences, and a lab, you will be able to: 1) explain basic concepts and theories of the natural sciences; 2) use logic and scientific methods to analyze the natural world and solve problems; 3) argue from multiple perspectives about issues in natural science that have personal and global relevance; 4) use technology in laboratory and field situations to connect concepts and theories with real-world phenomena. Upon completing a Foundations course in Quantitative Reasoning you will be able to: 1) apply appropriate computational skills and use basic mathematical concepts to analyze problems in natural and social sciences; and 2) use methods of quantitative reasoning to solve and communicate answers to real-world problems.

This course is one of two Foundations courses that you will take in the area of Social and Behavioral Sciences. Upon completing this area of Foundations, you will be able to: 1) explore and recognize basic terms, concepts, and domains of the social and behavioral sciences; 2) comprehend diverse theories and methods of the social and behavioral sciences; 3) identify human behavioral patterns across space and time and discuss their interrelatedness and distinctiveness; 4) enhance your understanding of the social world through the application of conceptual frameworks from the social and behavioral sciences to first-hand engagement with contemporary issues.

This course is one of four Foundations courses that you will take in the area of Humanities and Fine Arts. Upon completing of this area of Foundations, you will be able to: 1) analyze written, visual, or performed texts in the humanities and fine arts with sensitivity to their diverse cultural contexts and historical moments; 2) describe various aesthetic and other value systems and the ways they are communicated across time and cultures; 3) identify issues in the humanities that have personal and global relevance; 4) demonstrate the ability to approach complex problems and ask complex questions drawing upon knowledge of the humanities.

Explorations

Courses that fulfill the 9-unit requirement for Explorations in General Education take the goals and skills of GE Foundations courses to a more advanced level. Your three upper division courses in Explorations will provide greater interdisciplinary, more complex and in-depth theory, deeper investigation of local problems, and wider awareness of global challenges. More extensive reading, written analysis involving complex comparisons, well-developed arguments, considerable bibliography, and use of technology are appropriate in many Explorations courses.

This is an Explorations course in Natural Sciences. Completing this course will help you learn to do the following with greater depth: 1) explain basic concepts and theories of the natural sciences; 2) use logic and scientific methods to analyze the natural world and solve problems; 3) argue from multiple perspectives about issues in natural science that have personal and global relevance; 4) use technology in laboratory and field situations to connect concepts and theories with real-world phenomena.

This is an Explorations course in Social and Behavioral Sciences. Completing this course will help you learn to do the following with greater depth: 1) explore and recognize basic terms, concepts, and domains of the social and behavioral sciences; 2) comprehend diverse theories and methods of the social and behavioral sciences; 3) Identify human behavioral patterns across space and time and discuss their interrelatedness and distinctiveness; 4) enhance your understanding of the social world through the application of conceptual frameworks from the social and behavioral sciences to first-hand engagement with contemporary issues.

This is an Explorations course in the Humanities and Fine Arts. Completing this course will help you to do the following in greater depth: 1) analyze written, visual, or performed texts in the humanities and fine arts with sensitivity to their diverse cultural contexts and historical moments; 2) describe various aesthetic and other value systems and the ways they are communicated across time and cultures; 3) identify issues in the humanities that have personal and global relevance; 4) demonstrate the ability to approach complex problems and ask complex questions drawing upon knowledge of the humanities.
For existing courses: Complete a course modification via CurricUNET.

For either new or existing courses, the following procedures for dissemination of information apply:

**Initial Dissemination**
- Contact the chair of any department whose course offerings may overlap the proposed course. Attach correspondence showing approval to the proposal record.
- Course proposals for General Education shall be reviewed by the individual and/or committee responsible for curriculum within the college.

**College Level Decisions**
- Each college shall develop a procedure for informing all departments within the college about proposed changes to General Education sufficiently in advance of college curriculum committee meetings to allow for consultation.

**Campus Level Decisions**
- Final comments from departments in the college shall be sent to the college curriculum committee chair and the sponsor of the proposal at least three days before the meeting.
- Conflicts that appear to be motivated by college-level issues shall be decided by the college committee before the course is forwarded to Academic Affairs. Conflicts that focus on the relationship of the proposed course to GE goals and criteria shall be handled by the SDSU General Education Committee.
- Conflicts focusing on the relationship of the proposed course to GE goals and criteria and all inter-college issues shall be decided by the General Education Committee.

(Approved by the University General Education Committee April 22, 1982; Revised: March 8, 1983; October 4, 1988; April 13, 1989; May 1991; May 1999; February 2003; March 2008; June 2010)


All General Education courses shall be offered with enrollment at least once every three years at any San Diego State University campus. Any course not offered during this time shall be dropped from the General Education program. Departments who wish to have a deleted course reinstated in General Education should submit a proposal for reinstatement through the regular curricular process. Justification for the reinstatement should be included.
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Although the word syllabus (Latin for “list”) can be traced to ancient Greek words meaning “table of contents,” modern universities such as SDSU now depend on syllabi to fulfill many functions both within and beyond the boundaries of particular courses and/or classes.

**Institutional Functions of the Syllabus**

San Diego State University currently maintains no compendium of course descriptions beyond the 40-word (maximum) catalog description although, in recent years, it has begun to archive course proposals. This means that for the vast majority of our courses, the individual class syllabus is the only institutional record of the purpose or conduct of instruction. Syllabi thus constitute an important part of SDSU’s institutional memory which is accessed by diverse entities, including:

- Discipline-specific accrediting agencies as well as WASC, the Western Association for Schools and Colleges;
- Curriculum committees at various levels that are attempting to understand how the course fits into the curriculum as a whole or how to articulate courses with other departments or institutions;
- Technicians at other institutions who need to determine what kind of credit to assign to transfer students;
- Other instructors who will teach the course, perhaps after a primary instructor of record has retired or moved away;
- Advisers who are attempting to match student needs and interests with available courses or to help students address recency requirements for degrees;
- Personnel committees that are evaluating an instructor’s teaching effectiveness; and
- Students who want to make informed enrollment decisions.

**Teaching and Learning Functions of the Syllabus**

Although many syllabi are the product of collegial collaboration and consultation, maintenance and development of an effective syllabus is probably the single most important responsibility of an individual instructor.

Why? Because, by university policy, a class syllabus describes the purpose and scope of the course, outlines expected learning outcomes, describes the structure and sequence of activities and assignments, and explains grading policies. Thus, a syllabus reflects the organizing framework for most other course materials and learning resources.

Many instructors underestimate the powerful payoffs of a thoughtful and well-organized syllabus, which include:

- **More motivated students** who are able to focus on expected student learning outcomes, required assignments, and grading standards because these are clearly explained—and more students who understand the overall purpose of the course and who “get” how individual assignments and activities are part of the “big picture.”

- **More organized and thoughtful students** who can build on the syllabus document by adding their own notes and comments. Providing important instructions only as verbal announcements increases the likelihood they will be misunderstood, remain buried in lecture notes, or be missed entirely by students who come late or miss a class.

- **More students who plan ahead** in preparing deliverables and meeting deadlines. Most SDSU students work and/or commute to campus and appreciate clear scheduling of dates for major deliverables and exams. But there are other reasons for emphasizing the scheduling functions of syllabi: Psychologists now understand that the brains of young adults continue to develop into their mid-twenties and among the last cognitive functions to mature are those concerned with planning and predicting consequences. Well-organized syllabi help students to plan ahead as they work on projects and other major assignments by suggesting intermediate milestones and recommended study plans. Although some instructors feel such planning should be left to students, reviews of explicit timelines can serve as scaffolding for maturation of student planning capacities.
Reduced instructor workload concerned with ad hoc clarifications and explanations of confusing expectations ranging from classroom etiquette, to access to learning resources, to due dates and exam content, to policies on contacting the instructor. Time savings to students and instructors from clear and well-organized syllabi are likely to increase as a function of class size. It only takes a few misunderstandings with a large number of students to cancel out any time saved by a cursory syllabus.

Reduced “hassles” and disputes resulting from incomplete information about due dates and grading methods and policies. The Office of the University Ombudsman has identified poor syllabi as the single most important cause of student grievances.

Syllabi as Living Documents
Students are often frustrated and confused by ad hoc changes in course scheduling and requirements. Indeed, University policy forbids major departures from a class syllabus, once it has been issued, except for compelling reasons. Yet, viewed across semesters, syllabi can be seen as “living documents” (to be revised repeatedly over many offerings of a course and benefiting over time from incremental improvements and iterative design). It is often difficult for instructors to develop a mature and robust syllabus without experimentation and some trial-and-error; it may take several iterations of a course to sort through the best ways to implement requirements and recommendations summarized on the following pages. Outstanding syllabi often evolve from humble beginnings as cursory documents.

For these reasons, instructors may find it useful to treat their own copy of the syllabus as a framework (or notebook) for capturing data about problems and opportunities as the semester unfolds. Evidence of student confusion, options for improved organization and mechanics, and possibilities for enhanced teaching and learning strategies can be noted and recorded for future, improved versions.
Syllabus Checklist: Essential and Recommended Content

1. Information from the official schedule of classes

Since students may acquire a syllabus through a variety of means or be unable to attend the first class session, include the essential information students need to locate and enroll in the course and class section.

- **Essential**
  - □ Course number and title.
  - □ Semester and year.
  - □ Meeting dates, times, and places.
  - □ Schedule number unless suppressed in the official schedule of classes.

- **Recommended**
  - □ Special information on prerequisites, enrollment, and crashing policies.

2. Explicit, public description of the course

University policy requires that a syllabus describe a course’s purpose and scope. Include the standard catalog description of the course syllabi as well as an amplified description reflecting the way the particular course offering is “operationalized.” Syllabi may be used routinely to determine course equivalency in transfer situations, to resolve grievance cases, and for other purposes involving administration and advisement.

- **Essential**
  - □ Description from the official course catalog.
  - □ Description of scope and purpose of course.

3. Contact with instructor(s)

Policies and procedures for contacting instructors vary widely. At a minimum, university policy requires that faculty “shall hold regular office hours and shall post a schedule for those hours.”

- **Essential**
  - □ Basic contact information.

- **Recommended**
  - □ Multiple points of contact (e.g., available by phone, in person, by email).
  - □ Variety of office hours convenient to students.
  - □ Rules and/or policies regarding contact (when and about what students may contact the instructor via phone, email, etc.).

4. Student Learning Outcome Statements

University policies require that syllabi describe expected student learning outcomes. Almost all accrediting bodies now consider student learning outcomes and how they are assessed to be major issues in periodic reviews of institutional effectiveness. Accreditation standards have also shifted to emphasize the importance of outcomes that reflect the ability of students to actively analyze, synthesize, or evaluate rather than simply recall or comprehend information (i.e., more focus on broad competencies of transformation and less on storage and recall of topical content).

For more on how to formulate and write student learning outcome statements, see page 62 in this guide and go to [http://dus.sdsu.edu/assessment/](http://dus.sdsu.edu/assessment/)

(continued)
4. Student Learning Outcome Statements (continued)

**Essential**
- 5-10 student learning outcome statements for the course as a whole, consistent with the purpose and scope of the course.
- Expected learning outcomes stated as observable/measurable capabilities, capacities, or performance—not merely understand, know, demonstrate knowledge of, be familiar with.
- Student learning outcome statements are consistent with grading policies and procedures.

**Recommended**
- Outcomes emphasize dynamic student capabilities rather than mere recall or comprehension of content topics. They often employ “active verbs” to describe how students will demonstrate their capacities:
  - analyze
  - assess
  - compare
  - create
  - critique
  - depict
  - elucidate
  - implement
  - predict
  - solve
- Outcomes organized (e.g., listed, themed, grouped, or classified).
- Supplementary or more detailed learning outcomes are used to clarify the purpose or intent of specific assignments or activities.

5. Course activity sequences

A carefully designed and written description of course activities and assignments will help students stay on track and avoid confusion. Instructors often find that building in a few “buffer” sessions (not necessarily labeled as such) allows them to make adjustments in activities or assignments without the confusion attendant in re-issuing a course schedule.

**Essential**
- Due dates for major assignments and exams and method for submitting assignments.

**Recommended**
- Agenda for each class period, including topics, activities, and, if possible, expected learning outcomes.
- Major milestones for intermediate work products and dates identified or highlighted (e.g., drafts, practice exams, rehearsals, informal meetings).

6. Assessment and grading

No other aspect of syllabus content results in more confusion and disputes than grading. Lack of clarity about the nature and scope of exams often leads to misunderstandings as well. No exam can assess every possible topic or problem so that it is widely understood by students and instructors alike that exams will in some way sample the domain of the course.

However, such sampling should not reduce expectations about exams to mere guessing games that disempower students and can lead to fatalism and learned helplessness. Assist students to prepare for exams by reviewing student learning outcomes statements and by providing example and/or practice items consistent with both the outcomes statements and the actual exam items.

One of the most important strategies for developing well-rounded students and for accommodating diverse students’ experiences and abilities is to vary assignments and assessment methods. Overuse of any one particular modality or measure of competence—such as formal exams or academic papers—can deny students the opportunity to demonstrate their competencies in other ways.

(continued)
6. Assessment and grading (continued)

**Essential**
- Grading methods consistent with stated student learning outcomes.
- Standards, logistics, timelines, and other requirements for students regarding submittals.
- Amount of assessment/grading appropriate to scope/purpose of course.

**Recommended**
- Explicit criteria for grading student work products issued early enough for students to use them as guidelines for preparation or study.
- Assignments varied in scope and emphasis (e.g., size and grade-weighting).
- Diverse modalities of assessment (e.g., journal, outline, essay, report, charts, tables, photo/audio/video).
- Varied assessment/grading methods (e.g., timed test, take home exam, oral performance, essay, multiple-choice).
- Methods used in major assessments such as exams are consistent with previous opportunities for practice and feedback.

7. Overview of venues, environments, and media to be employed

Student expectations regarding venues for course communications and activity are rapidly shifting towards a nearly universal assumption that basic course information and materials will be available online, particularly for larger courses. SDSU automatically creates a BlackBoard course site for every course and populates it with student enrollment data, although it does not require that such sites be activated by the instructor. For more information, go to [http://blackboard.sdsu.edu](http://blackboard.sdsu.edu)

Faculty should check with your department administrative coordinator regarding requirements and options for notifying students in footnotes of the official schedule of classes regarding special scheduling or equipment requirements.

**Essential**
- Description of where and how materials, resources and environments provided by the university to students can be accessed/obtained.
- Policies and procedures or how these can be accessed.

**Recommended**
- Whether and how course will employ BlackBoard, the university’s course management system.
- Description of activities and assignments, differentiates between team-group assignments and individual work.

8. Materials and resources to be obtained by students

Syllabi should identify specialized equipment and tools required of students as well as conventional print materials.

Aztec Shops offers extensive services to assist faculty to order textbooks and customized materials. See [https://www2.aztecshops.com/faculty.aspx](https://www2.aztecshops.com/faculty.aspx)

The library summarizes online support for faculty at [http://infodome.sdsu.edu/faculty/faculty.shtml](http://infodome.sdsu.edu/faculty/faculty.shtml)

Faculty should check with your department administrative coordinator regarding requirements and options for notifying students in footnotes of the schedule of classes regarding special scheduling requirements.

**Essential**
- Description, approximate prices, and how to obtain.
- Purpose and use (e.g., will a book be read intensively or used as occasional reference).

**Recommended**
- Materials and resource descriptions well organized (e.g., by type, purpose, topic, theme).
- Additional descriptions of optional resources—conceptual or practical—as appropriate.
9. **General appearance, readability, and usability of syllabus**  
(additional criteria apply to Web sites)

The appearance and organization of a syllabus may influence student perceptions of the organization of the course’s content and activities—and the organization and competence of the instructor as well.

**Essential**
- Readable fonts and font size.
- Headings, (and for longer syllabi, subheads) and page numbers.
- Adequate margin space for student notes.

**Recommended**
- Effective use of tables, lists, numbering, and other indexing devices to enhance reference to particular elements during discussions or other course-related communication.
- Elements requiring repeated access by students (such as dates and assignments) are organized concisely for ready access.
- Adequate white space throughout syllabus.
- Consistent formatting.

### Additional Recommended Syllabus Content

10. **Rationale for sequence of topics and assignments**

Students often ask (or think about asking) for more guidance in understanding how class assignments and activities fit into larger themes related to the course’s scope and purpose. Consider including in the syllabus flags and pointers that remind students of the connections between individual activities and larger themes and goals of the course. Then review and expand upon these at appropriate times during the semester.

- Overview explains how topics and assignments fit into the learning arc of the semester.
- Elements of the overview are linked to or related to projects and assignments.
- Specific activities and assignments are linked to or related to major course learning outcomes.

11. **Support for general academic development and skills training**

Consider using the syllabus as a device for orienting students to study strategies or patterns appropriate to the scope and purpose of the course. Many younger students have learned in high school to expect that “homework” is primarily designed to “follow-up” on themes introduced during a class session whereas college courses often benefit from homework preparatory to class sessions.

- Strategies for study, preparation, and engagement.
- Time management skills.
- Pointers to workshops or special training for skill, development related to course.
- Implicit development of general academic skills not identified in student learning outcome statements.
12. Accommodations for students with disabilities

University policy requires that faculty cooperate with Student Disability Services in providing authorized accommodations for eligible students.

Although not required by official policy, syllabi should include language that encourages eligible students to identify themselves to the instructor. For more information on faculty responsibilities, see http://www.sa.sdsu.edu/sds/sds-main/facstaff.html

- Explicit statement indicating respect for and willingness to accommodate disabilities and protect student’s confidentiality regarding disability issues.
- Indicates the appropriate means by which an eligible student can confer with the instructor on a confidential basis or in a private setting.

13. Orient students to engage with activities and assignments

Although abbreviated syllabi often stick to the bare essentials, an amplified syllabus can reinforce connections and meaning for students. Use the syllabus to indicate ways in which the course design builds on students’ prior knowledge and experience. Help students to understand the benefits of the new capabilities they will develop whether these benefits are psychic, or entirely practical.

- Build on students’ prior experience and knowledge.
- Explain benefits or value (of assignments and learning outcomes).
- Relate learning to situations (real world or otherwise) that provide context and meaning.
- Structure social organization (e.g., individual, group-team, community forum, or discussion).
- Diverse modalities of deliverables (e.g., journal, outline, essay, report, charts, tables, photo/audio/video).
- Interactive (require more than mere attendance or passive reception of content).

14. Student privacy and intellectual property

Federal Law (FERPA) imposes important obligations on instructors to ensure the confidentiality of student grades and other evaluation of student work. For example, instructors may not distribute or post grades in a way that allows anyone other than the individual student to access them. In addition, university policy grants to students intellectual property rights to work products they create as part of a course unless they are formally notified otherwise. Therefore, syllabi should notify students of special provisions regarding use or distribution of their work.

- Policies and procedures assure privacy of student grades and feedback on individual assignments or ensure that students have granted written waivers.
- Students notified at the time of an assignment if copies of students work will be retained beyond the end of the semester and/or used as examples for future students or the wider public.

15. Syllabus as social “contract” or agreement regarding expected student behavior, performance, and deportment

Although university policy does not accord syllabi the status of formal legal contracts, a course syllabus provides an excellent opportunity for instructors to clarify the obligations and responsibilities of the members of the course “learning community.”

- Description/explanation of student and faculty responsibilities for contributing to a successful learning climate.
- Other policies regarding expectations—including consequences for behaviors such as academic dishonesty, uncivil, or disruptive behavior.
- Description of procedures and policies for addressing student or instructor concerns.
Access to Syllabi

University policy requires that instructors provide students with access to the class syllabus at or before the first class meeting except when circumstances beyond the control of the instructor prevent this. All instructors must make available to their department the most recent version of each syllabus.

Departments must retain and make accessible the most recent version of each syllabus. Although no formal policy currently requires that syllabi be available electronically, departments, in meeting this requirement, may want to consider the benefits of making syllabi available online or as downloadable files. Although many syllabi are posted on course sites maintained by BlackBoard, the university’s course management system, they are only accessible to enrolled students.

Ownership of Syllabus Content

SDSU’s generous intellectual property policies grant ownership of syllabus content to instructors in most circumstances, providing the instructor can clearly establish authorship. However, SDSU requires that it retain for use by its employees and students a license to any syllabus authored by an SDSU employee and used as a syllabus for an SDSU course offering. This allows syllabi to perform their function as part of SDSU’s institutional memory while not preventing instructors from using the syllabus at other institutions or in other settings. Instructors who have developed content beyond the basic content required by university policy for all syllabi and who want to protect that content from the licensing requirement should distribute it to students in another document such as a reader, workbook, or handbook.
Student Learning Outcomes

For more detailed information on learning outcomes, including tutorials on how to write outcome statements, see the SDSU Center for Teaching and Learning Web site at http://go.sdsu.edu/dus/ctl/

Nearly every accrediting agency in the United States now expects colleges and universities to use student learning outcome statements to clarify the educational purpose of programs and courses and to provide a basis for assessment and improvement. The ability of SDSU faculty and administrators to use learning outcome statements as a basis for planning instruction, measuring results, and devising improvement strategies will be critical to future accreditation success and resource allocations.

As early as 1990, the CSU Board of Trustees endorsed the use of learning outcomes as a cornerstone for academic planning. Later it adopted learning outcome statements to articulate broad, system-wide priorities for CSU graduates. For example:

- Integrate knowledge across discipline boundaries.
- Locate, analyze, and synthesize information.
- Make both qualitative and quantitative assessments.
- Appreciate and value cultures other than one’s own.

SDSU policy requires that all course syllabi and course proposals include statements of expected student learning outcomes. Although policies do not dictate specific numbers of outcome statements, 5-10 outcomes, carefully aligned with the major course purposes and themes, are often enough to communicate essential expectations.

What are Learning Outcome Statements?

Student learning outcome statements succinctly describe student capacities – observable and measurable manifestations of knowledge, skills, and attitudes—attained as a result of some learning process or educational experience. The simplest format for outcome statements consists of an action verb and a noun phrase:

- Classify vertebrate specimens.
- Employ metaphors in rhetorical arguments.
- Explain convective effects.
- Predict returns on invested capital.
- Choose to participate in civic affairs.

Learning outcome statements express intentions for learning and describe how students can demonstrate what they have learned. In this sense, they describe some of the ways learning will empower or enable students. Thus, learning outcomes provide a foundation for communicating (and in some cases negotiating) with students about academic responsibilities.

At a collegial and programmatic level, learning outcome statements can help faculty and administrators understand and plan the structure of the curriculum, estimate student and instructor work loads, communicate with SDSU stakeholders, and market degree and certificate programs.

Learning outcomes seem strange to some faculty, perhaps because traditional approaches to academic learning often emphasize transmission of topical information (“covering the content”) with little regard for explicit student competencies. It is therefore unsurprising that, in their first attempts at writing outcomes, faculty often merely amend conventional topical expressions with very general verbs such as “know,” “understand,” “demonstrate knowledge,” and “appreciate.” These are essentially placeholders for more considered and precise action verbs.

Student Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place holder verbs</th>
<th>More precise action verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Know</strong> the policies</td>
<td>Identify the policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Understand</strong> the margin of error</td>
<td>Define “margin of error.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demonstrate knowledge</strong> of catalysis</td>
<td>Describe examples of catalysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appreciate</strong> mid-century 20th century jazz composition</td>
<td>Analyze thematic development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Syllabi often contain seeds of intention that can be developed into more concrete descriptions of expected learning outcomes.

### Syllabus Excerpts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broad Statements of Abstract Intent</th>
<th>Possible Learning Outcome Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students should have a thorough understanding of the statistical margin of error.</td>
<td>You should be able to <strong>describe</strong> and <strong>explain</strong> how the margin of error changes when standard deviation, population size, or confidence interval are altered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We will explore the influence of traditional, modern, and post-modern perspectives on the role of religion in contemporary American spiritual life.</td>
<td>We will learn to <strong>compare and contrast</strong> the influence of traditional, modern, and post-modern perspectives on the role of religion in contemporary American spiritual life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of political issues will encourage open exchanges and tolerance of other views.</td>
<td>During discussions about politics, students will be able to listen to other speakers well enough to: <strong>verbally summarize</strong> the other speakers’ views, <strong>seek clarification</strong> from the original speaker, and <strong>incorporate clarifications</strong> in a revised summary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no final answer regarding what it means to “know the content” other than clarification through discussion and negotiation. Yet many students benefit from clarity of expectations and find clear outcome statements to be a useful guide to preparation, study, and engagement.
Student Learning Outcomes

Outcome Statements as a Foundation for Student Grading and Program Assessment

Learning outcome statements serve as anchors for grading individual student performance as well as for measuring the overall effectiveness of courses and programs. As suggested in the diagram below, the underlying assumption in either case is that assessment instruments should be consistent with course or program learning outcome statements and learning activities and environments.

Examples of Consistency Between Outcomes and Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Statement</th>
<th>Inconsistent</th>
<th>Consistent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify the formula for the standard deviation.</td>
<td>Calculate the standard deviation.</td>
<td>Mark the formula for the standard deviation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predict effects of convection.</td>
<td>Define convection.</td>
<td>Use arrows to indicate air flow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critique pointillist compositions.</td>
<td>Match these impressionist paintings with the appropriate artist.</td>
<td>Outline the artist's presumed intentions and the likely effects on viewers of this painting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze environmental policy.</td>
<td>List the major causes of environmental degradation in the Coastal Redwood Forests.</td>
<td>Which of these is not a direct implication of the policy excerpt on mitigation?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment of Individual Student Performance for Grading. Instructors can promote understanding of grading and assessment by reviewing learning outcome statements with students in conjunction with discussion of exams and assignments and by using outcome statements as a basis for designing exam questions and rubrics for evaluating assignments. Consistency between learning outcome statements and grading methods/policies reduces confusion about grading which is, according to the Office of the University Ombudsman, the most frequent source of student complaints and grievances.

Aligning grading methods with learning outcome statements also provides a framework for diagnosing individual student learning problems by allowing instructors or programs to target specific competencies for improvement. Some departments maintain individual student records of outcomes attained to ensure that students meet minimum competency requirements.

Assessment of Courses and Program Effectiveness. Measuring the effectiveness of courses and academic programs involves many questions about learning outcomes that transcend mere summation of student grades. Does a course promote lifelong learning? Will a program meet professional standards or employer expectations? Does it prepare students for civic engagement or appreciation of diverse cultural expressions?

These questions clearly go beyond what can be measured within the boundaries of course requirements or grades, but that does not mean such questions cannot be measured periodically as a basis for improvement or adjustment of courses or academic programs. When the purpose of such assessment is primarily improvement of SDSU courses and programs, methods of data collection and analysis need not be as comprehensive or rigorous as might be required for generalizable research studies.

Using Outcome Statements to Guide Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Examples of Possible Assessment Strategies (occasional or periodic)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promote lifelong learning.</td>
<td>Randomized survey of students following graduation to estimate the extent they continue to learn on their own through reading or self-study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet performance standards in a profession or occupation.</td>
<td>Focus groups with selected employers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage in civic affairs and appreciate diverse cultural expressions</td>
<td>Telephone interviews with students regarding volunteer community work, voting activity, participation in cultural events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student performance on standardized tests.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructional Quality and Continuous Improvement

SDSU has entered an era in which, more than ever, it must adjust educational programs and courses to changing realities: rapid expansion of human knowledge, changing demographics and cultural values, new global problems and opportunities, increased demands for cost-effectiveness and innovative technologies for learning and knowledge management.

Major accreditation standards and stakeholder expectations will increasingly challenge the university to employ systems of continuous assessment to replace older periodic or occasional data collection conducted primarily in response to pending academic reviews. Yet ultimately, as suggested by the diagram below, course and program assessment have little value unless faculty and program administrators employ assessment data to drive decisions about how to improve the effectiveness of teaching and learning.
Concurrent Programs Leading to Two Graduate Degrees

Objective
Policy
Procedure
Concurrent Programs Leading to Two Graduate Degrees

(Policy adopted by the Graduate Council, February 19, 1988)

Objective

The purpose of offering a concurrent program of graduate study leading to the conferring of two advanced degrees is to serve students with interests in two disciplines. Such students can be allowed to waive certain overlapping requirements and pursue a program of study to take advantage of a specific career opportunity and the unique interdisciplinary perspective that a combined study of these two disciplines can offer. In no case should a concurrent program result from the merely arbitrary meshing together of two distinct sets or requirements. Rather, the program should reflect a single organic and unified field of study which crosses current disciplinary lines for reasons integral to the methods or subject matter.

Concurrent programs may, therefore, be appropriate in certain professional areas that require similar common experiences (internships, research methodology, or supporting academic subjects outside the major area) or in those areas where traditional academic disciplines have come to share interest in a common subject.

In all cases, concurrent programs require that the student be carefully advised so the academic components of the program are as comprehensive as possible for both degree areas while also providing a common substantive core. Thus, only certain highly qualified students, usually with significant experience, such as professional employment, or advanced standing in one or more areas of knowledge applicable to the degree(s), should be admitted to a concurrent program. When a concurrent program of study is offered, the normal condition is for the student to complete the two degrees in approximately 25 percent less time than if the two degrees were taken serially.

Policy

1. Normally, all concurrent programs at the graduate level will be from existing professional two-year degree offerings: MFA, MPH, MSW, MCP, MBA, MS in Rehabilitation Counseling, or MS in Counseling, or similar professional degrees from other institutions with approved cooperative academic programs.

2. Under exceptional conditions the Graduate Council will consider proposals for concurrent programs where only one of the degrees is a two-year applied and professional degree or where the program is based on two discipline-based (MA, MS) degrees.

3. The concurrent program unit total in relation to the unit value of the two degrees taken serially should not exceed a reduction of about 25 percent.

4. It must be demonstrated that the unit reduction proposed for the concurrent program involves overlapping requirements and does not reduce the educational value and content of the separate degrees and that graduates from the concurrent program will be fully qualified to carry out all of the responsibilities that pertain to graduates of the two separate programs. Acceptable reductions could be through shared internships and practicum experiences; a carefully specified, shared body of knowledge in relation to theory and method; or in similar required supporting courses outside the major area.

5. Concurrent programs of study leading to two graduate degrees will usually be intended for very specific career objectives. Proposals for concurrency must include information about the career opportunities and justify the accelerated concurrent program as necessary relative to these career objectives.

6. The sponsoring departments shall form a concurrent graduate program faculty advisory committee which shall take responsibility for recommending admission, advising, and advancement.

7. Concurrent graduate programs require a substantial ability to integrate and apply knowledge beyond that necessary for either single degree. The prospective student will meet the minimum admission standards of both single degree programs.

8. Similarly, students applying for advancement to candidacy will meet both program requirements for such advancement.
9. All concurrent graduate degree programs must include one thesis or project (Plan A) culminating experience integrating methods and interests from both programs.

10. If a student in a concurrent graduate program returns to a single degree program, none of the provisions of the concurrent degree program of this policy shall pertain.

11. Transfer units will not be accepted toward a concurrent graduate program of study. (See, however, the provisions of Item 1 with respect to cooperative programs with other institutions.)

12. Previous graduate study or prior degrees will not be accepted toward meeting the unit requirements of the concurrent graduate program of study.

Procedure

Proposals for concurrent programs leading to two graduate degrees are processed through the regular curricular process as outlined in this guide. The following information should be provided in the request for concurrent degree programs.

1. Purpose and objectives of the program. Include information about career opportunities and justify the accelerated concurrent program as necessary relative to these career objectives.

2. Total unit reduction in program in relation to unit value of the two degrees. What courses that are included in the two separate degree programs have been deleted for students in the concurrent program?

3. Bulletin copy (catalog output blocks) to include:
   - General information.
   - Admission requirements.
   - Specific requirements for program information listed in items 10, 11, and 12 under “Policy” heading above must be included in bulletin copy.
Academic Master Plan

Procedures for Submitting Proposals for New Degree Major Programs for Inclusion on San Diego State Academic Master Plan

Mission of the University

Summary of Trustee and System Policies Governing Academic Planning

Guidelines for New Bachelor’s Degree Majors
Procedures for Submitting Requests for New Degree Major Programs for Inclusion on the San Diego State Academic Master Plan

Requests for new degree programs should be submitted through the college curricular screening committee and the dean of the college to curriculum services, no later than March 1 each year, for consideration for inclusion on the Academic Master Plan for San Diego State University.

Proposals are viewed by the Academic Policy and Planning and Academic Resources Planning Committees and are submitted to the Senate as an information item before being forwarded to the office of the Chancellor.

From there, proposals go to the Board of Trustees who have final authority for placing degrees on the Academic Master Plan. Typically, action is taken by the Trustees on this matter during the month of January.

The following format should be followed in submitting requests for new degrees.

1. Full and exact designation (degree terminology) for the proposed degree program, and academic year of intended implementation.
2. Name of department(s) which would offer the proposed degree program.
3. Name, title, and rank of the individuals who will be primarily responsible for drafting the proposed degree.
4. Reason for and objectives of the proposed degree program. Also include preliminary expected learning outcomes.
5. Student demand.
   a. The expected number of majors in the year of initiation and three years thereafter.
   b. The expected number of graduates in the year of initiation and three years thereafter.
   a. Indicate the kind of resource assessment used in deciding to request to place the program on the academic plan.
   b. If additional resources will be required, there should be an indication of commitment to secure them.
7. If the program is an occupational or professional one, summarize the need for graduates with the specific educational background.
8. If the new degree program is now offered as an option, include a brief rationale for the conversion.
9. If the new program is not commonly offered as a bachelor's or master's degree, provide a compelling academic rationale explaining how the proposed subject area constitutes a coherent, integrated degree major which has potential value to students.
10. If the proposal does not appear to conform to the Trustee policy calling for “broadly based programs,” rationale should be provided.
11. Describe the relation of the program to the mission and goals of SDSU.

In some areas, program development is limited or guided by system or CPEC policy. Subjects where there are specific policy guidelines include architecture, computer science, engineering, fine and applied arts, health professions, home economics, and industrial arts and technology. “Guidelines for Breadth in New Bachelor's Degree Majors” (EP&R 85-13, See page 74) and “Definitions of Graduate Level Instruction” (EP&R 82-39, See pages 153-156) should also be consulted in the preparation of summary statements for new programs.
Mission of the University
The mission of San Diego State University is to provide well-balanced, high quality education for undergraduate and graduate students and to contribute to knowledge and the solution of problems through excellence and distinction in teaching, research, and service.

The university serves to impart an appreciation and broad understanding of human experience throughout the world and the ages. This education extends to diverse cultural legacies; accomplishments in many areas, such as the arts and technology; the advancement of human thought including philosophy and science; the development of economic, political and social institutions; and the physical and biological evolution of humans and their environment. San Diego State University accomplishes this through its many and diverse departments and interdisciplinary programs in the creative and performing arts, the humanities, the natural and physical sciences, and the social and behavioral sciences.

Academic Goals
SDSU has adopted the following academic goals to sustain and strengthen its position as a leading university:

• To encourage the intellectual and creative development of a diverse group of students by helping them learn about themselves and others, their own and other cultural and social heritages, and their environment;

• To foster development of critical thinking, reading, oral communication, quantitative and qualitative analysis as well as a commitment to lifelong learning and international perspectives needed to contribute to communities and chosen fields of endeavor;

• To provide the basis for informed citizenship in a democracy;

• To offer advanced undergraduate and graduate students professional training and preparation for further study in a broad range of disciplines, with a special emphasis on the preparation of teachers;

• To support faculty in developing specialized contributions to knowledge, including innovative curriculum and pedagogy responsive to intellectual and professional needs of undergraduate, master’s, and doctoral students;

• To support faculty in their professionally related community activities and informed exchanges with diverse professional and lay communities that strengthen the university’s courses and scholarship;

• To encourage scholarship, including creative and performing arts, by students, faculty and administrators from all areas of the university; and

• To continue our commitment to research, including the expansion of externally funded projects and doctoral programs where appropriate.

San Diego State University pursues its mission and goals through shared vision, a community-wide conversation out of which five goals were identified by a broad cross section of faculty, staff, students, administrators, alumni, parents, and community leaders:

• Academic excellence in all SDSU’s programs and offerings;

• Educational opportunities for the whole person, both inside and outside the classroom;

• The appreciation of diversity in its many manifestations and social justice within the university community;

• The wise use of our precious human and fiscal resources; and

• An international institution where pupils become global citizens.

The vision that first motivated our founders continues to energize us. We are a community of learners, of all ages and levels of experience, engaged in a continuous journey of invention, creation and discovery.
Summary of Trustee and System Policies Governing Academic Planning
(EP&R 85-19, updated AAP 91-15)

A. Trustee Guidelines

The following is a summary of academic planning policies which have been adopted over time by the Board of Trustees:

1. Curricula are to reflect the needs of students and of the State.

2. 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.]

3. 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.

4. “All colleges 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.

5. While all colleges may wish to offer the same programs, the trustees exercise great selectivity in the final approval of new curricula.

6. 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:

7. Degree programs are to be broadly based and of high academic quality.

8. Unnecessary proliferation of degrees and terminologies is to be avoided.

9. A formal review of existing curricula is to be conducted by each campus for campus master planning (facilities).

B. Guidelines recommended by the Division of Academic Affairs, Plans (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 five-year or ten-year Academic Master Plan of each campus:

1. Are the anticipated resources of the campus (primarily in terms of existing faculty positions and new faculty positions anticipated from total campus enrollment growth) sufficient to initiate and sustain all of the programs offered and projected? If not, will some faculty positions be reassigned from existing programs, or will the number of projected programs be reduced?

2. Is there a campus commitment to placing resources into the development of new programs rather than into existing programs?

For each program projected on the Academic Master Plan:

1. Does this program fill an unmet need in terms of (a) student demand or (b) statewide or regional manpower needs? If neither of these, is there a compelling rationale for the program?

2. Is the new program the most efficient way of meeting the need identified, or are there other alternatives?
3. Are expectations about student enrollment realistic when compared with experience at other campuses?

4. 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?

5. If the program is one which 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 not, is this a wise investment of campus and State resources?

6. If the program is one which is designed to provide professional upgrading of individuals who are already employed, are there openings in the higher professional levels?

7. Will failure to implement this program require altering other plans of the campus? Will some instructional areas be left incomplete?

C. Additional academic planning guidelines suggested by the Division of Academic Affairs, Plans; the Committee on Academic Planning and Program Review; and/or the Committee to Study Graduate Education in the CSU:

1. New master’s degree programs should be projected only where the sponsoring department is well established and has achieved a level of quality which has been affirmed by a program review or, in subjects where 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.

2. New master’s degree programs should be initiated only if they have the enrollment potential to support the offering of at least four graduate-level courses each year; there is evidence of the proposing department’s capacity to support the level of research required for a graduate program; and sufficient graduate-level coursework can be offered to permit a student’s graduate program to include 70 percent of such coursework.

3. Resource investments/reallocations in support of new programs should be sufficient to demonstrate the campus’ 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, each campus should seriously consider whether they should be initiated at all.

4. The Academic Master Plan should be more than a list of new programs. It should represent the collective opinion of campus constituencies about which designed 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.

5. New bachelor’s degrees should be as enduring as possible in content and title (see EP&R 85-13).

Policy Guidelines for Breadth in New Bachelor’s Degree Majors (EP&R 85-13)

Each California State University annually updates its Academic Master Plan—a five-year projection of new degree majors. Recent plans have revealed a trend toward creating new bachelor’s degree majors from fields previously offered as specializations within broader subjects. The trend is observable in professional and liberal arts disciplines alike. For example, unique degrees in Small Business Management, previously a subset of business, and in publishing and editing, traditionally part of English majors, have been among those proposed. There is a potential problem if the increasing specialization works against achieving some of the other expressed goals for the bachelor’s degree, if it limits students’ options in a changing environment and if, as a result, it does not serve students or society well.

The purpose of this paper is to address one aspect of specialization in bachelor’s degrees, namely the development of new degree majors that are highly specialized in title, content, or both. The paper proposes some guidelines for campus use in reviewing Academic Master Plan proposals for bachelor’s degree majors when those majors are in specialized subjects not generally or previously offered as majors in four-year colleges. Campuses may wish to add to these guidelines some of their own guidelines relating to specialization in options and concentrations.
Reasons for Increasing Specialization

Advances in knowledge typically cause changes in academic discipline content and structure and sometimes lead to whole new configurations. Some changes are critical to the vitality of the academic enterprise. But it appears that the current trend has among its causes several that are unrelated to a conception of the best ordering of knowledge or optimal ways of imparting values, understandings, theory, and competence. The kind of specialization currently observable in new majors (and sometimes in changes within existing majors) appears instead to result from artificial pressures. Some of the pressures arise from business and industry and from public officials concerned about the state of local or regional economies. Some arise from within the university by those anxious to provide an apparent variety of choice in curriculum without major resource expenditure or in response to enrollment pressures. But primarily the pressures are coming from students who associate specialization of program title, content, or both, with enhanced employability or graduate school admission. In the fall of 1983, the annual ACE-UCLA national survey of freshmen revealed that the ability to get a better job was cited by freshmen more often (76.2 percent of respondents) than any other reason for attending college. Surveys of faculty have suggested a disjunction between faculty and students in this respect. However, there are genuine differences of opinion about the desirability of narrowing the focus of bachelor’s degree majors. On the one hand, Bradford College president Art Levine has called the current curriculum a victim of the survival ethic. Others argue that most if not all important outcomes of college are independent of the major and that any subject can be taught in ways that produce breadth and perspective.

The Problem

We assume that most students, while generally needing to update their specialized skills and knowledge from time to time, will nevertheless earn only one bachelor’s degree in their lives. If we assume that the title and content of that degree continue to carry some kind of lifetime importance, then degree majors should be designed for comprehensiveness and durability—no matter how young or old the student. The comfort of knowing that there will be easy access to continuing education—the lifelong learning society—may lull us into neglecting responsibilities to ensure that the bachelor’s degree major is as comprehensive and enduring as it can possibly be. Specialized programs that use identified occupations or skills as their titles and their knowledge bases may enhance immediate employability, but they probably do so at the expense of long-term job satisfaction, adaptability, mobility, and employability. It may also be at the expense of limiting the broadening of perspectives which might enhance creativity or the ability to synthesize or to have enriched experiences in the work environment. Specialized programs not related to specific jobs may deny students both employability and breadth. This has also been the case, but it seems especially so given what we can reasonably expect of the future. The “post-industrial society,” the “information economy,” the “telecommunications age,” and the “post-Gutenberg era” may be overused slogans, but they suggest something important about planning bachelor’s degree majors: Imbuing the major with any kind of enduring value for students will require more effort than ever. Even with that effort and with lifetime opportunities for continuing education, that durability is threatened. It has been speculated that, within a few decades, everyone in the country will have access to nearly all accumulated information and knowledge. That is good news for those who value knowledge and learning. But even if general education programs succeed in imparting the understandings and skills needed by students to sort and use these quantities of information, we have not done enough for students or for society.

Steven Muller, president of the Johns Hopkins University, has wondered: “If we are serious about educating people to solve problems, is there anything left that enables people to integrate what they know, because we have compartmentalized knowledge so much? Are we in danger of having people who can manipulate data and hide it in compartmentalized ways?”
Some Topics for Discussion
While there are some convincing arguments for durability in the names and the content of bachelor's degree majors, there are some questions and issues which have no easy answers. There is some question that the bachelor's degree will survive as currently structured, yet proposals for new majors appear regularly and must be reviewed conscientiously. If knowledge “keeps no better than fish,” can we develop and state any reasonable expectations about the durability of the major for any given student? Can expectations about comprehensiveness be framed? What are our obligations to students, many of whom will not again be able or willing to invest the concentrated time required to complete a major? What guidelines will campus faculty use in deciding what kinds of majors should lead to the bachelor's degree? When majors are proposed which have not previously been offered at four-year colleges, what criteria shall be applied to determine their propriety? Can some common understandings, theories, and contexts be identified for these decisions? At least a short list would include the ability to develop and extend knowledge in the discipline—beyond existing limits.

Review Guidelines
Guidelines are needed for campus review of new academic master plan proposals, and those suggested here could be profitably refined after thoughtful campus discussion. The following guidelines are tentatively suggested for situations involving the elevation of options or specializations to degree status or for cases where highly specialized degrees not usually offered in four-year institutions are under consideration. The guidelines assume that “broadly based degrees of high academic quality” remain the norm in The California State University and that specialized degree programs are added only when there is compelling academic rationale to add them.

1. Are there alternative curricular structures that would better serve the purposes proposed?—i.e., should the subject be offered as a certificate, a minor, an option or concentration? Is the subject matter sufficiently complex to consider offering the program as a master's degree only? Might it be appropriate as a postbaccalaureate certificate?

2. Is there a body of knowledge which has become so sizable that unique degree status is a consequence of advancement of knowledge?

3. If the proposed degree program is preparatory to a specific occupation:
   a. Is the occupation likely to exist over the lifetime of the student?
   b. What is the probable lifetime of the knowledge or information that will be imparted in this major? Is the answer one that is satisfactory to the university?

4. Is the preparation narrowly conceived? If so, are there ways that preparation (and title) can be broadened?

5. Is the major accurately named?—i.e., is the title so narrow that it unnecessarily restricts student employment opportunities and mobility?

6. Does the major use as its foundation and prerequisites the methods, processes, skills, and knowledge of a core or basic academic discipline? If not, should it be offered at all?

7. Is the size of the major and degree of specialization going to be such as to call into question the broadly based nature of the bachelor's degree itself?

8. What provisions have been made to ensure continued breadth in the major?

Division of Educational Programs and Resources, August 1984; Revised February 1985.
New Degree Programs

Procedures for Submitting Proposals for Implementation of New Degree Major Programs (Bachelor's and Master's Levels)

Adding Self-Support Version of a Previously Approved State-Support Offering

Procedures for Developing Joint Doctoral Proposals

Procedures for Fast-Track and Pilot Programs
Procedures for Submitting Proposals for Implementation of New Degree Major Programs (Bachelor’s and Master’s Levels)


This document presents the format, criteria, and submission procedures for CSU bachelor’s and master’s degree program proposals. Please see the Academic Program Planning website for doctoral degree proposal formats. (http://www.calstate.edu/APP/)

Criteria
Proposals are subjected to system-level internal and external evaluation, through which reviewers seek evidence indicating that current campus budgetary support levels provide sufficient resources to establish and maintain the program. Review criteria include: curriculum, financial support, number and qualifications of faculty, physical facilities, library holdings, responsiveness to societal need and regional and workforce needs, academic assessment plans, and compliance with all applicable CSU policies, state laws, and accreditation standards.

Procedures
Before a proposal is submitted to the Chancellor’s Office, the campus adds the projected degree program to the campus academic plan. See “Procedures for Submitting Requests for New Degree Major Programs for Inclusion in the San Diego State Academic Master Plan.” Subsequent to the CSU Board of Trustees approval of the projection, a detailed, campus-approved program implementation proposal is submitted to Chancellor’s Office for review and approval. Proposals are to be submitted in the academic year preceding projected implementation. Only programs whose implementation proposals have been approved by the CSU Chancellor may enroll students. Campus Academic Plans appear in the Educational Policy Committee Agenda Item of the annual March meeting of the Board of Trustees.
CSU Degree Proposal: Faculty Check List

Please confirm ( ) that the following are included in the degree proposal:

☐ The total number of units required for graduation is specified (not just the total for the major):
  ☐ A proposed bachelor’s program requires no fewer than 120 semester units
  ☐ Any proposed bachelor’s degree program with requirements exceeding 120 units must provide a justification for the excess units

☐ Please specify the total number of prerequisite units required for the major.
  Note: The prerequisites must be included in the total program unit count.
  List all courses and unit counts that are prerequisite to the major:

☐ Title 5 minimum requirements for bachelor’s degree have been met, including:
  ☐ Minimum number of units in major (BA 24 semester units), (BS 36 semester units)
  ☐ Minimum number of units in upper-division (BA 12 semester units), (BS 18 semester units)

☐ Title 5 requirements for proposed master’s degree have been met, including:
  ☐ Minimum of 30 semester units of approved graduate work are required
  ☐ No more than 50% of required units are organized primarily for undergraduate students
  ☐ Maximum of 6 semester units are allowed for thesis or project
  ☐ Title 5 requirements for master’s degree culminating experience are clearly explained.
  ☐ For graduate programs, at least five-full time faculty with terminal degrees in appropriate disciplines are on staff.
CSU Degree Proposal: Faculty Check List– page 2
Please confirm (✓) that the following are included in the degree proposal:

☐ For self-support programs:
  ☐ Specification of how all required EO 1047 criteria are met
  ☐ The proposed program does not replace existing state-support courses or programs
  ☐ Explanation of why state funds are either inappropriate or unavailable
  ☐ A cost-recovery program budget is included *
  ☐ Student per-unit cost is specified
  ☐ Total cost for student to complete the program is specified

* Cost Recovery Budget Elements

- Revenue and Enrollment Projections
- Direct Expenses
  Instructional and Operational Costs
- Indirect Expenses
  Campus partners
  Campus reimbursement general fund
  Extended Education overhead
  Chancellor's Office overhead
- Reinvestment funds for program development
Proposals for Implementation of New Degree Major Programs

CSU Degree Program Proposal Template
Revised November 2013

Please Note:

- Campuses may mention proposed degree programs in recruitment material if it is specified that enrollment in the proposed program is contingent on final program authorization from the CSU Chancellor's Office.

- Approved degree programs will be subject to campus program review within five years after implementation. Program review should follow system and Board of Trustee guidelines (including engaging outside evaluators) and should not rely solely on accreditation review.

- Please refer to the document “Tips for Completing a Successful Program Proposal” (which follows this document) before completing a proposal in CurricUNET.

1. Program Type (Please specify any from the list below that apply—delete the others)
   a. State-Support
   b. Self-Support
   c. Delivery Type: Fully face to face, full online, or hybrid program
   d. Fast Track (bachelor's or master's only; not already on campus academic plan)
   e. Pilot (bachelor's or master's only; not already on campus academic plan)
   f. Pilot Conversion
   g. New Program
   h. Proposal Revision (updating a previously reviewed proposal)

2. Program Identification
   a. Campus
   b. Full and exact degree designation and title (e.g. Master of Science in Genetic Counseling, Bachelor of Arts with a Major in History).
   c. Date the Board of Trustees approved adding this program projection to the campus Academic Plan.
   d. Term and academic year of intended implementation (e.g. fall 2014).
   e. Total number of units required for graduation. This will include all requirements (and campus-specific graduation requirements), not just major requirements.
   f. Name of the department(s), division, or other unit of the campus that would offer the proposed degree major program. Please identify the unit that will have primary responsibility.
   g. Name, title, and rank of the individual(s) primarily responsible for drafting the proposed degree major program.
   h. Statement from the appropriate campus administrative authority that the addition of this program supports the campus mission and will not impede the successful operation and growth of existing academic programs.
   i. Any other campus approval documents that may apply (e.g. curriculum committee approvals).
   j. Please specify whether this proposed program is subject to WASC Substantive Change review. The campus may submit a copy of the WASC Sub-Change proposal in lieu of this CSU proposal format.
   k. Optional: Proposed Classification of Instructional Programs and CSU Degree Program Code

Campuses are invited to suggest one CSU degree program code and one corresponding CIP code. If an appropriate CSU code does not appear on the system-wide list at: [http://www.calstate.edu/app/resources.shtml](http://www.calstate.edu/app/resources.shtml), you can search CIP 2010 at [http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/cipcode/Default.aspx?y=55](http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/cipcode/Default.aspx?y=55) to identify the code that best matches the proposed degree program. The Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) is a National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) publication that provides a numerical classification and standard terminology for secondary and postsecondary instructional programs. The CSU degree program code (based on old HEGIS codes) and CIP code will be assigned when the program is approved by the Chancellor.
3. Program Overview and Rationale
   a. Provide a rationale, including a brief description of the program, its purpose and strengths, fit with institutional mission, and a justification for offering the program at this time. A comprehensive rationale also explains the relationship between the program philosophy, design, target population, and any distinctive pedagogical methods.
   b. Provide the proposed catalog description, including program description, degree requirements, and admission requirements. For master's degrees, please also include catalog copy describing the culminating experience requirement(s).

4. Curriculum – (These requirements conform to the revised 2013 WASC Handbook of Accreditation)
   a. These program proposal elements are required:
      • Institutional learning outcomes (ILOs)
      • Program learning outcomes (PLOs)
      • Student learning outcomes (SLOs)

      Describe outcomes (also sometimes known as goals) for the 1) institution, 2) program, and for 3) student learning. Institutional learning outcomes (ILOs) typically highlight the knowledge, skills, and dispositions all students are expected to have upon graduating from an institution of higher learning. Program learning outcomes (PLOs) highlight the knowledge, skills, and dispositions students are expected to know as program graduates. PLOs are more narrowly focused than ILOs. Student learning outcomes (SLOs) clearly convey the specific and measureable knowledge, skills, and/or behaviors expected and guide the type of assessments to be used to determine if the desired level of learning has been achieved.

   b. These program proposal elements are required:
      • Comprehensive assessment plan addressing all assessment elements;
      • Matrix showing where student learning outcomes are introduced (I), developed (D), and mastered (M)

      Include plans for assessing institutional, program, and student learning outcomes. Key to program planning is creating a comprehensive assessment plan addressing multiple elements, including strategies and tools to assess student learning outcomes, (directly related to overall institutional and program learning outcomes). Constructing an assessment matrix, showing the relationship between all assessment elements, is an efficient and clear method of displaying all assessment plan components.

      Creating a curriculum map matrix, identifying the student learning outcomes, the courses where they are found, and where content is “Introduced,” “Developed,” and “Mastered” insures that all student learning outcomes are directly related to overall program goals and represented across the curriculum at the appropriate times. Assessment of outcomes is expected to be carried out systematically according to an established schedule.

   c. Indicate total number of units required for graduation.

   d. Include a justification for any baccalaureate program that requires more than 120-semester units or 180-quarter units. Programs proposed at more than 120 semester units will have to provide either a Title 5 justification for the higher units or a campus-approved request for an exception to the Title 5 unit limit for this kind of baccalaureate program.
e. If any formal options, concentrations, or special emphases are planned under the proposed major, identify and list the required courses. Optional: You may propose a CSU degree program code and CIP code for each concentration that you would like to report separately from the major program.

f. List all requirements for graduation, including electives, for the proposed degree program, specifying course catalog numbers, course titles, total units required for completion of the degree, major requirements, electives, and prerequisites or co-requisites (ensuring there are no “hidden prerequisites that would drive the total units required to graduate beyond the total reported in 4c above). Include proposed catalog descriptions of all new courses.

g. List any new courses that are: (1) needed to initiate the program or (2) needed during the first two years after implementation. Include proposed catalog descriptions for new courses. For graduate program proposals, identify whether each new course would be at the graduate-level or undergraduate-level.

h. Attach a proposed course-offering plan for the first three years of program implementation, indicating likely faculty teaching assignments.

i. For master's degree proposals, include evidence that program requirements conform to the minimum requirements for the culminating experience, as specified in Section 40510 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations.

j. For graduate degree proposals, cite the corresponding bachelor's program and specify whether it is (a) subject to accreditation and (b) currently accredited.

k. For graduate degree programs, specify admission criteria, including any prerequisite coursework.

l. For graduate degree programs, specify criteria for student continuation in the program.

m. For undergraduate programs, specify planned provisions for articulation of the proposed major with community college programs.

n. Describe advising “roadmaps” that have been developed for the major.

o. Describe how accreditation requirements will be met, if applicable, and anticipated date of accreditation request (including the WASC Substantive Change process).

**Accreditation Note:**

*Master's degree program proposals*

If subject to accreditation, establishment of a master's degree program should be preceded by national professional accreditation of the corresponding bachelor’s degree major program.

*Fast-track proposals*

Fast-track proposals cannot be subject to specialized accreditation by an agency that is a member of the Association of Specialized and Professional Accreditors unless the proposed program is already offered as an authorized option or concentration that is accredited by an appropriate specialized accrediting agency.
5. Societal and Public Need for the Proposed Degree Major Program
   a. List other California State University campuses currently offering or projecting the proposed degree major program; list neighboring institutions, public and private, currently offering the proposed degree major program.

   b. Describe differences between the proposed program and programs listed in Section 5a above.

   c. List other curricula currently offered by the campus that are closely related to the proposed program.

   d. Describe community participation, if any, in the planning process. This may include prospective employers of graduates.

   e. Provide applicable workforce demand projections and other relevant data.

   Note: Data Sources for Demonstrating Evidence of Need
   APP Resources Web  http://www.calstate.edu/app/resources.shtml
   US Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics
   California Labor Market Information
   Labor Forecast

6. Student Demand
   a. Provide compelling evidence of student interest in enrolling in the proposed program. Types of evidence vary and may include national, statewide, and professional employment forecasts and surveys; petitions; lists of related associate degree programs at feeder community colleges; reports from community college transfer centers; and enrollments from feeder baccalaureate programs, for example.

   b. Identify how issues of diversity and access to the university were considered when planning this program. Describe what steps the program will take to insure ALL prospective candidates have equitable access to the program. This description may include recruitment strategies and any other techniques to insure a diverse and qualified candidate pool.

   c. For master’s degree proposals, cite the number of declared undergraduate majors and the degree production over the preceding three years for the corresponding baccalaureate program, if there is one.

   d. Describe professional uses of the proposed degree program.

   e. Specify the expected number of majors in the initial year, and three years and five years thereafter. Specify the expected number of graduates in the initial year, and three years and five years thereafter.

7. Existing Support Resources for the Proposed Degree Major Program
   Note: Sections 7 and 8 should be prepared in consultation with the campus administrators responsible for faculty staffing and instructional facilities allocation and planning. A statement from the responsible administrator(s) should be attached to the proposal assuring that such consultation has taken place.

   a. List faculty who would teach in the program, indicating rank, appointment status, highest degree earned, date and field of highest degree, professional experience, and affiliations with other campus programs. For master’s degrees, include faculty publications or curriculum vitae. Note: For all proposed graduate degree programs, there must be a minimum of five full-time faculty members with the appropriate terminal degree. (Coded Memo EP&R 85-20)

   b. Describe facilities that would be used in support of the proposed program.
c. Provide evidence that the institution provides adequate access to both electronic and physical library and learning resources.

d. Describe available academic technology, equipment, and other specialized materials.

8. Additional Support Resources Required

Note: If additional support resources will be needed to implement and maintain the program, a statement by the responsible administrator(s) should be attached to the proposal assuring that such resources will be provided.

a. Describe additional faculty or staff support positions needed to implement the proposed program.

b. Describe the amount of additional lecture and/or laboratory space required to initiate and to sustain the program over the next five years. Indicate any additional special facilities that will be required. If the space is under construction, what is the projected occupancy date? If the space is planned, indicate campus-wide priority of the facility, capital outlay program priority, and projected date of occupancy. Major capital outlay construction projects are those projects whose total cost is $610,000 or more (as adjusted pursuant to Cal. Pub. Cont. Code §§ 10705(a); 10105 and 10108).

c. Include a report written in consultation with the campus librarian which indicates any necessary library resources not available through the CSU library system. Indicate the commitment of the campus to purchase these additional resources.

d. Indicate additional academic technology, equipment, or specialized materials that will be (1) needed to implement the program and (2) needed during the first two years after initiation. Indicate the source of funds and priority to secure these resource needs.

9. Self-Support Programs

a. Confirm that the proposed program will not be offered at places or times likely to supplant or limit existing state-support programs.

b. Explain how state-support funding is either unavailable or inappropriate.

c. Explain how the program is different, in one or more of the following ways, from state-supported campus offerings operating on campus:

   i. Primarily designed for career enrichment or retraining
   ii. Program location is significantly removed from state-supported campus facilities
   iii. The program client group receives educational or other services at a cost beyond what could be reasonably provided under state support.

d. For self-support programs, please provide information on the per-unit cost to students and the total cost to complete the program (in addition to the required cost recovery budget elements listed earlier in this document).
BFA Degree Programs
(Additional information needed as outlined in AR&RP 73-37)

1. The specific criteria and procedures that will be used to identify talented students to be admitted to and continued in the program.

2. The means that will be used to keep the number of majors in the performance-oriented programs within the limits of approximately 20% and 40% respectively of all students seeking regular bachelor’s and master’s degrees in the subject area. (This is a long-standing element of the Trustees’ performing arts policy that’s been formally suspended for at least one pilot program; if the campus intends not to adhere to this policy element, it would probably be useful for the response to provide a rationale for the campus’s alternative, with particular attention to other means of ensuring quality.)

3. The professional experiences/attainments of all faculty who will teach in the program.

4. A list of significant arts activities the department engaged in for the past five years.

5. Plans for exposing students to professionalism in the respective area of study.

6. Plans for securing supplementary support for the program, beyond what the State normally provides, from governmental/private foundations and community sources.

7. A copy of the latest NASD visiting team’s report, with an indication of what the department has done to respond to any suggestions for improvement.
Degree Proposals Subject to CPEC Review

Graduate Programs Only: CSU independent Ed.D. programs and CSU joint doctoral programs in all disciplines are subject to formal CPEC review and comment.

Master’s Programs: CSU state-support master’s program proposals in the following discipline areas are subject to formal CPEC review and comment:

Agriculture
Architecture
Biological sciences
Business/Management
Education
Engineering
Health professions
Information science/Informatics
Interdisciplinary
Mathematics
Physical science
Professional studies
Psychology

CPEC does not review master’s programs in the humanities, such as literature, art history, and music, and nearly all programs in the social sciences, such as sociology and political science.

CPEC review may take 60 days or more, depending on any required following questions and submission of additional material.

Please direct questions to Dr. Christine Mallon at (562) 951-4672 or app@calstate.edu
CSU Degree Program Proposals and CPEC Review Criteria

As CSU campuses prepare program proposals and revisions, the following elements should be well developed and supported by appropriate specific data. This list provides CSU clarification of historically applied CPEC proposal-review criteria. The original CPEC guidelines are available at: http://www.cpec.ca.gov/completerepos/2006reports/06-12.pdf CPEC has asked that campuses clearly label where in the proposal the following CPEC review criteria are presented:

- **Student demand**
  This can be demonstrated with surveys of student intention to enroll in the program. Include current and projected enrollments of related existing programs at the proposing campus or feeder institutions.

- **Societal Needs**
  The proposal should establish that there will be sufficient employment opportunities for graduates of the proposed program. Workforce demand projections can be helpful in establishing the balance between graduates and employment opportunities. Letters from regional employers are helpful, as well. Workforce data are available at: http://www.calstate.edu/app/workforce_data.shtml

- ** Appropriateness to Institutional and Segmental Mission**
  Describe how the proposed degree program fits with the campus, school/college, and departmental missions.

- **Number of Existing and Proposed Programs in the Field**
  Demonstrate how the proposed program differs from or is similar to existing programs in the state.

- **Total Costs for the Program**
  Are there sufficient funds available to support the resources that are required in order to initiate and maintain the program, including: the number of new faculty required; equipment; library resources; and classroom, office, and laboratory facilities. Identify the source of the funds required to support the program, both initially and in the long run.

- **Maintenance and Improvement of Quality**
  Submit formal assessment plans that address program goals and student learning outcomes. Goals should be measurable, plans should be manageable, and data should be meaningful. Goals should be related to institutional and program mission, and to the curriculum. See the CSU assessment site for further information: http://www.calstate.edu/acadaff/sloa/index.shtml

- **Advancement of Knowledge**
  Describe how the program will contribute to the growth and development of intellectual and creative scholarship.
Adding Self-Support Version of a Previously Approved State-Support Offering

Campuses may implement proposed programs that have been reviewed and approved by the Chancellor’s Office. All recruitment and application materials for proposed programs must feature a qualification that makes clear that admission and enrollment are subject to program approval by the CSU Office of the Chancellor and—if appropriate—accreditation approval.

Policy
From EO 1047 Section C (http://www.calstate.edu/EO/1047.html) Section C (2) (c):

The Chancellor’s Office shall be notified when previously approved, state-supported degree or credential programs are first offered in self-support mode through special sessions.

Self-supporting special sessions shall not supplant regular course offerings available on a state-supported basis during the college year (Education Code Section 89708). However, self-supporting courses and programs may be offered in addition to state-supported offerings if the requirements of Executive Order 1047 are met.

Procedure (Please review the WASC Substantive Change requirements at the end of this document)

Campuses shall notify Academic Program Planning in the Chancellor’s Office prior to implementing self-support counterparts to previously approved state-support degree programs. Notifications should be sent to APP@calstate.edu and shall include the original program’s implementation date (if known) and the planned implementation term for the self-support version. Curricular requirements for both programs shall be included in the notification, which shall also specify the self-support program’s fulfillment of the requisite conditions stated in EO 1047 (see below).

C. Requisite Conditions

1. For a group of courses or program to be offered under special sessions, both of the following criteria must be met:
   a. State General Fund appropriations to support the program must be either unavailable or inappropriate. Examples of inappropriate use of State General Fund appropriations would include courses or programs delivered primarily out of state.

CSU Campuses
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San Bernadino
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San Luis Obispo
San Marcos
Santa Cruz
Simi Valley
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b. The courses or program must be different from approved, state-supported programs operating on campus by one or more of the following:
   i. The courses or program is designed primarily for career enrichment or retraining (Education Code Section 89708).
   ii. The location of the courses or program offerings is significantly removed from permanent, state-supported campus facilities.
   iii. The client group for the courses or program receives educational or other services at a cost beyond what could be reasonably provided under state support.

2. All special sessions must have the following characteristics:
   a. Each must consist of a planned presentation of a degree, credential, or certificate program or a group of courses offered at a particular location or through a distinct technology. Courses may be presented concurrently or sequentially but in a defined time frame.
   b. While a special session need not offer all or even a significant portion of a degree, credential, or certificate program, it must be planned to serve a substantive educational objective supportive of such programs; e.g., an opportunity for a matriculated student to accelerate achievement toward an objective, or a significant portion of a degree program offered for military or business personnel.
   c. Degree, credential, or certificate programs offered through special sessions must secure all regular campus and system approvals. Such programs may have a state-supported counterpart operating on campus, or they may operate only as self-supported programs through special sessions. The Chancellor's Office shall be notified when previously approved, state-supported degree or credential programs are first offered in self-support mode through special sessions.
   d. Self-supporting degree, credential, or certificate programs offered under the provisions of this executive order shall be operated in accordance with all appropriate campus and system policies and procedures.
e. Campuses offering special sessions shall provide educational support services (e.g., admissions and records, advising, library, financial aid) appropriate to the nature and scope of the program.

f. All instruction offered shall have been approved under procedures utilized for state-supported programs, and all academic policies governing special sessions shall be identical to or established under the same procedures as those governing state-supported programs.

g. All students in special sessions degree programs and education credential programs must be matriculated. Non-matriculated students paying self-support fees may enroll in special sessions courses on a space-available basis. A maximum of 24 semester units (36 quarter units) in special sessions course credit taken as a non-matriculated student may be applied toward a degree (Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Section 40407.1).

h. Location of instruction must be in accordance with pertinent system policies.

i. Special sessions offerings must be consistent with all applicable policies of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges and other accrediting bodies under whose jurisdiction special sessions fall.

j. Academic credit offered through special sessions shall be applicable toward residence credit requirements at the campus offering the special sessions.

k. Special sessions courses shall not be offered at times or places that are likely to supplant or limit offerings of the state supported program (Education Code Section 89708).

l. Faculty shall be compensated according to approved special sessions salary schedules.

WASC

Programs that meet the criteria requiring WASC Substantive Change approval must also be submitted for CSU substantive change approval (using the WASC proposal). A copy of the WASC substantive change proposal must be submitted to the Chancellor’s Office for review and approval. WASC requires a Chancellor’s Office approval letter before the accreditor will approve the substantive change. WASC policies apply and can be found at: http://www.wascsenior.org/wasc/Doc_Lib/20055CMmanual.pdf

Please see the entire EO 1047 document at: http://www.calstate.edu/oa/EO-1047.html
MEMORANDUM

To: CSU Presidents

From: Charles B. Reed
Chancellor

Subject: Executive Order No. 795
Procedures Governing Self-Supporting Programs Outside the State of California, Conducted Through the Continuing Education Revenue Fund or Local Trust Accounts

Attached is a copy of Executive Order No. 795, which defines out-of-state and out-of-country self-supporting instructional programs, specifies the procedures for depositing funds (in the Continuing Education Revenue Fund), and establishes that policies governing self-supporting instructional programs shall also apply to out-of-state and out-of-country programs. This executive order supersedes Executive Order No. 448.

In accordance with the policy of the California State University, the campus president has the responsibility for implementing executive orders where applicable and for maintaining the campus repository and index for all executive orders.

Please address any questions you may have regarding this executive order to the State University Dean, Extended Education (562) 951-4795 or the Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer, Business Affairs (562) 951-4600.

CBR:clm

Attachment

c: Executive Staff, Office of the Chancellor
Extended Education Deans
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
Office of the Chancellor
401 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California 90802-4210
(562) 951-4700

Executive Order: 795
Title: Procedures Governing Self-Supporting Programs Outside the State of California, Conducted Through the Continuing Education Revenue Fund or Local Trust Accounts
Effective Date: November 12, 2001
Supersedes: Executive Order No. 448

1.0 Definitions and Introduction

Out-of-state and out-of-country programs are campus-based, self-supporting instructional activities of the California State University that provide instruction outside California, either site-bound or transmitted electronically. Those programs shall be conducted through the Continuing Education Revenue Fund (Education Code 89705) or through Continuing Education funds, which are deposited in local trust accounts (Education Code Section 89721). The procedures herein do not apply to self-support foreign travel-study programs nor to those sponsored by auxiliary organizations.

The programs authorized by this executive order and related Board of Trustees policy provide a means of utilizing the expertise of the CSU faculty in activities benefiting both students and campuses. Students benefit from instruction not readily available from nearby educational institutions. The sponsoring campus benefits from the faculty’s broadened understanding of the educational practices and cultures of other states and countries.

This executive order supplements existing policies and procedures governing self-supporting instructional programs. Unless specifically excluded or clearly inapplicable, those existing policies and procedures shall also apply to out-of-state and out-of-country programs.

Particular attention should be given to the following executive orders:

- E.O. 181—Provisions for Extension & Summer Session Independent Study Programs Involving Foreign Travel
- E.O. 255—Provisions Governing Implementation of the Continuing Education Unit Within the California State University and Colleges
Executive Order No. 795

- E.O. 298—Regulations Governing Extension Student Enrollment in Regular Session Offerings
- E.O. 313—Financial Management of Continuing Education
- E.O. 466—Special Sessions
- E.O. 590—Student Air Travel
- E.O. 740—California State University Student Fee Policy
- E.O. 745—Self-Support Campus Based Study Abroad Programs

2.0 Authority

This executive order is issued in accordance with Board of Trustees resolution REP 07-84-04, adopted by the Board on July 11, 1984.

2.1 Responsibility

The campus president is responsible for all out-of-state and out-of-country programs sponsored by the campus and shall ensure that these programs are established and managed in accordance with the laws of the State of California; the laws of the state, territory, or nation in which the program is being offered; the policies of the Board of Trustees, and all pertinent directives issued by the chancellor.

2.2 Academic Standards

2.2.1 The academic standards and requirements are the same as for comparable on-campus activities.

2.2.2 Programs shall be developed and administered in accordance with applicable standards, policies, and procedures of the Senior Commission of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).

2.3 Fiscal Support

Programs shall be self-supporting and shall be administered in accordance with the fiscal policies and procedures governing the Continuing Education Revenue Fund (EC 89704) or trust funds (EC 89721).

2.4 Programs to Be Offered in Other States and Territories

Programs offered in other states and territories shall be designed to expand the educational opportunities of the region being served, rather than to compete with local educational institutions. Mutual understanding shall be reached with the local public institutions of higher education to ensure that California State University programs will neither duplicate nor compete with the instructional activities of these institutions. Where there are circumstances that make a mutual understanding impossible, the campus president shall consult with the chancellor prior to deciding whether to offer the program. Program planners shall notify the appropriate regional accrediting agencies of their intentions. Any such program must be in compliance with laws and regulations of the state or territory concerned.
2.5 Programs to Be Offered in Other Nations

In addition to the provisions of Article 2.4, whenever an institution is considering the development of a program for delivery in a foreign country, the institution shall take the following additional steps early in the planning process:

A. Contact the United States Department of State to advise appropriate personnel of campus intentions and to seek advice.

B. Contact the United States Embassy (and/or Consulate) in the nation concerned to inform appropriate personnel of campus intentions and to seek advice and comments concerning such matters as living conditions, security, etc. Once contact has been established, it should be maintained as need dictates during the life of the program.

C. Contact the embassy of the nation concerned to inform appropriate personnel of campus plans and to seek advice.

D. Special attention should be given to the foregoing when there is any reason for concern that the health or safety of California State University personnel might be an issue.

3.0 Program Evaluation

In order to assure compliance with systemwide and campus policies and procedures, the president of any campus offering out-of-state or out-of-country instructional programs shall establish procedures for their evaluation, review, and approval with respect to academic, contractual, faculty, fiscal, legal, and logistical arrangements and commitments. These procedures and subsequent modifications shall be filed with the State University Dean of Extended Education in the Office of the Chancellor at least 60 days prior to the initiation of the first program to be offered under the provisions of this executive order. Once procedures are on file, the president shall routinely advise the Division of Extended Education in the Office of the Chancellor of intention to initiate a program.

3.1 Administration

Any contract related to out-of-state or out-of-country instructional programs to which the campus is party must conform to the following as well as all other pertinent policies and procedures:

A. The contract must be made in conformance with applicable laws and procedures and Board of Trustees policy and chancellor directives.

B. The contract must be specific concerning the matters for which the institution is and is not responsible.

C. The contract must be reviewed and approved as to proper legal form by the Office of General Counsel in the Chancellor’s Office.
3.2 Out-of-State or Out-of-Country Program Director

Each out-of-state or out-of-country program shall have a director assigned by means of a letter of appointment issued by the campus president or president’s designee. This letter must specify the extent of the director’s responsibility as a campus employee.

Charles B. Reed
Chancellor

Date: November 12, 2001
Review Process for Proposals for CSU and UC JOINT DEGREE PROGRAMS

Doctoral Program Proposal Resources

- CSU Ed.D. Programs
  [http://www.calstate.edu/app/EdD/](http://www.calstate.edu/app/EdD/)
- UC-CSU Joint Doctoral Programs
- Joint Doctorates with Independent Institutions

Proposals for new doctoral degree programs to be offered jointly by CSU and UC* should follow the guidelines in the *Handbook for the Creation of CSU/UC Joint Doctoral Programs* approved by the CSU/UC Joint Graduate Board on June 21, 2001 ([http://www.ucop.edu/institutional-research-academic-planning/_files/jointdochandbook.pdf](http://www.ucop.edu/institutional-research-academic-planning/_files/jointdochandbook.pdf))

*Professional Doctorate Degrees* There are separate CCGA guidelines for the professional doctorate, i.e., applied doctorate. This degree is designed to prepare individuals for professional practice rather than scholarly research and study. Examples of applied doctorates include: Doctorate of Education (Ed.D.), Doctorate of Physical Therapy (D.P.T.), Doctorate in Optometry (O.D.), and the Doctorate of Audiology (Au.D.). Please refer to Appendix I in the CCGA Handbook.

Permission to Negotiate

The CSU campus and UC campus request their respective system offices for “permission to negotiate.” An expression of interest in and the rationale for a joint doctoral program is submitted by the CSU campus to the Academic Program Planning of the CSU Office of the Chancellor, and by the UC campus to the Academic Affairs Division at the UC Office of the President. The initial expression of interest contains an indication of program need and supporting evidence of the requesting department’s ability to offer the appropriate instruction. Approved requests to negotiate allow the campuses to develop a joint doctoral program proposal.

Planning

Before the joint doctoral proposal may be submitted to the CSU and UC system offices, the proposals require approvals from the:

1. relevant disciplinary Deans at the CSU and UC campuses
2. Graduate Council at the UC campus
3. divisional Academic Senate at the UC campus
4. CSU campus academic senate, curriculum committees, and all other requirements that apply at that CSU campus.
5. President at the CSU campus and the Chancellor at the UC campus

Systemwide Review

The final proposal is sent to the Provost and Executive Vice President—Academic & Health Affairs, UC Office of the President, and to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Office, CSU Office of the Chancellor (c/o Academic Program Planning). The Provost requests systemwide review by the (UC) Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA). CCGA conducts a preliminary review to determine whether or not to proceed with a full review of the proposal, or whether the Committee wishes to obtain additional information. The CSU Office of Academic Program Planning (APP) and CCGA consult regarding preliminary findings of the program reviews. If CCGA or the CSU Office of the Chancellor requires more information, the proposal is sent back to the campuses for revision. If CCGA agrees to move forward with a full review and the CSU Office of the Chancellor concurs, the UC Office of the President sends the proposal to the California Postsecondary Education Commission for concurrence (CPEC). CPEC will complete its review within 60 days of receipt of the document.
**Proposals for Implementation of New Degree Major Programs**

**Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC)**
CSU partners (except San Diego State University) need to request approval for a new program at the doctoral level from the regional accrediting agency, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). The CSU request is an application to the Substantive Change Committee of WASC. The WASC Commission acts on substantive change proposals at its February and June meetings.

**Joint Graduate Board**
Joint Graduate Board, which has final authority on the inter-system doctoral review process, requires a minimum of six votes of the CSU members and six of the UC members. The Board’s action is communicated to the CSU and UC chief academic officers.

Proposals for new graduate degree programs require approvals from the:
1. Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA)
2. CSU Chancellor’s Office Academic Program Planning (APP)
3. California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC)
4. Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Office, CSU Office of the Chancellor
5. Provost and Executive Vice President–Academic & Health Affairs, UC Office of the President
6. Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) authorizing the CSU campus to offer a program at the doctoral level

References *Handbook for the Creation of CSU/UC Joint Doctoral Programs*
http://www.ucop.edu/institutional-research-academic-planning/_files/jointdochandbook.pdf
*CCGA Handbook*
http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/committees/ccga/reports.html
GENERAL PROCEDURES FOR DEVELOPING JOINT DOCTORAL PROGRAMS
WITH INDEPENDENT INSTITUTIONS

These procedures are based on documents developed by the CSU and California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) staff, including coded memorandum AP 69-68. They have been updated to reflect changes in system terminology and practice.

Obtaining formal approval for a doctoral program to be offered jointly by a CSU campus and an independent institution proceeds in four stages: (A) initiating discussions; (B) requesting and obtaining permission to negotiate; (C) developing the implementation proposal; (D) obtaining CPEC and WASC approvals.

A. Initial Discussions

1. Interest in developing a joint doctoral program is ascertained, typically at the department/faculty level. An ad hoc joint planning committee, with members from both the CSU campus and the independent institution, is usually formed.

2. The cooperating academic units at both institutions follow their customary procedures for proceeding to formal negotiations.

3. The graduate dean or assistant/associate vice president for academic programs at the CSU campus communicates informally with the Office of Academic Program Planning in the Office of the Chancellor.

B. Permission to Negotiate

4. The CSU campus president addresses a request for “permission to negotiate a joint doctoral program” to the Chancellor, with a copy to Academic Program Planning. (See Page 115 for a description of the contents of this document.)

5. Academic Program Planning may communicate with the CSU campus about the desirability and appropriateness of the proposed program and the evidence of need and feasibility. Revisions of the documentation may be requested.

6. When review of the request is satisfactorily completed, the Chancellor sends a letter granting permission to negotiate to the CSU campus and sends a copy of the letter to the chief executive officer of the partner institution.

7. The chief executive officer of the partnering institution sends a letter to the executive director of CPEC, stating that formal negotiations to establish a joint doctoral program have begun.

8. In the next scheduled update of the CSU campus’s Academic Plan, the CSU Board of Trustees approves the projection of the proposed joint doctoral program.

\(^1\) “Independent institutions” are defined in California law as “nonpublic higher education institutions that grant undergraduate degrees, graduate degrees, or both, and that are formed as nonprofit corporations in this state and are accredited by an agency recognized by the United States Department of Education.” It is expected that the partnering institution will be accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges.
C. Development of the Program Implementation Proposal

9. The ad hoc joint committee drafts a formal program implementation proposal. *(See Pages 116-120 for a description of the contents of this document.)*

10. The proposal is submitted through local university administrative channels to the CSU Chancellor and to the chief executive officer of the independent institution.

11. The CSU campus sends four copies of the proposal to the Office of Academic Program Planning, which reviews the proposal with the assistance of external reviewers with expertise in the discipline.

12. Academic Program Planning may request revision of the proposal. Copies of the revised proposal are prepared and sent to Academic Program Planning.

D. CPEC and WASC Approval

13. Academic Program Planning submits the program implementation proposal to CPEC staff.

14. CPEC staff, in consultation with Academic Program Planning and the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities, convenes an ad hoc CPEC joint graduate board to review and provide advice on the proposal. Representatives of the proposing institutions may be invited to meet with the ad hoc CPEC joint graduate board. The proposing institutions may be asked to provide additional information or clarification before final action is taken on behalf of CPEC.

15. CPEC staff notifies the CSU and the independent institution of action taken on the proposal.

16. Following CPEC approval, the Chancellor sends a letter granting full approval to award the degree to the CSU campus and sends a copy of the letter to the chief executive officer of the partner institution.

17. The participating institutions ensure that all necessary WASC approvals are obtained. *(See the WASC Substantive Change Manual 2001 [http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/committees/ccga/reports.html](http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/committees/ccga/reports.html), especially Section III.C.5.)*
CONTENT: REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO NEGOTIATE

Expression of interest in the joint doctoral program

Rationale for the program

- Indications of need for the program
- Supporting evidence of the requesting academic units’ ability to offer doctoral instruction
  - Faculty: degrees, honors, grants, professional and other relevant experience, publications and other matters pertinent to judging qualifications to guide advanced graduate work. Curriculum vitae for faculty members from both participating institutions are usually submitted.
  - Academic units: experience with graduate study, degrees offered, number of degrees awarded, year in which each graduate degree program was authorized.
  - Instructional and research facilities: description of facilities available to accommodate joint doctoral candidates.

CONTENT: PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION PROPOSAL

Implementation proposals for joint doctoral programs with independent institutions must include the following elements:

Basic Information

1. The names of the institutions that will be awarding the degree
2. The full and exact designation of the degree to be awarded (e.g., Ph.D. in Chemistry)
3. The names of the departments, divisions, or other units of the campuses that will have primary responsibility for administering the program
4. The names and titles of the individuals primarily responsible for drafting the proposal

Timelines

1. The anticipated date that the program will be implemented
2. A timetable for the development of the program, including enrollment projections for the first five years

Program Rationale, Aims and Objectives

1. The rationale for proposing a joint program
2. The aims and objectives of the program
Proposals for Implementation of New Degree Major Programs

Justification for the Program

1. A description of how the proposed program is related to existing programs on the participating campuses, especially to closely related master’s and doctoral programs
2. A list of similar doctoral programs offered or projected by California institutions (state clearly how the proposed program differs from the existing programs listed)
3. A summary of the evidence of student demand for the proposed program
4. A summary of the employment prospects for graduates of the proposed program and the professional uses of the proposed program
5. A summary of the importance of the program to the discipline and to meeting the needs of society

Information About Participating Institutions and Departments

1. A description of the relationship of doctoral degree programs to the missions of the participating institutions
2. The number, variety, and longevity of the doctoral programs currently being offered and the degree completion rates for previous or current joint doctoral programs
3. A brief review of the historical development of the field and departmental strength in the field, including the experience of the participating academic units with graduate education (degrees offered, number of degrees awarded, and year in which each graduate degree program was authorized)
4. A description of how the proposed program is expected to draw support from existing programs, departments, and faculty

Information About Participating Faculty Members

1. A description of the relationship of the program to the research and professional interests of the faculty
2. A description of how the faculty expertise and resources at one participating institution complement the faculty expertise and resources at the other participating institution and create synergies
3. The criteria for choosing faculty members for participation in the program
4. Copies of faculty vitae, including rank, appointment status, highest degree earned, date and field of highest degree, professional experience, publications, and other information demonstrating faculty commitment to research and ability to chair dissertation committees
Information About Resources

1. A brief review of existing financial, physical and information resources supporting the program, including research support within the institution, library support appropriate for doctoral degree work, physical facilities, and stability and sufficiency of financial resources
2. A description of the ability of the institutions to provide graduate student support, including teaching or research assistantships, fellowship eligibility, and financial aid
3. A summary of resource requirements for each participating institution by year for the first five years, including:
   a. FTE faculty
   b. Library acquisitions
   c. Computing costs
   d. Equipment
   e. Space and other capital facilities (including rented facilities, where applicable)
   f. Other operating costs
4. A description of the intended method of funding the additional costs (including fee structures, internal reallocation, and external resources) and effects of the method of funding on existing programs

Detailed Statement of Requirements for the Degree

The statement should include all of the following elements that are applicable:

1. Undergraduate—and, if appropriate, postbaccalaureate and master’s level—preparation for admission; other admissions requirements; and provisions, if any, for conditional admission of selected applicants who do not meet all the requirements for admission
2. Criteria for continuation in the program
3. Unit requirements
4. Specific fields of emphasis
5. Required and recommended courses, including catalog descriptions of present and proposed courses
6. Foreign language requirements, if any
7. Other activities required of students (e.g., laboratory rotations, internships)
8. Field examinations, written and/or oral
9. Qualifying examinations, written and/or oral
10. Dissertation
11. Final examination
12. Other demonstration of student competence, if any
13. Special preparation for careers in teaching
14. Sample program
15. Normative time from matriculation to degree, normative time for pre-candidacy and candidacy periods, and incentives to support expeditious time-to-degree
16. Special arrangements for delivery of instruction, where applicable
Proposals for Implementation of New Degree Major Programs

Provisions for Joint Decision-Making and Administration of the Program

1. Administrative support at each participating campus and mechanisms for coordination
2. Assistance for faculty, staff and students in meeting the unique demands of the proposed joint program (e.g., travel among participating institutions, distance learning expenses, relocation expenses)
3. Rules for determining registration and fee payment obligations, especially when students are receiving instructional services simultaneously from more than one participating institution
4. Comprehensive support services for students (e.g., housing, health care, child care, access to information resources) at multiple institutions
5. Mechanisms to ensure the involvement of each participating institution in admission decisions, curricular coordination and modification, advisory committees, and dissertation committees
6. Any other relevant features of the relationship between the partnering institutions in the development and implementation of the proposed joint degree program

Assessment and Accreditation

1. A description of the review process that will be used to evaluate the proposed program, including an assessment plan
2. A description of the provision for meeting accreditation requirements, where applicable
Proposals for Implementation of New Degree Major Programs

California State University Ed.D. in Educational Leadership
Degree Implementation Proposal Template

Campuses are asked to submit to Academic Program Planning (APP) proposals following this template, which is also available at http://www.calstate.edu/app/Ed.D./. Please submit six hard copies via US mail (CSU Academic Program Planning 401 Golden Shore Long Beach, CA 90802-4210) and one Word version via email to APP@calstate.edu. This form is to be used only for programs that are to be offered solely by a CSU campus or CSU campuses jointly. Further Ed.D. program planning resources are available at http://www.calstate.edu/app/Ed.D./. Questions may be directed to: Christine Mallon, Dean, Academic Program Planning, at (562) 951-4672 or APP@calstate.edu.

This format was designed to streamline WASC and CSU proposal review processes as much as possible, with the intention to facilitate preparation and electronic submission of the WASC Substantive Change Proposal.

Important:
- Please retain the CEPC criteria designations, which appear in bold in the proposal headlines.
- Elements in common with the WASC Substantive Change Proposal are featured in italics.

I. Overview
   A. Name of degree program proposed—“Ed.D. in Educational Leadership”
   B. Initial date of offering
   C. Projected number of students and type of student the program is designed to serve (adult learners; full-time or part-time employed students)
   D. Timeframe for course delivery (e.g. accelerated program, weekends only, traditional format)
   E. Length of the program for the typical student to complete all degree requirements
   F. The names of the departments, divisions, or other units of the campus(es) that will have primary responsibility for administering the program
   G. The names and titles of the individuals primarily responsible for drafting the proposal
Proposals for Implementation of New Degree Major Programs

II. Program Rationale
   A. The rationale for proposing the program, including:
   B. Description of how the program philosophy, design, and pedagogical methods suit the target student population
   C. Justification for introducing the program at this time

III. Summary of Employment Prospects and Workforce Demand
   A. Fit with the campus’ mission and strategic goals (CPEC—Appropriateness to Institutional and Segmental Mission)
   B. A list of similar doctoral programs offered or projected by California institutions (state clearly how the proposed program differs from the existing programs listed) (CPEC—Number of Existing and Proposed Programs in the Field)
   C. A summary of the employment prospects for graduates of the proposed program and the professional uses of the proposed program (CPEC—Societal Needs)
   D. Regional need for program, as identified by partners. What local needs do partners intend to address through the help of program graduates? (CPEC—Societal Needs) and (CPEC—Advancement of Knowledge)
   [Note: Proposals will need to indicate the ways in which the curriculum has been designed in response to California Education Code California Education Code Section 66040.3, which authorized the CSU to offer the Doctor of Education degree as specified in that law.]

IV. Student Demand
   The case for student demand can be made stronger by summarizing the enrollments in related community college certificate programs, and related master’s programs on the campus or in the service area.

Enrollment Projections
   A. Enrollment projections for the first five years
   B. Evidence used to support enrollment projections and to support the conclusion that interest in the program is sufficient to sustain it at expected levels beyond the first cohort—summary only, not the full study. (CPEC—Student Demand)
   C. Explain how the program will provide for the continuing participation of students who do not complete their degree requirements within three years.
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V. Program Context and History
   A. A description of how the proposed program relates to existing programs on the participating campuses, especially to closely related master’s and doctoral programs.
   B. The number, variety, and longevity of the doctoral programs currently being offered, including student enrollment data and degree completion and non-completion rates for previous or current joint doctoral program—three to five years of data should be provided.
   C. If the campus is a partner in an existing joint Ed.D. program:
      Indicate whether the joint doctoral program(s) will continue;
      1. Submit a copy of the proposal to discontinue the joint Ed.D. program, including provisions for teaching out the program. Follow the instructions provided in Coded Memo AA-2006-42, available at http://www.calstate.edu/AcadAff/codedmemos/AA-2006-42.pdf
      3. Submit a copy of the Chancellor’s permission to discontinue the joint Ed.D. program.

VI. Partnership with Public Elementary and Secondary Schools and/or Community Colleges (CPEC—Societal Needs)
   A. A list of public school districts, schools and/or community colleges that are partnering with the campus(es) in the development and operation of the proposed program.
   B. Consistent with California Education Code Sections 66040-66040.7, the role of school district, school, and/or college partners in program design, candidate recruitment and admissions, teaching, and program assessment and evaluation.
   C. Other involvement of school districts, schools and/or colleges in the program.
   D. Listing of the P-14 personnel participating in partnership meetings.

VII. Information About Participating Department(s) or other CSU Campuses (if applicable)
   A. A description of how the proposed program is expected to draw support from existing programs, departments, and faculty.
   B. Provisions for partnership among participating departments.
   C. Letters committing to partnership.

VIII. Governance Structure for the Program (consistent with systemwide requirements as detailed in California Education Code Sections 66040.3(b) and EO 991)
   A. Membership and responsibilities of groups, boards, and committees.
   B. Participation, as appropriate, by program faculty; other faculty; administrators at the department, college, and university levels; regional public school and college educators; students in the program; and alumni of the program.
   C. Program bylaws or a statement affirming that bylaws are being developed.
   D. A description of how the governance structure complies with the provisions of California Education Code Sections 66040.3(b) and allows for substantial and meaningful participation by P-12 and community college partners.
IX. Faculty

A. A listing of program faculty and their research and professional interests related to the program (P-12, community college, adult learning, research methods, etc.)

B. The criteria for choosing core doctoral faculty, affiliated doctoral faculty, and other faculty members for participation in the program

C. Number and type of faculty allocated to support the program in terms of developing the curriculum, delivering instruction to students, supervising internships and dissertations, and evaluating educational effectiveness

D. Faculty background and experience to engage in doctoral-level instruction. Include copies of abbreviated faculty vitae (or summaries of 3-5 pages addressing an overview of the key credentials, publications; if applicable, for primary faculty responsible for the program, include prior experience supervising dissertation work).

E. Strong proposals will demonstrate with specific numbers that as the program admits new cohorts, there will be enough faculty headcount to undertake dissertation supervisions, examination committee responsibilities, and teaching assignments. Please include formal campus commitments to faculty expansion, based on careful planning.

F. If more than one campus is participating, provide a description of how the faculty expertise and resources at one participating campus complement the faculty expertise and resources at the other participating campus(es).

X. Resources (CPEC—Total Costs for the Program)

During the December 2006 meeting of the CSU Executive Council, fiscal issues related to the Ed.D. programs were addressed, and it is expected that proposals will reflect the system's recommended guidelines for fiscal planning, which were presented in that meeting. A brief review of existing financial, physical and information resources supporting the program, including research support within the institution, library support appropriate for doctoral degree work, physical facilities, and stability and sufficiency of financial resources.

A. A summary of resource requirements for each participating institution by year for the first five years, including:
   1. FTE faculty
   2. library acquisitions
   3. computing costs
   4. equipment
   5. space and other capital facilities (including rented facilities, where applicable) other operating costs

B. A description of the intended method of funding the additional costs (including fee structures, internal reallocation, and external resources) and effects of the method of funding on existing programs. Note: Section 66040.5(a) of the California Education Code states:

   Enrollment in these [Ed.D.] programs shall not alter the California State University’s ratio of graduate instruction to total enrollment, and shall not come at the expense of enrollment growth in university undergraduate programs.

C. The financial structuring of the programs should address the specific issue of the cost associated with students who lag in completing the dissertation.

D. Where the campus plans to expand faculty resources, provide documentation of the campus commitment to and specific budgetary resources for acquiring additional faculty with the appropriate credentials experience (including recent scholarship and publications and doctoral dissertation advising).

---

The criteria must incorporate pertinent systemwide standards. The criteria applicable to a full-time faculty member whose primary affiliation is with the university may differ from the criteria applicable to a part-time faculty member whose primary affiliation is with a P-12 institution or a community college. The criteria may also vary with the type of participation in the program.
XI. Admission Requirements

A. Admission criteria, including: undergraduate, master’s-level, and, if appropriate, other postbaccalaureate preparation for admission; other admission requirements; and provisions, if any, for conditional admission of selected applicants who do not meet all the requirements for admission.

B. Identify the type of student targeted and qualifications required for the program.

C. Credit policies, including:
   1. The number of credits that students may transfer in to the program.
   2. The distribution of credits allowed or required at the master’s, doctoral, and combined doctoral and master’s levels.

D. Academic residence requirements

XII. Detailed Statement of Requirements for the Degree

The statement should include all of the following elements that are applicable to the proposed program:

A. Unit requirements
B. Criteria for continuation in the program
C. Criteria for satisfactory progress
D. Academic disqualification
E. Foreign language requirements, if any
F. Field experiences, if any
G. Internships and monitoring procedures—if internships are required
H. Field examinations, written and/or oral, if any
I. Written qualifying examinations
J. Dissertation proposal
K. Dissertation examination
L. Dissertation
M. Final examination oral defense of dissertation
N. Other demonstration of student competence, if any
O. Special requirements for graduation or distinctive elements of the program

---

2 All requirements must incorporate pertinent systemwide standards. Please see http://www.calstate.edu/APP/EdD/.
XIII. Curriculum

A. Listing of core courses, identifying those that are required
B. Listing of specialization courses, identifying those that are required
C. Listing of additional recommended courses
D. Total number of units required
E. Length of the program for the typical student to complete all degree requirements
F. Draft catalog description of the program
G. Draft catalog descriptions of existing and proposed courses
H. For each Ed.D. specialization, a matrix demonstrating how the core and specialization courses ensure coverage of core curricular elements. Please use the matrix template enclosed at the end of this packet.
I. Sample schedule of courses for a full cycle of the program.
J. Provisions for accommodating the enrollment of professionals who are working full time
K. Provisions, as appropriate, for students in the program to complete requirements for the Professional Clear Administrative Services Credential (Tier II)

XIV. Assessment and Accountability (CPEC—Maintenance and Improvement of Quality)

Programs will need to develop formal assessment plans and should not rely on regular 5-year program review cycles or NCATE accreditation to provide insight about how well students are learning or how well the program meets its objectives. While program goals and student-learning outcomes goals should both be assessed, it is recommended that a clear distinction be drawn between the two. Program goals should drive program assessment, and core concepts should drive the curriculum and its assessment. Both should be related, so that the curriculum carries out the program goals.

Dissertation goals should be included among student learning goals, with outcomes assessed using a dissertation-evaluation rubric. Embedded assessment, conducted in courses, can reveal how well students are achieving the stated learning outcomes, and are a valuable tool for improving curriculum and pedagogy. Indicate how regularly planned analysis of assessments will allow faculty to adjust the program, as appropriate, to support learning effectiveness.

Assessment Plan

A. Include School/College and Ed.D. Program Mission Statements
B. List of programs outcomes goals (most broad)
C. Student-learning outcomes (SLOs) for the proposed program (narrower, identifying what students know and can do)
D. Curricular map articulating the alignment between program learning outcomes and course learning outcomes
E. Criteria used to assess success of meeting program goals (Identification of the performance criteria used to assess the effectiveness of the program.)
F. Include a matrix that shows assessment criteria for student-learning outcomes. (Assessment matrix describing the achievement of the program’s student learning outcomes)
G. Indicate how the results of the assessment will be used to achieve program improvement (the assessment “feedback loop”); and that specifies the schedule for review of assessment reports by the Faculty Group, Executive Committee, and Advisory Board.
H. Provisions for conducting systemwide Ed.D. program evaluation and reporting as required by California Education Code Section 66040.7. The proposal should explain the processes in place that will allow the program to report these performance criteria, as required by California Education Code Section 66040.7(d):
   1. How graduates of the programs have affected elementary and secondary school and community college reform efforts
   2. How CSU Ed.D. graduates have positively affected student achievement in elementary and secondary school and community college settings.
XV. Student Support Services

A. A description of the ability of the institutions to provide graduate student support, including teaching or research assistantships, fellowship eligibility, financial aid, and research funding, if any

B. Advising, mentoring, and cohort interaction, including a description of how timely and appropriate interactions between students and faculty, and among students will be assured. This is especially relevant for online programs.

C. Specify the arrangements that have been made to identify and assist students who struggle in meeting academic requirements and for those who fall behind their cohort.

D. Ed.D. program student handbook or a plan to create and distribute a program student handbook, as required by Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Section 40511

XVI. Doctoral Culture (CPEC—Advancement of Knowledge)

Proposals should explain where support for doctoral students and faculty currently exists and how the campus will enhance a sense of graduate community and an environment supportive of doctoral-level study. Plans may be addressed from the faculty perspective, as well as from the student viewpoint.

A. Description of how a doctoral-level culture will be established to support the proposed program, including such elements as doctoral level course requirements, nature of the research environment, balance between applied and research components of the degree, and description of dissertation. (Note: Greater rigor will be represented for doctoral courses than in syllabi at the master's level. Ed.D. syllabi should be designed to align course objectives, content, assignments, texts, and exams with learning outcomes at both the program and course levels. The number and intellectual rigor of required readings and student assignments will be appropriate for doctoral study.)

B. Support/resources for faculty to develop a doctoral culture, engage in research, and if applicable, receive an orientation in order to chair dissertation committees.

C. Support services available for doctoral students, such as financial aid, professional placement, and research opportunities.

XVII. Special Provisions for Administration of a Multi-Campus Program (if applicable)

A. Administrative support at each participating campus and mechanisms for program coordination

B. Assistance for faculty, staff and students in meeting the unique demands of the proposed joint program (e.g., travel among participating campuses, distance learning expenses, relocation expenses)

C. Rules for determining registration and fee payment obligations, especially when students are receiving instructional services simultaneously from more than one participating campus

D. Comprehensive support services for students (e.g., child care, access to information resources) at multiple campuses

E. Mechanisms to ensure the involvement of each participating campus in admission decisions, curricular coordination and modification, advisory committees, and dissertation committees

F. Any other relevant features of the relationship between the partnering campuses in the development and implementation of the proposed degree program

XVIII. Accreditation

If the proposed program is within a school or related to other programs accredited by a professional accrediting agency, please list the agency, the year accredited, and include in the appendix a copy of the most recent accreditation evaluation. This pertains only to those participating departments that have relevant accreditation.
Core Concepts and Curriculum Matrix  
Indicating Inclusion of Core Curricular Elements in Proposed Ed.D. Program in Educational Leadership  
*Please submit one form each Ed.D. specialization*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number and Title</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Research Methods</th>
<th>Field-Based Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Systemic educational reform</td>
<td>Assessment and evaluation</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visionary educational leadership</td>
<td>Applied quantitative inquiry</td>
<td>Data-driven decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complexity and organizations</td>
<td>Applied qualitative inquiry</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborative management</td>
<td>Student development and learning</td>
<td>Professional practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diversity and equity</td>
<td>Curriculum &amp; instructional reforms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational policy environments</td>
<td>Human resource development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational accountability</td>
<td>School and campus cultures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School and campus cultures</td>
<td>Curriculum &amp; instructional reforms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum &amp; instructional reforms</td>
<td>Human resource development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human resource development</td>
<td>Student development and learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student development and learning</td>
<td>Curriculum &amp; instructional reforms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community &amp; governmental relations</td>
<td>Resources and fiscal planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resources and fiscal planning</td>
<td>Assessment and evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment and evaluation</td>
<td>Applied quantitative inquiry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applied quantitative inquiry</td>
<td>Applied qualitative inquiry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data-driven decision-making</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Professional practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate:  
- I = Element is introduced  
- R = Element is reinforced  
- A = Element is addressed at an advanced level
Joint Doctoral Degree Programs

Policy
The CSU is authorized to offer joint doctoral degrees only with the University of California and with independent institutions of higher education in California. Joint doctoral degrees shall not be offered with out-of-state, out-of-country partners, nor with for-profit partners in California.

California Education Code section 66010.4(b)
The doctoral degree may be awarded jointly with the University of California, as provided in subdivision (c) and pursuant to Section 66904. The doctoral degree may also be awarded jointly with one or more independent institutions of higher education, provided that the proposed doctoral program is approved by the California Postsecondary Education Commission.

California Education Code section 66010(b)
As used in this part, “independent institutions of higher education” are those nonpublic higher education institutions that grant undergraduate degrees, graduate degrees, or both, and that are formed as nonprofit corporations in this state and are accredited by an agency recognized by the United States Department of Education.

Procedures
CSU and Independent Institutions Joint Doctoral Programs
http://www.calstate.edu/app/documents/joint_doc_other.pdf

CSU and UC Joint Doctoral Programs
CSU and UC Joint Degree Programs

Flow Chart CSU and UC Joint Degree Programs
http://www.calstate.edu/app/jdb/documents/it_process_new_degrees_chart.pdf

Handbook for Creation of CSU/UC Joint Doctoral Programs
http://www.ucop.edu/acadimit/ucesu/jointdchandbook030502.htm

CSU/UC Joint Doctoral Programs—Review Criteria
http://www.ucop.edu/acadimit/ucesu/jointdchandbook030502.htm#6
Date: August 12, 1997

To: Vice Presidents, Academic Affairs

From: Charles W. Lindahl
Interim Senior Vice Chancellor
Academic Affairs

Subject: Procedures for Fast-Track and Pilot-Program Alternatives for Establishing New Degree Programs

Attached is a copy of the Board of Trustee agenda item addressing the revision of the process for reviewing and approving new degree programs. The resolution was adopted by the Board in July 1997. Three alternatives for establishing a new degree program are now authorized.

(1) Existing Process

This alternative is the traditional process, involving first the update of the campus Academic Master Plan and subsequently the development of a proposal for implementing the degree program. It will continue to be available for any proposed program and must be used for new programs that would involve major capital outlay and other significant additional new resources. Programs that involve degrees in areas new to the CSU as well as most programs that would involve separate specialized accreditation would also benefit from the longer, two-step review process. We shall request proposed updates to the Academic Master Plans early in the fall term, with a response requested by January 5, 1998.

(2) Fast Track Process

A campus may submit an implementation proposal for a new degree program that is not already projected on the campus Academic Master Plan if it meets the criteria for the “fast track.” (The criteria are detailed in the attached agenda item.) It will be reviewed just as if it were a second-phase implementation proposal in the two-phase process. We expect that fast-track proposals that are submitted to the Chancellor’s Office, Office of Academic Planning, by the first Monday in January and which raise no major issues can be acted on by the Board of Trustees in March and receive full approval in July. Those that are submitted by the second Monday in June and raise no major issues can be acted on by the Board of September and receive full approval in December.

Fast-track proposals should, for the time being, follow the existing format for degree implementation proposals (Attachment 2). Table 1, however, will be optional. Campuses may instead provide a narrative statement describing which areas of the curriculum will contract or fail to expand as quickly if the proposed program is implemented.

Note: This is an opportune time to reconsider what information should be provided in a degree program implementation proposal. Please convey suggestions to Dr. Jo Service, Dean, Academic Program Planning (telephone: 562/985-2845; e-mail: jo@calstate.edu).

(3) Pilot Programs

The Trustees have authorized a limited number of pilot programs which campuses may establish without prior approval of the Chancellor’s Office or CPEC. A pilot program must meet the criteria listed in Attachment 1 and may enroll students for five years. Conversion of a pilot program to regular-program status would require campus commitment of resources, a thorough program evaluation, review and comment by the Chancellor’s Office and CPEC, and approval by the Board and the Chancellor (these conditions are outlined in Attachment 1).

At this point, a campus is free to establish one pilot program in 1997-98 and one in either 1998-99 or 1999-2000. This guideline is consistent with the suggestion in Attachment 1.

Prior to implementing a pilot program, the campus must notify the Chancellor’s Office, Office of Academic Planning, which will formally acknowledge the program, assign a HEGIS code, and inform CPEC. The notification should be accompanied by the catalog copy describing the pilot program.
Proposed Revision of New-Degree Program Review and Approval Process

Background on Current Process

In 1963, the system’s Board of Trustees adopted planning policies that were designed to regularize curricular development and guide program distribution in the rapidly expanding system and to facilitate the progress of each individual campus in meeting its primary function as expressed in the California Master Plan for Higher Education (i.e., the provision of instruction for undergraduate and graduate students, through the master’s degree, in the liberal arts and sciences, in applied fields and in the professions, including the teaching profession). These policies are summarized below.

The programs offered by the CSU are to meet the needs of the entire state. One of the trustees’ guidelines explicitly states, “All universities cannot be all things to all people.” While employer need and student demand are not the primary considerations in establishing programs in the liberal arts and sciences, curricula in the applied fields and professions are to be located in a systemwide pattern that will achieve an equitable and educationally sound distribution of programs throughout the state. Although all universities may wish to offer the same programs, the trustees are to 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. Therefore, all proposed new programs are to be reviewed by the trustees to ensure that the needs of the state, as well as of any individual campus, are taken into account. The priority order that the trustees are to consider is: (1) needs of the state, (2) needs of the campus service area, and (3) identification of employment opportunities. In some areas, program development is also limited or guided by system or California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) policy. Subjects for which there have been specific policy guidelines include architecture, computer science, engineering, performing arts, health professionals, home economics, industrial arts and technology.

Trustee policy requires a two-part program planning and implementation process. First, each campus submits an updated academic plan, which contains projections of programs to be established in the next five (or, in some cases, ten) years. New projections are reviewed by Chancellor’s Office staff and, when campus and Chancellor’s Office staff agree, the updated plan is submitted to the trustees for their approval in March of each year. Trustee approval allows the campus to incorporate projected programs in their capital outlay planning. Second, following trustee approval of that plan, detailed proposals for implementation of projected programs are submitted to the chancellor for approval. (The Board of Trustees has delegated to the chancellor review and approval of new degree programs when their projection has been endorsed by the board.)

California law charges CPEC with the responsibility to review proposals for new degree programs. CPEC staff have traditionally concentrated their activity at the end of the process, just before approval of the chancellor, but the commission has approved moving the primary focus of the CPEC staff review to the point just after trustee approval of the projection, so that key questions are raised at an earlier stage of planning.

Rationale for Revision

The board’s planning policies were adopted 34 years ago, when the CSU was being formed from a mix of existing state colleges, colleges with the polytechnic emphasis, and newly established campuses. Existing campus curricula had developed largely independently, and there was great concern with program “duplication” across institutions. The first baby-boomers were entering college, and the state was focused on the needs of eighteen-to-twenty-four-year-old students, most of whom were expected to attend full time. The policies have been at least moderately successful in meeting the goals set in 1963 – especially in ensuring that academic program planning drives physical planning – but new needs have emerged that call for a review of trustee planning policies.

Although CSU will have to engage in careful planning during the next several decades if it is to accommodate Tidal Wave II, the emphasis will be on expanding access through such approaches as shared programs, greater reliance on distributed learning, and technological advances rather than development of traditional campuses. The rapid pace of change challenges our system to move more nimbly to improve responsiveness to the needs of students and the state. There is frustration with an approval process that requires all types of new programs to use a two-step process that was based on the assumption that virtually all new programs would require new facilities, and therefore have to move at the pace of facilities planning and approval processes. We are therefore proposing that the new-degree program review and approval process be modified.
Procedures for Fast-Track and Pilot-Program Alternatives for Establishing New Degree Programs

Proposed Revision

Goal of Revised Process

The revised process should continue the shift of emphasis in academic planning from gatekeeping to facilitation, service, coordination, and support (especially support in the maintenance of quality).

The revision of the process is designed to meet the following objectives:

- to create a true partnership between the campuses and academic planning
- to promote more campus responsibility for new-degree program proposal quality
- to speed up and simplify the new-degree program review process
- to promote greater cooperation and collaboration among campuses and across segments
- to promote greater attention to workforce and societal needs in program development
- to enhance and strengthen our working relationship with CPEC

It is proposed that the new-degree program approval process be revised in four ways:

1. Tailoring of approval processes to type of degree program proposed.
2. Automatic approval if no questions are raised by specific date.
3. Removal of projection from Academic Plan if not implemented with five years (or date originally projected for implementation).
4. Development of post-authorization review process for limited number of “pilot” programs.

1) Tailoring of approval processes to type of degree program proposed.

The current review process remains appropriate for new programs that would involve major capital outlay and other significant additional new resources. Programs that involve degrees in areas new to the CSU as well as most programs that would involve separate specialized accreditation would also benefit from the longer, two-step review process. However, programs that involve no major capital outlay and which can be accommodated within the existing resource base of the campus could be handled more quickly while retaining the elements of the two-step review process. Such programs could be placed on a “fast track.” Examples would be degree programs that are “elevations” of well-established options in fields for which there are existing degree programs elsewhere in the system, and degree programs that involve little more than the repackaging of existing courses and faculty. The ideal would be a fast-track program that could be approved and implemented within one year from the time a campus first proposed that program, instead of the current two- to three-year time lag between proposal and implementation.

A program could be placed on the fast track only if:

(a) it could be offered at a high level of quality by the campus within the campus’s existing resource base, or there is a demonstrated capacity to fund the program on a self-support basis;
(b) it is not subject to specialized accreditation by an agency that is a member of the Association of Specialized and Professional Accreditors, or it is currently offered as an option or concentration that is already recognized and accredited by an appropriate specialized accrediting agency;
(c) it can be adequately housed without a major capital outlay project;
(d) it is consistent with all existing state and federal law and trustee policy;
(e) it is a bachelor’s or master’s degree program;
(f) the program has been subject to a thorough campus review and approval process.

Two approval cycles per year for fast-track are envisioned because program implementation might be limited by the short time between approval at the March Board of Trustees’ meeting, subsequent July approval by CPEC, and fall implementation. A second, briefer agenda item at the September Board of Trustees’ meeting would make it possible for a proposal to come in by June, have any concerns resolved by the time of the board meeting in September, be authorized by the board, go to CPEC directly after the meeting, be endorsed by CPEC by December, be incorporated in campus catalogs and other campus informational materials in the spring and perhaps be implemented in a limited manner in the spring term, and be ready for full implementation in August.
Procedures for Fast-Track and Pilot-Program Alternatives for Establishing New Degree Programs

Timelines for Fast-Track Approval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus activity</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>End of December</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Chancellor’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Board of Trustees’ approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>CPEC endorsement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus activity</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early June</td>
<td>Proposal to Chancellor’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Board of Trustees’ approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>CPEC endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Limited implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Program description in campus catalog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Full implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Automatic approval if no questions are raised by specified date.

Another proposal for speeding up approval of both traditional and fast-track programs would be to set firm deadlines for review by the Chancellor’s Office and CPEC. Neither the Chancellor’s Office nor CPEC reviewers could routinely ask for extra time. If no questions were forwarded to the campus by the end of the review deadline, then approval would be automatic. For at least some programs, review by the Chancellor’s Office and CPEC could be concurrent.

(3) Removal of projection from Academic Plan if not implemented with five years (or date originally projected for implementation).

For the traditionally traced new-program proposals, if the implementation proposal does not come in within five years or the date originally projected for implementation, whichever is later, the projection would be removed from the Academic Plan and would have to be resubmitted and/or revised. This proposal should improve the responsiveness of our program offerings. Many areas are changing so rapidly that five years could make a significant difference in the needs of students and of the state. This provision would not apply to “foundation” liberal arts and science programs, for which employer need and student demand are not primary considerations. It is recommended, however, that the concept of foundation programs be reevaluated so that it is consistent with the current reconsideration of the baccalaureate degree by the Academic Senate and the Cornerstones project.

(4) Development of post-authorization review process for limited number of “pilot” programs.

Some experimentation in the planning and offering of academic programs is part of the CSU tradition (e.g., pilot external degree programs, MFA in Cinema). We propose that the trustees authorize the establishment of a limited number of degree programs (we suggest one or two per campus per three-year period) under the following conditions:

(a) A pilot program would be authorized to operate only for five years. If no further action is taken by the end of the five years, no new students could be admitted to the program. (The campus would be obliged to make appropriate arrangements for students already enrolled in the program to complete it.)

(b) A pilot program could be converted to regular-program status and approved to continue to operate indefinitely if the following conditions are met:

(i) The campus committed the resources necessary to maintain the program beyond five years;

(ii) A thorough program evaluation (including an on-site review by one or more experts in the field) showed the program to be of high quality; to be attractive to students; and to produce graduates attractive to prospective employers and/or graduate programs, as appropriate;

(iii) Approval by the board and the chancellor would be required after review and comment by the Chancellor’s Office and CPEC.
(c) A program could be established as a pilot program only if it met the criteria for fast-track programs; that is,
   (i) it could be offered at a high level of quality by the campus within the campus’s existing resource base, or there is a
demonstrated capacity to fund the program on a self-support basis;
   (ii) it is not subject to specialized accreditation by an agency that is a member of the Association of Specialized and
Professional Accreditors, or it is currently offered as an option or concentration that is already recognized and accredited
by an appropriate specialized accrediting agency;
   (iii) it requires no major capital outlay project to be adequately housed;
   (iv) it is consistent with all existing state and federal law and trustee policy;
   (v) it is a bachelor’s or master’s degree program;
   (vi) the campus has a thorough review and approval process for pilot degree programs, through which the program has
   passed.

(d) The campus would be obliged to notify the Chancellor’s Office of the establishment of the program and its curricular
requirements prior to program implementation.

(e) A pilot program could be implemented without its having been projected on the campus Academic Plan. It would require
the acknowledgment, but not the prior approval of, the Chancellor’s Office and CPEC, and it would be identified as a pilot
program in the next annual update of the campus Academic Plan.

Proposed Resolution
The proposed resolution refers to the revision of the new-degree review process. The following resolution is recommended for
adoption.

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the current new-degree program
review and approval process be revised to permit a semi-annual, fast-track review process and the establishment of
a limited number of pilot programs. The revised new-degree program review and approval process will be reviewed
and evaluated five years from implementation.
Concentrations, Emphases, Minors

Procedures for Submitting Proposals
WASC Substantive Change Proposals
Procedures for Submitting Proposals for New Concentrations*, Emphases, and Minors

With Revisions Through 2014

Each new concentration, emphasis, and minor is subject to review unless it is exempted under the provisions of Executive Order 1071 (formerly 602 – See Appendix), which delegates approval authority to the presidents. While campuses may have unique definitions, a concentration, and a special emphasis are all defined for purposes of system review as an aggregate of courses within a degree major designed to give a student specialized knowledge, competence, or skill. Programs not meeting the above criteria will be designated by the campus as a “specialization.”

Requests for a specialization within a major may be submitted and do not require Chancellor’s Office approval. Programs approved as an emphasis or concentration will be noted on students’ transcripts and diplomas. Specializations are not listed on these two documents.

A minor is a formal aggregate of courses in a designated subject area distinct from and outside the student’s degree major, consisting of 15-24 semester units. Normally 12 units of coursework in the minor will be upper division.

The information required for review and approval of a proposed concentration, emphasis, or minor is less detailed than for a full degree major program. Requests for approval of a concentration, emphasis, or minor should follow the format below. The proposal must include a Resource Impact Statement:

1. Name of the campus submitting the request and the full and exact title of the proposed aggregate of courses, whether it is a concentration, emphasis, or minor.
2. Full and exact title of the degree major program under which the aggregate of courses will be offered, where applicable.
3. Concentrations or emphases already existing under the degree major program for which the new aggregate of courses is proposed.
4. Department(s) to offer the aggregate of courses.
5. Purpose of the proposed aggregate of courses.
6. Goals for the (1) program and (2) student learning outcomes. Program goals are very broad statements about what the program is intended to achieve, including what kinds of graduates will be produced. Student learning outcomes are more specific statements that are related to the program goals but that more narrowly identify what students will know and be able to do upon successful completion of the program.
7. Need for the proposed aggregate of courses.
8. List of the courses, by catalog number, title, and units of credit, as well as total units to be required under the proposed aggregate of courses.
9. List of courses, by catalog number, title, and units of credit, as well as total units to be required for the major in which the proposed aggregate of courses is to be included.
10. New courses to be developed. Include proposed catalog descriptions.
11. Advising “roadmap” that has been developed for the new emphasis or concentration.
12. List of all present faculty members, with rank, appointment status, highest degree earned, date and field of highest degree, and professional experience, who would teach in the proposed aggregate of courses.
13. Additional instructional resources (faculty, space, equipment, library volumes, etc.) needed to implement and sustain the proposed aggregate of courses. List all resources needed for the first five years beyond those currently projected, including specific resource, cost, and source of funding.

* Including Doctoral Concentrations.
14. In addition to planning for the direct instructional costs of a new program, there is general agreement that in a time of declining resources, greater attention also needs to be devoted to assessing opportunity costs. While recognizing the great difficulty of identifying such new programs’ costs—possible negative effects on the quality of other existing programs, foregone opportunities for mounting other new programs, inability to increase resource allocations to existing programs, etc.—we are requesting that each proposal for a new program address this question and suggest the following as an interim approach:

a. Careful assessment of the direct costs of implementing and sustaining the program, including evidence that the campus has identified and is prepared to (re)allocate sufficient resources to the new program to ensure a reasonable chance for its success on a quality basis.

b. Identification, if possible, of the source of resources to be reallocated, and assessment of the impact on the area(s) losing resources.

c. Relation of the new program to the campus’ mission and to its academic master plan, including consideration of whether implementation might preclude the establishment of other planned programs.

d. Consideration of whether the new program represents the best possible use of campus resources. This includes such concerns as the need on an immediate and continuing basis for program graduates (relative to other program possibilities) and scarcity of program alternatives for students in a region, either through lack of programs or program impaction elsewhere.

Proposals for new programs must be supplemented by specific information on the above.

15. Include a complete proposed catalog description (catalog output blocks).
The following types of programs require substantive change approval from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).

Programs that fit the description outlined above cannot be implemented until approval has been received from WASC.

- New site (in WASC region, more than 25 miles).
- New site (out of WASC region).
- Modality (distance education in which 50% or more is delivered through any technology assisted medium).
- Blended (new site and modality).
- Existing degree level – outside scope of current degrees offered.
- Existing degree level – increase in number of programs offered in disciplines not currently offered.

Consult the Division of Undergraduate Studies for detailed information on the following:

- Timeframe for Submitting a Proposal.
- Substantive Change Application forms.
- Description of Substantive Change Categories.
Certificate Programs

Types of Certificate Programs

General Guidelines for All Certificate Programs

Academic Certificate Programs

Professional Certificate programs

Cosponsored Certificate Programs

Other Certificates
University Guidelines for Certificate Programs
(Guidelines Based on Executive Order 806)

Types of Certificate Programs
San Diego State University offers two types of certificate programs:

- Academic certificate programs, and
- Professional certificate programs.

Academic certificate programs carry academic credit from SDSU and are offered at two levels: basic (undergraduate-level) and advanced (graduate-level).

Professional certificate programs do not carry academic credit from SDSU. However, some of these programs carry X-level professional development credit. Professional certificate programs are offered only through the College of Extended Studies, SDSU. In addition, the university also offers cosponsored certificate programs, which may be either credit or non-credit bearing.

General Guidelines for All Certificate Programs

1. No certificates other than those described in this policy may be awarded at SDSU.
2. Self-supporting certificate programs, both basic and advanced, credit and non-credit, will be administered by the College of Extended Studies.
3. Unless otherwise stated, academic certificate programs are available to matriculated and nonmatriculated students. Students seeking a certificate must apply for admission according to the guidelines set forth by the individual certificate program. Non degree seeking students who meet departmental guidelines may earn a certificate through Open University.
4. The policies listed here do not apply to SDSU Certificates of Appreciation, Recognition, etc. For information on these certificates, please contact SDSU ReproGraphic Services.

Academic Certificate Programs

Basic Certificate Programs

Definition
Basic certificate programs provide individuals whose educational objectives do not require a full degree program the opportunity to participate in university academic activities designed to meet specific educational needs.

Jurisdiction
Basic certificate programs are under the jurisdiction of the Undergraduate Curriculum committee.

Specific Requirements

1. Basic certificate programs must include a minimum of 12 units of coursework.
2. Basic certificate programs may include courses numbered 100 through 599. No 600- or 700-level courses may be included in basic certificate programs.
3. A basic certificate program cannot substitute for an approved major, minor, or emphasis program.
4. Courses taken for a major or minor may not be applied to a basic certificate program unless otherwise specified in the catalog.
5. The grading option of credit/no credit is available for courses in basic certificate programs.
6. The adviser or director of the program is responsible for verifying a student's satisfactory completion of the academic requirements established for the program and for forwarding a copy of the verification form to the Office of the Registrar (see page 132). The Office of the Registrar records the completion of the program on the student's transcript and forwards the signed certificate to the director for distribution to the student.
Advanced Certificate Programs

**Definition**
An advanced certificate program offers post-baccalaureate students coursework leading to a specific applied goal. An advanced certificate program may be inter- or multidisciplinary and generally should have some professional application. It is the responsibility of the department offering an advanced certificate program to carefully evaluate the subjects to be studied and the job opportunities available to graduates to ensure that the program adequately addresses the professional needs of students and the requirements of the professional discipline or area.

**Jurisdiction**
Advanced certificate programs are under the jurisdiction of the Graduate Council.

**Specific Requirements**
1. Advanced certificate programs must include a minimum of 12 units of coursework.
2. Advanced certificate programs may only include courses numbered 500 through 799. At least half of the coursework must be at the 600 and 700 level.
3. Coursework for an advanced certificate must not duplicate in content and level the student's prior educational experience.
4. Clearly stated objectives must be included in the proposal.
5. With the approval of the department, units may be applied to both an advanced certificate program and a graduate degree program.
6. All coursework must be letter graded, except for courses that are offered only as credit/no credit.
7. Students must maintain a minimum GPA of 3.0 in all advanced certificate coursework, with no less than the grade of “C” in any course. Only 3 units of coursework with a grade of “C” can count toward an advanced certificate. A maximum of 3 units of coursework may be repeated.
8. The offering department should establish a minimum of one adviser for each advanced certificate program. In the case of interdepartmental certificate programs, each department involved must have a designated adviser.
9. The adviser or director of the program is responsible for verifying a student's satisfactory completion of the academic requirements established for the program and for forwarding a completed copy of the verification form to Graduate and Research Affairs (see page 133). Graduate and Research Affairs records the completion of the program on the student's transcript and forwards the signed certificate to the director for distribution to the student.
10. These guidelines constitute minimum standards for advanced certificate programs; departments may propose additional requirements for approval by the Graduate Council.

**Admission**
Admission to an advanced certificate program requires a bachelor's degree from an accredited institution, with a major in the appropriate field(s) of study, as well as a grade point average of at least 2.5 (where A=4) in the last 60 semester (90 quarter) units attempted. If the major is in a related field of study, the department offering the certificate may require the student, prior to admission, to take certain coursework with minimum specific standards of achievement to remove deficiencies. There is no conditional admission to advanced certificate programs. Departments offering advanced certificate programs may specify subject matter and/or coursework prerequisites for admission into the certificate program. Such prerequisites will be listed in the *Graduate Bulletin*. The candidate's record must demonstrate currency of bachelor-level major in terms of these prerequisite requirements. All portions found not to be current or relevant in terms of these requirements must be taken again (for a letter grade) or waived through examination (written or oral) prior to admission. Where appropriate, some form of portfolio presentation, performance audition, or other evidence of specific competence may be required for admission. Such criteria will also be listed in the *Graduate Bulletin*. 
University Guidelines for Certificate Programs

Guidelines for Proposing and Reviewing Academic Certificate Programs
Academic certificate programs (either basic or advanced) may be proposed by individuals, departments, deans, or college curriculum committees. Proposals may be submitted, reviewed, and approved at any time during the academic year.

The process for proposing and reviewing academic certificate programs is as follows:

1. A proposal for a new academic certificate program is submitted to the appropriate department chair(s), the curriculum committee(s) of the college(s), and then to the college dean(s) for review and approval.

2. Proposals approved by the appropriate college curriculum committee(s) and college dean(s) are forwarded for initial review and dissemination to Curriculum Services with the following information submitted via CurricUNET:
   a. Originator and title of program;
   b. Justification for and objectives of the program;
   c. Proposed clientele;
   d. Curriculum outline and course descriptions;
   e. Administration and logistical support plan;
   f. Instructional resources;
   g. Catalog copy, which includes the following:
      • brief statement of purpose,
      • admission requirements,
      • course requirements,
      • total number of units,
      • grade point average needed to receive certificate if other than 2.0 for basic certificates and 3.0 for advanced certificates,
      • program adviser or where to get additional information,
      • number of units applicable (if any) to a degree and/or major.

3. Information copies of the proposal are sent to academic deans with a time limit provided for review, questions, and comments. Copies of the proposal are also forwarded to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee or the Graduate Curriculum Committee.

4. The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Curriculum Committee are responsible for timely review and approval of academic certificate programs and for on-going evaluation of such programs. Specifically, the committees:

   Review all proposals for the following:
   (1) Is the program adequately justified and does it have the necessary resources (faculty, space, equipment, material, etc.)?
   (2) Are the unit or units proposing to administer the program appropriate and has the proposal followed the established approval process?
   (3) Does the proposal duplicate or overlap with existing certificate programs, majors, minors, concentrations, or emphases?
   (4) Is there satisfactory evidence of coordination and consultation with all appropriate University units?
   (5) Does the proposal contain clear and realistic objectives?
Professional Certificate Programs

Definition
Professional certificate programs do not carry academic credit from SDSU. However, some carry X-level professional development credit; these programs use course numbers X001 – X075. All professional certificate programs are administered by the College of Extended Studies. For further information on these programs, contact the Dean of the College of Extended Studies or Curriculum Services.

Jurisdiction
The College of Extended Studies has jurisdiction over all professional certificate programs.

Specific Requirements
1. Professional certificate programs that carry professional development credit must include a minimum of the equivalent of 12 units of coursework.
2. The number of courses and contact hours required to earn a non-credit certificate is based on one or more of the following:
   a. Recommendation by industry professionals,
   b. Industry standards.
3. The College of Extended Studies maintains the records of enrollment and completion for all participants in professional certificate programs.
4. Upon petition and payment of fees by the student, the Dean of the College of Extended Studies will verify that the student has completed all requirements for the certificate.
5. Upon certification by the dean, the certificate will be awarded and a notation will be made in the student’s file.

Guidelines for Designing, Proposing, and Reviewing Professional Certificate Programs
Professional certificate programs may be proposed by individuals, departments, and colleges. Proposals may be submitted at any time during the academic year.

1. The originator of a professional certificate program submits the following information to the Dean, College of Extended Studies:
   a. Originator and title of the proposed program,
   b. Justification for and objectives of the program,
   c. Proposed clientele,
   d. Curriculum outline and course or program description,
   e. Administration and logistical support plan,
   f. Program budget,
   g. Instructional resources,
   h. Evaluation mechanism.
2. Proposals for professional certificate programs that carry professional development credit must have the approval of a participating department, the dean of the participating college, and the Dean of the College of Extended Studies.
3. Proposals for non-credit certificate programs must have the approval of the Dean of the College of Extended Studies.
Cosponsored Certificate Programs
Cosponsored certificate programs are programs cosponsored by the university and an outside agency or organization, such as a professional association, hospital, international agency, or company. Cosponsored certificate programs may either carry academic credit or not (see appropriate guidelines for academic or professional certificate programs above). The program director is responsible for obtaining these specially prepared certificates from the Office of University Advancement and, in the case of academic credit-bearing cosponsored certificate programs, for ensuring that the Office of the Registrar receives a verification form in order to record the completion of the program on a student's transcript. (See page 135 for example of the acceptable format for a cosponsored certificate.)

Other Certificates
Certificates may also be presented for participation in College of Extended Studies courses, workshops, or seminars which have not formally been designated as certificate programs. Such certificates may be of two types:

a. Certificate of Appreciation, Participation, or Recognition: used for an approved non-credit educational or training-related activity (such as a workshop or seminar) sponsored by the university (see page 138).

b. Certificate of Completion: used for self-support, non-credit for continuing education units and extension credit through the College of Extended Studies for certificate programs such as Contract Management, Human Resource Management, Construction Supervisory Management, etc. Page 136 is extension credit, page 137 is non-credit.
Certificate Samples

Notification of Certificate Program Completion Sample
Notification of Completion of Advanced Certificate Program Sample
Academic Certificate Sample
Cosponsored Certificate Sample
College of Extended Studies Certificate Samples
Certificate of Appreciation, Participation, or Recognition Sample
TO: Registrar, Office of the Registrar

FROM: ________________________________

RE: Notification of Certificate Program Completion*

Student’s Name: ________________________________

Last    First    Middle

Other names under which records might be listed:

______________________________________________

RedID: __________________ Date of Birth: _____ / _____ / ______

Date Completed: _____ / _____ / ______

Date Awarded: _____ / _____ / ______

Matriculated student at SDSU? □ Yes □ No

Verification that all requirements were successfully completed:

Verified by: ________________________________

Certificate Program Coordinator Signature

Academic Unit: ________________________________ Date: _____ / _____ / ______

Date Posted: ______________

Initials: __________________

*Send completed form to the Office of the Registrar in order for the certificate completion to be recorded on the student’s academic record.

Distribution:

White—Office of the Registrar

Yellow—Department

Pink—Student

Enrollment Services, 2010
SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY
Graduate and Research Affairs
Division of Graduate Affairs

Notification of Completion of Advanced Certificate Program

Type or Print

Last Name
First
MI
Red ID #

Street Address
Apt. No.
Local Telephone No.

City
State
Zip Code

Status of Student:  Matriculated at SDSU
Extended Studies

Name of Advanced Degree Program

COURSES COMPLETED TO MEET REQUIREMENTS

Dept./Course No.  Title  Units  Grade  Institution

Department examination required:  Yes  No
If yes, date passed

Program completed on  . I verify that all requirements have been successfully completed.

Certificate Program Director Signature  Date

Graduate Division:  Admission and Records:

(Date)  Copy to Admissions and Records to post certificate

(Date)  Certificate Ordered

Name of Advanced Certificate to be Posted:

Dates awarded

Posted by Date

Graduate Dean/Designee Signature  Date

Current form is available on Graduate and Research Affairs Web site at
http://gra.sdsu.edu/index.php?area_id=1&section_id=51&subsection_id=13#AdvancedCertificates
[ACADEMIC CERTIFICATE SAMPLE]
(For Basic Certificates, contact contact Mary Bell [extension 44903] or Diane Burgraff [extension 44900], Office of the Registrar.)
(For Advanced Certificates, contact Cristina Sanchez, Division of Graduate Affairs, extension 41356.)
(For Professional Certificates, contact Tamara McLeod, Executive Director of Professional Development, College of Extended Studies, extension 45640.)
THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO AND
SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY

Award this certificate to
in Recognition of Satisfactory Completion of Training as a Resident in
PREVENTIVE MEDICINE

from
Given at San Diego this

two thousand

[q]
San Diego State University

hereby awards an Academic Certificate to

Student Name

in recognition for the satisfactory completion of requirements leading to a Certificate in Contract Management.

Dated this 29th day of June 2006

Dean, College of Extended Studies

President, San Diego State University
[CONTACT COLLEGE OF EXTENDED STUDIES FOR THIS CERTIFICATE]
[CONTACT SDSU REPROGRAPHIC SERVICES FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPRECIATION, PARTICIPATION, OR RECOGNITION]
Course Classification System

Course Classification System Chart

Course Classification System Examples

S – Factor Categories and WTU Generation

AAR 92–07 Faculty Workload Policy Amendment
The Course Classification System

The formula used to determine faculty workload for “C” (classroom) classes is as follows:

\[(\text{Adjusted Course Credit Units}) \times (\text{K-Factor}) \times (\text{Team Teaching Fraction}) = \text{WTU}\]

The formula used to determine faculty workload for “S” (supervision) classes is as follows:

\[\frac{\text{Enrollment}}{S \text{ Factor}} \times 12 = \text{WTU}\]

(S factor for each — S23, S24, S25, S36, S48 — is identified in the footnote at the bottom of the page.)

### The California State University

#### COURSE CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekly Course Classification Number</th>
<th>Class Hrs. APDB Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Per Unit of Credit</th>
<th>Normal LD</th>
<th>Class UD</th>
<th>Size GD</th>
<th>Workload K-Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1 01</td>
<td>large lecture</td>
<td>1 facility limits (50)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 02</td>
<td>lecture discussion</td>
<td>1 40 40 40</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 03</td>
<td>lecture-composition</td>
<td>1 30 30 30</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lecture-counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lecture-case study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4 04</td>
<td>discussion</td>
<td>1 25-39 25-39 25-39</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5 05</td>
<td>seminar</td>
<td>1 20 20 15</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6 06</td>
<td>clinical processes</td>
<td>1 20 10 10</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7 07</td>
<td>fine arts and science activities</td>
<td>2 24 24 24</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8 08</td>
<td>education workshops and social science activities</td>
<td>2 30 30 30</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9 09</td>
<td>music activity – large group</td>
<td>2 40 40 40</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10 10</td>
<td>music activity – small group</td>
<td>2 10 10 10</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11 11</td>
<td>physical education and recreation activities</td>
<td>2 30 30 30</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12 12</td>
<td>speech, drama &amp; journalism activities</td>
<td>2 20 20 20</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13 13</td>
<td>technical activities and laboratories</td>
<td>2 facility limits (24)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14 14</td>
<td>remedial courses</td>
<td>2 15 15 15</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15 15</td>
<td>technical activities and laboratories</td>
<td>3 facility limits (24)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C16 16</td>
<td>science laboratories</td>
<td>3 facility limits (24)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C17 17</td>
<td>clinical practice off campus</td>
<td>3 8 8 8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C18 18</td>
<td>major intercollegiate sports (not more than four per year)</td>
<td>3 or more 20 20 –</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C19 19</td>
<td>minor intercollegiate sports</td>
<td>3 or more 20 20 –</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C20 20</td>
<td>major performance</td>
<td>3 or more 20 20 20</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C21 21</td>
<td>music performance</td>
<td>3 or more 40 40 40</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S23 23</td>
<td>supervision</td>
<td>N/A 12 12 12 N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S24 24</td>
<td>supervision</td>
<td>N/A 18 18 18 N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S25 25</td>
<td>supervision</td>
<td>N/A 24 24 24 N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S36 36</td>
<td>supervision</td>
<td>N/A 36 36 36 N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S48 48</td>
<td>supervision</td>
<td>N/A 48 48 48 N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C77 77</td>
<td>peer-taught courses, ROTC or non-workload instruction which is not state supported</td>
<td>varies N/A N/A N/A</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C78 78</td>
<td>nontraditional instruction, examination, or evaluation (workload is assigned)</td>
<td>varies N/A N/A N/A</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 23 = Code for APDB and Class Schedule
† 24 = Code for APDB and Class Schedule
‡ 25 = Code for APDB and Class Schedule
* 36 = Code for APDB and Class Schedule
* 48 = Code for APDB and Class Schedule

12= S Factor to use in formula to determine WTU's
16= S Factor to use in formula to determine WTU's
24= S Factor to use in formula to determine WTU's
36= S Factor to use in formula to determine WTU's
48= S Factor to use in formula to determine WTU's

revised 8/83, 5/92, 5/93, 3/96
## COURSE CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM — EXAMPLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Classification Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Typical Examples and Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-1</td>
<td>Large lecture</td>
<td>Lecture courses in any discipline with more than 50 enrollments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-2</td>
<td>Lecture – discussion</td>
<td>Lecture courses in any discipline in which class participation is a planned portion of the instructional method.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-3</td>
<td>Lecture – composition</td>
<td>Business, education, English, and psychology courses in which students write, are counseled or study law cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture – counseling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture – case study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-4</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Courses in any discipline in which student participation (discussion) is the primary instructional method.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-5</td>
<td>Seminar</td>
<td>Courses in any discipline using seminar methods of instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-6</td>
<td>Clinical processes</td>
<td>Nursing and psychology courses in clinical processes and education courses involving individual testing, such as driver training in a simulator. Art, anthropology and science activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-7</td>
<td>Fine arts and science activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-8</td>
<td>Education workshops and social science activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-9</td>
<td>Music activity – large group</td>
<td>Does not result in a major public performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-10</td>
<td>Music activity – small group</td>
<td>Instrumental or vocal instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-11</td>
<td>Physical education and recreation activities</td>
<td>Gym classes or intramural sports if credit is given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-12</td>
<td>Speech, drama and journalism activities</td>
<td>Class work in debate, acting and publication; no public performance involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-13</td>
<td>Technical activities and laboratories</td>
<td>Courses involving the use of business and other machines; accounting, geography, foreign languages, home economics, psychology, library science, photography, engineering, industrial arts, agriculture, mathematics and statistics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-14</td>
<td>Remedial courses</td>
<td>Courses for students admitted as exceptions only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-15</td>
<td>Technical activities and laboratories</td>
<td>Laboratories in art, foreign language, home economics, industrial arts, physical education, speech correction, cartography, audiovisual, mathematics, library science, police science.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-16</td>
<td>Science laboratories</td>
<td>Laboratories in natural science, life science, psychology, natural resources, agriculture, engineering, meteorology, photography.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-17</td>
<td>Clinical practice – off campus</td>
<td>Nursing, social work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-18</td>
<td>Major intercollegiate sports</td>
<td>Football, basketball, baseball, track and field, wrestling, swimming, etc.; limited to four sports per year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-19</td>
<td>Minor intercollegiate sports</td>
<td>Other sports not listed as C-18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-20</td>
<td>Major performance</td>
<td>Production courses in art, drama, journalism, music, photography, radio-TV, debate; results in a major public performance, showing or distribution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-21</td>
<td>Music performance</td>
<td>Major performance groups, such as orchestras, bands and choruses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>★S-23</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>Supervision requires three hours per week with each supervised student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>★S-24</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>Supervision requires two hours per week with each supervised student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>★S-25</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>Supervision requires one and one-half hours per week with each supervised student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>★S-36</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>Supervision requires one hour per week with each supervised student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>★S-48</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>Supervision requires three-quarters of one hour per week with each supervised student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-77</td>
<td>Peer-taught courses, ROTC or non-workload instruction which is not state supported</td>
<td>Courses which generate no workload for faculty but generate FTES for the campus and are not state supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-78</td>
<td>Non-traditional instruction, examination or evaluation</td>
<td>Courses which generate credit by examination, or evaluation, or which are taught in modes not described by the formulas. Faculty workload is assigned.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

★ Refer to AAR 92-07 for more detailed description of workload responsibilities.

Original 8/75  Revised 8/83, 5/92, 5/93, 3/96
**Supervision Course Categories and WTU Generation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Students per:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S–1</td>
<td>S–48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S–2</td>
<td>S–36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S–3</td>
<td>S–25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S–4</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S–5</td>
<td>S–23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For coding purposes on curricular proposal forms, APDB and Class Schedule, the following CS numbers need to be used:

S–1 = S–48  
S–2 = S–36  
S–3 = S–25  
S–4 = S–24  
S–5 = S–23

★ Each number in this column is the S Factor (by category) to be used in the workload formula for Supervision classes, based on 12 WTU standard.
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
Office of the Chancellor
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California 90802-4275

Date: February 27, 1992

To: Presidents

From: Lee R. Kerschner  June M. Cooper
Senior Vice Chancellor  Vice Chancellor
Academic Affairs  Human Resources and Operations

Subject: Amendment to Coded Memorandum EP&R 76-36 — Faculty Workload Policy Materials

You are aware that the current contract between the CSU and the California Faculty Association (CFA) provides for a joint CSU/CFA Workload Committee to, inter alia, review and recommend revisions and clarifications to existing workload formulae. This committee has reviewed the existing supervision (S factor) course classification and recommended that revised definitions which are discipline independent be provided for existing supervision categories, and that a new category S-4 (equivalent to S-18 in the previous nomenclature) be created. These recommendations have been reviewed by the Management Advisory Group and, subsequently, by all campus presidents. A memorandum of understanding involving these revisions has been signed by the CSU and CFA (see attachment).

These new supervision course classifications are available for use by the campuses beginning with the Summer 1992 term. The new definitions and numbers make no changes in workload for the categories. They do as indicated above, add a new category (S-4) for which eighteen supervised students constitutes a full workload. The new definitions attempt to clarify the connection between the workload measured in WTU and the amount of time spent with each student in the course of supervised activity. Please note that the existing supervision course categories have been renumbered as S-1 through S-5 (corresponding to S-48, S-36, S-25, S-24, and S-23, respectively).

The new category and the revised numbers should be used for faculty workload reporting beginning with Summer quarter, 1992.

Attachment

Distribution: Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs (w/a)
Directors of Institutional Research/Analytic Studies (w/a)
Members, Joint CFA/CSU Faculty Workload Committee (w/a)
Chancellor’s Office Staff, without attachment
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

The California State University and the California Faculty Association agree that in the calculation of faculty workload, the following definitions shall be used in describing instruction involving one-on-one contact between faculty and student.

S–FACTOR COURSE DEFINITIONS

S-Factor courses are assigned when the mode of instruction involves direct one-on-one contact between faculty and student. The average amount of faculty time per student referenced in the definitions includes faculty preparation, evaluation, travel, and liaison with agencies when necessary.

(S48) S–1. This category may be used for any supervision that requires of the instructor an average of three quarters of one hour per week of activity with each individual supervised student. The faculty member would receive one-fourth WTU for each student.

(S36) S–2. This category may be used for any supervision that requires of the instructor an average of one hour per week of activity with each individual supervised student. The faculty member would receive one-third WTU for each student.

(S25) S–3. This category is restricted to supervision as a primary technique of instruction requiring of the instructor an intensity of supervision resulting in an average of one and one-half hours per week with each supervised student or in liaison with school or agency personnel. The faculty member would receive one-half WTU for each student.

(S24) S–4. This category is restricted to supervision as a primary technique of instruction in which the instructor assumes direct responsibility for the activities of the student, and that requires of the instructor an intensity of supervision resulting in an average of two hours per week with each supervised student or in liaison with agency personnel. The faculty member would receive two-thirds WTU for each student.

(S23) S–5. This category is restricted to supervision as a primary technique of instruction in which the instructor assumes direct responsibility for the activities of the student, and that requires of the instructor an intensity of supervision resulting in an average of three hours per week with each supervised student or in liaison with agency personnel. The faculty member would receive one WTU for each student.

For The California State University

/s/ Jacob M. Samit
Jacob M. Samit
January 30, 1992
Date

For the California Faculty Association

/s/ Edward R. Purcell
Edward R. Purcell
2/4/92
Date
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Executive Order No. 1071 – Delegation of Authority for Program Approvals

Year-Round Operations Planning Principles and Calendar
Degree Programs Offered Through Special Sessions

EP&R 82 – 39 Definitions of Graduate Level Instruction
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Degree Program Discontinuation – SDSU Policy
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Elevating Options and Concentrations to Full Degree Major Programs
Converting Pilot Programs to Regular Program Status

Adding Self-Support Version of a Previously Approved State-Support Offering
March 26, 2012

MEMORANDUM

TO: CSU Presidents

FROM: Charles B. Reed
Chancellor

SUBJECT: Delegation of Authority to Approve Options, Concentrations, Special Emphases and Minors — Executive Order 1071

Attached is a copy of Executive Order 1071, which supersedes Executive Order 602 and which delegates to presidents the authority to approve options, concentrations, special emphases and minors.

In accordance with policy of the California State University, the campus president has the responsibility for implementing executive orders where applicable and for maintaining the campus repository and index for all executive orders.

If you have questions regarding this executive order, please contact the State University Dean, Academic Programs and Policy at (562) 951-4672 or APP@calstate.edu.

CBR/clm

Attachment

c: Executive Staff, Office of the Chancellor
Provosts/Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs
Associate Provosts/Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs
Deans of Extended Education
Deans of Graduate Studies
Directors of Admission and Records
Mr. Eric Forbes, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Academic Support
Ms. Sheila Thomas, State University Dean, Extended Education
Executive Order 1071

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY  
Office of the Chancellor   
401 Golden Shore  
Long Beach, California 90802-4210  
(562) 951-4722

Executive Order: 1071  
Effective Date: March 26, 2012  
Supersedes: Executive Order 602  
Title: Delegation of Authority to Approve Options, Concentrations, Special Emphases and Minors

This executive order is issued pursuant to Section II (a) of the Standing Orders of the Board of Trustees of the California State University and sections 40100 and 40500(c) of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations. This executive order supersedes Executive Order 602.

1. Delegation of Authority  
Authority is delegated to the presidents to approve campus implementation of options, concentrations, special emphases and minors (also referred to as “subprograms”).

2. Definition of Terms  
Subprograms are not defined at the system level.

3. Requisite Conditions of Approval  
An option, concentration, special emphasis or minor may be approved under the authority delegated by this executive order only where adequate faculty, physical facilities, and library holdings sufficient to establish and maintain that subprogram already exist or where such support can reasonably be expected to become available.

4. Required Chancellor’s Office Notification  
4.1 There is no requirement to notify the Chancellor’s Office of new, modified or discontinued minors.

4.2 Prior to actual implementation of any option, concentration or special emphasis approved under this delegation, the Chancellor’s Office Department of Academic Programs and Policy shall receive e-mail notification (to APP@calstate.edu), including:

   a. the exact title of the new option, concentration or special emphasis;
   b. a list of courses constituting that new subprogram;
   c. the CSU degree program code (formerly called “HEGIS”) that students will use to apply to the program;
d. the complete degree designation and title of the degree program housing the new subprogram (e.g. Bachelor of Science in Biology with a Concentration in Biochemistry); and

e. documentation that all campus-required curricular approvals are in place.

4.3 Prior to actual implementation of any option, concentration or special emphasis approved under this delegation, the campus shall enter that new sub-program into the CSU Degrees Database and activate the “Notify” button. Information regarding minors is not included in the CSU Degrees Database.

Signed: Charles B. Reed, Chancellor

Dated: March 26, 2012
Year-Round Operations Planning Principles
(The Senate approved the following Year-Round Planning Principles to take effect in Summer 2001; approved May 9, 2000)

Year-Round Planning Principles:
The following principles are designed to facilitate planning for year-round operations over the next few years. These principles and the calendar adopted shall be reviewed within three years.

Principle 1. All planning for year-round operation shall be undertaken with the participation of affected divisions and the Senate. Primary responsibility for coordination of planning shall lie within the Provost’s office. Proposed changes to faculty workload and working conditions shall be negotiated between the CSU and CFA. Meanwhile current policies for summer staffing shall be followed.

Principle 2. The academic quality and rigor of the courses taught in Summer Term shall be consistent with courses taught in the Fall and Spring Semesters.

Principle 3. Only courses offered through the regular general-fund course schedule shall be offered through the Summer Term. This will not preclude for-credit summer session programs offered through the College of Extended Studies.

Principle 4. Summer Term assignments shall be consistent with and supportive of the teacher/scholar model. Time shall be preserved for faculty research.

Principle 5. Faculty shall have input into which semesters and terms they teach.

Principle 6. Tenured and tenure-track faculty shall retain use of their offices and laboratories year round.

Principle 7. Faculty compensation for Summer Term teaching shall be consistent with Unit 3 Agreement and supplemental to the CSU and CFA Summer Term agreements.

Principle 8. Office space shall be provided for lecturers during the term of their employment, consistent with current departmental policies and practices.

Principle 9. Graduate Assistant, Graduate Research Assistant, and Graduate Teaching Associate positions shall be made available in the Summer Term to support grant and contract activities, student-faculty research, and teaching of introductory courses where appropriate.

Principle 10. University fees for Summer Term shall be proportional to fees charged in the Fall and Spring Semesters.

Principle 11. Student support services shall be sustained year-round. In the Summer Term, graduate and undergraduate student services shall be appropriate to the number of students enrolled.

Principle 12. Library and computing services shall be sustained year-round. In the Summer Term, library and computing services shall be appropriate to the number of students enrolled.

Principle 13. Housing and financial aid services shall be sustained year-round. In the Summer Term, housing and financial aid services shall be appropriate to the number of students enrolled.

Principle 14. Initially, applications and admissions shall be reserved to the Fall and Spring Semesters.

Principle 15. Initially, disqualification and reinstatement shall apply to Fall and Spring Semesters only.

Principle 16. Adequate time shall be provided for implementing changes to operational systems such as SIMS/R and financial aid processing.

Principle 17. Adequate business, financial, security, maintenance, computer networking, and auxiliary organization services shall be assured year round.

Principle 18. On a rotating basis, university facilities (classrooms, laboratories, housing, and others) shall be taken off-line for remodeling, renovation, and repair.
Principle 19. Evaluation of the effectiveness of the Summer Term and the impact of the Summer Term on curriculum development, research, the College of Extended Studies, facilities renovation, and other activities normally conducted during the summer shall be coordinated by the Office of the Provost, with the participation of the affected university divisions. The results shall be reported to AP&P and the Senate annually.

Principle 20. To maintain academic quality, standard annualized assignments consistent with the teacher-scholar model shall be maintained. Any teaching above the standard annualized assignment will be treated as overload (extra pay for extra work) irrespective of the term in which it occurs.

Principle 21. Year-Round Operations shall not dilute resources required to maintain and enhance the quality of Fall and Spring semester operations.
Date: December 4, 1996

To: Presidents

From: Charles W. Lindahl
Interim Senior Vice Chancellor
Academic Affairs

Subject: Degree Programs Offered Through Special Sessions

At its November 1995 meeting, the Board of Trustees changed the Standing Orders of the Board to omit references to “external degree” programs while continuing to ensure that the CSU can offer degree programs on a self-support basis, through special sessions. This change allows campuses to use the fiscal and academic credit structure of special sessions for self-support degree programs that better serve adult students on campus and at distant sites through technology-mediated delivery of instruction. Except as specifically noted, the restrictions imposed by Executive Orders 166 and 466 on external degree programs will not apply to degree programs offered through special sessions.

Existing External Degree Programs. Campuses that have existing external degree programs may continue those programs without modification or may change the operation, so long as the change is consistent with policies and procedures governing degree programs in general and degree programs offered through special sessions. No new programs will be authorized specifically as external degree programs.

Establishment of Degree Programs Offered Through Special Sessions. If a campus wishes to offer a degree program through special sessions that it already offers as a regular state-supported program, it may do so, provided that (1) the program conforms to campus policies and procedures governing such programs, (2) the program meets all requirements pertaining to degree programs offered through special sessions, (3) the establishment of the program conforms to all relevant WASC policy and procedures (including WASC policy on substantive change and off-campus instruction, as appropriate), and (4) the campus notifies the Office of Extended Education and the Office of Academic Planning within the Chancellor’s Office. It is not necessary to seek Chancellor’s Office approval. If the academic requirements of the program as offered through special sessions will differ from the academic requirements of the program as offered through state support, the differences should be reviewed and approved through the standard campus curricular approval processes.
As is current practice, a degree program to be offered through special sessions that is not already offered by the campus as a regular state-supported program needs to go through the same review and approval processes at the campus, system, and state levels as a new state-supported degree program. (It must be approved by the Trustees for projection on the campus’s Academic Plan, and the proposal for implementation is subject to review and comment by the Chancellor’s Office and the California Postsecondary Education Commission and approval by the Chancellor.) We expect that this process will be swifter for degree programs to be offered solely through special sessions, as many resource issues are simpler to resolve for self-supporting programs than for state-supported programs, and we will make every effort to ensure that the process moves expeditiously.

Course listings and degree completion documents for degrees offered through special sessions need not be differentiated from those associated with state-supported programs.

Degree Programs Offered Through Special Sessions: Ongoing Policy. All degree programs offered through special sessions should maintain campus academic standards and provide appropriate academic and student support services. The programs should be under the supervision of full-time tenured or tenured-track campus faculty and have such faculty involved in an appropriate portion of the instruction.

All instruction offered for credit in degree programs should be approved under campus procedures used for regular state-supported programs, and academic policies governing degree programs offered through special sessions should be comparable to those governing state-supported programs. Existing regulations and procedures for special sessions should be followed in planning and offering degree programs through special sessions.

Further Information. Questions regarding degree programs offered through special sessions may be addressed to Dr. Edward McAleer, State University Dean, Extended Education (310-985-2817).
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
Office of the Chancellor
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California 90802

Date: August 12, 1982
To: Presidents
From: Glenn S. Dumke
Chancellor
Subject: Definitions of Graduate Level Instruction

In the fall of 1979, the Statewide Academic Senate established an ad hoc committee on graduate education. The committee included faculty, graduate deans, a Vice President for Academic Affairs, and Chancellor’s Office staff. Its charge was to review the mission and goals of graduate education in The California State University, recommending modes of instruction appropriate to those missions and goals, evaluating resources available for graduate education in the CSU, examining national trends in graduate education, and reviewing position papers of the Council of Graduate Schools and other national organizations for their applicability to graduate education in the CSU.

In January 1981, statewide Senate received the report of the ad hoc committee and endorsed the “Definitions of Graduate Level Instruction,” which appeared as Part IV of the report. These definitions were designed to respond to a 1979 recommendation of the Project Team on Academic Programs that guidelines outlining minimal qualitative standards for graduate programs be developed.

In March of 1981, the Senate approved a second resolution in this area, recommending a revision in Title 5 to require that students successfully complete a thesis, project, or comprehensive exam before the master’s degree is awarded. We expect this revision to Title 5 to be presented for action by the Board of Trustees in November, 1982.

The “Definitions of Graduate Level Instruction,” endorsed by the Senate, are attached. They have been carefully reviewed, and we strongly endorse them. We believe that campuses will find them useful and recommend that they be considered and adapted, as appropriate, to the needs of each campus. The “Definitions” are generally guidelines which should be considered as a whole individual departments when developing new programs and reviewing existing ones. We expect that use of these guidelines will lead to an improvement in the quality of graduate education in The California State University, and we appreciate the contributions of the ad hoc committee and the Academic Senate in their development.

GSD/ sgp
Attachment

Distribution: Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs (w/a)
Deans of Graduate Studies (w/a)
Chairs, Campus Academic Senates (w/a)
Legislative Analyst (w/a)
Chair, Statewide Academic Senate (w/a)
CSSA Liaison Office (w/a)
Chancellor’s Office Staff
IV. DEFINITIONS OF GRADUATE-LEVEL INSTRUCTION IN THE CSU

A. The Graduate Course

1. It is assumed that students who enroll in graduate courses possess:
   a. Maturity, responsibility, and scholarly integrity appropriate to study beyond the baccalaureate level.
   b. A broad base of knowledge, usually represented by the possession of the bachelor's degree.
   c. Competence in the specified field, usually represented by a substantial body of upper division study in the field or in a closely related field.
   d. A command of basic techniques and skills essential for independent, self-directed study in the field.

2. The graduate course deals with more complex ideas, materials, techniques or problems than the undergraduate course, and demands researching and exhaustive analysis.

3. The graduate course requires:
   a. The identification and investigation of theory or principle.
   b. The application of theory to new ideas, problems, and materials.
   c. Extensive use of bibliographic and other resource materials with emphasis on primary sources of data
   d. Demonstration of competence in the scholarly presentation of the results of independent study.

4. Satisfactory completion of a graduate course requires more creative thinking than an upper division course.

5. Performance expectations for graduate students enrolled in undergraduate-level courses normally are such that students complete at least one additional assignment. The quality of their written and oral performance in the course normally would be at least one grade point higher than that of an undergraduate. Performance expectations for undergraduate students enrolled in graduate-level courses are such that where campus policy permits undergraduate enrollment in a graduate course, the quality of the written and oral performance of undergraduates in the course normally would be at least half a grade point higher than that of an undergraduate enrolled in an undergraduate course.

B. Lecture-Discussion

The lecture-discussion course conforms to the criteria for graduate courses in general, and

1. Is an organized course with regularized content.
2. Is a combination of lectures and group discussion, based on specialized studies and research.
3. Involves a consideration of a series of vital problems, reviews trends, examines different points of view, and interprets issue.
4. Involves problem analysis, research, and high level participation in discussion.
5. Involves the use of a wide variety of material and resources which provide a range and depth beyond that obtainable through a single textbook, although the use of a basic textbook may be appropriate in some lecture-discussion courses.
6. Provides an opportunity for synthesis and analysis through scholarly writing and through course examinations that go beyond simple recall of fact.
C. **Seminar**

The seminar conforms to the criteria for graduate courses in general, and

1. Is organized around a series of related problems significant to the discipline.
2. May have a focus which varies from semester to semester within the framework of the general objectives.
3. Limits the lecture, when it does occur, to setting the stage and clarifying issues.
4. Requires that students assume primary responsibility for an investigation that will contribute to the objectives of the seminar and that they report, interpret, and defend their findings orally as well as in writing.
5. Within the framework of general goals, may allow student participation in course planning and in course evaluation.
6. Has class meetings primarily to develop, share, and critically examine independent investigations by members of the group. Time devoted to individual or small-group conferences under the direction of the professor may on occasion replace general class meetings.

D. **Laboratory**

Laboratory coursework conforms to the criteria for graduate courses in general and focuses on data gathering and analysis, with an emphasis on research and investigation rather than on laboratory techniques. Its chief distinguishing characteristic is the use of specialized facilities and relatively independent investigation.

E. **Field Work and Clinical Practice**

Field work and clinical practice require that

1. The students have a high level of theoretical competence and a mastery of the basic skills necessary to perform professional duties with a minimum of direction.
2. The selection of experiences provides opportunity for the student to
   a. Bring to bear and apply a high level of theoretical knowledge.
   b. Exercise judgment of a high order.
   c. Assume responsibility for determining procedures as well as for implementing them.
   d. Report the experience to a supervising instructor in such a way as to point out it significance, to explain the rationale behind his/her major decisions, and to evaluate their adequacy.

F. **Graduate Independent Study**

At the graduate level independent study is based upon the assumptions set forth in part in the section above entitled, “The Graduate Course.” Furthermore, such independent study

1. Has a specific objective related to the student’s educational goals and to a graduate program.
2. Is precisely defined as a result of joint planning by the professor and the student.
3. Requires periodic and final demonstration of competence in scholarly presentation of the result of the independent study.

G. **The Culminating Experience**

The culminating experience for the granting of a graduate degree is the successful completion of a thesis, project or comprehensive examination. The quality of work accomplished, including the quality of the writing, is the major consideration in judging the acceptability of the thesis, project or comprehensive examination.

1. **Thesis**

   A thesis is the written product of the systematic study of a significant problem. It clearly identifies the problem, states the major assumptions, explains the significance of the undertaking, sets forth the sources for and methods of gathering information, analyzes the data, and offers a conclusion or recommendation. The finished product must evidence originality, critical and independent thinking, appropriate organization and format, clarity of purpose, and accurate and thorough documentation. Normally an oral defense of the thesis will be required.
2. **Project**  
A project is a significant undertaking of a pursuit appropriate to the fine and applied arts. It is more than the presentation of a mere outline, plan, depiction, description or demonstration, though it may include these. It must evidence originality and independent thinking, appropriate form and organization, and a rationale. It usually takes the form of a creative work such as a literary or musical composition, a group of paintings, a performance, a film or other endeavor. It must be described and summarized in a written abstract that includes the project’s significance, objectives, methodology and a conclusion or recommendation. An oral defense of the project may be required.

3. **Comprehensive Examination**  
The results of a written comprehensive examination, which has been prepared by either the appropriate department or TSA faculty, should demonstrate the student’s ability to integrate the knowledge of the area, evidence critical and independent thinking, and in general show the mastery of the subject matter. The results of the examination must evidence independent thinking, appropriate organization, critical analysis and accuracy of documentation.
Date: August 2, 1991

To: Vice Presidents, Academic Affairs

From: Lee R. Kerschner, Vice Chancellor
Academic Affairs

Subject: Policies on Academic Program Discontinuation

System policies on academic program discontinuation were last addressed in the late 1970s and early 1980s and are still extant. The purpose of this memorandum is to provide information about these policies and the procedures to be used in the event of academic program discontinuations.

EP&R 79–10, issued on January 26, 1979, outlined interim policies for program discontinuance. These are attached. They call on each campus to have written procedures, approved by the Chancellor, for the discontinuance of academic programs. These agreements were later developed by most CSU campuses and approval was granted for each policy that incorporated the elements outlined in the interim policy, namely broad consultation and mechanisms to permit enrolled students to earn their degrees. Approved policies for 16 campuses are on file in the Chancellor’s Office (four campuses have not submitted policies for approval). Campus program discontinuation policies were approved by the Chancellor on the following dates:

- Chico 1/8/90
- Dominguez Hills 10/7/80
- Fullerton 9/17/81
- Hayward 10/9/81
- Humboldt 7/14/90
- Long Beach 11/27/90
- Los Angeles 7/20/80
- Northridge 12/17/82
- Sacramento 8/11/81
- San Bernardino 9/16/81
- San Diego 4/15/81
- San Francisco 5/13/80
- San Jose 5/28/80
- San Luis Obispo 10/29/81
- Sonoma 9/15/81
- Stanislaus 6/12/89

Distribution: Presidents
Associate Vice Presidents, Academic Affairs
Deans of Graduate Studies
Deans of Undergraduate Studies
Chairs, Academic Senates
Chancellor’s Office Staff
The interim policy also specified that proposals for degree program discontinuation were subject to review by the Chancellor, and EP&R 80-45 (June 12, 1980), advised campuses of the guidelines that were being used by the Office of the Chancellor to review academic degree program discontinuation proposals. That memorandum advised that recommendations of the Project Team on Academic Programs would be honored, specifically the following recommendation:

The primary responsibility for identifying programs to be discontinued in response to enrollment changes should rest with each campus. Campus recommendations for program discontinuation should, however, be reviewed by the Chancellor’s Office for assessment of system and statewide impact.

Since that memorandum was issued the Chancellor’s Office has asked that proposals for academic program discontinuation contain assurance that approved campus procedures were followed. Campuses were advised that “system and statewide impact” might be questioned only if programs to be discontinued were core undergraduate programs; programs which would leave a large population without program alternatives; and/or systemwide impacted programs. In subsequent years, all program discontinuation proposals were submitted using campus guidelines (or, in their absence, the interim system guidelines shown attached), and all discontinuation proposals have been approved.

We are aware that a number of campuses are considering academic program discontinuation, and that the time of such decisions is crucial. Consequently, we are modifying the requirements for Chancellor’s Office review, as follows:

1. **Campuses without approved discontinuation policies will continue to observe the guidelines of EP&R 79-10. Discontinuation proposals should be submitted to the Chancellor, and they should include an explanation of how the interim criteria were met. Degree program discontinuations shall not become effective until they have been approved by the Chancellor.**

2. **Campuses with approved discontinuation policies may discontinue programs without prior Chancellor’s approval, provided the campus policies are observed; provided the Chancellor’s Office is informed of the discontinuations; and provided that the discontinuation is consistent with all Trustee and system policies, including provisions of the MOU where applicable.**

To the extent possible, we will attempt to remove programs from the list of programs in the 1992-93 application booklet, which is being revised over the next few months. Prompt notification of discontinuations would therefore be appreciated.

SLC: Prog Disct. Code Memo
DISCONTINUANCE OF AN ACADEMIC PROGRAM

An Academic program is defined for this purpose as a sequence of courses leading to a degree.

1. Each campus shall have written procedures, approved by the Chancellor, for the discontinuance of academic programs. These campus procedures are to be based on the following general provisions, insofar as possible:

   a. A proposal to discontinue an academic program will ordinarily be the result of a regular or ad hoc review of the program.

   b. The review shall include broad consultation with groups or persons likely to be affected by the discontinuance, including enrolled students.

   c. The proposal shall specify mechanisms to permit enrolled students to earn their degrees.

   d. The president shall review the proposal with the advice of the campus academic senate and/or appropriate representative committees constituted for this task.

2. All proposals for program discontinuation are subject to review by the Chancellor. This review will be conducted within the following guidelines:

   a. The campus president shall inform the Chancellor of the proposed discontinuation.

   b. The Chancellor will review the proposal for systemwide effects with advice from whatever groups he deems appropriate, and may request additional information from the campus if needed for this review.

   c. The Chancellor will ordinarily provide comments on all such proposals within 30 days. He will inform the President of any system concerns so that these may be considered in the final decision.

   d. The President shall not take any administrative action leading to the de facto or official discontinuation of an academic program before the Chancellor has commented on the proposal.
Degree Program Discontinuation

(Policy adopted by the Senate February 10, 1981)

Procedures for the Discontinuation of Degree Programs at San Diego State University

Proposals for the discontinuation of degree programs may be initiated by departments, faculty members, appropriate college and University committees, and/or administrative officers of the University. All proposals must specify mechanisms to protect the interests of students currently enrolled in such programs and, if possible, to allow those students to complete their degrees in a reasonable time period. Proposals for degree program discontinuation must include a declaration of intent: (a) degree program discontinuation (Senate Policy File, VII-B-3, 1.2-1.54), or (b) discontinuation of degree program with department dissolution (Senate Policy File, VII-B-3, 2.0-2.5). All proposals must address employment options, informed by the applicable Memorandum of Understanding for the affected tenured and probationary faculty and for permanent staff.

Proposals shall be reviewed by designated department and college curriculum committees, and the dean of the college. Proposals approved by the college dean shall be forwarded to the Office of the Provost for University-wide review as specified in Senate Policy File III-F-4 and III-F-15.

Undergraduate Proposals

Undergraduate proposals shall be reviewed for approval by the University Committee on Academic Policy and Planning. This committee must seek broad consultations with groups or persons likely to be affected by the degree program discontinuation, including enrolled students in the degree program affected. Proposals shall be additionally reviewed by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee with recommendations forwarded to the Senate.

All approved proposals shall be forwarded to the Senate as action items.

All approved proposals shall be forwarded to the President for final action.

Graduate Proposals

All graduate proposals shall be reviewed for approval by the Graduate Council. The council must seek broad consultation with groups or persons likely to be affected by the degree program discontinuation, including enrolled students in the degree programs affected.

Proposals shall be further reviewed by the University Committee on Academic Policy and Planning with recommendations forwarded to the Senate.

All approved proposals shall be forwarded to the Senate as action items.

All approved proposals shall be forwarded to the President for final action.
Degree Designation Changes

Chancellor's Office approval is required for changes in degree designation, for example from BA to BS. To propose a title change, campuses submit a request to Academic Program Planning (app@calstate.edu). The request should include:

1. A rationale for the change
2. Assurance that all necessary campus approvals have been obtained

A rationale would typically be one or two paragraphs long and should refer to campus policy differentiating BA and BS degrees or MA and MS degrees, if the campus has such a policy. There is no prescribed format, but the rationale may address disciplinary convention, recruitment issues, employer concerns, or the degree designations used at other CSU campuses or at public or private institutions across the country, for example. The Master Plan and longstanding Trustee policy discourage the proliferation of degree titles and degree terminology, so these proposals are evaluated carefully.

Changes in degree designation do not require prior Trustee approval, but they will be included in the next campus Academic Plan sent to the Board of Trustees.

The California Postsecondary Education Commission does not review changes in degree designation.

Contact Information
Christine Hanson
Interim Dean, Academic Program Planning
(562) 951-4672
app@calstate.edu
http://www.calstate.edu/APP/

APP 10/11/06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSU Campuses</th>
<th>Fresno</th>
<th>Fullerton</th>
<th>Humboldt</th>
<th>Long Beach</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>Maritime Academy</th>
<th>Monterey Bay</th>
<th>Northridge</th>
<th>Pismo</th>
<th>Sacramento</th>
<th>San Bernardino</th>
<th>San Diego</th>
<th>San Francisco</th>
<th>San José</th>
<th>San Luis Obispo</th>
<th>San Marcos</th>
<th>Sonoma</th>
<th>Stanislaus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Degree Title Changes

Chancellor’s Office approval is required for changes in degree titles. To propose a title change, campuses submit to Academic Program Planning (app@calstate.edu) a request and rationale for the proposed title change. There is no prescribed format, but the rationale may address disciplinary convention, recruitment issues, employer concerns, or the titles used at other CSU campuses or at public or private institutions across the country, for example. The Master Plan and longstanding Trustee policy discourage the proliferation of degree titles and degree terminology, so these proposals are evaluated carefully.

Campuses have the authority to establish options, concentrations, and emphases within specific disciplinary degree majors, as described in Executive Order 602. http://www.calstate.edu/EO/EO-602.pdf For those campus-authorized specializations, there is no need to propose to the Chancellor’s Office a change in title.

The California Postsecondary Education Commission does not review changes in degree titles, and Academic Master Plans submitted to the Board of Trustees do not require a footnote identifying title changes. Changes to the names of academic departments are decided by the campus.

Contact Information

Christine Hanson
Interim Dean, Academic Program Planning
(562) 951-4672
app@calstate.edu
http://www.calstate.edu/APP/

CSU Campuses
Bakersfield
Chico
Dominquez Hills
East Bay
Fresno
Fullerton
Humboldt
Long Beach
Los Angeles
Maritime Academy
Monterey Bay
Norbridge
Pomona
Sacramento
San Bernardino
San Diego
San Francisco
San José
San Luis Obispo
San Marcos
Sonoma
Stanislaus
Elevating Options and Concentrations to Full Degree Major Programs

An implementation proposal is required to elevate a formal option, concentration, or emphasis to a full degree program. Each proposal must include, at minimum:

1. A well-supported rationale for elevating the concentration to a full degree program;
2. Side-by-side comparison of the existing degree major and concentration with the proposed new major, showing the catalog number, title, and number of units; and
3. Evidence of a significantly greater campus commitment to the program than was required to establish it as a specialization area.

The elevation process requires system-level review and approval. To merit approval, the new degree program must not have significant overlap with the requirements of the existing degree program from which it was derived. The existing concentration will need to be discontinued when the degree elevation is approved, as programs should not have significantly overlapping content.


Assigned Degree Program Code

Using a master list of degree programs and reporting codes, campuses report to the Chancellor’s Office data on applications, enrollments, and degrees granted in degree programs. To ensure consistent record keeping, campuses use the same pairings of generic systemwide degree program titles and corresponding reporting codes.

The required curriculum for each CSU degree program title (and level) is roughly comparable across the system and reflects the Classification of Instructional Programs (“CIP”) program definition for each CIP code. Campuses are allowed to use a slightly different campus-specific title, as long as it is reasonably similar to the official title. The program codes, however, remain the same across the system. The CSU Degrees Database has fields for the official “generic” CSU title and a campus-specific title.

One Degree Title—One Curriculum—One Code

Campuses are to maintain the degree requirements associated with a degree program approved by the Chancellor’s Office; and substantive curricular changes are to be approved by the campus curriculum-approval process. To ensure the integrity of degree programs, each approved degree title is to be associated with only one set of curricular requirements. Requirements in addition to the core curriculum may be achieved through use of subprogram (an option, concentration, or special emphasis), as noted in Executive Order 1071. The program core shall represent the majority of required units so that the program’s student learning outcomes can be achieved by all enrolled students, regardless of subprogram pursued. For more information on the meaning, quality, and integrity of degrees, please see the Western Association of Schools and Colleges Handbook of Accreditation:


Approved Official Systemwide Degree Titles and Reporting Codes

The official list of approved systemwide degree titles and their assigned CSU and CIP reporting codes may be found at:


For further information, please contact:

Academic Programs and Faculty Development (562) 951-4722
app@calstate.edu
[http://www.calstate.edu/APP/](http://www.calstate.edu/APP/)
Converting Pilot Programs to Regular Program Status

The California State University allows a limited number of degree programs that meet certain criteria to be established as “pilot programs,” without review beyond the campus level. Pilot programs are proposed to the Chancellor’s Office and may be authorized to admit students for up to five years, at which point the program must be phased out or converted to regular-program status. Conversion requires that the campus submit a pilot-conversion proposal to the Chancellor’s Office, which includes a thorough program evaluation, including an on-site review by one or more experts in the field. Additionally, the proposal should address faculty resources, facilities resources, enrollments, quality, societal need (including labor-market demand), student demand, appropriateness to institutional mission, costs, and preparation of graduates for employment and/or graduate education. The campus may use the traditional implementation proposal format. Campuses electing not to convert to regular status are expected to submit a letter of discontinuation, including program teach-out provisions.

Conversion of a pilot program is subject to review and comment by CPEC staff.

Pilot Program Criteria

(a) The program can be offered at a high level of quality by the campus within the campus’s existing resource base, or there is a demonstrated capacity to fund the program on a self-support basis; and

(b) it is not subject to specialized accreditation by an agency that is a member of the Association of Specialized and Professional Accreditors, or it is currently offered as an option or concentration that is already recognized and accredited by an appropriate specialized accrediting agency;

(c) it can be adequately housed without a major capital outlay project;

(d) it is consistent with all existing state and federal law and Trustee policy;

(e) it is a bachelor’s or master’s degree program;

(f) the program has been subject to a thorough campus review and approval process.
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CSU Campuses
Bakersfield
Channel Islands
Chico
Dominguez Hills
East Bay
Fresno
Fullerton
Humboldt
Long Beach
Los Angeles
Maritime Academy
Monterey Bay
Northridge
Pomona
Sacramento
San Bernardino
San Diego
San Francisco
San José
San Luis Obispo
San Marcos
Sonoma
Stanislaus
Adding Self-Support Version of a Previously Approved State-Support Offering

Campuses may implement proposed programs that have been reviewed and approved by the Chancellor’s Office. All recruitment and application materials for proposed programs must feature a qualification that makes clear that admission and enrollment are subject to program approval by the CSU Office of the Chancellor and, if appropriate, accreditation approval.

Policy
From EO 1047 Section C (http://www.calstate.edu/co/EO-1047.html) Section C (2) (c):

The Chancellor’s Office shall be notified when previously approved, state-supported degree or credential programs are first offered in self support mode through special sessions.

Self-supporting special sessions shall not supplant regular course offerings available on a state-supported basis during the college year (Education Code Section 89708). However, self-supporting courses and programs may be offered in addition to state-supported offerings if the requirements of Executive Order 1047 are met.

Procedure (Please review the WASC Substantive Change requirements at the end of this document)

Campuses shall notify Academic Program Planning in the Chancellor’s Office prior to implementing self-support counterparts to previously approved state-support degree programs. Notifications should be sent to APP@calstate.edu and shall include the original program’s implementation date (if known) and the planned implementation term for the self-support version. Curricular requirements for both programs shall be included in the notification, which shall also specify the self-support program’s fulfillment of the requisite conditions stated in EO 1047 (see below).

C. Requisite Conditions

   1. For a group of courses or program to be offered under special sessions, both of the following criteria must be met:

      a. State General Fund appropriations to support the program must be either unavailable or inappropriate. Examples of inappropriate use of State General Fund appropriations would include courses or programs delivered primarily out of state.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSU Campuses</th>
<th>Fresno</th>
<th>Monterey Bay</th>
<th>San Francisco</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield</td>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>Northridge</td>
<td>San José</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel Islands</td>
<td>Bakersfield</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>San Marcos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominguez Hills</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>San Bernadino</td>
<td>Sonoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bay</td>
<td>Maritime Academy</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Sonoma County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. The courses or program must be different from approved, state-supported programs operating on campus by one or more of the following:

i. The courses or program is designed primarily for career enrichment or retraining (Education Code Section 89708).

ii. The location of the courses or program offerings is significantly removed from permanent, state-supported campus facilities.

iii. The client group for the courses or program receives educational or other services at a cost beyond what could be reasonably provided under state support.

2. All special sessions must have the following characteristics:

a. Each must consist of a planned presentation of a degree, credential, or certificate program or a group of courses offered at a particular location or through a distinct technology. Courses may be presented concurrently or sequentially but in a defined time frame.

b. While a special session need not offer all or even a significant portion of a degree, credential, or certificate program, it must be planned to serve a substantive educational objective supportive of such programs; e.g., an opportunity for a matriculated student to accelerate achievement toward an objective, or a significant portion of a degree program offered for military or business personnel.

c. Degree, credential, or certificate programs offered through special sessions must secure all regular campus and system approvals. Such programs may have a state-supported counterpart operating on campus, or they may operate only as self-supported programs through special sessions. The Chancellor’s Office shall be notified when previously approved, state-supported degree or credential programs are first offered in self-support mode through special sessions.

d. Self-supporting degree, credential, or certificate programs offered under the provisions of this executive order shall be operated in accordance with all appropriate campus and system policies and procedures.
e. Campuses offering special sessions shall provide educational support services (e.g., admissions and records, advising, library, financial aid) appropriate to the nature and scope of the program.

f. All instruction offered shall have been approved under procedures utilized for state-supported programs, and all academic policies governing special sessions shall be identical to or established under the same procedures as those governing state-supported programs.

g. All students in special sessions degree programs and education credential programs must be matriculated. Non-matriculated students paying self-support fees may enroll in special sessions courses on a space-available basis. A maximum of 24 semester units (36 quarter units) in special sessions course credit taken as a non-matriculated student may be applied toward a degree (Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Section 40407.1).

h. Location of instruction must be in accordance with pertinent system policies.

i. Special sessions offerings must be consistent with all applicable policies of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges and other accrediting bodies under whose jurisdiction special sessions fall.

j. Academic credit offered through special sessions shall be applicable toward residence credit requirements at the campus offering the special sessions.2

k. Special sessions courses shall not be offered at times or places that are likely to supplant or limit offerings of the state-supported program (Education Code Section 89708).

l. Faculty shall be compensated according to approved special sessions salary schedules.

WASC

Programs that meet the criteria requiring WASC Substantive Change approval must also be submitted for CSU substantive change approval (using the WASC proposal). A copy of the WASC substantive change proposal must be submitted to the Chancellor’s Office for review and approval. WASC requires a Chancellor’s Office approval letter before the accreditor will approve the substantive change. WASC policies apply and can be found at:


Please see the entire EO 1047 document at: http://www.calstate.edu/co/EO-1047.html
November 12, 2001

MEMORANDUM

To: CSU Presidents

From: Charles B. Reed
Chancellor

Subject: Executive Order No. 795

Procedures Governing Self-Supporting Programs Outside the State of California, Conducted Through the Continuing Education Revenue Fund or Local Trust Accounts

Attached is a copy of Executive Order No. 795, which defines out-of-state and out-of-country self-supporting instructional programs, specifies the procedures for depositing funds (in the Continuing Education Revenue Fund), and establishes that policies governing self-supporting instructional programs shall also apply to out-of-state and out-of-country programs. This executive order supersedes Executive Order No. 448.

In accordance with the policy of the California State University, the campus president has the responsibility for implementing executive orders where applicable and for maintaining the campus repository and index for all executive orders.

Please address any questions you may have regarding this executive order to the State University Dean, Extended Education (562) 951-4795 or the Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer, Business Affairs (562) 951-4600.

CBR:clm
Attachment

C: Executive Staff, Office of the Chancellor
Extended Education Deans