

New Degree Programs

**Procedures for Submitting Proposals
for Implementation of New Degree Major Programs
and Doctoral Concentrations**

Doctoral Proposals

**Procedures for Fast-Track
and Pilot Programs**

Procedures for Submitting Proposals for Implementation of New Degree Major Programs and Doctoral Concentrations

Revised March 1985, February 2007

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.

1. Program Type (Please specify any from the list below that apply—delete the others)

- ✓ State-Support
- ✓ Self-Support
- ✓ Online Program
- ✓ Fast Track
- ✓ Pilot
- ✓ Pilot Conversion
- ✓ Conversion of Self-Support to State-Support Program
- ✓ Elevation of Option or Concentration to a Full Degree Program
- ✓ New Program
- ✓ 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 2007).
- e. 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.
- f. Name, title, and rank of the individual(s) primarily responsible for drafting the proposed degree major program.
- g. 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. (CPEC "Appropriateness to Institutional and Segmental Mission")
- h. Any other campus approval documents that may apply (e.g. curriculum committee approvals).
- i. Please specify whether this proposed program is subject to WASC Substantive Change review.
- j. **Optional: Proposed Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) Code 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 systemwide list at: http://www.calstate.edu/app/documents/HEGIS-CIP2000_102406.xls , you can search CIP 2000 at <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2002/cip2000/> 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. 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. The rationale may explain the relationship among the program philosophy, design, target population, and any distinctive pedagogical methods. (CPEC “Appropriateness to Institutional and Segmental Mission”)
- b. 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

- a. 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.
- b. Plans for assessing program goals and student learning outcomes. Some planners find it helpful to develop matrices in which student learning outcomes and required courses are mapped, indicating where content related to the learning outcomes is introduced, reinforced, and practiced at an advanced level in required courses. **(CPEC “Maintenance and Improvement of Quality”)**
- c. Total number of units required for the major.
- d. Include a justification for any baccalaureate program that requires more than 120-semester units or 180-quarter units.
- e. If any formal options, concentrations, or special emphases are planned under the proposed major, identify and explain fully. 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, if the option is approximately equivalent to a degree currently listed on the CSU application-booklet degree program table. If you do not find an appropriate CSU degree program code at: http://www.calstate.edu/app/documents/HEGIS-CIP2000_102406.xls , you can search CIP 2000 at <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2002/cip2000/> to help identify the code that best matches the proposed curriculum.
- f. A list of all courses required for the major, specifying catalog number, title, units of credit, and prerequisites or co-requisites (ensuring that there are no “hidden” prerequisites that would drive the total units required to graduate beyond the total reported in 4c above).
- g. List of elective courses that can be used to satisfy requirements for the major, specifying catalog number, title, units of credit, and prerequisites or co-requisites. Include proposed catalog descriptions of all new courses. For graduate program proposals, identify whether each course is a graduate or undergraduate offering.

Note: With regard to Sections 4f and 4g, a proposed program should take advantage of courses already offered in other departments when subject matter would have considerable overlapping content.

- h. List of any new courses that are: (1) needed to initiate the program and (2) needed during the first two years after implementation. Only include proposed catalog descriptions for new courses. For graduate program proposals, identify whether each course is a graduate-level or undergraduate-level offering.
- i. Attach a proposed course-offering plan for the first three years of program implementation, indicating, where possible, likely faculty teaching assignments.
- j. 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.
- k. Admission criteria, including prerequisite coursework.
- l. Criteria for student continuation in the program.
- m. For undergraduate programs, planned provisions for articulation of the proposed major with community college programs.
- n. If there is a Lower-Division Transfer Pattern (LDTP) for this major, indicate the relationship between the LDTP and the requirements presented in this proposal. Information on LDTP is available at: <http://www.calstate.edu/AcadAff/ldtp.shtml>
- o. Advising "roadmaps" that have been developed for the major.
- p. Provision for meeting accreditation requirements, 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. Need for the Proposed Degree Major Program

(CPEC "Societal Need," "Number of Existing Programs in the Field," and "Advancement of the Field")

- a. List of other California State University campuses currently offering or projecting the proposed degree major program; list of neighboring institutions, public and private, currently offering the proposed degree major program.
- b. Differences between the proposed program and programs listed in Section 5a above.
- c. List of other curricula currently offered by the campus that are closely related to the proposed program.
- d. Community participation, if any, in the planning process. This may include prospective employers of graduates.
- e. Applicable workforce demand projections and other relevant data.
- f. If the program was proposed to meet society's need for the advancement of knowledge, please specify the need and explain how the program meets that need.

Note: Data Sources for Demonstrating Evidence of Need

APP Resources Web <http://www.calstate.edu/app/resources.shtml>

6. Student Demand (CPEC “Student Demand”)

- a. 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. Issues of access considered when planning this program.
- c. For master’s degree proposals, 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. Professional uses of the proposed degree 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.

7. Existing Support Resources for the Proposed Degree Major Program (CPEC “Total Costs of the 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. 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, a minimum of five full-time faculty members with the appropriate terminal degree should be on the program staff.
(Code Memo EP&R 85-20)

- b. Space and facilities that would be used in support of the proposed program.
- c. A report provided by the campus Library, detailing resources available to support the program (discussion of subject areas, volume counts, periodical holdings, etc. are appropriate).
- d. Existing academic technology, equipment, and other specialized materials currently available.

8. Additional Support Resources Required (CPEC “Total Costs of the Program”)

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. Any special characteristics of the additional faculty or staff support positions needed to implement the proposed program.
- b. 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.

- c. A report written in consultation with the campus librarian, indicating any additional library resources needed. Indicate the commitment of the campus either to purchase or borrow through interlibrary loan these additional resources.
- d. 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.

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.

Initiation of Doctoral Proposals

Periodically, the university has the opportunity to offer doctoral programs jointly with Ph.D.—granting public or private institutions in the State of California. New doctoral degree programs will not be projected unless a sponsoring department has a well-established master's degree and has achieved an appropriate level of quality in existing teaching and research programs which has been affirmed by an academic review and accreditation where such national accreditation is available. Specifically, the department must have proper facilities and a core of research-oriented faculty whose research specializations are complementary to those of the faculty of the other sponsoring institution. There must be adequate library holdings. The department should already have a strong master's thesis program and outside research funding, including a support program for graduate students. The proposed doctorate must be in an area where there is both student demand and need. Departments that are interested in pursuing the establishment of a doctoral degree should first consult with the dean of their respective college and the Dean of the Division of Graduate Affairs.

The major steps required to secure approval of a new joint doctoral program include:

1. Permission to Negotiate

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

2. Development of Degree Proposal

- This is a joint effort by the cooperating universities.

3. Approval of proposal by each campus

4. Transmittal to UC and CSU system offices or independent university and the CSU.

*5. Review by Coordination Council of Graduate Affairs (CCGA) and California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC)

*6. Review by Joint Graduate Board

*7. Formal approval to campus from CSU Chancellor and UC President

*For doctoral degrees with an independent university, steps 5, 6, and 7 above are replaced with the following procedures:

- Academic Planning Program submits the program implementation proposal to CPEC staff.
- 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.
- CPEC staff notifies the CSU and the independent institution of action taken on the proposal.

- 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.
- The participating institutions ensure that all necessary WASC approvals are obtained. (See the WASC Substantive Change Manual 2001, especially Section III.C.5)

Format For Doctoral Degree Program Proposal

Section 1. Introduction

A statement setting forth the following:

1. Aims and objectives of the program. Any distinctive features.
2. Historical development of the field and historical development of departmental strength in the field.
3. Timetable for development of the program, including enrollment projects. Consistency of these projections with the campus enrollment plan. If the campus has enrollment quotas for its programs, state which program(s) will have their enrollments reduced in order to accommodate the proposed program.
4. Relation of the proposed program to existing programs on campus and to the Campus Academic Plan. If the program is not in the Campus Academic Plan, why is it important that it be begun now? Evidence of high campus priority. Effect of the proposed program on undergraduate programs offered by the sponsoring department(s).
5. Interrelationship of the program with other University of California institutions, if applicable. The possibility of cooperation or competition with other programs within the University should be discussed. Proposers should send copies of their proposal to all departments on other campuses offering similar degrees. Review letters should be obtained from chairs of such departments and these letters should be attached to the proposal.
6. Department or group which will administer the program.
7. Plan for evaluation of the program within the offering departments(s) and campuswide.

Section 2. Program

A detailed statement of the requirements for the program including the following:

1. Undergraduate preparation for admission.
2. Foreign language. "The CCGA recognizes that foreign language competence may be an important element of graduate education of doctoral programs. It is the responsibility of the Divisional Graduate Councils to insure that the proponents of new doctoral programs have carefully considered the value of a foreign language requirement. We shall assume that when a proposal for a new doctoral degree has been forwarded to CCGA, this issue has been addressed and resolved to the satisfaction of the Division. Divisional Graduate Councils should apply the same standard adopted for new programs in reviewing existing doctoral programs" (CCGA Minutes, 5/14/85, p.6)
3. Program of study:
 - a. Specific fields of emphasis
 - b. Plan(s): Masters I and/or II; Doctors A or B
 - c. Unit requirements
 - d. Required and recommended courses, including teaching requirement
 - e. When a degree program must have licensing or certification, the requirements of the agency or agencies involved should be listed in the proposal, especially the courses needed to satisfy such requirements (CCGA Minutes, 1/17/78, p.5)
4. Field examinations-written and/or oral.

5. Qualifying examinations-written and/or oral.
6. Thesis and/or dissertation.
7. Final examination.
8. Explanation of special requirements over and above Graduate Division minimum requirements.
9. Relationship of master's and doctor's programs.
10. Special preparation for careers in teaching.
11. Sample program.
12. Normative time from matriculation to degree. (Assume student has no deficiencies and is full-time.) Also specify the normative lengths of time for pre-candidacy and for candidacy periods. (If normative time is subsequently lengthened to more than six years, prior approval of CCGA is required.) Other incentives to support expeditious times-to-degree: what policies or other incentives will assure that students make timely progress toward degree completion in the proposed program?

Section 3. Projected need

A statement setting forth the following:

1. Student demand for the program.
2. Opportunities for placement of graduates. UC anticipates that CPEC in particular will expect detailed and convincing evidence of job market needs. This will be especially true for programs in graduate fields now well represented among UC campuses and California independent universities, as well as programs in the same field proposed by more than one campus. IF UC already offers programs in the field, what are their placement records in recent years? What recent job listings, employer surveys, assessments of future job growth, etc. can be provided to demonstrate a strong market for graduates of this program, or for graduates of specialty areas that will be the focus of the program?
3. Importance to the discipline.
4. Ways in which the program will meet the needs of society.
5. Relationship of the program to research and/or professional interests of the faculty.
6. Program Differentiation. How will the proposed program distinguish itself from existing UC and California independent university programs, from similar programs proposed by other UC campuses? Statistics or other detailed documentation of need should be provided.

Section 4. Faculty

A statement on present faculty and immediately pending appointments. This should include a list of faculty members, their ranks, their highest degree and other professional qualifications, and a citation of relevant publications; data concerning faculty should be limited to only that information pertinent to the Committee's evaluation of faculty qualifications. (For group programs only, one copy of letters from participating faculty indicating their interest in the program should be included. In addition, comments from chairmen of departments with graduate programs closely related to or affected by the proposed program should be included.)

Section 5. Courses

A list of present and proposed courses including instructors and supporting courses in related fields. The catalog description of all proposed courses should be appended. The relationship of these courses to specific fields of emphasis and future plans. How will the courses be staffed given existing course loads?

Section 6. Resource requirements

Estimated for the first 5 years the additional cost of the program, by year, for each of the following categories:

1. FTE faculty
2. Library acquisition
3. Computing costs
4. Equipment
5. Space and other capital facilities
6. Other operating costs

Indicate the intended method of funding these additional costs.

If applicable, state that no new resources will be required and explain how the program will be funded. If it is to be funded by internal reallocation, explain how internal resources will be generated.

State Resources to Support New Programs. The resource plan to support the proposed program should be clearly related to campus enrollment plans and resource plans. Campuses should provide detailed information on how resources will be provided to support the proposed program: from resources for approved graduate enrollment growth, reallocation, and other sources. What will the effects of reallocation be on existing programs? For interdisciplinary programs and programs growing out of tracks within existing graduate programs: What will the impact of the new program be on the contributing program(s)? When the proposed program is fully implemented, how will faculty FTE be distributed among contributing and new programs?

Section 7. Graduate Student Support

It is recommended that all new proposals include detailed plans for providing sufficient graduate student support. In fields that have depended on federal research grants, these plans should also discuss current availability of faculty grants that can support graduate students and funding trends in agencies expected to provide future research or training grants. Are other extramural resources likely to provide graduate student support, or will internal fellowship and other institutional support be made available to the program? Describe any campus fund-raising initiatives that will contribute to support of graduate students in the proposed program.

How many teaching assistantships will be available to the program? Will resources for them be provided through approved enrollment growth, reallocation, or a combination? How will reallocation affect support in existing programs?

Section 8. Changes in Senate regulations

The proposal should state clearly whether or not any changes in Senate Regulations at the Divisional level or in the Academic Assembly will be required. If changes are necessary (e.g., for all proposals for new degrees), the complete text of the proposed amendments or new regulations should be provided.

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
Office of the Chancellor
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California 90802-4275

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.

ITEM

Agenda Item 1
July 15-16, 1997

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

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.

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.

Timelines for Fast-Track Approval

Campus activity

End of December	Proposal to Chancellor's Office
March	Board of Trustees' approval
July	CPEC endorsement
August	Implementation

and

Campus activity

Early June	Proposal to Chancellor's Office
September	Board of Trustees' approval
December	CPEC endorsement
February	Limited implementation
Spring	Program description in campus catalog
August	Full implementation

(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.