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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

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.

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.
Year-Round Operations Planning Principles

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.

(continued)
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).
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 its 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.
Chancellor’s Office approval is required for changes in degree designation, for example from BA to BS. To propose a degree designation 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 designations 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.

Contact Information

Academic Programs and Faculty Development
(562) 951-4672 app@calstate.edu
http://www.calstate.edu/APP/

APP 10/11/06
Revised 10/08/14
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 Hansen
Interim Dean, Academic Program Planning
(562) 951-4015
app@calstate.edu
http://www.calstate.edu/APP/

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
Santa
Stanislaus
Elevating Options and Concentrations to Full Degree Major Programs

As with proposals for new degree programs, elevating an option or concentration to a full degree program should reflect the needs of the students and the state, be broadly based, and demonstrate depth, relevancy and applicability to the real world of work. Board of Trustees guidelines prohibit proliferation of degrees and degree terminology.

An implementation proposal using the Elevating Options or Concentrations to a Full Degree Program Template is required when requesting to elevate a formal option, concentration, or emphasis to a full degree program. Each proposal must include:

1. A program overview, a description of the program’s fit with the institutional mission or institutional learning outcomes, and a rationale for elevating the option or concentration at this time;
2. The proposed catalog copy including the program description, degree requirements and admission requirements, (including course catalog numbers, titles, course units), and admission requirements. For master’s degrees, please also include catalog copy describing the culminating experience requirement(s);
3. A side-by-side comparison showing the course requirements of the existing degree major and concentration on one side and the proposed new major on the other;
4. A comprehensive assessment plan addressing all assessment elements and a curriculum map matrix showing where student learning outcomes are introduced (I), developed (D), and mastered (M);
5. Enrollment numbers in the option for the past three to five years;
6. Teach-out policy language to accommodate those students who will complete the original program with the option or concentration;
7. Evidence the current option will be discontinued once all existing students exit the program;
8. Documentation of the campus approval process with written evidence of continued administrative support to sustain the stand-alone program.
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 full degree program from which it was derived. The existing concentration will need to be discontinued when the degree elevation is approved.


**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 major program may be achieved through the use of a subprogram (an option, concentration, or special emphasis), as noted in [Executive Order 1071](http://www.calstate.edu/oe/EO-1071.html). An option, concentration, or special emphasis must constitute less than one half of the units required in the major core to insure 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](http://www.wascenior.org/resources/handbook-accreditation-2013/part-iii-wase-quality-assurance/institutional-report/components-institutional-report/3-degree-programs-meaning-quality-and-integrity-degrees):

**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: [http://www.calstate.edu/app/documents/CSU-Codes-to-CIP-2010def.pdf](http://www.calstate.edu/app/documents/CSU-Codes-to-CIP-2010def.pdf)

**For further information, please contact:**
Academic Programs and Faculty Development
(562) 951-4722
app@calstate.edu
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 after a policy-compliance review, 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 to regular program status requires that the campus submit to the Chancellor's Office a pilot-conversion proposal, which includes: 1) all relevant program identification information, 2) a program catalog description including a list of all curricular requirements, 3) a thorough program evaluation, including an on-site review by one or more experts in the field, 4) a comprehensive assessment plan which includes a) all current student learning outcomes, b) a representative sample of one or more years of student learning outcome data, and c) a description of strategies applied to address areas of concern (closing the loop), 5) evidence of adequate faculty and facilities resources, 6) enrollment statistics over the prior five years, 7) evidence of program quality, 8) evidence of societal need (including labor-market demand), 9) evidence of continued student demand, 10) appropriateness to institutional mission, and 11) a brief narrative on how the program prepares graduates for employment and/or graduate education. For self-support programs, please provide a complete budget indicating all revenue sources and anticipated expenditures as well as 1) the per-unit cost to students, 2) the total cost to complete the program, and 3) a cost recovery budget. (See Program Proposal Template or Pilot Conversion Template for required budget elements.)

The campus may use either the traditional new program proposal template, making sure to include an on-site review by one or more experts in the field, or the “Pilot Conversion Template” found at http://calstate.edu/app/program_dev.shtml. Campuses electing not to convert to regular status are expected to submit a letter of discontinuation, specifying program teach-out provisions.

Pilot Program Criteria

The qualifications required for pilot status (listed below) remain in place when a campus converts a pilot program to regular program status.

(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;
(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; and
(f) the program has been subject to a thorough campus review and approval process.

APP 10/11/06
Revised 10/9/14
Revised 10/22/14
Revised 11/18/15