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### DISCLAIMER
This guide has been established as a service for the SDSU campus community and as an introduction to new faculty and staff. The information in this guide is subject to change at any time and may not reflect current policy or regulatory developments. While Curriculum Services makes every attempt to keep the information in this guide current, we make no claims, promises, or guarantees about the accuracy, completeness, or adequacy of the information presented.
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Curricular Processing Deadlines

Curricular Proposals

To ensure the deadline for final catalog copy can be met, a schedule of deadlines for university-level consideration of curricular proposals has been established. Colleges must advance proposals for university-level review by the following dates:

- **November 29, 2019**  Academic Engagement and Student Achievement, Arts and Letters, Business, SDSU Imperial Valley
- **December 6, 2019**  Education, Engineering, Sciences
- **December 13, 2019**  Health and Human Services, Professional Studies and Fine Arts

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 non-curricular 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. Proposals may be prepared throughout the year in CurricUNET; however, submissions may only occur during fall semester.

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 in the Curriculum Guide.
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 SDSU Imperial Valley 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 AAP 91-14 in the Appendix.

CurricUNET, along with instructional materials for CurricUNET use, can be found at [https://www.curricunet.com/SDSU/](https://www.curricunet.com/SDSU/).

**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 can be found in the Memos section of this guide. 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 in the Topics Courses and General Studies Courses section of this guide.

**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
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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 Ability Success Center), 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 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 can be found in the Course Syllabi section of this guide. For syllabus accessibility information and resources, visit https://accessibility.sdsu.edu/instructional-materials.

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.

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 https://ces.sdsu.edu/.
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 procedures at the department, college, and university levels. Departments which 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

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.

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

For reinstatement of deleted undergraduate courses, contact Curriculum Services for information about appropriate procedures.

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.

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 prerequisiteline 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. Department 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 prerequisites for the major requirements may be used as 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 bureaus 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.
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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. The review dates for each college are as follows:

- **February 18, 2020**
  - Health and Human Services
  - Professional Studies and Fine Arts
- **February 16, 2021**
  - Sciences
  - SDSU Imperial Valley
- **February 14, 2022**
  - Arts and Letters
  - Business Administration
- **February 13, 2023**
  - Education
  - Engineering

At the end of this section 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 the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, Resource Management.

SDSU Curriculum Policy for Service Learning (SL) Designation and Approval of New SL Courses
The new Service Learning (SL) course proposal is reviewed by a University-level Service Learning Committee. If the proposal is deemed to meet the learning outcomes for Service Learning (SL), it receives the SL designation. Designation as an SL course requires that the following criteria be met. These elements must be addressed in writing as part of the SL designation curriculum proposal and should be clearly reflected in the proposed syllabus:

1. Justification that the SL component is integral to and supportive of the academic focus of the course. In the syllabus, this can be communicated in the course description, in a separate description of the SL component of the course, and/or in the learning outcomes.

2. Description of the mechanism(s) used to introduce the SL component to the students. This may be done through various methods including, but not limited to: class discussions, guided readings, experiential class periods, or utilizing the Service Learning and Community Engagement Programs (SLCE), http://servicelearning.sdsu.edu, as a resource.

3. Description of the:
   a. community partner(s) and location(s) where the SL assignment will be completed;
   b. community partner needs and their relationship to the course learning outcomes;
   c. expected professional skills and civic learning goals;
   d. activities that will meet the service requirement;
   e. length of time students will be required to serve (minimum of 15 hours during the semester, with 20 hours being optimal, regardless of the unit value of the course);
   f. process for verification of service hours.

4. Description of the mechanisms and opportunities for ongoing student reflection on the integration of the SL component with course content (e.g., class discussions, journals, papers, presentations).

5. The grading standards of the course must reflect that the weight assigned to the service-learning component accounts for a significant portion of the total course grade (minimum of 15%, with 20% or more being optimal).

Service Learning (SL) Definitions, Outcomes, and Other Items to Include in SL Course Syllabi
The information provided below is to help faculty develop a thorough Service Learning course syllabus. Please include the following items in your syllabus:

- The definition of Service Learning
- General policies related to Service Learning
- Learning outcomes associated with Service Learning

Definition of Service Learning
Service Learning entails active student participation in intentional and collaborative service experiences that help promote long-term community development and civic engagement. Service Learning projects significantly relate to course content as well as enrich student education through the acquisition of professional skills in a practical (or applied) setting while also satisfying the needs of partner institutions. Through various pedagogic activities involving reflection, students enhance their sense of civic responsibility, self-awareness, and commitment to the community.

A Service Learning Course is an academic course that provides students opportunities to participate in organized service activities that meet community needs while linking these experiences to course content. Service Learning courses enhance education by providing activities that expand the scope of the course beyond traditional in-class assignments and group projects. Collaboration and the further development of ongoing relationships between SDSU and partner institutions serve as service learning’s cornerstone.

Learning Outcomes Associated with Service Learning
Students who apply themselves fully to the Service Learning component of this course should:

- Identify the local social problems facing communities **
- Recognize the diversity of communities within and around the San Diego region *
- Practice professional and social skills at working with others effectively to address community challenges***
- Relate the course content, the major, and the field of study to individual goals and interests ***
- Cultivate a network of connections at the university and community level ****

These service learning outcomes support the Seven Essential Capacities developed through SDSU’s General Education curriculum, which are:

- Construct, analyze, and communicate arguments
- Apply theoretical models to the real world
- Negotiate differences
- Integrate global and local perspectives
- Illustrate relevance of concepts across boundaries

*Contextualize phenomena
**Integrate global and local perspectives
***Negotiate differences
****Illustrate relevance of concepts across boundaries
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General Policies Related to Service Learning
At SDSU, Service learning and community service activities are supported by the Service Learning and Community Engagement Programs (SLCEP): http://servicelearning.sdsu.edu. SDSU requires the following forms to be completed to ensure a general and professional liability for students enrolled in service-learning courses for which they receive academic credit: (1) Community Partner Service-Learning Agreement; and (2) Student Waiver of Liability and Assumption of Risk form. You will need to submit these forms to your Department Coordinator or other Department Designee at the beginning of the semester and before starting any service learning activities related to the course.

Additional Items to Include in Your Syllabus for SL Courses

- A course description that includes a discussion of the service-learning project or experience.
- A more detailed description of the Service Learning project or experience in the course assignments section, including main tasks, outcomes for student and community partner, identification of community partner(s), and brief description of partner organizations.
- Textbooks, articles, or book chapters related to Service Learning in general, or relevant to the specific context of Service Learning for your course.
- A more detailed description of the structured reflection assignment. Such assignments can include journal writing based on specific prompts, formal and informal oral presentations based on specific prompts, role playing, interviewing classmates, photo essays, collages, and more. Consider consulting with the SLCEP for ideas and examples of how to structure reflections.

Discontinuance of an Academic Program

Code: EP&R 79-10
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)

Proposals 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 the college dean and 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.

Year-Round 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. Housing and financial aid 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. Initially, applications and admissions shall be reserved to the Fall and Spring Semesters.

Principle 14. Initially, disqualification and reinstatement shall apply to Fall and Spring Semesters only.

Principle 15. Adequate time shall be provided for implementing changes to operational systems such as SIMS/R and financial aid processing.

Principle 16. Adequate business, financial, security, maintenance, computer networking, and auxiliary organization services shall be assured year round.

Principle 17. On a rotating basis, university facilities (classrooms, laboratories, housing, and others) shall be taken off-line for remodeling, renovation, and repair.

Principle 18. 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 19. 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 20. Year-Round Operations shall not dilute resources required to maintain and enhance the quality of Fall and Spring semester operations.
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 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.

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.

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

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 Academic Engagement and Student Achievement, one representative from each college and SDSU Imperial Valley selected by the Committee on Committees, and two students named in accordance with procedures approved by the Associated Students Council.

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 interdepartmental 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 curricular 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.

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*

A. General Principles on Cross-Disciplinarity and Course Overlap

- **Principle 1:** Interdisciplinarity is valuable. The interdisciplinary nature of scholarship often results in a degree of overlap between courses. Different approaches to the same topic or subject matter expose students to multiple paths to knowledge and understanding.

- **Principle 2:** Overlap is not replication. Overlap in course subject matter should not be conflated with replication. The distinction between courses with some degree of overlap should be evident in the course learning outcomes, activities, and assessments.

- **Principle 3:** No exclusive ownership of areas of knowledge. No department or school has exclusive ownership of any particular topics, themes, disciplines, approaches, methods, or areas of knowledge. Each department or school represents a concentration of expertise rather than an exclusive purview with respect to courses. A department or school proposing a course with content that extends significantly beyond its faculty’s general concentration of expertise should demonstrate sufficient expertise to offer that course.

- **Principle 4:** Curriculum decisions should be based on intellectual and educational rationales. Decisions by review committees about new course proposals should be based strictly on intellectual and educational reasons in the context of a coherent curriculum and not on enrollment or budgetary concerns.

- **Principle 5:** The GE curriculum is the purview of the entire faculty. The General Education Curriculum is not the purview of any particular department or school. SDSU encourages collegiality and cooperation between and across departments and schools in the continued development of the GE curriculum in service to student learning. Cross-disciplinary conversation and collaboration in the development of new courses can yield innovative approaches in education and should be incentivized.

B. Guidelines for Dealing with Course Proposals Perceived to Overlap

1. In proposing a new course, originators should list the courses in the university curriculum that in their judgment might raise reasonable concerns of substantial overlap or replication by review committees. Originators should be responsible for reviewing the course catalog to identify potentially overlapping courses. In order to avoid undue delays in the review process, originators are advised to err on the side of caution and to follow the steps outlined in B.2. below with regard to generating that list of courses.

2. A department or school proposing a new course has the responsibility to initiate a conversation with the departments or schools offering courses with which the new course may overlap. The goal of these conversations is to ensure that the courses complement one another and do not substantially replicate one another (see principle 2). Such conversations should be evidence-based, specifically through comparison of syllabi with focus on their course learning outcomes, activities, and assessments. While the burden of initiating the conversation between academic programs falls on the department or school proposing the new course, both parties should seek a mutually agreeable resolution with reference to the principles in section A. Originators are encouraged to obtain a letter of support for the new course from the other department or school, though a letter of objection may also be submitted. In the event that attempts to contact the other department or school yield no response, course originators are advised to include evidence of a good faith effort to initiate a conversation.

3. In evaluating a new course proposal, review committees should focus on whether a proposed course substantially overlaps with or replicates an existing one. Review committees will need to use their discretion in making this determination. Principle 2 offers concise criteria for evaluation. The goal should be to prevent the possibility of a student obtaining credit for two separate courses with similar learning outcomes, activities, and assessments. When a review committee has a reasonable concern regarding course distinctiveness, and that concern has not been addressed by the new course originator, the committee should require the originator to follow the steps outlined in B.2. above. Where there is no reasonable concern about significant overlap or replication, review committees may consider overlap between courses as healthy interdisciplinarity and not request the steps in B.2.

4. Review committees should evaluate the complete proposal before making a decision. In doing so, they should focus on intellectual and educational rationales for the new course. An objection from a department or school should not be treated as a veto, a statement of support should not be regarded as ensuring approval, and a lack of any response from a department or school should not be construed as an objection.

---

*Approved by the University Senate on October 2, 2018.

Guidelines for Submitting Curricular Proposals

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

**Course Prerequisites and Description**

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

**Course Justification**

- Does the course warrant academic credit?
- Does the need for the course seem sufficient given resources required?
- Do the course objectives address the stated need for the course?
- Do the course objectives reflect the level of the course, as indicated by the proposed course number?
- Do the suggested texts validate the proposed level of the course? Relate to the course content?
- Does the course content articulate with the mission of the university?

**Facilities / Resources**

- Are unusual resources required? Are they available?
Guidelines for Submitting Curricular Proposals

• Did the Dean indicate that additional resources will be needed to offer the course? Does this seem realistic?
• Does the staffing formula seem appropriate?
• Is the mode of instruction congruent with the course objectives (i.e., lectures, activity, laboratory)?

Course Outline
• Does the course outline articulate with the course objectives?
• Does the course outline articulate with the course description?

Grading
• The grading weight, class activities, etc., must indicate a degree of rigor appropriate to the course level.
• 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.
• 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.

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, Fowler College of Business; Dean, College of Education; Dean, College of Engineering; Dean, College of Health and Human Services; Dean, SDSU Imperial Valley; Dean, College of Extended Studies; Associate Vice President of the Division of Academic Engagement and Student Achievement, and the Dean of the Division of Graduate Affairs.

*1. Deans of colleges shall review all proposals 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.
3. The Dean of the Division of Graduate Affairs shall review solely for impact on the graduate program. The Dean may approve the proposal or, when in his or her opinion the proposal raises important policy questions, request reasonable delay to permit review by the Graduate Council. The Dean shall inform Curriculum Services of action taken on each proposal.

*3. The Associate Vice President for the Division of Academic Engagement and Student Achievement shall review solely for impact on the undergraduate program. The Associate Vice President may approve the proposal or, when in his or her opinion the proposal raises important policy questions, request reasonable delay to permit review by the Undergraduate Council. The Associate Vice President shall inform Curriculum Services of action taken on each proposal.

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.

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).

Guidelines for Submitting Curricular Proposals

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 of the 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.

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 compiles 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 admission changes to admission criteria for existing impacted programs, they need to contact the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, Enrollment, 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 the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, Enrollment, 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...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 15</td>
<td>Departments submit proposed changes to the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, Enrollment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 30</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2016/17 Proposed Changes in Admission Criteria for Current Impacted Majors (Emphases)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major/Emphases</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>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

‡ Review concurrently.
+ When appropriate.
¢ Review upper division courses acceptable for advanced degrees.
¤ Credential programs only.

New Programs and Deletion of Existing Programs

New Courses, Certificates, and Changes in Existing Programs and Courses Deletion of Existing Programs

‡  Academic Policy and Planning Committee
‡  Academic Resources and Planning Committee
Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
+Graduate Curriculum Committee
Academic Deans
+Graduate Council
Senate
President
+Chancellor
+Board of Trustees
+General Education Committee
+Writing Committee
Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
+Graduate Curriculum Committee
Academic Deans
‡  Graduate Council
Senate (information item)
President
¤ California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
+Chancellor
+Board of Trustees
Flow Chart for Graduate Curricular Proposals
Includes Proposals for Advanced Credential Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Programs and Deletion of Existing Programs</th>
<th>Concentrations, Certificates, Credentials, New Courses; and Changes in Existing Programs and Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Curriculum Committee</td>
<td>Graduate Curriculum Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‡ Academic Policy and Planning Committee</td>
<td>‡ Academic Policy and Planning Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Deans</td>
<td>Academic Deans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Council</td>
<td>Graduate Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate (action item)</td>
<td>Senate (when requested)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Necessary Off-Campus Approval)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‡ Review concurrently.
Flow Chart for Undergraduate Curricular Proposals

Flow Chart for Academic Master Plan Proposals and New Degrees
Includes Proposals for Advanced Credential Programs

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.
Flow Chart for Undergraduate Curricular Proposals

Traditional CSU Degree-Program Proposal Process

Bachelor’s and Master’s Level

- State-support programs
- Self-support programs
- Fast-track programs

Pilot Programs are not included

The CSU campus submits to Academic Program Planning (APP) a proposal to add a projected program to the campus Academic Master Plan

BOT Approval granted?

Yes

Campus develops formal proposal

Proposal undergoes campus-level curriculum approval process

Campus-approved, detailed program proposal is submitted to APP—in academic year prior to desired implementation date

APP sends proposal to external reviewers

APP analyzes proposal and synthesizes reviews—Extended Education participates in review of self-support proposals

APP makes recommendation

Revise and resubmit. Sent directly to APP or through campus-approval process first.

No

Not approved

Chancellor’s decision

Approved

Chancellor’s approval letter sent to campus president

APP assigns CSU and CIP Codes

Campus enters new program in CSU Degrees Database

January: traditional
July: fast-track

APP 3/20/15  APP@calstate.edu
Procedure for Processing Curricular Proposals from SDSU Imperial Valley

(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 degree programs at SDSU-IV may be initiated either by SDSU-IV or by academic departments of the San Diego campus; however, in either case such initiations shall be approved both by SDSU-IV 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 SDSU-IV the responsibility for the quality of SDSU-IV programs and courses.

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

(Note: 500-level courses offered at SDSU-IV 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 SDSU Imperial Valley 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., SDSU-IV.
   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
      • needed to initiate the program, and
      • 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
      • needed to initiate the program, and
      • needed during the first two years after implementation.
      Include proposed catalog description of all new courses.
   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 in the fifth year 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:
   • needed to implement the program, and
   • 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.
Program Procedures

Credential Program Procedures
Distance Education Policy
Topics Courses and General Education Courses
Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement
Credential Program Procedures

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 in the Credential Program Procedures section of this guide before being forwarded to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

The proposal submitted for local review should follow the format outlined in the Procedures for Submitting Proposals section of this 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 80086 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;

h. 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;

g. 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;
Credential Program Procedures

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 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

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 instructor 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, midterm, final campus meetings allowed) with asynchronous instructional course section (orientation, midterm, 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.
Topics Courses and 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 Topics 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
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)
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

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
   a. 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).
   b. Demonstrate an understanding of the rhetorical situation-purpose, context, and audience.
   c. Apply writing processes effectively (i.e., research, prewriting, drafting, revision, and editing).
   d. Actively read texts using a variety of reading strategies such as annotation, visual organizers, questioning, and discussion.
   e. 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 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.

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 Writing Placement Assessment with a score of 8 or higher (or earned a grade of C (2.0) or better in Rhetoric and Writing Studies 280, 281 [or Linguistics 281] if score on WPA was 6 or lower); and completed General Education requirements in Communication and Critical Thinking. Proof of completion of prerequisites required: Test scores or verification of exemption; copy of transcript.
PART 3

General Education

Course Syllabi
Student Learning Outcomes
Concurrent Programs
Academic Master Plan
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 science.
• 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.

D. Cultural Diversity Requirement

One explorations course in areas A, B, or C must be a course in cultural diversity, as indicated by an asterisk. Cultural diversity courses focus on the theoretical and practical factors of age, class, disability, ethnicity, gender, gender identity, immigration, nation, race, religion, sexuality, socioeconomic status, and other significant markers of social identity. Courses meeting this requirement examine the complexity of diversity through an analysis of differential inequities, oppression, power, and privilege. Cultural diversity courses focus on non-dominant views and perspectives.

Goals for GE courses meeting the diversity requirement:

• Goal 1: Enhance understanding of the diverse efforts and strategies used by groups to transform and/or dismantle structures of oppression.
• Goal 2: Foster reflection and appreciation of non-dominant perspectives, their contribution to society and culture, and models for their inclusion.
E. Lifelong Learning and Self-Development

Lifelong Learning and Self-Development facilitate understanding of the human being as an integrated physiological, social, and psychological organism. Students learn about such matters as human behavior, sexuality, nutrition, health, stress, key relationships of humankind to the social and physical environment, and implications of death and dying. Courses in Lifelong Learning and Self-Development integrate three kinds of inquiry (though not necessarily with equal emphasis): 1. Sociological: in this context, the relationships between an individual and a broader society; 2. Physiological: the human body as an integrated organism with systemic functions such as movement, nutrition, growth, reproduction, and aging; and 3. Psychological: the study of the mental processes that create consciousness, behavior, emotions, and intelligence. Lifelong Learning and Self-Development also may include physical activity courses, varsity sports, and basic training in the military provided that the activity is an integral part of the study described above and is awarded academic credit. Students may not complete Area E using only physical activity courses.

Goals for GE Courses in Lifelong Learning and Self-Development

- Goal 1: Develop cognitive, physical, and affective skills to become more integrated and well-rounded individuals in society.
- Goal 2: Comprehend various behaviors conducive to physiological health and development.
- Goal 3: Identify and apply strategies leading to psychological well-being.
- Goal 4: Formulate informed views on the mechanisms for maintaining existing power structures and their impact on personal and collective identities.
- Goal 3: Analyze the intersection of the categories of various dimensions of difference as they affect cultural groups’ members lived realities and/or as they are embodied in personal and collective identities.
- Goal 4: Formulate informed views on the mechanisms for maintaining existing power structures and their impact on all sectors of society.

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 applies 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?

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

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 health 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 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)

**NOTE:** General Education Courses - Frequency of Offerings - Policy adopted by the Senate, May 1983 and revised December 1998.

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.

**Guidelines for Evaluating Course Proposals that Include General Education**

**Guidelines for Evaluating Course Proposals that Include General Education**

- When considering category assignments for GE courses, originators and reviewers alike are encouraged to consult the CSU-distributed document “Guiding Notes for General Education Course Reviewers.”
- Implementation of EO 1100’s “double-counting” provision must respect the mission of General Education to give students a broad base of knowledge about the world in which they live, how they impact that world, and how it impacts them. To be approved, new GE course proposals must fulfill all GE requirements and fit clearly and logically within the GE categories for which they are proposed. (See http://advising.sdsu.edu/graduation/nine_graduation_requirements/general_education).

- In implementing EO 1100 and other Executive Orders, the application of new and revised categories to particular cases should align with the wording of those categories while maintaining reasonable flexibility in interpreting that wording.

*Approved by the University Senate on October 2, 2018.*
Course Syllabi

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.

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 crash policies.

Recommended
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 Student Learning Outcomes in this guide.

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.

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).
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 course site through its learning management system 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 about SDSU’s current learning management system, go to https://its.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 the university’s learning 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.

The library summarizes online support for faculty at https://library.sdsu.edu/help-services/services-faculty.

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 occasionnal 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 websites)

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 the Student Ability Success Center 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, see http://go.sdsu.edu/student_affairs/sds/services-overview.aspx.

- 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 give 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 the university’s learning 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 website at https://ctl.sdsu.edu/.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place holder verbs</th>
<th>More precise action verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Know the policies.</td>
<td>Identify policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand the margin of error.</td>
<td>Define “margin of error.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate knowledge of catalysis.</td>
<td>Describe examples of catalysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciate mid-century 20th century jazz composition.</td>
<td>Analyze thematic development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognize innovative technique.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Choose to attend jazz performances.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Learning Outcomes

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syllabus Excerpts</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 describe and explain 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 compare and contrast the influence of traditional, modern, and post-modern perspectives on the role of religion in contemporary American spiritual life.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Discussion of political issues will encourage open exchanges and tolerance of other views. | During discussions about politics, students will be able to listen to other speakers well enough to:  
  • verbally summarize the other speakers’ views;  
  • seek clarification from the original speaker;  
  • incorporate clarifications in a revised summary. |

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.

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>Grading or Assessment Item</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. Student performance on standardized tests.</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>
</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

(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.
SDSU Academic Master Plan—Procedures for Submitting Requests

Procedures for Submitting Requests for New Degree Major Programs for Inclusion on the SDSU 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 California Postsecondary Education Commission (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 in this section) and “Definitions of Graduate Level Instruction” (EP&R 82-39 in the Appendix of this guide) 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 manifestions 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.


**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).


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?
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 must 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...
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b. Is the preparation narrowly conceived? If so, are there ways
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 pro-
fitably 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
degree programs are added only when there is compel-
noted. 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 fresh-
men revealed that the ability to get a better job was cited by fresh-
men 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. How-
ever, there are genuine differences of opinion about the desirabil-
ity 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
carry some kind of lifetime importance, then in general, it
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 life-
long learning society—may lull us into neglecting responsibilities
to ensure that the bachelor's degree major is as comprehensive
and lasting 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 lim-
iting the broadening of perspectives which might enhance cre-
vativity 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 soci-
ey," 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 cur-
rently structured, yet proposals for new majors appear regularly
and must be reviewed conscientiously. If knowledge "keeps no
b. Is the preparation narrowly conceived? If so, are there ways
Is the subject matter sufficiently complex to consider offering
the program as a master's degree only? Might it be appropri-
ate 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.
Degree Programs and Proposals

New Degree Programs
Degree Proposals
Fast-Track and Pilot Program
Concentrations, Emphases, Minors
Procedures for Submitting Proposals

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 (http://www.calstate.edu/APP/) for doctoral degree proposal formats.

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 Program Proposal Template

For a downloadable version of the CSU Degree Proposal Faculty Checklist, visit http://www.calstate.edu/app/documents/ProposalChecklist.docx.

A downloadable version of this information can also be found at http://www.calstate.edu/app/documents/ProgramProposalTemplate.pdf.

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)
   a. State-Support
   b. Self-Support
   c. Online Program
   d. Fast Track
   e. Pilot
   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 2018).
   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. If campuses choose to submit the WASC Substantive Change Proposal, they will also be required to submit a program assessment plan using the format found in the CSU program proposal template.
   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, you can search CIP 2010 at 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.
Procedures for Submitting Proposals

3. Program Overview and Rationale
   a. Provide a brief descriptive overview of the program citing its 1) purpose and strengths, 2) fit with the institutional mission or institutional learning outcomes, and 3) the compelling reasons for offering the program at this time.
   b. Provide the proposed catalog description. The description should include:
      » a narrative description of the program
      » admission requirements
      » a list of all required courses for graduation including electives, specifying course catalog numbers, course titles, prerequisites or co-requisites (ensuring there are no “hidden prerequisites” that would drive the total units required to graduate beyond the total reported in 2e above), course unit requirements, and any units associated with demonstration of proficiency beyond what is included in university admission criteria.
      » total units required to complete the degree, and if a master’s degree
      » 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 for the 1) institution, 2) program, and for 3) student learning. Institutional learning outcomes (ILOs) typically highlight the general 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 graduates from a specific program. PLOs are more narrowly focused than ILOs. Student learning outcomes (SLOs) clearly convey the specific and measurable 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. (WASC 2013 CFR: 11.1.2, 2.3)
   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)
      Key to program planning is creating a comprehensive assessment plan addressing multiple elements, including a strategy and tool to assess each student learning outcome. SLOs operationalize the PLOs and serve as the basis for assessing student learning in the major. 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, generally every five years.
   c. Indicate total number of units required for graduation.
   d. Include a justification for any bachelor’s 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 bachelor’s 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 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- or undergraduate-level.
   g. Attach a proposed course-offering plan for the first three years of program implementation, indicating likely faculty teaching assignments. (WASC 2013 CFR: 2.2b)
   h. 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.
   i. For graduate degree proposals, cite the corresponding bachelor’s program and specify whether it is (a) subject to accreditation and (b) currently accredited. (WASC 2013 CFR: 2.2b)
   j. For graduate degree programs, specify admission criteria, including any prerequisite coursework. (WASC 2013 CFR: 2.2b)
   k. For graduate degree programs, specify criteria for student continuation in the program.
   l. For undergraduate programs, specify planned provisions for articulation of the proposed major with community college programs.
   m. Provide an advising “roadmap” developed for the major.
   n. Describe how accreditation requirements will be met, if applicable, and anticipated date of accreditation request (including the WASC Substantive Change process). (WASC 2013 CFR: 1.8)

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.
6. Student Demand
   a. Provide compelling evidence of student interest in enrolling in the proposed program. Types of evidence vary and may include (for example), 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.
   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 B5-20, see Appendix)
   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 at least one of the following additional criteria shall be met:
      » The courses or program are primarily designed for career enrichment or retraining;
      » The location of the courses or program is significantly removed from permanent, state-supported campus facilities;
      » The course or program is offered through a distinct technology, such as online delivery;
      » For new programs, the client group for the course or program receives educational or other services at a cost beyond what could be reasonably provided within CSU Operating Funds;
   d. For existing programs, there has been a cessation of non-state funding that previously provided for educational or other services costing beyond what could be reasonably provided within CSU Operating Funds.
Procedures for Submitting Proposals

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 in the CSU degree proposal faculty check list found earlier in this document and listed below):

Basic Cost Recovery Budget Elements*
(Three to five year budget projection)
• Student per-unit cost
  » Number of units producing revenue each academic year
  » Total cost a student will pay to complete the program
• Revenue - (yearly projection over three years for a two-year program; five years for a four-year program)
  » Student fees
  » Include projected attrition numbers each year
  » Any additional revenue sources (e.g., grants)
• Direct Expenses
  » Instructional costs – faculty salaries and benefits
  » Operational costs – (e.g., facility rental)
  » Extended Education costs – staff, recruitment, marketing, etc.
  » Technology development and ongoing support (online programs)
• Indirect Expenses
  » Campus partners
  » Campus reimbursement general fund
  » Extended Education overhead
  » Chancellor’s Office overhead

*Additional line items may be added based on program characteristics and needs.

Submit completed proposal packages to: APP@calstate.edu

Academic Programs and Faculty Development
CSU Office of the Chancellor
401 Golden Shore
Long Beach, CA 90802-4210

Contact Us

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

Extended Education
Assistant Vice Chancellor and Dean, Extended Education
Phone (562) 951-4795
Degree Proposals

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 NASID visiting team’s report, with an indication of what the department has done to respond to any suggestions for improvement.

Review Process for Proposals for CSU and UC Joint Degree Programs

Doctoral Program Proposal Resources

- CSU Au.D. Programs
  http://www.calstate.edu/app/aud/
- CSU Ed.D. Programs
  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 (https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/_files/committees/ccga/ccga-handbook-august-2016.pdf).

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 office at 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 Post-secondary Education Commission for concurrence (CPEC). CPEC will complete its review within 60 days of receipt of the document.

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:
- Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA)
- CSU Chancellor’s Office Academic Program Planning (APP)
- California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC)
- Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Office, CSU Office of the Chancellor
- Provost and Executive Vice President—Academic & Health Affairs, UC Office of the President
- 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

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.

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.

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
1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.

C. Development of the Program Implementation Proposal
1. The ad hoc joint committee drafts a formal program implementation proposal.
2. The proposal is submitted through local university administrative channels to the CSU Chancellor and to the chief executive officer of the independent institution.
3. 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.
4. 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
1. Academic Program Planning submits the program implementation proposal to CPEC staff.
2. 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.
3. CPEC staff notifies the CSU and the independent institution of action taken on the proposal.
4. 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 [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
  a. Indications of need for the program
  b. Supporting evidence of the requesting academic units’ ability to offer doctoral instruction
  c. 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.
  d. Academic units: 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

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

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

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/EdD/. 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/EdD/. 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.
Degree Proposals

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

II. Program Rationale
   The rationale for proposing the program, including:
   a. Description of how the program philosophy, design, and pedagogical methods suit the target student population
   b. 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.

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;
   • 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 https://www2.calstate.edu/csu-system/administration/codedmemos/Academic%20Affairs%20Coded%20Memos/AA-2006-42.pdf
   • A discontinuation checklist is available at http://www.calstate.edu/app/EdD/documents/Discontinuation_Matrix.pdf
   • 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

1 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.
XI. Admission Requirements

a. Admission criteria, including: undergraduate, master’s-level, and, if appropriate, other post-baccalaureate preparation for admission; other admission requirements; and, 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:
   » The number of credits that students may transfer in to the program
   » 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

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

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.
Degree Proposals

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 address 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):
   » How graduates of the programs have affected elementary and secondary school and community college reform efforts
   » 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>Visionary educational leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complexity and organizations</td>
<td>Collaborative management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diversity and equity</td>
<td>Educational policy environments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational accountability</td>
<td>School and campus cultures</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>Student development and learning</td>
<td>Community &amp; governmental relations</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>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>Professional practice</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
Procedures for Fast-Track and Pilot Program

(For full text of CSU memorandum announcing fast track process and pilot programs, see Appendix.)

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.

Submitting Fast-Track Proposals
When submitting an update to the campus academic plan, please note any fast-track degree proposals and include a very brief description of the program and a rationale for offering it through the fast-track process.

Please use the traditional degree proposal template, available on the APP Web at http://www.calstate.edu/app/program_dev.shtml under the New Program Development link.

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 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).

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.

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

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. 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;
d. it is consistent with all existing state and federal law and trustee policy;
e. it leads to a bachelor’s or master’s degree;
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 full 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
The first Monday in January—for July approval
The second Monday in June—for December approval

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:
   • The campus committed the resources necessary to maintain the program beyond five years;
   • 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;
   • 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,
   • 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;
   • 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;
   • it requires no major capital outlay project to be adequately housed;
   • it is consistent with all existing state and federal law and trustee policy;
   • it is a bachelor’s or master’s degree program;
   • the campus has a thorough review and approval process for pilot degree programs, through which the program has passed.

d. The campus would be obligated 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.

Helpful Resources
• CSU Board of Trustees: https://www2.calstate.edu/csu-system/board-of-trustees
• Fast Track Procedures: http://calstate.edu/app/documents/fasttrackprocedures.docx

Campus Procedures for New Self-Support Degree Programs and Certificates: University Level Review

A limited number of proposals that meet fast-track criteria may be implemented as 5-year “pilot programs” without prior review and comment by the Chancellor. Prior to implementation, the campus is obligated to

1. notify the Chancellor’s Office of plans to establish the program,
2. to provide a program description and list of curricular requirements, and
3. to confirm that each of the six pilot criteria apply to the pilot program.

Current SDSU Approval Process

Following department and college approvals, proposals for new degree programs are reviewed at the university level by the AP&P, AR&P, Undergraduate and/or Graduate Curriculum Committee, Academic Deans, Graduate Council (if the new program is at the graduate level), Senate, and President.

Proposals for new certificates do not require system-level approval; however, the campus approval process is similar to that for new degree programs.

Trial of an SDSU Fast-Track for New Self-Support Degree Programs

Up to seven proposals for new self-support programs offered through CES can be reviewed using the following process.

1. Proposals for new degree programs intended for the CSU Fast-Track and CSU Pilot processes and proposals for new certificate programs will undergo the campus review process at the levels of department, college, and Undergraduate and/or Graduate Curriculum Committee. At each level, committees shall endeavor to prioritize review of these proposals, given the fast-changing nature of target market for these programs and the need for CES to be as responsive as possible to these market demands so as to maximize the potential for revenue that benefits the entire campus. Any new courses that are created for the new degree program would be reviewed concurrently with the new program proposal. Courses created through this expedited review process can only be used in self-support programs.

2. Following review by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee or Graduate Curriculum Committee, in lieu of separate reviews by AP&P, AR&P, and Graduate Council, proposals will advance to a CES Expedited Program Review Committee consisting of representatives from the (1) AP&P, (2), AR&P, (3) SEC and (4) CES Advisory Council. Following the approval of the CES Expedited Program Review Committee, the proposal will be forwarded to the Senate for approval.

3. A proposal’s originator shall attend the meeting of the CES Expedited Program Review Committee to respond to any members’ questions regarding the proposal.

4. Following the approval of the Senate:
   • CSU Fast-Track Program proposals are submitted to the Chancellor’s Office for review.
   • CSU Pilot Program proposals are implemented using the Chancellor’s Office Pilot Program Implementation procedures.
   • Certificate programs are implemented following SDSU campus procedures.

While this proposal will shorten the review timeline at the University level, all proposals will still be reviewed by curriculum committees at the department and college levels and by either the University Curriculum Committee or the Graduate Curriculum Committee. Thus, this proposal seeks to strike a proper balance between conducting an appropriately rigorous review and the timely launch of the program. This expedited process is being proposed only for new self-support programs; thus, the normal resource concerns associated with new state programs will not arise. The process will be implemented on a trial basis; no more than seven proposals could be processed using this procedure. By December 2019, a review of the procedure will be initiated. Following that review, the expedited process could become permanent policy, abandoned, or refined.
Procedures for Submitting Proposals

FAQs: Policies for Bachelor’s and Master’s Degrees

What is EO 1071?
This Executive Order will require that each degree has a set of required courses that account for more than half of the total units required for the degree. For example, a 30-unit Master’s program needs to have 16 or more required units that are completed by every student earning that Master’s degree. The CO refers to these required units as the “core” for the degree. Colloquially, this Executive Order is often referred to as the “> 50% rule” or the “more than half rule,” rather than EO 1071.

When do degree requirements need to change?
In 2017, SDSU was required to submit a report on the number of required units for every bachelor’s and master’s degree. The CO has the following expectations and timeline for bringing any out-of-compliance degrees into compliance:

- For new programs (or new concentrations in existing programs), the final step is CO approval. Beginning 2017-2018, proposals that reached the CO and were not in compliance with the > 50% rule were returned for modification. This will continue.
- Beginning in 2018, the SDSU Graduate Curriculum Committee has been checking all proposals for Master’s degree changes against this new rule. We are not requiring full compliance at this time. But if a Master’s program does not currently meet the > 50% rule, then their proposed changes cannot reduce the number of required units (bring the program further from compliance). In the handful of cases where this has been proposed, I met with the program to clarify the policy and discuss possible solutions. Vetting of proposals by the Graduate Curriculum Committee will continue next year in the same way.
- Graduate and undergraduate programs that do not meet the “more than half rule” are expected to discuss the issue during their next Academic Review and develop a reasonable plan for degree revisions.

What about <insert your program-specific question about compliance>?

- SDSU has already conducted a preliminary review of all Master’s programs on campus to determine how close each is to compliance with the > 50% rule. We have sought flexibility from the CO for a number of course- and program-specific issues.

Here are the highlights:

a. Research course numbers, special study, and thesis (e.g., 797, 798, 799A) can be counted as required classes if they are required of all students.

b. If the required “core courses” are clearly evident as degree requirements in your catalog or bulletin section, then there isn’t any need to reformat that section. No specific language has been dictated for EO 1071, and we don’t see a need for every program on campus to reformat their entry.

c. For degree requirements with many options (such as “Choose one course from 600, 601, 602 or 603”), these courses are considered to be electives rather than core, for the purposes of the > 50% rule. As unique and well-justified exceptions come up in the coming years, we will determine if there is any flexibility on this issue.

d. The focus is on the degree, not concentrations or specializations within the degree. The required units for each degree need to comprise more than half of the total units. This is true whether or not the degree has concentrations or specializations. If this is not possible because a concentration/specialization has many unique requirements, then the concentration/specialization can be “elevated” (promoted) to its own degree. Across the entire CSU system, many programs will be promoting concentrations to the level of degrees.

What is the motivation for this rule?
The proximate motivation seems to be federal reporting requirements. The CO believes that it is currently unable to provide accurate information to the Department of Education’s National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) in many cases. As mentioned above, the unit for reporting purposes is the degree (not concentrations or specializations). Degrees with a very small number of core units share the same challenges, even if they don’t have concentrations or specializations.

What should my program be doing over the next year?

- If you are considering changes to your programs’ degree requirements, and it does not currently meet the “> 50% rule”, then your proposed changes cannot further reduce the number of required units.
- If your program is preparing its Academic Review during the next year, discuss this issue and develop a plan for revising course requirements if necessary.

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 (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.”

NOTE: Changes to concentration titles may be approved at the campus level as long as the title changes are minor.

* Including Doctoral Concentrations.

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.
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).

For more information, visit: http://calstate.edu/app/documents/AcadProgramApprovalReqts.pdf.

WASC Substantive Change Proposals

The following types of programs require substantive change approval from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (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 Academic Engagement and Student Achievement for detailed information on the following:
- Timeframe for Submitting a Proposal.
- Substantive Change Application forms.
- Description of Substantive Change Categories.
Forms for all WASC substantive change proposals can be found on their website, https://www.wscuc.org/subchangetemplates.
Frequently Asked Questions

Executive Order 1071 Revised January 20, 2017
Delegation of Authority to Approve Subprograms (Options, Concentrations, Special Emphases) and Minors
and
Coded Memorandum ASA-2017-02 Accurate National Enrollment and Degree Reporting

During the consultation phase for revising Executive Order 1071 and Coded Memorandum ASA-2017-02, the Academic Senate CSU, campus senates, presidents, provosts, academic associate vice presidents, individual faculty and others provided feedback. The following questions represent the most frequently expressed concerns. Related answers were provided during the consultation period and are included below.

1. **What do these new policies require?**
   **Answer:** To ensure accurate reporting of degree-related data, a Chancellor’s Office approved degree program title, associated CSU degree code, Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) code, and CIP definition need to reflect more than 50 percent of the required major core. Subprograms (options, concentrations, special emphases, and similar) need to represent less than 50 percent of the major requirements.

2. **What is a “major core”?**
   **Answer:** The major core or program core is the set of courses required of all students pursuing a major degree program. The core shall represent the majority of required units, allowing the program student-learning outcomes to be achieved by all enrolled students, regardless of subprogram pursued.

3. **Does the revised executive order change the review process for adding concentrations and other subprograms? There appears to be an additional level of scrutiny beyond “giving notice.”**
   **Answer:** Presidents still have authority to approve concentrations, and the Chancellor’s Office is still responsible for ensuring that subprograms (options, concentrations, and special emphases, among others) comply with all applicable policies. Chancellor’s Office review of subprograms does not evaluate curricular coherence, rigor or similar review criteria.

4. **Why is this distinction required?**
   **Answer:** When the Chancellor approves a campus degree proposal, a specific set of curricular requirements is approved, and an appropriate related CIP code (with an associated curriculum definition) is assigned for reporting purposes. The codes assigned are used to track enrollments, degrees granted, retention, time-to-degree, and financial aid, among other data. Through Intersegmental Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), these CSU data are submitted to the federal government.
We have learned that some campuses have added large-unit concentrations, options (and other subprograms) within approved degree programs, at the same time diminishing the curriculum originally approved by the Chancellor’s Office. This can result in invalid IPEDS reporting. Accurately aligning degree title, required courses, degree code, CIP code and the related CIP definition critical to providing valid data to IPEDS. Inaccurate reporting of data can result in resource consequences, including federal fines.

Other considerations include:

- Consistent titles, codes, and CIP definitions—across the CSU—result in a systemwide achievement of comparable meaning and integrity in degree programs with the same title.

- Students should receive a diploma with a degree title reflecting the majority of required courses.

- Employers should be able to understand the curriculum and student preparation represented by a degree title.

- Program degree requirements that align with the appropriate CIP code are critical to the processing of both undergraduate and graduate student visas, which are reviewed by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

5. **Is conforming to IPEDS reporting requirements a sufficient justification for changing curriculum?**
   **Answer:** IPEDS reporting has not forced the curriculum to change, but a review of data has made us aware of irregularities in CSU degree programs. For the reasons explained above, this needs to be resolved.

6. **Will this policy-update result in the loss of programs?**
   **Answer:** This policy is not a directive to reduce the number of degree programs. Campuses will make local decisions about how to bring high-unit subprograms into compliance. As always, mission, societal demand and resources will be part of local decisions.

7. **Will this cause degree programs in many disciplines to lose their accreditation?**
   **Answer:** Degree requirements are expected to comply with accreditation standards. Accrediting bodies (such as WASC) have placed increased emphasis on the meaning, quality and integrity of degrees, with a focus on student learning outcomes and program-level assessment. When the majority of required courses in a major are the same (a core), that provides greater meaning and integrity of the degree, no matter which concentration is pursued. Common student learning outcomes across a degree are required in order to conduct meaningful assessment and program review for ongoing quality improvement.
8. **Will you allow all current programs that are out of compliance to remain that way (Can they be grandfathered in)?**
   **Answer:** In order to achieve accurate reporting, there will be no grandfathering allowed for out-of-compliance subprograms and unauthorized degree programs. Instead, campuses may decide among a number of choices for achieving compliance. The campus may adjust the proportion of courses in the major core and in the subprogram, may discontinue the subprogram, or may propose a new degree program developed from the subprogram.

9. **Will graduate programs be treated differently than undergraduate programs?**
   **Answer:** All degree programs report to IPEDS; therefore, undergraduate and graduate programs are subject to the same policy requirements.

10. **Do courses that come from other departments count as part of a degree core?**
    **Answer:** The courses required in the core are subject to these policies; there is no consideration of the department offering major core courses.

11. **What is the process for discontinuing degree programs and subprograms?**
    **Answer:** Campuses are required to follow campus discontinuation policies.

12. **What is the timeline for implementation?**
    **Answer:** Existing subprograms will be required to come into compliance by their next scheduled program review. Extensions may be granted for exceptional circumstances. Program changes requiring Chancellor’s Office action may be submitted at any time and do not have to be held until the next scheduled program review.

13. **Is there a different timeline for campuses undergoing quarter-to-semester conversion?**
    **Answer:** Programs found to be out of compliance have until the next program review to accomplish the needed changes. This may translate to from five-to-seven years beyond 2017, the year the revised executive order is implemented. If quarter-to-semester conversion requires additional time to address curriculum revision, the campus academic associate vice president may contact the Chancellor’s Office to work out a reasonable accommodation.

14. **How will campuses report the status of degree programs and subprograms to the Chancellor’s Office?**
    **Answer:** By July 17, 2017, campuses shall report to APP@calstate.edu (1) a list of all degrees and concentrations, specifying those in compliance with the major-to-concentration proportion; and (2) the program review year by which compliance will be achieved. The CO will provide a template for each campus to use to provide this information. To collect this
information most efficiently, campus academic AVPs may seek information from associate deans and department chairs.

**Resources for more information:**

**CIP**

**CSU Degree Codes, Titles, and CIP Definitions**
http://www.calstate.edu/app/documents/CSU-Codes-to-CIP-2010def.xlsx

**IPEDS**
https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/

**Search CSU Degrees and Subprograms**
http://degrees.calstate.edu/

**For further information:**
Please direct curriculum-related questions to Dr. Alison Wrynn at awrynn@calstate.edu or (562) 951-4603. For more information about reporting procedures, please contact Dr. Edward Sullivan at esullivan@calstate.edu or (562) 951-4767.
Certificate Programs and Samples

University Guidelines for Certificate Programs
Program Completion
Course Classification System
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. 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. 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 the currency of bachelor-level major in terms of these prerequisite requirements.
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:
   a. Is the program adequately justified and does it have the necessary resources (faculty, space, equipment, material, etc.)?
   b. Are the units or units proposing to administer the program appropriate and has the proposal followed the established approval process?
   c. Does the proposal duplicate or overlap with existing certificate programs, majors, minors, concentrations, or emphases?
   d. Is there satisfactory evidence of coordination and consultation with all appropriate University units?
   e. 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 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 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 the Certificate Program Examples 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.

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.
Program Completion Certificates

For Basic Certificates, contact the Office of the Registrar. For Advanced Certificates, contact the Division of Graduate Affairs. For Professional Certificates, contact College of Extended Studies. For Certificates of Appreciation, Participation, or Recognition, contact SDSU Reprographic Services.

TO: Registrar, Office of the Registrar

FROM: ________________________________

RE: Notification of Certificate Program Completion *

Student's Name: ________________________________

Other names under which records might be listed: ________________________________

RedID: ___________________ Date of Birth: _______ / _______ / _______

Name of Certificate Program: ________________________________

Code: ________________________________

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: _______ / _______ / _______

*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

Date Posted: ____________

Initials: __________________

Enrollment Services, 2010
Program Completion Certificates

SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY
Graduate and Research Affairs
Division of Graduate Affairs

Notification of Completion of Advanced Certificate Program

Type or Print

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>Red ID #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>Apt. No.</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Status of Student: Matriculated at SDSU [ ] Extended Studies [ ]

Name of Advanced Degree Program

COURSES COMPLETED TO MEET REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept./Course No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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: 

Name of Advanced Certificate to be Posted:

Dates awarded 

Certificate Ordered (Date) 

Posted by Date 

Graduate Dean/Designee Signature Date 

5/04
Program Completion Certificates

[ACADEMIC CERTIFICATE SAMPLE]

(For Basic Certificates, 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

two thousand

Given at San Diego this

Chancellor
University of California, San Diego

Vice Chancellor, Health Sciences
Dean, School of Medicine
University of California, San Diego

Chair, Department of Community
and Family Medicine
University of California, San Diego

Director, General Preventive Medicine Residency
San Diego State University

President
San Diego State University

Dean, College of Health
and Human Services
San Diego State University

Director, Graduate School of Public Health
San Diego State University
[CONTACT COLLEGE OF EXTENDED STUDIES FOR THIS CERTIFICATE]
Program Completion Certificates

[CONTACT COLLEGE OF EXTENDED STUDIES FOR THIS CERTIFICATE]
Course Classification System

The formula used to determine faculty workload for “C” (classroom) classes is as follows:
(Adjusted Course Credit Units) x (K-Factor) x (Team Teaching Fraction) = WTU

The formula used to determine faculty workload for “S” (supervision) classes is as follows:
Enrollment ÷ S Factor x 12 = WTU
(S factor for each — S23, S24, S25, S36, S48 — is identified in the footnote at the bottom of the page.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekly Course Classification Number</th>
<th>Class Hours 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></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>facility limits (50)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 02</td>
<td>lecture discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 03</td>
<td>lecture–composition</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.0</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></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5 05</td>
<td>seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6 06</td>
<td>clinical processes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7 07</td>
<td>fine arts and science activities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8 08</td>
<td>education workshops and social science activities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9 09</td>
<td>music activity – large group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10 10</td>
<td>music activity – small group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11 11</td>
<td>physical education and recreation activities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12 12</td>
<td>speech, drama &amp; journalism activities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13 13</td>
<td>technical activities and laboratories</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>facility limits (24)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14 14</td>
<td>remedial courses</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15 15</td>
<td>technical activities and laboratories</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>facility limits (24)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C16 16</td>
<td>science laboratories</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C17 17</td>
<td>clinical practice off campus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C18 18</td>
<td>major intercollegiate sports (not more than four per year)</td>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C19 19</td>
<td>minor intercollegiate sports</td>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C20 20</td>
<td>major performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C21 21</td>
<td>music performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* S23 23</td>
<td>supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>† S24 24</td>
<td>supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‡ S25 25</td>
<td>supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• S36 36</td>
<td>supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># S48 48</td>
<td>supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C77 77</td>
<td>peer-taught courses, ROTC or non-workload instruction which is not state supported</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C78 78</td>
<td>nontraditional instruction, examination, or evaluation (workload is assigned)</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.0</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
18 = 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
# Course Classification System

## COURSE CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM EXAMPLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekly Course Classification Number</th>
<th>Class Hours APDB Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-1 Large lecture</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture courses in any discipline with more than 50 enrollments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-2 Lecture – discussion</td>
<td></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 Lecture – composition</td>
<td></td>
<td>Business, education, English, and psychology courses in which students write, are counseled or study law cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-3 Lecture – counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td>Business, education, English, and psychology courses in which students write, are counseled or study law cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-3 Lecture – case study</td>
<td></td>
<td>Business, education, English, and psychology courses in which students write, are counseled or study law cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-4 Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td>Courses in any discipline in which student participation (discussion) is the primary instructional method.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-5 Seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td>Courses in any discipline using seminar methods of instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-6 Clinical processes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nursing and psychology courses in clinical processes and education courses involving individual testing, such as driver training in a simulator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-7 Fine arts and science activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Art, anthropology and science activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-8 Education workshops and social science activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Includes methods taught on an activity basis in education and subject areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-9 Music activity – large group</td>
<td></td>
<td>Does not result in a major public performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-10 Music activity – small group</td>
<td></td>
<td>Instrumental or vocal instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-11 Physical education and recreation activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gym classes or intramural sports if credit is given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-12 Speech, drama and journalism activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Class work in debate, acting and publication; no public performance involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-13 Technical activities and laboratories</td>
<td></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 Remedial courses</td>
<td></td>
<td>Courses for students admitted as exceptions only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-15 Technical activities and laboratories</td>
<td></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 Science laboratories</td>
<td></td>
<td>Laboratories in natural science, life science, psychology, natural resources, agriculture, engineering, meteorology, photography.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-17 Clinical practice – off campus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nursing, social work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-18 Major intercollegiate sports</td>
<td></td>
<td>Football, basketball, baseball, track and field, wrestling, swimming, etc.; limited to four sports per year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-19 Minor intercollegiate sports</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other sports not listed as C-18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-20 Major performance</td>
<td></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 Music performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Major performance groups, such as orchestras, bands and choruses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*S-23 Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervision requires three hours per week with each supervised student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*S-24 Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervision requires two hours per week with each supervised student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*S-25 Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervision requires one and one-half hours per week with each supervised student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*S-26 Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervision requires one hour per week with each supervised student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*S-27 Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervision requires three-quarters of one hour per week with each supervised student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-77 Peer-taught courses, ROTC or non-workload instruction which is not state supported</td>
<td></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 Non-traditional instruction, examination or evaluation</td>
<td></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.
Supervision Course Categories and WTU Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Students per</th>
<th>1 WTU</th>
<th>12 WTU*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-1</td>
<td>S-48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-2</td>
<td>S-36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-3</td>
<td>S-25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-4</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-5</td>
<td>S-23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</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.
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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:elm

Attachment

c: Executive Staff, Office of the Chancellor
   Extended Education Deans

401 GOLDEN SHORE • LONG BEACH, CA 90802-4210 • (562) 951-4700 • Fax (562) 951-4986 • creed@calstate.edu
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THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
Office of the Chancellor
401 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California 90802-4210
(562) 951-4700

Executive Order No. 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

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
January 20, 2017

MEMORANDUM

TO: CSU Presidents

FROM: Timothy P. White
Chancellor

SUBJECT: Delegation of Authority to Approve Subprograms (Options, Concentrations, Special Emphases) and Minors

Executive Order 1071 Revised January 20, 2017

Attached is a copy of Executive Order 1071 revised January 20, 2017, which supersedes Executive Order 1071 March 26, 2012 and updates policy for options, concentrations, special emphases, and similar subprograms. The policy also addresses 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 Office of Academic Programs and Faculty Development at (562) 951-4722 or degrees@calstate.edu.

TPW/clm

Attachment

c: CSU Presidents
   CSU Office of the Chancellor Leadership
   Provosts and Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs
   Associate Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs
   Deans of Graduate Studies
   Directors of Institutional Research
   Directors of Admission

http://www.calstate.edu/EO/EO-1071-rev-1-20-17.html
Executive Order: 1071 Revised January 20, 2017

Effective Date: January 20, 2017

Supersedes: Executive Order 1071 Effective March 26, 2012

Title: Delegation of Authority to Approve Options, Concentrations, Special Emphases (and Similar Subprograms) 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 1071 March 26, 2012.

1. **Delegation of Authority**
   Authority is delegated to the presidents to approve campus implementation of options, concentrations, special emphases (and similar subprograms), and minors.

2. **Definition of Terms**
   2.1 Options, concentrations, special emphases and similar subprograms are not defined at the system level, nor are unit minima for these “subprograms” established at the system level.

   2.2 Minors are not defined at the system level, and campuses may set local policy regarding minors.

3. **Requisite Conditions of Approval**
   3.1 An option, concentration, special emphasis (or similar subprogram) or a minor may be approved under the authority delegated by this executive order only if the requirements comply with CSU policy and applicable law and if 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.

   3.2 To ensure valid reporting to the National Center for Education Statistics through the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, an option, concentration, or special emphasis (or similar subprogram) must constitute less than one half of the units required in the major program.
Appendix

Executive Order 1071
Revised January 20, 2017

4. Required Chancellor’s Office Notification

4.1 Prior to implementation of any option, concentration or special emphasis (or similar subprogram) approved under this delegation, the campus shall obtain a Chancellor’s Office confirmation of compliance with CSU policy and applicable law. Campus notifications shall be submitted to the Department of Academic Programs and Faculty Development (at degrees@calstate.edu), and shall include:

a. The exact title of the new subprogram and the complete degree designation and title of the major degree program housing the new subprogram (e.g., Bachelor of Science in Biology with a Concentration in Biochemistry);

b. A list of courses and required units constituting the major and the new subprogram;

c. Total units required to complete the entire degree, including the combination of subprogram and major program;

d. The complete list of courses and required units constituting the major degree program;

e. A 4-year major-and-subprogram roadmap for freshmen and a 2-year major-and-subprogram roadmap for transfer students;

f. The CSU degree program code (formerly called “HEGIS”) that students use to apply to the major degree program;

g. The campus-proposed CSU degree program code to be used to report enrollments in the concentration (may be the same as the degree code);

h. A detailed cost-recovery budget for self-support subprograms to be offered within state-support major degree programs; and

i. Documentation of all campus-required curricular approvals.

4.2 Subsequent to receiving Chancellor’s Office confirmation and prior to implementation of any option, concentration or special emphasis (or similar subprogram) approved under this delegation, the campus shall enter the new subprogram into the CSU Degrees Database. Minors are not included in the CSU Degrees Database.

4.3 There is no requirement to notify the Chancellor’s Office of new, modified or discontinued minors.

5. Policy Compliance

The Chancellor’s Office shall require the discontinuation of any option, concentration, or special emphasis (or similar subprogram) that does not comply with CSU policy within the timeframe specified by the Chancellor’s Office.

Dated: January 20, 2017

Timothy P. White, Chancellor
MEMORANDUM

TO: CSU Presidents
FROM: Timothy P. White
      Chancellor
SUBJECT: Extended Education: Self-Supporting Instructional Courses and Programs – Executive Order 1099 Revised October 5, 2018

Attached is a copy of Executive Order 1099 Revised October 5, 2018 relating to self-supporting instructional courses and programs. This policy supersedes Executive Order 1099, which was issued on June 9, 2014. The policy clarifies the procedures to be followed by each campus of the California State University in offering extended education self-supporting instructional courses and programs, including those offered online and during summer session and winter intersession. It also defines the term “supplant” consistent with Education Code section 89708, as amended in 2015, and clarifies campus-reporting requirements related to extended education activities.

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 Extended Education at extended-ed@calstate.edu or (562) 951-4880.

TPW/sat

Attachment

c: CSU Office of the Chancellor Leadership
   Chair, Academic Senate CSU
   Provosts and Vice Presidents, Academic Affairs
   Vice Presidents, Administration and Finance
   Associate/Assistant Vice Presidents, Academic Affairs
   Deans of Graduate Studies
   Deans of Extended Education
   Commission on the Extended University

http://www.calstate.edu/EO/EO-1099-revised.html
This executive order is effective immediately and is issued pursuant to section II of the Standing Orders of the Board of Trustees; sections 40100, 40100.1, 40102, 40103, 40200, 40201, 40202, 40300, 40402, 40403, 40400, and 40407 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations; sections 89704, 89705, 89708, and 89721 of the California Education Code; and Trustee Resolution REP 07-84-04. This policy clarifies the procedures to be followed by each campus of the California State University (CSU) in offering self-supporting instructional courses and programs, including those offered online and during summer session and winter intersession. In all cases, such offerings shall be consistent with the CSU mission, policies, and applicable laws and regulations. Academic standards associated with all aspects of such offerings are identical to those of comparable state-supported CSU instructional programs.

Article 1. Purpose of California State University’s Extended Education Operations

Through extended education operations (also known as “special sessions” as defined in Education Code section 89708 or known as “continuing education” as it appears in Education Code section 89704), the CSU provides educational opportunities on a self-supporting basis to specialized audiences and local communities across the state and nation, and internationally. For the purposes of clarity and consistency, the term “extended education” will be used in this document.

Article 2. Definition of Terms

2.1 Certificate

A certificate declares that a student has satisfactorily completed the prescribed course of study in a certificate program (defined below). (Title 5 section 40400)
2.2 **Certificate Programs**

A certificate program provides a set of learning experiences concentrated in a specific set of educational goals. At the discretion of the campus, academic credit earned in certificate programs may be awarded at the graduate and undergraduate levels. Certificate programs may grant Continuing Education Units (CEUs) or academic credit; or they may include non-credit offerings. (EO 806)

2.3 **Continuing Education Unit (CEU)**

Distinct from the semester or quarter unit defined in Title 5 section 40103, Continuing Education Unit (“CEU”) is a flexible unit of measurement for non-academic credit in extended education activities. One CEU is defined as ten hours of participation in an organized, extended education experience under responsible sponsorship, capable direction and qualified instruction.

2.3.1 CEUs can be used to record an individual’s participation in non-credit courses, programs, and activities, which may include various forms of independent and informal study.

2.4 **Contract Credit**

Contract Credit is that for which an administrative fee is charged but no instructional costs are paid through CSU extended education. Contract credit shall apply to special sessions credit and extension credit. For example, contract credit is awarded for contracted professional development, as for teacher training when the CSU does not provide the actual instruction but does administer the awarding of credit. Contracted activities may also include non-credit for a specific audience, such as employees of a company.

2.5 **Cost-Recovery Budget Model**

A self-supporting cost-recovery budget ensures that costs incurred by the CSU Operating Fund for services, products, and facilities provided to extended education and to CSU auxiliary organizations are properly and consistently recovered with cash and/or a documented exchange of value. (EO 1000)

2.6 **Extended Education**

Extended education (also known as special sessions and continuing education) is a means whereby the instructional courses and programs of the CSU can be provided on a self-supporting basis at times and in locations not supported by the CSU Operating Fund. Examples of extended education include but are not limited to: interim sessions between college year terms; course and degree program offerings scheduled online, at military bases, employment locations, organizations, correctional facilities, and other
distant locations; and instructional programs for a specific client group requiring special services or scheduling accommodations.

2.7 Extended Education Local Trust Fund

Formerly the Continuing Education Revenue Fund, the Extended Education Local Trust Fund (“EE Local Trust Fund”) is the fund into which revenues received by the Trustees of the CSU from extended education and other self-supporting instruction – excluding auxiliary programs – shall be recorded.

2.8 Extension Credit

Extension credit is often associated with professional development activities and is awarded (with limitations) for self-supporting courses, conferences, workshops and seminars. No more than 24 semester units of extension credit may be applied toward the degree. (Title 5 section 40407)

2.9 Matriculated Student

A matriculated student is a student who has, through normal procedures, been admitted formally at a CSU campus to pursue an authorized degree, credential or certificate (for academic credit) and who is enrolled in or is expected to enroll in courses. A student may be matriculated through state-supported university enrollment or through self-supporting extended education enrollment, or both.

2.10 Non-Credit Contract Program

A non-credit contract program offers non-academic credit activity for a specific audience, such as employees of a company.

2.11 Open University

Open University (also called “open enrollment”) allows non-matriculated individuals paying self-supporting fees to enroll in state-supported course offerings on a space-available basis – after reasonable steps have been taken to provide full enrollment opportunity to eligible state-supported matriculated students. (Title 5 section 40202; EO 805)

2.12 Out-of-State or Out-of-Country Programs

Out-of-state and out-of-country programs are campus-based, self-supporting instructional activities of the CSU that provide instruction outside California. These programs 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 campus, staff, faculty and students benefit from broadened understandings of other states’ and countries’ educational practices and cultures. Unless
specifically excluded or clearly inapplicable, these programs are subject to policies and
procedures governing self-supporting instructional programs and international programs.
(Education Code section 89705; Trustee Resolution REP 07-84-04)

2.13 Self-Support Mode

Instruction offered through self-supporting mode does not receive state general fund
appropriations and instead collects non-state student fees that are adequate to meet the
cost of maintaining operation in the long run. Such fees shall be required pursuant to
rules and regulations prescribed by the trustees, including but not limited to fee policies
such as Executive Order 1102 and Education Code section 89708.

2.14 Service Areas

Service areas are locations in which CSU campuses have traditionally delivered academic
service. This includes but is not restricted to courses and programs transmitted by online
learning technologies, self-supporting “off-campus centers,” and face-to-face instruction.
While the assignments of campus service areas was repealed by resolution of the Board
of Trustees on January 30, 2002 (ROR 01-02-01), campus presidents shall confer before
delivering academic services, recruiting, conducting outreach and marketing in a
community traditionally served by another CSU campus. (See article 11.1.2.5.1 in this
executive order)

2.15 Special Sessions

As defined in Education Code section 89708, Special Sessions are self-supporting
instructional programs conducted by the CSU. Examples of special sessions include, but
are not limited to, credit degree, credential or certificate programs as well as individual
academic credit-bearing courses. For the sake of consistency in this executive order,
“extended education” shall be the term used for instruction that does not receive state
appropriations.

2.16 Special Sessions Credit (Academic Credit Earned in Extended Education)

Students enrolled in extended education may earn academic credit (“special sessions
credit”) applicable to degree, certificate and credential programs. Special sessions credit
may be applied in fulfillment of graduation residence requirements, consistent with
Title 5 section 40403.

2.17 State-Supported Mode

State-supported mode is the type of funding structure in which the university receives
state appropriations for instruction offered.
2.18 Supplant

Self-supporting special sessions shall not supplant regular course offerings available on a non-self-supporting basis during the regular academic year. “Supplanting” means reducing the number of state-supported course offerings on a campus while increasing the number of self-supporting versions of that same course on the same campus. “Reducing” and “increasing” are measured by comparing the academic year to the prior academic year. “The same course” means a course with substantially the same course name, course description and student learning outcomes. (Education Code section 89708)

2.19 Supplement

A self-supporting version of an existing state-supported course or program may be offered to supplement established offerings, as long as it does not constitute supplanting. Self-supporting offerings may exist without a state-supported counterpart.

Article 3. Requirements

3.1 Accreditation

All CSU extended education instruction, whether offered within California or offered out of the state or out of the country, shall be consistent with all applicable policies of the Senior Commission of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) and other accrediting bodies under whose jurisdiction the instruction falls. Required regional accreditation approvals shall be secured prior to program implementation.

3.2 Compliance with Campus and System Policies

Extended education degree, credential, and certificate programs shall be operated in accordance with all appropriate campus and system policies and procedures. Nothing in this policy shall change or alter the terms of the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement and Article 39 – Intellectual Property in particular.

3.3 Educational Support Services

Campuses offering extended education shall provide educational support services (e.g. admissions and records, advising, library, and financial aid, among others) appropriate to the nature and scope of the program, with costs to be reimbursed by extended education.

3.4 Faculty Compensation

Faculty teaching academic-credit-bearing extended education courses or programs shall be compensated according to appropriate approved CSU salary schedules that are consistent with the applicable collective bargaining agreement for the program and fiscal year in question.
Article 4. Academic Standards

4.1 The campus president is responsible for the academic aspects of extended education instructional programs. (EO 1000)

4.2 Academic standards and requirements for state-supported on-campus and online educational activities, courses and programs are the same for comparable extended education instruction, including extended education instruction conducted online, out-of-state and out-of-country. (EO 795)

Article 5. Requisite Conditions for Extended Education Operations

5.1 During Summer Sessions or Intersessions Between College Terms

5.1.1 Extended education instruction may provide continuing student access during summer sessions and intersessions, when CSU Operating Funds are unavailable or inappropriate.

5.1.2 Students shall be charged the full cost of instruction and any applicable campus-based fees for extended education offered during summer or intersessions.

5.1.3 No student shall be charged the nonresident tuition fee in addition to extended education fees.

5.1.4 Students enrolled in state-supported programs with a year-round curriculum schedule that includes a required offering in the summer term shall be charged state-supported fees.

5.2 During Regular College Terms

For a degree, credential or certificate program, or for individual academic-credit-bearing courses to be offered in extended education: (1) CSU Operating Funds shall be either unavailable or inappropriate for supporting the offering(s), and (2) at least one of the following additional criteria shall be met:

a. The courses or program is designed primarily for career enrichment or retraining (Education Code section 89708); or

b. The location of the courses or program offerings is removed from permanent, state-supported campus facilities; or

c. The course or program is offered through a distinct technology, such as online delivery; or
d. For new programs, the client group for the course or program receives educational or other services at a cost beyond what could be reasonably provided within CSU Operating Funds; or

e. For existing programs, there has been a cessation of non-state funding that previously provided for educational or other services costing beyond what could be reasonably provided within CSU Operating Funds.

Article 6. Limitations on Self-Supporting Courses, Programs, and Enrollments

6.1 Supplanting

6.1.1 Self-supporting special sessions shall not supplant regular course offerings available on a non-self-supporting basis during the regular academic year. Supplanting means reducing the number of state-supported course offerings while increasing the number of self-supporting versions of that same course at the same campus. “Reducing” and “increasing” are measured by comparing the academic year to the prior academic year. “The same course” means a course with substantially the same course name, description and student learning outcomes.

6.1.2 As a state institution, the CSU shall not require state-supported matriculated students to enroll in self-supporting courses in order to fulfill the graduation requirements of a state supported degree program. Each campus shall ensure that any course required as a condition of undergraduate degree completion for a state-supported program be offered as a state-supported course. (Education Code 89708)

6.2 Teacher Credential Programs

Basic teacher credential programs (those for multiple subject, single subject, and education specialist) shall not be offered on a self-supporting basis. However, the chancellor may grant exceptions based on the cost to students and the local demand for preparing new teachers. Proposed exceptions are to be addressed to the chancellor. (Title 5 sections 40100.3 and 40101)

Article 7. Enrollment Limitations

Self-supporting students and state-supported students shall not be enrolled in the same academic course, except:

a. As allowed through Open University; or

b. When non-CSU students enroll in these special sessions terms: summer, winter, or spring intersession; or
c. When self-supporting matriculated students also pay state-supported Tuition Fee to enroll in state-supported courses; or

d. When state-supported matriculated students pay self-supporting fees to enroll voluntarily in self-supporting courses.

Article 8. Open University

8.1 A campus may designate each semester or quarter those state-supported regular course offerings for which non-matriculated students may enroll through Open University and earn special session credit, provided that enrollment in any such course for special session credit be permitted only after state-supported matriculated students have had an opportunity to enroll in the state-supported regular course offering. (Title 5 section 40202)

8.2 State-supported matriculated students shall not be permitted to enroll through Open University.

Article 9. Required Residence Applicability

9.1 Special Sessions credit may be used to fulfill the residence graduation requirement. (See article 2.16 of this executive order)

9.2 Extension credit (such as credit often associated with professional development activities) shall not be used to fulfill the residence graduation requirement. However, the chancellor may designate specified extension courses that may be offered for residence credit. (Title 5 section 40403(b)) (See article 2.8 of this executive order)

Article 10. Applicability of Types of Credit

10.1 Credits Earned in Non-Matriculated Status

10.1.1 Special Sessions Credit Applied Toward Baccalaureate Degree Requirements

A maximum of 24 semester special session course credits taken by a non-matriculated student may be applied toward the baccalaureate degree. This maximum applies to special session course credit earned through self-supporting course offerings, as well as to state-supported offerings in which credits are earned through Open University. (Title 5 section 40407.1)

10.1.2 Extension Credit

An academic department may allow up to a maximum of 24 semester units of extension credit to be applied toward degree requirements. (Title 5 section 40407)
10.1.3 Continuing Education Credit

CEUs shall not be converted to units of academic credit (semester or quarter units).

10.1.4 Special Sessions Credit Applied Toward Master’s Degree Requirements

At the discretion of the academic department, up to 30 percent of the units that are applied toward satisfaction of graduation requirements may be earned while in non-matriculated status, whether taken through state-supported or self-supporting course offerings.

10.1.5 Exceptions

When the circumstances of an individual case make it appropriate, the appropriate campus authority, in consultation with the academic department, may authorize additional extended education courses (taken by non-matriculated students) to be applied toward fulfillment of degree requirements.

10.2 Credits Earned by Matriculated Students

There is no limit on the number of special session course units that may be earned by matriculated students and applied toward the extended education degree. (Title 5 section 40407.1)

10.3 Credit Allowance

A maximum of one semester unit may be allowed for each fifteen hours of instruction. (Title 5 section 40201)

10.4 Continuing Education Units

10.4.1 Implementation of Campus Policies Related to Continuing Education Units

Each campus is authorized to develop and implement policies and procedures for non-credit extended education program activities utilizing the Continuing Education Unit (CEU) as the standard unit of measurement of individual participation. Campuses choosing to utilize the CEU shall develop local policies and procedures consistent with national standards and systemwide requirements provided hereafter.

10.4.1.1 Campuses may choose to award a decimal fraction of a CEU when appropriate. However, when computing the number of CEUs to be awarded, only the number of complete instructional hours, or the equivalent, shall be considered. For example, a program involving 18.5 contact hours would award a maximum of 1.8 CEUs.
10.4.1.2  CEUs shall not be converted to units of academic credit (semester or quarter units).

10.4.2 Criteria for Individual Programs and Activities Awarding Continuing Education Units

Each campus shall develop its own criteria for awarding CEUs through non-credit-granting programs and for activities. At a minimum, these criteria shall include all of the following:

a. The activity is planned to meet the educational needs of a specific target audience. The following shall have an opportunity for input into the planning process: the target audience, faculty (or other qualified experts approved by the appropriate campus authority), and campus personnel assigned responsibility for the administration of such activities;

b. The following program elements are determined during the planning stages and prior to program implementation approval: program purposes and objectives; student performance requirements; evaluation procedures suitable for measuring the effectiveness of program design and operation; and the number of CEUs to be awarded for satisfactory completion of performance requirements; and

c. The program or activity is of an instructional nature and is sponsored or approved by an academic or administrative unit of the campus best qualified to determine the quality of the program content and to approve the resource personnel required.

10.4.3 Administration Related to Continuing Education Units

Each campus shall develop local administrative policies and procedures that at minimum shall provide for all of the following:

a. Assignment of local administrative program responsibility to appropriate campus personnel;

b. Recordkeeping and reporting functions ensuring that a permanent record is maintained for all CEUs awarded and for all programs for which the awarding of CEUs is authorized. The form and content of these records shall be consistent with nationally recognized standards for the maintenance of CEU records for students and programs, and the records shall be maintained and retained in accordance with CSU systemwide records/information retention and disposition schedules implementation policy (see Executive Order 1031);
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c. Program review-and-approval procedures consistent with procedures used for other campus-sponsored continuing education programs;

d. Instructional and personnel review-and-approval procedures that are consistent with procedures used for other campus-sponsored continuing education programs; and

e. Steps to preclude duplicate recordkeeping when such a program is jointly sponsored by another campus.

10.4.4 Fiscal Management Related to Continuing Education Units

Fiscal management related to activities for which CEUs are to be awarded shall be operated in accordance with the policies and procedures established in article 13 of this executive order.

Article 11. Implementation Procedures

Prior to implementation, all extended education instruction shall have been approved under procedures in place for state-supported instruction, and all academic policies governing self-supporting instruction shall be identical to or established under the same procedures as those governing state-supported instruction.

11.1 Required Approvals

11.1.1 Credential Programs and Certificate Programs

11.1.1.1 Basic teacher credential programs (those for multiple subject, single subject and education specialist) shall not be offered on a self-supporting basis. However, the chancellor may grant exceptions based on the cost to students and the local demand for preparing new teachers. Requests are to be addressed to the chancellor. (See article 6.2 of this executive order)

11.1.1.2 Other credential or certificate programs may be offered through extended education subsequent to securing all regularly required campus approvals; however, no Chancellor’s Office approval is required.

11.1.2 Degree Programs

11.1.2.1 New Degree Programs

New degree programs and subprograms (options, concentrations, special emphases or similar subprograms) may be offered through
extended education subsequent to securing all regularly required campus and Chancellor’s Office approvals.

11.1.2.2 Multiple Support Modes

Subsequent to obtaining requisite Chancellor’s Office approvals, a campus may operate degree programs in state-supported mode, self-supporting mode, or both, subject to the prohibition against supplanting.

11.1.2.3 Implementing a Self-Supporting Version of an Existing State-Supported Program

Before implementing a self-supporting version of a previously approved state-supported degree program (degree type and title), adding a subprogram (option, concentration, special emphasis or similar subprograms), or adding a new delivery method (face-to-face or online), Chancellor’s Office approval is required. The proposal shall provide details sufficient to confirm that the existing state-supported offering is not being supplanted, shall specify the program’s qualification(s) to operate as a self-supporting special session, and shall include: a rationale for the new support mode, a detailed cost-recovery budget, student fees per unit and total student cost to complete the program, anticipated enrollment, a campus commitment to provide adequate faculty resources, the anticipated impact on the existing state-supported program and the disclosure of any third party partners or vendors contracted to support the program.

11.1.2.4 Changing from Self-Support Mode to State-Support Mode

Chancellor’s Office approval is required in order to change a degree program’s support mode from self to state support. The campus shall propose the change to the Chancellor’s Office, specifying the degree program, offering a brief program description and rationale for making the change, and shall include: a detailed cost-recovery budget, student fees per unit and total student cost to complete the program, anticipated enrollment, a campus commitment to provide adequate faculty resources, the anticipated impact on the existing state-supported program, and disclosure of any third party partners or vendors contracted to support the program.
11.1.2.5 Change of Geographic Location

Before implementing a previously approved degree program in a different geographic location or online, Chancellor’s Office approval is required if WASC substantive change approval is required or if the program would be offered in another CSU campus’ traditional service area. The proposal shall specify the program’s qualification to operate through extended education and shall include a rationale for the new location, a detailed cost-recovery budget, student fees per unit and total student cost to complete the program, anticipated enrollment, a campus commitment to provide adequate faculty resources, and the anticipated impact on the existing state-supported program, and disclosure of any third party partners or vendors contracted to support the program.

11.1.2.5.1 Service Areas

Chancellor’s Office approval is required prior to offering degree, certificate, and allowed credential programs within a service area traditionally served by another CSU campus. Proposals shall include evidence of both campus presidents’ consent to the proposed location of operation, and any recruitment, outreach and marketing conducted in conjunction with the program.

11.1.2.5.2 Out-of-State and Out-of-Country Operations

Chancellor’s Office approval is required prior to offering degree programs out of the state or out of the country. Campuses shall comply with all existing requirements of WASC, as well as with CSU policies and procedures, including but not limited to Executive Orders 795, 1080, 1081, and 1082.

Article 12. Sponsorship and Ownership of Extended Education Programs, Courses, and Activities

12.1 Extended education instructional programs awarding academic credit or CEUs shall be owned and/or sponsored by a CSU campus and shall not be assigned or contracted to another party or organization, including campus auxiliary organizations.
12.2 Educational courses and programs offered through CSU auxiliary organizations may be only non-academic, credit-bearing instruction or non-CEU instruction. (EO 1059 section III (D.4))

12.3 Those extended education instructional programs that do not award academic credit or CEUs may be owned and/or sponsored by a CSU campus or CSU auxiliary organization, and shall be operated in accordance with the Education Code and Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations.

12.4 At the discretion of the campus president, extended education instructionally related programs and activities that do not award academic credit or CEUs and that are operated through CSU auxiliary organizations may use the CSU name and logo, along with identifying program ownership (i.e., extended education, foundation, etc.).

Article 13. Financial Management

13.1 Fiscal Responsibility

The campus president is responsible for the financial oversight of self-supporting instructional programs operated by the campus through extended education and for the financial aspects of non-credit bearing instructional programs offered by authorized CSU auxiliary organizations.

13.2 Financial Operation

13.2.1 Except for auxiliary organizations generating revenue by offering non-credit instruction, revenues that the Trustees of the CSU receive from extended education instructional programs (which include credit and non-credit courses and programs offered in or out of the state or out of the country) shall be deposited to the credit of the State Controller’s Office (SCO) “California State University Trust Fund” 0948 and recorded to the extended education local trust fund (“EE Local Trust Fund”). (Education Code sections 89721(i) and 89704(a))

13.2.1.1 All revenue generated by non-credit instruction operated through a CSU auxiliary organization shall be deposited in auxiliary accounts.

13.2.2 The EE Local Trust Fund and its expenditures shall comply with all applicable Chancellor’s Office directives (i.e. ICSUAM, EOs, Coded Memoranda); laws; statutes and regulations of the State of California, and local or federal governments and is available solely “for the support and development of self-supporting instructional programs” as provided in Education Code section 89704.

13.2.3 EE Local Trust Fund balance may be carried forward from one year to the other to serve as working capital and to level out the fluctuations in operations.
13.2.4 Extended education operations shall establish reserves in amounts and for purposes described in the ICSUAM Policy 2001.00 Campus Reserves.

Each campus and the Chancellor’s Office must designate reserves in amounts and for purposes described in this policy. The campus chief financial officer (CFO) is responsible for establishing reserves to ensure that amounts are consistent with campus plans and requirements.

Reserves for economic uncertainty may be established in each of the CSU operating funds in order to limit the impact of cyclical state recessions and to support year-to-year consistency in the university’s operations. Designations for “reserve for economic uncertainty” may accumulate up to an amount that is no more than one-half of the projected annual operating budgets in each of the CSU funds for which the reserve is established.

In addition, other reserve designations should be established as applicable in each of the CSU operating funds for specific capital projects, capital renovation, facilities maintenance and repair, encumbrances, catastrophic events or any other specified purpose consistent with the underlying funding requirements and restrictions. Designated reserves must be accounted for annually using the appropriate Financial Information Recording Management System (FIRMS) reserve object code.

13.2.5 All extended education revenues may be pledged to the acquisition, construction, and improvement of facilities for extension programs, special session, and other self-supporting instructional programs, and may also be pledged to supplement other revenue funded projects relating to debt obligations issued by the trustees. (Education Code section 89704(d); State University Revenue Bond Act of 1947)

13.2.6 EE Local Trust Funds shall be self-sufficient by maintaining a continuous positive cash flow and/or positive fund balance at the campus fund level.

13.3 Budget Process

13.3.1 Extended education shall reimburse the CSU Operating Fund for any direct and indirect costs (including instructional and administrative costs) incurred during the offering of a self-supporting program. (Executive Order 1000; ICSUAM 3552.01, 202.2)

13.3.2 Each campus extended education unit shall submit an annual plan for revenue generation in extended education programs. These projections shall be included in the trustees’ annual budget submission to the state and shall include all extended education revenues.
13.3.3 It is the primary responsibility of the campus to monitor enrollments, revenues, and expenditures during any given fiscal year to assure fiscal stability. Budget changes should be initiated as necessary to assure this fiscal stability.

13.4 Student Fees

13.4.1 Campus fees shall be established in compliance with CSU fee policy. (EO 1102)

13.4.2 Extended education fees shall be determined locally on the basis of estimated per-person delivery cost and shall be approved by the president or designee.

13.4.3 In determining the fee, the campus shall:

a. Detail the costs to be supported by the fee (including at least the cost of salaries, materials, travel, and student services and accommodations, for example);

b. Specify the student cost per unit;

c. As applicable shall specify the total cost to complete degree requirements; and

d. Shall specify the number of students expected to enroll in the program annually.

13.4.4 A record of these details associated with fees assessed for self-supporting programs and courses shall be maintained in auditable condition, in accordance with CSU systemwide records/information retention and disposition schedules implementation policy. (Executive Order 1031)

13.4.5 Campuses shall provide a complete inventory of their self-supporting extended education fees, including past and current fee rates, the total revenue collected for each fee and the remaining balance of revenue collected for each year.

13.4.6 Campus presidents shall consider statements of revenues and expenditures prepared by the chief financial officers before making a determination on self-supporting program fees.

13.5 Financial Aid

13.5.1 Schools must report to the Federal Department of Education any location at which 50% or more of an educational program is provided. This is done via the Program Participation Agreement. In general, approval by the Department of Education is required before financial aid can be awarded or disbursed to students in the program. Since the approval process may take some time, it is advisable to coordinate and confirm with the financial aid office as early as possible to prevent delays.
Article 14. Records Maintenance and Retention

Records shall be maintained and retained in accordance with systemwide records and information policy for retention and disposition schedules. (Executive Order 1031)

Article 15. Reporting Requirements

15.1 Upon Chancellor’s Office request, campuses shall report on extended education activities.

15.2 Campuses are required to report annually on any supplanting activities during the prior academic year.

a. Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs will be asked to respond indicating:

   1. There was no reduction in state-supported courses and increase in self-supporting courses with substantially the same name, description and student learning outcomes in the prior academic year, or

   2. Yes, supplanting occurred in the prior academic year (see section 2.18 and 6.1.1 for definition).

b. For each academic year, each campus shall report the number of self-supporting versions of each course, the number of state-supported versions of that course (if applicable) with substantially the same name, description and student learning outcomes and any change in the numbers of versions offered as state-supported or self-supporting since the prior academic year.

c. The Chancellor’s Office will follow up with any identified campuses to determine if supplanting occurred and to advise regarding any possible changes to campus practices and procedures.

Dated: October 5, 2018

Timothy P. White, Chancellor
August 23, 2017

MEMORANDUM

TO: CSU Presidents

FROM: Timothy P. White
Chancellor

SUBJECT: General Education Breadth Requirements
Executive Order 1100 Revised August 23, 2017

Attached is a copy of Executive Order 1100 Revised August 23, 2017 relating to the California State University General Education Breadth (CSU GE Breadth) requirements. This policy supersedes Executive Order 1100, which was issued on February 16, 2015. The policy incorporates changes recommended by faculty, students, administrators and the Academic Senate CSU regarding how systemwide GE policy can better: (1) clarify requirements, (2) ensure equitable opportunity for student success, and (3) streamline graduation requirements. Additionally, the revised executive order includes a revised definition for mathematics/quantitative reasoning (CSU GE Breadth Subarea B4), in response to recommendations from a variety of sources.

In accordance with California State University policy, 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 Academic Programs and Policy department at APP@calstate.edu or 562-951-4603.

TPW/clm

Attachments

c: CSU Office of the Chancellor Leadership
Dr. Christine Miller, Chair, Academic Senate CSU
Provosts/Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs
Associate Provosts/Associate Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs
Articulation Officers
Deans of Undergraduate Studies
Directors of Admissions and Records
Directors of General Education

http://www.calstate.edu/EO/EO-1100-rev-8-23-17.html
Executive Order: 1100 Revised August 23, 2017

Effective Date: August 23, 2017

Supersedes: Executive Order 1100 Effective February 16, 2015

Title: CSU General Education Breadth Requirements

This executive order is issued pursuant to Education Code 66763, Title 5, California Code of Regulations, sections 40402.1, 40403, 40405, 40405.1, 40405.2, 40405.3, 40405.4, and 40508, and the Standing Orders of the Board of Trustees, Section II(a).

This executive order is intended to establish a common understanding of the requirements for CSU General Education Breadth (GE) and to provide for the certification of courses completed by transfer students at regionally accredited institutions. Reciprocity among CSU campuses for full and subject-area completion of lower-division GE Requirements is also addressed in this executive order. This executive order is effective for students subject to the fall 2018 and subsequent catalog years.

This document also addresses:

- Applicability of the policy (Article 1, page 1),
- Patterns that fulfill General Education requirements (Article 2, page 2),
- Premises of CSU General Education Breadth (Article 3, page 5),
- Distribution of General Education Breadth units (Article 4, page 6),
- Transfer and articulation (Article 5, page 9),
- Implementation and governance (Article 6, page 16).

Article 1. Applicability

1.1 Prior to Completion of CSU Lower-Division General Education Breadth Requirements

The requirements, policies and procedures adopted pursuant to this executive order are effective for students subject to the fall 2018 and subsequent catalog years who have not previously been enrolled continuously at a campus of the CSU or the California Community Colleges (CCC) and who have not satisfied lower-division general education
1.2 Subsequent to Completion of Entire CSU General Education Breadth Requirements

Subsequent to completion of CSU GE lower-division and upper-division requirements, a student shall not be required to satisfy additional exclusively general education breadth requirements.

Article 2. Fulfilling CSU General Education Breadth Requirements

2.1 CSU GE Breadth Patterns

Policies adopted by the Board of Trustees in July 1991 provide three optional patterns for undergraduate students to fulfill CSU GE requirements:

a. CSU General Education Breadth
   Fulfillment of CSU GE requirements (Title 5, Section 40405.1), includes lower-division certification by a California Community College or a CSU, and also includes the completion of 9 upper-division semester units (or 12 upper-division quarter units) consisting of a minimum of 3 semester units each (or 4 quarter units) each in Areas B, C and D; or

b. Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC)
   Completion of the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) (Title 5, Section 40405.2), as certified by a CCC, and also includes the completion of 9 upper-division semester units (or 12 upper-division quarter units) consisting of a minimum of 3 semester units (or 4 quarter units) each in Areas B, C and D; or

c. University of California (UC) Campus Lower-Division
   Completion of lower-division general education requirements of a University of California campus (Title 5, Section 40405.3), as certified by that campus, and also includes the completion of 9 upper-division semester units (or 12 upper-division quarter units) consisting of a minimum of 3 semester units (or 4 quarter units) each in Areas B, C and D.

2.2 CSU Systemwide Requirements

2.2.1 General Education Requirements

a. CSU campus GE requirements shall conform to the requirements established in this executive order and shall not exceed the requirements for 39 lower-division and 9 upper-division
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semester-units (or quarter-unit equivalent) in the defined GE Areas.

b. A baccalaureate candidate who has not completed either the IGETC or UC-campus pattern specified in Article 2 shall complete the CSU General Education Breadth requirements described in Article 4, Subsections A through E, totaling a minimum of 48 semester units or equivalent quarter units.

c. Subsequent to a change of major, the student shall not be subject to different or additional GE requirements solely to address CSU GE requirements already satisfied.

2.2.2 Minimum Grades
a. A grade of C- or better is required in each CSU or transfer-course in written communication in the English language (A2), oral communication in the English language (A1), critical thinking (A3), and mathematics/quantitative reasoning (B4). (Title 5 Sections 40803, 40804, 40804.1).

b. Each CSU campus shall establish the minimum grades for satisfactory completion of remaining general education breadth courses, subject to reciprocity requirements specified in Section 5.6 of this EO.

2.2.3 Upper-Division Requirement
Nine upper-division semester units (12 upper-division quarter units) are required according to the following distribution:

- Area B (3 semester or 4 quarter units) Scientific Inquiry and Quantitative Reasoning
- Area C (3 semester or 4 quarter units) Arts and Humanities
- Area D (3 semester or 4 quarter units) Social Sciences

The 9 upper-division GE courses are designed to be taken after upper-division status (completion of 60 semester units or 90 quarter units) is attained. Students enrolling in upper-division GE courses shall have completed required lower-division GE courses in written communication, oral communication, critical thinking, and mathematics/quantitative reasoning. Campuses may require no more than 9 upper-division GE semester units (or the quarter equivalent).

2.2.4 Residency Requirement
The 9 semester (12 quarter) units of upper-division GE shall be taken within the CSU. In all cases, students shall meet the residency requirements specified in Title 5 Section 40403.
2.2.5 Exceptions
Exceptions to the foregoing requirements may be authorized only under the following circumstances:

a. In the case of an individual student, the campus may grant a partial waiver of one or more of the particular requirements of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, Section 40405.1 to avoid demonstrable hardship. Each campus shall have clearly stated policy regarding such waivers.

b. In the case of high-unit major degree programs, the chancellor may grant exceptions to one or more requirements for students completing the particular program. Such exception must be approved at the campus level prior to initiating a request to the Chancellor’s Office. A full academic justification shall be submitted to the executive vice chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs, who shall submit his or her recommendation and the campus recommendation (along with all relevant documents) to the chancellor.

c. A student who has been admitted to a baccalaureate degree program is exempt from additional GE requirements if:

1. The student has previously earned a baccalaureate or higher degree from an institution accredited by a regional accrediting association; or

2. The student has completed equivalent academic preparation, as determined by the appropriate campus authority.

d. Each campus is authorized to make reasonable adjustments in the number of units assigned to any of the five required distribution Areas (A through E). The total number of GE units required shall not be fewer or greater than 48 semester units or 72 quarter units. Except when 49 semester (74 quarter) units is allowed as described in Article 4, Area B.

2.2.6 Double Counting

2.2.6.1 General Education, Major, and Other Requirements
Major courses and campus-wide required courses that are approved for GE credit shall also fulfill (double count for) the GE requirement.
2.2.6.2 General Education and US History, Constitution, and American Ideals Statutory Requirement

CSU campuses may permit up to 6 semester units or 8 quarter units taken to meet the United States History, Constitution and American Ideals Requirement (Title 5, Section 40404) to satisfy GE requirements.

Article 3. Premises of CSU General Education Breadth

3.1 Background

CSU GE requirements have been designed to complement the major program and electives completed by each baccalaureate candidate, to assure that graduates have made noteworthy progress toward becoming truly educated persons.

These requirements are designed to provide the knowledge, skills, experiences, and perspectives that will enable CSU students to expand their capacities to take part in a wide range of human interests and activities; to confront personal, cultural, moral, and social problems that are an inevitable part of human life; and to cultivate both the requisite skills and enthusiasm for lifelong learning. Faculty are encouraged to assist students in making connections among disciplines to achieve coherence in the undergraduate educational experience.

Courses approved for CSU GE should be responsive to the need for students to have developed knowledge of, or skills related to, quantitative reasoning, information literacy, intellectual inquiry, global awareness and understanding, human diversity, civic engagement, communication competence, ethical decision-making, environmental systems, technology, lifelong learning and self-development, and physical and emotional health throughout a lifetime.

3.2 Instructional Modality

GE requirements may be satisfied through courses taught in all modalities (e.g., face-to-face, hybrid, or completely online). Pursuant to California Education Code Section 66763, an online course shall be accepted for credit at the student’s home campus on the same basis as it would be for a student matriculated at the host campus.

3.3 CSU Student Learning Outcomes

Each CSU campus shall define GE student-learning outcomes within a programmatic structure. For example, GE student-learning outcomes may fit within the framework of the four “Essential Learning Outcomes” drawn from the Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP), an initiative of the Association of American Colleges and Universities.
Article 4. Subject Area Distribution

Instruction approved to fulfill the following subject-area distribution requirements should recognize the contributions to knowledge and civilization that have been made by members of diverse cultural and gender groups.

Area A  English Language Communication and Critical Thinking

9 semester units (12 quarter units)
One course in each Subarea.

A1  Oral Communication  (3 semester units or 4 quarter units)
A2  Written Communication  (3 semester units or 4 quarter units)
A3  Critical Thinking  (3 semester units or 4 quarter units)

Area A requires 9 semester units or 12 quarter units in oral communication in the English language (A1), written communication in the English language (A2), and critical thinking (A3). Campuses shall not exceed these unit requirements.

Students taking courses in fulfillment of Subareas A1 and A2 will develop knowledge and understanding of the form, content, context and effectiveness of communication. Students will develop proficiency in oral and written communication in English, examining communication from the rhetorical perspective and practicing reasoning and advocacy, organization, and accuracy. Students will enhance their skills and abilities in the discovery, critical evaluation, and reporting of information, as well as reading, writing, and listening effectively. Coursework must include active participation and practice in both written communication and oral communication in English.

In critical thinking (Subarea A3) courses, students will understand logic and its relation to language; elementary inductive and deductive processes, including an understanding of the formal and informal fallacies of language and thought; and the ability to distinguish matters of fact from issues of judgment or opinion. In A3 courses, students will develop the abilities to analyze, criticize, and advocate ideas; to reason inductively and deductively; and to reach well-supported factual or judgmental conclusions.
### Area B Scientific Inquiry and Quantitative Reasoning

12 semester units (18 quarter units), with 3 semester units (4 quarter units) taken at the upper-division level. 

One course each in Subareas B1, B2, and B4, plus laboratory activity (B3) related to one of the completed science courses, and 3 additional semester units (4 quarter units) at the upper-division in one of the following Subareas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subarea</th>
<th>Course Description</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Physical Science</td>
<td>(3 semester units or 4 quarter units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Life Science</td>
<td>(3 semester units or 4 quarter units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Laboratory Activity</td>
<td>A laboratory course of not more than 1 semester (2 quarter) unit value, associated with B1 or B2, may be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>(3 semester units or 4 quarter units)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Area B requires 12 semester units or 18 quarter units to include inquiry into the physical universe and its life forms, with participation in a related laboratory activity that may be embedded in a lecture course or taught as a separate 1-credit course, and into mathematical concepts and quantitative reasoning and their applications. Campuses shall not exceed these unit requirements.

It is expected that campuses could offer the laboratory experience within:

- a 3 semester (4 quarter) unit lecture course;
- a lecture plus laboratory course of 4 semester (6 quarter) units; or
- a standalone laboratory course of 1 semester (2 quarter) units.

In the latter two cases, the total number of GE semester units shall not exceed 49 (74 quarter units).

In Subareas B1-B3, students develop knowledge of scientific theories, concepts, and data about both living and non-living systems. Students will achieve an understanding and appreciation of scientific principles and the scientific method, as well as the potential limits of scientific endeavors and the value systems and ethics associated with human inquiry. The nature and extent of laboratory experience is to be determined by each campus through its established curricular procedures.

Through courses in Subarea B4 students shall demonstrate the abilities to reason quantitatively, practice computational skills, and explain and apply mathematical or quantitative reasoning concepts to solve problems. Courses in this Subarea shall include a prerequisite reflective only of skills and knowledge required in the course. In addition to traditional mathematics, courses in Subarea B4 may include computer science, personal finance, statistics or discipline-based mathematics or quantitative reasoning courses, for example.
Satisfaction of CSU GE Area B4 Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning shall fulfill CSU graduation requirements for mathematics/quantitative reasoning, exclusive of mathematics/quantitative reasoning courses necessary for satisfaction of major requirements.

**Area C**  
**Arts and Humanities**  
12 semester units (18 quarter units), with 3 semester units (4 quarter units) taken at the upper-division level  
*At least one course completed in each of these 2 Subareas, and 3 additional semester units (4 quarter units) at the upper-division in one of the following Subareas.*

- **C1**  
  Arts: Arts, Cinema, Dance, Music, Theater

- **C2**  
  Humanities: Literature, Philosophy, Languages Other than English

Area C requires 12 semester units or 18 quarter units among the arts, literature, philosophy and foreign languages. Campuses shall not exceed these unit requirements.

Across the disciplines in Area C coursework, students will cultivate intellect, imagination, sensibility and sensitivity. Students will respond subjectively as well as objectively to aesthetic experiences and will develop an understanding of the integrity of both emotional and intellectual responses. Students will cultivate and refine their affective, cognitive, and physical faculties through studying works of the human imagination. Activities may include participation in individual aesthetic, creative experiences; however, Area C excludes courses that exclusively emphasize skills development.

In their intellectual and subjective considerations, students will develop a better understanding of the interrelationship between the self and the creative arts and of the humanities in a variety of cultures.

Students may take courses in languages other than English in partial fulfillment of this requirement if the courses do not focus solely on skills acquisition but also contain a substantial cultural component. This may include literature, among other content.

**Area D**  
**Social Sciences**  
12 semester units (18 quarter units), with 3 semester units taken at the upper-division  
*At least two courses completed in 2 different disciplines, and 3 additional semester units (4 quarter units) at the upper-division.*

Area D requires 12 semester units or 18 quarter units dealing with human social, political and economic institutions and behavior, and their historical background.
Students shall complete courses from at least two different disciplines, and one upper-division Area D course is required. Campuses shall not exceed these unit requirements.

Students learn from courses in multiple Area D disciplines that human social, political and economic institutions and behavior are inextricably interwoven. Through fulfillment of the Area D requirement, students will develop an understanding of problems and issues from the respective disciplinary perspectives and will examine issues in their contemporary as well as historical settings and in a variety of cultural contexts. Students will explore the principles, methodologies, value systems and ethics employed in social scientific inquiry. Courses that emphasize skills development and professional preparation are excluded from Area D.

Area E  Lifelong Learning and Self-Development
3 semester units (4 quarter units)

Area E requires 3 semester units (4 quarter units) of study, and campuses shall not exceed this unit requirement.

This requirement is designed to equip learners for lifelong understanding and development of themselves as integrated physiological, social, and psychological beings. Physical activity may be included, if it is an integral part of the study elements described herein.

Content may include topics such as student success strategies, human behavior, sexuality, nutrition, physical and mental health, stress management, information literacy, social relationships and relationships with the environment, as well as implications of death and dying or avenues for lifelong learning. Courses in this area shall focus on the development of skills, abilities and dispositions.

Article 5. Transfer and Articulation

This article pertains to regionally accredited CCC and non-CSU institutions that certify transfer students’ fulfillment of CSU GE requirements.

5.1  Premises of General Education Breadth Transfer and Certification

a. It is the joint responsibility of the public segments of higher education to ensure that students are able to transfer without unreasonable loss of credit or time.

b. The faculty of an institution granting the baccalaureate degree have primary responsibility for maintaining the integrity of the degree program and determining when requirements have been met.
c. There shall ordinarily be a high degree of reciprocity among regionally accredited institutions unless there are specific indications that such reciprocity is not appropriate.

5.2 Conditions for Participation in CSU General Education Breadth Certification

CSU campuses may continue to articulate courses that meet GE requirements from other regionally accredited institutions. However, only CCC may participate in the annual CSU GE certification process, subject to the following provisions:

a. The community college shall designate a liaison representative who shall participate in various orientation activities and provide other institutional staff with pertinent information.

b. The community college shall identify for certification purposes those courses or examinations that fulfill the objectives set forth in Article 3 of this executive order and any additional objectives implemented by the CSU Chancellor.

1. The courses and examinations identified should be planned and organized to enable students to acquire abilities, knowledge, understanding, and appreciation as interrelated elements, not as isolated fragments.

2. Interdisciplinary courses or integrated sets of courses that meet multiple CSU GE Breadth objectives may be used to satisfy CSU GE requirements.

3. Units earned through an interdisciplinary course or integrated set of courses may be distributed among different GE Areas, as appropriate.

c. The CSU Office of the Chancellor, Division of Academic and Student Affairs, shall maintain a list of courses and examinations that have been accepted for certification purposes by virtue of meeting requirements set forth in this policy for each GE Area.

1. Each entry in the list shall specify the area to which the course or examination relates and the number of units associated with each area.

2. The list shall be updated annually. Each institution shall transmit annually to the CSU Office of the Chancellor, Division of Academic and Student Affairs, any proposed changes to its portion of the list. If a course is to be added or if the specification of areas and objectives
for a course is to be modified, the participating institution shall include in its submission the approved course outline. If a course is part of an integrated set of courses, the submission shall identify the set and describe how the course complements the others in the set.

3. A copy of the list shall be made available in electronic form to any CSU campus or institution. CCC are free to share with other institutions their course outlines and communications about those course outlines.

4. The CCC shall be responsible for reviewing periodically its portion of the list to assure that entries continue to be appropriate and to reflect current knowledge in the field.

5. The CCC shall report certification for individual students in a format to be specified.

5.3. Certification Requirements

5.3.1 Definition
GE certification indicates that a transfer student has met CSU lower-division GE requirements. CSU campuses shall accept participating institutions’ full certification or subject-area certification, as defined below.

5.3.2 Full Certification

5.3.2.1 Fulfillment of Lower-Division Requirements
Students admitted to a CSU campus with full certification shall not be held to additional lower-division general education requirements.

5.3.2.2 Additional Lower-Division Graduation Requirements
Full certification does not exempt students from unmet lower-division graduation requirements that may exist outside of the GE program of the campus awarding the degree.

5.3.2.3 Qualification for Full Certification
To qualify for full certification, a student must satisfactorily complete 39 lower-division semester units, or the quarter unit equivalent, of instruction appropriate to meet the objectives of Articles 3 (Premises) and 4 (Subject-Area Distribution). If a student completes a laboratory experience with academic credit, as described in Subarea B3, the student may be certified for 40 semester units or the quarter equivalent. CCC
GE certification does not guarantee that all CSU campus admission requirements have been met. Units must be distributed as follows below (except as specified in 5.3.5 below):

a. In Area A, 9 semester units (or the quarter equivalent), including instruction in oral communication, written communication, and critical thinking.

b. In Area B, 9 semester units (or the quarter equivalent), including instruction in physical science and life science, at least one part of which must include a laboratory component, and mathematics/quantitative reasoning. If a student completes a laboratory experience with academic credit, as described in Subarea B3, the student may be certified for 10 semester units (or the quarter equivalent).

c. In Area C, 9 semester units (or the quarter equivalent), with at least one course in the arts and one in the humanities.

d. In Area D, 9 semester units (or the quarter equivalent), with courses from at least two different disciplines.

e. Area E, 3 semester units (or the quarter equivalent).

5.3.3 Lower-Division Subject-Area (Partial) Certification

5.3.3.1 Fulfillment of Lower-Division Requirements by Area
Students admitted to a CSU campus with subject-area certification may not be held to any additional lower-division GE coursework in the subject areas certified.

5.3.3.2 Certification Limits on Credits that Exceed Minimum Subject-Area Requirements
For subject-area certification, CSU campuses are not required to certify credits that exceed the number of lower-division units required for the five Subject Areas—A through E.

5.3.3.3 Additional Lower-Division Graduation Requirements
Subject-area certification does not exempt students from completing unmet lower-division graduation requirements that may exist outside of the GE requirements at the campus awarding the degree.

5.3.3.4 Qualification for Subject-Area Certification
To qualify for subject-area certification, a student must satisfactorily complete instruction appropriate to meet the objectives of one or more subsections of Article 4 (Subject-Area Distribution). Except as specified in 5.3.5, the units shall be distributed as follows:

a. For Area A, 9 semester units (or the quarter equivalent), including instruction in oral communication, written communication, and critical thinking. A single course may not be certified as meeting more than one Subarea within Area A for any given student.

b. For Area B, 9 semester units (or the quarter equivalent), including instruction in mathematics/quantitative reasoning and physical science and life science, at least one part of which must include a laboratory component. A single course may not be certified as meeting more than one Subarea within Area B for any given student, except for laboratory components incorporated into a physical or life science course. If a student completes a laboratory experience with academic credit, as described in Subarea B3, the student may be certified for 10 semester (or the quarter equivalent) units.

c. For Area C, 9 semester units (or the quarter equivalent), with at least one course in the arts and one in the humanities.

d. For Area D, 9 semester units (or the quarter equivalent), with courses taken from at least two disciplines.

e. For Area E, 3 semester units (or the quarter equivalent).

5.3.4 Approved Associate Degree for Transfer
Students are considered lower-division CSU GE certified if they successfully complete and are awarded a CCC Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) that includes the CSU lower-division GE requirements.

5.3.5 General Education Breadth for STEM Majors within ADTs
Students pursuing certain ADTs may be eligible to take “GE Breadth for STEM,” deferring one lower-division course in Subarea C and
one lower-division course in Subarea D until after transfer. GE Breadth for STEM is applicable only to majors for which the Transfer Model Curriculum specifies GE Breadth for STEM.

CCC preparing a CSU GE Breadth for STEM certification as part of an ADT shall ensure that the student has completed:

a. All courses in Areas A, B, and E of the traditional GE curriculum; and
b. One course in Area C1 Arts and one course in Area C2 Humanities; and
c. Two courses in Area D from two different disciplines.

Details of each Transfer Model Curriculum are maintained and published at www.c-id.net.

5.3.6 Exceptions to Certification Requirements
At the discretion of the CSU campus, exceptions to the requirements for full certification and subject-area certification (as specified above) may be made for programs in which instruction is integrated into a set of courses or into interdisciplinary courses designed to meet multiple objectives. Interdisciplinary courses in this case would be expected to be offered at an appropriately greater number of units.

5.4 Certification of Courses and Examinations

5.4.1 Qualification for Certification
A CCC may certify completion of courses or examinations taken at other eligible institutions, provided that all such courses and examinations would be identified for certification purposes by the institution offering them.

5.4.2 If so identified, those courses and examinations shall contribute to qualification of a student for either full certification or subject-area certification, as appropriate.

5.4.3 CCC may include upper-division courses taken at an eligible university in certification of lower-division CSU GE or IGETC.

5.5 Limitations of Certification

5.5.1 Restriction to General Education Requirements
Neither full certification nor subject-area certification exempts students from unmet lower-division graduation requirements that
may exist outside of the GE program of the campus awarding the degree.

5.5.2 Maximum Number of Credits Allowed

5.5.2.1 Limit on Certification on Total General Education Units
A CCC shall not certify a student for more than 39 semester units or the quarter equivalent. If more than one CCC certifies a student, the CSU campus granting the degree is not required to accept certification for more than 39 semester units or the quarter equivalent. If a student completes a laboratory experience with academic credit, as described in Subarea B3, the student may be certified for 40 semester (or the quarter equivalent) units.

5.5.2.2 Restrictions on Certification of Upper-Division Courses
No upper-division credit may be allowed for courses taken in a community college (Title 5 Section 40409.)

5.6 General Education Certification Reciprocity Among CSU Campuses

5.6.1 Lower-Division Reciprocity
a. Lower-division GE requirements satisfied through a course or an examination at one CSU campus shall be accepted as fulfilling the same requirements at the CSU campus granting the baccalaureate degree.

b. For the purposes of this section, completion of lower-division GE requirements is equivalent to qualification for full certification, as defined in 5.3.2.

5.6.2 Subject-Area Reciprocity

a. Subject-area course certification accepted for CSU GE at one CSU campus shall be accepted at any CSU campus. The student may not be held to any additional lower-division GE coursework in the subject areas certified.

b. Students seeking to transfer under the provisions of this section shall be responsible for requesting verification that lower-division GE program or subject-area requirements have been met. Upon the request of a currently or formerly enrolled student, the CSU campus from which the student seeks to transfer shall determine the extent to which that student has satisfactorily completed the lower-division GE
requirements in each subject area, and shall provide official documentation of such completion.

c. For the purposes of this section, completion of lower-division GE subject-area requirements is equivalent to qualification for subject-area certification, as defined in 5.3.3.

d. Transfer students admitted with documentation of completion of one or more GE subject areas at another CSU campus may not be held to any additional lower-division GE requirements in that subject area by the campus awarding the degree.

5.6.3 Upper-division Reciprocity
Upper-division GE requirements satisfied at one CSU campus shall be accepted as fulfilling the same requirements at the CSU campus granting the baccalaureate degree.

5.6.4 Reciprocity Limitations
The provisions of 5.6 do not exempt students from fulfilling unmet lower- or upper-division graduation requirements at the CSU campus awarding the degree or from lower or upper-division courses required by individual baccalaureate majors at the CSU campus awarding the degree.

Article 6. Implementation and Governance

6.1 General Education Advisory Committee
A systemwide Chancellor’s General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) is hereby established. While it is important that the membership of this committee be broadly based, it shall in largest part be drawn from the instructional faculty of the CSU. Each member of the committee shall have an equal vote. The membership shall include

- At minimum, six CSU faculty to be appointed by the Academic Senate, CSU. One shall serve as chair, and another as vice-chair.
- One CSU student to be appointed by the California State Student Association,
- One instructional faculty member from the CCC,
- One CSU campus academic affairs administrator,
- One CSU articulation officer,
- One CCC articulation officer,
- One Chancellor’s Office administrator to staff the committee (ex-officio, non-voting)
- One CCC Chancellor’s Office administrator (ex-officio, non-voting)
The chancellor or the executive vice chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs Division may from time to time request that the committee address and provide advice on issues related to the development and well-being of CSU GE policy and programs.

The responsibilities of this committee shall be as follows:

a. Review and propose revisions to the objectives, requirements, and implementation of CSU GE policy to ensure high-quality general education.

b. Study GE policies and practices inside and outside the system and, as appropriate, stimulate intersegmental discussion of GE policy and curricula.

c. Review the implications of CSU GE policy for students transferring to the CSU and for the institutions from which they transfer, and propose any necessary adjustments to pertinent policies and practices so that students may be better served in their educational pursuits and achievement of the baccalaureate degree.

d. Report as appropriate to the chancellor.

6.2 Campus Responsibility

6.2.1 Development and Revision of Campus Requirements

Campus faculty have primary responsibility for developing and revising the institution’s particular GE program. Within the CSU GE distribution framework, each CSU campus is to exercise creativity in identifying courses, disciplines, and learning outcomes. In undertaking this task, careful attention should be given to the following:

a. General Education Program Development

1. Assure that GE requirements are planned and organized so that their objectives are perceived by students as interrelated elements, not as isolated fragments.

2. Provide for reasonable ordering of requirements so that, for example, courses focusing on learning skills will be completed relatively early and those emphasizing integrative experiences will be completed relatively later.

3. Develop programs that are responsive to educational goals and student needs, rather than programs based on traditional titles of academic disciplines and organizational units.
b. General Education Course Development

1. Consider the organization of approved courses so that students may choose from among a variety of “cores” or “themes,” each with an underlying unifying rationale.

2. Consider the possibility of incorporating integrative courses, especially at the upper-division level, that feature the interrelationships among disciplines and traditional GE categories.

3. Consider possibilities for innovative teaching and learning, including activity as well as observation in all GE coursework.

c. General Education Course Delivery

1. Provide sufficient numbers of Area A2 written communication and Area B4 mathematics/quantitative reasoning course sections to allow freshmen to complete these requirements in the first year of enrollment.

2. Courses approved for GE that have not been offered within a five-year period shall have GE status removed.

6.2.2 Campus General Education Committee
The effectiveness of a campus GE program is dependent upon the adequacy of curricular supervision, internal integrity and overall fiscal and academic support. Toward this end, each campus shall have a broadly representative GE committee, a majority of which shall be instructional faculty and shall also include student membership. The committee will provide oversight and make recommendations concerning the implementation, conduct and evaluation of requirements specified in this executive order. As a companion to the GE committee, a campus may choose to establish a GE program assessment committee to conduct the work described in 6.2.5 of this executive order.

6.2.3 General Education Breadth Requirements and the Development of New Baccalaureate Degrees
The development of new baccalaureate programs shall include consideration of how the degree requirements will incorporate at least the minimum required GE credits, the major program requirements, and other graduation requirements. Justifications must be provided to the Office of the Chancellor for any program extending the baccalaureate credit requirement beyond 120 units (Title 5, Section 40508).
6.2.4 General Education Academic Advising

Each campus shall provide for systematic, readily available academic advising specifically oriented to GE as one means of achieving greater cohesiveness in student choices of course offerings to fulfill these requirements.

a. General Education Website
   Each CSU campus shall provide a public website that describes the institution’s GE program. This website should include at minimum: GE requirements, courses certified for GE, CSU system GE policy and campus GE policy, and campus GE program and GE Area student-learning outcomes.

b. Each CSU campus shall clearly identify, in the catalog and/or course schedule, courses that are certified for each GE Subarea.

6.2.5 General Education Review and Assessment

In accordance with WASC Senior College and University Commission accreditation requirements, campuses shall:

a. develop an assessment plan that: (1) aligns the GE curriculum with campus GE outcomes; (2) specifies explicit criteria for assessing the stated outcomes; (3) identifies when and how each outcome shall be assessed; (4) organizes and analyzes the collection of evidence; (5) and uses the assessment results to make improvements to the GE program, courses and pedagogy.

b. provide for regular periodic reviews of GE program policies and practices in a manner comparable to those of major programs, including evaluation by an external reviewer. The review should include a statement of the Meaning, Quality and Integrity of the campus GE program and the ongoing assessment of GE student learning outcomes.

Timothy P. White, Chancellor

Dated: August 23, 2017
### Requirements for Lower- and Upper-Division
California State University General Education Breadth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GE Area</th>
<th>Lower-Division Semester Units</th>
<th>Upper-Division Semester Units</th>
<th>Total Semester Units Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area A English Language Communication and Critical Thinking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One course in each Subarea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 Oral Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Written Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Critical Thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Area A total semester units required:</em></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area B Scientific Inquiry and Quantitative Reasoning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One course in each Subarea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 Physical Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Life Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 Laboratory Activity - associated with the course taken to satisfy either B1 or B2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4 Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Area B total semester units required:</em></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area C Arts and Humanities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one course in each Subarea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Arts: Arts, Cinema, Dance, Music, Theatre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Humanities: Literature, Philosophy, Languages Other than English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Area C total semester units required:</em></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area D Social Sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Area D total semester units required:</em></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area E Lifelong Learning and Self- Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Area E total semester units required:</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total GE Units</strong></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note:

Students who transfer to the CSU with an Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) or full CSU GE certification, have completed the required lower-division 39 GE semester units. This includes 9 lower-division semester units each in Areas A, B, C and D, and 3 lower-division semester units in Area E. Their remaining required 9 semester units fall into CSU GE Areas B, C and D, and are to be taken at the upper-division level.

*To determine unit requirements at quarter-based campuses, multiply the semester unit requirement by 1.5.
August 2, 2017

MEMORANDUM

TO: CSU Presidents

FROM: Timothy P. White
      Chancellor

SUBJECT: Assessment of Academic Preparation and Placement in First-Year General Education Written Communication and Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning Courses
         Executive Order 1110

Attached is a copy of Executive Order 1110 relating to the assessment of academic preparation for and placement in written communication in English courses and mathematics/quantitative reasoning courses. This executive order supersedes Executive Order 1048 and elements of Executive Order 665 and reflects significant guidance and feedback from the Academic Senate CSU, discipline faculty, students and our educational partners. The order provides for the broadest utilization of multiple measures in assessing academic readiness and determining course placement for first-year students. The Early Start Program is recast to allow students to focus on a single discipline and acquire necessary foundational content at the same time they earn baccalaureate credit. The executive order also supports faculty innovation in curriculum and facilitates equitable opportunity for first-year students to succeed through existing and redesigned education models.

The timeline for implementation begins in fall 2018 with the introduction of new baccalaureate credit-bearing courses that strengthen skills development to facilitate achieving the appropriate general education student learning outcomes. Recognizing the engagement necessary for developing or reshaping curriculum, the effective term for implementation of all changes to the Early Start Program shall be summer 2019; however, campuses may pilot innovative instructional approaches to the Early Start Program prior to summer 2019.

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 office of Student Academic Services at EVCASA-assists@calstate.edu or (562) 951-4744.

TPW/ne

Attachment

c:  CSU Office of the Chancellor Leadership
    Dr. Christine Miller, Chair, Academic Senate CSU
    Provosts/Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs
    Vice Presidents for Student Affairs
    Associate Provosts/Associate Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs
    Deans of Undergraduate Studies
    Directors of Admissions and Records
    Admissions Advisory Council
Executive Order: 1110

Effective Date: August 2, 2017

Supersedes: Executive Order 1048 Effective June 2010
In part Executive Order 665 Effective February 1997 (IA; IB; IIA; IIB)

Title: Assessment of Academic Preparation and Placement in First-Year General Education Written Communication and Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning Courses

This executive order is issued pursuant to Section 40402.1 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, and Section II (a) of the Standing Orders of the Board of Trustees of the California State University (CSU) REP 01-96-02 and REP 01-08-01. This executive order applies to all first-time freshmen who enter the CSU for fall 2018 matriculation and subsequent academic terms.

I. Purpose

This executive order establishes CSU policy regarding first-year enrollment in CSU-required written communication and mathematics/quantitative reasoning courses and college-level skills assessment to inform placement in appropriate courses.

II. Delegation of Authority

In accordance with CSU policy, the campus president is responsible for implementing executive orders where applicable and maintaining the campus repository and index for all executive orders.

III. Guiding Principles

- The CSU is committed to providing students an equitable opportunity to succeed academically at the university and to providing rigorous instruction in general education written communication and mathematics/quantitative reasoning.

- Rigorous high school preparatory experiences in general education written communication and mathematics/quantitative reasoning prepare prospective CSU students for academic success.

- Successful completion of general education written communication and mathematics/quantitative reasoning courses in the first year of CSU enrollment establish a foundation for continuous learning.
Executive Order 1110

- Freshmen in need of additional academic development are supported in the Early Start Program and in enhanced college-level, baccalaureate credit-bearing courses.

- CSU faculty provide academic support by making curricular modifications to existing courses, by developing new courses, or by introducing innovative instructional approaches that achieve appropriately rigorous student-learning outcomes.

- General education written communication and mathematics/quantitative reasoning requirements completed at one campus seamlessly transfer to other CSU campuses.

IV. Skills Assessment and Course Placement Recommendations

Freshman skills assessment and recommended placement for general education written communication and mathematics/quantitative reasoning courses shall be based on multiple measures of academic proficiency. Such measures may include high school English and mathematics/quantitative reasoning course grades, high school grade point averages, grades in collegiate courses, ACT scores, SAT scores, Advanced Placement scores, International Baccalaureate scores, SAT subject tests or Smarter Balanced Assessment/Early Assessment Program scores.

A. The CSU shall establish systemwide placement standards.

B. The CSU Admissions Advisory Council (AAC) comprised of CSU faculty, students and administrators shall be responsible for the review and recommendation of revisions to systemwide policies regarding:

1. Assessment of college readiness for successful completion of general education written communication and mathematics/quantitative reasoning courses;

2. Preparatory requirements for general education written communication and mathematics/quantitative reasoning course placement; and

3. The Early Start Program.

C. Each campus shall establish a student course-placement appeals process.

D. Effective with this executive order, the English Placement Test (EPT) and the Entry-Level Mathematics (ELM) Test shall not be offered, and the EPT and ELM committees are discontinued.

V. Enrollment in General Education Written Communication and Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning Courses

A. During the first academic year, unless the requirement has been completed, freshmen shall enroll in general education written communication and mathematics/quantitative reasoning courses appropriate to each student’s major and skill level, as demonstrated by applicable systemwide standards.
B. Students whose skills assessments indicate academic support will be needed for successful completion of general education written communication or mathematics/quantitative reasoning courses shall enroll in appropriate college-level, baccalaureate credit-bearing courses that strengthen skills development to facilitate achieving the appropriate general education student learning outcomes. Supportive course models may include, among others, co-requisite approaches, supplemental instruction, or “stretch” formats that extend a course beyond one academic term. In these approaches, instructional content considered pre-baccalaureate may carry a maximum of one unit and shall be offered concurrently with a college-level, baccalaureate credit-bearing course.

C. Campuses shall offer sufficient general education written communication and mathematics/quantitative reasoning course sections to meet student enrollment needs in their first academic year.

VI. Early Start Program

A. The Early Start Program serves CSU admitted freshmen who have not demonstrated proficiency in English and/or mathematics/quantitative reasoning as established by CSU.

B. For summer 2018, campuses may continue to offer Early Start Program courses as established under Executive Order 1048 and/or may offer pilot credit-bearing baccalaureate courses.

C. Effective summer 2019, Early Start Programs shall offer primarily baccalaureate credit-bearing general education written communication and mathematics/quantitative reasoning courses, and those courses shall be offered in sufficient numbers to meet student demand. Instructional content considered pre-baccalaureate will carry a maximum of two units and shall be offered concurrently with a college-level, baccalaureate credit-bearing course.

D. Early Start Program participation is required for students needing skills development, as determined by systemwide placement standards. Students needing skills development in both general education written communication and mathematics/quantitative reasoning shall be required to enroll in a written communication or mathematics/quantitative reasoning course but not both during the Early Start Program.

E. Students required to participate in the Early Start Program may choose to participate at any CSU campus. CSU campuses may partner with California community colleges in the development and offering of Early Start Program courses. Baccalaureate credit earned and general education requirements completed through the Early Start Program shall seamlessly transfer to all CSU campuses.

F. Campuses may grant student exceptions from required Early Start Program participation, based on extenuating circumstances.
G. Early Start Program fees shall be determined by the Office of the Chancellor. Financial aid shall be available for qualifying students who are required to participate in the Early Start Program.

Dated: August 2, 2017
January 24, 2017

MEMORANDUM
Coded Memorandum ASA-2017-02

Initial Reports due July 17, 2017

TO: CSU Presidents

FROM: Christine Mallon, Ph.D.
Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Programs and Faculty Development

Edward Sullivan, Ph.D.
Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Research and Resources

SUBJECT: Accurate National Enrollment and Degree Reporting

Background
Providing accurate field-of-study information is essential when the California State University (CSU) reports enrollment- and degree-related data to the United States Department of Education’s National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). Based on an informal internal audit of enrollment and degree reporting, it has been determined that CSU reporting to the NCES Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) system requires correction for degree programs in which the number of required units in a concentration are greater than the units required for the major core.

CSU Degree Codes and Reporting
The Chancellor’s Office maintains a list of official CSU degree program codes, each of which is linked with a corresponding national Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) code for IPEDS reporting. To support accurate reporting of each field of study, the national data reporting system assigns a CIP definition for the curriculum associated with each code.

At the Chancellor’s Office, each CSU-approved degree program is assigned a title, a CSU degree code and corresponding Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) code that—
based on the CIP definition—is associated with the major curriculum required to complete the degree.

As noted in Executive Order 1071—Revised January 20, 2017—additional discipline-based required content may be achieved through an option, concentration, or special emphasis or similar subprogram—referred to as simply “concentration” in the CSU Degrees Database and in this coded memorandum. In order to ensure accurate reporting of enrollments and degrees granted, the major program core must have more required units than the number required in a concentration. When a concentration requires the majority of discipline units in the degree, the federal reporting CIP code and program definition assigned to the degree major program no longer match the majority of the curriculum—resulting in inaccurate reporting to the federal government.

Corrective Plan
Having learned of these reporting conditions, the CSU cannot endorse IPEDS reporting in which existing high-unit concentrations create inaccurate data submissions. To correct future reporting, concentrations will need to constitute less than 50 percent of the major curriculum so that the major requirements will most closely match the reported field of study. Campuses may pursue various approaches for rectifying the reporting inconsistencies, as described below.

Proposed timeline (July 2017 through April 2024)
By July 17, 2017, campuses are asked to report to APP@calstate.edu: (1) a list of all degrees and concentrations, specifying those in compliance with the major-to-concentration proportion; and (2) the program review year for those degrees in which concentrations constitute more than half of the major requirements. Campuses would be expected to bring all program requirements into compliance by the time of the next program review, with all corrections being completed by April 2024.

By no later than April 2024 (in conjunction with the next scheduled program review), campuses choose one of four approaches to correcting IPEDS enrollment reporting and degree reporting of concentrations:

1. Propose a degree title change, following Chancellor’s Office procedures;
2. Reduce required concentration units, allowing the majority of required discipline units to reside in the major, following campus procedures;
3. Discontinue the high-unit subprogram, following campus procedures; or
4. Propose a new stand-alone degree program, following Chancellor’s Office procedures. In this kind of proposal, student demand can be substantiated by providing a history of enrollments in the subprogram. To be approved for implementation as a new degree program, the proposed curricula would be distinct from existing programs, not representing significant overlap with degree programs already offered at the campus.
All changes would need to be entered in the [CSU Degrees Database](http://www.csudegrees.com), which populates the [Search CSU Degrees](http://www.csudegrees.com) website.

Please direct curriculum-related questions to Dr. Christine Mallon at cmallon@calstate.edu or (562) 951-4672. For more information about reporting procedures, please contact Dr. Edward Sullivan at esullivan@calstate.edu or (562) 951-4767.

Attachment

c: Dr. Timothy P. White, Chancellor
Dr. Loren J. Blanchard, Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs
Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs
Associate Provosts/Associate Presidents of Academic Planning
Deans of Graduate Study
Directors of Institutional Research
Directors of Admission and Records
Attachment
Achieving Accurate IPEDS Reporting

Background
CSU enrollment- and degree-related data reporting must be accurate for submissions to the U.S. Department of Education’s National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). CSU enrollments and graduations are reported to IPEDS using a NCES CSU code-and-definition scheme that CSU curricula are expected to match, generally.

Review of CSU programs and reporting codes has revealed that, in order to achieve more accurate reporting, CSU data submitted through the NCES Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) system requires correction for those degree programs in which the number of required units in a concentration are greater than the units required for the major core. Campuses will be called on to review curriculum to determine whether the appropriate CSU degree code is assigned to the degree program, based on the majority of the required curriculum in the major and concentration. Reporting is intended to capture the major program (major) and not general education or campus-specific required courses.

A campus may need to make adjustments to the major, the subprogram (“option,” “concentration,” “special emphasis,” etc.), or to the degree program title. Alternatively, campuses may elect to discontinue a subprogram.

CSU Degree Codes and Reporting
The Chancellor’s Office maintains a list of official CSU degree program codes, each of which is linked with a corresponding Classification of Instructional Programs code for IPEDS reporting. According to the NCES website:

The Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) provides a taxonomic scheme that supports the accurate tracking and reporting of fields of study and program completions activity. CIP was originally developed by the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) in 1980, with revisions occurring in 1985, 1990, and 2000.

To support accurate reporting of each field of study, the IPEDS national data reporting system assigns a CIP definition for the curriculum associated with each code. Below is an illustrative sample drawn from the CSU list of codes, titles and associated definitions.
As is true for other postsecondary institutions across the country, CSU program curricula are expected to be representatively matched to the CIP definition. In order to ensure accurate reporting of enrollments and degrees granted, the degree title and the required major-related courses would need to align more with the title-associated CIP definition and related code than any other. Further, the major program core would be expected to have more required units than the number of units required in a related, but different, subprogram. This would allow CSU reporting to most accurately represent the educational experience of all students in the reported major degree program. An example of an appropriate proportion in core and options appears in the following example.
Example 1
Title: Family and Consumer Sciences
CIP Code 19.0101
CIP Definition: A general program that focuses on family and consumer sciences, including how individuals develop and function in family, work, and community settings and how they relate to their physical, social, emotional, and intellectual environments.

In the example above, the core courses constitute the majority of the educational requirements and will result in accurate reporting. Students in both subprograms are mostly receiving an education in the major, rounded out by a smaller focus in one of the two specialized areas.

However, when a subprogram (“option” in this case) constitutes the majority of units in the degree, the degree program’s federal reporting CIP code and program definition no longer match the majority of the curriculum. This results in inaccurate reporting to the federal government. The next example illustrates this circumstance.
Example 2
Title: Family and Consumer Sciences
CIP Code 19.0101
CIP Definition: A general program that focuses on family and consumer sciences, including how individuals develop and function in family, work, and community settings and how they relate to their physical, social, emotional, and intellectual environments.

As shown above, students in this major share a very minimal educational experience of two courses, and some options do not match the CIP program definition or “family and consumer sciences” title. Student enrollments and degrees granted that are reported using the family and consumer sciences degree program code would therefore accurately represent the educational preparation received by students only in some of these concentrations.
Recording Changes in the CSU Degrees Database

All changes would need to be entered in the [CSU Degrees Database](#), which populates the [Search CSU Degrees](#) website.

In the Search CSU Degrees results pages, degrees and subprograms are displayed this way:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAMPUS</th>
<th>DEGREE</th>
<th>UNITS REQUIRED</th>
<th>MAJOR (CONCENTRATION)</th>
<th>VIDEO</th>
<th>FORMAT</th>
<th>PROGRAM CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakera</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>180 qtr</td>
<td>Kinesiology (Physical Education)</td>
<td>Video</td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>08361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>120 sem</td>
<td>Kinesiology (Exercise Science)</td>
<td>Video</td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>08351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domino</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>120 sem</td>
<td>Physical Education (Fitness Director)</td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>08351</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domino</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>120 sem</td>
<td>Physical Education (Teaching)</td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>08351</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domino</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>120 sem</td>
<td>Physical Education (Athletic Training Education)</td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>08351</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domino</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>120 sem</td>
<td>Physical Education (Pre-Physical Therapy)</td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>08351</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Underlined content in the sample above reflects hyperlinks to campus websites (campus home page, degree program page, and recruitment video). Campuses are encouraged to review CSU Degrees Database information regularly to ensure that data is accurate and that hyperlinks are functioning.

Please Direct Comments to:
For more information about reporting procedures, please contact Dr. Edward Sullivan at esullivan@calstate.edu or (562) 951-4767.

For curriculum-related questions to Dr. Christine Mallon at cmallon@calstate.edu or (562) 951-4672.
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/completelreports/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.
Changing a Degree Title or Suggesting a New Code

Chancellor’s Office approval is required for changes in degree titles. To propose a title change, campuses submit to Academic Program Planning (degrees@calstate.edu) a request that includes a rationale for the proposed title change, a table listing the CSU campus degree requirements and degree requirements from comparable CSU programs or programs from other US institutions. There is no prescribed format for the title-change rationale, but the proposal may address disciplinary convention, recruitment issues, employer concerns, or 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.

Background
In support of the trustee policy prohibiting proliferation of degree terminology, campuses are required to obtain Chancellor’s Office approval before implementing a new degree program or changing the title, reporting code, or degree designation (MA, BFA, etc.) for an existing degree program.

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: http://calstate.edu/app/documents/CSU-Codes-to-CIP-2010def.pdf
## Academic Program Approval Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chancellor’s Office Approves</th>
<th>Notify Chancellor’s Office</th>
<th>Notification via Degrees Database Only</th>
<th>No Notification or Approval Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Program Proposals</strong>, including projections</td>
<td>Before adding new concentrations, options, or emphases, specific information is sent to the Chancellor’s Office, including exact titles, course list, CSU Degree program codes</td>
<td>Changes in unit requirements for degrees (as long as a bachelor’s does not exceed Title 5 maximum)</td>
<td><strong>Certificates</strong> Add Discontinue Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pilot Conversion to Regular Program Proposals</strong></td>
<td>Pilot Proposal notification is sent prior to implementation.</td>
<td>Degree Program Admission Suspension and/or Reinstatement</td>
<td>Minors Add Discontinue Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposal to elevate options and concentrations to full degree major programs</strong></td>
<td>4 + 1 Degrees: Two programs such as a Bachelor’s + Master’s degree may be linked in an accelerated “blended” route to a graduate degree. E-mail notification + update to Degrees Database.</td>
<td>Reasonable (minor) modification of Campus-Specific Degree Title or Concentration Title.</td>
<td>Department Name Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposal to convert special sessions programs to state support</strong></td>
<td>Degree Program Discontinuance: Campuses with approved discontinuation policies may discontinue programs without prior Chancellor’s approval. Notification + update to Degrees Database.</td>
<td>Degree Program change to Obsolete status: used when there are no more students in a discontinued program.</td>
<td>Credentials Add Discontinue Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chancellor’s Office Approves</strong></td>
<td><strong>Notify Chancellor’s Office</strong></td>
<td><strong>Notification via Degrees Database Only</strong></td>
<td><strong>No Notification or Approval Required</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to add a self-support counterpart of a previously approved state-support degree program</td>
<td></td>
<td>Concurrent Degrees: contact the CO for issuance of a unique CSU degree code for concurrent degrees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to change a degree title or suggest a new CSU degree reporting code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to change a CSU degree designation (e.g., BA to BS, MA to MS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| WASC substantive change  
- Degree Authority  
- Off-campus > 25 miles  
- ≥ 50% online | | | |
Changing CSU Degree Designations

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
Adding Self-Support Counterpart of a Previously Approved State-Support Degree Program

See EO 1099 at [http://www.calstate.edu/EO/EO-1099.html](http://www.calstate.edu/EO/EO-1099.html)

Proposal Requirements

From Executive Order 1099, section 11. Implementation Procedures:

Prior to implementation, all extended education instruction shall have been approved under procedures in place for state-supported instruction, and all academic policies governing self-support instruction shall be identical to or established under the same procedures as those governing state-supported instruction.

11.1.2.3 Implementing a Self-Support Version of an Existing State-Support Program

Before implementing a self-support counterpart of a previously approved state-supported degree program (degree type and title), Chancellor’s Office written approval is required.

The proposal shall include:

- Confirmation the existing state-support offering is not being supplanted;
- Specification of the program’s qualification(s) to operate as a self-support special session (per EO 1099);
- Rationale for the new support mode;
- Detailed cost-recovery budget specifying student fees per unit and total student cost to complete the program;
- Anticipated enrollment;
- Campus commitment to provide adequate faculty resources; and
- Anticipated impact on the existing state-support program.

Subsequent to obtaining requisite Chancellor’s Office written approvals, a campus may operate degree programs in state-support mode, self-support mode, or both, subject to the prohibition against supplanting.

Please see notes on accreditation and service areas, pages 2 and 3.
Summary of Proposed Program Requirements and Limitations

1. Campuses are allowed to offer a self-support counterpart of a state-support degree program if all requirements in EO 1099 (and all relevant policies) are met and if CO approval is obtained. EO 1099 Article 11.1.2.3 (http://www.calstate.edu/EO/EO-1099.html):

2. Chancellor’s Office approval is required prior to offering degree, certificate, and allowed credential programs within a service area traditionally served by another CSU campus. Proposals shall include evidence of both campus presidents’ consent to the proposed location of operation. Entirely online instruction is not subject to service-area restrictions. EO 1099 Article 11.1.2.5.1 (May 2010) (http://www.calstate.edu/EO/EO-1099.html)

3. CSU campuses shall not offer joint degree programs with foreign or out-of-state institutions. If a campus plans to offer a degree or credential program out of state or in a foreign country, EO 795 must be complied with, and a proposal must be approved by the Chancellor’s Office. http://www.calstate.edu/EO/EO-795.pdf

4. CO approval is required prior to implementation, and any WASC substantive change proposals will also require a Chancellor’s letter of approval before the Commission can approve.

5. The CSU mission, and access and affordability remain important for self-support CSU degree programs, and should be reflected in program pricing.

6. All recruitment and application materials for proposed programs must feature a qualification that makes clear that admission and enrollment are subject to Chancellor’s Office program approval and accreditation approval, if applicable.

7. Self-supporting special sessions shall not supplant regular course offerings available on a non-self-supporting basis during the regular academic year. (Education Code section 89708) EO 1099 Article 6.1.1 (http://www.calstate.edu/EO/EO-1099.html)

Service areas
Chancellor’s Office approval is required prior to offering degree, certificate, and allowed credential programs within a service area traditionally served by another CSU campus. Proposals shall include evidence of both campus presidents’ consent to the proposal location of operation. Entirely online instruction is not subject to service-area restrictions. EO 1099 Article 11.1.2.5.1
Accreditation: New Self-Support Programs and Related Substantive Changes
Self-Support programs are subject to the same approval processes that state-support proposals must undergo (Executive Order 1099 Article 3.1). As such, WASC accreditation proposals that address new or changed self-support degree programs require documentation of all applicable university approvals—including a Chancellor’s Office authorization letter.

The associated WASC process will need a Chancellor’s program authorization letter to complete the WASC review process. Campuses need not complete a separate CSU proposal but may submit the WASC Substantive Change proposal to the Chancellor’s Office. WASC policies can be found at: http://www.wascsenior.org/annoucements/revised-substantive-change-manual

The California Board of Registered Nursing (BRN) also requires a Chancellor’s Office approval letter. The proposal submitted to the BRN may serve as the campus proposal to the Chancellor’s Office.

Please submit proposals to degrees@calstate.edu.

Please direct questions to Dr. Alison Wrynn, Interim Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Programs and Faculty Development at (562) 951-4672 or app@calstate.edu

Questions about self-supporting courses and programs may be directed to Dr. Sheila Thomas, State University Dean, Extended Education at (562) 951-4795 or stthomas@calstate.edu.
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. 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-wasc-quality-assurance/institutional-report/components-institutional-report/3-degree-programs-meaning-quality-and-integrity-degrees](http://www.wascenior.org/resources/handbook-accreditation-2013/part-iii-wasc-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
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.
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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

- 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;
- 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;
- it can be adequately housed without a major capital outlay project;
- it is consistent with all existing state and federal law and trustee policy;
- it is a bachelor’s or master’s degree program;
- 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus activity</th>
<th>End of December</th>
<th>Proposal to Chancellor’s Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Board of Trustees’ approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>CPEC endorsement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus activity</td>
<td>Early June</td>
<td>Proposal to Chancellor’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September</td>
<td>Board of Trustees’ approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
<td>CPEC endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>February</td>
<td>Limited implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Program description in campus catalog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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 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 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.)
- A pilot program could be converted to regular-program status and approved to continue to operate indefinitely if the following conditions are met:
  » The campus committed the resources necessary to maintain the program beyond five years;
  » 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;
  » Approval by the board and the chancellor would be required after review and comment by the Chancellor’s Office and CPEC.
- A program could be established as a pilot program only if it met the criteria for fast-track programs; that is,
  » 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;
  » 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;
  » it requires no major capital outlay project to be adequately housed;
  » it is consistent with all existing state and federal law and trustee policy;
  » it is a bachelor’s or master’s degree program;
  » the campus has a thorough review and approval process for pilot degree programs, through which the program has passed.
- 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.
- 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.
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_devs.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.
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Posted 7/2/10

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 66010.5(e)
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

CSU and UC Joint Doctoral Programs

Flow Chart CSU and UC Joint Degree Programs

Handbook for Creation of CSU/UC Joint Doctoral Programs
http://www.ucop.edu/acadinit/uccsu/jointdocheinbook030502.htm

CSU/UC Joint Doctoral Programs—Review Criteria
http://www.ucop.edu/acadinit/uccsu/jointdocheinbook030502.htm#6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSU Campuses</th>
<th>Partner Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel Islands</td>
<td>Fullerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>Hueneme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominguez Hills</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bay</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marin Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Bay</td>
<td>Northridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>Palos Verdes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>San Bernardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>San Mateo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>Santa Maria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Speedwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>Stainback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
Office of the Chancellor
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California 90802-4275

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).
Appendix

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
Office of the Chancellor
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California  90802-4275
Code:  AAP 91-14

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>1/8/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominguez Hills</td>
<td>10/7/80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>9/17/81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>10/9/81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>7/14/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>11/27/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>7/20/80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northridge</td>
<td>12/17/82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>8/11/81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>9/16/81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>4/15/81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>5/13/80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>5/28/80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>10/29/81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>9/15/81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanislaus</td>
<td>6/12/89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
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.

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 an 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.
MEMORANDUM

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, the 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 general guidelines which should be considered as a whole by 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

cc:  Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs (w/a)
     Deans of Graduate Studies (w/a)
     Chair, Campus Academic Senate (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 searching 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 issues.
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 course work 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 judgement 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.