

AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Meeting: 9:20 am., Wednesday, March 21, 2001
CSULB, University Student Union-Multipurpose Room ABC

Dee Dee Myers, Chair
Debra S. Farar, Vice Chair
Roberta Achtenberg
William D. Campbell
Harold Goldwhite
Neel I. Murarka
Ralph R. Pesqueira
Ali C. Razi

Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of January 23, 2001

Discussion Items

2. Meeting California's Need for the Education Doctorate, *Information*
3. Academic Planning and Program Review, *Action*

AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Meeting: 10:00 a.m., Tuesday, March 20, 2001
CSULB, University Student Union-225 ABC

Governmental Code Section 3596[d] – Committee Members
Chair of the Board
Chancellor and Staff

Discussion Items

Review and Recommendation of Nominee for Honorary Degree (Government Code Section 11126[c])[5]

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

**Trustees of The California State University
Office of the Chancellor
Glenn S. Dumke Conference Center
401 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California**

January 23, 2001

Members Present

Dee Dee Myers, Chair
Debra S. Farar, Vice Chair
Roberta Achtenberg
William D. Campbell
Laurence K. Gould, Jr., Chair of Board, ex officio
Harold Goldwhite
Neel I. Murarka
Ralph R. Pesqueira
Ali C. Razi
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor, ex officio

Other Trustees Present

Daniel N. Cartwright
Martha C. Fallgatter
Murray L. Galinson
William Hauck
Shailesh J. Mehta
Frederick W. Pierce IV
Stanley T. Wang

Chancellor's Office Staff

David S. Spence, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer
Richard P. West, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer
Jackie R. McClain, Vice Chancellor, Human Resources
Douglas X. Patiño, Vice Chancellor, University Advancement
Christine Helwick, General Counsel

Closed Session**Review and Recommendation of Nominees for Honorary Degrees**

The Subcommittee on Honorary Degrees of the Committee on Educational Policy met Tuesday, January 23, 2001 at 11:00 a.m. in closed session and acted on nominations for honorary degrees.

Open Session

Chair Myers called the meeting to order at 4:40 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of November 8, 2000, were approved by consent as submitted.

Remedial Education Policy Implementation: Fifth Annual Report

Chair Meyers introduced the item by stating that the trustee policy on remedial education calls for annual reports on progress toward attainment of the established 1996 goals.

Executive Vice Chancellor Spence reported on the academic preparation of students entering CSU in fall 2000 and the extent to which underprepared students who entered in fall 1999 achieved competency in English and mathematics during their first year of enrollment. Dr. Spence commented that CSU's placement standards are the highest in the nation. He stressed that CSU needs to continue to test students early, reduce the proportion of students enrolling in the CSU who do not meet the goals set by the Trustees, and to expect students to complete these goals in a timely manner.

Dr. Spence noted that virtually every student is being tested for English and mathematics proficiency prior to CSU enrollment. CSU is shifting the focus from students' need for remediation to students' proficiency at entry and their proficiency one year later. Dr. Spence stated that 97 percent of fall 1999 first-time freshmen who continued their education fall 2000 had achieved proficiency by fall 2000.

Dr. Spence indicated that 55% of first-time freshmen were proficient in mathematics, an increase of three percentage points from the prior year. However, proficiency in English remained constant at 54 percent. Research shows that all sectors of education are finding it easier to improve student proficiency in math than in English. This is due, in part, because of the diversity of languages of students enrolled in K-12 and higher education. Dr. Spence noted that 38% of all students enrolled in K-12 in California, 55% in Los Angeles County, and 40% in CSU speak a language other than English in their homes. In order to address the issue of how to increase the proficiency of students in English, Dr. Spence will ask the Collaborative Academic Preparation Initiative Advisory Committee chaired by President James Rosser and K-12 Superintendent Ron

Hockwalt to identify the reasons why student proficiency in English is not improving and ways we can help increase proficiency in English. Trustee Goldwhite inquired if campuses are sharing strategies regarding remedial programs. Dr. Spence responded that a report about best practices in math is reaching completion. Trustee Cartwright questioned the effect on campus diversity when students who do not achieve proficiency after one year are disenrolled. Dr. Spence responded that the diversity of the fall 1999 freshmen who reenrolled in fall 2000 remained about the same, and he will provide more information about this.

Trustee Pesqueira stressed the continued need for campus outreach programs and commented that if students are better prepared in high school, CSU will have to provide less remediation. Trustee Galinson also emphasized the importance of outreach efforts. He asked if transfer students are included in proficiency statistics. Dr. Spence responded that the community colleges do not share the same placement standards as first-time CSU students and that successful completion of General Education courses in mathematics and English in the community colleges is accepted as proof of proficiency in English and mathematics.

Trustee Campbell commented that it may not be in the best interest of a student to continue CSU enrollment if after a year of remediation that student does not demonstrate English or mathematics proficiency. He stressed the importance of teacher education. Trustee Razi asked if there would be any changes to the 1996 trustee policy. Dr. Spence responded that there are no plans to recommend changes to the trustee policy. It appears that the system will meet the Trustee goal for mathematics in 2001. Trustee Wang commented that a five-year projection of proficiency would be useful.

Trustee Achtenberg asked about the proficiency rate of those students whose first language is English versus those students whose second language is English. Dr. Spence commented that this needs to be examined. President Suzuki, Cal Poly Pomona, commented that he chaired a committee studying students whose first language was not English. The committee concluded it takes eight years of English language education before college level proficiency is achieved. Dr. Suzuki questioned if one year of remediation is sufficient. Trustee Murarka asked if there are data about disenrolled students. It was noted that campuses have these data.

Trustee Goldwhite added that in his experience transfer students do as well if not better than native CSU students. President Smith, CSU Monterey Bay, commented that CSU should retain a variety of ways to access CSU. Trustee Galinson concluded that it is critical to identify all entering students who need remediation.

Recognition of Outstanding Teaching, Research, and Scholarship: Master of Arts in Multimedia: California State University, Hayward Multimedia Program

President Rees, CSU Hayward, commented that the Master of Arts degree in Multimedia began in fall 1995 and is a leader in educating the next generation of interactive content providers. A video describing the program was shown. Dr. Rees introduced Dr. Carl Bellone, Dean of Graduate Studies, Dr. James Petrillo, Director of the Graduate Multimedia Program, and Dr. Michael Henninger, Associate Professor of Art, who received applause from the Board of Trustees.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:32 p.m.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Review and Recommendation of Nominee for Honorary Degree

Presentation By

Dee Dee Myers, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy

David S. Spence
Executive Vice Chancellor
and Chief Academic Officer

Summary

Recommendations from the Committee on Educational Policy, Subcommittee on Honorary Degrees, will be addressed in closed session pursuant to Government Code Section 11126 (c) (5) [closed session “to consider the conferring of honorary degrees”].

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION POLICY

Meeting California's Need for the Education Doctorate

Presentation By

David S. Spence
Executive Vice Chancellor
and Chief Academic Officer

Summary

California must produce substantially more education doctorates in the coming decades than it does now in order to meet the demands of California's K-12 and postsecondary education systems. To accomplish this, doctoral programs in education must be more affordable, more accessible, and of higher quality. California must produce education doctorates whose holders are more diverse, and it must prepare more recipients of education doctorates to lead instructional improvement efforts at the district and school levels and to serve as leaders and professors of education in two-year and four-year postsecondary institutions.

A special study was commissioned by the CSU to reexamine California's educational leadership needs and the availability of high quality affordable education doctorate programs. Entitled "Meeting California's Educational Needs: Why California Needs More Holders - and Suppliers - of Education Doctorates," the report is being sent separately.

The education doctorate (Ed.D.) represents a critical component of California's commitment to high-quality public education. As demand for the Ed.D. continues to outpace supply, an expansion of the CSU's degree-granting capability would make significant progress toward meeting this end. By taking this logical step, California would be making an important investment in the educational leaders, the schools, and the students of tomorrow.

The Master Plan Provision for Joint Doctorates Has Not Met the Need

The Master Plan for Higher Education grants the University of California (UC) the sole authority in public higher education to award the doctorate and authorizes UC to cooperate with the CSU to award joint doctoral degrees in selected fields. Joint doctoral degree programs developed by the UC and CSU are subject to review by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC).

In 1985, the Board of Trustees adopted a mission statement for the CSU, which stated that the CSU “offers or proposes to offer instruction at the doctoral level jointly with the University of California and with private institutions of postsecondary education, or independently in the field of education where the need is clearly demonstrated.” The authority to award the Ed.D. independently has not been granted to date.

Although CSU and UC have had the authority to offer joint doctoral programs for nearly forty years, there are only four CSU-UC programs in education: one in educational leadership, one in mathematics and science education, and two in special education. From July 1998 to June 2000, the four programs awarded a total of 21 doctoral degrees, an average of fewer than three per program per year. The CSU also participates in two additional joint doctoral programs in education with independent institutions; one has just been established and has yet to produce any graduates. Formal negotiations are under way with three UC campuses, and discussions have been held with a fourth UC campus. Our experience, however, has not made us sanguine about establishing joint doctoral programs expeditiously.

In fall 1998, CSU graduate deans were asked on behalf of the Joint Graduate Board about joint doctoral program discussions that had not yet reached the stage of a request for permission to negotiate. Of approximately 30 possible programs that were mentioned (in education and other disciplines, with UC or other partnering institutions), only two have as yet produced a request for permission to negotiate—in one case, with a different partnering institution than originally considered.

While passage through the formal steps has a somewhat higher probability of success than informal discussions, it is no guarantee. Of seventeen proposed CSU-UC joint doctoral programs (in education and other disciplines) that had formal permission to negotiate as of 1990 or have subsequently received permission, only six have been established. Four have effectively been abandoned or rejected, and seven are still in negotiation. With four decades of experience, Herculean efforts, and the best of intentions, CSU and UC have been unable to make the joint doctoral program provision of the Master Plan work for education disciplines, even in areas where the need is widely acknowledged. Developing more programs at the speed and scale

necessary to meet demand would be all but impossible, especially given the difficulties of collaboration across institutions with very different missions. It is time to recognize the overwhelming evidence that the joint approach has failed to produce the number of high-quality education doctorates the state should expect from its public universities.

Need for More Education Doctorates in K-12 Education

As California continues its efforts to improve the public schools, well-prepared educators are critical to success. Schools, school districts, and county offices of education urgently need leaders with the skills and knowledge to improve student learning. Over the past 10 years, the growth of California's student population and the ever-changing complexity of its educational system have resulted in an increased need for more educators with Ed.D. degrees. Yet throughout this same time period, the number of Ed.D.s produced each year in California has remained nearly constant. In spite of the size of its K-12 school population, and the changing roles of educational leaders, California's production of education doctorates is less than two-thirds the national average.

A recent report by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) provides useful insights into the public school aspect of this supply problem. In California, the report notes, there is one education doctorate awarded for every 14,685 K-12 students, compared with one of every 9,438 students nationally. California now trails the nation by a third in the ratio of education doctorates to K-12 students. The report identifies a need for more individuals from underrepresented groups to earn an Ed.D., as well as a need to make doctoral programs more accessible to educators in rural areas and to those who are working full-time.

At a time when more accessible and affordable doctoral programs in education should be available to fill this demand, the California State University – the state's largest public university system – is precluded from taking a significant role in solving this dilemma. The CSU believes that an expansion of its degree-granting capabilities would help meet the need for well-qualified educational leaders in California. The CSU is particularly well-positioned to help meet this demand, because of its accessibility, affordability, the experience of its faculty, and the system's historical responsibility for preparing teachers and K-12 administrators.

The Ed.D. is different from most other doctoral degrees because it is uniquely related to a core state function: the public education of the state's children. Several professional organizations supporting educational administration have closely examined the issue of preparation for educational leadership; one of them, the National Policy Board for Educational Administration, has formally recommended that the Ed.D. be a prerequisite for national certification and state licensure for all full-time school administrators. Nevertheless, California has few low-cost

doctoral programs in education. It relies on private universities for over two-thirds of its education doctorates.

Need for More Education Doctorates by the State's Higher Education System

Although the CPEC report begins an important dialogue on the need for education doctorate holders in K-12 schools, it does not address the needs of the California Community Colleges and of higher education in California generally for doctoral degree holders. The state's higher education systems clearly demand additional education doctorates. A large number of community college leaders and university professors will reach retirement age in the next decade.

The community colleges' need for more administrators (deans, vice presidents, presidents, superintendents) who hold the doctorate is widely recognized. In addition, community college faculty often earn an education doctorate to strengthen their curriculum development and teaching skills. The California Community College Chancellor's Office prepared a report "Long-Range Faculty Needs Projections: Preparing California's Community Colleges for Tidal Wave II" in May 2000. In this report, it is estimated that the community colleges are facing a need for between 16,400 and 18,700 full-time faculty by 2010. This projection is based on both increased enrollment projections and anticipated faculty retirements. The report states that the candidates for this very large number of faculty positions "...will primarily come out of graduate programs in California colleges and universities." If even a small proportion of them seek an Ed.D. to help them meet the formidable instructional challenges of the community college environment, existing Ed.D. programs would be hard pressed to accommodate them.

There is also a shortage of individuals with the education doctorate who are qualified to be faculty members in California schools of education. Within the CSU alone, teacher education has become one of the top five discipline areas classified "most difficult to recruit" (Report on Faculty Recruitment Survey, CSU, November 2000). The hiring success rate in this area for the last two years has been only 68 percent, well below the system average. This is due, in part, to the exceptionally large number of Education searches across the system in response to the increasing demand for expansion of Schools of Education. Education departments in the University of California and in independent universities, while smaller, are sure to be experiencing similar difficulties as they too attempt to expand capacity. The creation of a new public route to an education doctorate would help to alleviate this pressing difficulty.

Access, Affordability, and High Quality Teaching Will Characterize CSU Education Doctorate Programs

California cannot afford to continue producing the same limited number of doctorates, in the same places, at the same high cost, with the same lack of diversity. This is where the CSU can bring access, affordability, and high-quality teaching expertise to the table.

Access: A study by the American Association of School Administrators concluded that most people seeking an advanced degree in educational administration must commute to a university, since moving in order to attend graduate school on a full-time basis would require their giving up their full-time positions. For this reason, there is a great need for programs that are near to where prospective students live and work. However, 56 percent of Californians live within 10 miles of a CSU campus and just 21 percent live within 10 miles of a UC campus. The CSU specializes in flexible programs that allow students to pursue degrees during evening hours, weekends, and from a distance.

The diversity of California's K-12 classrooms continues to increase with each passing year. The Department of Finance's Demographic Research Unit estimates that Hispanic students will comprise half the public school student population by the 2007-08 school year, a 29 percent raise. Overall, more than two-thirds of the state's K-12 students in 2007-08 will be people of color. However, year after year (through 1998), fewer than 30 percent of education doctoral degrees are awarded to people of color. And in 1998-99, the ethnicity of superintendents, deputy superintendents, and principals holding doctorate degrees showed an even greater imbalance: 79 percent of them were white, nine percent Hispanic, six percent African-American, and four percent Asian. The CSU has a proven track record in attracting, retaining, and graduating students from underrepresented groups. Over 53 percent of CSU students are from targeted ethnic groups.

Affordability: The CPEC report noted that non-public colleges and universities produced more than two-thirds of all education doctorates in the State. Doctorate education at a CSU campus would cost students as little as 11 percent of the price of such education at private colleges and universities, and as little as 40 percent of the price of such programs at the University of California, which produces most of the remaining education doctorates. The cost to a student of completing an Ed.D. program at a non-public institution is typically about \$45,000 and may be considerably more.

Expertise: The CSU, which prepares nearly 60 percent of California's teachers and half of its K-12 administrators, has a responsibility for working closely with the public schools. Its campuses have developed an extensive network of collaborations and partnerships with K-12 administrators and teachers. An applied doctoral program would represent a natural extension of these efforts, especially considering that the CSU already has the faculty, experience, and practitioner-focused models in place.

Preparing Leaders Capable of Improving Student Learning

If CSU is authorized to offer Ed.D. degrees, these applied doctorates will be grounded on the latest findings on the characteristics of the most effective educational leaders and on the best research on the improvement of teaching and learning. In addition to providing sound, state-of-the-art training to handle basic administrative tasks such as budget, human resources, planning, and organizational dynamics, emphasis will be placed on preparing K-12 and community college administrators fully capable of providing informed leadership of curriculum development, assessment, enabling teachers to help students achieve state standards, and generally sustaining an effective learning environment. Individuals aspiring to become community college professors or faculty members of schools of education will learn the latest developments in teaching and learning and become fully qualified to teach the full range of students in their classrooms and to prepare teachers who know how to guide students to the highest levels of performance. The doctoral curriculum, program content, and instructional approaches will be developed by faculty at the CSU campuses authorized by the Board of Trustees to offer the education doctorate.

Conclusion

Actively seeking legislative authority for the California State University to award the Doctor of Education degree (Ed.D.) is fully consistent with the mission of the California State University established by the Board of Trustees. Toward this end, Chancellor Reed has added this item to the 2001 CSU Legislative Program.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Academic Planning and Program Review

Presentation By

David S. Spence
Executive Vice Chancellor
and Chief Academic Officer

Summary

This annual report on academic planning and program review is in accord with Board of Trustees policy established in 1963. While academic planning at each university involves the planning and development of new programs, it also includes the regular review of existing programs, which can lead to program consolidation and discontinuation.

The five-year curricular plans for each campus have been updated to cover the years 2001-02 through 2005-06 (a few campuses have curriculum development processes that require longer planning time frames). These campus academic plans are in Attachment A to this agenda item. This is the fourth year that the planning approval process adopted by the Board in July 1997 is in effect; programs that are taking advantage of the alternatives to the traditional process are noted. Summaries of academic program review activities for each campus appear in Attachment B. In 1999-00, several campuses received visits by teams from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC); summaries of the teams' reports are included as Attachment C. The attachments have been distributed separately.

The proposed resolution would approve the updated campus academic plans and specify the conditions under which projected programs may be implemented.

Background

This item summarizes the California State University academic planning process over the past year and submits the campus academic plans for the next five years (up to ten years for campuses that require a longer planning time frame). While academic planning at each university involves the planning and development of new programs, it also includes the regular review of existing programs. This sometimes leads to program consolidation and discontinuation. Program consolidation and discontinuation is likely to be an increasingly active concern of the campuses over the next several years as a result of

Cornerstones recommendations, opportunities for increased collaboration through technology, and a more concerted effort by the campuses to focus their program offerings in accord with their missions.

Six academic planning topics (and a proposed resolution) are addressed in this item:

1. Campus Academic Plans (Attachment A)
2. Implementation of Revised Process for Review and Approval of Academic Programs
3. Review of Existing Degree Programs (Attachment B)
4. Reduction of Total Units Required for a Bachelor's Degree
5. Program Discontinuations
6. Summary of WASC Visiting Team Reports (Attachment C)

1. *Campus Academic Plans (Attachment A)*

Each year, campuses update and submit to the Board of Trustees the academic plans guiding program, faculty, and facility development. These plans list the existing degree programs offered, the proposed new programs, and the dates for review of existing programs. They are the product of extensive consultation and review at each campus.

The academic plans are reviewed annually by the Office of the Chancellor before their submission to the trustees. This review is grounded in a body of trustee and state policy which has been developed over the last three decades. The Board of Trustees authorizes the inclusion of these proposed programs on the academic master plan. Consequently, the "proposed" columns of the academic plans in Attachment A represent only "planning authorization." If and when a campus decides to pursue implementation of a new program (other than a pilot program), a detailed degree proposal must be submitted to the chancellor before the planned implementation date. The trustees have delegated to the chancellor the authority to approve implementation of degree programs that have been authorized. In most cases, the concurrence of the California Postsecondary Education Commission must also be sought before a degree program can be established. Not all projected programs are eventually implemented; campuses request occasionally that projected programs be removed from their academic plans. Four previously projected programs have been removed this year.

Included for the first time is an initial academic plan for California State University, Channel Islands. It was developed in consultation with and on the recommendation of the Faculty Council for CSU Channel Islands, which was established by the Academic Senate CSU. The curricula will be developed by the first complement of CSU Channel Islands faculty, beginning in fall 2001.

In addition to the programs under consideration for the Channel Islands campus, fifteen new bachelor's and master's degree programs have been proposed for addition to campus academic plans. Six of those represent conversions to full degree programs of well-established options or concentrations. Three are interdisciplinary fields that students in considerable numbers have been exploring in individualized majors. Five are closely related to existing programs in the computing field, for which demand remains strong. Three are master's or bachelor's degree programs especially designed to serve teachers or prospective teachers. Almost all the newly requested programs can be initiated in existing facilities. The programs for which "planning authorization" is requested are listed below.

Bakersfield	MA, Teaching Mathematics
Chico	BA, Linguistics
	BS, Geology
	BS, Management Information Systems
	BS, Computer Science
Humboldt	BA, Asian American Studies
Long Beach	MS, Science Education
	BS, Information Technology
Northridge	MS, Computer Engineering
	MS, Electrical Engineering
	MS, Engineering Management
	MS, Mechanical Engineering
	MS, Software Engineering
	MS, Food Industry Management
Pomona	BA, Global Studies

Also included in the academic plans are proposed joint doctoral programs that have been granted permission to negotiate. In the past year, programs receiving permission to negotiate include an EdD in Urban Educational Leadership, being developed by CSU Hayward, San Francisco State, San José State, and UC Berkeley; a doctoral degree in Education, being developed by CSU Sacramento and UC Davis; a Doctor of Physical Therapy Sciences (DPTSc), being developed by San Francisco State and UC San Francisco; a PhD in Evolutionary Biology, being developed by

San Diego State and UC Berkeley; and a PhD in Computational Science, being developed by San Diego State and Claremont Graduate University.

2. Implementation of Revised Process for Review and Approval of Academic Programs

In July 1997, the Board adopted revised procedures for the review and approval of new degree programs. In addition to the long-established process described above, campuses have two new alternative processes for establishing programs: the "fast track" and the pilot program.

The fast track combines the program projection and program implementation phases of the traditional process for proposed programs that meet certain criteria. Two of the newly projected programs on the updated academic plans are on the fast track and have been proceeding through campus and system proposal review processes.

The pilot program process allows campuses, under certain conditions, to implement a limited number of programs without prior review and approval by the Chancellor or the California Postsecondary Education Commission. A pilot program may admit students for no more than five years, unless converted to regular-program status; conversion requires a thorough program evaluation, review and comment by the Chancellor's Office and the California Postsecondary Education Commission, and approval by the Board and the Chancellor. One new pilot program has been established: a Master of Engineering degree program in Manufacturing and Design at San Diego State University, which may be offered from fall 2000 to fall 2005.

The alternative processes are congruent with the Cornerstones recommendations, which have called for "[streamlining] the process governing program development and program approval, minimizing standardization and maximizing institutional flexibility."

The revised procedures also specify that projected programs be removed from campus academic plans if an implementation proposal is not developed within five years or by the date originally projected for implementation (whichever is later), unless a new justification is submitted. This provision does not apply to "foundation" liberal arts and science programs. Three existing projections were subject to automatic removal from the academic plans this year; planning for each of them is continuing at the request of the campus.

3. *Review of Existing Degree Programs (Attachment B)*

In 1971, the Board of Trustees adopted policy requiring that each campus review every academic program on a regular basis. Since that time, summaries of campus program reviews have been provided annually to the board. The summaries appear as Attachment B to this item.

In the early 1990s, several campuses were unable to use external reviewers in the program review process because of budget difficulties. Campuses are again employing external reviewers on a regular basis, some from other CSU campuses and some from outside the system. A few campuses have recently revised their program review processes, often better to coordinate reviews with campus strategic planning initiatives. In general, the campus review processes are as rigorous in determining areas for improvement as in recognizing program strengths.

4. *Reduction of Total Units Required for a Bachelor's Degree*

In July 2000, the Board amended Title 5 to reduce the minimum total units required for a bachelor's degree to 120 semester units (180 quarter units). A campus may establish a higher unit requirement for certain majors to ensure that students have achieved the knowledge and skills ordinarily expected of graduates in those fields, but the campus must establish and maintain a monitoring system to ensure that justification is provided for all program requirements that extend the baccalaureate unit requirement beyond 120 units. As indicated in the July 2000 agenda item, it was understood that baccalaureate unit requirements are to be reviewed on campuses by the faculty in the course of regularly scheduled program reviews, which are ordinarily conducted on a staggered schedule over a five-year period.

Several campuses have already made significant progress in implementing the letter and spirit of the Title 5 amendments. Their activity is noted in Attachment B, along with other information on program review processes.

5. *Program Discontinuations*

Campuses have informed the chancellor of the discontinuation of the following degree major programs since the last report on academic planning and program review.

Hayward

BS, Physical Science

Los Angeles	MS, Microbiology
San José	MS, Radiological Health Physics

The Cornerstones plan encourages each university to “make special efforts to ensure that programs and courses are strengthened, added, retained, and eliminated according to explicit criteria and procedures.... [that are] designed to ensure that programs are continually responsive to ... societal needs and the needs of an increasingly diverse student population, changes in disciplines, and campus priorities.” We note that there has already been substantial consolidation of options or concentrations within existing degree programs on some campuses.

6. *Summary of WASC Visiting Team Report (Attachment C)*

The Board of Trustees adopted a resolution in January 1991 that requires information on recent campus accreditation visits to be included in the annual agenda item on academic planning and program review. Summaries of the results and recommendations resulting from visits by teams from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges during 1999-00 can be found in Attachment C.

Recommended Action

The proposed resolution refers to the campus academic plans in Attachment A. The following resolution is recommended for adoption:

RESOLVED, by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the amended projections on the Academic Plans for the California State University (as contained in Attachment A to Agenda Item 2 of the March 20-21, 2001, meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy), be approved and accepted as the basis for necessary facility planning; and be it further

RESOLVED, that those degree programs included in the Academic Plans are authorized for implementation, at approximately the dates indicated, subject in each instance to the chancellor's determination of need and feasibility, and provided that financial support, qualified faculty, facilities, and information resources sufficient to establish and maintain the programs will be available; and be it further

RESOLVED, that degree programs not included in the Academic Plans are authorized for implementation only as pilot programs, subject in each instance to conformity with current procedures for establishing pilot programs.