

1 **APC Resolution on: Certificate Programs Policy**

2

3 WHEREAS, A campus policy on certificate programs is needed in order to continue
4 offering several approved credit certificates and to encourage and guide the development
5 of further credit (and non-credit) certificate programs; and

6 WHEREAS, The Certificate Policy passed by the Academic Senate at the May 12, 1999
7 meeting was approved as an interim policy for the academic years 1999-2000, 2000-01,
8 2001-02, and 2002-03; and

9

10 WHEREAS, The Academic Senate was requested to study the effect of certificate
11 programs on baccalaureate and master's degree programs in 2001-02, and to make a
12 recommendation that either the policy be continued indefinitely, continued for a fixed
13 length of time, or discontinued; and

14

15 WHEREAS, APP examined the need for certificate programs in 2001-02 and
16 recommended that the policy be renewed for an additional three years, and the Academic
17 Senate unanimously approved this continuation on May 15, 2002; now, therefore be it

18

19 RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate renews the Certificate Policy without a sunset
20 date.

21 **Overview of the Policy**

22
23 The centerpiece of the policy is the distinction between credit certificates and non-credit
24 certificates. The former are certificates earned by completing courses that carry credit toward an
25 undergraduate or graduate degree, and the latter are certificates offered through Extended Studies earned by
26 completing courses that (for the most part) do not carry degree credit. Credit certificates will be developed
27 by college-based programs, subject to Academic Senate review and approval. Non-credit certificates will
28 be developed by the Office of Extended Studies, in consultation with college-based programs, as outlined
29 in the Extended Studies Policy (see http://lynx.csusm.edu/policies/policy_online.asp?ID=65).

30 APC recommends retaining four different categories of certificate programs: Two kinds of non-
31 credit certificates, reflecting current practice in Extended Studies, and two kinds of credit certificates, one
32 supplementing undergraduate programs of study, and one supplementing graduate programs. Further details
33 are provided in the policy document itself.

34 Certificate programs are not intended to supplant or compete with traditional Majors, Minors, or
35 graduate programs of study; rather, their purpose is to serve a variety of student audiences whose
36 educational objectives would be better met through the pursuit of more focused and specialized programs
37 of study. This policy establishes criteria and guidelines for the development, review, and approval of
38 certificate programs, to ensure that these programs will serve their intended function.

39
40
41
42 **Certificate Programs at CSUSM: Policy**

43
44 This document describes the kinds of certificate programs offered at CSUSM, establishes
45 minimum requirements of various kinds of certificates, sets forth regulations governing certificate
46 programs, and outlines procedures for proposal and review of certificate programs.

47 Under this policy, CSUSM will be able to offer a variety of Certificate programs, enabling
48 students at various stages of their academic careers to pursue specialized and focused areas of study not
49 covered by traditional degree programs. Certificate programs are designed for a variety of purposes: to
50 offer integrated programs of study in the context of continuing education, to offer programs of study that
51 increase and certify the student's competency in a specialized technical or professional skill or area of
52 study, to offer paraprofessional training, in a particular career field, or to offer a focused program of study
53 in an academic area not addressed through traditional majors, minors, or graduate degree programs.

54 The time to completion, requirements, and prerequisites of Certificate programs vary with the kind
55 of Certificate pursued by the student. Certificates may be awarded for short- or longer-term courses of
56 study, depending upon the breadth and depth of teaming and competency to be gained through completion
57 of the certificate. Classes taken as part of a certificate program may or may not carry academic credit
58 toward undergraduate or graduate degrees. Certificates may be awarded to students upon completion of the
59 Certificate program, or in some cases, at the student's completion of other undergraduate degree
60 requirements.

61 Credit certificate programs consist entirely of classes that carry credit toward an undergraduate or
62 graduate degree. Credit certificates are developed by college-based programs, subject to Academic Senate
63 review and approval. Two kinds of credit certificates are distinguished, one offered at the undergraduate
64 level (The CSUSM Certificate of Specialized Study, defined below) and one at the graduate level (The
65 CSUSM Certificate of Advanced Study).

66 Non-credit certificate programs are offered through Extended Studies and consist of classes and
67 activities that (for the most part) do not carry degree credit. Non-credit certificates are developed by the
68 Office of Extended Studies, in consultation with college-based programs. Non-credit certificate programs
69 may combine credit and noncredit classes and activities, subject to consultation between college-based
70 programs and the Office of Extended Studies. Two kinds of non-credit certificates are distinguished,
71 reflecting distinct purposes of such programs and different expectations of student teaming outcomes to be
72 demonstrated upon completion of the programs.

74 **Certificate Programs: Definitions and Minimum Requirements¹**
75

76 *Extended Studies Certificates* are non-credit certificates offered through Extended Studies and developed in
77 consultation between the Office of Extended Studies and related college-based programs. The curricula are
78 designed for individuals who participate in an organized and integrated program of study but who are not
79 (for the most part) matriculated students of the University.
80

- 81 1. *The Extended Studies Certificate of Completion* is awarded for successfully completing a planned
82 educational experience (workshop, conference, short course, seminar, or series of courses and
83 seminars) designed for specific academic and/or professional training objectives. Individual
84 classes and activities composing Certificates of Completion carry no University degree credit.
85
- 86 2. *The Extended Studies Certificate of Technical, Vocational or Professional Competence* is awarded
87 a.) for successfully completing a planned educational experience (workshop, conference, short
88 course, seminar, or series of courses and seminars) designed for specific academic and/or
89 professional training objectives; and b.) for successfully demonstrating the acquisition of desired
90 skills and/or mastery of a body of knowledge, upon completion of the program of study. Classes
91 and activities composing Certificates of Competence may or may not carry University degree
92 credit. Where degree credit classes are included in a program of study, students who are not
93 matriculated students of the University can enroll in classes through Open University.
94

95 *CSUSM Certificates* are credit certificates developed and offered by college-based programs, subject to
96 review and approval by the Academic Senate. These programs are open only to matriculated students of the
97 University.
98

- 99 1. *The CSUSM Certificate of Specialized Study* is awarded to baccalaureate and post-baccalaureate
100 students a.) for successfully completing a structured program of educational experiences, at least
101 12 semester units, determined in advance by a program, department, or college, geared toward
102 mastery of a focused academic field of study or a specialized professional or vocational area of
103 competency; and b.) for successfully demonstrating, the acquisition of desired skills and/or
104 mastery of a body of knowledge, upon completion of the program of study. Curriculum for
105 Certificates of Specialized Study include mainly Upper Division (300-499) classes and may
106 include Graduate (500-599) classes. These classes carry academic credit toward completion of the
107 baccalaureate degree and, where applicable to a specific Master's program, the Master's degree.
108

109 Certificates of Specialized Study supplement and do not replace traditional Major and
110 Minor programs, addressing areas of study more specialized, or more professionally or
111 vocationally oriented than the focus of Majors or Minors. They are intended to serve regularly
112 enrolled baccalaureate students who wish to gain an additional academic credential, upon
113 completion of the certificate program. They are also geared toward post-baccalaureate students
114 seeking the same credential, for who a traditional graduate or second baccalaureate degree is not
115 suitable. Post-baccalaureate students should consult individual program descriptions for
116 admissions requirements and procedures.

- 117 2. *The CSUSM Certificate of Advanced Study* is awarded to post-baccalaureate students and
118 graduate degree candidates a.) for successfully completing a structured program of educational
119 experiences, at least 12 semester units, determined in advance by a graduate program, department,
120 or college, geared toward advanced mastery of a focused academic field of study or a specialized
121 professional area of competency; and b.) for successfully demonstrating the acquisition of desired
122 skills and/or mastery of a body of knowledge, upon completion of the program of study.
123 Curriculum for a Certificate of Advanced Study is composed primarily of Graduate (500-699)
124 classes. Where applicable, these classes carry academic credit toward completion of a specific
125 Master's degree.

¹ These descriptions are to be adapted and updated for inclusion in the CSUSM General Catalog and in Extended Studies Bulletins, as warranted by advancing levels of implementation of various certificate programs.

126 Certificates of Advanced Study supplement and do not replace traditional graduate
127 degree programs, addressing areas of study more specialized or more professionally or
128 vocationally oriented than the focus of traditional Master's degrees. They are intended to serve
129 regularly enrolled, graduate candidate students who wish to gain an academic credential in
130 addition to the Master's degree. They are also geared toward post-baccalaureate students seeking
131 the same credential, for whom a traditional graduate or second baccalaureate degree is not
132 suitable. These programs may also serve post-graduate students. Post-baccalaureate and
133 postgraduate students should consult individual program descriptions for admissions requirements
134 and procedures.
135

136 **Guidelines for Proposal and Review of Credit Certificates**

- 137
- 138 • Credit certificate programs should not supplant or replace traditional majors, minors, or Master's
139 degree programs. Rather, certificate programs should supplement traditional degree programs,
140 attracting students whose needs are better served by more focused and specialized programs of study.
141 Proposals for credit certificate programs should identify precisely the technical/professional/vocational
142 skill(s) or the academic specialty whose study is facilitated by the development of the program.
143 Proposals should explain the distinction between the certificate and any related majors, minors, and
144 Master's degree programs. Proposals should also explain why the academic objectives served by the
145 certificate are not sufficiently served through existing, academic programs (majors, minors, and
146 Master's).
- 147 • Oversight for credit certificate programs is provided by the Academic Senate. Proposals for credit
148 certificate programs will follow the one-year cycle of review established for new minors, options,
149 concentrations, etc. Existing program proposal forms will be adapted to the purpose of guiding authors
150 of proposals through the process.
- 151 • Courses associated with credit certificate programs can be offered in General Fund-based and
152 Extended Education settings, as courses in the fall and spring semesters, in the Summer Session, or in
153 other possible settings, subject to arrangements agreed upon by programs offering the certificate and
154 the Office of Extended Studies.
- 155 • This policy stipulates that credit certificates are to be composed of a minimum of 12 semester units of
156 study, a figure that is consistent with minimum standards established at other CSU campuses.
157 However, authors and reviewers of certificate program proposals should be aware that, beyond this
158 minimum specification, credit certificate programs at other CSU campuses typically comprise an
159 average 18 to 30 semester units of study. The determination of the number of units of study to be
160 required in any particular certificate program is therefore a relative issue; authors and reviewers of
161 proposals should relate this issue to the final learning outcomes to be advanced by the program.
162 Depending upon the skills or knowledge to be gained through completion of the certificate program,
163 some programs will be relatively concentrated and others more extensive, in terms of the required
164 number of units of study.
165
- 166 • Criteria for Certificates of Specialized Study:
 - 167 ○ Certificates of Specialized Study must include a minimum of 12 units of study, with a
168 minimum of 9 units of upper division coursework.
 - 169 ○ Lower division course requirements and prerequisites may be waived based on transfer of
170 credit from a previous institution, or demonstrated competence in the field, as specified in the
171 program proposal.
 - 172 ○ At least 75% of coursework required for the certificate must be completed at CSU San
173 Marcos.
174 At least nine units of upper division coursework required for the certificate must not be
175 applied toward the student's major or minor.
 - 176 ○ GE courses taken to fulfill certificate requirements may not be applied to GE requirements of
177 the baccalaureate degree.
 - 178 ○ All courses required for a certificate must be passed with a grade of C (2.0) or better; higher
179 standards may be imposed within a particular certificate program.

180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227

- Criteria for Certificates of Advanced Study:
 - Certificates of Advanced Study must include a minimum of 12 units of study, with a minimum of nine units at the Graduate level (500-699).
 - No more than three units of advanced undergraduate coursework (400-499) may be applied to the certificate.
 - At least 75% of required coursework must be completed at CSU San Marcos.
 - Up to 12 units of coursework may be applied to progress toward a Master's degree, upon approval of the relevant graduate program.
 - All courses required for a certificate must be passed with a grade of B (3.0) or better.

Procedure for Submitting Proposals for New Certificates

Each new Certificate is subject to review and approval by the relevant college curriculum committee and the University Curriculum Committee and, for resource implications, the Budget Long-range Planning Committee of the Academic Senate. Requests for approval of a Certificate should be submitted according to the timeline of the appropriate college curriculum committee and should follow the format below:

1. Full and exact title of the Certificate program and level of the program (Certificate of Specialized vs. Advanced Study). Name and position of the person(s) submitting the proposed Certificate. Intended implementation date of the program.
2. List of the existing programs in the discipline(s) under which the new Certificate is to be offered.
3. List of the existing program(s) that may be affected by the proposed Certificate.
4. Purpose of the proposed Certificate, including specific academic objectives served, professional applications, potential student market, and a statement explaining the need for the Certificate in comparison to existing related Majors, Minors, and Graduate programs.
5. List of the courses, by catalog number, title, and units of credit, as well as total units to be required under the proposed Certificate.
6. Definition of the minimum level of competence to be demonstrated to earn the proposed Certificate, and a description of the means of assessing that competence (examination, practicum, field experience, etc.).
7. Description of assessment strategies for waiver of lower division requirements (where applicable).
8. New courses to be developed. Include proposed catalog descriptions in the Certificate proposal. "C-forms" for these courses should accompany the proposed Certificate package for curricular review.
9. 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.
10. Instructional resources (faculty, space, equipment, library volumes, etc.) needed to implement and sustain the Certificate program.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

Resolution on satisfaction of DD requirement for “Social Science” majors

RESOLVED: *A student in the “Social Sciences” major may use (and double count) a course taken in one of his/her secondary fields toward the Upper Division General Education requirement in the Social Sciences (DD).*

V. PRINCIPLES FOR THE REVIEW PROCESS

A. General principles

1. Faculty shall be evaluated in accordance with the Unit 3 CBA as well as standards approved for their Departments or equivalent units (when such standards exist), standards approved by their College/Library/SSP,AR, and in accordance with this policy. ~~Such standards shall be reviewed by the College Dean, the Faculty Affairs Committee, and the Provost, approved by the Faculty Affairs Committee, and forwarded to the Academic Senate as an information item.~~ In case of conflict between the Department and College/Library/SSP,AR standards, the College/Library/SSP,AR standards shall prevail. The policies and procedures in this document are subject to Board of Trustees policies, Title 5 of the California Administrative Code, California Education Code, the Unit 3 CBA, and other applicable State and Federal laws.
2. Faculty members will present the relevant evidence in each category of performance. Each level of review is responsible for evaluating the quality and significance of all evidence presented.
3. Everyone, at all levels of review, shall read the Candidate's file.
4. Committee members shall work together to come to consensus.
5. Retention, tenure, and promotion of a faculty member always shall be determined on the basis of professional performance as defined by the CBA (20) and the University and Department/Unit/College/Library/SSP,AR documents, demonstrated by the evidence in the WPAF. In the evaluation of teaching performance, student evaluation forms shall not constitute the sole evidence of teaching quality. No recommendation shall be based on a Candidate's beliefs, nor on any other basis that would constitute an infringement of academic freedom.
6. The Candidate shall have access to her/his WPAF at all reasonable times except when the WPAF is actually being reviewed at some level.
7. Prior to the final decision, candidates for promotion may withdraw, without prejudice, from consideration at any level of review.
8. Maintaining confidentiality is an extremely serious obligation on the part of committee reviewers and administrators. All parties to the review need to be able to discuss a Candidate's file openly, knowing that this discussion will remain confidential. All parties to the review shall maintain confidentiality, respecting their colleagues, who, by virtue of election to a personnel committee, have placed their trust in each other. Deliberations and recommendations pursuant to evaluation shall be confidential (CBA, 15). There may be a need for the parties to the review to discuss the Candidate's file with other levels of review when all levels do not agree. Also, the Candidate may request a meeting with parties to the review at any level. These particular discussions fall within the circle of confidentiality and comply with this policy. Otherwise, reviewing parties shall not discuss the file with anyone. Candidates who believe that confidentiality has been broken may pursue relief under the CBA. (10)
9. Service in the personnel evaluation process is part of the normal and reasonable duties of tenured faculty, Department Chairs, and administrative levels of review. Lobbying or harassment of parties to the review in the performance of these duties constitutes unprofessional conduct. Other University policies cover harassment as well. The statement here is not intended to restrict the University in any way from fulfilling the terms of other policies that cover harassment.
10. When a probationary faculty member does not receive tenure following the mandatory sixth year review, the University's contract with the individual shall conclude at the end of the seventh year of service, unless the faculty member is granted a subsequent probationary appointment by the President. (13.17)

B. Standards Applied in Different Types of Decisions

59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113

1. Review for Retention of Probationary Faculty
 - a. Whenever a probationary faculty member receives reappointment, CSUSM shall provide to the Candidate a review that identifies any areas of weakness.
 - b. To the extent possible and appropriate, the University should provide opportunities to improve performance in the identified area(s).
2. Review for Granting of Tenure
 - a. The granting of tenure requires a more rigorous application of the criteria than reappointment.
 - b. A Candidate for tenure at CSUSM shall show sustained high quality achievement in support of the Mission of the University in the areas of teaching, research and creative activity, and service (for teaching faculty and librarians) or in the primary duties as assigned in the job description, continuing education/professional development, and service (for SSP,ARs).
 - c. Normally, tenure review will occur in the sixth year of service at CSUSM or one or two years earlier in cases where the Candidate has been granted service credit. Tenure review prior to the normal year of consideration requires clear evidence that the Candidate has a sustained record of achievement that fulfills all criteria for tenure as specified in University, College/Library, and Department standards.
 - d. An earned doctorate or an appropriate terminal or professional degree that best reflects the standard practices in an individual field of study is required for tenure. In exceptional cases, individuals with a truly distinguished record of achievement at the national and/or international level will qualify for consideration for purposes of granting tenure. An ad hoc committee consisting of three members jointly appointed by the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Department Chair shall judge all exceptions. This ad hoc committee shall make a recommendation to the President for or against awarding tenure.
3. Review for Promotion
 - a. Promotion to Associate Professor, Associate Librarian or SSP II AR requires a more rigorous application of the criteria than reappointment.
 - b. Promotion to the rank of Professor, Librarian or SSP III AR shall require evidence of substantial and sustained professional growth at the Associate rank as defined by University, College/Library/SSP,AR, and Department standards.
 - c. In promotion decisions, reviewing parties shall give primary consideration to performance during time in the present rank. Promotion prior to the normal year of consideration requires clear evidence that the Candidate has a sustained record of achievement that fulfills all criteria for promotion as specified in University, College/Library, and Department standards.
4. College/Library/SSP,AR Standards
 - a. A College or equivalent unit shall develop standards for the evaluation of faculty members of that College or equivalent unit.
 - b. College or equivalent unit standards shall not conflict with law or University policy. In no case shall College standards require lower levels of performance than those required by law or University policy.
 - c. Written College or equivalent unit standards shall address:
 - 1) Those activities which fall under the categories of Teaching Performance, Scholarly and Creative Activity, and Service;

- 114 | 2) A description of standards used to judge the quality of performance;
115 | 3) The criteria employed in making recommendations for retention, tenure, and promotion.
116 |
117 | d. These standards shall be reviewed by the Faculty Affairs Committee for compliance with
118 | university, CSU, and Unit 3 CBA policies and procedures. Once compliance has been verified,
119 | the College/Library/SSP,AR standards will be recommended to the Academic Senate for approval.
120 |

121 |
122 | 4.5. Departmental Standards

- 123 | a. A Department or equivalent unit may develop standards for the evaluation of faculty members of
124 | that Department or equivalent unit.
- 125 | b. Department or equivalent unit standards shall not conflict with law or University policy. In no
126 | case shall Department standards require lower levels of performance than those required by law or
127 | University policy.
- 128 | c. Written Department or equivalent unit standards shall address:
- 129 | 1) Those activities which fall under the categories of Teaching Performance, Scholarly and
130 | Creative Activity, and Service;
131 | 2) A description of standards used to judge the quality of performance;
132 | 3) The criteria employed in making recommendations for retention, tenure, and promotion.
- 133 | d. The Dean/Director of the College/Library/SSP,AR shall review the Department standards for
134 | conformity to College/Library/SSP,AR standards. If the Dean finds it in conformance, she/he will
135 | forward the Department standards to the Faculty Affairs Committee. The Faculty Affairs
136 | Committee has the responsibility to verify and ensure compliance with university, CSU, and Unit
137 | 3 CBA policies and procedures. Once compliance has been verified, the Department standards
138 | will be forwarded to the Provost for review. The Provost will provide the Faculty Affairs
139 | Committee with a recommendation (with explanation) regarding approval of the Department
140 | standards. The Faculty Affairs committee will base its approval of the standards on its own review
141 | and the recommendation of the Provost. Once approved, Department standards will be forwarded
142 | to Academic Senate as an information item. Departments or equivalent units shall follow this
143 | approval process each time they wish to change their standards.
144 |
145 |

TIMETABLE FOR PERIODIC EVALUATION AND PERFORMANCE REV 2006/07

REVIEW	WPAF due	Pre-review for completeness		Candidate adds requested material no later than	Peer Review Committee Review		Candidate picks up recommendation no later than	End of rebuttal/response period *	End of PRC response period **	Dean Review		Candidate picks up recommendation no later than	End of rebuttal/response period *	End of Dean's response period **	P&T Committee Review		Candidate picks up recommendation no later than
		Begin	End		Begin	End				Begin	End				Begin	End	
Periodic Evaluation (typically 1st, 3rd, and 5th year)	JAN 17	JAN 18	JAN 25	FEB 02	FEB 05	MAR 02	MAR 12	MAR 19	APR 03	APR 04	MAY 01	MAY 09	MAY 16	MAY 24	N/A	N/A	N/A
2nd Year Retention	SEP 05	SEP 06	SEP 13	SEP 21	SEP 22	OCT 12	OCT 20	OCT 27	NOV 06	NOV 07	NOV 28	DEC 06	DEC 13	DEC 21	N/A	N/A	N/A
2nd Year Retention w/ optional Tenure and/or Promotion	Use above timeline for 2nd Year Retention and continue with the following P&T Committee/President schedule:														FEB 12	MAR 23	APR 09
3rd thru 5th Year Retention (typically 4th year)	SEP 20	SEP 21	SEP 28	OCT 06	OCT 09	NOV 13	NOV 21	NOV 28	DEC 06	DEC 07	JAN 17	JAN 25	FEB 01	FEB 09	N/A	N/A	N/A
3rd thru 5th Year Retention w/ optional Tenure and/or Promotion	SEP 20	SEP 21	SEP 28	OCT 06	OCT 09	NOV 13	NOV 21	NOV 28	DEC 06	DEC 07	JAN 17	JAN 25	FEB 01	FEB 09	FEB 12	MAR 23	APR 09
Tenure and/or Promotion Review	SEP 20	SEP 21	SEP 28	OCT 06	OCT 09	NOV 13	NOV 21	NOV 28	DEC 06	DEC 07	JAN 17	JAN 25	FEB 01	FEB 09	FEB 12	MAR 23	APR 09

Holidays/Breaks:
 Labor Day: Sep 04
 Thanksgiving: Nov 23-25
 Winter Holiday/Break: Dec 22 - Jan 16
 Spring Break: Mar 26 - 31

* Candidate may submit a rebuttal/response within 7 days of receipt of the recommendation end date listed on timeline - whichever comes first.
 ** Reviewing committee/administrator may submit response to a candidate's rebuttal within 7 days of receipt of the recommendation end date listed on timeline - whichever comes first.

BUDGET & LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT TO SENATE

Members: Bonnie Bade & Kathleen Watson (co-chairs), Kit Herlihy, Robin Marion, Patty Seleski,
Non-voting members: David Barsky, Tom Bennett, Vicki Golich, Wayne Veres

Review of Proposed Changes in the Master of Business Administration

The Budget and Long Range Planning Committee (BLP) has reviewed and discussed the P-form for changes in the MBA program. BLP has reviewed the immediate and long range prospects for this proposed degree program and has considered the resource implications of initiating the degree. BLP submits the following analysis of the impact of this program to the Academic Senate to guide Senators in their consideration of this proposal.

Program Changes

BLP commends the MBA proposal originators for the unique design of the program that includes a one-unit theme project integrated into each MBA course. The four themes of Ethics, Evolving Technology, Global or Environmental are designed to engage students in activities that integrate the functional areas of business with issues of relevance to current business environment. Students would take two 4-unit courses each semester, rather than the present format of three 3-unit courses. The revised format seems much more manageable for the fully-employed professionals that comprise the student market.

BLP had some concerns that the theme projects would increase resource demands on IITS and library resources. Although proposal originators felt the impact would be minimal, projects that included website development and video production could benefit from access to University academic technology resources. As with the Library, early planning and coordination between faculty and IITS as they are developing their assignments within the thematic options would ensure that the resources are available to meet the needs of the assignments. Availability of staff, given the program includes Saturday sessions, could be coordinated if IITS and Library are included in the planning stages of the thematic projects.

Program Demand

The proposed program requires a total of 64 units. The current program is 39 units, plus 12 pre-MBA units taken only by students who do not have a baccalaureate degree in business. That is an increase in 25 or 13 units respectively and BLP questioned whether the increased time-to-degree and tuition costs would impact program demand. The program originators provided information that mitigates these concerns, given present students (when polled) favored the 2 course per term option even though that lengthens the program and increases cost.

The proposal originators provided data on the competition, and in comparison, the proposed program changes show the program to be a bargain. Costs are either similar, or far less in the case of Executive Programs. In comparison, the time-to-degree is favorable, and the Saturday class option, very appealing to fully-employed students, is not offered by much of the competition.

In closing, BLP would like to express our appreciation to the originators of the proposal for their collegiality and their quick responses to our many questions throughout the review process.

***An Academic Blueprint for Cal State San Marcos
2005-06 Annual Report to the Academic Senate***

A. Academic Blueprint Committee (ABC)

Name	Title	Representing
Robert “Bob” Sheath <i>Co-Chair</i>	Provost	Division of Academic Affairs
Sharon Elise <i>Co-Chair</i>	Professor, Department of Sociology College of Arts and Sciences	Academic Senate Chair or designee – (Chair, Academic Senate’s University Curriculum Committee)
David Barsky	Associate Vice President	Academic Programs
Gerardo González <i>(Interim)</i>	Dean, Graduate Studies	Graduate Studies
Sandy Punch	Senior Director, Career, Advising and Testing Services	Division of Student Affairs
G. H. “Bud” Morris	Director, Health and Human Services	Health and Human Services
Nathan Evans	Director, Office of Admissions and University Outreach	Office of Admissions
Bonnie Bade	Associate Professor, Department of Liberal Studies, College of Arts and Sciences	Academic Senate’s Budget and Long- range Planning Committee
Linda Pershing	Associate Professor, Women’s Studies Program, College of Arts and Sciences	Hiring and Academic Planning Committee (HAPC), CoAS
Gary Oddou <i>(Fall 2005)</i>	Professor, Department of Management and Marketing College of Business Administration	Curriculum/Planning Committee CoBA
Regina Eisenbach <i>(Spring 2006)</i>	Associate Dean, College of Business Administration	Curriculum/Planning Committee CoBA
Jennifer Jeffries	Assistant Professor, College of Education	Curriculum/Planning Committee CoE
Matt Garvin	Student	Associated Students, Inc.
Marcy Boyle	Assistant to the Provost	Staff to Committee

B. Definition

- A rolling eight-year plan for expansion of academic programs (degrees and degree options)
- Includes the design, processing and implementation phases
- Complements the college and academic senate processes
- Will take into account
 - State and regional needs
 - Student demand
 - Pedagogical concerns
 - Resources
 - Collaborations

C. 2006 Blueprint

See table on next page.

An Academic Blueprint for Cal State San Marcos 2005-06 Annual Report to the Academic Senate

College	Champion/ Status	Progress Meter	Program	Number of Majors (Headcount)									2012		
				2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	FTEs	FTEF	
COAS	Approved by CO effective Spring 2004		B. Biochemistry	46	49	50	54	58	61	64	68	72	64	3.2	
COAS	Approved by CO effective Spring 2004		B. Criminology & Justice Studies	55	157	221	236	253	268	279	296	317	178	8.9	
HHS	Approved by CO effective Fall 2004		B. Kinesiology	34	98	138	148	158	168	175	185	198	122	6.1	
COE	Approved by CO effective Winter 2005		D. Educational Leadership	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0.0	
COAS	Approved by CO effective Fall 2005		B. Biotechnology		13	35	52	56	59	61	65	69	62	3.1	
COBA	Approved by campus effective Fall 2005		B. Opt. Finance		116	120	128	137	145	151	160	171	110	5.5	
COAS	Approved by campus effective Fall 2005		B. Opt. Computer Information Systems		25	70	103	110	117	122	129	138	94	4.7	
COBA	Approved by campus effective Fall 2005		B. Opt. Marketing		134	138	148	158	168	175	185	198	122	6.1	
COAS	V. Bennett (On UAMP; approved by Academic Senate, under review at CO)		B. Border & Regional Studies			20	30	60	70	80	90	90	72	3.6	
HHS	Approved by CO effective Fall 2005		B. Nursing			44	108	194	220	258	258	258	150	7.5	
COAS	B. Bade (On UAMP; under review at Academic Senate)		B. Anthropology				8	23	34	35	37	40	48	2.4	
COAS	G. Oberem, C. DeLeone (On UAMP; approved by Academic Senate, under preparation for CO)		B. Applied Physics				5	14	20	20	22	23	41	2.0	
COAS	B. Safenstein, K. Brown (On UAMP; approved by Academic Senate, under preparation for CO)		B. Mass Media				40	158	168	175	185	198	122	6.1	
COAS	J. Watts, P. Amade (On UAMP; approved by Academic Senate, under preparation for CO)		M. History				21	22	24	24	26	28	14	0.7	
COE	S. Moineau (Under review at Academic Senate)		M. Opt. Communicative Sciences & Disorders				30	30	30	30	30	30	16	0.8	
COE	J. McDaniels		M. Opt. Middle Level Education				30	30	30	30	30	30	16	0.8	
HHS	B. Morris (On UAMP; under review at Academic Senate)		M. Social Work				35	67	87	100	103	103	96	4.8	
COAS	K. Diekman, D. Small (On UAMP)		B. Digital and Media Arts					148	157	163	173	185	116	5.8	
COAS	R. Brown, L. Newman (On UAMP; under review in COAS)		B. Environmental Studies					8	23	33	35	37	47	2.4	
COAS	S. Greenwood (On UAMP)		B. Global Studies					12	36	51	54	57	57	2.8	
HHS	R. Marion		B. Health Science					17	48	69	73	78	66	3.3	
COAS	M. Arriaga (On UAMP)		B. Philosophy					6	18	26	28	30	44	2.2	
COAS	S. Hamill, M. Fitzpatrick		B. Child Development						37	104	152	162	106	5.3	
COAS	V. Fabry		B. Environmental Science						2	6	9	9	34	1.7	
COAS	S. Elise		B. Ethnic Studies						4	10	15	16	37	1.9	
HHS	K. Watson		B. Health Care Management						8	22	32	34	46	2.3	
COAS	B. Bradbury		B. Music						24	66	96	103	78	3.9	
HHS	K. Witzke		M. Occupational Therapy/Physical Therapy						46	47	50	54	30	1.5	
HHS	J. Papenhausen		M. Nursing						20	40	40	40	22	1.1	
COAS	Dept. of Biological Sciences		B. Computational Biology							Comparison Data not available					
COAS	V. Anover		B. French							2	4	6	32	1.6	
COAS	M. Martinez		B. Theatre							14	40	59	58	2.9	
COBA	B. Anderson		MBA Executive							NA	NA	NA	0	0.0	
COAS	Dept. of Chemistry & Biochemistry		M. Biochemistry							7	7	7	2	0.1	
COAS	K. Diekman		M. Digital and Media Arts							16	16	18	8	0.4	
COBA/ COAS	B. Anderson		M. Public Administration								41	44	24	1.2	
COAS	F. Soriano		M. Human Development									44	24	1.2	
Total Headcount in New Majors^				89	292	529	461	790	814	675	502	178	2036		
Total Headcount in Mature (post-2003) Majors^^				0	0	0	384	577	902	1389	1819	2327			
Headcount Growth in New Majors^				89	204	237	291	484	278	253	169	69			
Headcount Growth in Mature (post-2003) Majors^^				0	0	0	24	39	71	95	89	115			
Headcount Growth in Existing (pre-2004) Majors				-475	241	5	232	102	214	42	368	566			
% of Univ. Growth in New Program Growth^				NA	46%	98%	53%	77%	49%	65%	27%	9%			
% of Univ. Growth in Mature (post-2003) Program Growth ^^				NA	0%	0%	4%	6%	13%	24%	14%	15%			
% of Univ. Growth in Existing (pre-2004) Program Growth				NA	54%	2%	42%	16%	38%	11%	59%	75%			
Total CY FTES for Univ.				6139	5913	6269	6462	6900	7400	7850	8162	8662	9262		
Approx. Fall Headcount for Univ.				7777	7391	7836	8078	8625	9250	9813	10203	10828	11578		
Approx. Univ. Fall Headcount Growth					-386	445	241	548	625	563	390	625	750		

^ Other than Biochemistry (conversion of existing option) and Finance and Marketing (options breaking off of previously existing options) programs are considered to be "new" for their first 3 years. Enrollments for these programs are included with Existing (pre-2004) Majors.
 ^^ Programs are considered to be "mature" beginning in their 4th year

All headcount predictions are based on Academic Blueprint Methodology as described in 2003 Academic Blueprint Committee Report except for figures in **bold font** (indicating projections supplied by champion because no comparable CSU data is available) or *italics* (indicating that enrollments have been rounded/lowered to reflect a cohort design to the curriculum).
 FTES targets in the Academic Blueprint are pre-rebenching.

***An Academic Blueprint for Cal State San Marcos
2005-06 Annual Report to the Academic Senate***

2006 Academic Blueprint “Placeholder List”

These are programs for which there has been an expression of interest, but which do not currently appear on the Academic Blueprint. For most of these majors, enrollment projections based on the same methodology used for programs on the Academic Blueprint can be obtained from Academic Programs.

B. Art History	M. (Opt.) Accounting
B. Asian Pacific American Studies	M. Biotechnology
B. Bio-Engineering	M. Chemistry
B. Chicano/a Studies	M. Economics
B. Cognitive Science	M. (Opt.) Entrepreneurship
B. Opt. Computer & Network Technologies (Comp. Eng.)	M. (Opt.) Finance
B. Creative Writing	M. Kinesiology
B. Dance	M. Marriage & Family Therapy
B. Earth Science/Geology	M. Public Health
B. Opt. Entrepreneurship	M. Recreational Administration
B. Film Studies	
B. Geography	
B. German	
B. Gerontology	
B. Opt. Hospitality Management	
B. Human Services/Social Work	
B. Humanities	
B. (Library) Information Science	
B. Japanese	
B. Journalism	
B. Latin American Studies	
B. Linguistics	
B. Native Studies	
B. Neuroscience	
B. Radiology	
B. Speech Pathology & Audio logy	
B. Statistics	
B. Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)	
B. Technical & Professional Writing	
B. Urban Planning / Public Administration	

Summary of the changes from the 2005 Academic Blueprint

- Enrollment projections have been updated using Fall 2004 CSU system enrollment data and April 28, 2005 multi-year planning estimates from the Chancellor’s Office; projections now extend to AY 2012-13.
- Program “champions,” program status, and the “Progress Meter” have been updated. In particular, the following Academic Blueprint programs were implemented in 2005-06:
 - Biotechnology BS was approved by the Chancellor’s Office.
 - Nursing BS was approved by the Chancellor’s Office.
 - The following options were approved locally, and they have each received a separate (HEGIS) program code from the Chancellor’s Office:
 - Computer information Systems Option in the Computer Science BS

***An Academic Blueprint for Cal State San Marcos
2005-06 Annual Report to the Academic Senate***

- Finance Option in the Business Administration BS
- Marketing Option in the Business Administration BS
- Additions to the Academic Blueprint:
 - Ethnic Studies BA in 2009
 - Digital and Media Arts MA in 2010
 - Computational Biology BS in 2011
 - Theatre BA in 2011
- Changes in implementation dates on the Academic Blueprint:
 - Mass Media BA moved from 2006 to 2007
 - History MA moved from 2006 to 2007
 - Communicative Sciences and Disorders (previously Speech Therapy) Option in the MA in Education moved from 2006 to 2007
 - Environmental Studies BA moved from 2007 to 2008
 - Global Studies BA moved from 2007 to 2008
 - Philosophy BA moved from 2007 to 2008
 - Environmental Science BS moved from 2008 to 2009
 - Biochemistry MS moved from 2008 to 2010
 - Music BA moved from 2010 to 2009
 - Nursing MS moved from 2010 to 2009
 - Human Development BA moved from 2009 to 2012
- Removals from the Academic Blueprint
 - Self-Support MBA moved (was 2007)
 - Biotechnology MS (was 2009) moved to the Academic Blueprint Placeholder List
 - Communication & Network Technologies Option in the BS in Computer Science (was 2009) moved to the Academic Blueprint Placeholder List
- Other changes/corrections:
 - Arts and Technology was changed to Digital and Media Arts
 - The Chancellor's Office approved changing the Kinesiology BA to a BS effective Spring 2006.
 - The asterisk attached to the Philosophy BA and the French BA indicating that inclusion on the UAMP should be contingent on evidence of sufficient student demand was removed since these are "broad foundation programs," for which, per Board of Trustees policy, societal need and student demand are not the preeminent criteria for offering such programs.
- Note: The College of Education is planning the following credential programs which are not reflected in the Academic Blueprint as they have not yet been assigned target implementation dates:
 - Integrated Credential Program for the Single Subject Credential (in the areas of mathematics and science)
 - Early Childhood/Multiple Subject Credential
 - Special Education Credential with a specialization for High School.

D. University Academic Master Plan (UAMP) Updates

The following programs were added to the UAMP after review by BLP:

- Environmental Studies BA (2007)
- Social Work MS (2007)
- Arts and Technology BA (2008)

An Academic Blueprint for Cal State San Marcos 2005-06 Annual Report to the Academic Senate

- Global Studies BA (2008)
- Philosophy BA (2008)

Additionally, the Chancellor's Office added the following program to the UAMP:

- Education Ed.D. (2010) (stand alone potential start date)

E. Activities in 2005-06

Consultancies

Meetings with College Committees:

- College of Arts and Sciences Hiring and Academic Planning Committee – March 21, 2006
- College of Business Administration Undergraduate Curriculum Committee – declined meeting
- College of Education Executive Committee – March 9, 2006
- Health and Human Services – March 14, 2006

Summits/Information Meetings

Arts and Technology Summit – submitted by Prof. Kristine Diekman

The Arts and Technology Planning Committee held a summit on January 31, 2006, to receive critical feedback on our proposed curriculum and to learn about programs being offered at other comparable institutions. Our new major forms an interdisciplinarity approach to digital and new media across the disciplines of digital art, video, performance studies, electronic music, new media theory, community based projects and installation art. Four outside reviewers were present. In addition to assisting us in reviewing our draft curriculum, we asked them to present their research and knowledge about digital arts education and where they think it is going. The reviewers were: Michelle Riel, Assistant Professor, Teledramatic Arts and Technology, CSUMB, Kim Stringfellow, Assistant Professor, School of Art, Design and Art History, SDSU, Brett Stalbaum, Faculty and Undergraduate Advisor, Visual Arts, UCSD, Joe Delappe, Associate Professor, Department of Art, University of Nevada at Reno.

In addition to the reviewers, several faculty, staff and administrators from Cal State San Marcos were invited as well as faculty from the community colleges: Karen Schaffman, VPA, Deborah Small, VPA, Bill Bradbury, VPA, David Avalos, VPA, Minda Martin, Communication, Lorna Zorman, Computer Science, Wayne Veres, IITS, Chuck Allen, IITS, Robert Sheath, Provost, Anna O'Cain, Mira Costa, Peggy Jones, Mira Costa.

We found the meeting extremely useful in preparing the new major, including: 1. Need a foundational course in digital arts theory and history; 2. Cultural concepts along with technical skill are important to the digital arts; 3. Our digital art and community program is important and unique; 4. "Technology" implies computer science, programming, computing, and robotics. Need to rethink the title of the major and are currently revising it to be Digital and Media Arts; 5. Need to think about the role of computing and programming and we are discussing an introductory level course in computing; 6. We are redesigning the courses to be "sequences", with clearly defined requisites; 7. It was noted that BFA is creative production, BS is technical production, and BA is a generalist approach. This helps to define the major and needed resources; 8. For new core classes, it was useful to know that typography, color theory, design and photographic production could be offered in one course in the digital arts; 9. IITS plays an important role, especially in resources and technological support.

***An Academic Blueprint for Cal State San Marcos
2005-06 Annual Report to the Academic Senate***

Anthropology Summit – submitted by Prof. Bonnie Bade

The Anthropology Summit to discuss the development of the CSUSM Anthropology Major scheduled to begin Fall 2007 was held on April 19, 2005 at 5:30 pm. Representatives from Anthropology, Native American Studies, Nursing and Health and Social Science Departments of Palomar College, Mira Costa College, and CSUSM were invited to contribute to the design of the Anthropology Major at CSUSM that can complement the efforts of their own course offerings and generate opportunities for transfer of students to the major. Also invited were professional Cultural Resource Management (CRM) archaeologists of the region, administrators and health service providers of local health clinics, and tribal education representatives from neighboring Indian Reservations.

Discussion centered around ways to articulate existing anthropological and anthropology-related community college courses with the CSUSM major as well as on generating applied learning opportunities for anthropology students in the forms of internships with local CRM firms, health care clinics, and Native American communities. An important, yet still unresolved issue concerns articulation of lower division Community College courses with the CSUSM anthropology major. Many courses are offered by NCHEA-participating community colleges that must be listed as lower division, while in practice contain activities, research methods, and data analysis meriting upper division credit. The CSUSM Anthropology major would like to find a way to credit students taking advanced Community College courses with upper division anthropology credit, but thus far has not found a way that benefits the student as well as the two institutions involved. One option discussed included having students taking advanced lower division courses at local community Colleges, such as Palomar's archaeological fieldwork course, in conjunction with a one- or two-unit upper division course at CSUSM that has associated class activities above and beyond the scope of the Community College class. This option may be too cumbersome for students, but a solution must be found if the colleges are to truly complement each other. The biggest question is how can we get the fantastic courses presently being offered at Palomar and Mira Costa at the lower division level to count toward the major?

Another discussion centered around the development of internships with local agencies for advanced ethnographic research. The North County Health Services and Vista Community Clinic have various programs, such as the NCHS program on Farmworker Mental Health, that anthropology students could contribute to in ways that are worthwhile to the agency while being unique learning opportunities for anthropology students. This discussion enabled the representatives from Nursing programs (specifically CSUSM and USD, as those from Palomar and Mira Costa did not attend) to connect with local health care agencies and discuss articulation between Anthropology and Nursing/Health Occupations.

The Anthropology Summit was successful in that it provided a venue through which communication between CSUSM and local community colleges, health service agencies, and cultural resource management entities centered on the common goal of facilitating unique learning experiences for our students. I thank NCHEA for the support.

***An Academic Blueprint for Cal State San Marcos
2005-06 Annual Report to the Academic Senate***

Border & Regional Studies Summit – submitted by Prof. Bonnie Bade

To be held April 28, 2006 at Noon, Community Service Learning Luncheon

The Border and Regional Studies program has invited Janna Shadduck-Hernandez from UCLA to come for half a day to campus, to meet with the program and to be a speaker at a Service Learning luncheon. Dr. Shadduck-Hernandez practices an activist form of service learning pedagogy and will present on a notable Community Service-Learning (CSL) experience that Dr. Janna Shadduck-Hernandez was involved with at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst. The entire university community is invited.

Dr. Shadduck-Hernandez's presentation is based on a recent paper that she published in the journal *Ethnography and Education*. Liberal Studies faculty feel that her analysis can provide valuable insights on how best to integrate university-community relations into the academic curriculum. We are particularly drawn by the following elements of the CSL model she discusses:

- (1) The CSL coursework focused on ethnicity, immigration and cross-cultural community issues.
- (2) UMASS offered a three-course CSL general education sequence that, among other things, allowed for the formation of student cohorts.
- (3) Undergraduate minority students were specifically targeted for the CSL coursework and were paired with middle school and high school students of similar ethno-cultural backgrounds to participate in the development of local community projects.
- (4) Through innovative pedagogies, UMASS pushed the idea of 'critical thinking' beyond the mere promotional rhetoric.
- (5) The CSL projects were based on long-term, broad-based multisectorial partnerships between local communities, government agencies, and the university.
- (6) A research/training center at the university that focused on ethnicity, immigration and cross-cultural community issues, coordinated the implementation of the CSL efforts. Through small grants, the center funded both curricular and co-curricular activities.

Child Development Summit – submitted by Prof. Sharon Hamill

The Child Development Summit will be held May 18, 2006. The purpose of the summit is to elicit input from community agencies and academic institutions that would provide employment or graduate school positions for our students upon graduation from CSUSM. We are looking for information about the skills and competencies that these employers and graduate schools will expect of our graduates. This information will be used in designing the Child Development degree at CSUSM. We are especially interested in information regarding education of students in a multicultural society and how the Center for Children and Families can support, and be served by, the child development students. Consideration will also be given to the proposed legislation on preschool-for-all and the issues related to articulation with our feeder community colleges.

Ethnic Studies Summit – submitted by Dr. Sharon Elise

The first of three Ethnic Studies summits—faculty, students, and community centered—was held Summer 2005. This first summit targeted members of the Ethnic Studies Faculty Affiliates on campus who are members of diverse academic programs that offer elective courses for Ethnic

An Academic Blueprint for Cal State San Marcos 2005-06 Annual Report to the Academic Senate

Studies. Faculty who attended were presented with evidence of the importance of ethnic studies to the campus based on a consistent pattern of Ethnic Studies Minors, ongoing faculty interest, its potential support in times of related campus crises, and the importance of the program to the communities that it represents in its academic focus.

This summit sought to develop a new hybrid model of Ethnic Studies that would combine the “area studies” approach to Ethnic Studies (e.g., Asian American/Pacific Islander Studies, Black Studies, Chicano Studies, etc.) with the comparative Ethnic Studies approach seen in more contemporary programs. We also sought to examine ways to build on the collaborative, campus-wide involvement in Ethnic Studies while developing a “core team” of in-house faculty to properly advise and direct the program. This discussion was guided by the Program Coordinator’s review of Ethnic Studies programs nationally and regionally. Future summits are planned for community members—both community agencies that might employ our student interns and graduates and colleagues in Ethnic Studies programs in our local region—and Ethnic Studies students. In this regard, Ethnic Studies is keenly aware of its unique obligation to work collaboratively to create a curriculum that addresses the racial/ethnic issues linked to those communities that are traditionally marginalized in society and in academe. Following this summit, the Program Coordinator developed and submitted a proposal to develop an Ethnic Studies major. The Ethnic Studies Program has been recommended for (re)placement on the campus’ Academic Master Plan.

Health Sciences Summit – reported prepared by Prof. Robin Marion and submitted by Dr. G. H. “Bud” Morris

As part of the process of developing a new undergraduate BS in Health Science for the College of Health and Human Services, a summit of local, regional and campus representatives was convened on January 11, 2006. The purpose was to harness the collective wisdom of the community to shape the new major in ways that will best meet the needs of the North County San Diego region. This process has been tremendously helpful in the development of other majors on the campus, and CSUSM has been commended for seeking the voices of community members early in the process of development.

Several highlights arose from the summit with regard to shaping the new BS in Health Science. These revolved around demand for the major, skills needed by graduates, focus for options/certificates, possible prerequisites, practical experience/service learning, specifics about the student population (recruiting and advising to attract and retain a diverse student population, recruiting quality faculty, creative utilization of space, and community support. One message very clearly stated was the need to invest in a full time champion for development of the major. At present, Robin Marion is on loan from the College of Education half time as champion, working as part of a team within HHS.

A complete, comprehensive report of the Summit proceedings is available upon request from the office of the Provost (contact Marcy Boyle), and will be available for download on the ABC webpage under Committees on Division of Academic Affairs web site.

Application form for ABC Funding of New Programs

In order to make the funding for new program development more transparent to the university community, the ABC developed the following form, which will be posted on its website:

*An Academic Blueprint for Cal State San Marcos
2005-06 Annual Report to the Academic Senate*

CSUSM tenured/tenure-track faculty may apply to the ABC for small amounts of funding to cover some expenses of developing new programs. By new programs, we are referring to new majors, degree options, and Master's degrees (but not minors or tracks). Funds are limited and reasonable requests are addressed below. Applications may be submitted at any time during the academic year. The ABC will review applications as expeditiously as possible. We have developed this brief form so that all faculty can be informed about the ABC process, and so that the ABC funding process is transparent to the university community.

Funding for new program development to date has consisted of the following types of activities:

- Summits with constituent groups or meetings with external consultants
 - Catering
 - Travel/parking for guests
- Funded time for faculty developers
 - A single course release during the Fall or Spring semester
 - Defined salary during the Summer

APPLICATION FORM

Please address the following questions and submit your request to the Office of the Provost:

1. Brief description of academic program being developed
2. Nature of the immediate funding needs (give a brief accounting of proposed costs; ranges are given for that funding provided to date, the amounts of which have been determined based on the scope of the project). Future funding will also be considered for progressive program development needs (e.g., summit funding in early development stages and course release at the time of A- and P-form writing)
 - Summit costs (\$250-2000)
 - Outside consulting (\$200)
 - Course release (\$4750)
 - Summer salary funding (\$3800-5000)
 - Other (none to date)

Requests for release time or summer salary funding should describe why this work falls outside of your normal service

3. Timeframe for program development and implementation
4. Outcomes expected from funding
5. If you have received or are in the process of applying for other funds for program development, please give a brief summary.

***An Academic Blueprint for Cal State San Marcos
2005-06 Annual Report to the Academic Senate***

ABC Funding Recommendations for Program Development/Awards by Provost
Based upon the recommendation of the ABC, the Provost awarded the following funds based on requests received:

Applied Physics program development Summer 2005	5,010
Ethnic Studies major program development July & Aug 2005	4,570
Ethnic Studies Summit Aug 2005	700
Global Studies Major program development Fall 05 CR	4,750
Arts & Technology major - program development	4,570
Arts & Technology Summit Feb 2006	3,404
Child Development BA Summit May 2006	2,000
Child Development BA program development June 2006	5,000
Philosophy program development project	2,932
TOTAL	\$32,936

Fundraising efforts

Health and Human Services has raised the following:

\$65,000	Nursing Scholarships
\$25,000	Endowment to defray student supply start-up costs
<u>\$7,500</u>	Health education/promotion/outreach activities
\$97,500	TOTAL

University Budget Request

A multi-year budget proposal was drafted in consultation with program champions and College Deans. These requests included one-time start-up needs and ongoing permanent expenses. In terms of one-time needs, the Academic Affairs contingency was able to fund library materials for Border and Regional Studies, Communication Sciences and Disorders, Anthropology, Environmental Studies, Global Studies and Philosophy, as well as equipment and lab supply needs for Kinesiology, Mass Media, Communication Sciences & Disorders and Applied Physics. One-time requests in the 2006-7 budget request that will go to the University Budget Committee (UBC) include 0.5 technical staff for Speech Therapy and Applied Physics and a data base for Environmental Studies. Permanent requests were largely partial staff support (including computer) for Kinesiology, Border & Regional Studies, Nursing and Social Work plus library resources for most of the programs noted. The multi-year proposal will go forward to UBC as part of the WASC institutional support package (Theme #1). If this is supported, all levels of program review will know the level of support available to new programs.

Brochure

An Academic Blueprint brochure to replace the one produced in spring 2004 has being designed and program champions are currently editing the brief descriptions of their programs. It is expected that this brochure, which will be useful in student recruitment, will be printed over summer 2006.

***An Academic Blueprint for Cal State San Marcos
2005-06 Annual Report to the Academic Senate***

Curriculum process clarifications/recommendations

The ABC contributed to discussions in conjunction with the Academic Senate University Curriculum Committee (UCC) and Budget and Long-range Planning Committee (BLP) that led to revisions of several curriculum and planning forms. These forms and highlights of the changes are described below:

- Revised New Program Template
 - The template contains many footnotes intended to clarify what information is being requested and to direct proposers to campus resources.
 - Student learning outcomes are now required, and the proposal must also specify where these are addressed in the curriculum and contain an initial assessment plan.
 - A sample schedule indicating how a student beginning study at CSUSM as a first-time freshman could complete graduation requirements in four years is now required.
 - A three-year plan for course offerings is required.
 - A standard table has been provided for summarizing start-up and on-going costs, as well as expected external funding.
- Revised P Form
 - This form is now used as a signature sheet for new programs; changes to existing programs should be submitted on the new P-2 Form described below.
 - The meaning of the various signatures has been clarified. In particular:
 - The Review and Approval Process has been divided into Review Process (Library, Instructional and Information Technology Services (IITS), Planning, Design & Construction (PDC), and Student Affairs), College-Level Approval Process, and University-Level Approval Process, with the University-Level Approval Process not beginning until all Review and College-level Approval signatures are obtained.
 - In order to remove redundancy in the different reviews, the committees reviewing the proposal are now required to attach memos summarizing their curricular and/or resource deliberations, and the administrators signing the P Form are required to attach a memo describing the impact of the program on their units and the ability of their units to support it.
- New P-2 Form
 - This new form is used for changes to, or deletion of, an existing program. Where appropriate, the committees and administrators involved in the approval process are asked to attach memos of the type described above for the P Form.
- Revised A Form
 - The revised form includes an explanation of the Academic Master Planning process and the role of the A Form in this process.
 - Preliminary estimates of the resources necessary for implementation must now be included on the A Form.
 - The meaning of the signatures has been clarified; signatures indicate support that the program move forward for consideration for placement on the UAMP.

All of these new forms have been approved by the Academic Senate, Provost and President and are posted on the Academic Programs curriculum forms website http://www.csusm.edu/academic_programs/Curriculum_Forms/index.html.

An Academic Blueprint for Cal State San Marcos 2005-06 Annual Report to the Academic Senate

- Redefining our broad foundations
 - Since its founding, the Cal State San Marcos campus has maintained a vision of education that prepares students to live in the 21st Century by including race and ethnic studies, global studies, gender/sexuality and women's studies; these are thereby considered important additions to the "broad foundation" of academic programs in higher education listed by the Board of Trustees.

Website

An ABC page has been created under "Committees and Councils" on the Division of Academic Affairs website, available at the following url:

<http://www.csusm.edu/aa/committees/ABC/>

The ABC membership roster, annual reports to the Academic Senate, ABC Minutes, funding application form, etc., have been (or will be) posted to the site. Unfortunately, staffing shortages in the Provost's Office have resulted in a delay in maintaining currency on the site.

WASC Accreditation Reaffirmation

- Theme #1, Academic Master Planning
 - The ABC agreed to serve as the committee overseeing campus work on WASC Theme #1 (Academic Master Planning), which is being led by AVP Barsky.
 - The following are related to understanding how successful Academic Master Planning efforts have been at CSUSM, and where they may be further improved:
 - Recollecting data similar to that which guided the construction of the initial Academic Blueprint to understand the extent to which the Academic Blueprint has been successful in stimulating the development of programs that address state and regional needs and to guide the construction of future versions of the Academic Blueprint:
 - Collected occupational outlook data which included: job titles, job descriptions, required skills, national statewide and regional employment outlook and earnings for Child Development and Health Sciences using U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, the California Labor Market Division of the Employment Development Department, the San Diego Workforce Partnership, Choices CT and other regional resources.
 - To assist in determining demand for new academic programs, the ABC endorsed obtaining qualitative and quantitative data from counselors and applicants. Feedback from high school and community college counselors was solicited as part of three workshops conducted by the Office of Admissions & Recruitment. Counselors provided information on frequently requested and/or specializations which were not currently offered at CSU San Marcos. The purchase of quantitative data on applicants to CSU San Marcos that did not enroll was approved by ABC in December 2005. The data will be obtained from the National Student Clearinghouse and will indicate the institutions at which applicants enrolled that did not attend CSU San Marcos. This data will be subsequently disaggregated by major of the applicant to identify competing institutions and majors and/or specializations of choice at other institutions. Finally, the Office of Admissions & Recruitment will request data from San

***An Academic Blueprint for Cal State San Marcos
2005-06 Annual Report to the Academic Senate***

Diego State University on behalf of ABC on applicants by major from North County who attended SDSU.

- Improvements that have been made in curriculum review processes (see Curriculum process clarifications/recommendations above).
- Annual consultations with college curriculum and planning committees.
- Institutionalization of a budget for the development of new programs.
- The ABC will meet April 27th to outline further work related to WASC Theme #1 which can be conducted during summer 2006.

**Resolution Concerning Release Time Needs for
Senate Officers and Standing Committee Chairpersons**

WHEREAS, The effectiveness of the Cal State San Marcos Academic Senate each year relies upon the hard work of a handful of faculty members who volunteer to preside over the Senate and chair its standing committees; and

WHEREAS, Fulfilling these duties requires a substantial amount of time and effort on the part of the faculty volunteers; and

WHEREAS, As our institution grows and committee workload increases, it becomes more and more difficult to find faculty willing to undertake these responsibilities in addition to their regular workload; and

WHEREAS, The 2005/06 officers conducted a survey of workload in order to determine an appropriate distribution of course releases for Senate officers and standing committee chairs; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate survey the workload of the officers and chairs every three years to assess the level of release time warranted; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Executive Committee respectfully requests the budget advisory committees and university administration provide funds to the Academic Senate beginning FY 06/07 sufficient to fund a total of 56 units of release time by 2008/09, to be distributed as follows:

Office	Current RT	06/07	07/08	08/09
Senate chair	12	12	12	12
Vice chair/Chair elect	0	0	3	3
Secretary	0	0	0	3
APC chair	3	3	3	3
BLP chair	3	6	6	6
FAC chair	3	3	3	4
GEC chair	3	3	3	5
LATAC chair	0	3	3	3
NEAC chair	3	3	3	3
PAC chair	0	3	3	5
SAC chair	3	3	3	3
UCC chair	3	6	6	6
Total	33	45	48	56