AGENDA
Executive Committee Meeting
CSUSM Academic Senate
Wednesday ~ March 16, 2011 ~ 12 – 2 p.m. ~ Kellogg 5207

I.   **Approval of Agenda**

II.   **Approval of Minutes of 03/09/2011**

III.   **Chair's Report, Rika Yoshii**   New MOU between APC and Graduate Studies -- Yoshii

IV.   **Old Business**

PAC   Program Review policy revision

V.   **New Business**

A.   BLP/UCC Single Subject Preparation in History
B.   BLP/UCC Single Subject Credential Program/English Language Authorization with Option for
                     Preliminary Mild/Moderate Education Specialist Credential option
C.   APC   Inactive Courses policy revision
D.   APC   Graduation Requirements policy revision
E.   BLP/UCC Bachelor of Science in Business Administration / Temecula campus

VI.   **Discussion Items:**

Next Steps draft report - Watson, Boren, Eisenbach, Kohlbry, Powell, Seleski   *Time certain 12 pm*

VII.   **Information Item:**

A.   BLP   Masters in Public Health on UAMP
B.   Fundraising - Genung   *Time certain 1:30 pm*

VIII. **Provost's Report, Emily Cutrer**

IX.   **ASCSU Report, Brodowsky/Montanari**

X.   **CFA Report, Don Barrett**

XI.   **Brief Oral Committee Reports**   As needed.

XII.   **EC Members' Concerns & Announcements**

Online courses - Yoshii

Hot Topics   *For more information, visit the Senate website*

Restructuring proposal	Early Start program
Diversity	SB 1440
Next Steps Workload Committee	Graduation Initiative
Temecula campus / Self support	

Next meeting: 3/30/11 ~ 12-2 pm ~ Kellogg 5207

**MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
Between the ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE
And the DEAN OF GRADUATE STUDIES for
COORDINATION OF TASKS BETWEEN APC AND GSC
Beginning AY 2011/12**

The Academic Policy Committee (APC) is a standing committee of the Academic Senate. It is responsible for developing academic policies for undergraduate and graduate students. The Graduate Studies Council (GSC) is a group of graduate program coordinators who meet on regular basis to advise the Dean of Graduate Studies. GSC is not a standing committee of the Academic Senate; however, in the past, GSC has taken responsibility for drafting academic policies governing graduate students. This memorandum of understanding will formalize the relationship between APC and GSC so that smooth coordination of the two groups can occur, and so that the Senate's role in developing academic policies is maintained.

Starting in AY 2011/12, APC and GSC shall use the following steps to coordinate their tasks:

1. Dean of Graduate Studies will notify APC **in writing** that GSC will be drafting a policy. This must **include the rationale** for creating/modifying the policy.

2. APC will review the rationale and present it to EC to receive a referral for APC to work on it.

3. EC makes a referral to APC.

4. APC requests that GSC draft a policy.

5. GSC drafts the policy.

6. The Dean of Graduate Studies and/or a designated member from GSC will bring a policy draft to APC. This must **include the names** of people who were involved in drafting the policy. This must also **include the rationale** for creating/modifying the policy.

7. APC will review the policy draft and **work with GSC** to make improvements as needed.

8. APC will bring the final policy draft to EC and then later to the Senate.

9. APC will forward comments from EC/Senate to GSC and **will work closely with GSC** to make improvements as needed.

This agreement shall be reviewed again by all parties (APC Chair, Dean of Graduate Studies, and Senate Chair) in the Fall semester of 2012. This document and any modifications will be kept on file in the Academic Senate Office.

The parties who sign below are also signing this agreement on behalf of the future APC Chairs, the Deans of Graduate Studies and the Senate Chairs.

_____
Academic Policy Committee, Chair   Date

_____
Dean of Graduate Studies   Date

_____
Academic Senate Chair   Date

Comparison of Current and Revised Program Review Procedures

OLD VERSION	NEW VERSION
There was no policy as such, document outlined philosophy and procedure.	The new policy with separate guidelines providing procedure and specific instructions.
While student learning outcomes were part of the items to be addressed during program reviews there was no specific reporting of assessment.	Accreditation bodies and the CSU have placed increasing focus on assessment of student learning and reporting. Therefore, assessment reports are incorporated into the program review.
Repeated every 5 years	Assessment is ongoing. Program review cycle is 5 or 7 years.
Comprehensive review. Department addresses 9 topics, one of which is student learning outcomes. Others are design of degree program, student readiness, graduates, advising, enrollments, pedagogy and instruction, resources, and extracurricular activities.	Content of review begins with reflection on achieving educational objectives (SLO's) on student learning outcomes by examining annual assessment data, followed by a section on developing and allocating resources and concluding with the selection of not more than **two** additional themes/special interests.
Data Notebook required departmental action	Data Notebook contents identified by department, located by IPA and OPAA Faculty Fellow and provided to the department.
Lack of guidance on structure of narrative.	Includes instructions for report structure and content. Also a model outline is provided (sections VI and VII).
PAC and External Reviewer roles unclear	Clarifies roles of PAC, External Reviewers, and others (sections III).
Little or no specific funding or support.	Support from Learning Outcomes Assessment Fellow on PSLOs and from OPAA Faculty Fellow on data notebook development. Provides resources for faculty conducting annual assessment and self study.
Usually one External Reviewer	Provides for 2 External Reviewers, whenever possible. Includes specific information on selection, visit, and expectations.
Planning report required	Part of narrative includes discussing future goals.
Few specifics on masters programs	Graduate programs included throughout.
Senate receives end of year report.	Senate office receives end-of-year report.
Includes mention of system for ad-hoc committee to review viability of program	Includes recommendations for program continuation comprised of 3 levels of recommendations.
Planning report has only mention of MOU but specifics were vague. The program review report became "baseline" for next PEP.	Includes final meeting and MOU for future goals/developmental plan (section III).
	3/07/11

<div align="center">**PAC: Review of Academic Programs**</div>

Definition: A policy outlining the responsibilities for and requirements of the CSUSM academic program review, evaluation, and planning process.

Authority:

Scope: All academic degree programs.

I.   Preamble
    A.   Program Review at the California State University originated with the Chancellor's Office memorandum AP 71-32, "Performance Review of Existing Degree Major Programs," which asks each campus to "establish a formal performance review procedure for all existing degree programs on campus in order to assess periodically both the quantitative and qualitative viability of each undergraduate and graduate program in the total context of offerings." A summary of the program review is sent to the Chancellor's Office by the Associate Vice President of Planning, Accreditation, and Assessment (AVP-PAA).
    B.   The intention of Program Review is to open and maintain dialogue among the program faculty and between all of the parties (the academic unit and various administrative offices, etc.) whose cooperation is necessary for the delivery of a high-quality academic degree program.
    C.   In adopting this policy, the Academic Senate acknowledges the serious investments in time and effort involved and stands committed to making assessment and sustaining program quality as important aspects of the campus culture.

II.   Definition of terms and abbreviations
    A.   Academic unit
        1.   Refers to the department, program, school, or college that oversees the curriculum for a degree program.
    B.   Academic degree programs
        1.   Refers specifically to baccalaureate, master's, and doctoral degree programs.
        2.   Program review will focus on both the academic unit's capacity to deliver the program as well as the educational effectiveness of the degree program.
            a.   When colleges/schools or departments manage more than one academic degree, each degree program shall undergo a separate review.
            b.   It is expected, however, that major sections of the self-study report may be duplicated when more than one degree program is reviewed in the same department or program.

III.   Principles:
    A.   The program review process will be central to academic planning, budget, and decisions about allocation of resources.
    B.   The program review process will not duplicate, but rather will build upon, other campus-wide processes or reporting activities such as annual assessment reports, annual departmental reports, and strategic planning documents.
    C.   Program review helps to identify strengths, challenges, opportunities for improvement, and provides a chance to plan for the future. It is only useful to the extent that it is a systematic, developmental, ongoing process of inquiry conducted by academic programs that includes data from annual assessments.
    D.   The value of program review derives, in part, from the use of results in programmatic, collegiate and institutional planning, and in resource allocation decisions to meet program needs and help program to improve, especially where correctable weaknesses can be identified.
    E.   One outcome of the review process is a plan specifying goals and strategies for program improvement and student learning assessment. This represents the formative, developmental, and planning phase of the process, once the summative stage, in the form of various reviewers' recommendations, has passed. For the next cycle of review, this plan becomes an important point of focus. In time, as current reviews build upon

53		their predecessors, program review, learning assessment, and curriculum development should become a
54		significant and altogether routine aspect of life at CSUSM.
55	F.	Recognizing that program review is labor-intensive and time-consuming, this Academic Senate policy aims to
56		ensure that the process operates under a realistic timeline and that it is sensitive to the effort required.
57		In order to fulfill this commitment, resources must be provided for annual assessment projects, the
58		development of the self study, and the external reviewers. The Provost's office will provide resources for
59		annual assessment projects, external reviewers, and the resources to support faculty in the development of
60		the self-study. Should budget constraints impact support for program review processes, appropriate
61		adjustments will be made in program review expectations and processes.
62		
63	**IV.**	**Program Review Responsibility**
64	A.	Department/Program (hereafter referred to as department)
65		1.	The responsibility for carrying out the program review process lies with faculty that deliver the
66			curriculum for the particular degree program, and they are assisted in this endeavor by CSUSM staff
67			and administration.
68		2.	The department will conduct a candid self-study examining departmental goals and accomplishments
69			(including progress on accomplishing goals set forth in the previous review's Memorandum of
70			Understanding (MOU), and reviewing the results of annual assessment of student learning outcomes
71			and suggestions from Office of Planning, Accreditation, and Assessment (OPAA) in response to these
72			reports.
73			a.	The self-study will include discussion of the student learning outcomes and assessments, as well
74				as the program's currency, capacity, and academic integrity as outlined in the program review
75				procedures.
76			b.	For specific self-study guidelines, see the *CSUSM Guidelines for Program Review*
77	B.	College Deans[1]
78		1.	Deans or their designees are responsible for working with the OPAA to assure the timely completion of
79			the program review.
80		2.	Deans review the self-study for completeness and accuracy prior to the external review visit.
81		3.	Deans provide evaluative comments on the self-study after receipt of the external reviewer report.
82		4.	Deans participate in the development of the MOU.
83		
84	C.	The Program Assessment Committee of Academic Senate (PAC)
85		The PAC is responsible for overseeing the program review process, for the final response to the department,
86		including recommendations for five or seven-year review cycles, for recommendations regarding program
87		continuation, for meeting with those who develop the MOU, and for reporting to the Academic Senate.
88	D.	Institutional Planning and Assessment (IPA)
89		1.	IPA is responsible for providing timely and accurate data to each program undergoing review.
90		2.	IPA is available to provide support and expertise for programs that wish to conduct surveys for data
91			collection purposes.
92	E.	Administrative Support
93		1.	The Office of Academic Planning and Accreditation (OPAA) provides administrative support for the
94			entire process. OPAA is also responsible for reporting the results of program review to the Chancellor's
95			Office.
96		2.	The AVP-PAA will confer with the College Deans and with the Dean of Graduate Studies (DGS) for
97			reviews of graduate programs.
98		
99	F.	Provost
100		1.	As the Chief Academic Officer, the Provost is ultimately responsible for the entire program review
101			process and reviews and responds to all reports.
102		

---

[1] The term "College Deans" also refers to administrative equivalents, such as Director of a school.

103	V.	Review Cycles
104		A.	The program review process at CSUSM runs on a five or seven year cycle.
105		B.	The schedule for program review is published in the Academic Master Plan.
106		C.	Generally, reviews of graduate programs will be scheduled at the same time as the review of the
107			undergraduate program(s) within the same discipline. Departments may submit a request to the PAC, OPAA,
108			and DGS to separate undergraduate and graduate reviews.
109		D.	For programs that undergo accreditation, care will be taken to coordinate program review with accreditation
110			cycles for the discipline (See Section VI of this policy).
111		E.	In the case of new programs, a developmental period of up to five years will be allowed before the first
112			program review.
113			
114	VI.	Periodic Review of Accredited Programs
115		A.	Any currently accredited academic program may request to substitute the accreditation report for the self
116			study and external review. This request is made to the OPAA.
117		B.	Documents prepared for accreditation, visits from the accreditation body, and reports from the accreditation
118			body will normally be accepted as satisfying components of the self-study report in whole or in part if the
119			accreditation report includes a discussion of assessment and student learning outcomes.
120		C.	Substitution of an accreditation report for a program review will only be permitted if annual assessment plans
121			and reports have been submitted by the program during the period prior to the accreditation process.
122	VII.	External Review
123		A.	Except for unusual situations approved by the AVP-PAA, the DGS (for graduate programs only) and the PAC,
124			external review will be part of all program reviews.
125		B.	Sufficient funds to cover the expense of the external reviews will be included in the budget of the University.
126		C.	For specific guidelines, see the *CSUSM Guidelines for Program Review*.
127			
128	VIII.	Concluding the Program Review Process
129		A.	The Chancellor's Office receives a summary statement of the assessment section of the self-study, including
130			information about how assessment results have been used to improve the academic degree program.
131		B.	The actual program review reports remain on campus in the OPAA, online as part of the Program Portfolios,
132			and are the foundation for the next program review.
133		C.	After the faculty of the academic program, the College Dean, and the Provost (or designee), have had an
134			opportunity to study all reports and recommendations, representatives of these three areas and the chair of
135			PAC will meet to discuss recommendations and agree on actions to be taken.
136			1.	Based on this conversation, the AVP-PAA will draft a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that all
137				parties will sign, which will be in effect until the completion of the next review cycle. The MOU is an
138				opportunity for all to agree on a set of desired developmental goals, subject to a corresponding
139				agreement about necessary resources and their availability.
140			2.	This MOU will be used in future planning, budget, and resource allocation processes.
141			3.	Where consensus cannot be achieved, as determined by the AVP-PAA the parties will file
142				separate memoranda outlining their difference in views. These differences will be reviewed
143				by the Senate Chair or his/her designee and the Provost or his/her designee who will work
144				with the involved parties until consensus is reached.
145			4.	It is understood that College Deans will seek advice related to the MOU from appropriate college
146				governance committees.
147			5.	For specific guidelines, see the *CSUSM Guidelines for Program Review*.

BLP / UCC: Single-Subject Preparation in History/Social Science

BLP Report: The Budget and Long Range Planning Committee (BLP) has reviewed the P-Form for an option in the History major that underwent revision for state accreditation purposes. This option satisfies state standards allowing graduates to bypass the California Subject Exam for Teachers (CSET) on their way to a teaching credential. Our review included attention to the option's likely enrollments as well as its resource implications. BLP submits the following analysis of the impact of this proposed credential to the Academic Senate to assist senators in their consideration of the proposal.

Program Demand: The P-form indicates that the number of History majors pursuing the previously approved option (which expired in 2009) ran anywhere from 10-60 students; the proposal does not anticipate significant enrollments in future years due to uncertain job prospects for prospective teachers, but the proposal emphasizes the minimal resource implications of the proposal.

Resource Implications:
Overview: This proposal was prompted by the expiration of the previous waiver certification. The new proposal includes attention to state-mandated advising resources and additional curriculum requirements.

Curricular & Faculty Resources: To fulfill state requirements, History students pursuing this option must take EDUC 350, an existing course providing field experience to undergraduates. Upper-division coursework also draws from Economics, Geography, and Political Science. Further, one new 1-unit course was developed to meet the new state standards: HIST 393 Experiential Learning in History for Future Teachers.

Additionally, state standards now mandate the designation of a program-level "coordinator" specifically for this option. While it is currently anticipated that advising needs can be handled within the History Department's current faculty advising capacity, a surge in student interest could lead to a need for increasing that capacity (e.g., a funded course release for the designated advisor).

IITS/Library Resources: No resource requirements were noted.

UCC Report: UCC has finished its review of the option of Single Subject Preparation in History, which is in fact a renewal of an existing option for the history major. The reason it comes back as a new program/option review is because that the state certification had expired as of 2009 but the renewal application did not get approved until this spring. There is only a minor change of this option proposal compared to the expired one, which was to require students take EDUC 350 (Foundation of Teaching as a profession) early in the program, and to add a new course HIST 393 (Experiential Learning in History for Future Teachers, offered previously as a special topic course) to supplement EDUC 350. The changes are aligned with the California Committee on Teaching Credentialing (CCTCT) requirements in order to get the renew approval.

The program and courses have been designated by the sate is students wish to waive the California Subject Exam for Teachers (CSET). The courses provide history depth, social science breadth and teaching preparation in accordance with state credentialing requirements for high school teachers. It is an interdisciplinary option which will be hosted under the history department in the catalog.

The program requires that students take 30 units Lower-Division Preparation courses and 46 units of Upper Division requirements. The detailed list of course requirement is provided in the catalogue description attached. All the courses except one (HIST 393) are existing courses since this is simply a renewal of existing option. UCC has reviewed the overall proposal and see no additional issues to be addressed. UCC has voted and approved to forward it for review by the Academic Senate.

50 For the complete curriculum associated with this proposal, visit the Curriculum Review
51 website:
52
53 http://www.csusm.edu/academic_programs/curriculumscheduling/catalogcurricula/2010-
54 11_curriculum.html#CoAS
55
56 The proposal is #45 in the College of Arts & Sciences listing
57
58
59   **Proposed Catalog Language for the**
60 **Single-Subject Preparation in History/Social Science, History Major Option**
61
62   Students interested in majoring in History and teaching at the secondary level may elect the
63 Single-Subject Option in History/Social Science. Successful completion of this option will
64 allow students to waive the California Subject Examination for Teachers (CSET) in
65 History/Social Science. For certification of this option, students must maintain a 2.7 GPA both
66 in overall work and in all courses used to complete the major and option.
67
68 **Lower-Division Preparation for the Major**:
69 Thirty units in lower-division courses including:

70 U.S. History Survey HIST 130 and 131	6 units
71 World History HIST 101 and 102	6 units
72 Related breadth courses including	
73 U.S. Government (PSCI 100)	3 units
74 Economics including Macro/Micro economics	6 units
75 (ECON 201 and 202)	
76 GEW	3 units
77 Supporting social science courses: PSYC 100 and SOC 101	
78 recommended, but other lower or upper division courses in	
79 Psychology or Sociology can satisfy this requirement.	<u>6 units</u>
80 **Total**	**30 units**

81
82 **Upper Division Requirements:**
83 Forty-Six units in upper division courses including
84

85 GEOG 302 or 320	3 units
86	
87 Political Science, U.S. focus,	
88 Choose from: PSCI 305, 321, 412, 413	3 units
89	
90 Political Science, Global focus	

91	Choose from PSCI 331, 350	3 units
92		
93	EDUC 350	3 units
94	Note: HIST 393 and EDUC 350 should be taken concurrently.	
95		
96	HIST 301 Historical Methods and Writing	3 units
97		
98	HIST 347 California History	3 units
99		
100	2 U.S. Courses from HIST 336C, 336D, 336E, 336F	6 units
101		
102	Upper Division History electives, U.S. focus	6 units
103		
104	Upper Division History electives, non-U.S. focus	12 units
105	Note: Of the above, courses must be taken from at least three	
106	world areas that include: Africa, Asia, Europe,	
107	Latin America, Middle East, and Comparative/	
108	Transnational history	
109		
110	HIST 393 Experiential Learning in History for	
111	Future Teachers	1 unit
112		
113	History course, 400 level seminar	3 units
114	Total	46 units

115

116 Note: of the history courses above:
117 a. one course must have the majority of its content before 1800
118 b. one course must have considerable content on Women History/Gender.
119 c. one course must have significant consideration of ethical, moral, or religious issues in
120 history.
121 (Choose from: HIST 306, 310, 313, 317, 318, 323, 341, 343, 356, 360, 380, 383, 388)

122 Students must complete and submit a portfolio of their coursework with a written narrative
123 reflecting on their pre-credential teaching experience, and must complete all above courses
124 with GPA of 2.7 or above.

125

126 _____

127

128 New Course approved with this Option:

129

130 HIST 393   Experiential Learning in History for Future Teachers   1 unit

BLP / UCC: Single-Subject Credential Program / English Language Authorization
with Option for Preliminary Mild / Moderate Education Specialist Credential Option

BLP Report: The Budget and Long Range Planning Committee (BLP) has reviewed the P-Form for a proposed teaching credential in the field of Single Subject Credential/English Language Authorization with Option for Preliminary Mild/Moderate Education Specialist Credential. Our review included careful consideration of the enrollment prospects for the proposed program as well as the resource implications of initiating the program. We thank Professor Jacqueline Thousand, the proposer and also the COE representative to BLP, for her collegial responses to our feedback and our queries so that we could provide a useful evaluation for the Senate's review. BLP submits the following analysis of the impact of this proposed credential to the Academic Senate to assist senators in their consideration of the proposal.

Program Demand: The P-form for this proposed curriculum lays out the state's continuing demand for special education teachers at the secondary level. This proposed program would qualify candidates for teaching positions to work with both "general and special education students in selected content areas."

Resource Implications:

Overview: This proposal was prompted by a change in California's statewide accreditation requirements, which required the revision of existing COE curricula. As noted in the P-form, the new program brings together courses from programs currently known as the "Single Subject" and "Preliminary Mild/Moderate Education Specialist," both of which included an "Authorization to Teach English Learners."   The program has already been available to students for some time.

Curricular & Faculty Resources: The program of study is already being offered, and the current P-form "formalizes the combined program as a credential option" that would be represented in the CSUSM Catalog. The statewide accreditation revisions required the addition of one new course in the COE curriculum, EDMX 575, Education Specialist Transition Development Plan.

Eleven current COE faculty members are expected to participate in various aspects of the credential; the COE has made clear that this new program can be launched and maintained for the first several years even without new faculty hires.

IITS/Library Resources: While information provided by the Library indicates that the proposed program could benefit from subscriptions to additional journal databases (specifically, Education Research Complete and ProQuest Education Journals were mentioned), COE has made clear that this new credential can be launched and maintained without new Library or IITS resources. The proposed new course, EDMX 575, will be required to meet CSU "accessibility" requirements, but it can be offered with currently available resources. However, as with *all* curriculum proposals, it is imperative to bear in mind the "inflationary costs" associated with access to journal databases; the Library's Dean estimates "that additional annual increases of 8-10% [in the Library's Collections budget] will be needed to continue purchasing content at the current level."

An additional point that came up during BLP's discussion of this proposal was the campus's need for enhanced IITS support for students whose classes meet on evenings and weekends, windows when IITS is currently unavailable. The proposed Catalog language specifically identifies this program as being offered during evenings and weekends, so the lack of IITS support is particularly troublesome here. This statement is not intended as a criticism of the current proposal; it is instead an acknowledgement of how students can be better served by aligning resources for student support with a realistic assessment of when courses are being taught on campus.

UCC Report: UCC has finished its review of the *Single Subject Credential Program/English Language Authorization with Option for Preliminary Mild/Moderate Education Specialist Credential option*. The purpose of the option is to provide students the aggregate of courses that melds the courses for the Single Subject and Preliminary Mild/Moderate Education Specialist Credentials, both of which offer the Authorization to Teach English Learners. There has been a critical demand for special education teachers who are qualified to teach single subject content at the secondary level. This program meets this demand by integrating the Preliminary Mild/Moderate Education Specialist coursework and clinical practice with the Single Subject Credential coursework and clinical practice. The candidates can be highly qualified to teach general and special education students in selected content areas.

53
54 The program provides students a variety of choices. There is a total of 34-35 units of course requirement for Single Subject
55 Credential Candidates, including 17 units of core courses, 3-4 unit of additional Single Subject area methods course
56 elective, and two Single Subject clinical practice course (EDSS 571 and 572). For Candidates who want to acquire
57 Concurrent Single Subject AND Mild/Moderate Education Specialist Credentials, there is a 56-57 unit course requirement,
58 including 18 units of core common course work, 3-4 unit of additional Single Subject area methods courses, 20 units of
59 additional Preliminary Mild/Moderate Education Specialist Courses, and 15 units of Concurrent Single Subject and
60 Education Specialist Candidates Clinical Practice. The detailed list of course requirement is provided in the catalogue
61 description attached.
62
63 There is only one new course proposed accompanying this proposal: EDMX 575, Education Specialist Transition
64 Development Plan, 2 units. This course is developed and added to the updated Preliminary Mild/Moderate Education
65 Specialist program options to bring the options into compliance with new (2010) California Committee on Teaching
66 Credentialing (CCTCT) Education Specialist standards. UCC has reviewed the overall proposal and see no additional issues
67 to be addressed. UCC has voted and approved to forward it for review by the Academic Senate.
68
69
70   Catalog Language to be provided

APC: Inactive Courses Policy / Procedure

Summary of Changes

The location of revision in current policy document is listed in brackets, where appropriate. Most revisions occur broadly across the document

- Whereas/Resolved resolution language has been replaced by a shorter Executive Summary.
- The old policy statement (previously hidden in the Overview) has become an explicit policy. The language has been updated and made more precise, but there are no substantive changes. [Section II]
- The procedures have been updated:
    - The section on "Voluntary Inactivation of Course and Programs of Study" has been largely eliminated since the program inactivation part of this procedure has been superseded by the Academic Program Discontinuance Policy.
    - The inactivation process is now a biennial, rather than annual, process since the catalog is now biennial.
    - Courses slated for inactivation are those that have not been offered in a 3.5 year period; the old procedure targeted courses that had not been offered in 2.5 years.
    - Instead of defining "inactive" and "deleted" courses, inactive courses are divided into two groups: recently inactive (i.e., "re-activatable," [previously termed "inactive"]) and older inactive (i.e., re-activatable only via curricular review and approval process [previously termed "deleted"]).
    - Courses required for a program cannot be eliminated, but the appropriate Dean's office will be notified when such courses turn up as candidates for inactivation by virtue of not having been offered for three consecutive years. [Section III, A, 4]
    - When courses that are electives in programs are inactivated, they are removed from the program lists of electives in the catalog. [Section III, E]
    - "Office of Academic Programs" is replaced throughout by "Curriculum and Scheduling Office."

Rationale: This policy establishes procedures for the removal of courses from the catalog that have not been offered for prolonged periods and for their reinstatement. Implementation of this policy establishes a regular cycle of communications between academic units, Academic Programs and the Academic Senate.

The previous version of this policy contained a resolution, which was unnecessary and redundant. Further, the previous version provided policy for resolving inactive 'Programs of Study' which is addressed in the Academic Program Discontinuance Policy.

Definition *The policy governs the treatment of inactive courses .*

Authority *Title 5 Section 40100*

Scope *Courses that have not been offered for prolonged periods.*

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This policy creates means by which courses offered infrequently may be periodically removed from the catalog, and, for a certain period of time, re-instated in the catalog upon the decision of the academic unit wishing to offer the course once again. By leaving open the possibility for rapid re-activation , this policy will ensure a more accurate catalog listing of Active courses, without requiring irreversible deletion of courses that are only temporarily removed from the catalog. This authority to remove courses from the catalog has always existed; current technology now allows a formalized procedure for doing so.

II. POLICY

Courses that are not offered for several years shall be removed from the catalog and inactivated in the administrative database (i.e., PeopleSoft CMS).

48
49 Courses that have been recently inactivated will be reactivated upon notification from the department that it intends to
50 offer them again.
51
52 Courses that have not been offered for many years must go through the curriculum review and approval process in a
53 manner similar to new courses.
54
55 III.   PROCEDURE
56
57   A.   Every other summer, the Curriculum and Scheduling Office will identify courses in the new catalog that
58 have not been offered in the preceding three academic years and that are not scheduled to be offered in the fall. The
59 following courses are exempt and will not appear on this list:
60
61   1.   Generic course titles under which varying individual topics are offered
62   2.   On-demand courses such as Independent research, Independent study, Internship, and Thesis
63   3.   Courses that appear in the catalog for articulation purposes and which are clearly identified as
64 currently unoffered by CSUSM
65   4.   Courses that are required for completion of a major, option, concentration, minor or certificate.
66 The Dean's Office of the college offering such a course will be notified that the course is not being offered.
67
68   B.   The Curriculum and Scheduling Office will then notify the appropriate academic units by September 1
69 that these courses are subject to removal from the catalog. The academic units may reply by:
70
71   1.   Allowing the course to be inactivated (this is the default response)
72   2.   Correcting the report (e.g., pointing out that the course has not been in the catalog for three
73 years, that it has been offered within the past three years, that it is scheduled for the fall, that it is one of the exempt types
74 of courses listed above [See Section IIIA], or that it was scheduled, but cancelled due to low enrollment)
75   3.   Committing to offer the course in the next two academic years.
76
77   C.   Academic units may choose voluntarily to place individual courses on Inactive status by notifying the
78 Curriculum and Scheduling Office in the November 1 report.
79
80   D.   Replies are due in the Curriculum and Scheduling Office by November 1. The Curriculum and Scheduling
81 Office will forward to the Academic Senate a list of all Inactivations as an information item for the December meeting.
82
83   E.   Inactive courses have their status changed in PeopleSoft to "Inactive" (which keeps them from being
84 included in future class schedules) and are removed from all areas of the catalog where the course is referenced (i.e.,
85 electives in majors and minors, and the list of course descriptions located in the course section of the catalog) for the
86 subsequent published catalog. If removal of the course affects the unit value of a program requirement, then a P-2 form
87 must be submitted.
88
89   F.   Requests for course re-activation must be included in the reply due in the Curriculum and Scheduling
90 Office by November 1. Academic Programs will forward to the Academic Senate a list of all re-activations as an
91 information item for the December meeting.
92
93   G.   A course that has been Inactive for two catalog publication cycles may be reactivated at the request (sent
94 to the Curriculum and Scheduling Office) of the department offering the course. Re-activated courses will be announced in
95 the next published catalog or catalog addendum, in both the elective lists for any majors and minors for which the course
96 had been applicable prior to inactivation and in the list of course descriptions.
97
98   H.   Courses that have been inactive for longer than two catalog publication cycles must go through the usual
99 curriculum approval process as new courses.

APC: Graduation Requirements for Baccalaureate Degrees and Academic Certificate Programs

Explanation of Changes:
- The first change is rephrasing the requirement on additional units necessary for a second or a third major. Stating the rule in terms of the additional majors requiring units above those of the first major is a simpler statement of the older 'completely separate and disjoint' requirement. This is an editorial change.*
- A second change is deleting references to General Education from this statement, since the General Education Committee is the Senate committee (not APC) that is supposed to develop General Education policy. See the paragraph below on a suggested referral to the GEC.
- Changing the placement of this sentence makes this paragraph much more readable. This is an editorial change.*

The significance of gaining approval for these editorial changes is that the text of this "Procedure" is reproduced verbatim in the catalog (see pages 100 and 101 in the 2010-2012 General Catalog).

Suggested referral:
- Current GEC policy on upper-division General Education (see Cross Listed Upper Division General Education Courses - Effective 08/24/2010) does not give guidance on how it is to be interpreted in the context of a student with multiple majors. The GEC should be asked to revise the policy to address such situations.

PROCEDURE

I. Unit Requirement

Every baccalaureate degree requires completion of a minimum of 120 semester units. Some choices of majors will require more than 120 semester units; the descriptions of each major specify how many units are required.

At least forty (40) units shall be in upper-division credit and no more than seventy (70) units may be transferred from a community college.

II. Major Requirements

Every baccalaureate degree must include an approved major. A major for a Bachelor of Arts degree must include at least twenty-four (24) units exclusive of units used to meet the General Education requirement and a major for a Bachelor of Science degree must include at least thirty-six (36) units exclusive of units used to meet the General Education requirement. For a Bachelor of Arts degree, at least twelve (12) units required in the major shall be upper-division courses, and for a Bachelor of Science degree, at least eighteen (18) units required for the major shall be upper-division. Most majors require more than these minima.

III. Multiple Majors

It is possible for a student to complete more than one major within one degree (for example, a B.A.). Each major after the first major must consist of at least 24 semester units that are ~~completely separate and distinct from the~~not counted toward any other ~~majors'~~major's requirements ~~and General Education~~. To be recognized as graduating with multiple majors, a student must declare the additional major(s) with the appropriate discipline or program no later than the beginning of the student's final year of study. The completion of additional majors within one degree will be noted at the time of graduation by appropriate entries on the student's transcript and on the diploma. Majors appear on the diploma in the order in which the student has designated them to be the first major, second major, etc.

It is also possible for a student to complete a major (or majors) in one degree concurrently with additional majors from a different degree (for example, a major in a B.S. concurrently with another major from a B.A.). Each major after the first major must consist of at least 24 semester units that are ~~completely separate and distinct from the~~not counted toward any other ~~majors'~~major's requirements ~~and General Education~~. By declaring which major is the first major, second major, etc.,

53 the student also declares the order in which the degrees, and the majors leading to these degrees, appear on the diploma
54 and transcript. Students must make this declaration no later than the beginning of the student's final year of study.
55
56 **IV. Minors**
57
58 An undergraduate student may elect to complete one or more minors; this is not a degree requirement. <u>Unless the</u>
59 <u>description of the major(s) and minor contain additional stated restrictions, there is no restriction on double-counting units</u>
60 <u>in the major(s) and the first minor that a student declares.</u> After the first minor, each subsequent minor must contain
61 twelve units beyond those used for major requirements and other minors. Students may not declare or receive a minor in
62 the same subject or title as the major. ~~Unless the description of the major(s) and minor contain additional stated~~
63 ~~restrictions, there is no restriction on double-counting units in the major(s) and the first minor that a student declares.~~
64 Minors are awarded as part of a baccalaureate degree. The completion of a minor will be noted on the student transcript,
65 but not on the diploma.
66
67 **V. Academic Certificates & Certificate Programs**
68
69 Cal State San Marcos grants certificates to individuals who complete certificate programs that enhance major
70 requirements or credential programs. A certificate is issued upon the successful completion of an academic certificate
71 program. The university acknowledges the completion of a certificate by recording it on the student transcript, but not on
72 the diploma.
73
74 **PROCEDURE**
75
76 I.   No student may use a course from their major area, or any course cross-listed with their major area, to satisfy upper
77 division general education (UDGE) requirements BB, CC, DD.
78
79 II.   For interdisciplinary majors with a primary field, students are prohibited from using courses in their primary field or any
80 course cross-listed with their primary field. For majors in which students take courses from a variety of fields and no
81 primary field is named, students are not prohibited from taking courses in these fields. (E.g., Human Development majors
82 take courses in Biological Sciences, Psychology, and Sociology. They are not prohibited from taking courses that are cross-
83 listed with these fields.)

BLP / UCC: BS in Business Administration option at Temecula campus

BLP Report: The Budget and Long Range Planning Committee (BLP) has reviewed the P-Form for an additional Option for the Bachelor's of Science in Business Administration. This option will be offered solely at CSUSM's Temecula facility as a self-support program run through Extended Learning. It represents an adaptation of CSUSM's existing BSBA options, as it was not feasible to offer any of the existing options at this separate facility. BLP's review included attention to the enrollment prospects for the proposed program as well as its accompanying resource implications. We thank Professor Kathleen Watson, the proposer and also the COBA representative to BLP, for her collegial attention to our feedback and our queries. Dean Guseman and Associate Dean Eisenbach were also very helpful as we prepared this report. BLP submits the following to the Academic Senate to assist senators in their consideration of the proposal.

Program Demand: The P-form does not address enrollment projections, but a viable self-support program at Temecula would require a minimum cohort size of 22 students. It is not clear whether the program would be delivered in its early years in the event that enrollment falls just short of that minimum.

It is believed that a CSUSM program offered at Temecula will be cost-competitive with comparable programs in the region. Data provided by COBA provide a preliminary estimate of students' anticipated costs for this self-support program: 64 Units (upper-division coursework) @ $425/unit + $157/semester fee for Temecula site= $28,142 for 2 years of upper-division coursework. The program's most likely competitor is believed to be the University of the Redlands; the projected cost of that BSBA is $38,085.
For purposes of comparison: projected CSUSM tuition/fees for two years of upper-division coursework at the main campus are $11,558/year tuition and fees x 2 years =$23,116 (based on numbers available at CSUSM's website, factoring in next year's projected fee increases).

Resource Implications:
Curricular & Faculty Resources: All of the courses in this curriculum are already offered at CSUSM. No new faculty lines will be required to launch and deliver this option. All current COBA faculty members are potentially eligible to participate in delivering this program at the off-site location. Tenure-track faculty members may be offered the opportunity to teach a course in this option either as an "overload" course to earn extra compensation or as part of their normal Academic Year teaching load. According to the draft "MOU" developed between COBA and Extended Learning, the anticipated faculty compensation for this program is $3250 per unit of instruction. COBA does not anticipate difficulties in soliciting sufficient participation by tenure-track or lecturer faculty to deliver this option; however, careful attention will need to be paid to how delivering this option may affect the availability of sufficient faculty resources to maintain existing programs at CSUSM's main campus.

IITS/Library Resources: As a self-support program, this new option is expected *not* to place demands on "stateside" IITS or Library resources; instead, all relevant IITS and Library costs must be built into course fees for students at the Temecula site. While IITS has an "MOU" with Extended Learning to cover its support operations, careful ongoing attention must be paid to Library resources both to ensure adequate access to students at the Temecula site and to ensure that costs are not shifted to "stateside" budgets. One concern expressed in the Library's report was that "offsite access" for "core print business reference sources that do not circulate" will need to be addressed; if additional resources must be purchased, such expenses will need to factored into the fee structure, certainly increasing the program's cost. Additionally, with increasing attention to the Library's inflationary subscription costs, it is likely that such costs will also need to be factored into the Temecula fee structure on an annual basis.

UCC Report: UCC has finished its review of the new option of B.S. in Business Administration, proposed as a new option offered through Extended Learning towards students in Temecula. The new option is housed in the College of Business Administration. The purpose of the option is to serve the unique needs of the students in Temecula and yet utilize the current resources the most effective way possible. The option is created by cutting across departments in the colleges so one area is not over-burdened.

52 The program requires that students take a total of 64 units, including 9 units of GE credits, 26 units of Business Foundation
53 Courses, 20 units of business electives chosen from selected courses in at least 3 options, and 9 unit capstone courses. The
54 Foundation business courses include BUS 302-Foundation of Business Environments (2), BUS 304-Data Analysis (4), FIN
55 304-Introduction to Corporate Finance (4), MIS 304-Principles of Management Information Systems (4), MKTG 305-
56 Principles of Marketing (4), MGMT 305-Organizational Behavior (4), OM 305-Operations Management (4). The elective
57 courses will be selected based on the coordination among CoBA options. The capstone courses are: BUS 444-Strategic
58 Management in Global Environments (4), BUS 492-Problem Assessment and Critical Thinking (1), and BUS 493- Problem
59 Analysis and Implementation (4).
60
61 This is a 64-unit undergraduate bachelor degree that combined a list of existing CoBA foundation courses across
62 department. There is no new course proposed accompanying this application. During the review process, the committee
63 has raised a series of questions/concerns. ***The major concern relates to the program offered through Extended Learning,***
64 ***such as the ensuring of the program quality, the impact on faculty workload, and the impact on future students demand***
65 ***on our main campus. In addition, the committee also expressed concerns on the possible online/hybrid courses.***
66
67 The following specific questions have been raised during the discussion. Regina Eisenbach, Associate Dean of CoBA, was
68 invited to UCC to address those questions. Below is a summary of the questions/answers:
69
70 **PART 1:** The following questions considered by the committee as being directly related to curriculum:
71
72 1. **Q:** How will the students choose electives?
73   **A:** The program is a cohort-based program. Students will not have the freedom to choose electives, per se. The
74   electives are just courses CoBA may offer differently to each cohort, based on student interest and faculty availability.
75
76 2. **Q:** How different is the proposed program is from existing programs?
77   **A:** In existing programs, all the students take the 4-unit version core course of their own option, but 2-unit versions
78   from other business areas. For example, Marketing students are required to take Mktg 305 (4 unit Principle of
79   Marketing) but other business students (e.g. accounting, finance, MIS, etc.) only take Mktg 302 (the 2 unit counterpart
80   of Mktg 305, Foundations of Marketing). In this new program, students are required to take all the 4 unit version core
81   courses, plus a few electives approved by the college.
82
83 3. **Q:** Where do Temecula students take Lower Division courses?
84   **A:** Usually, at Mt. San Jacinto College. The college has agreed and expressed great interest in providing the necessary
85   lower division courses.
86
87 4. **Q:** Is there possible attraction of the Temecula program to our existing students in San Marcos?
88   **A:** Not likely. Most of the existing students have already claimed an option here and cannot find the necessary elective
89   courses in Temecula.
90
91 5. **Q:** How long do student need to finish the program?
92   **A:** Approximately 6 semesters.
93
94 6. **Q:** How would students take electives?
95   **A:** Will be a collaborative effort by CoBA faculty. Strictly speaking they are not electives because students won't have
96   choices in a cohort.
97
98 7. **Q:** What is the value of the Temecula degree compared to the degree here?
99   **A:** Value of the degree should be the same at both campuses.
100
101 8. **Q:** Is there any plan to bring the program back to campus?
102   **A:** No plan.
103
104 9. **Q:** Will EL students have higher expectations since they pay more?

105   **A:** They might.
106
107   10. **Q:** Nursing students at Temecula have complained about the unavailability of personal advising. Has CoBA thought
108   about it?
109   **A:** CoBA has not thought about it yet.
110
111   11. **Q:** What is the student capacity here?
112   **A:** We are impacted as a major.
113
114   **PART 2:** The following questions are considered by the committee as not being directly related to curriculum. However
115   the committee feels that the questions should be acknowledged to the senate when reviewing the proposal:
116
117   1. **Q:** The IITS report has mentioned the cost of online courses. The committee did not find any online courses in the
118   proposal.
119   **A:** There is no pure online course. However, some sessions of BUS 304 (Business Statistics) have been taught as hybrid
120   courses. CoBA has not decided whether to offer pure face-to-face lecture or a hybrid statistics course.
121
122   2. **Q:** What is the Assessment plan of the Temecula program?
123   **A:** Nothing different from what we do here. Students will take exit exams prior to graduation (the BAT exam) as one
124   way to evaluate their learning.
125
126   3. **Q:** Who will be teaching the program?
127   **A:** Courses will be offered to current CoBA faculty on an overload basis. No plan to hire more adjunct faculty.
128
129   4. **Q:** What is the ultimate goal, to help eventually build another CSU at Temecula or purely revenue driven?
130   **A:** CoBA has been asked by the administration of our campus to look into the possibility of meeting the demand up
131   there. Communities in Temecula have expressed strong interest to our central administration.
132
133   5. **Q:** Are there resources for program assessment and course assessments? Any state subsidy?
134   **A:** The assessment resource will come mostly from EL. EL has promised on course support and administrative support.
135   CoBA advisors are currently working on training EL advisors. There is course release built into the cost of the program
136   for a faculty coordinator/director who will be involved with program assessment.
137
138   6. **Q:** Will faculty hold office hours at Temecula?
139   **A:** Yes. They will have offices and hold office hours.
140
141   7. **Q:** Are the scholarships offered here available to Temecula students?
142   **A:** They should be.
143
144   8. **Q:** Student accessibility to the services such as library, writing center, etc.?
145   **A:** Not available.
146
147   9. **Q:** What are the RTP implications? Who can ensure junior faculty will not be teaching too many overload courses and
148   affecting their research and service activities? In SoN, faculty are bought out to teach in Temecula. But compensation is
149   lower comparing to teach in the state support program. How is CoBA faculty being compensated?
150   **A:** Department chairs should have a conversation with the faculty who teach the programs. CoBA has talked to EL and
151   has been offered a rate that all the CoBA faculty have agreed upon.
152
153
154   Catalog Language to be provided
155