A program could be placed on the fast track only if the year time lag between proposal and implementation of the program, instead of the current two years, could be accommodated within the existing resource base of the campus. The ideal would be a fast track program that could be approved and implemented within one year from the time a campus first proposed that program, instead of the current two- to three-year time lag between proposal and implementation.

A program could be placed on the fast track only if the year time lag between proposal and implementation of the program, instead of the current two years, could be accommodated within the existing resource base of the campus. The ideal would be a fast track program that could be approved and implemented within one year from the time a campus first proposed that program, instead of the current two- to three-year time lag between proposal and implementation.
a. it could be offered at a high level of quality by the campus within the campus's existing resource base, or there is a demonstrated capacity to fund the program on a self-support basis;
b. it is not subject to specialized accreditation by an agency that is a member of the Association of Specialized and Professional Accreditors, or it is currently offered as an option or concentration that is already recognized and accredited by an appropriate specialized accrediting agency;
c. it can be adequately housed without a major capital outlay project. Major capital outlay construction projects are those projects whose total cost is $610,000 or more, as adjusted pursuant to Cal. Pub. Cont. Code 10705(a), 10105 and 10108;
d. it is consistent with all existing state and federal law and trustee policy;
e. it leads to a bachelor’s or master’s degree;
f. the program has been subject to a thorough campus review and approval process.

Two approval cycles per year for fast-track are envisioned because program implementation might be limited by the short time between approval at the March Board of Trustees’ meeting, subsequent July approval by CPEC, and fall implementation. A second, briefer agenda item at the September Board of Trustees’ meeting would make it possible for a proposal to come in by June, have any concerns resolved by the time of the board meeting in September, be authorized by the board, go to CPEC directly after the meeting, be endorsed by CPEC by December, be incorporated in campus catalogs and other campus informational materials in the spring and perhaps be implemented in a limited manner in the spring term, and be ready for full implementation in August.

Timelines for Fast-Track Approval

■ The first Monday in January—for July approval
■ The second Monday in June—for December approval

2. Automatic approval if no questions are raised by specified date

Another proposal for speeding up approval of both traditional and fast-track programs would be to set firm deadlines for review by the Chancellor’s Office and CPEC. Neither the Chancellor’s Office nor CPEC reviewers could routinely ask for extra time. If no questions were forwarded to the campus by the end of the review deadline, then approval would be automatic. For at least some programs, review by the Chancellor’s Office and CPEC could be concurrent.

3. Removal of projection from Academic Plan if not implemented with five years (or date originally projected for implementation)

For the traditionally traced new-program proposals, if the implementation proposal does not come in within five years or the date originally projected for implementation, whichever is later, the projection would be removed from the Academic Plan and would have to be resubmitted and/or revised. This proposal should improve the responsiveness of our program offerings. Many areas are changing so rapidly that five years could make a significant difference in the needs of students and of the state.

This provision would not apply to “foundation” liberal arts and science programs, for which employer need and student demand are not primary considerations. It is recommended, however, that the concept of foundation programs be reevaluated so that it is consistent with the current reconsideration of the baccalaureate degree by the Academic Senate and the Cornerstones project.

4. Development of post-authorization review process for limited number of “pilot” programs
Some experimentation in the planning and offering of academic programs is part of the CSU tradition (e.g., pilot external degree programs, MFA in Cinema). We propose that the trustees authorize the establishment of a limited number of degree programs (we suggest one or two per campus per three-year period) under the following conditions:

a. A pilot program would be authorized to operate only for five years. If no further action is taken by the end of the five years, no new students could be admitted to the program. (The campus would be obliged to make appropriate arrangements for students already enrolled in the program to complete it.)

b. A pilot program could be converted to regular-program status and approved to continue to operate indefinitely if the following conditions are met:
   ■ The campus committed the resources necessary to maintain the program beyond five years;
   ■ A thorough program evaluation (including an on-site review by one or more experts in the field) showed the program to be of high quality; to be attractive to students; and to produce graduates attractive to prospective employers and/or graduate programs, as appropriate;
   ■ Approval by the board and the chancellor would be required after review and comment by the Chancellor’s Office and CPEC.

c. A program could be established as a pilot program only if it met the criteria for fast-track programs; that is,
   ■ it could be offered at a high level of quality by the campus within the campus’s existing resource base, or there is a demonstrated capacity to fund the program on a self-support basis;
   ■ it is not subject to specialized accreditation by an agency that is a member of the Association of Specialized and Professional Accreditors, or it is currently offered as an option or concentration that is already recognized and accredited by an appropriate specialized accrediting agency;
   ■ it requires no major capital outlay project to be adequately housed;
   ■ it is consistent with all existing state and federal law and trustee policy;
   ■ it is a bachelor’s or master’s degree program;
   ■ the campus has a thorough review and approval process for pilot degree programs, through which the program has passed.

d. The campus would be obliged to notify the Chancellor’s Office of the establishment of the program and its curricular requirements prior to program implementation.

A pilot program could be implemented without its having been projected on the campus Academic Plan. It would require the acknowledgment, but not the prior approval of, the Chancellor’s Office and CPEC, and it would be identified as a pilot program in the next annual update of the campus Academic Plan.

Service Learning (SL) Designation and Approval of New SL Courses, Curriculum Policy

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

1. Justification that the SL component is integral to and supportive of the academic focus of the course. In the syllabus, this can be communicated in the course description, in a separate description of the SL component of the course, and/or in the learning outcomes.
2. Description of the mechanism(s) used to introduce the SL component to the students. This may be done through various methods including, but not limited to: class discussions, guided readings, experiential class periods, or utilizing the Service Learning and Community Engagement Programs (SLCEP) webpage as a resource.

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

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

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