THE CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES
Office of the Chancellor
5670 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90036

March 30, 1971

AP 71-32

TO: Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs
Deans of Academic Planning

FROM: Gerhard Friedrich
State College Dean, Academic Planning

SUBJECT: Performance Review of Existing Degree Major Programs

In his memo of July 24, 1970, to the State College Presidents, on the "Impact of Budget Allocations on Existing and Proposed Curricular Programs," the Chancellor requested "that each college undertake to review its complement of existing degree programs and courses to determine which of these are not performing at viable levels and should thus be phased out, in line with previous mandates from the Board of Trustees and the Coordinating Council for Higher Education. The Division of Academic Planning will consult with and assist you in this matter." The Trustees, in approving the revised Academic Master Plans on November 23-24, 1970, also resolved "that the Colleges review their existing and projected programs in line with the declared policy of the Board to encourage broadly based degrees of high academic quality and to avoid unnecessary proliferation of degrees and terminologies."

Further, the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, by resolution adopted on March 2, 1971, advised the California State Colleges as follows: "Each current program leading to a graduate degree or a credential should be reviewed periodically at intervals of from five to ten years in order to ascertain what is needed both to maintain and improve quality, and whether or not the program has sufficient priority of demand upon resources to warrant its continuance." The Coordinating Council also recommended that the California State Colleges consider delaying the implementation of any new graduate programs until the performance of existing graduate programs has been appraised.

While considerable progress has been made in reassessing the structure and productivity of degree major programs, current and prospective support conditions make imperative a systematic and stringent review of all existing degree major programs which show low degree production and are thus likely to be high cost. I am therefore sending you attached a list of those bachelor's degree major programs currently existing at your college which were approved for implementation prior to the 1967-68 academic year but produced fewer than 10 degrees in 1969-70, and also those master's degree major programs approved for implementation prior to the 1967-68 academic year but producing less than 5 degrees in 1969-70. The list does not include programs which the colleges are already phasing out, although most of those do fall into the categories identified above. This is to request that you undertake immediately a performance review of each program so identified in the attached chart and submit with your proposed revision of the Academic Master Plan a detailed explanation as to why the respective low-degree-production program should not be phased out on your campus, or consolidated with other existing programs, or on what grounds it should be retained.

Specifically, any undergraduate or graduate degree programs which are currently producing less than the minimal number of degrees per year indicated above may qualify for retention if:

1. There is evidence in terms of increasing numbers of students enrolled in the major that the production of degrees is soon to increase considerably;

2. There is evidence that low degree production in 1969-70 represents a temporary fluctuation rather than a downward trend;

3. The program requires no courses for the major which are not also required for some other viable major or for fulfillment of General Education requirements; or

4. The program is a unique one not available to students at other State Colleges and is essential for the State Colleges to offer.

Also, following up on the preliminary discussion at the most recent meetings of the Deans of Academic Planning and the Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs, this is to request that you establish a formal performance review procedure for all existing

degree programs on your campus, in order to assess periodically both the quantitative and qualitative viability of each undergraduate and graduate program in the total context of your offerings. Please inform this office of any policies, procedures, and criteria developed on your campus for this purpose.

Review of existing degrees and degree terminologies has of course long been part of the annual Academic Master Planning process. We must now recognize the performance review of all ongoing programs as a major planning function at the campus and system levels.

GF:pz

Copies to: State College Presidents
Deans of Undergraduate Studies
Deans of Graduate Studies
Chancellor's Staff