#### DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 235 729

HE 016 704

TITLE

Annual Summary of Program Review Activities, 1981-82.

Commission Report 83-24.

INSTITUTION

California State Postsecondary Education Commission,

Sacramento.

PUB DATE

20 Jun 83

NOTE

36p.; Some tables may not reproduce well due to small

print.

AVAILABLE FROM

California Postsecondary Education Commission, 1020

Twelfth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814.

PUB TYPE

Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE

MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS

Agency Role; College Planning; \*College Programs;

College Role; \*Community Colleges; Enrollment Trends; Higher Education; Intellectual Disciplines; Planning

Commissions; \*Program Development; \*Program

Evaluation; Program Proposals; Public Education;

\*State Colleges; \*Statewide Planning

IDENTIFIERS

\*California; California Community Colleges;

California State University and Colleges; Mission Statements; Program Discontinuance; University of

California

#### **ABSTRACT**

The program planning and review activities of the California Postsecondary Education Commission and the public segments for 1981-1982 are summarized. In addition, recommendations for segmental action for the 1981-1982 year are offered. Information is provided on the number of proposals for new programs for the University of California (the University), California State University (the State University), and California Community Colleges. Each of the 1981-1982 proposals is identified by campus, program title and level, and date submitted, and comments of Commission staff on the proposals are included. Data are also provided on the number of proposals by discipline for the three public segments for 1978-1979 through 1981-1982. The Commission's rola in program review and segmental review activities are described, including information on programs or units that were discontinued in 1981-1982. Data are presented on projected and existing programs and 5-year enrollment trends in majors for the University and the State University. Attention is also directed to activities at the University and the State University to develop or revise mission statements for academic planning. (SW)



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EOUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.



The California Postsecondary Education Commission was created by the Legislature and the Governor in 1974 as the successor to the California Coordinating Council for Higher Education in order to coordinate and plan for education in California beyond high school. As a state agency, the Commission is responsible for assuring that the State's resources for postsecondary education are utilized effectively and efficiently; for promoting diversity, innovation, and responsiveness to the needs of students and society; and for advising the Legislature and the Governor on statewide educational policy and funding.

The Commission consists of 15 members. Nine represent the general public, with three each appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly, the Senate Rules Committee, and the Governor. The other six represent the major educational systems of the State.

The Commission holds regular public meetings throughout the year at which it takes action on staff studies and adopts positions on legislative proposals affecting postsecondary education. Further information about the Commission, its meetings, its staff, and its other publications may be obtained from the Commission offices at 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, California 95814; telephone (916) 445-7933.

# ANNUAL SUMMARY OF PROGRAM REVIEW ACTIVITIES 1981-82



CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, California 95814

Commission Report 83-24
Adopted June 20, 1983



# CONTENTS

	Page
REVIEW OF PROPOSALS FOR NEW PROGRAMS	1
Proposals of Each Segment Proposals Grouped According to Discipline	2 3
REVIEW OF EXISTING PROGRAMS	4
The Commission's Role in the Review of Existing Programs Segmental Review Activities During 1981-82	4 5
DEVIEW OF MICCION CONTROL	
REVIEW OF MISSION STATEMENTS FOR ACADEMIC PLANNING	10
University of California The California State University	10 10
REVIEW OF PROJECTED PROGRAMS	
	11
Projected Programs Requiring Commission Review	12
RECOMMENDATIONS	v
	14
APPENDICES	
A. Proposals for New Programs Submitted to the Commission, July 1, 1981 - June 30, 1982	15
B. Number of Proposals by Discipline, 1978-79 - 1981-82	21
C. Projected and Existing Programs and Five-Year Enrollment Trends in Majors, University of California and California State University Combined, 1983-1988	25



# ANNUAL SUMMARY OF PROGRAM REVIEW ACTIVITIES 1981-82

This report summarizes the program planning and review activities of the Commission staff and the public segments for the period between June 30, 1981 and July 1, 1982. It concludes with recommendations for segmental action during the coming academic year.

The Commission is required by the Education Code to "review proposals by the public segments for new programs and make recommendations regarding such proposals to the Legislature and Governor" [Section 22716(6)]. Shortly after its formation, the Commission requested the staff to prepare an annual report describing the nature and extent of its activities in regard to the program review function. This is the seventh in the series of annual reports.

# REVIEW OF PROPOSALS FOR NEW PROGRAMS

The sharp overall reduction in the number of proposals for new programs, a decline first noted in 1978-79, continued to be the pattern in 1981-82. Proposals from the University of California and the California State University fell below the number for any previous year, while those from the California Community Colleges remained at the much reduced level of the three preceding years. It is clear that the total from all three segments in 1981-82 represents the lowest number of new program requests from California's public colleges and universities in at least several decades. The following table illustrates the trend:

Number of Proposals for New Programs From Each Public Segment

er Neg	<u>UC</u>	<u>csu</u>	<u>ccc</u>	<u>Total</u>
1976-77 1977-78 1978-79 1979-80 1980-81 1981-82	17 15 13 12 9 5	29 20 17 16 17	93 101 55 . 43 51 . 43	139 136 85 71 77 62

Appendix A identifies each of the 1981-82 proposals by campus, program title and level, and date submitted, and presents selected comments of Commission staff on the proposals.

As has been true of most program proposals in recent years, few of this group required any major additions to the faculty or any additional expenditures for facilities or equipment. Many proposed the formation of new degree programs by a regrouping of courses already in the catalog or by the



addition of a new course or two to those already offered. It is quite apparent that few campuses these days will submit a request for a new program without having thoroughly analyzed the program's fiscal implications.

#### Proposals of Each Segment

The University of California submitted only five proposals to the Commission in 1981-32. Two of these were for Organized Research Units, including one to establish a branch of an existing Multi-Campus Research Unit in Geophysics and Planetary Physics at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. A good indication of how drastically the generation of new programs has declined within the University is to compare the five proposals received last year with the 24 submitted during a similar period ten years ago. How much of the virtual suspension of activity in creating new programs is due to budget-ary uncertainties and how much to a satisfaction with the curriculum in its present state of development is difficult to estimate. In any event, that so few proposals for new programs were forthcoming from nine campuses of the University during an entire academic year is still another indication of the changing academic climate in the 1980s.

The number of proposals from the State University also reached a new low in 1981-82, with only 14 being sent to the Commission. Four of these proposals—three for options under existing programs and the other for a self-supporting external degree program—required no Commission action because of a standing agreement about such cases. (They are sent for information, with Commission staff reserving the right to comment.)

Of the remaining proposals, four were for programs in Computer Science and two for master's programs in Taxation and in Accountancy. It is not surprising that almost half of the proposed programs should be in these fields because they are currently in highest demand. The demand in these few fields is in fact so preponderant, it is now noteworthy that several proposals in fields outside the business-high technology areas should also contain sufficient evidence and justification of need to warrant approval.

As with proposals from the University, it was apparent that all those reaching the Commission from the State University had been closely reviewed at all levels and had passed a more rigorous test than many proposals a few years ago would have been subjected to.

The 43 proposals sent to the Commission by the Community Colleges—a number which matches the previous low of two years ago—still represent a broad range of academic and vocational subjects. Six were for programs in basic academic subjects as some colleges are still in the process of rounding out their core curricula. The majority of proposals, however, were for trade and technical training programs aimed at a specific job market.

A problem noted in last year's report concerning proposals for programs already in operation was still in evidence in 1981-82. During the period covered by last year's report, the Chancellor's Office was in the process of developing its Program Administrative Review and Course Classification System documents and had urged colleges at that time to review their catalogs for any programs which had not been officially approved at the State level.

Thus some of the proposals for programs in existence noted in last year's report were attributable to this effort to clear the record. However, in 1981-82 when almost one of every five proposals were for programs already in operation, it seems as if there is more than a lingering catch-up process responsible for this number of irregularities. Again it seemed inappropriate to review such proposals as if they were presenting new programs. Instead they were recorded as evidence of a persistent difficulty which if not corrected would seriously discredit existing review procedures. It will remain on the Commission staff-Chancellor's Office staff agenda as an issue to be resolved as early as possible.

With the exception of the eight proposals for programs already in effect, most others met with Commission staff concurrence. As in the other segments, few programs proposed in the Community Colleges required additional equipment or new facilities. In a vast majority of cases, any new instructional staff required to offer the program were to be hired on a part-time basis, a practice which if overdone may not be in the last long-range interests of the institution, but which does simplify phasing out the program if demand slackens.

### Proposals Grouped According to Discipline

With the comparatively small number of new programs making their way through the review process during the last few years, it is questionable whether a grouping of proposals according to discipline will reveal anything other than a coincidental clustering of programs in a few fields. In 1981-82, however, the field with more proposals for new programs than any other was the one which could have been predicted--Computer Science. (Engineering had more proposals only because most trade and technical programs in the Community Colleges are included in this classification.) Business and Health Professions, although both were down from last year, tied for second in number of proposals. The remaining 43 proposals were scattered quite evenly throughout the curriculum, as indicated in the table in Appendix B.

When proposals for new programs for the past four years are compiled, some more definite patterns begin to emerge (Appendix B). By far, the largest number (49) were in Engineering, but this total is somewhat misleading because of the classification practice mentioned above. Otherwise, a few fields are well ahead of the rest in the number of new programs proposed. Business and Management has added 32 new programs since 1979, although this category also benefits from the inclusion of a number of certificate and associate degree programs in office and secretarial skills. The Health Professions added 28 new programs, 18 of them in Community Colleges. And 20 new programs in Computer Science were proposed between 1979 and 1982, half of these being from campuses within the State University.

On the opposite side of the scale were several disciplines which showed virtually no growth in the numbers of programs. The addition of new programs is in itself not necessarily an indication of the vitality of a given field of study. In fact, the field of Communications which added only two new programs during the last four years, is enjoying greater than normal growth in enrollment of majors.



In other fields with the least number of new programs in all three public segments--Library Science, Foreign Languages, and Area Studies--enrollments have also been falling recently, and the two conditions combined may point to difficulties ahead. In general, however, a four-year list of new program proposals is much too brief a record to use for this purpose. As the record extends itself, of course, it will become more valuable.

#### REVIEW OF EXISTING PROGRAMS

Since the mid-1970s, the review of academic and occupational degree programs has commanded increasing attention as an issue in higher education nationally. Most state coordinating agencies have issued guidelines, a host of books and. articles discuss procedures and problems, and the topic appears regularly on the agenda of professional meetings. One reason for the widespread interest in program review at the state level is the expectation that it may provide the mechanism for reducing the budgets of public colleges and universities. The early assumption that significant savings would result almost automatically from stepped up program review efforts has been tempered recently because experience has not borne it out. For one thing, many programs recommended for termination thus far have been marginal, low-cost, low-enrollment offerings that provided easy targets for review panels. Moreover, since major savings from eliminating programs can come only from the concommitant elimination of faculty psoitions, the difficulties associated with that action . remain to be faced after the program is gone. Any large scale reduction in faculty positions still attracts national attention as illustrated by the reaction to Sonoma State's announcement in May 1982 that it would be forced to cut more than twenty faculty positions. The evidence concerning savings to be achieved through the review process is, according to a recent survey by Robert J. Barak, "not yet in" (Program Review in Higher Education, Boulder, Colorado, 1982, p. 90).

### The Commission's Role in the Review of Existing Programs

As defined in the Education Code, the Commission's role in the review of existing programs is to establish in consultation with the public segments "a schedule for the segmental review of selected programs, evaluate the program review process of the segments, and report its findings to the Governor and Legislature." For several years, therefore, Commission staff have been surveying program review practices within the public segments, and the last four annual reports on program review activities have summarized reviews of existing programs in each of the segments.

As noted in previous reports, a mere listing of specific programs reviewed on each campus during a given academic year provides no indication of the rigor or objectivity of the reviews. Another difficulty in evaluating the effectiveness of program review on an individual campus is that the results of the review often do not lend themselves to summary appropriate for distribution beyond the campus, dealing as they frequently must with sensitive personnel matters. One measure of the seriousness of the review process, of course, is the number of programs recommended for actual elimination. To

date, however, the Commission has not considered the elimination of certain numbers of programs each year an appropriate or necessary goal for the campus review process. Instead, the Commission regards this periodic review of each-program as a safeguard--if reductions must be made--against arbitrary. and ill-considered programmatic decisions. For a number of years, the Commission has encouraged segmental offices to oversee the adoption of a schedule on each campus and to work toward uniformity and thoroughness of review procedures. In its revised program review guidelines adopted in December 1981 ("The Commission's Role in the Review of Degree and Certificate Programs," Commission Report 81-31), the Commission emphasized the importance it attaches to systematic curricular review by adding two requirements to those contained in the original guidelines: (1) the annual academic master plan submitted by each segment should identify all programs scheduled for review on each campus during the next two years; and (2) the summary of program review activities to be submitted by each segment on November 1 each year should contain more information than heretofore about the nature and extent of each review listed.

The action of the State University Board of Trustees in 1971 requiring each campus to establish procedures for the periodic review of all programs antedated by several years the groundswell of interest in program review later in the decade. As a result, campuses of the State University were ahead of most public colleges and universities in instituting regularly scheduled reviews of their programs. Since then all campuses of the University of California have also established schedules for the review of existing programs on a five to seven year cycle. For a variety of reasons, progress within the Community Colleges is more difficult and the Chancellor's Office has still been unable to complete a comprehensive survey of review practices throughout the segment.

### Segmental Review Activities During 1981-82

University of California: In addition to the regularly scheduled campus reviews of individual programs and departments, two significant actions were announced by the University in 1982. At the Regent's meeting in February, President Saxon and Vice President Frazer announced a plan to cut some \$2.5 million from general campus programs and \$6.5 million from health sciences programs. The general campus reductions would involve 750 students and 43 faculty positions. While details of the plan were not revealed, it was made clear that reductions would be selective, since further across-the-board reductions threatened the quality of all programs.

Meanwhile, the University was increasing markedly the number of University-wide program reviews under a policy issued by the President in September 1980. The policy authorized such reviews when comparative evaluations of programs on the various campuses were necessary to decisions that had to be made at the systemwide level. In essence, reviews were to be undertaken when (1) resource contraints may call for a reduction in number or intercampus consolidation of programs, or (2) a program offered on a few campuses should perhaps be offered on an additional campus. At the present time, reports of the reviews of Law and Engineering programs have been completed, and reviews of programs in Foreign Languages, Education, Sociology, Psychology, Mathematics, and those in the related fields of Administration, Busi-



ness, Management, and Public Policy are either in progress or soon to get underway. In addition, a general review of humanities programs by each campus was requested as part of the process of revising graduate enrollment plans.

On the campuses, the reported reviews generally seemed to represent a sufficient number to assure coverage of most programs on a five to seven year cycle. In a few cases, however--for example, Riverside which reported reviews of only four graduate programs and Irvine of only nine Ph.D. programs---there were too few to come close to staying on schedule. As we have observed in earlier reports, the demands of adhering to a strict schedule for reviewing between 100 and 150 degree programs every five years are relentless, and the costs in time and energy are significant.

Review activity within the University led to the discontinuation of eight degree programs, two certificate programs, and one Organized Research Unit during 1981-82. Even though a large majority of these were on a single campus, the number can be compared to only two programs and two ORUs terminated a year earlier.

The following programs or units were discontinued in 1981-32:

<u>Program/Unit</u>	Campus
Systems Ecology, BS	Riverside
Economics/Administrative Studies, BA	Ri <b>v</b> erside
Middle Eastern Studies, BA	Santa Barbara
Russian Area Studies, BA	Santa Barbara
Physical Education, BA	Santa Barbara
Ergonomics, MA	Santa Barbara
Social Sciences, General, BA	Santa Barbara
African Area Studies, BA	Santa Barbara
French Translater-Interpreter, Certificate	Santa Barbara
Spanish Translater-Interpreter, Certificate	Santa Barbara
Jepson Herbarium, ORU	Berkeley

California State University: When the Board of Trustees in 1971 resolved that each campus should establish procedures for the review of existing programs, their primary intent was to ensure quality in programs not to eliminate them. The maintenance of quality is still the fundamental purpose for most of the regularly scheduled review of programs on college campuses. Still, in a policy statement on program discontinuation issued in January 1979, the Chancellor suggested (among other stipulations) that program discontinuation should "normally result from regular or ad hoc reviews of

programs . . " which is, of course, the only reasonable approach. This policy statement also requested each campus to develop detailed local procedures for discontinuing programs. Even though fourteen campuses thus far have such procedures in place, and despite the impressive number of programs again reviewed on all State University campuses, few programs were recommended for discontinuation during 1981-82.

The annual summary of completed reviews from each campus, presented to the Board of Trustees in January, provides an excellent record of review efforts throughout the State University. Few reviews, however, no matter how questionable the program's vitality may sound from the report, propose eliminating it. Perhaps the review committee at this level cannot realistically be expected to make many such recommendations. Whatever the case, only eight program discontinuations, the same number as during the preceding year, have been effected since January 1982:

Program	Campus
Corrections, BA (Converted to Option under BA in Social Work)	Sacramento
Sociology, MA	San Francisco
Biology, BA (retain BS in Biology)	Los Angeles
Environmental Health Science, BS	Los Angeles
East Asian Studies, BA	Humboldt
Business Education, BA	Chico
Mathematics, MA	Sonoma
Expressive Arts, BA	Sonoma

California Community Colleges: One indication of program review activity within the Community Colleges is the following list of programs deleted in 1981-82. Even though no reasons for elimination are given and some may have existed only as "paper" programs, still the 133 associate and certificate programs listed below suggest some attention to curricular evaluation on at least 38 campuses. (By the same token it might be said that for 68 others we have no such indication.)

Half of the colleges reporting deletions eliminated only one program, and most of the rest between two and five. One college, however, dropped 26, programs; two others, ll and ten.

The list, drawn from information provided by the Chancellor's Office, groups programs according to the classification of instructional programs currently in use within the Community Colleges,



Certificate and/or Degree Program	Colleges Deleting Program	Certificate and/or Degree Program	Colleges Deletin Program
Forestry	Cabrillo Chaffey	Design/Drafting Electronics	L. A. Harbor Chaffey
Environmental Design, Gen.	Cabrillo Chaffey	Tech. & Occ. Curricula	L. A. Harbor Santa Ana
Urban Planning Technology	Chaffey Orange Coast .	Industrial Electronics Electrical - Power	Canyons Chaffey
Interior Design	L. A. Harbor	Instrumentation Tech.	Cerritos
Botany, General	Chaffey Desert	Bio-Medical Instrumentation / Mechanical Tech., General	L. A. Trade-Tech Coastline
Bacteriology -	Chaffey Desert	Refrigeration Systems	Desert L. A. Trade-Tech
Zoology, General	Chaffey Desert	Diesel Mechanic	Kings River
Physiology (Incl. Anatomy)	Desert	Heavy Equipment Maintenance Commercial Pilot	Santa Ana
Business & Commerce, Gen. Banking (Management)	Southwestern Chaffey	Aircraft Electronics	Sacramento
Credit Management	Chaffey	Carpentry	Southwestern
Business Management	Coastline	Chemical Tech. (Incl. Plas.)	Orange Coast
Hotel & Restaurant Mgmt.	Chaffey L. A. City	Industrial Tech., General	Chaffey Desert
Apparel & Accessories	L. A. Harbor	Surveying	Chaffey
Food, Wholesale & Retail	L. A. Trade-Tech.	Public Works Inspection	Fresno Coastline
Merchandising (Incl. Sales)	L. A. Harbor L. A. Trade-Tech.	Sanitation & Pub. Hlth. Tech.  Industrial Safety Tech.	L. A. City
Materials Support	Moorpark Chaffey	Dramatic Arts	Canyons Imperial Valley
Insurance	Cerritos	Applied Design	Orange Coast
Clerical	Cosumnes River L. A. Harbor	Graphic Arts Technical Illustration	Chaffey Chaffey
Labor & Industrial Relations	Chaffey		
Other Business	Pasadena	Med. Asst. & Med. Of. Asst. T.	
Communications, General	Canyons	Dental Assistant Dental Hygienist	Grossmont Chaffey
Advertising	L. A. Harbor Moorpark	Medical Lab Assistant	Chaffey
Computer Programming, Sci.	Orange Coast	Physicians Asst., General Optical Techician	Cerritos Crafton Hills
Education, General	Cabrillo Orange Coast	Physical Therapy	Chaffey
Health Education	Desert Santa Barbara	Medical Record Librarianship Medical Record Technology	L. A. Harbor L. A. Harbor
		Mental Health Aide	L. A. Harbor

Certificate and/or Degree Program	Colleges Deleting Program
Clothing & Textiles	L. A. Trade-Tech.
Clothing Design	Foothill
Clothing Merchandising	L. A. East
Consumer Education	Yuba
Child Dev. & Lab.	Merced
Dietetics Supervisor	Chaffey
Law, General	Desert
Legal Assistant	Orange Coast
Comparative Literature	Cosumnes River
Religious Studies	Chaffey
Librar Science, General	Chaffey
Library .ech. or Aide	Canyons Fresno Riverside Saddleback San Diego Miramar
Physics, General	Taft
Chemistry, General	Taft
Astronomy	Desert
Atmospheric Sciences	Desert
Public Administration	Moorpark
Public Works Tech.	Fresno
Parks & Recreation Mgmt.	Southwestern
Social Work & Helping Svs.	Cerritos
Social Work Aide	San Jose
Probation & Parole	Saddleback
Industrial Security	Fresno Saddleback
Early Childhood Ed. Aides	Santa Ana
Child Development	Chaffey Cosumnes River
Parent Education	Chaffey
Education Aide	Canyons Moorpark Orange Coast
Recreation Assistant	Cosumnes River L. A. Harbor Moorpark
Fire Control Tech.	Grossmont L. A. City Santa Barbara Southwestern

Certificate and/or Degree Program	Colleges Delețing Program
Waiter/Waitress	Chaffey
Transportation	Palomar
Carpentry	Gavilan Southwestern
Plumbing & Pipefitting	San Jose 🐷
Glazing	L. A. Trade-Tech. San Diego City
Millwright	San Diego City
Ironworker	San Diego Mesa
Welding & Cutting	Fresno L. A. Pierce
Cooks & Bakers	Pasadena San Diego City

: <del>)</del>.



#### REVIEW-OF MISSION STATEMENTS FOR ACADEMIC PLANNING

Program review, whether of new or existing programs, is only one aspect of academic planning—the determination of all policies relating to the instructional and research functions of colleges and universities. Academic planning in this broad sense establishes a context for the review of existing programs and indicates whether proposed new programs are appropriate additions to the curriculum of a particular campus.

An essential phase of academic planning is the development of missions statements in which campuses set forth their own special purposes, goals, strengths, and plans for the future—all in relation to their history, geographic location, and other distinctive features. Such statements are important exercises in institutional self-definition and, if periodically revised, provide direction for day—to—day decisions and future plans of individual campuses.

In all three public segments, development of new or revised campus mission statements is actively underway, as the following paragraphs reveal. In the University, the revisions are already completed. In the State University, three campuses had completed such statements as of January 1983, and all others are well along in the process. With the Community Colleges, State and district officials are discussing the possibility of expanding the districts' five-year plans by coordinating them with the self-study reports required for regional accreditation. At this point, it is difficult to estimate when statements of this kind might be completed.

#### University of California

At the University, the recently completed "campus planning statements" mark the culmination of an intensive University-wide planning phase initiated in 1979. Each statement went through a number of revisions after being reviewed by APPRB and Systemwide Administration, among others. They all contain detailed accounts of enrollment patterns, student and faculty characteristics, curriculum, and physical plant—in short, all aspects of campus life, with often candid assessments of problems in one or more of these areas.

Apart from their value as narrative records of the academic situation in our time, these documents represent an essential step in identifying those special strengths on individual campuses that might constitute nuclei for centers of excellence in those fields. Along with the systemwide reviews mentioned earlier, they make possible a much more informed judgment about which, if any, programs should be consolidated or phased out and which should be reinforced.

#### The California State University

Since 1967, the Trustees of the State University have required that five-year plans of new degree programs be updated annually. In 1979, the Project Team on Academic Programs, created in response to Proposition 13 reductions,



recommended that the review of existing programs be coordinated with the planning of new programs, that curriculum changes of all kinds be related to campus mission, and that any campus which had not developed a statement of missions and goals should do so. The Team also called for the creation of a standing committee on academic planning. That committee—the Committee on Academic Planning and Program Review—followed through with the request for a comprehensive plan from each campus consisting at least of a mission statement, planning assumptions, and a five-year curricular plan. Among other purposes to be served by these documents, the Committee listed that of identifying "existing or planned areas of curricular excellence" which the campus wishes to target for special development or recognition. The plans should "emphasize and clarify those elements of the campus mission which are unique."

Clearly, the Committee regarded the development of these plans as groundwork for future decisions concerning program additions, reductions, and consolidations—just as University of California officials have viewed the planning statements in that segment. The three completed mission statements from State University campuses, however, are at so high a level of generality and abstraction that their value for this purpose seems questionable. In each case, special strengths must be more or less deduced from either geographic location or the list of degree programs the campuses offer. Yet despite the absence of detail in these statements, they do present in broad outline an educational philosophy that periodically needs to be reaffirmed. They express a commitment to the liberal arts and sciences as the foundation of the educational program and as the basis for a rewarding and constructive life. Mission statements from the other 16 campuses, now in various stages of development, will be presented to the Board of Trustees when completed.

### REVIEW OF PROJECTED PROGRAMS

The original guidelines outlining the Commission's role in program planning and coordination recognized the importance of the early screening of programs proposed for initiation a year or more in the future and requested that the segments annually submit updated master lists of projected programs along with their inventories of existing programs. Commission staff began reviewing lists of projected programs in 1976, and on the basis of criteria developed in consultation with the Intersegmental Review Council, identified in its annual reports those projected programs which appeared to represent possible unnecessary duplication or which, for a variety of reasons, appeared to be of questionable need.

This process was temporarily disrupted in 1979-80, when the uncertainties resulting from Proposition 13 prevented the segments from revising their five-year plans on schedule. The Commission's last two annual reports, therefore, have not dealt with projected programs.

In its revised guidelines issued in December 1981, the Commission reasserted its belief in the importance of advanced screening of projected programs by calling for a brief statement to accompany each projected program listed in the updated segmental master plans. The Commission asked that such statements

contain "a description of the program and the reasons for proposing it, the relationship of the program to existing programs and to the mission of the campus, its new staff and facilities requirements, and the possible date for the program's initiation." The University and State University complied with this request by gathering descriptive statements for each projected program listed in the master plan, even those whose implementation is clearly three to five years in the future. These materials have proven to be as valuable as anticipated in the initial screening of projected programs and obviously have allowed for more informed preliminary judgment than having only the program's title.

#### Projected Programs Requiring Commission Review

With the additional information contained in the statements, it is possible to separate projected programs that from a statewide perspective raise no serious questions concerning possible unnecessary duplication from those which may be questionable on these or other grounds. From the complete list of programs projected on all campuses of the University and State University attached as Appendix C, Commission staff has identified those which, for a variety of reasons, it feels should be reviewed with particular care; if the campus decides to develop proposals for these programs they should be submitted (assuming approval at all stages of the segmental process) for regular Commission review. If any projected programs not on the following list reach the proposal stage, these proposals should be thoroughly reviewed within the segment and, if approved, can be sent in summary form to the Commission primarily for information.

The projected programs that at this stage seem to require Commission review, grouped according to the reasons for identifying these programs, are listed below. Such a grouping is somewhat arbitrary, of course, since a variety of considerations must enter into the determination of need for each program.

Joint Doctoral Programs: Since the Commission is required by statute to participate in the review and approval process for joint doctoral programs, the following proposals for such programs will naturally receive special consideration:

#### Program

#### Campuses

Communicative Disorders
(Speech Pathology and Audiology)
Biology

UC, San Diego, San Diego State UC, San Diego, San Diego State

<u>Doctoral Programs</u>: By their very nature, proposed Ph.D. programs require careful consideration at all stages of the review process. The Commission therefore will continue to review all proposals for new doctoral programs including those currently projected:

Program

Campus

Cell and Developmental Biology Neurobiology Communication Computer Science Bioengineering Engineering Science Musical Arts (DMA) Exercise Physiology and Nutrition Environmental Toxicology	Davis Davis San Diego Santa Barbara BerkeleySan Francisco (Joint) Santa Barbara San Diego Davis
Bioengineering	
Engineering Science	Santa Barbara
Musical Arts (DMA)	San Diego
Exercise Physiology and Nutrition	
Environmental Toxicology	Irvine
Nursing	San Francisco
Cognit Science	San Diego
Demography	Davis (with Berkeley and Santa Cruz)
Economics	Irvine

Projected Programs in Fields with Many Existing Programs: In some fields, a number of programs are proposed to be added to the many already available. Some or all of the following new programs may be justified, but each should be reviewed on its own merits:

Program	Degree	Campus
Theater Art Art Art Art Art Art Art Art Art Ar	BFA BFA BFA, MFA BFA, MFA BFA MFA MFA MFA MS MS MS MS	Santa Barbara Chico Dominguez Hills Fullerton Los Angeles Sacramento San Diego State San Francisco Sonoma Bakersfield Sacramento San Francisco State Sonoma

Projected Programs with Questionable Student or Societal Demand: The following programs are in subjects which during the past few years have shown declining enrollments of majors at the degree level proposed and/or for which employment prospects are uncertain:

Program	<u>Degree</u>	Campus
Natural Resources Forest Resources Health Science Health Science Architecture Native American Studies	BS BS BS MS BArch, MArch BA	Chico San Luis Obispo Pomona San Bernardino San Diego State Sonoma

Home Economics		MS .	Chico
Criminal Justice	•	BS	San Diego
			(Imperial Valley Campus)

<u>Uncommon Programs</u>: A few projected programs are sufficiently distinctive that they should be examined at all levels of the review process:

Program	<u>Degree</u>	Campus
History of Public Policy	BA	Santa Barbara
Arts Management	MA	Dominguez Hills
Art Therapy	MA	Los Angeles State
Nuclear Medicine Technology	BS	Dominguez Hills
Museum Studies	MA	San Francisco State
Public History	MA	San Diego State

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. Because levels of funding and patterns of enrollment remain uncertain, the segmental office of each public segment should continue to expand its role in the program planning and review process, enforcing strict standards of priority and justification in the approval of new programs, promoting and monitoring campus review of existing programs, and sponsoring systemwide reviews of programs in more and more fields of study.
- 2. The segmental offices should continue efforts to identify certain campuses as centers for specialization and distinction in specified fields of study and should report their progress on this recommended action to the Commission by February 1, 1984.
- 3. The Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges should comply with the request to provide information as specified in the Commission's revised guidelines (The Commission's Role in the Review of Degree and Certificate Programs, pp. 5-8), especially the following items:
  - a. A list of projected programs on all campuses with a brief descriptive statement for each program.
  - A summary of program review activities on each campus for the preceding academic year.



### APPENDIX A

# Proposals for New Programs Submitted to the Commission July 1, 1981 - June 30, 1982

### UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

	•			•
Date	Campus	Program	Danuar	
11/1/31	Riverside		<u>Degree</u>	Commission Staff Comment
	kiverside .	Computer Science	MS	With a strong computer science orien-
		•		tation on the part of the Mathematics faculty, some recently acquired equip-
				ment, and several years' experience with a bachelor's level program, the
		<b>.</b>		prospects for offering a quality grade
•	Y.	1		uate program are goodas are employ- ment prospects for graduates. Concur.
11/6/81	Riverside	Dance History	MA	Although not likely to attract large
				enrollments, this program represents a
			•	distinctive and worthwhile experiment in graduate education, both in content
				and design. The proposed use of fac-
				ulty from several campuses seems com- mendable. However, it should be
	:	-		closely monitored until it can demon-
11/10/81	Ioo Appalas			strate viability. <u>Concur.</u>
	Los Angeles	American Indian Studies	MA	The existing resources at UCLA make it
		:	•	the appropriate campus to offer this interdisciplinary program, possibly
			•	the first of its kind in the country.
	•		•	Staffing needs will be supplied by participating departments. Concur.
11/20/81	San Diego	Laboratory for Mathe-	ORU	Such a Laboratory should clearly be
		matics and Statistics		valuable in its relations to Scripps
•		•		Institute, the School of Medicine, the Salk Institute, and the campus at
			•	large. The proposal insists that no
				additional State faculty will be re- quested for this ORU and expects it to
				attract extramural grants and research
6/14/82	At the Lawrence	A homenah ar a	<u>ي</u>	contracts. <u>Concur</u>
· - ·	Livermore Na-	A branch of the Insti- tute of Geophysics and	Multicampus	This proposal, similar to a recent
	tional Labor- atory	Planetary Physics		action which brought the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory into the Insti-
•	,,	•		tute, is intended to provide greater access for University scientists to
				the facilities of the Laboratories and
	9	• .		expand opportunities for collaboration between campus-based faculty and lab-
'	,			oratory staff. Concur.
		CALIFORNIA STA	TE UNIVERSITY	
8/5/81	Dominguez Hills	Public History and His-	MA <sup>-</sup>	After suggesting a modification in the
		toric Preservation		original proposal, we were satisfied
•		•		that the response of the Chancellor's Office and campus met our concerns.
•		•		The program aims to equip students
				with historians' skills applicable outside the academy. Concur.
8/21/81	San Francisco	Classics	., MA	Approaching this proposal with a quite
••		•		negative preconception as to need we
	<del>-</del>			found that its objectives were worthy; it would be the only program of its
		•	0.4	kind in the system, and it could be
	• .	-15	<i>[</i> ]	offered with no additional resources. It seemed deserving of a chance.
•	•		•	Concur.

Concur.

ERIC

Full Text Provided by ERIC

### CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

			•	•
Oate	Campus	Program	Degree	Commission Staff Comment
8/26/81	Pomona	Nutrition and Food Man-	MS	Proposal sent as Information Copy.
		agement (Option under		No Commission action.
	•	existing M.S. in Agri-		· ·
		culture)	•	,
9/28/81	Los Angeles	Computer Science	BS	The program appears sound in all details.  Concur.
1/12/82	San Jose	Criminal Justice Admin-	<b>M</b> S	Proposal for a Cooperative Self- Support External Degree program
52	•	25012020		offered on campus of Chaminade, Univer-
		. •		sity in Honolulu and sent as Informa-
	*****			No Commission Action Required.
1/18/82	Northridge	Taxation	MS	This proposal raises the question of
				whether a program of this kind might
				not be offered on a self-support
			•	basis. All courses will be in the evening, most students will already be
	* *	. )		employed full-time, and many employers
r		÷		stand ready to subsidize costs. In
				the absence of policy guidelines, how-
		/		ever, we must accept the proposal which, in itself, is impressive and
•	•	/		thorough in its presentation. Concur.
244400				
3/4/82	San Diego	Option in Musical Theater under M.F.A. in Drama	MFA	This is a good example of a campus
		dider H.F.A. In Diama		capitalizing on existing strengths to offer, at modest additional cost, an
		-3	v	interesting and distinctive program.
-				Acknowledged.
3/10/82	San Diego	Women's Studies	BA	While we have regarded women's studies
<del>,</del> ,		,		as a valid, interesting, and timely
•	•	•		undergraduate major program, the wis-
ř	•	•	•	dom of establishing a separate depart- ment of women's studies and offering
	• •			the program as a departmental major is
	•		* A	open to question. The departmental
	•			organization of a campus is beyond our
				purview, however, and this department already exists. Concur.
		,		
3/10/82	Sonoma	Computer Science	BS	Even though a BS in Computer Science
•		. •		has come to be regarded as virtually a core program, this one has exceptional
	*	· / / /	· .	staff, equipment, and facilities re-
•			**	quirements. We support the condition
				imposed by the Chancellor's Office
				that this program cannot be imple- mented until two new faculty members
•				are hired. The commendable feature of
				this program is its requiring a sec-
	u.			ondary field of each student. <u>Conditional Concurrence.</u>
3/10/82	<sup>°</sup> Pomona	Computer Science	MS	Since there seems to be no question
				about student interest or market de-
				mand in this field, even at the Mas- ter's level, the issue seems to be
,	*			finding faculty and resources to meet
			•	the need. It sounds in this case as
			•	if that is achievable. <u>Concur.</u>

# CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

	, _	•		ı
Date	Campus	Program	Degree	Commission Staff Comment
3/22/82	San Diego	Nursing	F	
	-8-	nut sing	MS	After questioning the justification
	· a			for the option in Community wester :-
		·		the original proposal and harden above
		•		clarified, we found this to be a
3/26/82	Los Angeles			strong proposal. Concur.
3, 20, 02	ros vudetes	Special Education	MA.	This proposal, sent as an Information
			4	Copy, is to elevate the existing op-
				tion in special education under at-
	*			MA IN Education to separate degree
	``	•		status. No Commission Action Required.
4/19/82	Stanislaus	Computer Science	BS -	
•	•	•	23	In view of the faculty, space, equip-
		*		ment, and courses already available,
				there seems little reason for the cam- pus not to offer a formal degree pro-
		•		
4/26/82	Hayward	Business Administra-		·
		tion/Accountancy	BS/MS	This proposal for a combined BS in
,		czou/accountancy		DUSTILESS AUDITISTRATION/NG
		•		Lanty Applies the "ebass/ ii .
1				ortucture In a way that gooms acres
				Die and academically count.
		•		To practical enough in a coroom dans to
				opment sense to have popular appeal remains to be seen. Since it will
				require no additional recourses
		•		
	* .			Concur.
		CALIFORNIA CO	MMUNITY COLLEGES	
7/8/81		,	WINDHILL COFFERES	)
//0/01	Mission	Printing Technology	AA/Cert.	Program seems to require an excep-
				tional number of new courses and there
			,	are several omissions in he proposal.
	+			After further explanation by the Cal
•	•			lege, objections were withdrawn.
		•		Concur.
7/9/81	Cabrillo	Asian Studies	AA ·	
			• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Proposal did not indicate whether ar-
			_ :	ticulation agreements had been worked
		•		out for what is essentially a transfer program. Upon inquiry, were assured
	•			
7/17/81	Chabot	Vocadas I V 4		Concur.
		Hospital Unit Secretary	Cert.	Since this program appears in the Col-
	•	Secretary		Tege's catalog, it must already be de-
				premented. It seems questionable
•				whether a separate program is appro-
ja.	.\			priate for such a specific and re-
	, \	, i	•	stricted occupational category.
	• \			Wouldn't it be preferable to offer this training as an option within a
	/-			medical secretary program? No Action.
7/18/81	San Mateo	Pest Control		
	\	rest control	Cert.	Well-done proposal. Concur.
8/13/81	Yuba	Nursing		· .
			AA	Program designed partly to allow up-
		•	,	Stading of LVNs. We duestioned the
			•	tardy submission of the proposal and stated several general concerns (auto-
i i	-	<u>\</u>		matic 19 credits awarded to LVN appli-
		\\`.	4 · *	cants, for example). After forebox
		.\ .		discussion with Chancellor's Office
		•		and campus, there was some resolution
	· · · · ·			of issues. Concur.



### CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Date	Campus	Program	Degree	Commission Staff Comment
8/18/81	Yuda	Psychiatric Technician	AA/Cert.	Program satisfies licensure requirements of Business and Profession's Code and job market seems favorable.
				Concur.
8/26/81 .	Skyline	Computer and Information Science	AA	Good proposal but submitted well after deadline for fall programs. Concur.
8/26/81	Santa Barbara	Drafting Technology	, <b>AA</b> 3 .	Proposal contains a brief but informa- tive history of drafting instruction in the campus. Other proposals might
	•		•	include something similar. Concur.
8/28/81	Fresno	Anthropology with Arch- eology Option	AA/Cert.	Well-designed program. Concur.
9/3/81	Los Angeles Trade-Technical	Solid Waste Management	AA/Cert.	Concur.
9/3/81	Coastline	Court Reporting	AA/Cert.	Contract program with proprietary school providing instruction. College went too far in making formal arrangements before review was completed.
•	٠ -			Concur.
9/8/81	Foothill .	Apprenticeships in: Plumbing Pipefitting		
		Refrigeration and Air Conditioning		Concur.
9/22/81	Los Angeles Southwest	Computer Operations	AA/Cert.	Received proposal several weeks after program was scheduled to begin.  No Action.
			44/0	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
9/23/81	Mission	Real Estace	AA/Cert.	Thorough proposal even though it seems a questionable time to be proposing a program in this field.  Concur.
9/23/81	Columbia	Welding Technology	AA/Cert.	Job market analysis in this proposal is rather casual especially since the EDD reports that are quoted don't make an overly strong case for a new weld-
,	•			ing program. Since all courses and equipment are in place however, it might as well be a program. Received proposal after deadline. Concur.
10/28/81	Columbia	Automotive Technology	AA/Cert.	Documentation of need is not especially convincing, but all courses and facilities are already in place.
		•		Concur.
11/19/81	Chaffey	Court Reporting and Machine Shorthand	AA	Proposal states that this program is "fully operational" as a non-degree program. It is difficult to understand how the College could have established this many highly specialized
	·			vocational courses without having in- dicated its intention to offer a degree program. Concur.
12/9/81	Sequoias	Paralegal	AA/Cert.	Well-developed proposal with a curric- ulum that some already established paralegal programs might wish to



# CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Date	Campus	Program	Degree	Commission Staff Comment
12/.9/81	V <b>ist</b> a	Mathematics		John John Double Comment
		Biological Sciences	· AA	
		Physical Sciences	AA	Concur.
12/30/81	Coastline	Electrical Maintenance	AA/Cert.	<del></del>
	u u		AA/ Cert.	Couldn't this have been an option under the existing Electrical Power
	,			program? At least there should be
				some indication of the relationship
			•	between the two programs. Concur.
12/30/81	Golden West	Biological Photography	AA/Cert.	Distinctive program that will require
				more careful supervision than most.
				It is not clear who is responsible for
		•		overseeing it or advising students in the program. Concur.
12/30/81	C			che program. <u>Concur.</u>
12/30/61	San Mateo	Nutrition and Foods	AA	Proposal makes a satisfactory case for
				this being separate from the AA degree
2///02				program in Home Economics. Concur.
3/4/82	Solano	Biology	AA	Concur.
3/10/82	Palomar	Construction Inspection	AA/Cert.	There are the second of
1	•	Plumbing	AA/Cert.	These programs, being offered for several years, somehow had never been
/		Carpentry		submitted for review. No Action.
3/25/82	Vista	English Language and	AA	
		Literature	, AA	Proposal suggests a few more courses will be added. If that doesn't happen
		• •		soon, the title of this program should
•	•			be changed since there is now no
				course that deals with English Litera- ture before 1900. Concur.
3/30/82				cure before 1900. <u>Concur.</u>
3/30/62	Mission	Engineering (General)	, <b>AA</b> .	According to the proposal, this pro-
				gram is already in operation with 327 students enrolled. No Action.
0.420.400		•		scudents enrolled. No Action.
3/30/82	Palomar	Interior Design	AA/Cert.	Proposal indicates that this program
				has been offered since 1977.
	•	•		No Action.
4/5/82	Los Angeles Harbor	Solar Energy Technology	AA/Cert.	Despite the negative assessment of job
	narbor .	2		prospects by EDD, this program seems
		•		justified if only because there is no similar program in the area. The ad-
•				visory committee, especially important
				in a field like this one, seems well
		• '		chosen here. Concur.
4/5/82	Mission	Chemistry	AA	Concur.
4/7/82	Los Angeles	Business Machine Main-	AA/Cert.	<del></del>
1	Southwest	tenance	AA/Cert.	The curriculum for the AA degree offers an especially well-balanced
į				program of instruction. One hopes
				that a number of students will opt for
:				the degree rather than certificate program. Concur.
/ /20/22				program. <u>Concur.</u>
4/20/82	Palo Verde	Custom Sewing and Alter-	Cert.	Except that the 46 units required for
		ation		the certificate seems well beyond the
				accepted maximum (perhaps because of that) this program looks thorough and
1				sound. Concur.
w 1				



### CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Date	Campus	Program	<u>Degree</u>	Commission Staff Comment
5/3/82	Palomar	Quality Assurance Control	AA/Cert.	Another program already in effect.  New staff on campus were apparently unfamiliar with review requirements.  No Action.
5/19/82	Columbia	Computer Science	AA/Cert.	It makes sense to group this series of existing courses into a degree program. <u>Concur.</u>
6/2/82	King's River	Information Systems	<b>AA</b>	This program is already in the catalog. No o Action.
6/2/82	Chabot	Word Processor II	Cert.	Concur.
6/2/82	Mission	Secretarial Science	AA/Cert.	Program has been in operation since 1979. No Action.
6/22/82	Cypress	Dance	<b>?</b>	This proposal is inadequately documented. It contains no degree category, no proposed curriculum, no indication of new courses, etc.  More Information.
6/25/82	Coastline	Optometric Technician	Cert.	This proposal, to contract with Southern California College of Optometry to train 20 Coastline students a year as Optometric Technicians, did not present convincing evidence of need. Follow-up discussions produced no additional justification.  Nonconcur.
6/29/82	San Bernardino	Piano Tuning	AA/Cert.	Although listed as an AA and certificate program, there is no discussion in the accompanying materials of the AA degree. With the requirements for either the one- or two-year certificate (optional), it is difficult to see how an AA degree could be completed in less than three years. We recommend not listing the AA degree.  Concur.

# APPENDIX B

Number of Proposals by Discipline, 1978-79--1981-82

	À		*.	,		ı
Discip1	ine	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	<u>1981-82</u>	Total
Agriculture a Resources	nd Natural (0100)*	~~. 				·
UC CSU CCC	TOTAL	0 0 1 1	0 0 2 2	1\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	0 1 1 2	1; 1 4 6
Architecture a	and Envi- esign (0200)					
UC CSU CCC	TOTAL	0 1 0	0 0 1 -1	0 1 0 1	0 0 1 1	0 2 2 4
Area Studies	(0300)					
uc csu ccc	TOTAL	1 1 0 2	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 1 1	1 1 -1 3
Biological Sci	lences (0400)	, , ,		1	;	
UC CSU CCC	TOTAL	1 0 1 2	0 1 0 1	1 0 1 2	0 3 3	2 1 5 8
Business and M	lanagement (0500)	i i				
uc csu ccc	TOTAL	0 0 6 6	0 1 4 5	2 3 9 14	0 2 5 7	2 6 24 32
Communications	(0600)		***	. •	. '	
UC CSU CCC	TOTAL	1 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 1	0 0	1 0 1 2
Computer and 1						•
Sciences	(00/00)				***	•
UC CSU CCC	TOTAL	0 3 2 5	0 2 0 2	1 1 2	1 4 4	2 10 8
0		· :	4	4	9	20

Discipli	ne	1978-79	<u>1979-80</u>	<u>1980-81</u>	1981-82	<u>Total</u>
Education	(0800)					
UC CSU CCC	TOT <sub>e</sub> L	0 1 5 6	0 0 2 2	1 2 1 4	. 0 1 0	1 4 8 13
Engineering	(0900)			•		
UC CSU CCC	TOTAL	1 2 12 15	0 3 7 10	0 2 9 11	0 0 13 13	1 7 41 49
Fine Arts	(1000)					
UC CS CCC	TOTAL	0 0 4	0'. 1 2 3	0 0 5 5	1 1 1 3	1 2 12 15
Foreign Langua	ges (1100)			•	•	٠,
UC CSU CCC	TOTAL	0 0 1	0 0 1 1	1 0 0	0 0 0	1 0 2 3
Health Profess	ions (1200)	)				
UC CSU CCC	TOTAL	3 2 3 8	0 1 6 7	1 2 5 8	0 1 4 5	4 6 18 28
Home Economics	(1300)					
uc csu ccc	TOTAL	0 1 7 8	0 0 3 3	0 2 0 2	0 0 1	0 3 11 14
Law (including Assistant)	Legal (1400)	·	-			
uc csu ccc	TOTAL	0 0 <u>1</u>	3 0 0 1	0° 0 2 2	0 0 1 1	1 0 4 5

	No.	· Marian		٥					
Di	scipl	ine	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	Total		
Letters		(1500)							
	UC CSU CCC	TOTAL	2 0 0 2	0 1 1 2	0 0 2 2	0 1 1 2	2 2 4 8		٠.
Library S	Scienc	e (1600)				•	•		
	UC CSU CCC	TOTAL	0 0 1 1	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 1 1		
Mathemati	ics ·	(1700)							
·.	UC CSU CCC	TOTAL	1 0 0 1	2 0 2 4	0 0 0	1 0 1 2	4 0 <u>3</u>		
Physical	Scien	ces (1900)							
	UC CSU CCC	TOTAL	1 0 2 3	1 1 0 2	1 1 1 3	1 0 2 2	4 2 5 11	,	
Psycholog	У	(2000)				*			
;	UC CSU CCC	TOTAL	0 1 1 2	0 1 4 5	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 2 5		
Public Af	fairs	and Ser- (2100)					:		
	UC CSU CCC	TOTAL	0 1 1 2	0 1 2 3	1 1 5 7	0 1 0 1	1 4 8 13		
Social Sc		s (2200)				1			
	UC CSU CCC	TOTAL	0 0 1	5 1 1 7	0 1 1 2	0 1 1 2	5 3 4 12		

Discipline		1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	Total
Interdisciplinary			. •	•		
Studies	(4900)				•	
UC		1	· · 0	1, '	1	3
CSU		2	0	. 0	1	3
CCC		_0_	1_	_2_	0	3 /
Te	OTAL	3	1	3	. 2	9
Apprenticeships						. /
UC		-	_	_	_	-
CSU			_	<b>-</b> .	_	_
CCC	,	_3_	2	2	3	10
T	OTAL	3	2	2	3	10

<sup>\*</sup> Number assigned to this instructional category in the Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS) of the National Center for Education Statistics.



#### APPENDIX C

Projected and Existing Programs and Five-Year Enrollment Trends in Majors, University of California and California State University Combined, 1983-1988

NOTE: The programs listed in the left-hand columns are projected programs reported by the University of California and the California State University, with asterisks indicating those programs requiring Commission staff review, as noted on pages 12-14 above. The right-hand columns indicate (1) the combined number of graduate and undergraduate degree programs in each subject in the two segments (with the number of doctoral programs noted in parentheses), and (2) the percentage increase or decrease in enrollment of majors between 1976 and 1981 in both the University and State University combined.

Program	Degree(s)	Campus	Date	Number of E UC & CSU Pr Graduate Ba	xisting ograms chelors	Five-Year Enrollme Graduate	UC & CSU nt Trend Bachelors
Agriculture and Natural Resources	,		•		<del></del>		
Resource Sciences	MAM	Davis	TEDa	1 .	4	+42.2	-22.0
Plant Science	MAM ·	u .	TBD	2 (1 D)	3	·	
Resource Manage- ment and Policy	MA	Santa Cruz	'83	1	4	+42.2	-22.0
*Natural Resources	BS	Chico	'83	1	4 .	+42.2	-22.0
Mechanized Agri- culture	BS	Pomona	'83	0	2	-	-
*Forest Resources	BS	San Luis Obispo	'83	3	3	+15.7	-15.7
Architecture							
**Architecture	BArch	San Diego St.	'83	4 (1 D)	4	+97.0	+31.8
*Architecture	MArch	H i H	. '85	4 (1 D)	4 .	+97.0	+31.8
Biological Sciences		,		<i></i>		•	
*Cell and Develop- mental Biology	PhD	Davis	'83	4 (3 D)	9	+80.5	+30.0
*Neurobiology	PhD	***	'83	5 (5 D)	2	+13.7	+6.2
*Biology	PhD .	UC-San Diego & San Diego St. (Joint)	83	23 (6 D)	27	-27.6	-25.2
Nutritional Science	MS	San Diego	'83	5 (1 D)	10 "	+15.9	-2.2
*Environmental Science	MS	Sonoma	<b>'</b> 84 .	6 (4 D)	14 <sup>b</sup>	<b>-7 .</b> 3	+133.3
Business and Manage- ment				. :	и		
Business Adminis- tration	МВА	Riverside	<b>'</b> 83	23 (4 D)	19	<del>.</del> 87.4	+27.9
	•	•					[



,		,		·			
Program	Degree(s)	Campus	Date	Number of Ex UC & CSU Pro- Graduate Baci	isting grams helors	Five-Year   Enrollmen Graduate	UC & CSU t Trend Bachelors
				<u>.</u> ,			
Accountancy	MS	Fullerton	'83	9 (8 Opts)	19	-1.6	+1.5
International Business	BA	11	'83	4	6	-10.0	+209.9
Accountancy	MS	Long Beach	'83	9 (8 opts)	19	-1.6	+1.5
Taxation	MS	и п	184	3	0 -		
Accountancy	MS	Northridge	'83	9 (8 Opts)	19	-1.6	+1.5
Administration	ВА	San Diego (I.V.C.)	<b>'</b> 83	23 (4 D)	19	+87:4	+27.9
Accountancy	MS \	San Francisco	186	9 (8 Opta)	19	-1.5	+1.5
Communications		. •/		•			•
*Communications	PhD	UC, San Diego	<b>' *</b> 85	8	15	-26.1	+62.4
Computer and Information Science							
*Computer Science	MS and PhD	Santa Barbara	'83	14 (6 D)	21	+94.6	+200:5
Computer Science	BS	Bakersfield	.184	14 (6 D)	21	+94.6	+200.5
Computer Science	MS -	Dominguez Hills	83	14 (6 D)	21	<del>+9</del> 4.6	+200.5
Computer Science	- MS	Fresno	184	, 14 (6 D)	21	+94.6	+200.5
Computer Informa- tion Systems	BS .	Humboldt	<b>'</b> 83		-	<b>-</b>	
Computer Science	BS	Long Beach	*83	14 (6 D)	21	+94.6	+200.5
Business Informa- tion Systems	BS	Los Angeles	183	0	2	<b>~</b> .	-
Business Informa- tion Systems	MS	" "/-	'85	. 0	2	-	. , -
Computer Science	BS	San Jose	<b>'</b> 83	0	2 .	+94.6	+200.5
Education	*	/					
Spacial Education (Learning Handi- capped)	Credential	Davis	TBD	12 (Opts)	18 <sup>c</sup>	+24.2	· · · · ·
Teaching and Learning	MA,	UC-San Diego	'83	8 (3 D)	o <sup>d</sup>	-31.8	. <b>-</b>
Educational Admin- istration	МА	Los Angeles	<b>'</b> 83	19 (Opts)	0	-	: <del>-</del>
Special Education	MA	San Francisco	183	16 (5 D)	0	<del>-</del> 8.7	-
Human Development	BA . ¬	San Bernardino	<b>'</b> 83	0	5		_
Child Development	BA	San Jose	84	1	10	-	

Program	Degree(s)	Campus	Date	Number of Existing UC & CSU Programs Graduate Bachelors		Five-Year UC & CSU Enrollment Trend Graduate Bachelors	
Engineering							
*Bioengineering	MS and PhD	UC-Berkeley, San Francisco	'83	6 (5 D)	5	+48.4	+103.4
*Engineering Scienc	e MS and PhD	Santa Barbara	'84	1 (1 D)	3	<del>-</del> '	
Engineering	BA	Santa Cruz	'83	11 (4 p)	13	+22.8	+53.3
Electrical Engi- neering	<b>EE</b> - ,,	Long Beach	183	12 (5 D)	17	+18.8	+78.6
Fine and Applied Art	<u>s</u>	. /				. *	
*Musical Arts	DMA	.UC-San Diego	'84	9 (5 p)	16	+56.9	+33.1 <sup>e</sup>
*Theater	BFA	Santa Barbara	'83	15 (4 D)	25 <sup>f</sup>	+49.1	-2.8
Dance	BFA	17 17	<b>'</b> 83	-5	14	-0.8	-13.8
*Art	BFA	Chico	: <sub>*83</sub>	16	25.	-21.9	-14.9
*Art	BFA	Dominguez Hills	'85	16	25	-21.9	-14.9
*Arts Management	MA	Dominguez Hills	* 184	0	. 0	-	_
*Art	BFA, MFA	Fullerton	'83	16	25	-21.9	-14.9
Theatre Arts	MFA	Long Beach	'83	15 (4 D)	25	+49.1	-2.8
Music	MM \·	11 0 11	'83	9 (5 D)	16	+56.9	+33.1 <sup>e</sup>
*Arc	MFA V	Los Angeles	'83	. 16	25	-21.9	-14.9
*Art Therapy	MA	es II II	'83	0	0	-	-
Music	MM ·	Northridge	<b>'83</b>	9 (5 D)	16	+56.9	+33.1 <sup>e</sup>
*Art	BFA	Sacramento	'83	16	25	-21.9	-14.9
*Art	MFA	San Diego St.	'83	16	25	<b>-21.9</b>	-14.9
Music	MM	. IT IT IT	184	9 (5 D)	25	+56.9	+33.1 <sup>e</sup> .
*Art	MFA	San Francisco	'84	16	25	-21.9	-14.9
Drama	MFA	er 11	'83	15 (4 D)	25	+49.1	-2.8
Dance	BA	et 11	184	5	14	-0.8	-13.8
Theater Arts	MFA	San Jose	'83	15 (4 D)	25 .	+49.1	-2.3
*Art	MA	Sonoma	'84	16	25	-21.9	-14.9
Health Professions	i .			).			
*Exercise Physiol- ogy and Nutrition	Cert. or MA, PhD	Davis	TBD	, o /		-	
*Environmental Toxicology	PhD	Irvine	'83	4 (3 D)	1	· -	



Program	Degree(s)		Date	Number of Existing UC & CSU Programs Graduate Bachelors		Five-Year UC & CSU Enrollment Trend Graduate Bachelors	
Health Professions (Continued)			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
*Communicative Disorders	PhD	UC-San Diego & San Diego St. (Joint)	'83	13	13	-0.6	-4.0
*Nursing	PhD .	UC-San Fran- cisco	183	7 (1 D)	18	÷54.9	+5.8
*Nursing	MS	Bakersfield	<b>'</b> 85	7 (1 D)	18	+54.9	+5.8
*Nuclear Medicine Technology	BS	Dominguez Hills	<b>.</b> '84	<b>o</b> /	0 .	· <b>-</b>	<b>-</b> 
Physical Therapy	BS	Northridge	<sup>'</sup> '83	, O	ż	-27.7	-8.6
*Health Science	BS	Pomona	'83	5	12	-39.1	-20.0
*Nursing	MS	Sacramento	'84	7 (1 D)	18	+54.9	+5.8
*Health science	MS	San Bernardino	'83	5	12	-39.1	-20.0
Speech Pathology	BS	и п	<b>'</b> 85 ,	; ; 13	13 .	-0.6	-4.0
Clinical Laboratory Science	MS	San Diego St.	'84 .////	2	15 <sup>8</sup>	-17.8	-29.2
Public Health	MS	San Diego St.	/83 /	9 (3 D)	5	+44.7	+76.4
Nursing	MS	San Francisco	/ <sub>'83</sub> /	7 (1 D)	18	+54.9	+5.8
Gerontology	BA	San Jose	'85	1 (1 D)	0 '	-	
Nursing	MS	Sonoma	/184	ή (1 D)	18	+54.9	+5.8
Home Economics		• /			.		
Food and Nutrition	MAM ·	Davis	TBD	3	10	+162.8	+6.7
Home Economics	MS .	Chico /	<b>'</b> 84	7	12 -	-35.7	-21.9
Home Economics	MA	Sacramento	'83	7	12	-35.7	-21.9
Nutritional Science	BS	San Bernardino	<b>'</b> 85	3	10	+162.8	÷6.7
Foods and Nutrition	BS,	San Diego	'83	3	10	+162.8	+6.7
Interdisciplinary			**			\ .	
Cognitive Science	PhD	UC-San Diego	'83	1 (1 D)	. 1	_`	- `
Museum Studies	MA	San Francisco	<b>'</b> 84	. 0	. 0		
Liberal Studies	MA	Sonoma	'83	0	19	· <b>-</b>	, <b>-</b>
Letters							•
Philosophy	BA	Stanislaus	<b>'</b> 84	11 (7 b)	26	-33.3	-22.8

Program	Degree(s)	Campus	Date	Number of Ex UC & CSU Pro Graduate Bac	disting ograms chelors	Five-Year UC & CSU Enrollment Trend Graduate Bachelors	
Mathematics							
Applied Mathematics	MS and PhD	Davis	183	7 (1 D)	13	+116.6	+138.3
Mathematics	BS (Add to BA)	Chico	'83	21 (8 D)	27	-9.4	<b>-7.0</b>
Physical Sciences		•		,		,	
Geology	BS (Add to BA)	Chico	'83	12 (5 D)	20	+14.3	+26.8
Geology	BS (Add to BA)	San Francisco	<b>'</b> 83	12 (5 D)	20	+14.3	+26.8
Geology	BS	Stanislaus	<b>'</b> 84	12 (5 D)	20	+14.3	÷26.8
Psychology Psychology	•					•	•
Psychology	<b>BA</b>	Sar Diego St. (IVA)	'83	26 (9 D)	26	-24.7	-13.5
Paychology	BS (Add to BA)	San Francisco	'83	26 (9 D)	26	-24.7	-13.5
Public Affairs and Services	•					·	
Rural Planning	MA	Chico	'85	0	0	•	
Public Administra- tion	BS	San Bernardino	'83 ·	18	17	-21.8	-16.2
*Criminal Justice	BS	San Diego St. (IVC)	'83	6	13	-47.3	-36.4
Public Administra- tion	BA	San Diego St. (IVC)	'83	18	17	-21.8	-16.2
Social Science	•						
*Demography	MA and PhD	Davis (with UC- Berkeley and Santa Cruz)	- TBD	1 (1 D)	Ò	•	
*Economics	PhD .	Irvine	'83	17 (6 D)	27	<del>-</del> 2.8	-2.2
*History of Public Policy	BA	Santa Barbara	'83	0	0.	•	· <b>-</b>
Chicano Studies	MA	UC-Los Angeles	'83	3	19	+30.9	-21.1
Deaf Studies	ВА	Northridge	'83	0	. 0		
*Native American Studies	ВА	Sonoma	'83	0 	2 .	-	-
Environmental Studies	MS	San Jose	185	3 (1 D)	11		<b>-</b> .
*Public History	MA	San Diego	'83	0	0 '		. <del>-</del>



- a. To be determined.
- b. Including Ecology.
- c. Credential.
- d. Including Education Psychology.
- e. Performance program in CSU only. Enrollments in performance programs in UC and all a here programs in both segments (classified separately) were down 26.4% at the bachelor's level 12.3% at the graduate.
- f. Including Dramatic Arts.
- g. Medical Laboratory Technician.

