Adopted: May 2 I. J996

ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNP/ERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

AS-459-96/LRPC
RESOLUTION TO
APPROVE POLICY AND REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR
DISCONTINUANCE OF AN ACADEMIC PROGRAM

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly approve the attached Policy and Review
              Procedures for Discontinuance of an Academic Program; and, 'be it further

RESOLVED: That the attached Policy and Review Procedures for Discontinuance of an Academic
              Program be forwarded to the President and Yice President for Academic Affairs for
              approval and implementation.

                                    Proposed by the Academic Senate Long-
                                    Range Planning Committee
                                    February 15, 1996
                                    Revised May 2 1, 1996

AS--159-96/LRPC: Revisions to
Resolution to Approval Policy and
Review Procedures for Discontinuance
of an Academic Program

-7-

Revision of March 20, 1997
by the Academic Senate Budget and
Long-Range Planning Committee

POLICY AND REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR
DISCONTINUANCE OF AN ACADEMIC PROGRAM

Many CSU campuses, including Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, may find it necessary to reduce faculty, support staff, and administrative positions due to enrollment declines or financial support reductions. ~~When~~ financial support is reduced, *The* discontinuance of programs or departments sometimes emerges as the alternative which does the least harm to the quality of remaining programs. Program and department discontinuance are valid ways of responding to reductions in resource's; however, program discontinuance can and must be accomplished with minimal impact. Program discontinuance decisions must be made in a reasoned way which will minimize damage to the institution ~~university~~ and to the majority of their programs. The process should be based on the fact that the university is a community with a responsibility for the well being and interest of students, faculty, staff, and alumni.

The following procedures have been developed in response to EP&R 79-10, January 26, 1979, Chancellor Dumke to Presidents, "Interim Policy for the Discontinuance of Academic Programs," and EP&R 80-45, June 12, 1980, Vice Chancellor Sheriffs to Presidents, "Clarification of Interim Policy for Discontinuance of Academic Programs." These documents outline general procedures for program discontinuance and request that campuses submit local discontinuance procedures.

I.   PROCEDURES

A.   Initiation of a discontinuance oroposal

A proposal to discontinue an academic program will ordinarily be the result of regular program review but a request for special ~~review~~ discontinuance may be initiated at any time by any of the following:

> a majority of the tenured and tenure track faculty of the affected department(s)
> the dean of any of the colleges involved in the program
> the Provost for the university
> the President for the university

The proposal shall ~~clearly~~ indicate that the proposed discontinuance is to be pennanent. The proposal shall be submitted to the Provost for review.

B.   Review of a discontinuance proposal

The Provost will review the proposal for discontinuance and accept or reject the ~~proposal either reject~~ the proposal of begin the discontinuance process within three calendar weeks, If the ~~request for review~~ is ~~approved~~ If the discontinuance procedure is to begjn, a discontinuance review committee will be appointed within the next three calendar weeks ~~after approval,~~ to conduct a review in accordance with the procedures outlined in this document and make recommendations to the Provost as required by the CSU Chancellor's Office.

C.   Apoointment of a discontinuance review committee

The discontinuance review committee will consist of two groups appointed by the Provost in consultation with the Chair of the Academic Senate.

The first group will include ~~six~~ persons (one ~~nonvoting~~):
1.   a nonvoting representative from the Academic Programs office (nonVoting), nominated by the Provost;
2.   two members of the deans Council representing colleges not involved in the program and nominated by the Chair of the Academic Senate;
3.   one student not involved in the program, nominated by the ASI President;
4.   two faculty representatives from colleges not involved in the program. nominated by the Chair of the Academic Senate; and
5.   a staff representative not involved in the program, nominated by the Provost.

The second group will include at least ~~five~~ persons:
1.   the dean(s) of the college(s) involved in the program [or a representative nominated by the deans(s)];
2.   the chairs/heads of departments or the coordinators of areas involved in the program;
3.   one student involved in the program, nominated by the ASI President; .
4.   faculty representatives involved in the program nominated by the tenured and tenure track faculty involved in the program There ~~will~~ be at least one ~~faculty~~ from each program inyolved if there is more than one program being ~~reviewed~~; .
5.   a staff representative involved in the program, nominated by the chairs/heads of departments or the coordinators of areas involved in the program;
6.   at leastone   graduate of the program nominated by the faculty involved in the program.

D,   Recommendations from the discontinuance review committee

The ultimate decision to discontinue a program rests with the Chancellor's Office. The purpose of the discontinuance review committee is to create a report for the President and Provost on the merits or lack of ~~merit~~ strengths and weaknesses of the program under review. If there is no opposition to the proposed discontinuance within the committee, the proposal will be forwarded to the Provost, with a report indicating that there is no opposition. If any of the committee members oppose the discontinuance. the discontinuance review committee will generate a report, using the following two step process,

In the first step, each group will elect its own chair and create a document describing the strengths and weaknesses of the program under review, and a justification of why the program should or should not be terminated discontinued. The documents must be generated within sixteen weeks after the committee has been appointed. The merits of the program shall be assessed using the elements described in Sections II and III below, and in the Academic Program Review and Improvement Guidelines. If appropriate, the documents shall include what remedies could be taken to address weaknesses, including a precise statement of goals and a time table to reach those goals.

The chair of each group shall make ~~the~~ its document available to all faculty the Cal Poly faculty members community for comments for four weeks. A written request for comments must be sent to all the faculty and staff directly affected by the potential discontinuance at the start of the period for comments. Jhe two groups will review the comments and revise their document as appropriate.

In the second step, immediately following the four weeks of comments, the two groups will exchange documents and provide a written critique of the arguments presented in the document from the other group within six weeks.

The two groups will [hen each select five votiog re.preseotaties"who will then merge into a single group, with the nonvoting representative from the Academic Programs office as chair. Within four weeks, the group will elec: a ~~chair~~ and joinfl.,'dis uss and amend the documents produced. The final version of the two anal vses, with the comments frem the ether groups critiques of the arguments presented, and with all the information deemed relevant, shall be bound in a single document (which,

at this p.oint should have a fonnat similar to what is produced by the state analyst to assist voters). A tally of how many committee members voting representatives are in favor or against discontinuance shall be part of the final document sent to the Provost, the Academic Deans' Council, and the Academic Senate for their review and recommendation.

E. Final decision on dis ontinuance of the program

The Provost. the Academic Deans' Council, and the Academic Senate \viII forward their recommendations to the President \vithin six weeks, and the President will make the final recommendation to the Chancellor's Office.

n. CONSIDERATIONS IN PROGRAM DISCONTINUANCE REVIEW

Considerations for program discontinuance will be similar to those for initiation of new programs. In addition to the program review criteria, the elements that will be considered in a final recommendation must also include, but will not be limited to:

1. the university Strategic Plan and Mission statement;-
2. the effectiveness of the program to meet the identified needs in meeting its goals and objectives:
3. The existence of programs within the CSU which could enroll students in this program a three-year history of student enrollment, a projection of future student enrollment, and the existence of s imilar programs within the CSU;
4. a three-year history of the student-faculty ratio, and the total cost per FTEF and per FTES for the program at Cal Poly and at other 'insttrutions offering comparable similar programs;
5. the effects of enrollment c h a n g e s on other instructional areas at Cal Poly;
6. the current or expected statewide or regional demand for graduates of the program;
7. the contributions of the program to the general education and breadth of students;
8. the effects of discontinuance on facilities,
9. the financial effects of discontinuance, including an estimate of the yearly costs or savings for the three years following discontinuance;
10. the effects on faculty and staff, including a description of what career opportunities \vithin the CSU will offer them: agreements to transfer to other departments or to may be' available; i.e. opportunities for temporary or permanent appointments at Cal Poly or visiting appointments in other branches of the CSU, retaining, etc-   -
11. the inpact of discontinuance on student demand.

ill. INFORMATION FOR PROGRAM DISCONTINUANCE REVIEW

The information considered during the evaluation of an academic program for discontinuance will contain all the information that is needed for the creation of a new program. In addition, the infonnation will include but will not be limited to:

A. The most recently completed Review of Existing Degree Programs with current statistical update;
B. The most recent accreditation report, if a program is accredited or approved, If the accreditation is over six years old. or if there is no accrediting body for the program; a review of the program by a panel of professionals outside the CSU with no contractual association with Cal Poly can be substituted for the accreditation report. 'provided the review has been completed within the last six years The re\-ie:\- shall contain all the elements included in' an accreditation report;

C.   If not contained in A or B:
    1.   FTEF required each quarter for the past three years
    2.   special resources and facilities required
    3.   number of students expected to graduate in each of the next three years;
D.   Conclusions and recommendations of the project team on Academic Programs, contained in the most recent edition of Academic Program and Resource Planning in The California State University.

TIME TABLE FOR PROGRAM DISCONTINUANCE

Initial step
1.   Proposal to discontinue an academic program received by the Provost.

Three calendar weeks after receipt of the proposal
2.   The Provost accepts or rejects the proposal.

Three calendar weeks after acceptance of the proposal
3.   Discontinuance review committee appointed.

Within sixteen weeks after appointment of the discontinuance review committee
4.   Initial report: Each of the two groups from the program discontinuance *review* committee produce their report and exchange it for the report from the other group.

Within four weeks after the initial reports ha e been exchanged
5.   Period of comments: Each of the two groups from the program discontinuance review committee solicit comments on the reports from the university at large.

Within six weeks after the end of the period of comments
6.   Critique of the initial reports: Each of the two groups from the program discontinuance review committee produce a critique of the findings produced by the other group.

Within four weeks after the critique of reports have been produced
7.   Final report: The two groups from the program discontinuance review committee jointly discuss and amend, if necessary, the final document and send it to the Provost, the Academic Deans' Council, and the Academic Senate.

Within four weeks after the critique of reports have been sent
8.   Recommendations: The Provost, the Academic Deans' Council, and the Academic Senate make recommendations to the President.

NOTE: A calendar week is five working days. Calendar weeks exclude summer ~~breaks~~ quarter and the breaks between quarters.

TIME TABLE FOR PRO(;RAM DISCONTINUANCE   fin weeks)

biriation of
:he proposal
                        |
Review by the |
\"ice President for ⊢3⊣
Academic Affairs I
                        |
Appointment of | 1-3-1
:he corrunittee |
                    1
First step of the | - - - - 1 6 - - - -
review

Period of   ⊢ 4 ⊣
comments

Second step of   ⊢ 6 ⊣
the review

Final document   ⊢ 4 ⊣
drafted

Review by   1 - - 6 - 1
upper levels

Final comments
:0 the President

Total time   : - - -- -- -- -- 42 weeks : - - - - - - - - - - - -

CAL POLY
SAN LUIS OBISPO

M e m o r a n d u m

Academic Senate

To: Harvey Greenwald, Chair
Academic Senate

Date: September 23, 1996

From: Warren J. Baker
President

Copies; Paul J. Zingg
Glenn W. Irvin
Michael Suess
Carlos Cordova

Subject; Initial Response to AS-459-96/LRPC Resolution to
Approve Policy and Review Procedures for
Discontinuance of an Academic Program

This is in response to the above subject Academic Senate resolution. The following are a number of initial observations of this Resolution. However. based upon the complexities involved, further administrative review by the Academic Deans' CounciL Faculty Affairs, and University Legal Counsel must be conducted. This review will begin this Fall Quarrer.

General Comments:

Throughout the document. references to the Vice President for Academic Affairs should be revised to refer to the *Chief* Academic Officer.

References to "school" should be revised to refer to colleges or other appropriate units.

Department "heads" should be revised to "chairslheads."

The process and information required by this policy should be consistent with the resolutions on external program review, the information required for program and course proposals, and the requirements of the Program Review and Improvement Committee.

Specific Comments:

Opening paragraph, sentence 2: as proposed. there is only one condition for discontinu::mce-- reduction of financial support. There could be others, some of them voluntary, such as loss of student enrollments. As an example, in the past, *this* policy was used to discontinue the master's degree in Chemistry at the request of the Department.

I.   Procedures

A.   Initiation of a discontinuance proposal. Tnis section states that a proposal to discontinue an academic program will ordinarily be the result of a regular program review. However, the opening paragraphs propose that discontinuance will occur only when there is a reduction of financial support.

The first bulleted item differentiates programs and departments, and requires a vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty in those departments to instigate a special review. This may result in procedural difficulties if a program includes more than one department.

B.   "\vill review the proposal for discontinuance" revise to "will review the proposal for special revie\v."   .   .

C.   The first group: 2: Two members of the Deans Council. The Deans Council's membership includes individuals who are not college deans. If the membership of this committee is intended to include college deans specifically, then please revise accordingly.

The second group: "Faculty representatives involved in the program,"--something has been omitted from this statement. Should it be item 4?

Last sentence in this section: revise to read: "There will be at least one faculty member from each program involved if more than one program is being revie\ved." Ho\vever, this requirement could make the memberships of these comInittees very complex. It is not merely a case of adding faculty members, but affects Items 1, 2, and 3 as well if the programs include more than one department and college.

D.   Recommendations from the committee:

First sentence: "merits or lack of merit," revised to "strengths and weaknesses."

Paragraph 2, sentence 1: "terminated," revise to "discontinued."

Paragraph 3: it is not clear who "all faculty members" in Sentence One refers to--all faculty members on the committees? Or in the affected programs/departments? Or in the University? Item 5 of the timetable suggests this may be all faculty members in the University.

Last par3graph in item D:

Sentence 1' the "eleven members" could be considerably larger given the conditions for membership set forth in Item C.

Sentence 2: it is not clear who the "other groups" are.

Reference to the document produced by the State Analyst: *this* is desirable, but perhaps not achievable. The State Analyst is a disinterested party; the document called for in this paragraph \vill not be produced by disinterested parties.

The process set forth in *this* paragraph may be workable, but it is not certain that the two groups can produce the report called for, or that it would not result in unnecessary bitterness and acrimony that could be avoided by having the two reports forwarded to the *Chief* Academic Officer, who will then have them reviewed according to the proposed procedure.

II. Considerations in Program Discontinuance Review

Item 2: "program to meet the identified needs," revise to: "program in meeting its goals and objectives."

Item 4: FTEF and FTES data from comparable programs in other institutions might be difficult to obtain. Funher, it might be problematic if the programs are not identical.

Item j: "sifts," revise to "changes."

J. Information for Program Discontinuance Revie\v

B. Sentence 1, revise to: "The most recent report of external revie\v, if a program is accredited or approved."

A "panel of professionals outside the CSU." This condition needs to be consistent with the requirements for external program review, \vhich may include reviewers from CSU institutions.

1. FTEF "required./ It is not clear what "required" means in *this* context.

Time Table for Program Discontinuance

Item 6: "produce a critique of the arguments," revise to "produces a critique of the fmdings."

Item 8: as the title to the items suggests, the Academic Senate \vould make "recommendations" to the President, not "a recommendation.."

I would appreciate the Senate's review and comments to the above suggestions.

State of California

RECEIVED

CAL POLY
SAN LUIS OBISPO

Memorandum

CCi   7 1997

To: Anny Morrobel-Sosa, Chair   **Academic Senate** Date: September 22, 1997
        Academic Senate

From: Warren J. Baker   Cc: Paul J. Zingg
        President   Harvey Greenwald

Subject: AS-459-96/LRPC, Resolution to Approve Policy and
           Review Procedures for Discontinuance of an Academic
           Program

Based upon the additional review conducted by the Academic Senate this past academic year on this
Resolution, based upon the initial response to this Resolution dated September 23, 1996, I am approving this
Resolution, subject to the following editorial changes:

1. Section ID, first sentence of the third paragraph: delete the words "members community". This change
    will make this sentence more clear.
2. Section lIIC1, replace the word "required" with "allocated and used." The word "required" is unclear in
    this context.
3. In the Time Table for Program Discontinuance, replace the word "produce" with "produces."

Please extend my appreciation to the Academic Senate and members of the Long-Range Planning
Committee for the work they have accomplished in improving this document.

ACADEMIC SENATE
Of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA

AS-482-97/LRPC

RESOLUTION TO
APPROVE REVISIONS TO AS-459-97/LRPC "POLICY AND REVIEW
PROCEDURES FOR DISCONTINUANCE OF AN ACADEMIC PROGRAM"

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly approve the attached revisions to the Policy and Review Procedures for Discontinuance of an Academic Program (AS-459-96/LPRC) passed by the Academic Senate on May 21, 1996; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the attached revisions to Policy and Review Procedures for Discontinuance of an Academic Program (AS-459-96/LRPC) be forwarded to the President and Provost for approval and implementation.

Proposed by: the Academic Senate Long-Range
Planning Committee
Date: May 2 7, 1997

Revisions to AS-459-96/LRPC:
Resolution to Approval Policy and
Review Procedures for Discontinuance
of an Academic Program

Revisions of May 27, 1997 (per AS-482-97/LRPC) to

POLICY AND REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR
DISCONTINUANCE OF AN ACADEMIC PROGRAM

Many CSU campuses, including Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, may find it necessary to reduce faculty, support staff, and administrative positions due to enrollment declines or financial support reductions. When finaneial SHpport is redHeed, The discontinuance of programs or departments sometimes emerges as the alternative which does the least harm to the quality of remaining programs. Program and department discontinuance are valid ways of responding to reductions in resources; however, program discontinuance can and must be accomplished with minimal impact. Program discontinuance decisions must be made in a reasoned way which will minimize damage to the instimtion university and to the majority of their programs. The process should be based 011 the Jact that tbe university is a community with a responsibility for the v ell bei ng and interest of stud 111 • faculty, staff. and alum ni.

The following procedures have' been developed in response to EP&R 79-10, January 26, 1979, Chancellor Dumke to Presidents, "Interim Policy for the Discontinuance of Academic Programs," and EP&R 80-45, June 12, 1980, Vice Chancellor Sheriffs to Presidents, "Clarification of Interim Policy for Discontinuance of Academic Programs." These documents outline general procedures for program discontinuance and request that campuses submit local discontinuance procedures.

I.   PROCEDURES

A.   Initiation of a discontinuance proposal
A proposal to discontinue an academic program will ordinarily be the result of regular program review but a request for speeial review discontinuance may be initiated at any time by any of the following:
            a majority of the tenured and tenure track faculty of the affected department(s)
            the dean of any of the colleges involved in the program
            the Provost for the university
            the President for the university

The proposal shall elearly indieate that the proposed diseontiol:lanee is to be permanent. The proposal shall be submitted to the Provost for review.

B.   Review of a discontinuance proposal
The Provost will review the proposal for discontinuance and aeeept or reject the proposal either reject the proposal or begin the discontinuance process within three calendar weeks. lithe reqHest for review is approved If the discontinuance procedure is to begin, a discontinuance review committee will be appointed within the next three calendar weeks after approval, to conduct a review in accordance with the procedures outlined in this document and make recommendations to the Provost as required by the CSU Chancellor's Office.

C.   Appointment of a discontinuance review committee
The discontinuance review committee will consist of two groups appointed by the Provost in consultation with the Chair of the Academic Senate agreement with the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate.

The first group will include ~~six~~ persons (one nonvoting):
1.   a nonvoting representative from the Academic Programs office (nonvoting), nominated by the Provost;
2.   two members of the deans Council representing colleges not involved in the program and nominated by the Chair of the Academic Senate;
3.   one student not involved in the program, nominated by the ASI President;
4.   two faculty representatives from colleges not involved in the program, nominated by the Chair of the Academic Senate; and
5.   a staff representative not involved in the program, nominated by the Provost.

The second group will include ~~at~~ least five persons:
1.   the dean(s) of the college(s) involved in the program [or a representative nominated by the deans(s)];
2.   the chairs/heads of departments or the coordinators of areas involved in the program;
3.   one student involved in the program, nominated by the ASI President;
4.   faculty representatives involved in the program nominated by the tenured and tenure track faculty involved in the program There will be at least one faculty from each program involved if there is more than one program being reviewed;
5.   a staff representative involved in the program, nominated by the chairs/heads of departments or the coordinator of areas involved in the program:
6.   at least one graduate of the program nominated by the faculty involved in the program.

D.   Recommendations from the discontinuance review committee
The ultimate decision to discontinue a program rests with the Chancellor's Office. The purpose of the discontinuance review committee is to create a report for the President and Provost on the merits or lack of merit strengths and weaknesses of the program under review. If there is no opposition to the proposed discontinuance within the committee, the proposal will be forwarded to the Provost, with a report indicating that there is no opposition. If any of the committee members oppose the discontinuance, the discontinuance review committee will generate a report, using the following two step process.

In the first step, each group will elect its own chair and create a document describing the strengths and weaknesses of the program under review, and a justification of why the program should or should not be ~~terminated~~ discontinued. The documents must be generated within sixteen weeks after the committee has been appointed. The merits of the program shall be assessed using the elements described in Sections II and III below, and in the Academic Program Review and Improvement Guidelines. If appropriate, the documents shall include what remedies could be taken to address weaknesses, including a precise statement of goals and a time table to reach those goals.

The chair of each group shall make ~~the~~ its document available to all ~~faculty~~ members the Cal Poly community for comments for four weeks. A written request for comments must be sent to all the faculty and staff directly affected by the potential discontinuance at the start of the period for comments. The two groups will review the comments and revise their documents as appropriate.

In the second step, immediately following the four weeks of comments, the two groups will exchange documents and provide a written critique of the arguments presented in the document from the other group within six weeks.

The two groups will then each select five voting representatives who will then merge into a single group, with the nonvoting representative from the Academic Programs office as chair. Within four weeks, the group will ~~elect a chair and jointly~~ discuss and amend the documents produced. The final version of the two analyses, with the ~~comments from the other groups~~ critiques of the arguments presented, and with all the information deemed relevant, shall be bound in a single document (which, at this point, should have a

format similar to what is produced by the state analyst to assist voters). A tally of how many ~~committee members~~ voting representatives are in favor or against discontinuance shall be part of the final document sent to the Provost, the Academic Deans' Council, and the Academic Senate for their review and recommendation.

E.   Final decision on discontinuance of the program
The Provost, the Academic Deans' Council, and the Academic Senate will forward their recommendations to the President within six weeks after receiving the final document, and the President will make the final recommendation to the Chancellor's Office.

II.   CONSIDERATIONS IN PROGRAM DISCONTINUANCE REVIEW

Considerations for program discontinuance will be similar to those for initiation of new programs. In addition to the program review criteria, the elements that will be considered in a final recommendation must also include, but will not be limited to:

1.   the university Strategic Plan and Mission statement;
2.   the effectiveness of the program ~~to meet the~~ ideHtified Heeds in meeting its goals and objectives;
3.   ~~The existence of programs within the CSU which~~ could emoll ~~students~~ iH ~~this program~~ a three-vear hi tory of student enrOllment. a projection of future student enrollment and the existence of similar programs within the CSU;
4.   a three-year history oEthe student-faculty ratio, and the total cost per FTEF and per FTES for the program at Cal Poly and at other institutions offering ~~comparable~~ similar programs;
5.   the effects of enrollment ~~shifts~~ changes on other instructional areas at Cal Poly;
6.   the current or expected statewide or regional demand for graduates of the program;
7.   the contributions of the program to the general education and breadth of students;
8.   the effects of discontinuance on facilities,
9.   the financial effects of discontinuance, including an estimate of the yearly costs or savings for the three years following discontinuance;
10.   the effects on faculty and staff, including a description of what career opportunities within the CSU ~~will~~ offer ~~them: agreements to~~ traHsfer ~~to other departments~~ or ~~to~~ may be available: i.e.. opportunities s for temporary Or permanent appointments at Cal Poly o   r   visiting appointments in other branches of the CSU, retraining, etc.;
11.   til   impact of discontinuanceon studel1t clemand.

m.   INFORMATION FOR PROGRAM DISCONTINUANCE REVIEW

The information considered during the evaluation of an academic program for discontinuance will contain all the information that is needed for the creation of a new program. In addition, the information will include but will not be limited to:

A.   The most recently completed Review of Existing Degree Programs with current statistical update;
B.   The most recent accreditation report, if a program is accredited or approved. If the accreditation is over six years old, or if there is no accrediting body for the program; a review of the program by a panel of professionals outside ~~the CSU~~ with no contractual association with Cal Poly can be substituted for the accreditation report, provided the review has been completed within the last six years ~~The review shall~~ cOHtaiH all ~~the elements~~ iHcluded iH aH acereditatioH ~~report;~~

C.   If not contained in A or B:
    1.   FTEF required each quarter for the past three years
    2.   special resources and facilities required
    3.   number of students expected to graduate in each of the next three years;
D.   Conclusions and recommendations of the project team on Academic Programs, contained in the most recent edition of Academic Program and Resource Planning in The California State University.

TIME TABLE FOR PROGRAM DISCONTINUANCE

Initial step
1.   Proposal to discontinue an academic program received by the Provost.

Three calendar weeks after receipt of the proposa!
2.   The Provost accepts or rejects the proposal.

Three calendar weeks after acceptance of the proposal
3.   Discontinuance review committee appointed.

Within sixteen weeks after appointment of the discontinuance review committee
4.   Initial report: Each of the two groups from the program discontinuance review committee produce their report and exchange it for the report from the other group.

Within four weeks after the initial reports have been exchanged
5.   Period of comments: Each of the two groups from the program discontinuance review committee solicit comments on the reports from the university at large.

Within six weeks after the end of the period of comments
6.   Critique of the initial reports: Each of the two groups from the program discontinuance review committee produce a critique of the findings produced by the other group.

Within four weeks after the critique of reports have been produced
7.   Final report: The two groups from the program discontinuance review committee jointly discuss and amend, if necessary, the final document and send it to the Provost, the Academic Deans' Council, and the Academic Senate.

Within four weeks after the critique of reports have been sent
8.   Recommendations: The Provost, the Academic Deans' Council, and the Academic Senate make recommendations to the President.

NOTE: A calendar week is five working days. Calendar weeks exclude summer breaks quarte and the breaks between quarters.

TIME TABLE FOR PROGRAM DISCONTINUANCE   (in weeks)

```
Initiation of        |
the proposal         |
                     J
Review by the        |
Vice President for  |—3-1
Academic Affairs     |
                     J
Appointment of       |      |—3—|
the conunittee       |
                     J
First step of the    |                        16 ——————
review               |
                     |
Period of            |                              |— 4—|
comments             |
                     |
Second step of       |                                   |— 6 —|
the review           |
                     |
Final document       |                                          1--4-1
drafted              |
                     J
Review by            |                                              1--6-1
upper levels         |
                     |
Final comments .     |
to the President     J


Total time      |———————————————42 weeks,-------------
```