



The Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates - University of California - The California State University - California Community Colleges

ICAS Special Committee on Baccalaureate Degree Duplication

Recommendations regarding Baccalaureate Degree Duplication Review
approved by ICAS November 29, 2023

Charge

The request to ICAS is to provide a recommendation on the curricular review process for determining program duplication, including:

- 1) a definition of program duplication,
- 2) a set of program duplication criteria (i.e., what components of a program should be examined and compared), and
- 3) a program duplication standard (i.e., how much or what percent of similarity determines program duplication).

Recommendations

The standard threshold for establishing duplication is that a proposed program is more alike than different when compared to existing programs. There may be potential for varying degrees of difference or similarity for some disciplines or programs based on program content, learning outcomes, and intended employment outcomes. While it is tempting to quantify the degree of difference or similarity, doing so may interfere with holistic review that entails an overarching qualitative assessment of all program elements using the Duplication Review Rubric.

Duplication Review Rubric: Program Level

Each program level element should be reviewed holistically from two perspectives:

- To what degree are the program level elements alike between the proposed CCC program and the existing CSU program?
- To what degree are the program level elements different between the proposed CCC program and the existing CSU program?

Program Duplication Review Rubric

Element	Little to No Duplication (much more different than alike)	Some Duplication (warrants closer review)	Nearly Full or Full Duplication (much more alike than different)
Program Name			
Program Description			
Program Learning Outcomes			
Program Certification or Licensing Outcomes			
Upper Division Major Courses (Broadly, inclusive of titles, descriptions, outcomes, and content)			
External Program Accreditation (where applicable)			
CIP Codes			
Holistic Review - Summary judgment considering all elements above	Proposed program is clearly more different than alike	Enough duplication exists that program and its elements should be reviewed more closely	Proposed program is clearly more alike than different

Comments regarding program similarities:

Comments regarding program similarities:

Key Elements of Program Duplication Comparisons

What: What information will be considered as part of the duplication analysis

- CIP codes: should be included, but CIP code alone cannot determine duplication.
- Program Name: should be included, but name alone cannot determine duplication.
- Program Description: should be included, but program description alone cannot determine duplication.
- Program Outcomes: must be included and is pertinent to the review.
 - Speaks to program intent.
 - Requires a comparative content analysis.
- Course Details (titles, descriptions, learning outcomes): must be included and is pertinent to the review.
 - This is the curriculum and is the heart of the comparative content analysis.
 - This should hold the greatest weight in the comparison.
 - Requires a comparative content analysis.
- Program accreditation: must be included where program accreditation exists, but program accreditation alone cannot determine duplication.
- Intended student industry licensure or certification: should be included, but intended student industry licensure or certification alone cannot determine duplication.
- Inclusions and Exclusions:
 - Does not include lower division course work (as there is purposeful alignment there for transfer).
 - Should include lower-division major prep.
 - Includes concentrations.
 - Does not include minors and certificates.
 - Excludes upper division general education.
 - Excludes intended modality of instruction.

How: How the comparison will be conducted and based on the standards recommended by the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS)

- Need to define program similarity, establish a standard or level of overlap for program duplication, and create a program duplication rubric. *Recommended by ICAS above.
 - Generally, program should be more different than alike given a holistic review of all program elements included in the program level duplication review rubric.
 - Process will be complex and is a constellation of all the elements.
- Requires a comprehensive comparative content analysis.
- Will need a neutral third party to conduct these analyses when campuses hit an impasse. Neutral third party should be from outside the CCC, CSU, and UC segments and should be determined in advance of any potential duplication challenges.

Types of Review: BDP applications will be categorized as follows to streamline the review process.

- Full Review: New programs being considered for the first time.
- Similarity Review: Previously CCC-based approved programs where there is a quick review that the curriculum is substantially similar.
- Expedited Review: Clear career technical education (CTE) or applied degrees that are not in UC's or CSU's wheelhouse that have been previously approved.

Establishing Agreement: The segments will come to an agreed upon conclusion before CCC BDPs are approved.

- Nature of the written agreement: that the duplication objection has been rescinded based on one of the following options:
 - Shared agreement that there is not sufficient evidence of program duplication.
 - Curricular revise & resubmit: Document any curricular changes to eliminate the duplication objection.
 - Add to the duplication objection form the prompt: What curricular changes could be made that would alleviate your duplication concerns?
 - Agreement to collaborate:
 - Agreement to establish a 2x2 program.
 - Agreement to establish an ADT.
 - Agreement to establish a satellite campus.
 - Agreement to establish a BA-to-MA pathway.
 - Agreement to coordinate on workforce needs.
 - CCC impact appeal (i.e., student & workforce need/impact analysis): Process still TBD

BDP Application Review Process:

- Faculty shall be included in the review process for their respective system.
- Some faculty reviewers should have expertise in the discipline, field, or program.
- Potential pre-application step (TBD):
 - The CCC submits an intent to apply form indicating the program title, CIP code, and program description to CCCCCO.
 - CCCCCO review of preliminary information for potential duplication, inclusive of ASCCC-
 - appointed faculty
 - CSU reviews this preliminary information and provides a list of campuses and programs that may have duplication objections (so the CCC can conduct a more targeted program duplication analysis).
- The CCC submits their BDP application:
 - Application indicates which type of review CCC believes their program falls under.
 - CCC details why they believe their program falls under a similarity or expedited review.
 - Application contains CIP code and indication of any professional licenses the degree leads toward.
 - Application includes a discussion of prior & current attempts to collaborate with CSU campuses.
 - CCC self-assesses potential duplication based on publicly available information for the program(s) CSU indicated in the pre-application process.
 - Using the BDP program duplication rubric (ICAS recommendation) in addition to course-to-course comparison.
- CCCCCO conducts an analysis of submitted applications and conducts the campus readiness and program quality review (internal CCCCCO process).
 - CCCCCO conducts program duplication analysis in partnership with ASCCC and forwards only those with little to no duplication and those needing additional review (there is still potential that the proposed program is more different than alike in comparison to existing programs) based on the holistic review using the program level baccalaureate duplication rubric.

- CCCCO submits vetted applications to CSUCO and to UCOP.
- CSUCO conducts process for CSU review of applications:
 - CSUCO provides CCC BDP program applications to CSU campuses with a form and templates for campuses to complete and submit duplication objections evidence.
 - CSU campus faculty, ASCSU Senators or ASCSU appointees, and academic leaders directly submit program duplication objections forms and evidence into a shared form/repository.
 - Within the program duplication objections forms, CSU campuses respond to “curricular revise & resubmit” and “agreement to collaborate” options.
- UCOP conducts process for UC review of applications.
- CCCCO provides CSU and UC campus’ program duplication objections forms and evidence to the respective CCC campus.
 - CCC self-assesses potential program duplication based on information submitted by CSU and UC campuses using the BDP program level duplication rubric (ICAS recommendation) and provides a response to the duplication objection.
 - CCC considers CSU and UC “curricular revise & resubmit” and “agreement to collaborate” options.
- CCC campuses convene with respective CSU or UC campuses to discuss their programs and find a resolution.
- If the respective CCC and CSU or UC campuses cannot reach resolution:
 - The CCC may submit additional information for an impact appeal (TBD).
 - Additional information submitted will be dependent on questions or concerns raised during CSU or UC review.
 - A neutral third party is engaged to review the details and provide a neutral assessment:
 - Reviews the CCC BDP application.
 - Reviews the CSU and UC program duplication objections and evidence.
 - Reviews the CCC program duplication analysis and responses to CSU and UC objections.
 - Reviews the respective program content details.
 - Conducts a comparative content analysis of the programs’ content.
 - Provides a report of their analysis and an assessment of program duplication.
- ICAS reviews the results of the third-party analysis and provides a recommendation on program approval.
- System Offices of the CCC and CSU or UC, dependent on the system lodging a duplication objection, review all of the above and make a final decision.