Problem with the instructional criteria, namely the criteria being used to evaluate "external demand." The template lists ONLY job prospects. This severely limits the scope of what is meant by external demand. It is important to note that the provost himself, at one of the pfD town hall meetings, expressed that it was insulting to think of the csu as a job training facility. Certainly, other criteria besides job prospects are crucial here.

On "quality of program" being used as criteria for instructional programs: It would seem that current quality ought not to be necessarily used in only one way to assess the needs of a program. A program that is currently NOT high quality may indicate that it needs further resources in order to become high quality, rather than the possibility of determining that a currently low-quality program ought to be de-funded.

Given that many of the responses on the criteria documents will be qualitative, and that many of the criteria are rather vague, how will the accuracy and completeness of the input be verified? Since PfD is basically a competition for resources, it is in the interest of each program representative to reply to questions such as, "What steps has the program taken to develop innovative and forward-looking curricula?" with some verbiage that will be difficult to evaluate objectively. Some questions, such as "Is there anything unique or distinctive about your service?" (full credit for any reply) seem like a waste of time, since all programs and services will answer in the affirmative. Unless, of course, the representative does not or cannot take the time necessary for a thorough response to the criteria - it is the type of document that will be most thoroughly completed by those who put the most time in on it, and not necessarily those representing the most deserving programs or services.

I note that, as of today, April 18, the definition of an academic program has not been altered despite the fact that the current definition seems to leave open the possibility that courses might also be considered as programs. The language needs to be revised in order to ensure that programs are larger than a single course in order to prevent the possibility of administrative meddling in specific courses in future.

Planning for Distinction? How about planning for a room big enough to accommodate the division. Nothing says welcome like standing room only.
April 18

Is the Ed.D. Program exempt from this review? The templates seem to indicate only BAs & MAs. I would hope ALL programs would be part of this process.

April 19

Criteria for Instructional Programs: Per your draft, 30% of the evaluation is devoted to program quality, which seems reasonable; however, the criteria are not so reasonable. You start with student and peer evaluations; however, as our current student evaluation questions are structured to be a popularity contest and are likely to continue to contain elements of a popularity contest even after revision, I think too much weight is given to them. In order to drive up my student evals (which, to date, have always been between 1-2), I could eliminate reading and writing, give them all multiple guess exams, and drive up my scores. NOT my idea of program quality. Teaching awards, grants, and recognition is also a questionable element. Some programs simply do not have awards in these areas, creating some inequity among programs. Professional activities is a reasonable criterion, but only when there are sufficient funds to support such activities. In recent years, I have spent a good deal of personal income on various professional activities. I’m now cutting back despite requests to speak and present. It’s too expensive, unless I’d like to go there anyway. Student success is only reasonable if there is balance between the professor’s responsibility and the student’s. I failed 8 students last quarter for the sole reason that they didn’t turn in work no matter how many ways I tried to get them to do so. Some re-thinking is needed in this category.

April 21

I have reviewed the drafts and I believe they are very comprehensive and well done. I am looking forward to the results. I can see that there is thoughtful and systematic processes. I have a few suggestions if they please the committee:

Overall: I realize this is a work in progress. Towards completion, one thing that may benefit the CSUEB campus is be transparent in the scoring rubric, not just what would give the highest score, but exactly what the rating system is. Is the rating 1-5 and if so, define exactly what a "1" means, and what a "5" means.

Also: The two criteria for Instructional vs Support Programs on campus’ ratings appear to be pretty different from each other. In particular as it is presented right now, the Instructional Programs criteria seem to have more quantitative criteria and the Support Programs criteria appear to have more qualitative criteria. Perhaps this is due to the where the campus is in the process of this draft.

Regarding the analysis of outcomes:
At the end of the analysis, It would be interesting to determine the global impact of
CSUEB on the larger Bay Area community:

1) We address (as part of all strategic commitments):
   After college (helping students prepare for gainful employment, contribute to their community or reconnect with the university);

   Support the civic, cultural, and economic life of all communities in the regions we serve through partnerships that promote education and social responsibility;

   Demonstrate our continuing record of leadership and innovation in higher education, focused on 21st century skills, including science, technology, engineering, and mathematics...

While these are very important indicators individually, to address the Regional Stewardship of CSUEB, perhaps the analysis of Planning for Distinction will take these individual strategic commitments and also analyze them together as one factor that impacts the outcomes of CSUEB in the larger community or impact on the CSU system as a whole. The three strategic commitments mentioned above, when ratings are combined into one factor, might be a very interesting predictor of CSUEB’s regional stewardship outcome for CSUEB or the whole CSU system.

The other strategic outcomes address academic quality, campus climate, and accountability. Will the committee analyze these results to determine how these indicators impact the overall outcomes of CSUEB in the Bay Area (i.e., number of CSUEB students’ employed by Bay Area Companies or alumni that are products of specific Academic Departments in CSUEB that make contributions to "21st century skills, including science, technology, engineering, and mathematics...")? In California? Nationally? Internationally?

2) There is a specific focus on Professional Achievement for Instructional Programs for faculty as defined by faculty contributions to peer reviewed journals, presentations, grants etc per department. Does the analysis also address non-faculty lecturers, or staff in departments that are considered administrative? There is space to write this in, but again the format of the Support Program criteria - it is unclear how much this is valued in the scoring rubric. For example, in the AS Department: a) I am not faculty, but I do publish articles and book chapters that contribute to the field of knowledge in which I work. b) We have Bay Area and National organizations that are interested in some of the programs that AS has developed. For example, the College Link Program is often asked to present at local conferences and we get requests for interviews from Local and National magazine. c) Our department is not academic but it does write several grants, some of which are refunded based on previous years' results and prior experience. d) Perhaps add: Accreditation, licensure, and external recognitions; list/describe the following (up to 100 words):
I attended a Council of Chair's meeting where members of the Instructional Steering Committee presented the template. I am left with the following concerns:

1. Validity and reliability of the instrument
   a. When asked where the criteria for weighting came from, we were told the committee looked at other campuses and had discussions among committee member. This leaves the question unanswered.
   b. What empirical evidence did other campuses use to generate their weighting? Can you point us to studies that would support your weighting schema?
   c. The template includes both quantitative and qualitative data, but I am still very unclear about the methodology you will employ to assess qualitative data. The appropriate methodology would require: 1). a team (2 or more) read the same set of documents/templates; 2.) each member of the rating/research team would work alone to rate the documents; 3.) team members would then compare ratings. This is a way to ensure inter-rater reliability.

2. Measurement: Questions designed to measure quality (weighted at 30%) seem narrowly geared toward larger, professional programs. The definition of quality is a social construct that can vary. For instance, questions about the rigor of courses/syllabi, assignments, and so on are absent from the section that measures quality. Criteria seems to dismiss the importance of disciplines deeply rooted in critical thinking, cultural diversity and so on. Offering space in section V to highlight what some define as quality features of a program is inadequate.

One consideration I would like to recommend for Criteria 3.1 (Professional Achievement) on the Instruction Programs side is an addition to scholarly work referenced by other authors as part of their research. While this may not directly relate to personal research being conducted presently, having work referenced by other authors/researchers demonstrates usefulness of the findings, methodologies, literature reviews, etc. for future work. It also may keep published authors/researchers tied to staying "current" in their area of expertise as well as sustain motivation for engaging in dialogue with researchers in their field. This may not be a major item, but I do think recognition of previous work continuing to hold value in the field is evidence of ongoing Professional Achievement.

Two Concerns:

1. The template is in draft form, but I counted 87 responses that must be provided in each report—some single numbers, others are averages over time, others are text narratives. To be accurate and complete, it will take many hours for a single report to
be finished.

(2) My main concern is about the requests for program data/information that may not exist at that level. Much data exists at the department level, some at the degree level, some at the credential level. However, I think there several types of data/information requested in the template that only exist at the department level.

For example, Criterion 2: Internal and External Demand (page 11), refers to a “Table 7 in Appendix 2” that provides five-year FTES data. I may be wrong, but I am fairly sure that this data will be at the Department level. The Department of Teacher Education will have to submit five reports (see attached). This means any Department FTES data would have to be disaggregated by program (e.g., [1] MS in Education, Option in Educational Technology Leadership; [2] Multiple Subject Teaching Credential; [3] Single Subject Teaching Credential; [4] MS in Education, Options in Curriculum/ECE; [5] MS in Education, Option in Reading Instruction). CEAS staff could only complete this disaggregation after many hours of manual sorting.

Another example would be under Criterion 3: Program Quality (page 14). Program writers are asked to provide average scores on Fall Quarter 2012 teaching evaluation ratings. But again, those averages exist at the Department level, not the program level. The Department of Hospitality/Recreation/Tourism will file three reports, and someone will have to sort through the Fall 2012 teaching evaluations by course number to generate program-level data. This is not an impossible task, but it will take time.

The same problem exists under Criterion 4: Costs and Productivity for Student Faculty Ratios and Instructional Costs (page 18). Any department with multiple reports will have face a real challenge in "slicing and dicing" department SFR and cost data at the program level. For departments with multiple reports, this is going to be a real challenge.

I support the Planning for Distinction initiative, and I agree with the Instructional Level Task Force that it makes sense to have program-level reports. I am, however, concerned about (1) how much time it will take to complete a report and (2) the amount of data/information required at the program level that currently exists at the department level.

April 24

I would like to note that the weighting of various criteria (in additions to problems with various criteria that I’ve already posted) is problematic. In particular, I. Consistency with CSUEB Shared Strategic Commitments and Institutional Learning Outcomes, receives only 10% of the "score" whereas this seems like it should be
crucially important. I would suggest that this particular criteria receive a higher weighting, somewhere closer to 25% - 30%, in fact.

April 25

I agree with the provost when he stated that it is insulting to consider our university a job training facility. In this light, I would suggest that giving a 25% weight to internal/external demand, where external demand appears to be measured simply by employer demand, goes entirely against the sentiments expressed by the provost and encourages the university to be seen increasingly as a job training facility!

April 25

The criteria established for evaluation do not sufficiently foreground diversity, a core tenet of our university’s mission statement. Further, adherence to the mission statement and ILO’s is only accorded a laughable 10% of value in the overall scoring. The criteria couldn’t possibly be more obviously weighted toward STEM. As such, PFD is a facade, a cruel joke, and a clear attempt to eliminate departments and jobs in the Liberal Arts. Talk about a death panel. Funny how this is happening for universities that serve the middle and lower classes. Berkeley isn't having this discussion.

PFD also violates Faculty Governance rights. If PFD criteria had gone through the Faculty Senate, ILOs, diversity, and other tenets of the mission statement would have been accorded more weight.

The war against faculty and programs with intellectual value continues as our administration seeks to turn a great university into a McDonald's of education, substantively de-professionalizing the work of faculty and starving the liberal arts. But you have us right where you want us. Most of the faculty are scared or blissfully ignorant of the implications of PFD. The success of PFD will be a great feather in the cap of every responsible administrator and I'm sure we'll think about them from time to time after they leave for better and higher paying jobs while we sift through the rubble they've left behind. Morale has never been lower on this campus.

April 25

In reviewing the instructional program report template, I was surprised to see that none of the criteria pertained to university reorganization. I have been told that reorganization was one of the end goals of this planning, and that it was very likely that some programs would probably be moved from one College to another, or at least from one department to another. Since the individual telling me this is a member of one of the committees, it seems reasonable to assume that s/he has more knowledge about this process than I. If it is true that reorganization is one of the desired end goals, the President and Provost should be more forthcoming about it.
At a minimum, the criteria should be modified to solicit information that a reasonable reorg decisionmaking process could use. If reorg is not one of the desired goals from this planning, it would be helpful for the President and Provost to openly state that, just as the Provost has openly stated that faculty layoff is not a goal. If reorg is in fact one of the goals, administration should be honest about that. If reorg decisions have already been made and all of this work is simply "window dressing" that would be a morale killer.

April 25

The following represent my partial critique of the proposed criteria:

I still fail to see how this process adds any value to the CAPR program review process. The Five-Year Reviews provide uniform and clear pictures of academic programs, with a detailed narrative and assessments designed by the faculty to get at the heart of quality of the program. PFD provides a paltry shadow process to this more legitimate one, and as such, I think it's a waste of time for the academic side of our house. But, that said, why doesn't PFD use the annual reports and Five-Year Review documents?

What I see in these PFD criteria are numerical corporate-styled performance measures. The criteria seem to treat students as widgets and faculty as assembly line workers seeing how many we can process. The PFD criteria are on the whole inappropriate for an investigation into the quality of higher education, just as standardized tests are a poor measure of student learning in K-12. Both are the wrong tools for the task.

It is clear to me that these performance measures will systematically disadvantage smaller programs and programs that serve GE. These are often the programs that are distinctive. Those of us in smaller programs can’t help but feel that this process is designed to go after our programs, especially when we here of actions on other CSU campuses targeting programs with small number of faculty and majors.

Our campus' values (and those of higher education in general) are seriously undervalued, and some are conspicuously absent in these criteria. Our mission and ILOs must be weighted much higher than the 10% they are weighted at here. I think that they should be at least 50%.

The criteria do not address the diversity of the students, the faculty, or the curriculum. Won’t WASC be interested in why we don’t seem to care much about diversity in this version of our strategic planning process?

What about data from our graduation initiative? If we are looking at student demand and success, then why aren’t we looking at what majors students which out of and into? Which majors are getting student through in 2-4 years (transfers and natives)?
Though I think that student evaluations can be useful to detect serious outliers, most faculty do well and mostly the same on student evaluations. This is a poor measure of program quality.

I do not think that the research and grant gathering activity of faculty is a measure of program quality, particularly for undergraduate students. What they need are good teachers, not good researchers. This also disadvantages departments who rely on lecturers; research is not a requirement of lecturer faculty (though some do quite a bit).

Grants also should not be figured into the cost of the program. Generally grants are designed for faculty research and special projects, not to fund programs. Grants usually don’t and shouldn’t pay for class offerings. Counting grants heavily disadvantages the arts and humanities and disciplines for which many fewer (and cheaper) grants are available.

Some programs, such as those with external accreditation already gather much of this data and have more at their disposal. This will reduplicate the privilege that these programs already have as professional preparation programs.

I am skeptical that we can get accurate data, though we may get uniform data. PS systematically undercounts double majors and minors. We already do not get accurate data for our Five-Year Reviews, but at least there we have the opportunity to narrate what’s wrong with the data.

Using the CSU system-wide alumni exam, which has an extraordinarily low return rate, will systematically disadvantage small programs.

I’ll stop here, though I could go on.

April 29

Weighting: ILOs 10%? Absurd -- The introduction to the criteria makes these seem central. This weighting needs to be more even across categories. And, the total number is odd -- I think each category should have its own score, rather than a total of 100 point for all categories.

Job Projection stats: a sad commentary on the vocation, trade-oriented direction of this once well-balanced university. I understand and I am glad there is room to comment -- but just needed to point this out.

Section 5a: Numerical evaluation of tt publications—This is a major problem to is annually discussed in terms of University RTP committee. The number and or weight of peer reviewed publications varies so drastically between departments and disciplines that there needs to be clarification. In my field (history) one peer reviewed publication
can takes several years from start to finish -- there is little or no co-authoring, ad the final product is a thirty page integrated primary-research based analysis and narrative. Very different from the sciences, for example. Aside the problem, there is not actually a space for TT accomplishments to be explained on this form -- only for publication achievements of lecturers. We need space for explanatory narrative here.

April 30

First of all I want to state that I am philosophically opposed to the Program prioritization endeavor:

1. The ranking is akin to the creation of castes with the lowest ranks as the “undesirable.”
2. This will create an un-collegial atmosphere on campus by pinning the highest ranked against the lowest ranked.
3. The whole message from the whole process is to abandon a sense of solidarity among faculty to privilege insularity.
4. The way the process is set, it is bypassing faculty governance, since the Committees will make recommendations but the decisions lie in the hand of administrators. Also, the committees were formed over the summer with no consultation with faculty.
5. The timeline for completion of the process is insane.
6. The Provosts has assured faculty that there will be no lay offs but I fail to see how defunding of programs will not eventually (in the future), result in faculty lay offs as defunding programs will take away the means for programs to flourish and much less survive overtime.
7. No matter how you slice it subjectivity in such a process is unavoidable. For example, whether or not programs are deemed less central or not is not just a matter of data but of what the definition of central is. Are we talking pure quantity or quality, and the definition of quality itself is highly subjective. Would we have Apple products, for instance, if Steve Job had not taken a Calligraphy course, a course that might be deemed “less central” by this campus?!

April 30

Instructional Program Report Template

While I can’t begin to imagine what daunting a task it must have been for the committee to come up with the document, here are several remarks:

1. The weighting of criteria as described on page 7 is not in keeping with what is stated on p. 4 “…maintaining steady funding for programs that remain central to the CSUEB mission.”

2. How does one definition of quality by the committee fits all?
3. Why measure the quality of a program against California Occupational Employment Projection? We are not an Occupational school. A university exists to educate human beings not to guarantee a job in one narrow area. Studies show that even business employers want employees with a broad range of skills outside of their focus so that they can have a versatile workforce. Also, if being central to the CSUEB mission is crucial, defunding some programs that are not deemed viable according to the template criteria goes against that mission as the ILOs offer a much broader range of possibilities than the criteria by which programs will be evaluated.

4. The template shows a weighting chart for the various criteria but how will the criteria in each criterion be evaluated? Subjectively? Whose subjectivity?

5. Criterion 5 does not make much sense since the whole campus and system has been starving for funds and nobody has been given enough resources to adequately function.

April 30

We have several concerns, mostly related to how your criteria envision the value of meeting the needs of our diverse student body in a rapidly changing world.

**Issue #1:** The most obvious place for a program to show that they have thought about and have developed specific programs related to diversity is in criteria #1. However, this criteria is only valued at 10%. We have asked several members of the instructional group why Criteria #1 is valued at only 10% and we heard “because ILOs were only developed last year.” We find this to be an entirely disingenuous statement. The ILOs do not reflect a change of course for the University. Commitments to diversity have been in place for quite a while. See, for example, the Diversity Action Plan: [http://www20.csueastbay.edu/about/strategic-planning/files/pdf/university-diversity-action-plan-2010.pdf](http://www20.csueastbay.edu/about/strategic-planning/files/pdf/university-diversity-action-plan-2010.pdf)

**Recommendation:** Increase valuation of criteria #1 to 20%

**Issue #2:** Even in Criteria #1 (and our mission, ILOs, strategic commitments, etc.) “diversity” is imagined as a such a broad category that a program could craft a response that relies on meaningless platitudes. To make answers about diversity more meaningful, we believe it is important to know how each program is dealing with diversity in very specific terms. Programs could be asked to provide data on how their curriculum, pedagogy, and/or hiring practices are meeting the needs of specific student populations, such as: Latino/a students; African American students; Asian American students; American Indian students; Muslim students; Sikh students; gay, lesbian and bisexual students; transgender students; female students; students with disabilities; first generation college students; returning students, international students, undocumented students, and students whose first language is not English. Each of these student
populations have specific needs, both in terms of pedagogy and faculty support. They also need to see themselves reflected in the curriculum. A truly excellent program would have thought systematically about how to best meet the needs of each of these student populations and would have undertaken concrete steps to do so.

**Issue #3:** Each program should also be required to provide evidence related to the diversity of their faculty and staff. Programs that have hired diverse faculty should be rewarded over programs that have not. Currently, faculty diversity is listed only under “other evidence.” [“Other evidence of quality indicators related to instruction that may not be listed elsewhere, including, for example, faculty diversity within the program (up to 100 words)]. There is no reason why this criterion cannot be quantified and measured instead of relegated to a narrative in “other evidence.” We would urge you to request that all programs provide evidence of faculty diversity in the following categories: Ethnicity/Race, Gender, GLBT faculty, and disability status.

**Recommendation:** Under Criteria #3, add a substantive evaluation of how each program responds to diversity issues, including quantitative data on the diversity of their faculty.

**Issue #4:** We are concerned about the way “external demand” is being framed solely in terms of jobs data. What about social and cultural needs of the communities our students will return to? What about the need for global citizens* who will become active in their communities and workplaces, either as community organizers, union activists, volunteers, or leaders making political demands? Since when has the university become the training ground for corporate and government needs? We don’t need more widgets in our society. We need empowered, articulate, creative thinkers who can wage critiques and advocate for a more just society.

**Issue #5:** Society is changing so rapidly, it is impossible to predict what kind of employment will be available during the years our students will be in the workforce. Instead of chasing the latest trend by highlighting “external demand,” we should instead focus on the skills we know will be needed: logical and critical thinking, writing, speaking, and reading. We’re sure we are not alone in thinking that we have a long way to go to be able to produce students who are at college level in these basic skills. We would like to hear concretely, how programs are working to produce students with these skills. Every survey of employers we have ever seen has said that these are the skills they are looking for when hiring.

**Issue #6:** Most programs don’t have data regarding their students’ employment after graduation. This criterion is prone to a “wishful thinking” answer. Such fudging of answers will not be the fault of the department chairs, who are under pressure to present their programs in the best possible light; rather, the data will be of questionable validity because there is no way to answer the question without guessing.

**Recommendation:** Eliminate external demand from the criteria.
*We use the term global citizen to be inclusive of our foreign and undocumented students. By "citizen," we mean someone who actively participates in the local and/or global communities.

May 1

Impressive job. You have done a tremendous amount of very thoughtful work! Thank you.

Here are my suggestions:

There is a lot to digest and not having the rubrics makes it harder. After reading the report carefully twice it is hard to get a handle on how all the different items will be rated and weighted. The rubrics will clarify a lot and help us get a better feel for your scale. It will also help us think more clearly about the weights of the different parts of your scale. Please make sure that faculty have a chance to respond to the whole package (criteria, rubrics, weights) once we get the rubrics.

Please tell us more about the methodology for conducting the ratings (e.g. rater selection, inter-rater reliability, piloting).

I see a big problem with interpreting what the scale means that needs dealt with more. The presumption seems to be that a low score means that the department is not serving the mission of the university as well as other departments, but in many instances a more reasonable interpretation might be that it has been hampered by the inability to replace retiring faculty. Departments that are strapped do not have time to do effective assessments, planning, curriculum development, etc. and may get unfairly punished by the scale. The efforts to make up for this through parts of criterion 5 are not adequate, but are a step in the right direction.

Please provide a rationale for the weights and then give faculty the opportunity to respond. I have strong reservations about the weights, but don’t want to respond until I know your rationales. One thing I will say now is that Criteria 5 should be weighted much more heavily and it should be expanded. Give departments more space to explain what they could do with additional funds and regular faculty; how their innovative plans and capacity to innovate have been hampered by declining resources; provide additional information, etc. Upgrading and expanding Criteria 5 will create more valid and more useful results.

As creators of this scale I recommend that the committee take some clear positions on how the scale will be used. I think potential misuses are well known, but I am most concerned that the decisions will be made a via a preconceived structure to the distribution and category sizes (e.g. ¼ high, ½ middle, ¼ low) that could magnify what are actually small differences.

May 1

April 30

Impressive job. You have done a tremendous amount of very thoughtful work! Thank you.

Here are my suggestions:

There is a lot to digest and not having the rubrics makes it harder. After reading the report carefully twice it is hard to get a handle on how all the different items will be rated and weighted. The rubrics will clarify a lot and help us get a better feel for your scale. It will also help us think more clearly about the weights of the different parts of your scale. Please make sure that faculty have a chance to respond to the whole package (criteria, rubrics, weights) once we get the rubrics.

Please tell us more about the methodology for conducting the ratings (e.g. rater selection, inter-rater reliability, piloting).

I see a big problem with interpreting what the scale means that needs dealt with more. The presumption seems to be that a low score means that the department is not serving the mission of the university as well as other departments, but in many instances a more reasonable interpretation might be that it has been hampered by the inability to replace retiring faculty. Departments that are strapped do not have time to do effective assessments, planning, curriculum development, etc. and may get unfairly punished by the scale. The efforts to make up for this through parts of criterion 5 are not adequate, but are a step in the right direction.

Please provide a rationale for the weights and then give faculty the opportunity to respond. I have strong reservations about the weights, but don’t want to respond until I know your rationales. One thing I will say now is that Criteria 5 should be weighted much more heavily and it should be expanded. Give departments more space to explain what they could do with additional funds and regular faculty; how their innovative plans and capacity to innovate have been hampered by declining resources; provide additional information, etc. Upgrading and expanding Criteria 5 will create more valid and more useful results.

As creators of this scale I recommend that the committee take some clear positions on how the scale will be used. I think potential misuses are well known, but I am most concerned that the decisions will be made a via a preconceived structure to the distribution and category sizes (e.g. ¼ high, ½ middle, ¼ low) that could magnify what are actually small differences.
Re: Instruction Criteria: Use of Student Evaluations

I am concerned that only one quarter’s student evaluations are being used as an evaluation criterion of programs. It would seem that using a snapshot of data is not as valuable as using a larger sample, perhaps three academic quarters of student evaluations, to average and use as a criterion for evaluating instructional programs. Since these criteria are being used to rank programs, I would assume that we would want to have as robust data as possible.

May 1

My feedback here is in response to the use of Student Evaluations of Teaching as one very few measures of Program Quality with regard to Instructional Achievement in the Instructional Program Criteria Template. In large part, but not wholly, I draw on the jointly authored CFA/CSU "Report of Student Evaluations of Teaching" available at http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Reports/documents/Report_on_Student_Evaluations_of_Teaching.pdf. The current student evaluation form measures student satisfaction more than anything else. Student satisfaction is not the same measure as student learning or teacher effectiveness. The criteria should acknowledge that the use of teaching evaluations to measure program effectiveness may therefore be an imperfect measure and invite programs to provide other measures or devise other common measures across programs.

The report on teaching evaluations stresses that the greater the variety of measures of teaching effectiveness, the greater confidence there will be in the effectiveness in an institutions teachers. I would suggest the PFD Instructional Criteria extrapolate this finding to its study of program effectiveness and seek to expand rather than to contract its measures of program effectiveness, especially with regard to instructional achievement.

May 1

Dear Colleagues on the Instructional Sub-Committee of the PFD process --

Without the rubrics, it is hard to give thorough feedback on the instructional subcommittee materials, but the aspect of the draft document I am most concerned about is the weighting of the categories of judgment. At this point, the categories are weighted as follows:

10% to I. Consistency with CSUEB Shared Strategic Commitments and Institutional Learning Outcomes
25% to II. Internal and External Demand
30% to III. Program Quality
25% to IV. Costs and Productivity
10% to V. Unique Issues and Future Directions

This means that a program that is inconsistent with the University's shared strategic commitments and institutional learning outcomes but with high "demand" will fare better than one that is consistent with the SSCs and ILOs but which cannot demonstrate large numbers of majors or employer awareness/demand (although graduates in that discipline may be well positioned for a lifetime of career development and adaptation to employment changes - and I do hope that the rubrics for II employment demand recognize that we are looking toward a lifetime of career development and change for our graduates).

The ILOs and Shared Strategic Commitments are the place where we have all come together to shape a vision for a university of which we can be proud. This was a whole-university process last year, involving administration, faculty, staff and students, building on work and conversations at the university over the past half decade or so. It is also almost the only place in the 5 criteria where a vision for the FUTURE of the university that is not based on evaluating the past (a past shaped by coincidence, budget squeezes, and unreconsidered historical legacies) but is rather strategic and principled with be judged. I believe they should be a central piece of the evaluation.

I would say that a more forward-looking ranking, and one that accords better with work the WHOLE UNIVERSITY engaged in over the past few years, would be the following:

I: 25%
II: 20%
III: 25%
IV: 20%
V. 10%

May 1

Despite the many hours and resources going into this project, the criteria and the templates that have been generated to review instructional programs sound as if they could have been lifted almost directly from the Dickeson text, which was the starting point. So, how deliberative was the process? How reflective of the particular nature of this campus and its needs? The results of the program reviews will be rendered down, for the most part, to numerical designators, to quartile placements, with little opportunity to examine qualitative input. But to scale up through such a process means, at the very beginning, that the choice has been made to embark on some very shaky research principles in order to justify decisions about reallocating resources, decisions that now look as if they have buy-in from faculty. But when people engage in these kinds of endeavors, no matter what their initial intentions, they do "buy in" unconsciously, and if only to justify the time and energy they've wasted on them.
May 1

The report on student evaluations on teaching also concludes that because students in different disciplines value different types of teaching and because certain disciplines generate lower ratings over all, global comparisons to a campus average should be avoided. The criteria invite just such comparisons.

The report also suggests that evaluations should not be used to rank faculty in a 'linear' manner or to categorize them as 'excellent' or 'above average.' Will the criteria encourage the instructional program review committee to do the same with departments based on numerical evaluation results above and below 2?

Peer evaluations are a valuable tool and add an additional measure of teaching quality, if not effectiveness. The committee might consider an additional category wherein departments responding to the PFD report could summarize in narrative form the results of peer evaluations.

If ascertaining program quality is a goal, I encourage the committee to devise an instrument that invites expansive and multiple measures rather than reductive and narrow measures of quality and effectiveness.

May 1

Instructional Program Review: Faculty; Professional Achievement:

Individual careers have different rhythms. The time to publication from research varies by discipline. Some scholars from some disciplines produce multiple short articles per year, many of these co-authored. For other disciplines, an article every 3 to 5 years of considerable length may be the norm. Does the annual count of peer reviewed and non-peer reviewed publications account for those disciplinary difference?

May 1

I am writing to recommend that the Planning for Distinction program evaluation criteria be allocated as follow:
I: 30% (Consistency with CSUEB Shared Strategic Commitments and Institutional Learning Outcomes)
II: 15%
III: 30%
IV: 15%
V: 10%

In my view, the proposed weighting should be revised to place much more emphasis on
number I (Consistency with CSUEB Shared Strategic Commitments and Institutional Learning Outcomes), and relatively less on numbers II and IV (Internal/external demand, and Costs/productivity).

A huge amount of collective CSUEB effort went into the university-wide dialogue to identify the Strategic Commitments and Institutional Learning Outcomes, and they are good ones. These represent a true vision of how Cal State University East Bay can best serve the multiple missions of higher education in California, a vision that is not artificially stunted by the current era of budget squeeze.

In my opinion these Strategic Commitments and Institutional Learning Outcomes should be the cornerstone of the program evaluation process. Therefore, I propose that Criterion I constitute at least 30% of the rubric in Planning for Distinction procedures.

Thank you for your attention to my point of view.

May 1

In the Instructional Program Criteria, Appendix 5 was not available. However I checked the referenced employment outlook here:
http://www.calmis.ca.gov/file/occproj/cal$occnarr.pdf

I am curious as to how the committee will judge liberal arts, social science, and humanities major programs against this report's categories. Clearly the largest growing job categories in California, home health care aides and personal care aides do not require college degrees. In fact, the figures show that a college degree is not required for most of the areas of job growth.

That said, liberal arts majors provide graduates with the skills of oral and written communication and data analysis that allow them to function across a broad spectrum of professions. One hopes the 'top five' job categories that programs must choose allow the program to demonstrate its relevancy beyond those job categories.

May 1

Instructional Program Criteria: 10% seems a bit low to align with SSCs and ILOs. If the weight for this criteria is only 10%, I question that true value, importance, and emphasis on SSCs and ILOs. With complete balance, each criteria would be worth 20%. I'm not sure that is appropriate, but I do feel the SSCs and ILOs should hold more weight. Demand, Quality, and Cost all have 2.5 to 3 times the weight? I would feel more comfortable with a bit more balance. (repeated under ILO/SSC)

May 2

Instructional Program Criteria: Criteria 1.1 (Institutional learning Outcomes) - Will there be some mention of how "planing alignment for each ILO" will be measured? Simply
stating the plan seems incomplete without also including how the plan's implementation and effectiveness will be measured.

May 2

Instructional Program Criteria: Criteria 2.2 California State Jobs Projections for Each Program. I would request a follow up period to make comments on this particular area. The Appendices referenced are not available so it is difficult to evaluate "job outlook" or "top jobs" without any reference to California Occupational Employment Projection (COEP). Will/when will the appendices be available to look at?

May 2

Instructional Program Criteria: Criteria 3 (Program Quality). There is an abundance of information gathered about faculty with very little coming from students. In fact, if I read the draft correctly, student evaluations are mention once (1.1a) and student success is mentioned in point 14. Point 14 references "employment," "employer evaluations," and "internships" among other things. Is this too much of an emphasis on work/employment related feedback? I certainly think job preparation and ability to get a job upon graduation is important, but many of those factors are not under our control. Evaluating the program with this heavy of an emphasis on employment doesn't seem fair to the university itself. If our graduates are unable to get jobs for whatever reason, does this mean we haven't done ours? I don't think that's the case.

I would like to see a heavier emphasis placed on feedback from graduates to evaluate job readiness and quality of faculty, curriculum, courses, department staff, advising, etc. In my opinion this looks like a 2-dimensional approach to "Quality": Faculty accolades and employment status. I am especially weary of this approach if we expect to see a short-term drop in online course evaluations which adds a subtle and needed 3rd dimension. I feel the student voice is minimized in this format and mostly focuses on employment issues.

May 2