1) **Review and approve meeting notes from Jan. 11, 2013 meeting**
   a. Notes from week before had only minor changes and were considered approved.
   b. The current notes should recognize that the list of programs includes some duplication.
   c. The 1/11 meeting notes were accepted with the mention of duplication in the number of programs and will be posted online.

2) **Review and discuss the revised program definition**
   a. An example of how the report template structure would include minors, options and credentials within the major academic program was presented for discussion. The example would reduce the number of reports to 114.
      i. This method will reduce the number of reports that each department needs to complete.
      ii. Most of the information for the report will come from the department and deans, not from centrally-maintained data.
   b. DCIE
      i. Should all the for-credit programs be completed as one program or separately?
      ii. Perhaps “non-credit” items could be lumped together.
   c. How should similar programs that offer both a BA and a BS degree be handled?
      i. Generally BA requirements are contained within the BS requirements.
         1. According to the definition, both are “programs.”
         2. They are clearly separate programs.
            a. A change will be made in the sample report to separate BA & BS of same subject.
            b. Academic credit vs. non-credit could also be separated.
   d. Library courses
      i. Library offers GE courses.
         1. Library would like to review their courses as a program separate from GE.
   e. The program definition be discussed further with the Deans and Provost.

3) **Presentations from subcommittees on consolidate criteria**
   a. Criteria #1 – Alignment with Missions, Commitments, ILOs
      i. Won’t address the mission as it is not concrete.
ii. Academic quality needs to be assessed on its own.

iii. Programs should not provide self-assessments, rather they should provide evidence of supporting the commitments and the task groups would evaluate how the evidence matches the criteria.
   1. There was discussion about whether examples should be provided by the task group or allow the departments to come up with evidence on their own.

iv. Provide flexibility, choice, and fairness.

v. For ILOs, the scoring should be bumped up a bit because most departments should be meeting most of the ILOs.
   1. Faculty is concerned about their programs being rated on such a new criterion.
      a. The suggestion is to ask which ILOs are currently in alignment with the outcome of the program and speak to the ones that have already been assessed?
      b. What we ask people to report should be useful in other ways to the departments (helps with future assessments, reviews, certifications, etc.).
      c. Weighting and overall value of ILOs will likely shift over time but at this point in time it is less key to reviewing academic programs.

b. Criteria #2 – Internal and External Demand
   i. Used a comparison with other CSU campuses.
      1. CSUEB current approach asks for more information than the other CSUs for determining internal demand.
      2. External demand is not as easy to measure for different departments. There is not centrally-maintained data to assist departments.
      3. A program does not need to have both internal and external demand to be justified.
   ii. The task group should address whether internal and external demand be weighted equally.
   iii. The state Employment Development Department could provide information about the demand for certain jobs. Also the federal Department of Labor would have useful information.
   iv. Consider, also, the transfer demand in addition to freshman applications.
   v. Should wait lists be used as a measure of demand?

c. Criteria #3 – Program Quality
   i. Prompts / Indicators
      1. Faculty, curriculum, student quality & outcomes, instructional achievement, professional achievement, design, implementation & improvement were all suggested as possible measures.
a. The question was asked about other measures of quality that apply to students other than GPA? What quality of students do we attract?

ii. There is a list of indicators that should probably go to other criteria or that are already covered.

d. Criteria #4 – Efficiencies: Costs and Revenues

i. There are a lot of limitations in working with the cost.
  1. It will be difficult to determine individual costs of separate options, minors, certificates, etc.
  2. The lowest level we will likely be able to get to is the department. Some departments can go down to the program level. A college like CLASS would not be able to do that because they handle a lot of GE.
  3. Instructional Efficiencies
     a. Inputs vs. outputs
     b. The subcommittee suggested looking at average number of students per option.

e. Criteria #5

i. Last group to go next week