Note - Two observers were present.

1 **Review and approve meeting notes from Jan. 25, 2013 meeting**
   a Notes from 1/25/13 were accepted.

2 **Affirm the number of criteria**
   a The group has narrowed down the initial list to five criteria plus “additional information”, which are:
      i Consistency with CSUEB Mission, Strategic Commitments, and ILOs
      ii Demand
      iii Program Quality
      iv Revenues, Costs, and Efficiency
      v Potential
      vi Additional Information
   b There was discussion about the value-added of using “mission” as a criterion since the mission statement is rather general and would apply to every program. There was a motion to strike the word, “mission” from the first criteria.
      i **There was unanimous approval to strike the word “mission” from the first criterion.**
   c There was discussion about the difference between the “potential” criterion and “additional information” and whether those two should be combined. This included some discussion about the weight of the various criteria, which will be determined later.
      i There was a motion to combine “potential” and “additional information”, which did not pass.
   d **There was a motion to accept the six criteria as final, which was passed unanimously.**
   e Members of the task group were asked to give some thought to how the “additional information” will work in the scoring schema.

3 **Discuss scoring rubric**

4 **Review template structure**
   a There was discussion about whether the library’s instructional program ought to be counted separately from other programs, and agreement that it should. The list of programs will include “Library”.
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b There are still some outstanding issues to resolve and information to collect before there can be further discussion on the GE program and DCIE programs.

c Three of the colleges handle the “No Option” option for majors the same way; the College of Science handles it differently.
   i Currently the list identifies the no option-option as a distinct program if there are other option choices, but it is not identified as a program if “no-option” is the only choice.
      1 An argument was made that if no option is the default, it will be written up as the major, so it does not need to be addressed as a separate program.
      2 **There was a motion to accept this approach to the program listing and not include the “no option” option as a separate program, which passed.**
   3 Any “no option” option will not be counted as a program.

5 **Other**
   a Dean Leung will work in the “Revenue, Cost, and Efficiency” group.
   b There was discussion about the number of categories to use in rubrics for the review. There seemed to be general agreement that four categories would be the best choice, but not final decision was made.
   c One member raised the question of discussing the CFA blog since there was not time last week. There was agreement to make time for discussion at the next meeting.
   d The chair raised the issue of their timeline and ensuring the group accomplishes its task before the conclusion of the spring quarter.
      i The objective is to complete all work, including criteria, weighting and the report template by March 1.
      ii From the beginning of May through the first week of June (7th) the task group will review and evaluate the report templates and reach conclusions. There will be workshops scheduled to assist the people responsible for completing the report template.
      iii The task group chairs will produce the report for the steering committee and transmit at the end of June or in July.
      iv A question was asked about allowing time for a peer review of the criteria, weighting and report template.
         1 The calendar already incorporates time for campus comment and feedback, with time for consideration of that feedback before the reports are given to the departments.
         2 There was discussion about how to best solicit feedback and what constituted a “peer”.
   v Another question was asked about the process and what happens with the recommendations.
      1 It was explained that the reports will go to the Steering Committee who will integrate the reports from the two task
groups, then they will forward the summary report to the sponsors and president’s cabinet for review. Any recommendations that effect an academic department or program will then be forwarded to the Academic Senate following its organizational policies and practices. This would likely happen in the fall quarter of 2013.

2 There were further questions about the process and a suggestion that it might be a good idea to invite the provost to attend a future meeting.

e Program definition
   i There was a motion to accept the following definition: “A program is defined as an academic activity that is required for degrees, credentials or certificates.”
      1 There was discussion about adjustments to the definition and when voted upon the motion failed.
   ii There was a motion: to accept a new definition as:
      1 Programs are operationally defined as a set of the following academic activities that are required for degrees, credentials or certificates. These include:
         a Major
         b Option
         c Minor
         d Certificate
         e Credential
         f Single-subject matter preparation
         g Remedial requirements
         h Library instruction
         i General education.
      2 The motion was passed unanimously.
      3 This definition will be accompanied by an explanation that a program does not include those programs that the Steering Committee has already decided should be covered with the Support Program task group:
         a Academic department offices
         b Athletic programs
         c Centers and institutes
         d Library general services
         e GE office
      4 Concerns were expressed about the importance of academic offices to the instructional programs they support and that the SPTG ensure this relationship is taken into account during its review. The Chair indicated that the Steering Committee had already adjudicated this matter. It was decided that the Support Task Group would assess the Dept. Offices.
Next steps
a Subcommittees will continue their work together.
   i Develop questions on their criterion for discussion at the meeting on 2/8.
   ii Identify what data would be helpful from Planning and Institutional Research.
   iii Discuss possible rubrics.