1. **Review and approve meeting notes from February 15, 2013 meeting**
   a. On 3b – Change wording from staff to faculty
   b. On 5b,ii – Rather than the word “accuracy” use “applicability”
   c. **The 2/15/13 notes were affirmed with the above changes.**

2. **Review programs list**
   a. The group reviewed an updated list of programs that has now incorporated GE.
   b. Since GE is a Title 5 requirement there was some discussion about how the GE program should be examined since the focus will be on how GE is delivered at East Bay, not whether it should be delivered. There was a suggestion that a unique template be used for the overall GE program report.
   c. The instructional program of the library will complete one report.
   d. There was discussion about the inclusion of DCIE in the scope of the review. The chairs responded that the sponsors had expressed a desire to include DCIE because they do not want to exclude any particular program. Discussion continued regarding how to handle the credit and the non-credit programs of DCIE.
      i. It was agreed that the question of including DCIE would be raised with the Provost since it presents more to evaluate.

3. **Review draft report template and department background information report**
   a. A draft of the department background information sheet was reviewed by the group.
   b. There was a suggestion that if a question is not applicable to a program it should not be included on the report form, or the form should be modified so it is clear no answer is required for that question.
   c. There was discussion about how to include GE information on the report template.
   d. Some language modifications were suggested and there was agreement that further wordsmithing is needed.
4. Reports from Subcommittees
   a. There was discussion about possible overlaps between criterion and detecting any missing pieces. There is some desire to look at all the criteria all at the same time in order to identify these issues.
   b. Chair Mangold indicated that she would put all the criteria together into one presentation and into the draft template report so that people can review this before the next meeting.
   c. Criterion 1 - Consistency with Strategic Commitments and ILOs
      i. Since the ILOs and strategic commitments are relatively new it was pointed out that if the question were about what programs are doing today based on their current learning outcomes that would likely produce a different answer.
      ii. Programs will be asked to rate themselves on their alignment / achievements and provide evidence for that assessment.
      1. How to score this criterion has not been determined.
      iii. The subcommittee suggested that this criterion could be used as a “tie breaker” where it would help a program that is on the cusp.
   d. Criterion 2 - Demand
      i. Internal Demand
         1. A portion of the criterion will look at total majors, average new majors, FTES, total sections offered, capacity (section fill rate), GE percentages, and remedial programs.
         a. Note that the fill rate might be constrained by room size rather than the course.
         2. There was discussion regarding “cluster” versus “cohort” and the conclusion was that both terms should be used.
         3. Regarding new majors there was discussion about looking at enrollment over time, and perhaps moving this to external demand.
         4. Including GE and remediation in this criterion would lower the scoring.
            a. There was a motion to remove GE and remediation from consideration in this criterion, which passed.
      ii. External Demand
         1. This criterion would be rated based on applicants, employment projections, and the share of CSU majors.
         2. There were concerns expressed about using applicants and share of CSU majors.
      iii. Internal and external demand will be combined and measured under one rubric.
   e. Criterion 3 - Program Quality
      i. There was a review of the three sections expected to compose this criterion: a) faculty = 40%; b) curriculum = 40% and c) student = 20%.
ii. The subcommittee used 5 rubrics to measure the responses.

iii. There was some discussion about the value of including “teaching awards, teaching grants, and recognitions.”

iv. Questions were raised about how to measure student quality. How relevant is incoming GPA and what is the relationship to the overall program quality?

v. **There was a motion to combine student quality and curriculum, which passed.**

vi. There was a motion to change the distribution of weight for the remaining two criteria to 30% for faculty and 70% for curriculum and students, which did not pass.

vii. **There was a motion to change the distribution of weight for the remaining two criteria to 40% for faculty and 60% for curriculum and students, which passed.**

viii. Questions were asked about the availability of data on student placement after graduation, which need to be directed to IR.

f. **Criterion 4 - Revenues, Costs, and Efficiency Productivity**

i. The subcommittee suggested that they would prefer to use the term “productivity” instead of “efficiency.”

ii. Measures will include FTES, FTEF, and cost.

iii. SFR = FTES / FTEF and Cost / FTES to measure productivity

iv. There was discussion about how many rubrics to use. There was a suggestion to use one rubric for the entire criterion. Each topic would be assessed individually, but combined into one placement on the rubric. There was discussion about using this model for all the criteria.

5. **Criterion 5 - Potential and Unique Issues**

i. Some of the suggestion prompts or questions were:
   1. Capacity – are you happy with where you are?
   2. Impact of augmentation – what you could do with more money?
   3. Impact of reduction – what would happen if resources were reduced?
   4. Provide a program snapshot.

ii. There was discussion about the title of this criterion and recognition that the intent has changed as discussions have continued about it. The focus now seems to be on resources.

iii. There was a suggestion that potential be considered where appropriate but should not be the central focus of this criterion.

iv. Questions were raised about how this criterion would be scored.

v. There was a suggestion that the program snapshot should be moved to the beginning of this criterion.
a. Subcommittees were asked to revise criterion based on the discussion and send to Nancy by Monday-Tuesday.
b. Subcommittees were asked to suggest a weight for their criterion.
c. The group will revisit the “template suggestion” document that was suggested as the background information.

There was one observer present: Mitch Watnik.