1. Review and approve meeting notes from February 22, 2013 meeting
   a. The 2/22/13 notes were affirmed with no changes.

2. Review report template:
   A draft of the report template was introduced. The group was asked to review all parts with an eye toward ensuring it is self-explanatory and understandable.
   a. Introduction and instructions
      i. Includes a brief description of the criteria, weighting and evaluation process that will be used.
   b. Program background
      i. Involves the history and development of the program.
   c. Criteria
      i. Consistency with CSUEB Strategic Commitments and ILOs
         1. Responses regarding the future included in this criterion could be more effective in criterion #5.
         2. The template for this criterion has a self-assessment aspect, which generated discussion about whether all criteria ought to have a self-assessment aspect or if it should be removed from this criterion.
         3. A question was raised about whether alignment with the SSCs would be rated?
            a. There was consensus that alignment with SSCs would be rated.
         4. A second question was raised about whether each SSC would be rated separately or would they be considered holistically?
            a. There was consensus that SSCs will be addressed holistically, response limited to 50 words.
         5. A final question was raised regarding whether existing and future alignment with the ILOs be combined in a rating?
            a. The question was agreed upon with 16 members in favor. This rating will combine existing alignment and expected future alignment with the ILOs.
   ii. Demand
      1. Data from the California State Jobs Projections will be presented, and report writers will be asked to select up to five job categories that would typically employ graduates from that program.
2. There was discussion and recognition that due to the nature of demand some programs will be better able to use external demand than others, but that this is only one measure amongst many and weighting will influence the evaluation.

3. There was recognition that a strong narrative could balance out a low value on the external demand data.

iii. Program Quality
1. Examples will be provided to prompt report writers to include additional material to demonstrate quality.
2. There was discussion about the word allocation for the Program Implementation and Outcomes section.
   a. Items #10-12 would get 250 words.
   b. Items 13-15 would get 250 words.
   c. No item is optional but if it does not apply, it should be noted that.
3. A question was raised about whether student retention should be included here as a measure of quality?
   a. **There was consensus that retention data should be included.**
4. There was discussion about whether incoming GPA is accurate and related to program quality, since it is self-reported.
   a. **There was agreement that GPA is related to retention and that first quarter GPA should be used.**
5. A question was raised about whether to include student success via placements, employer evaluations, student awards and presentations and alumni surveys as currently reflected in the draft criterion?
   a. **There was consensus that these items should not be included in the criterion.**

iv. Revenues, Costs, and Efficiency
1. Report writers will be asked to provide information on SFR, CSR (cost/FTES), revenue if applicable (non-DCIE), self-support for DCIE and retention and graduation rates.
2. There was much discussion about SFR and ensuring it will be an accurate benchmark to use.
3. One item was added to ask the program to describe any changes in productivity.

v. Potential and Unique Issues
Title changed to “Unique Issues and Future Directions”
1. There was discussion about whether the rubric titles should be modified.
   a. **There was consensus is to leave the titles as is.**
2. The committee developed a “program snapshot” to include information regarding the types of courses offered by the program, as well as sections. It includes much detail that would be onerous for the report writers, but still does have some value in terms of evaluation.

3. There was a motion regarding the use and location of the detail asked for in the “snapshot”.
   a. **There was consensus that the information should be captured but be simplified.**
      i. Simplification suggestions:
         1. Leave out the 90% threshold for enrollment majors, use “majors only,” “GE only,” and “combination.”
         2. Use number of majors versus number of courses.

3. **Discuss Categories**

4. **Other**
   a. CFA luncheon
      i. Several people asked to have a one-hour break at noon in order for interested faculty members to attend the CFA-sponsored lunch on March 8. It was agreed that the group will take a break next week so anyone who wants to attend the lunch can do so.
   b. The importance of student retention was raised to ensure that it is addressed somewhere within a criterion. At the moment it falls under the Cost, Revenue and Productivity criterion.

There was one observer present after lunch (Jennifer Eagan).