1. **Schedule**
   a. Next week’s meeting will be the last of this quarter.

2. **Criteria Updates for Criterion #2: Demand**
   a. At the last meeting, the criterion allocated 35% to FTES, 35% to jobs, 15% to majors, and 15% to degrees.
      i. The subcommittee recommended eliminating majors, especially since that data is not necessarily accurate, and put a larger focus on degrees. This would assign 30% to degrees.
         1. **There was agreement from the whole group on this allocation.**
         2. There was further discussion that majors might provide some useful information for some programs, and there the data will be provided and programs can speak to majors in their response, but this will not be rated.
   b. The narrative remains and can increase the score by up to two points.
   c. Changes to the chart of Occupational Employment Projections were discussed. **There was agreement that, for a variety of reasons, the full chart will be presented to the report writers, but some explanation will be provided for any confusing sections.**

3. **Weights for Criterion #4: Costs and Productivity**
   a. There were two options presented for weighting within this criterion:
      i. Equal weight for all three questions.
      ii. 50% for #2 and 50% total for 1A and 1B since the two are correlated.
   b. There was discussion that this is the only criterion where the narrative is un-scored. This is inconsistent with the approach taken on all other criteria.
   c. There was much discussion about the weighting of the measures and the rating of a narrative. The following options were considered:
      i. Option 1: Leave the un-scored narrative as is.
         1. The group voted and only 3 members were in favor of keeping an un-scored narrative.
      ii. Option 2: Score the narrative. The data also would be rated. This means there would be four scores for this criterion.
1. The group voted on this option with 15 members in favor. A successful vote requires 17 members.

   iii. Option 3: Score only the narrative. The data will be provided but will not be rated.
   
   1. The group voted on this option with 13 members in favor, which did not pass.
   2. After much discussion, a second vote resulted in 15 votes in favor. This result still was not enough for a substantive vote to pass.

d. After further discussion, there was a motion to give 50% of the score to the narrative and 50% for the other three measures within criterion #4. With 17 members voting in favor of this weighting, this motion passed.

e. With 50% of the criterion weight being given to items #1A, 1B, and 2 together, the group discussed the weighting options of those three items. There was a motion for weighting as follows: 12.5% for 1A, 12.5% for 1B and 25% for 2. This motion was passed successfully.

f. A small group of members were assigned the task of working on the prompt and the rubric for this criterion.

4. Weighting of All Criteria

a. As it stands, the criteria are weighted at:
   
   i. 10% - Consistency with CSUEB SSC & ILOs
   ii. 25% - Internal and External Demand
   iii. 30% - Program Quality
   iv. 25% - Costs and Productivity
   v. 10% - Unique Issues and Future Directions

b. Focusing on the future and putting less emphasis on the past, the group wants to reduce the value of criterion #4 (Costs and Productivity). There was a motion to reduce #4 to 15%, which was not passed. A second motion was made to reduce criterion #4 to 20%, which was passed successfully.

c. The group members provided input as to which criterion should be given the additional 5%.
   
   i. The group voted with 8 members in favor of adding the additional 5% to criterion #5: Unique Issues and Future Directions, which was not successful.
   ii. The group voted with 6 members in favor of adding the additional 5% to criterion #2: Demand, which was not successful.
   iii. The group voted with 7 members in favor of adding the additional 5% to criterion #1: ILOs, which was not successful.
   iv. The group added criterion 3# quality to the vote and voted again on which criterion would get the 5%. With only one vote per person, the votes were:
1. Four members in favor of adding the additional 5% to criterion #1: ILOs.
2. Four members in favor of adding the additional 5% to criterion #2: Demand.
3. Six members in favor of adding the additional 5% to criterion #3: Quality.
4. Eight members in favor of adding the additional 5% to criterion #5: Future Directions.
   v. There was a decision to vote on the top two choices, quality and future directions. **Future directions received 15 votes, and will receive the additional 5%**.
   vi. As a result the final weighting for the modified criteria are 20% for cost and productivity and 15% for unique issues and future directions.

5. **Categories of Recommendations**
   a. The proposed categories are:
      i. Merit additional investment
      ii. Sustain Present Level
      iii. Would Benefit from Consolidation
      iv. Less Central to the University Mission
   b. The preliminary Support Program task group categories are
      i. Enhance Support
      ii. Maintain Support
      iii. Reduce Support (eg: reorganize, consolidate, reconsider)
      1. The Steering committee has suggested using the word "reform" rather than reduce. There was discussion about this word and a suggestion that "revise" might be a better choice.
   c. The Steering Committee would like the two groups to be consistent with the categories.
   d. There was discussion about whether there is an expected percentage of programs that will fall into each of the categories. The response was that there is no expectation by the sponsors that each category will have a specific percent of programs.
   e. This conversation will continue online and the group will start the conversation next week on categories.

6. **Other**
   a. As of today, the subcommittees are disbanded because their work is complete. The task group will work as a whole.
   b. The group will need to discuss field testing and prototyping the template.
   c. Topics on criteria, rubrics, and weighting are completed.