Observing present: Pat Jennings, Susan Gubernat, Jennifer Eagan, Mitch Watnik

I. Program Definition

A. A working definition was adopted for the purposes of the discussion, which was “a program is an academic activity that consumes resources and is required for an academic degree, credential or certificate”. This definition would include degree programs, self-support, credential programs, certificate programs, DCIE programs. A final decision on this definition will be discussed in January.

B. There was discussion about placement of programs that do not clearly fit into either the instructional group or the support group.

1. The for-credit instructional program in the library will be considered by the Instructional Program task group and the support services of the library will be considered by the Support Program task group.

2. Academic department offices and the GE office will be considered by the Support group and GS courses will be covered by the Instructional group.

3. Writing Skills Test is complicated and no decision was made on this program.

C. The group reviewed again the lists of programs from each of the four colleges and DCIE.

1. There was recognition that there can be some overlap with DCIE, and when this occurs, the college department should complete the template with any needed assistance from DCIE.

2. There was then discussion about how the process will work for completing the report templates. It was concluded that the department chairs will forward the reports to the college deans for verification, and the deans will then submit the reports to the task group.

3. There was discussion about what data exists to populate the report template and getting a better handle on the level of detail in the data. Jose and Nancy will research further issues associated with data and report back.

4. The conversation on data, led to further clarification on the possible definition of “program”. There were questions about what constituted a minor and whether minors are revenue neutral. There were questions about using FTES or SCU as a
measurement. Cal Poly’s definition was: any academic affairs unit, program, center, or institute that generates FTE. On the support side, Cal Poly’s definition was anything that does not generate FTE. A new definition was proposed as: A program is an academic activity/entity/unit that generates SCU. It was decided to postpone finalizing program definition until Jose and Nancy can talk further with the deans and return to the group with more information in January. Members of the task group were encouraged to share ideas on program definition with the chairs.

II. Criteria

There were presentations by the subcommittees. Each subcommittee was asked to address the following questions:

A. What is the importance of the criterion in evaluating programs?
   1. Should it be included/excluded for CSUEB?
   2. Should it be combined/merged with other criterion?

B. What measures could be used and data would be required?
   1. Recommend measures/questions for the template.
   2. Recommend data for the template.

C. What does this criterion mean?
   1. What will the answers and the data tell us?

D. Are there other criteria that should be considered?

A. Consistency with CSUEB Mission, Strategic Commitments and ILOs – Michael Lee and Jeff Simons

1. Base it on current and actual practices that contain consistency with the mission i.e. what programs have done and are currently doing (recent past and approved changes that are already in the works). In addition, programs should be allowed to project how they will align with the mission, commitments and ILOs through changes they could make in the next five years. Given that commitments and ILOs are relatively new, many programs will not yet have had a chance to work through their relationship to the ILOs but they could speak about where potential lies and what resources would be needed to get there. This criterion thus provides an opportunity to project forward.

2. Being able to match the mission is a very subjective. Rather than making up what it looks like to match the ILOs, we want to go to the committees that created the ILOs and ask them “how would you know it you saw it?”

3. Yes, it should be included. Self-assessment combined with a narrative assessment. The answers and data will tell us the degree to which the program is matched to the mission and ILOs. A model rubic was created that could be provided as part of the report template. The self-assessment could be skewed and should count for only about 20% of the rating. The task group
concluded this was a good criterion but not sure it matches what their objective.

B. History, Development, and Expectations of the Program – Leann Christianson and Dana Edwards

1. It is preferable to not combine it with another criterion but if it must be, it could be combined with #10 (Impact, Justification, Essentiality).
2. History – should be a brief narrative.
3. Development – look at number of faculty/courses to see if it has grown or shrunk (may not be able to go back to the start of a program so the task group should decide how far back is acceptable).
4. Look at trends and funding.
5. This criterion is important since it is the only one that looks over time and includes the historical context. What has happened to/through the program over time can be included.
6. Expectations – will need to go back at least 5 years to view trends.
7. History could be used as supporting evidence but not necessarily something that all programs would be rated on. History could support future expectations. But history is important in considering demand.

C. External Demand for the Program – Tom Bickley and Gregory Theyel

1. The information provided from this will be regional relevance, competitiveness, quality/placement of graduates which indicates demand.
2. Other criteria to consider: certain courses are intrinsic to the identity of the university, adds richness. There are consequences for elimination of programs. Some programs may have intrinsic value independent of value towards job placement.
3. Consider that external demand is not just where students are going but where they come from.
4. Must be careful not to have overlap with other criteria: demand and outcome is being overlapped here.
5. Should consider major switches without subtracting from the initial major where students change their mind but adding to the new major that is able to capture students.
6. Whether this data analysis will be available and informative. This is only the case for some.
7. Perhaps some data can be pre-populated through a data researcher to take some work load off of the departments filling out the templates.

D. Internal Demand for the Program – Dennis Chester and Michael Leung
   1. Very important. Reflects the contact with students.
   2. Measurements: # sections offered, enrollment, advising sessions.
   3. Reflects whether the program is needed or not needed.
   4. Low internal demand does not necessarily indicate lack of importance.
   5. It should be include but not combined. It overlaps but needs to be identified on its own.
   6. Accreditation must also be addressed because it costs more.
   7. Programs should evaluate themselves including how involved they are with GE because that is a different cost.

E. Quality of Program Inputs and Processes and Quality of Program Outcomes – Vish Hegde, Saeid Motavalli and Zinovy Radovilsky
   1. Combining #5 and 6. Criteria can be quantitative and/or qualitative. Prefer the rubric method more than the others (see Washington State).
   2. Measuring “quality” of students is questionable.
   3. Annual reports and when was the last 5-year review should be included.
   4. Curriculum relevancy: what does it mean? “(aligned with external needs) advisory board, curriculum updates, etc.” There are other ways to show relevancy. Include alignment with internal needs.
   5. Add to curriculum: curriculum map & assessment.
   6. Was not put into a template for the sake of just being able to understand and digest such an inclusive criterion.

F. Size, Scope, and Productivity of the Program – Nina Haft and Penny McCullagh
   1. This criterion covers a lot of items from the other criteria.
   2. Data should be trends over time.
   3. We should be able to use Fall 2012 data because we should be looking at now.
   4. “Size” gives numbers but the numbers need to be interpreted. Many of the size measures were covered in other criteria.
5. A lot of what was covered in other criteria topics could be covered in “scope,” which is the breadth and depth of a program’s curriculum.

6. This criterion could possibly eliminated as much of it is met it in other areas.

G. Revenues and Other Resources Generated by the Program – Don Gailey and Erica Wildy

1. This could merged with #9 (Costs and Expenses).
2. Add sources of revenue as A2E2, clinics, donations, change title to “revenues, sales and services.”
3. Provides an additional measure by which to assess the importance of a program.
4. Other criteria to consider would be turning this into a cost effective type measure, financial impact of increasing/decreasing the program, is there an alternative source /way to get the revenue.
5. This criterion should be included.
6. When we talk about cost we must consider the cost from all sources.
7. With inconsistent criteria, it could be thought of as extra merit rather than demerits.

H. Costs and Other Expenses Associated with the Program – Dawna Komorosky and Sue Opp

1. A course offered to both majors and GE would have to be figured out based on how much was GE and how much major.
2. Essentiality of the program is divided by the different roles that are played.
3. Certain things could be broken down but some assumptions would be made, e.g., you could look at the majors in the course.
4. Include costs for remedial course but take them out of the costs for the regular program.
5. Will be different for every program but is significant still.
6. This alone is not a good measure.
7. It has to take into account everything.
8. Possibly only look at cost covered by state funds since other criteria include grants and such in the revenue.
9. Will we be looking at graduate and undergrad separately?

I. Impact, Justification, and Overall Essentiality of the Program – Nidhi Mahendra and Tom Hird
1. Gives people a chance to say what they have not already said and share crucial information not addressed in other criteria.

2. How do you limit the amount of response? The length of the response should be considered with weighting. More heavily weighted criteria should be allowed more room to explain.

3. See Faculty map.

J. Opportunity Analysis of the Program – Kathleen Rountree

1. This is recommended to be included and to be incredibly flexible because it needs to be tailored to each program.

2. Each program is to be given the chance to show **substantive** opportunity.

3. Suggest adding potential threats to the field.

4. Limit analysis to 1-2 pages.

III. Other Issues

A. Meeting notes – okay to be published on web

B. Tentative Schedule for Winter and Spring 2013 is Fridays from 9:00am – 12:00pm, during Winter quarter. First meeting will be Jan. 11.

C. Find new room: preference is VBT 136.

D. At the end of February, there will be meetings with the people who will be completing the report templates. At that point written documents and other things will be supplied to help them understand what the task group is looking for in the reports.

E. We will use one template. Will that allow all programs to respond fairly?

F. Any data issues will be taken to Institutional Research. Jose and Nancy will talk with Amber before the next meeting to review data issues.

G. Provide examples, but not necessarily requirements, for completing templates.