Perhaps it would be more accurate to state that I have concerns about some of the remarks I heard at the forum I attended.

1. Concern was expressed regarding our CSUEB graduation rate. Do we know why it is so low? The implication at the forum was that the flaw lay with the faculty, but that is too simplistic. I do not know our current data on this question, but I recommend that we spend some of our Planning for Distinction dollars to find out. In order to have an objective exploration, a third party company needs to be hired. Not a consulting company, but a polling company with a good reputation. We would give them the names and contact information (as we have it) for all students who dropped out, failed, or generally did not reach graduation. Five years of these names could be provided. The company would be asked to track down as many of these persons as possible and query them about why they did not graduate. Possible reasons? Faculty teaching, nature of programs, inability to navigate CSUEB bureaucracy, inability to navigate federal bureaucracy, advising, health issues, family issues, others (I'm sure). We could then focus on the most prominent of the issues.

2. Concern was expressed about the fact that CAPR has not questioned programs sufficiently in recent years. A discussion should be held with chairs of CAPR--Chris Chamberlain, Michael Lee, me, whoever preceded me, perhaps even earlier chairs of CAPR. The three I've named have covered five years of chairing CAPR. From my own time as chair, I can assure you that the pressure to pass problematic programs (existing or proposed) came not from fellow faculty or from the Senate as a body, but from the President's Office. Please do not assume that this issue of rigor is necessarily related to faculty.

3. It was stated that the Dickeson book was a 'guide'; yet, I understand that each committee member received a copy and from various remarks, there is some contradiction in how much this book is at the core of this process. On the website are links to various universities that have gone through this or a similar process. These appear to be successful examples, which is fine, but what is not fine is that we do not have a balanced view because there are no examples of unsuccessful processes. University of Northern Colorado, Dickeson's institution, did not have a successful experience, nor have some CSUs. The argument that they did not or are not following the same program as we intend to follow doesn't justify providing such a biased view of the end results of other processes and it is likely that we would learn more from unsuccessful processes than successful ones. Multiple views should be researched and presented on the website as well.

We are supposed to be researchers. I suggest we set an example to our students of an appropriate research process. That means delving far more deeply into "why" certain conditions exist on our campus rather than continuing to work from innuendo, assumption, and unverified opinion, and it also means reading more widely and exploring in a more objective manner the various processes that have been both successful and unsuccessful. I have no confidence that this is taking place, only a sense that assumptions have been made and that we are acting on those assumptions.
without investigation.

I am sufficiently disturbed by what I have heard so far to send this to every committee member on the three committees in the hope that I can have some effect on the outcome. In closing, thank you for reading this far (if you have). I have other concerns, but these are a place to start.

Aline Soules
November 18, 2012

I have been meaning to write you since I have not attended any of the academic task force meetings. I recall you had ambitious plans this quarter to discuss criteria and weighting for Academic Programs. As the Diversity and Equity Officer, I want to put in my recommendation that the broad area of Diversity become an identifiable criteria with strong weighting. The Dickeson book barely mentions it under Criteria #9. Diversity will need to be defined as to what is meant by our use of it, but with many on this campus having expertise in this topic we should be able to do so. I am not sure when these discussions will commence, but I hope they have not occurred yet.

Second, I have heard from several colleagues who have asked me if your committee can have an open forum with faculty before criteria are developed. I told them I would share this idea with you and Nancy for your consideration in case they have not done so already. A carefully crafted and transparent process is vitally needed as we go forward whatever the committee decides to do.

Kim Geron
November 20, 2012

The amount of money being spent on this process is ridiculous. It's obvious that the academic side of the house has been underfunded for years while administration ranks continue to grow. It makes me sick. The only positive thing that could come out of this process would be the elimination of unneeded bureaucracy (ie administrators & their high salaries) at CSUEB. Otherwise it's just more money being spent to justify the jobs of these administrators in the first place. Get back to basics. Fund depts, fund faculty jobs, hire more tenure line faculty, and do what the univ main mission is: teach students. It may not be the trendy, sexy fad in education management to do this, but it's what a university is all about. Get out of the way administrators and just let students learn and faculty teach.

Anonymous
December 3, 2012
Comments from survey sent to campus community Dec. 5, 2012

Program Definition
- A program/service unit definition should relate directly to the university mission and mandates which focus on student success.
- It seems obvious, but majors and minors ought to have different criteria, one would imagine.
- Focus on bachelors and masters degree programs. Consider programs within the context of the department that provides them.
- It may be helpful to provide a definition of the program or service that is the subject of the template. Following is a suggested definition of a support program or service: "A support program or service is a group of activities or tasks with a common purpose or goal that collectively require resources, including people, money, space, or technology.

Criteria
- Student success should be a criteria for each analysis.
- I think it is important that some comparison of similar programs at other institutions be considered more than comparing different programs across this campus.
- After reviewing one of the examples of the program prioritization process at another university, the Indiana State University Final Prioritization Report, I noticed that larger programs tended to be ranked higher (e.g. Nursing, Psychology, Management). Most of the programs recommended for elimination were smaller programs in the liberal arts and sciences. I am concerned that CSUEB may end up with the same results. If the primary goal of the process is to turn the university into a for-profit business, this could be achieved by simply eliminating programs based on size, i.e., cut the small programs. If, however, we want to continue to have a liberal arts institution that produces literate and socially-conscious graduate with numeracy skills and the ability to think outside of their own particular discipline, we need to preserve diversity within our program offerings. Programs should not be ranked based on size, but rather on other indications of value. Significant trends and their probable impact on programs in the next few years should be one criterion.

Weighting of Criteria
- Student outcomes as a criteria should carry a considerable weight.
- Measures such as student headcount and total number of SCUs should be normalized by the number of faculty.

Data Measurement
- Data and measurement should be qualitative as well as quantitative in nature.
• Institutional data that is available from Academic Programs will presumably be used.
• Smaller programs will by definition have smaller student headcounts and number of degrees awarded. These do not provide meaningful measures of academic quality or a department's overall contribution the University through general education offerings. Other measures such as the total number of SCUs taught vs. the number of faculty, student-faculty ratio, and average section size should be included in the ranking criteria.
• The data may contain some important trends that should be considered. For example, if a program's student headcount (number of majors) has surged in the past 1-2 years, it may not yet be reflected in the number of degrees granted.
• Other measures such as the degree to which tenure-track faculty are involved in research and publication should be included.

Report Template
• Include space for the following:
  o Discussion of significant trends in institutional data.
  o Faculty publications in peer-reviewed journals. Name of journal, year, title, authors, number of pages.
  o Faculty grants: Amount, name of project, PIs, granting agency, date awarded, period of award.

Other
• Many activities at the university may not be defined as programs, but programs that are clearly defined often get funding. Student services for example, or enrollment recruiting are very important aspects of value provided to the student that distinguish our campus when compared with other colleges a student might choose. I would hope the more difficult to define services and value added activities be included even if they are hard to measure in relation to outcomes.
• Thank you.
• Interdisciplinary programs are essential for training students how to address today's problems and succeed in the workplace. These programs tend to be smaller.
• Programs can be eliminated relatively quickly, but take much longer to build.
• Many tenure-track faculty members at CSUEB have chosen to work here not because it's a teaching university, but because it provides them with an opportunity to work at an advanced level in their field of study and engage in research. Teaching large introductory-level classes is often the most challenging part of their job, but they are willing to it because they also get to teach advanced-level classes and engage in research. If their degree programs were to be eliminated, and they were faced with the prospect of teaching only large introductory classes to non-majors, many of our best tenure-track faculty would leave CSUEB for industry, research labs, or other universities where they could continue to pursue their careers at the highest level.