

Feedback form program review criteria

This might be implied by the "similar degrees" criteria, but whether the major could be merged with another major/ form a concentration without losing its coherence

Criteria should include legislation passed recently that require and increase in the work force. The legislation related to arts education comes to mind meant to fill the disparate coverage of arts education in K-12 which will result in higher demand for art educators, - music, theater, dance, visual arts

I think looking at the resources used and the uniqueness of the program is important. Also departments should be given time (atleast 1 whole academic year) to make changes before any action is taken.

I am concerned with the potential conflation of programs and departments, particularly with respect to the criterion "GE/prerequisite contribution of department." Departments have multiple programs, and a department could offer these courses without offering all their programs. I was not sure how the following criteria are being evaluated (i.e. an argument for keeping or an argument for removing): accreditation, similar degrees at CSUEB, same or similar degrees at nearby CSU campuses. I say this because in some cases degrees may seem duplicative, but if they are impacted at other CSUs and we are not, we would want to provide a space... Also, maintaining accreditation is a great deal of work; is it being evaluated as if it is worth it (i.e. argument for removal) or as a positive because of prestige, etc...

I have two says. First, cutting programs and classes has significant impact on the competitiveness of our students in the job market and reputation of the campus as a whole. Simply cutting courses due to enrollment below a fixed threshold should take serious consideration of our students' future in the job market. Adversely students are required to take some repetitive courses with similar contents to graduate. This greatly reduces our student ability. Second, primary criteria are lack of vision into the future. The future will be a data-driven and artificial intelligence led fashion. All programs and courses with the insights and analysis of data and AI should maintain as a priority. Meanwhile these technologies cannot exist without good people. The ability of publishing research papers at Tier One journals should be a top priority in maintaining the program. Research ability of the current

programs should be also considered seriously. As a result, the thriving of our university depends on how our programs fit into the future of our society needs and retaining high quality researchers with good publications.

Definition of "enrollment" -- is this program enrollment? If so, will the data show change of major in and out of the major during this time period?

"Net cost" -- what does this mean? Will the "net cost" be broken down to be per major student? How will the non-program students be removed from program students?

Additional criteria should include the minor program coursework--does it overlap with major program coursework?

External current grant funding should be added to additional criteria

"Programmatic accreditation" should be listed as "Programmatic external accreditation"

Number of Declared Minors

I support all of the proposed primary quantitative data as well as the additional criteria and have no suggested additions to this criteria.

I am not a fan of "Documented regional workforce need and projected growth" -- it assumes a vocational nature of education CSU East Bay, an institution that traditionally serves first-generation and URM students. In addition, it presumes that programs in the arts or humanities are less valuable because there is less of a direct line into jobs. This supports a cultural misunderstanding of the valuable skills students learn in social sciences, humanities and arts classes.

I propose that an additional primary quantitative criterium is added that is related to the relevance of a course/program for student/faculty research at CSUEB. There are key courses that are required in order to ensure that student/faculty research activities can continue. Research activities lead to conference presentations and journal publications that increase the visibility and reputation of the university, and attract incoming students. The indirect cost from external research grants contribute to the overall university budget. If key courses cannot be taught to prepare students for certain research areas, faculty involved in these areas might consider leaving. I propose that a faculty survey is set up (e.g. through the Committee on Research and/or ORSP) to help identify relevant courses and quantify their contributions to CSUEB research activities.

The Arts & Performing Arts offer disciplined outlets for our students to express their creativity and practice empathy, the key ingredient of a holistic citizen. Humanity's value is not limited to quantitative numbers but to quality experiences of how we can all be critical contributors to our complex social interactions. How we care for each other is just as important than churning out numbers .

I don't have confidence that the net cost of a degree program will be calculated accurately. For example, external grant funding criteria often include student participation in research, which would be lost if there are no students in the major. Compensation for faculty teaching capstone/research/thesis/independent study is complex and differs among the colleges. Also, most of the physical science (Physics, Chemistry, Geology, Environmental Science, Biochemistry) are on the list. Are these challenging, rigorous degrees that lead to well-paying jobs not going to be available to our students? It's all but life sciences that would be wiped out. These degrees offer upward mobility. CSUEB makes a dent in the dearth of underrepresented students attaining these degrees. Please also consider the overall quality of the programs (faculty grants and publications, alumni achievements, awards & honors, student retention, etc.)

- 1) Change General education/prerequisite contribution of department to General education/breadth/prerequisite/Institutional Learning Outcomes contribution of department
- 2) Add Program Quality to additional criteria: Evidence of quality indicators for continuous improvement of teaching and learning (e.g. assessment of student learning resulting in curricular/DEI changes, evaluation scores for program faculty, alumni satisfaction surveys, CAPR reporting compliance)

I have two areas to contribute input. Documented regional workforce need and projected growth. The determination of this metric is problematic in that it needs to account for fields into which graduates of a given low enrolling program could go into - some majors are not professions per se - a civil engineering degree can be mapped to civil engineers, or a nursing degree to nurses but for other programs, especially in the Liberal Arts or Social Sciences, this is less obvious. For each low enrolling program being assessed, who is going to judge which assemblage of job classifications are going to be used to identify workforce need and projected growth? Will this list be provided by the CO, will it be generated by the pending Task Force (who would lack the understanding for programs), or by the programs themselves? This metric was used very poorly and with many disagreements among Planning for Distinction members as that process tried something similar. Net cost (enrollment revenue minus expense) How will this be determined? - both enrollment revenue and expense are very difficult to calculate at the program level especially since we don't fund programs per se but fund departments which frequently have multiple programs, may have both undergraduate and graduate programs, and may only have a portion of their faculty expenses allocated directly to instruction (and hence to enrollment). The measures I have seen and which were discussed while I was on COBRA are very simplistic and, in my judgment, currently inadequate to do justice to this very complex notion of cost, and certainly not capable of making an objective analysis that might allow apples v apples comparisons across programs. Here are some important considerations..... What constitutes revenue for a program? Revenue should include, at a minimum, the following Tuition fees paid by students - this is not a constant proportional to headcount but depends on the number of credit units being taken by the students taking the program's courses - if a program course is taken by a student who has a high unit count, then that FTES is contributing lower revenue to the University than for a student paying the same fees who has a low unit count. Undergrad and credential, graduate, post-bac, 2nd bachelor and masters students pay different fees and hence fees per credit unit depending on the number of units they register for. Moreover, tuition is in itself a complex variable - students receive different amounts of tuition depending on how much university-funded financial aid they receive. State funding - these dollars need to be allocated to instruction but how? If state funds are conceptually given to the university on the basis of FTES, then how will that then be allocated down to the program - the number of credit hours generated by the program or the head count/FTES of the students taking those credit hours? Course fees generated by students - these are now the A2E2 fees that are then redistributed to programs - how will we account for the fact that some programs generate A2E2 fees as a proportion of their enrolled students but do not cause those fees to be expended i.e. receive an A2E2 disbursement? Those programs that generate more A2E2 contributions than they receive are technically subsidizing other programs and presumably should be credited with revenue for their net fees. When considering tuition fees, a correct approach would be for each program to be given revenue credit for dollars accruing from their enrolled majors, a portion of the dollars accruing from their double major students (when they are the second major), and a portion of the dollars accruing from non-majors for whom the program provides service courses. Programs with a small number of majors offering a given number of credit hours will, all things being equal, be servicing other majors through GE and through courses required for the other major and thus need to be assigned

revenue to be balanced against instructional cost. Similarly, the flip side is true for expenses for service provided to each program; the credits provided to a program's majors by other programs must be distributed back to those programs, with the net between the two used in the cost calculation.

2. How to consider program expenses that support units in the University that do not have a source of income - enrollment, student affairs, IT, management facilities, shared governance, DEI, and so forth. The University has multiple categories of release time to achieve different purposes valued by the University, which thus need to be considered as equal to instruction. Many of those releases, for example for shared governance or for DEI work, will go to more senior faculty who have the experience and institutional knowledge required for those shared governance purposes and hence if not discounted from a program's cost analysis, may skew the net cost calculation. Similarly, how should we treat release time for administrative purposes? For example in CLASS, most programs have been assigned 16 wtu of release time for their Chair i.e. it is largely unrelated to program size and FTES. Chairs are often senior faculty on higher relative salaries but, all things being equal, their instructional contributions are delivered by temporary faculty employed at a much lower salary. Thus, in working out the cost of programs based on instruction (which is the basis for their revenue calculations) all administrative and non-instructional costs should be eliminated and/or only the costs of actual instruction (course wtu) and the salaries of those delivering it should be included on a pro-rata basis by program where faculty teach in multiple programs.

3. How to factor in or out the expenses allocated to professional development by the University through the faculty workload program which are a) temporary and b) proportionally more impactful on instructional cost calculations for smaller programs for which probationary faculty are a greater percentage of FTEF? These salary and benefit costs are accrued by programs but do not map to instruction. In essence, not discounting this assigned time from net cost calculations would counter-intuitively penalize those programs that the University has recently prioritized/rewarded with tenure-track hires designed to sustain/grow the program. By providing professional development release time, the University makes the program temporarily more expensive that it will be once the developmental, probationary period has passed.

4. How to allocate departmental expenses across multiple programs? Many academic departments in the University have multiple programs and, as previously identified, each of those programs will have a unique profile of instruction serving their own majors; their sister departmental majors; other majors; GE, code and overlay requirements for all majors; and unit total requirements (free units) for graduation. Departments are given funds in the form of Supplies and Services (S&S) and also salaries of administrative and instructional support - ASC, ASI, student assistants, and so forth. Some of these expenditures are paid for by A2E2 money and therefore belong in that net cost calculation (i.e. A2E2 monies generated and expended). Departments may also not spend all of their S&S and so only actual end of year expenditures and not the S&S allocation should be considered. Moreover, a method of S&S allocation by program needs to be determined - for example, in the case of AGES there are two S&S allocations but they do not easily map to the programs - ANTH (one program) gets one S&S allocation and GEEN (three programs and two certificates) gets a second S&S allocation but they are effectively commingled; this is likely the case in other programs such as Theater & Dance, HDEV&WS, HRD, etc. A mechanism for cost allocation across programs is required.

5.

How to consider grant and other faculty research buyouts and the associated indirect cost revenues? Many departments have faculty with internal RSCA grants (release time) and external grants (buy out) that should effectively be added to their revenue stream or reduced from their cost stream in a net cost of program calculation. As with service, research is valued by the University and should be appropriately reflected in a net cost calculation. For each wtu of research release time or buyout, departments should be credited the cost of salary, benefits and associated indirects and these should presumably be replaced with the actual cost of those instructional wtu - e.g. the nominal cost of salary and benefits of non-entitled temporary faculty used by the University when billing buy out or the actual amount reimbursed per wtu by the CO or other entity (e.g. for the Statewide Senators or for the ACIP representative).

Consider whether the degree is comprised of courses that have to exist for other majors. If so, does it make sense to get rid of it since it serves to increase options for students.

-Curious as to how the quantitative data will be aggregated across those years? Concern whether different majors may have been impacted by the pandemic. -Very important to consider the contribution of both lower and upper division GEs to the breadth of our students' education.

Enrollment, declared majors, and graduation rate are the most fair criteria to use. Many programs have no one enrolled or graduating, so they seem like obvious possibilities for discontinuation. Core classes should be preserved, along with enough faculty to meet those demands. Also, the likelihood of post graduation employment opportunities for programs should be examined as well.

Criteria all seem reasonable, but wondering about how cut offs will be determined for the primary quantitative data (guessing we are looking to cut way more than the 13 low-degree conferring programs identified by the CO). Also, will there be rubrics for the additional criteria that describe the level of performance needed in these areas for programs to remain in existence? How will the various criteria (primary and additional) be weighted for the final decision to cut or not?

Graduation rates are not completely in the control of the department. There are many external factors that affect this rate (along with equity gaps) which doesn't reflect on the effectiveness of a department, therefore, should not be included in the list of criteria. There is also something to be said of service courses to other large departments that should be evaluated. E.g., you can't have a biology program without chemistry/biochem. Will harm the the future workforce in biomedical fields if these departments/programs don't exist or shrink. Further, programs in disciplines that have an underrepresentation of URMs in the workforce should be considered since CSUEB (and other CSUs) provide an opportunity to diversify that workforce due to the students we serve.

Equity is listed along with Special circumstances. How does that fit in with academic considerations? I am concerned that a seemingly non-academic category may hinder the process.

I hope how much grant money generated by the department is also taken into account, and what kind/level of research opportunities there are for students via the department.

These considerations look appropriate, although a focus on net cost should not be a primary factor. Departments should be looked at in terms of degrees offered/conferred in aggregate, as opposed to individual programs. The importance of service contributions to other departments and their major requirements should also be a factor which is considered.

When calculating net cost take into account non-program courses that the students take and their positive enrollment impact outside the program. Do this by calculating two scenarios: with the students and the program and without the students and the program.

I think this email should have been directed to faculty and not the campus community at large. Not all staff are aware or have knowledge of academic affairs and programs.

Hello. I am a 7th year BS Biology (Physio Conc.) and BS Biochemistry major with a minor in Data Science. I am humbly requesting you to not shut down my Biochemistry major because I have worked so hard to make it this close to the finish line (estimated graduation is in a year). I've been double counting classes and taking more challenging classes for my Biochem major than my Bio major and if I can't get credit for my second major - it will be as though those classes were taken for nothing and my GPA could have been higher had I not taken those Biochem classes. Please do not shut down the Biochem program or at least allow us who are current Biochem majors to finish our degrees and get their deserved credit.

Can you consider how the department contributes to campus community, and if the majors can be incorporated/combined into other departments so we don't lose faculty?

1. Does the program teach creative thinking as well as critical thinking and problem solving. 2. Does it provide a public face for the university, and a way for the public to interact with CSUEB? 3. Does it offer holistic forms of interdisciplinary inquiry? 4. Does it we bring large groups of artists and general public onto our campus?

coursework offered that contributes to adjacent majors, interdisciplinary nature of major that includes coursework from other departments

I think 5 years is too short of time to evaluate and it should be 10. Covid changed everything and has not changed back completely. Two of those 5 years were covid. People as individuals are reactionary to current events, mature institutions like the CSU should not be.

Another criterion: Service to other degree programs and/or concentrations within or outside the home department

Here are some ways that I think the criteria could be expanded to be a more accurate gauge of the importance of each program:

1. How much does the program contribute direct and practical opportunities for students, staff, and faculty to come together in real time (either online or in person) to practice community building, diversity/inclusion/equity/justice skills, cultural sharing, and responsive listening around mental and physical health challenges as well as experiences of bias and prejudice?
2. How many inclusive and accessible campus events (open to all members of campus) does the program present each semester and how diverse are those offerings?
3. How many opportunities for small group interaction (in real time) does the program offer where students get to meet and work with professors closely?
4. What structures and practices does the program offer for the students it serves who learn in non-traditional styles and/or are neurodivergent? How are diverse learning styles celebrated and accommodated with the necessary small teacher to student ratios it takes for such diversity to be effectively honored?
5. How much does the program offer tangible opportunities for cross-program collaboration?
6. How much does the program participate in collaborations with student, staff, and faculty groups?
7. What are the tangible, public, and accessible ways that the program fosters a more vibrant and culturally diverse campus life?
8. How much does the program teach creativity in practical ways, so that as students navigate this troubled and fast-changing world they will be able to adapt to unpredictable job market changes, climate change effects, new pandemics/endemics and societal upheavals?
9. How do the students that are impacted by the program's services feel about the program? Do they want more or less course offerings? Bigger or smaller teacher to student ratios? How important is the program to their success as vibrant and thriving citizens?
10. How likely are students, faculty, staff, and community members that participate in the programs courses, public events, and relationships with faculty to recommend the program to others? (In other

words, how are the people served by the program's activities going to contribute to word-of-mouth outreach and publicity?) 11. There is a lot of talk and discussion about the university's values of Justice, Equity, Diversity and Inclusion. However, these values need to be put into practice in meaningful ways in order to become realities. How much does the program contribute to direct practice of these JEDI values?

The published numbers for attendance were not correct. Especially identified as graduates and attendance zero. I would suggest 1) These crucial numbers should be checked for accuracy prior to publishing and making decisions. 2). Deans must be involved with working with chairs to assure integrity of the figures. A plan is needed to evaluate task force on recruiting and new faculty hiring requirements based on faculty leaving / FERP retirement.

I personally would hope that we could have a more interdisciplinary option available, where classes could be attributed to multiple majors. I would also want there to be an interdisciplinary major option available, to allow students to be able to study the majors or similar topics that aren't available if entire majors are cancelled based on low-enrollment.

Crucial to emphasize service courses that a Department teaches which are required for other well-enrolled majors and areas of growth.

Overall Department quality as evaluated through the Five-Year Review process should be heavily weighted.

Faculty awards, student awards, and grants should be considered as reflective of Department excellence.

Indirect costs (IDC) brought in by the Department from external grants should be considered in terms of offsetting the "cost" of the program.

Contribution of the program to diversifying their field of study through their diverse students entering the workforce and graduate school.

Comparison of enrollment to other Departments and programs in the CSU system and for similar Universities should be considered, in terms of whether the program relatively over- or under-performing.

General education/prerequisite contribution of program Contribution to general education is a very important measure as is the degree to which one program's curriculum provides pre-requisites to others - these need also to be factored into a net cost calculation metric but will first require a curriculum mapping process based on assessment of degree road maps. But what is the appropriate metric for contribution to GE? Is it the proportion of all our student's GE met by a given program? That would ideally require a forensic analysis of DAR to know which course actually met the GE as opposed to potentially could have met the GE. This gets further complicated when a student takes a GE class not for the GE per se, but as free units contributing to their graduation - even then, the program clearly deserves credit for having contributed materially to that student graduating. Moreover, when students enroll in a given course approved for GE that also counts towards a major, a portion of the students will be simultaneously served for their major and for GE - can that be adequately accounted for? The purpose of a GE metric should be to capture some equivalent of degrees conferred because of a program's instruction that can be added to the more visible metric of the program's graduation of its own majors. Given that a minimum of 48 of 120 units for every degree is GE (the actual amount depending on how code, the UWR, etc. are satisfied), one can argue that every student taking a GE class in a program counts for 3/120 of a graduating senior. Thus, if program X has 30 students in a UD GE class worth 3 units, every student taking it for their GE is worth 1/40th of a degree granted at East Bay - thus if all 30 students used that course for their graduation, then that's 0.75 of a graduating student that the program can be credited with. Our GE metric look should look at actual DARs and the degree to which a given program's courses have made a material contribution to the education of, and hence graduation of our students. A more simplistic measure such as the proportion of a department's scheduled offerings in a given year that are approved for GE in different areas (e.g. GE units/Total units) is a less powerful indicator of contribution to GE, as is the GE FTES or SFR (GE FTES/GE FTEF). Contribution to Meeting ILOS A related metric to considering the contribution to GE is a program's importance to the University's Institutional Learning Outcomes. To be objective here, a criterion is needed to capture, for all programs and not just those on the CO low degree-conferring list, the Absolute and relative value to meeting the University Institutional Learning Outcomes. Meeting the ILOs is expected of every graduate of our institution, both undergraduate and graduate, and they are closely aligned with General Education requirements. Demonstrating that our graduates can meet the ILOs is a critical aspect of our WASC accreditation and thus any evaluation that might lead to future changes to the Academic Master Plan needs to put these considerations front and center. Although we assess and demonstrate to WASC whether we are achieving this at the institution scale through a periodic forensic analysis of evidence from a smaller cross-section of courses that are considered to map to the ILOs, there is no clear and systematic metric for this at the program level. One partial proxy metric is the degree to which a program contributes to the ILO-specific breadth overlays in their curriculum - to the Sustainability, Diversity, and Social Justice overlays which map directly to two specific ILOS. Sustainability Overlay Sustainability ILO - Act responsibly and sustainably at local, national, and global levels. Diversity and Social Justice Overlays Diversity ILO - Apply knowledge of diversity and multicultural competencies to promote equity and social justice in our communities. There are three other ILOs that apply differently to program course offerings: Think critically and creatively and apply

analytical and quantitative reasoning to address complex challenges and everyday problems
Communicate ideas, perspectives, and values clearly and persuasively while listening openly to others
Work collaboratively and respectfully as members and leaders of diverse teams and communities
A proxy for contribution to these ILOs could be the degree to which a program contributes to a corresponding GE breadth area that is closely aligned with them. However, the alignment to breadth Areas A-E is not as clear as with the three breadth overlays. We have no clear mapping of our A-E GE areas to the above three ILOs: Area A Communication in the English Language and Critical Thinking Area B Scientific Inquiry and Quantitative Reasoning Area C Arts and Humanities Area D Social Sciences Area E Lifelong Learning and Self-Development Area F is a unique GE that only applies to Ethnic Studies or courses approved by and cross-listed with Ethnic Studies and so cannot be used in a comparative assessment to look across programs. Any expedited review of low enrolling degree programs must find a way to look at those programs in the context of the ILOs which presumably means not just comparing them against each other, but against other programs which may graduate more majors each year but may be contributing little to the ILOs other than the universal: Demonstrate expertise and integration of ideas, methods, theory and practice in a specialized discipline of study. University Mission and Values and Future Directions priorities The list of criteria we have been provided for the review of low degree-conferring programs is largely a generic one and doesn't sufficiently reflect our particular campus values and priorities. Our University has both a Mission and Values statement and has recently engaged in an expensive visioning process to establish institutional Future Directions priorities. If an holistic and values-driven assessment of all our programs is to be undertaken for our periodic Master Planning, this consideration needs to be reflected in the list of quantitative and qualitative metrics to consider. Thus we need a metric that assesses Contribution to meeting the stated University Mission and Values and Future Directions priorities. It is important that a metric be included by which all our programs can be absolutely and relatively valued for the extent to which their curriculum and the learning outcomes embodied in them align with the University Mission and Values: Mission Cal State East Bay serves and values a student body with diverse lived experiences. Through innovative teaching, experiential learning, research, campus life and community engagement, our students, faculty and staff use their knowledge and experience to build and contribute to an equitable, inclusive and environmentally sustainable world. Values Cal State East Bay believes in and upholds the following values: Equity and Justice: We commit to identifying injustice and acting to make equity and accountability integral to our decisions and practices. Educational Engagement: We align knowledge, resources and equitable support in service of students' strengths to grow personally and professionally. Belonging: We value belonging and respect for all peoples and cultures, fostering a strong sense of inclusion and pride in an engaged university community. Innovative and Bold Action: We imagine and build a better future for all through an innovative exploration of ideas and critical thought. Integrity and Accountability: We uphold a culture of honesty, transparency and respect for one another while striving for continuous improvement. Respect for the Planet and its Peoples: We honor the earth and promote environmental sustainability on our campuses and in our communities. We also should adopt a metric that examines the absolute and relative extent to which the programs contribute to and align with the Future Directions priorities Priority #1: : Enhance the overall student

experience to increase engagement and retention, while promoting intellectual achievement and career readiness Priority #2: Create an authentic and empowering culture of equity, inclusion and anti-racism by embracing our diversity Priority #3: Develop and support responsive and innovative research, scholarship and creative activities for faculty and students along with new leading-edge degree and other programs Priority #4: Demonstrate continuous improvement, accountability and agility in administrative operations and financial management to prioritize student needs, employee empowerment and mission fulfillment Priority #5: Build connections with the region, state and nation through brand awareness and community, alumni and donor engagement Any program review that is truly in line with the principle and purpose of academic master planning for the efficient and effective use of resources must consider how programs align with and contribute to the University mission, vision, values and priorities.

High-impact involvement of students in research should count toward impact of program. For example, CSR scholars, BET McNair, Cal Bridge, etc. The Department's support of these programs is essential for the student support ecosystem!

I suggest the following criteria also be considered: (1) Department service courses— that is classes required by other majors or for higher degrees, for example, a CSUEB student would not be able to apply to med school without taking introductory physics. (2) Overall Department quality as evaluated through the Five-Year Review process should be heavily weighted. Faculty awards, student awards, and grants should be considered as reflective of Department excellence. (3) Indirect costs (IDC) brought in by the Department from external grants should be considered in terms of offsetting the "cost" of the program. (4) Contribution of the program to diversifying their field of study through their diverse students entering the workforce and graduate school—> for example, there is on average 1 Black woman awarded a

PhD in physics each year(!) and CSUEB just graduated a stunning Black woman physics major who is now in grad school. (5) Comparison of enrollment to other Departments and programs in the CSU system and for similar Universities should be considered, in terms of whether the program is relatively over- or under-performing.

I am concerned about two of the “Additional criteria” proposed to evaluate low degree-conferring programs. First, I do not think that “Same or similar degrees at nearby CSU campuses” should be evaluated. As a faculty advisor, I have met with multiple students from other CSUs who have recently transferred or are in the process of transferring to CSUEB because of the commuting distance. Students in the region served by our institution are not easily able to relocate to an alternate CSU, however proximate it may seem to us (from Hayward, San Jose is close, but if you’re commuting from Brentwood, it is not). This criterion stands to treat prospective students in our region inequitably, with those who have greater resources afforded greater opportunities. Second, I hope that “Documented regional workforce need and projected growth” will be used as a supplementary/beneficial criterion only, and not marked against programs in the humanities that do not have easily verifiable workforce need correlations. Many programs offer broad preparation for a variety of potential careers; these should not be discounted. Finally, I am concerned about the imperative to cancel small programs simply because of their small enrollments. While I fully appreciate that such programs *might* be contributing to higher costs and yielding little revenue, this is not necessarily the case. I’m skeptical of evaluating programs simply by their low numbers. My concentration, which is on the list, requires only two unique courses that are not otherwise required courses for other major programs, and principally filled by students in those other programs (one is a large lower-division GE course that contributes beneficially to our department’s SFR; the other is a supervisory capstone, usually taught as an unpaid workload overage – because of this, increasing the program’s enrollment would be *more* expensive than maintaining its current small size). Beyond consideration of prerequisite / GE contributions, I propose that the taskforce also consider how many courses are unique (not required or restricted electives for other programs) to each program proposed for cuts. I would also like to see consideration of how these low degree-conferring programs include courses offerings that contribute to improving SFR for their departments / colleges.

1. Evidence of University and College-level direct fiscal and staff investment in public-facing website and webpages representing or encompassing low degree-conferring programs 2. Evidence of Office of Student Outreach direct fiscal and staff investment/engagement with low degree-conferring programs 3. Evidence of Office of Student Outreach recruiting events in the last 5 years (including the period of the pandemic) and directly involving low degree-conferring programs 4. Evidence of Academic Advising and Career Education direct fiscal and staff investment/engagement with low degree-conferring programs and their students' unique career interests and internship experiences (as measured, for example, by the number of job fairs involving careers in cultural institutions or specific internships arranged for students enrolled in low degree-conferring programs; or evidence of career services appointments or resume consultations with active-enrolled students in low degree-conferring programs. 5. Audit of functionality and representation of low degree-conferring programs within Cal State Apply and CSU Degree Search, as fostered and supported by Enrollment Management and/or APS; metric of consultation with low degree-conferring programs and their representation in CSA and CSU Degree Search 6. Evidence or measures of professional advising support for low degree-conferring programs, especially as indicated by number of individual advising appointments by professional advisors for students in low-degree conferring programs (e.g., from Bay Advisor), from matriculation through graduation 7. Evidence of University Communications and Marketing engagement in the activities and events undertaken by low degree-conferring programs, as measured by numbers of stories and direct staff contact with faculty and chairs in low degree-conferring programs 8. Contributions of low degree-conferring departments to General Education and Breadth requirements 9. Contributions of low degree-conferring departments to University Institutional Learning Outcomes, University Mission and Values, and Future Directions priorities 10. Metrics related to the overall decline in CSUEB enrollment, and relative proportion of declines across all departments and programs since 2018-2019

example. If a program like art is low but the content is deemed important, the programs should find a way to merge. For example Art/Design/Communication

I think it is very important to train the next generation in disciplines that can tackle the problems of the future (e.g., climate change, scarcity of high quality water, aging population with an increase in neurological disorders). An additional criterion could be whether a degree program offers courses and research opportunities to students that reflect the most pressing needs of our society. Also, I am thinking that disciplines which offer hands-on laboratory experiences deserve special consideration. So many resources and online courses are available free of charge and students will no longer need to enroll in courses or degree programs which can be conveyed over the internet. Degree programs with hands-on training opportunities, however, are indispensable. Students who seek to enter a profession in Chemistry or Biochemistry, for example, need access to instrumentation and therefore need a university which offers such training opportunities close to their home.

Hi There, Since this process will affect every College in the University, having just two faculty representatives (from the information I have) makes it seem that there will be very little faculty input in this process? Since most of the administrators do not know what is happening on the front lines with many (if not all) of these programs, it seems to me that faculty representation on the committee would be more of an asset than a detriment. I know a resolution was just passed by the Senate, which is pretty useless if there are no changes to committees like this one. Additionally, not having faculty representation fosters the perception that changes will be made and implemented before any Universitywide (or College) discussion. I may have missed the email that states all the criteria that the committee will be looking at, but I think it should be made available to all departments in the University. Thanks,

Please consider the aggregate of the degrees from one program, rather than looking at individual degrees within a department. Additionally, realize that classes from a particular department are needed for other degrees, and may be critical for success. Keeping a vibrant department alive for service to others is just as important. Look at the program holistically.

Thanks for the opportunity to provide feedback. My feedback is motivated by the inclusion in the list of a specific program (the MS in Quantitative Economics), but the general message may be valid for other programs on the list as well. Currently the MSQE takes 0 resources from the University: the few (2) students who are still actively enrolled in the program are taking individual study to finish the degree. Faculty are not compensated for leading these individual studies. The program is suspended, and doesn't currently accept students. The Chancellor's Office may see this program as an obvious candidate to be eliminated, but my suggestion would be to keep it suspended, rather than proceeding to cut it, since there may be an opportunity to relaunch it in the future (avoiding the costs to create a new program from scratch). So, if the purpose of the list is to identify programs to cut, I would ask to keep into consideration the current and projected cost of the program for the University, and keep in mind that there are future costs and uncertainty associated with the creation of a completely new program.

Satisfied and possibly happy alumni are important for CSUEB and the College especially. Satisfied alumni are those who are recruited before or as soon as the student graduates. Happy alumni are more likely to give back to their alma mater. The academic research advises to cultivate would-be graduates while they are in school, in addition to providing quality education and career-readiness. Another important criteria to assess program success is how their graduates fare. Career readiness and college-grad appropriate employment needs to be tracked systematically.

I am in chemistry and biochemistry. All of our degree programs are on the LDC list. However, if our B.A./B.S. degrees are combined then we would not be on this list. This may be true for other programs as well. My suggestion is to consolidate degree programs within a department that have a high degree of redundancy. In our case, it would be to offer B.S. Chemistry and B.S. Biochemistry only, eliminating the B.A.

POSC BA International Studies/Global Studies - International Studies/Global Studies (Global Studies): BA

Please return this to POSC. It was part of our program until 2015 and is even listed as POSC but for some reason now resides in AGES.

Return to POSC please!

It seems that looking at numbers during Covid is not a practical or equitable expectation. If looking at student enrollment, look at prior numbers and current numbers without 2020-2021. Since Covid, many things have impacted the university, I would look to see if there's a plan, and if there is none in place, there should be an investigation to see if the interest in that major has declined or the modality, times courses are offered, the number of credits required etc are barriers to student enrollment and retention.

1. Does the program teach applied creative thinking and problem-solving, in addition to critical thinking and problem solving? If so, how does this lead to a wide range of employment skills and career pathways?
2. Does the program engage students in holistic and interdisciplinary modes of inquiry? If so, how does this lead to a wide range of employment skills and career pathways?
3. Does the program consistently bring community groups to visit campus, and to benefit from the activities of faculty, students and guest artists?
4. Does the program use high-impact practices, such as: formal and informal learning communities; personalized mentoring; collaborative assignments and projects; diversity/global learning through cultural and experiential learning; consistent involvement of students in faculty research and creative activity?
5. Does the program serve a diverse group of students in terms of dis/ability, race, ethnicity, documentation and first generation status, gender identity, sexual orientation and age?
6. Does the program have a record of professional achievement locally by alumni - in other words, is the program giving back to our communities in the long-term?

According to the CSU system, for undergrad programs in particular, certain disciplines are defined as "core" disciplines according to: Blue Book 1980 - Basic (Core) Programs. If a program is designated as a core program, it should be considered for "no action" as it is core to the mission of the University.

The values of the programs and Departments should be evaluated holistically based on results of 5-year reviews over the past 5, 10, 15 years. This should not be seen as a short-term cost-saving measure but a long-term plan! Because current students will have to be taught and graduated, eliminating programs offers little to no short-term cost savings.

An appropriate conclusion could reasonably be for some programs that "no action is required." Other campuses have noted this in their discussions and are proceeding with this in mind.

Please use the Basic Core Undergraduate Program Designations for identifying where according to the CSU "need and demand should NOT be the preeminent criteria for offering the undergraduate program." See https://www.calstate.edu/csu-system/administration/academic-and-student-affairs/academic-programs-innovations-and-faculty-development/Documents/Basic_Core_Undergrad_Programs_1980_Blue_Book.pdf

My comment doesn't specifically relate to review criteria, but could help with one of the majors on the present list. It is worth considering returning the Global Studies Program to the Political Science Department (as is currently listed on the spreadsheet). This could provide a beneficial opportunity to re-envision the program, including increasing recruitment both on and off campus. POSC has two faculty deeply rooted in the International Studies Association leadership (the largest professional association of teachers and scholars of international studies) who could work, with AGES faculty, to further develop and strengthen the program.

In terms of criteria by which programs should be evaluated, it is difficult to determine what metrics are most suitable when we do not know the intention of the review. So, without clarity on the purpose of the review itself, any criteria being selected will be, de facto, arbitrary.

That being said, it is also important to note that the criteria indicated by the CO as a starting point should not be applied equally to all programs. CSU policy (see Blue Book 1980) notes a set of "Basic (Core) Undergraduate Programs," which are all "ones wherein need and demand should not be the preeminent criteria for offering undergraduate programs. In evaluating these programs, qualitative criteria regarding program integrity should be paramount." (italics added). In fact, of the 19 undergraduate programs identified as low-degree-conferring, fully 12 of them are Basic (Core) Undergraduate Programs.

Given the fact that the CO has identified "enrollment" and "number of declared majors" as "primary quantitative criteria," it stands to reason that the Basic (Core) programs should be stricken from the list of programs under review. The following programs are, thus, inappropriate for review as established by the CO metrics: Geography BS; Art History BA; Art Design BA; French BA; Spanish BA; Philosophy BA; Chemistry BA; Chemistry BS; Geology BA; Geology BS; Physics BA; & Physics BS.

Since CSU policy is clear that such quantitative metrics are inappropriate for review of these Basic (Core) programs, then a focus on such metrics can only lead to review of the remaining programs not considered Basic (Core).

As such, one set of metrics, including the quantitative data identified as "primary," can be developed to review the following programs: Environmental Studies BA; International Studies BA; Biochemistry BA; Biochemistry BS; Environmental Science & Occupational Health BS; Environmental Science BS; & Interdisciplinary Studies BA.

Otherwise, two sets of criteria need to be established, one of which will not include the metrics designated as "primary" by the CO.

International Studies should be returned to POSC (from AGES). International Studies had been with POSC until 2015. Since then, there has been a decline in enrollment and student engagement.

-The graduation rate data published in the list of LDC programs is inaccurate, based on data available on CSUEB's Pioneer Insights and the CO's CSU Student Success Dashboard. It is unclear how the graduation rate data was determined. The fact that inaccurate data was used to create the LDC program list and has not yet been updated is deeply concerning and reflects poorly on the administration. This must be corrected moving forward in the review process.

-There is a significant proportion of LDC programs that are defined as Basic Core undergraduate programs (e.g. Art, Chemistry, Geography, Philosophy, Physics) in the CSU Blue Book 1980 (page 33), which is publicly available on the CSU wide Academic Policies website. How will this Basic Core undergraduate program designation be taken into account in the review process? These are programs for which "societal need and student demand are not the 'preeminent criteria' for offering baccalaureate programs in these disciplines." The Blue Book also states: "In evaluating these programs, qualitative criteria regarding program integrity should be paramount." Considering this Basic Core status is a critical aspect to the review process, assuming the primary goal of the review process is to "identify actions to improve" these programs. Ignoring this implies the ultimate goal of the review process is to eliminating these LDC programs entirely as an austerity measure, which may do a disservice to our student population in the long run.

-What constitutes as revenue for a given program? What constitutes expense?
-Will external grants and other faculty research buyout mechanisms be included in the "Net Cost" calculation? For example, CSCI departments such as Physics and Chemistry&Biochemistry bring in a significant amount of external funding (which in turn contributes towards indirect cost revenue). These departments significantly contribute to indirect cost revenue despite their LDC program status.

-How will "documented regional workforce need and projected growth" be defined? Who will define it (CSUEB specific task force, the Chancellor's Office?)? This seems extremely challenging and complicated to quantify. Certain major degrees can be applied to a many different disciplines/careers, especially those in the liberal arts and social sciences. For example, someone with a Philosophy degree could apply to law school or get a job in the tech industry.

-Will "regional" specifically refer to the SF Bay Area, or California? While many CSUEB alumni will remain in the SF Bay Area, many alumni will also relocate elsewhere for their future careers.

-How could admission and acceptance to graduate/professional level programs (PhD, JD, MD, etc.) be incorporated as a metric?

Proposed criteria: Relevance for future political/economic/social needs; quality of curriculum; availability of faculty; potential of the program to work with other programs for mutual benefit. One suggestion is to move some programs to other departments; for example, the Global Studies program is currently under AGES but was in the POSC department until around 2015. The POSC department has 2 tenured faculty who teach many of the POSC classes (International Relations and Comparative Politics) that are listed in the curriculum of GS. They are already part of a consortium of GS programs of CSUs and are working on increasing their programs' visibilities. The department has been introducing new courses that are relevant to wider society (governance, sustainability, law, among others), and the faculty are committed to continuing with the interdisciplinary nature of the GS program.

Thank you for this opportunity to share our thoughts. As chair of Communication, a department that has a small MA program (recently identified for suspension) I would ask that other criteria be taken into account. We were ordered to suspend our program even though almost all of our graduate courses are co-listed with upper-division undergrad courses. Most faculty readily agree to offer their classes "stacked" when asked. This surely changes the net cost equation, but was not accounted for. I would add that as departments we are not given a clear understanding of our net cost as a units in the University (revenue vs expenses) so it is difficult to make specific budget arguments.

As well, it would seem that undergraduate and graduate programs are being treated the same in terms of cost. Graduate education is meant to be more intensive and requires much more engagement and time of faculty on a per-student basis. They inherently have a lower student-faculty ratio. My reading of the ASCSU's 2007 document on meeting the needs of students in the 21st century (p 57-59) is that this element ought to be taken into consideration when conducting a review such as this.

The criterion regarding regional workforce and projected needs appears to be directly aimed at non-STEM programs. Students in the social sciences, arts and humanities do not have a single pathway to career. One of the strengths of these programs is that they explicitly prepare students for a wide variety of opportunities in the workforce. They help students develop critical thinking and literacy that is invaluable, indeed essential, in the 21st-century world of disinformation and anti-democratic politics. For Communication specifically, one of our most important roles is enabling our under-represented students in finding and using their voices -- in both their professional and personal lives and in mediated and interpersonal situations. This can never be measured in terms of school-to-job metrics. Graduates of our Communication programs, both graduate and undergraduate, work in fields too numerous to iterate. They include more obvious roles such as organizational or corporate communication, and journalism. But our graduates are also highly successful in the tech sector and in media production for both corporate and non-profit entities. Others are deeply embedded in community and activist organizations. Our masters students in particular are educators, several of whom are teaching at East Bay and local community colleges. Some go on to do doctoral work or attend professional programs such as law school. Finally, I argue more broadly that the arts and humanities in particular are essential to social cohesion and belonging for under-represented minority people. I can think of nothing more important in

our fractured society.

Thank you for inviting feedback.

1. How do the courses offered by the program support other degrees on campus? In other words, what is the larger impact of those courses on the student body and the ability of other degree programs to provide a high-quality education?
2. How do the programs support GE instruction, particularly for GE categories with fewer offerings?
3. What are the job prospects for these programs? Is there a high need for people with certain skills in the local economy offered by this program? Does the university have a reputation in the community with regard to strong graduates from this program?

Because our programs/departments do not exist independently of one another, program elimination based on some of the proposed criteria may have a domino effect on remaining programs. How will this be considered and/or measured?

We will need clarity in how we define program vs. department, etc. For departments that house more than one program/major how will the criteria be applied? In particular, it may be difficult to understand the cost of maintaining a small program within a large department.

For consideration of similar programs, some care needs to be taken since our students often change majors. Students who want a more common major are less likely to choose a campus based on the availability of that major vs. a more unusual major, which may have been what attracted a student in the first place. So, it is unclear whether duplicating a similar major at a neighboring campus is a "pro" or "con".

The phrasing of "Primary quantitative criteria" indicate that the "Additional criteria" are less important and/or are not quantitative in nature? How will these criteria be weighted, if at all?

We might also consider programs at our primary feeder community colleges as a means for growth along side the "documented regional workforce need".

What will the process overall look like? Will we be following existing senate processes and procedures for program review?

I do not believe this format is consistent with shared governance. The meeting of creative minds is not distinguished simply as a sum of its individual parts/thoughts. The value is in the discourse and deliberation through which brilliance can emerge. You may ask many individuals for their ideas on things, but you will end up missing the bigger picture and potential of the many who care deeply about the institution and who want it to succeed — despite all the initiatives conjured to engineer (thus, control) the process. Brilliance is messy. Caring is interpersonal. This format for collecting feedback is neither.

Ten Proposed Criteria for Review of Low Degree-Conferring Programs *Duplicate of #49

These criteria reflect the degree to which any program at CSUEB, including low degree-conferring programs, have received support from their college or the university that is relevant to recruitment, retention and graduation of majors. They are important in the context of the memo from the BoT/CO which calls for low degree-conferring programs to be reviewed using “quantitative and qualitative metrics” for the purpose of “taking actions to improve.”

1. Evidence of University and College-level direct fiscal and staff investment in public-facing website and webpages representing or encompassing low degree-conferring programs
2. Evidence of Office of Student Outreach direct fiscal and staff investment/engagement with low degree-conferring programs
3. Evidence of Office of Student Outreach recruiting events in the last 5 years (including the period of the pandemic) and directly involving low degree-conferring programs
4. Evidence of Academic Advising and Career Education direct fiscal and staff investment/engagement with low degree-conferring programs and their students’ unique career interests and internship experiences (as measured, for example, by the number of job fairs involving careers in cultural institutions or specific internships arranged for students enrolled in low degree-conferring programs; or evidence of career services appointments or resume consultations with active-enrolled students in low degree-conferring programs)
5. Audit of functionality and representation of low degree-conferring programs within Cal State Apply and CSU Degree Search, as fostered and supported by Enrollment Management and/or APS; metric of consultation with low degree-conferring programs and their representation in CSA and CSU Degree Search
6. Evidence or measures of professional advising support for low degree-conferring programs, especially as indicated by number of individual advising appointments by professional advisors for students in low-degree conferring programs (e.g., from Bay Advisor), from matriculation through graduation
7. Evidence of University Communications and Marketing engagement in the activities and events undertaken by low degree-conferring programs, as measured by numbers of stories and direct staff contact with faculty and chairs in low degree-conferring programs
8. Contributions of low degree-conferring departments to General Education and Breadth requirements
9. Contributions of low degree-conferring departments to University Institutional Learning Outcomes, University Mission and Values, and Future Directions priorities
10. Metrics related to the overall decline in CSUEB enrollment, and relative proportion of declines across all departments and programs since 2018-2019

My first comment is that quantitative criteria should not be the focus of program assessment, for multiple reasons. First of all, because it plays into an approach to higher education that elevates metrics over experiences, and thus reduces our attention to our values (such as racial equity) that are not well represented by the listed quantitative metrics. For example, the number of majors does not denote whether certain communities or values are served more by a program than others. Enrollment over the period described can also give a false impression of a program's overall value over time, to the students, and to society. We cannot ignore not only the pandemic, but economic factors that (for example) disincentivize students to attend a campus that requires a personal vehicle and all the costs associated.

Pertinent to my own experience, my teaching on sustainability topics is mostly to GE-seeking students, not majors. For a campus and admin leadership that claims to support sustainability, it strikes me as contradictory and short-sighted to have our only dedicated program teaching such issues (Environmental Studies) on the chopping block.

In addition, the idea that we should not have similar programs at multiple campuses (SFSA, SJSU, CSUEB) ignores our stated commitments to equity, expecting students living in lower income areas (often suburbs, often with their parents) to commute even further in order to attend a program they can afford and would like to study. It would actively undermine campus efforts to achieve social equity goals to shutter programs under this criteria. It should simply not factor into program decisions. If this were to go through, I would at least hope to see the CSU administration put resources into expanding the remaining programs, and supporting regional students to be able to attend them. Otherwise, we are simply killing our programs and offering a vision of an ever-shrinking university with fewer and fewer programs.

I also question why this demand from the Chancellor is not being questioned or opposed by our President and other campus leadership as a needless austerity measure, given the abundant reserves of the CSU system as a whole. Why are we not planning to grow our student enrollment? Why are we playing into the narrative of a dying university? Why are we assuming that programs with few students as majors are somehow less valuable to society and to the future?

Lastly, for our department (AGES), our programs are all part of the broad liberal arts curriculum that the CSU is constitutionally dedicated to providing, regardless of financial (business-minded) metrics. While there are many jobs that anthropology, geography, and environmental studies majors can go into, these are not straightforward as with a nursing or criminal justice program; to penalize these kinds of programs under a rationality about "documented regional workforce need and projected growth" is both biased against such programs, and self-defeating of the broad educational goals of a public university.