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 concentrat on without losing its coherence

Criteria should include legislat on passed recently that require and increase in the work force. The legislat on related to arts educat on comes to mind meant to fll the disparate coverage of arts educat on in K-12 which will result in higher demand for a

programs should be also considered seriously. As a result, the thriving of our university depends on how our programs ft 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?
Addit onal criteria should include the minor program courseworkdoes it overlap with major program coursework?
External current grant funding should be added to addit onal criteria
"Programmat c accreditat on" should be listed as "Programmat c external accreditat on"

I don't have conf dence that the net cost of a degree program will be calculated accurately. For example, external grant funding criteria of en include student part cipat on in research, which would be lost if there are no students in the major. Compensat on 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 of er upward mobility. CSUEB makes a dent in the dearth of underrepresented students at aining these degrees. Please also consider the overall quality of the programs (faculty grants and publicat ons, alumni achievements, awards & honors, student retent on, etc.)

- 1) Change General educat on/prerequisite contribut on of department to General educat on/breadth/prerequisite/Inst tut onal Learning Outcomes contribut on of department
- 2) Add Program Quality to addit onal 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)

revenue to be balanced against instruct onal cost. Similarly, the fip 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 How to consider program expenses that support units in the the cost calculat on. 2. University that do not have a source of income - enrollment, student af airs, IT, management facilities, shared governance, DEI, and so forth. The University has multiple categories of release t me to achieve dif erent purposes valued by the University, which thus need to be considered as equal to instruct on. Many of those releases, for example for shared governance or for DEI work, will go to more senior faculty who have the experience and inst tut onal 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 t me for their Chair i.e. it is largely unrelated to program size and FTES. Chairs are of en senior faculty on higher relative salaries but, all things being equal, their instruct onal contribut ons are delivered by temporary faculty employed at a much lower salary. Thus, in working out the cost of programs based on instruct on (which is the basis for their revenue calculations) all administrative and noninstruct onal costs should be eliminated and/or only the costs of actual instruct on (course wtu) and the salaries of those delivering it should be included on a pro-rata basis by program where faculty teach in mult ple 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) proport onally more impact ul on instruct onal 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 instruct on. In essence, not discount ng this assigned time from net cost calculations would counterintuit vely penalize those programs that the University has recently priorit zed/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, probat onary period has passed. 4. How to allocate departmental expenses across mult ple programs? Many academic departments in the University have mult ple programs and, as previously ident fed, each of those programs will have a unique prof le of instruct on 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 graduat on. 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 calculat on (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 allocat on should be considered. Moreover, a method of S&S allocat on 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 allocat on and GEEN (three programs and two cert f cates) gets a second S&S allocat on but they are ef ect vely commingled; this is likely the case in other programs such as Theater &

How to consider grant and other faculty research buyouts and the associated indirect cost revenues? Many departments have faculty with internal RSCA grants (release t me) and external grants (buy out) that should ef ect vely be added to their revenue stream or reduced from their cost stream in a net cost of program calculat on. As with service, research is valued

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

Criteria all seem reasonable, but wondering about how cut of s will be determined for the primary quant at ve data (guessing we are looking to cut way more than the 13 low-degree conferring programs ident f ed by the CO). Also, will there be rubrics for the addit onal criteria that describe the level of performance needed in these areas for programs to remain in existence? How will the various criteria (primary and addit onal) be weighted for the f nal decision to cut or not?

Graduat on rates are not completely in the control of the department. There are many external factors that af ect this rate (along with equity gaps) which doesn't ref ect on the ef ect veness 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 felds if these departments/programs don't exist or shrink. Further, programs in disciplines that have an underrepresentat on 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 ft 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 opportunit es there are for students via the department.

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

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

I think 5 years is too short of t me 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 react onary to current events, mature inst tut ons 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 pract cal opportunit es for students, staf, and faculty to come together in real time (either online or in person) to pract ce community building, diversity/inclusion/equity/just ce 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 of erings? 3. How many opportunit es for small group interact on (in real t me) does the program of er where students get to meet and work with professors closely? 4. What structures and pract ces does the program of er for the students it serves who learn in non-tradit onal styles and/or are neurodivergent? How are diverse learning styles celebrated and accommodated with the necessary small teacher to student rat os it takes for such diversity to be efect vely honored? 5. How much does the program of er tangible opportunities for cross-program collaboration? 6. How much does the program participate in collaborat ons with student, staf, 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 creat vity in pract cal 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 ef ects, 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 of erings? Bigger or smaller teacher to student rat os? How important is the program to their success as vibrant and thriving cit zens? 10. How likely are students, faculty, staf, and community members that part cipate in the programs courses, public events, and relat onships with faculty to recommend the program to others? (In other

words, how are the people served by the program's act vit es 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 Just ce, Equity, Diversity and Inclusion. However, these values need to be put into pract ce in meaningful ways in order to become realit es. How much does the program contribute to direct pract ce of these JEDI values?
The published numbers for at endance were not correct. Especially ident f ed as graduates and at endance 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 f gures. A plan is needed to evaluate task force on recruit ng and new faculty hiring requirements based on faculty leaving / FERP ret rement.
I personally would hope that we could have a more interdisciplinary opt on available, where classes could be at ributed to mult ple majors. I would also want there to be an interdisciplinary major opt on available, to allow students to be able to study the majors or similar topics that aren't available if ent re 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 refect ve of Department excellence.
Indirect costs (IDC) brought in by the Department from external grants should be considered in terms of of set ng the "cost" of the program.
Contribut on of the program to diversifying their feld 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 Universit es should be considered, in terms of whether the program relatively over- or under-performing.

General educat on/prerequisite contribut on of program Contribut on to general educat on is a very important measure as is the degree to which one program's curriculum provides prerequisites to others - these need also to be factored into a net cost calculat on metric but will first require a curriculum mapping process based on assessment of degree road maps. But what is the appropriate metric for contribut on to GE? Is it the proport on 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 -

analyt cal and quant tat ve reasoning to address complex challenges and everyday problems Communicate ideas, perspect ves, and values clearly and persuasively while listening openly to others Work collaborat vely and respect ully as members and leaders of diverse teams and communit es A proxy for contribut on 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 Communicat on in the English Language and Crit cal Thinking Area B Scient f c Inquiry and Quant tat ve Reasoning Area C Arts and Humanit es 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 comparat ve

experience to increase engagement and retent on, while promoting intellectual achievement and career readiness Priority #2: Create an authentic and empowering culture of equity, inclusion and ant -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-

1. Evidence of University and College-level direct f scal and staf investment in public-facing website and webpages represent ng or encompassing low degree-conferring programs 2. Evidence of Of ce of Student Outreach direct f scal and staf investment/engagement with low degree-conferring programs 3. Evidence of Of ce of Student Outreach recruiting events in the last 5 years (including the period of the pandemic) and directly involving low degreeconferring programs 4. Evidence of Academic Advising and Career Education direct fiscal and staf 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 inst tut ons 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 funct onality and representat on 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 consultat on 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 pr

Hi There, Since this process will af ect every College in the University, having just two faculty

According to the CSU system, for undergrad programs in part cular, 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 act on" as it is core to the mission of the University.

The values of the programs and Departments should be evaluated holist cally 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 of ersilit le to no short-term cost savings.

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

Please use the Basic Core Undergraduate Program Designat ons for ident fying where according to the CSU "need and demand should NOT be the preeminent criteria for of ering the undergraduate program." See ht ps://www.calstate.edu/csu-system/administrat on/academic-and-student-af airs/academic-programs-innovat ons-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 of 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 dif cult to determine what metrics are most suitable when we do not know the intent on 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 start ng 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

-The graduat on 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 graduat on 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 ref ects poorly on the administrat on. This must be corrected moving forward in the review process.

- -There is a signif cant proport on 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 designat on be taken into account in the review process? These are programs for which "societal need and student demand are not the 'preeminent criteria' for of ering 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 ult mate 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 const tutes as revenue for a given program? What const tutes expense?
 -Will external grants and other faculty research buyout mechanisms be included in the "Net Cost" calculat on? For example, CSCI departments such as Physics and Chemistry&Biochemistry bring in a signif cant amount of external funding (which in turn contributes towards indirect cost revenue). These departments signif cantly 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 Ofice?)? 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?

our fractured society.
Thank you for invit ng feedback.
1. How do the courses of ered 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 instruct on, part cularly for GE categories with fewer of erings?
3. What are the job prospects for these programs? Is there a high need for people with certain skills in the local economy of ered by this program? Does the university have a reputat on in the community with regard to strong graduates from this program?

Because our programs/departments do not exist indepedently of one another, program

Ten Proposed Criteria for Review of Low Degree-Conferring Programs *Duplicate of #49 These criteria ref ect 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, retent on and graduat on 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 "quant tat ve and qualitat ve metrics" for the purpose of "taking act ons to improve."

- 1. Evidence of University and College-level direct f scal and staf investment in public-facing website and webpages represent ng or encompassing low degree-conferring programs
- 2. Evidence of Of ce of Student Outreach direct f scal and staf investment/engagement with low degree-conferring programs
- 3. Evidence of Of ce of Student Outreach recruit ng 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 Educat on direct f scal and staf 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 inst tut ons 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 matriculat on through graduat on
- 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