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 a

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.
Definiton 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 accreditaton" should be listed as "Programmatic external accreditaton"

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)

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 &

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

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 quantative 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.

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

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 -

analy t cal and quan t ta t ve reasoning to address complex challenges and everyday problems Communicate ideas, perspec t ves, and values clearly and persuasively while listening openly to others Work collabora t vely and respec t ully as members and leaders of diverse teams and communi t es A proxy for contribu t 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 Communica t on in the English Language and Cri t cal Thinking Area B Scien t fc Inquiry and Quan t ta t ve Reasoning Area C Arts and Humani t 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 compara t ve

experience to increase engagement and retenton, while promotng intellectual achievement and career readiness Priority #2: Create an authentc and empowering culture of equity, inclusion and ant-racism by embracing our diversity Priority #3: Develop and support responsive and innovatve research, scholarship and creatve actvites for faculty and students along with new leading-

1. Evidence of University and College-level direct fscal and staf investment in public-facing website and webpages represen tng or encompassing low degree-conferring programs 2. Evidence of O f ce of Student Outreach direct fscal and staf investment/engagement with low degree-conferring programs 3. Evidence of O f ce of Student Outreach recrui tng 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 Educa ton direct fscal 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 tu tons or speci fc internships arranged for students enrolled in low degree-conferring programs; or evidence of career services appointments or resume consulta tons with ac tve-enrolled students in low degree-conferring programs. 5. Audit of func tonality and representa ton 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 consulta ton with low degree-conferring programs and their representa ton 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 affect every College in the University, having just two faculty

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

-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?

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 indepedently of one another, program

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 activites 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