

Comment Summary
May 3, 2008

Area	Section	Comments
Criteria	General	Service to the region is absent from the criteria, despite being one of the goals of the CSU-system. Given the number of local attendees to HSU, might this be part of demand or program quality?
Criteria	I	The mission and vision statements do not reflect our idea of the mission of HSU or our vision for the future.
Criteria	I	The mission and vision section is a perfect opportunity for everyone to rank highly, eliminating it as a part of the criteria at all. If everyone has activities that support the mission and vision, as I would agree we should, this means everyone receives the same points. The problem will come with the page restriction. While it is true that NO ONE has the time to do this work, having to explain 5 activities and complex programs that clearly support the mission and vision of the university in 2 pages or less will be exceedingly difficult if not impossible.
Criteria	I	As the Mission statement is very general, we suggest that at least some of the activities be required to address the Vision statement.
Criteria	I	Mission: - should be a filter (either a program passes or not...) then rank on other criteria - "activity" is too vague/defined as? At least cite a universe of examples...
Criteria	I	I just wanted to reaffirm the point that I made today at our chairs meeting. I feel that the primary consideration in the prioritization process should be the mission & vision of HSU, and that the mission & vision aspect of our review should take priority over the other factors. As I read the 1-page "Key Points and Action Items" memo that was handed out at today's meeting, I note that bullet item #3 under "Key Point" states that HSU must: -unite around a common vision -develop processes and structures for making decisions about how to achieve that vision, and -use data for planning and evaluating progress toward that vision I could not agree more with those statements!
Criteria	I	On the 1st page of the Program Criteria document - under HSU's Mission and Vision, we are supposed to identify up to five "ACTIVITIES" that are consistent with the Mission and/or Vision. a) What do you mean by an ACTIVITY? A few examples would help. b) Why is this section limited to HSU's mission/vision? Why not also link to the CSU's mission/vision? Is that also possible?

Comment Summary
May 3, 2008

Area	Section	Comments
Criteria	I	On page 10 you list HSU's mission/vision. As I noted in a previous item, why not also link to the CSU mission/vision?
Criteria	I	The Provost responded that while the mission is more generic, the vision is more specific and that departments have varying strategies in their use of the vision statement.
Criteria	II	The 2nd page includes a series of tables. Are these the data that will come from Institutional Research for each of our programs?
Criteria	II	*Faculty – Where is everyone included? Is it full-time faculty only? What about part-time with professional affiliations?
Criteria	II	Demand should be in terms of student demand and not just demand for graduates. Some programs are in demand despite not being clear about demand for graduates. Perhaps this can be grouped under potential. This should be good state/national data about student demand for programs.
Criteria	II.A	In regard to “demand,” to whom do “internal” and “external” refer? Non-majors? Community? In regard to the weighting of criteria we feel as though demand is weighted too low
Criteria	II.A.1	Demand: - clarity needed: 1. Program Headcount (majors or minors or certificates , etc. enrolled in each program - "Completed" = meaning what (graduated?)
Criteria	II.A.2	- clarity: 2. Program FTES: FTES produced by majors compared to "other"?? FTES produced by non-majors? (Can this data be generated easily for everyone?)
Criteria	II.A.2	*Differentiation needs to be made between primary and secondary majors because it is too easy for departments to manipulate secondary majors. *Is information available for minors except at time of graduation? It had not been available in the past.
Criteria	II.A.3	Part 3 titled "Service to Other HSU Programs/Options" is cause for concern because we have been told to offer a "minimum essential schedule" for many years. That means we have not been allowed to offer any courses that do not meet either a GE requirement or a Major requirement. As a result we have not been able to offer courses that would service other departments, such as health communication, instructional communication, or environmental communication even though we hired people specifically qualified to teach those classes.
Criteria	II.A.4	- change: 4 to actually read: Program Demand. Include under it: - # of applications HSU receives n that program each year (if a major) - other significant changes in internal program demand (as measured by ???)

Comment Summary
May 3, 2008

Area	Section	Comments
Criteria	II.A.5	Add a Table that includes the WASC II data regarding demand for program from underrepresented groups
Criteria	II.B	Also include student placements in jobs in the field? (Or this might better in the Quality section.)
Criteria	II.B	<p>II-B (“external demand for ‘graduates’ from the program”) is faulty. The instructions provide suggestions for places to research prospective demand for graduates. The first site suggested (state of California labor stats) does not include any category of employment for people with communication degrees other than communication (speech) teachers. Adding in all the things people could do with communication degrees (small business owner to firefighter) would allow the creation of a super-statistic of employer need.</p> <p>a. The National Association of Colleges and Employers web site recommended is an incorrect URL, the one listed takes one to a center for the study of corrosion (no joke).</p> <p>b. Evidence of employee need for communication degrees may be most evident from qualitative data gathered by actual program alumni. We regret that there isn’t a clear way to gather and present this data.</p> <p>c. The various dates of statistics will create further difficulties of comparison. The NACE site has recent dates (up to 2007), but the US department of Labor has only older statistics available. When</p>
Criteria	II.B	In regard to “demand,” to whom do “internal” and “external” refer? Non-majors? Community? In regard to the weighting of criteria we feel as though demand is weighted too low
Criteria	II.B	External demand. Please keep multiple sources to demonstrate demand. There are no unique sources that will adequately cover all the fields and programs at HSU.
Criteria	II.B	External demand should include the broader picture - the regional/national societal demand.
Criteria	II.B	The suggestion was made that for external demand one site be used because numbers vary between sites and could cause disparity within the reports.
Criteria	II.B	The question was asked if letters from the community could be evidence of external demand? Answer was no! This is much more of a summary type of report.
Criteria	II.B	Demand should include some measure of societal need – both locally and regionally.

Comment Summary
May 3, 2008

Area	Section	Comments
Criteria	II.B.5	<p>Recommendation Given the workplace demand for employees who are skilled writers in a range of fields, we propose that in addition to "writing and oral communication learning outcomes" already listed under "Program Quality" (III.C.1), we add "<u>Evidence of promoting excellence in student writing within and across the disciplines</u>" as a separate component of the criteria "Demand" (II.B). This evidence could be quantified as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Percentage of "writing-intensive" courses offered each academic year 2. Evidence of professional development activities focused on improving student writing. (These might include such engagements as writing across the curriculum [WAC]; faculty learning communities [FLC] focused on improving students' written communication; or discipline-specific writing workshops in which faculty members participated each year.) Express as a percentage of faculty members affiliated with the program who engage in at least one such activity per academic year. 3. Number of majors with publications in edited/referred journals, anthologies, or other public discourse arenas (like keynote speeches, presentations of research results, winning through honorable
Criteria	III	<p>This section concerned our committee a great deal because we didn't feel that it would actually measure the quality of a program. Among other things, the items bulleted in the scoring rubric are not found in the list of categories in the criteria. How will you determine "strong student engagement and achievement" if you don't ask programs to demonstrate this?</p>
Criteria	III	<p>Program quality has no place for disciplinary rankings of programs or qualitative (letters) feedback.</p>
Criteria	III	<p>The tables need to address credential students. It was asked if these were the tables that Institutional Data would be providing data for and that was answered in the affirmative.</p>
Criteria	III	<p>The following comments were made by one attendee.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Change inputs and outputs to something more precise. * Identify what you what for affiliations.
Criteria	III.A.1	<p>Transfer GPA and high school GPA are not useful pieces of data because HSU does not evaluate this data after students graduate in the same measurement.</p>
Criteria	III.A.1	<p>GRE scores marked as a student preparation indicator, but could just as easily be a marker of student achievement.</p>

Comment Summary
May 3, 2008

Area	Section	Comments
Criteria	III.A.1	Communication does not have a graduate program. But our graduates attend graduate school at other spots; wouldn't this be a sign of program success?
Criteria	III.A.1	Few graduate programs use the combined verbal and math score – usually graduate students are expected to excel in one or the other.
Criteria	III.A.1	The student quality section is right out of NCLB. While we are encouraged to recruit a diverse student population, this criteria punishes those programs who have succeeded, assuming that at-risk students come with fewer AP courses and lower GPAs. We are simply measuring what is easiest to measure, and claiming it represents a measure of program quality.
Criteria	III.A.1	There are many diverse measures of student achievement. Our students, for example, must take and pass a national licensing exam. Where will this be counted?
Criteria	III.A.1	We are unanimous that the preparedness indicator section should go. I expect our program would look rather good by this criteria - but it is more an assessment of our recruiters and not our program.
Criteria	III.A.1	- 1. you've heard enough by now: those who apply and arrive to HSU are not a measure of pgm quality... Get rid of this variable.
Criteria	III.A.1	I still don't see the relevance of III A 1 and 2. We are mandated to take a certain percentage of students with a certain GPA and HS preparation. This seems to me to be aimed at preserving some special interest.
Criteria	III.A.1	On the topic of the student background information, I have another concern. I don't see the connection between where our students start out and the quality of our program. Our job is to help them become stronger students and well prepared professionals. We work hard to help our students gain study and inquiry skills that many of them did not learn in their prior school experiences. High school and even community college counselors sometimes advise students to go into Child Development because they think it is an "easy major." Student's quickly learn that it is not, but it is our job to help them succeed - not to send them away. Are we going to be evaluated as a less strong program because our students may be less strong coming in? That would be grossly unfair! If you want to know the quality of the work our faculty is doing you should be asking how much change there is in the performance of those students, and I'm not sure how you would generate that data.

Comment Summary
May 3, 2008

Area	Section	Comments
Criteria	III.A.1	The 3rd page focuses on PROGRAM QUALITY. As noted in Monday's meeting this is a problematic section. It is weighted too heavily in the overall score and requests data that are not consistently required by all programs. For example, our MA in Education does not require the GRE. We do not have undergraduates - most of our students are in one of six different credential programs and there is not even a space to include data pertaining to credential students. It would seem that we are at a HUGE disadvantage on a section that is so heavily weighted and doesn't connect with our program constituents, requirements, or offerings.
Criteria	III.A.1	For evaluation of undergraduate students, I believe too much emphasis is placed on high school performance, including GPA's, standardized test performance, and AP course performance. The proposed criteria fail to consider the improvement in scholastic performance that students may achieve as a result of their work in our undergraduate program.
Criteria	III.A.1	In regard to the comments on student attributes; some of these things are very hard to determine, because there is a lack of input at the beginning in order to measure some attribute at the end – there is no real basis for making a judgment.
Criteria	III.A.1	Comments were made on the section III. "Program Quality." Student entrance rates should not have a lot of weight on the program quality. There are many older students with low high school GPA's who do well in college. Not all students take ELM Pass Rates and there are students who come in with low scores who have exceptionally high GPAs. These scores should not reflect negatively on programs; it is erroneous information. There are minimum qualifications for students coming to the university and if those qualifications are not been met, then students shouldn't be here. It was recommended that the section for undergraduates be removed.
Criteria	III.A.1	The task force is leaning towards removing that information for undergraduate students, but retaining it for graduate students, because of the highly selective process for graduate students.
Criteria	III.A.1	If the section on undergraduates is not removed from III.A., it was recommended that a way be found to compare entrance data to exit data, in order to provide more valuable data.
Criteria	III.A.1	One common denominator that all students have is General Education (GE) courses. It may not be a perfect measure, but looking at average GE GPAs may be a possible measure. Average GPAs may be difficult to compare across departments, but it is one common denominator and output measure.

Comment Summary
May 3, 2008

Area	Section	Comments
Criteria	III.A.1	*Concern was raised about using incoming student indicators as a measure of quality when what is needed is the difference between when they enter to when they leave. It was asked if anyone had ideas on where to get that information?
Criteria	III.A.1	*Transfers are one place where SAT data would fall through the cracks. Some programs have no freshmen.
Criteria	III.A.1	*Under-represented groups are not included here. *Criteria – graduate – portion of applications that are offered admission. *Graduate programs completion rate as a measure of quality. *What students are we talking about current, first major...?
Criteria	III.A.1	1) MA Social Sciences Program (Env & Comm) does not require GRE scores so we have none to report. 2) Suggest that a criteria be added concerning the proportion of applicants offered admission to the graduate program as an indicator of program competitiveness. This may be more appropriate as an indicator of demand, not quality.
Criteria	III.A.1	Program Quality being measured by input for undergraduates appears to be biased unless it is used as difference between input vs. output – maybe looking at graduation GPA vs. input or upper division GE vs. input or input vs. graduate rate.
Criteria	III.A.1	Why do students with a good transfer GPA equate to a “quality” indicator?
Criteria	III.A.1	Where is student in this process?
Criteria	III.A.1	Absolutely opposed to student preparedness criteria – this has no bearing on the quality of the program – what is important is what comes out. This is particularly damaging to programs that consist primarily of transfer students. Include degree completion rates at both undergrad and grad levels
Criteria	III.A.2	Add more hard data: Student GPA, results of Assessment of Student Learning outcomes, evidence of “value added” – student learning/growth from Freshman to Senior years. Also add discussion of acceptance rates for grad school, and placements in jobs in the field.
Criteria	III.A.2	Note: Many of us have concerns that the GWPE has not been an effective tool on our campus, leading us to suggest that this indicator be removed. However, as it is one of the few campus-wide tools for measuring our learning outcome of effective written communication, it might be the best tool to use at this point.
Criteria	III.A.2	Student achievement is marked entirely on the GWPE scores. This misses any skill set other than writing proficiency. We do not have an input that matches this output.

Comment Summary
May 3, 2008

Area	Section	Comments
Criteria	III.A.2	<p>The English Department has consulted on the Criteria for Program Prioritization, and the undersigned endorse the following recommendation.</p> <p>Writing competency is at the top of skills California employers have stressed repeatedly as being necessary, yet lacking, for California’s future workforce. Literate high school graduates—defined simply as students demonstrating the ability to write persuasively in English—are in short supply, most recently evidenced by the low scores for writing at “competency” levels (above “basic”) reported in April 2008 by the U.S. Department of Education in its Nation’s Report Card. California currently scores 38th out of 47 states.</p> <p>Specific to undergraduate students at HSU, the most recent analysis of GWPE scores (fall 2007) finds that only 24% of undergraduates are “strong” writers by the time they take the exam (in their junior or senior year). [See “HSU Writing Assessment & Action Planning Sessions: Brief Overview of HSU Writing Assessment Fall 2007” at http://www.humboldt.edu/%7Eugst/wac/hsu_write_f07.html.]</p>
Criteria	III.A.2	<p>- 2. Expand the "Student Achievement" variable: - first, IF we include the GWPE at all (I vote against it), use only the GWPE pass percentage rate for a major program, not the scores... If included, drop it to the last element here</p>
Criteria	III.A.2	<p>I still don't see the relevance of III A 1 and 2. We are mandated to take a certain percentage of students with a certain GPA and HS preparation. This seems to me to be aimed at preserving some special interest.</p>
Criteria	III.A.2	<p>I realize that I am extremely nervous about this process, but I feel like the way some of this is organized highlights a particular view of the college learning process. It feels like a "strong" department attracts top students and engages primarily in academic generation of knowledge. As a faculty person in the CSU I am preparing people to provide quality services to the children and families of our state.</p>

Comment Summary
May 3, 2008

Area	Section	Comments
Criteria	III.A.2	Under III.A.2, "Student Achievement" it was recommended that another line be added in addition to the GWPE Scores. Students may not put their full effort into the GWPE and a program shouldn't suffer because of low GWPE scores. Another mechanism for monitoring student achievement would be appreciated. The quality of an academic program encourages students to get involved outside of the discipline as well. Under III.A.3, there should be consideration of a student's achievement beyond their discipline as well. The environment of the program should be creating a context for students with diverse qualities.
Criteria	III.A.2	* In regard to student outcomes, why were some excluded when WASC is supposed to be University wide? Greg Crawford informed everyone that a pitch had been made for WASC Themes I and II to be included and were told that they were not far enough along in the process to be considered.
Criteria	III.A.2	* Career center used to collect the after graduation data but it was determined that it was not needed. In light of that it makes no sense to look at student's incoming numbers if there is no ending data.
Criteria	III.A.2	*Measure outcomes – Identify how we use program assessment results that are producing student learning.
Criteria	III.A.3	Edit text to read: "Describe patterns of student achievements in discipline-specific contexts (honors, awards, publications, presentations, etc.) <u>and/or that furthers WASC I Student Learning Outcome 7 regarding social justice, environmental responsibility and economic improvement</u> , that are indicative of program quality"
Criteria	III.A.3	Undergraduate research deserves some input.
Criteria	III.A.3	"Describe patterns of student achievement" -- clarify better what "patterns" mean here?
Criteria	III.A.3	I have no idea how to get the information about awards, honors and other student achievements. We do not maintain department records of these things. I know we have had students do presentations and receive rewards, some of which we only find out about by accident. Our students are very involved in the community and with our local professional organizations. Their achievements are often recognized groups not connected in any way with the academic community, and in some ways that is exactly what we are working for!

Comment Summary
May 3, 2008

Area	Section	Comments
Criteria	III.A.3	Assessing program quality is important. The students are the focus of why we are here. We need something for assessing output. Students come in at different levels, and this doesn't seem like a good measure. But output would be a good measure, whether it is overall GPA, overall success rate of graduate students, job success, employability, etc. It is a difficulty not knowing what is done across campus. But there must be something more substantive than looking at honors and awards. There needs to be a better way of assessing student success as a reflection of program quality.
Criteria	III.A.4	ADD the following text as an additional point: <u>“Refer to the best practices listed on pp. 115-122 in the WASC II Accreditation Reaffirmation report (Capacity and Preparatory Review for the WASC site visit – http://www.humboldt.edu/~wasc/docs/CPReport_Section2.pdf) and describe the ways in which your department has worked to incorporate these practices into the workings of your department.”</u>
Criteria	III.A.4	- ADD: 4. Other: (allow programs to exhaust all other measures of program quality by adding others we haven't thought of...)
Criteria	III.A.1	Omit table on “Student Preparation Indicators”
Criteria	III.B	Put the current subsection #3 first – teaching is the most important thing we do, and the centerpiece of a high-quality program! A program with lots of faculty doing world-class research and rotten teaching is NOT a high-quality program!
Criteria	III.B	Add “Community/Professional Service” to the chart in subsection #1. Also, how do the arts fit into this chart? Performances and art exhibitions are the equivalent of publications in those disciplines. Please add them somehow!
Criteria	III.B	*Faculty – How do you handle where the mix has changed drastically? Don't have any way to pull together data from prior years.
Criteria	III.B	*Limited nature of faculty involvement is being asked for at least add other category.
Criteria	III.B.1	Remove \$ limit for grants.
Criteria	III.B.1	The \$5000 cut-off for grant should be removed. All grants must be considered if used to measure faculty productivity.
Criteria	III.B.1	“Creative products” are vague enough to include almost anything.
Criteria	III.B.1	The arbitrary number of \$5,000 as a cut off for grants to count in section B is flawed. Smaller grants enable programs to implement academic programs, and to relieve budgetary pressures. And some grants are shared between programs, which makes this number easily manipulated.

Comment Summary
May 3, 2008

Area	Section	Comments
Criteria	III.B.1	The lack of delineation between tenure-track faculty and lecturers means that service standards will be skewed in departments that service the university with large numbers of GE classes.
Criteria	III.B.1	The faculty quality section reduces quality to that which is easy to count, or miscount. Is someone going to check this data?
Criteria	III.B.1	Some programs have easier access to large federal grants than others. Perhaps that means those are the only programs we should offer?
Criteria	III.B.1	Faculty - define or allow departments to define what is meant by Professional Service Activities. It should be consistent with Department RTP criterial. We have a question - how will this information be verified? The report will include a list of percentages - is there anyway to be sure the information is accurate?
Criteria	III.B.1	We suggest the exclusion should just pertain to all HSU internal grants and no limit be specified for grants from external sources.
Criteria	III.B.1	<p>Change "engagement" to read "service" in title here, as well as in table</p> <p>***Lobby heavily to get out of this "AT LEAST ONE..." standard – switch this entire category to read,</p> <p>€ " Describe the research and creative activities of your tenure-track faculty"</p> <p>€ "Describe the successful grants or contracts of tenure-track faculty" (get rid of the limit in \$\$\$ value entirely)</p> <p>€ "Describe the number of papers given at...by tenure-track faculty" This above would then match up with the requested service activities below</p> <p>... ADD:</p> <p>€ service in college or university roles (rewrite) -- (It's NOT just committee service that's important!)</p> <p>€ service in the community</p> <p>€ Other: (needed to be exhaustive here of variables that measure the quality of faculty) for ex: If accredited, include a copy of your last accreditation evaluation report if it covers faculty quality.</p>

Comment Summary
May 3, 2008

Area	Section	Comments
Criteria	III.B.1	<p>Quantity vs. Quality evaluations. The present criteria focus on productivity but not the quality of products. For example, publications are addressed numerically in term of how many faculty published in certain year. This fails to address the quality of publications. In XXX, most high quality publications involve multiple experiments whereas poor quality outlets tend to publish papers reporting on a single experiment. Recently one of our faculty members conducted a series of three experiments and had that work published in one of the field's most prestigious outlets. This article is widely cited and has made a considerable impact on the field. Alternatively, my colleague could have published each experiment as an individual study in far less selective outlets. These piecemeal published articles would likely be of little interest to others in the field , would make little impact on the field, and would associate HSU with outlets that most professionals view as poor quality. Clearly, there is a right path and a wrong path here.</p> <p>The "right path" would count only as a single publication given the present criteria. The "wrong path," i</p>
Criteria	III.B.1	<p>Space requirements. The present criteria limit narrative information to a certain page length. This means that a department with three faculty will have the same amount of space for comment as a department of fifteen. Smaller departments will have space for detailed explanations of accomplishments whereas a larger department may be forced to limit presentation and exclude accomplishments to fit the space limit. One size fits all doesn't work here.</p>

Comment Summary
May 3, 2008

Area	Section	Comments
Criteria	III.B.1	<p>Unproductive senior faculty. I work in a department where many of our more senior faculty were tenured and promoted without any evidence of research productivity. From speaking to other faculty across campus, I know this is not a unique situation. Faculty who arrived in XXX recently are far more active in research than our more senior colleagues. The present evaluation system creates a situation where our department's evaluation for faculty quality will be lower because we have several unproductive senior faculty members. Ironically, as less productive faculty reach retirement, their lack of productivity may be used as evidence to deny funding for future positions. Instead of being allowed to continue our trend of hiring productive researchers, we would have these positions cut, primarily because HSU was simply granting everyone tenure in the 80s. I urge the committee to take a very close look at performances for faculty who have been on campus for shorter periods of time. I expect this sort of analysis will yield a far better indicator of future productivity.</p>
Criteria	III.B.1	<p>Grant funding. Grant funding evaluations need to take into account the availability of funding for various fields and recognize unsuccessful attempts to obtain funding. The reality in our field is that most applicants to major funding organizations will receive 4-5 rejections before receiving their first funding. In serving as a reviewer for the National Science Foundation, I have seen several situations wherein grants that received extraordinarily high ratings were not funded because of the competitive nature of funding for Dept. XXX. Comparing our productivity in this area to departments like Dept. YYY wherein most funded contracts are less competitive fails to account for these differences. Similarly, taking unfunded proposals into consideration yields again, a better indicator of future productivity.</p>
Criteria	III.B.1	<p>I have some anxieties about producing the data about faculty achievements. I will probably have to go back to the individual faculty members and have them fill out forms to provide me with the data, and not all of them are still around. Again, I feel like the department is vulnerable if we can't produce complete data.</p>
Criteria	III.B.1	<p>"At least one paper given at a professional society meeting per year" --may be confusing and exclusionary for some fields. In a large field like XXX wherein conferences may attract 12,000-15,000 attendees, the primary means of presentation is the Poster session rather than the Paper presentations. So I urge the committee to change this criteria to read "At least one professional presentation given at a professional society meeting per year."</p>

Comment Summary
May 3, 2008

Area	Section	Comments
Criteria	III.B.1	More broadly within the criteria, the % of faculty measurement technique fails to take into account the productivity of individual faculty. For example, if Department A has three faculty members who each managed one publication in a specific year, they would earn a 100% ranking (reflecting three total publications). In contrast, if Department B had two of their three faculty members publish articles, they would earn 67%, regardless of whether it was two articles published or twenty.
Criteria	III.B.1	Even more broadly, scholarship criteria are problematic as no distinctions are made with regard to quality of work. A department wherein the modal publication is in a poorly regarded outlet is very different from one wherein the modal publication is in a top tier outlet. Yet in the current criteria, this is not addressed clearly. This suggests that evaluations of scholarship quality will be driven by data appropriate to evaluations of scholarship quantity.
Criteria	III.B.1	Page 4 has a table for FACULTY information. Given that most of our faculty teach in at least two different programs, could we create a common table across the School of Education for each Program to reference in its document?
Criteria	III.B.1	In general, I believe not enough emphasis is placed on the quality of scholarship produced by faculty. While the quantity of scholarship is a reasonable assessment measure, the quality and impact of different journals and professional meetings varies greatly. The task force should make an effort to assess and weigh the quality of scholarship.
Criteria	III.B.1	Finally, I believe some credit should be given to faculty for submitting grants for extramural funding, even when grant proposal are not funded. The rate of NSF and NIH funding has declined dramatically over the past few years. The task force ought to credit attempts to obtain grants, even if unsuccessful, given the current realities for research funding.
Criteria	III.B.1	*Students- compare qualities at time of graduation. Departments are required to accept all students (undergrad) who are admitted into their major. This information should not be used to the disadvantage of the department.
Criteria	III.B.1	*Change engagement to service for faculty portion.
Criteria	III.B.1	*Why are contracts being eliminated just because of the small amount?
Criteria	III.B.1	*Need more measures for faculty involvement besides peer review, creative activity, and professional service at national level.

Comment Summary
May 3, 2008

Area	Section	Comments
Criteria	III.B.1	Please add "Diversity" under curricular innovation and reference the DCG guidelines for a definition of diversity (history at HSU has shown how broadly "diversity" has been defined; clear guidelines are needed).
Criteria	III.B.1	RE: Scholarship – I don't see the point of having a year-by-year recitation of scholarship. It makes more sense to me to look at total number of activities across the faculty. For example, I publish books but haven't published one since 2002. So my 4 books don't count here nor does the one in progress. Also, for those of us how chair graduate thesis committees – it's a tremendous amount of work that should be reflected here. Thanks!
Criteria	III.B.1	For program quality what is it worth to have a student work toward world peace or meet crucial need in diverse communities.
Criteria	III.B.1	Should faculty be assessed by # of publications and grants over \$5,000?
Criteria	III.B.1	Where is the diversity on the committee?
Criteria	III.B.1	Should be a place for faculty awards/honors – both internal and external.
Criteria	III.B.1	Faculty service – change committee participation to 2 hours biweekly (most major committees meet every other week).
Criteria	III.B.1	Exclude only HSU small grants – allow other sources.
Criteria	III.B.2	After current text add: "Provide explanations of the data above and/or descriptions of the patterns of faculty engagement in Scholarly and/or Creative activities as appropriate for your program. Provide specific titles of grants, publications, and creative activities that foster diversity (see DCG guidelines) and/or promote inclusive academic excellence for traditionally underrepresented students (pp. 115-122 in the WASC II Accreditation Reaffirmation report)."
Criteria	III.B.2	III-B-2 and 3 should include faculty efforts at accessibility such as ATI, accessibility training, and curricular changes.

Comment Summary
May 3, 2008

Area	Section	Comments
Criteria	III.B.2	<p>My job is to create opportunities for students who come with a wide range of preparation, and to support them in becoming knowledgeable, committed, reflective community servants who will be the guardians and supporters of the next generation. I hope that we attract strong students, but I also hope that we attract students who realize that they didn't get off to the best start and want to change that for themselves and others. I am deeply committed to being current, providing our students with top quality content and critical thinking opportunities, but if they cannot DO real intervention, real teaching, real advocacy, then they cannot do what they are preparing to do. Learning and working with faculty who are engaged in service is as important for our students as doing research in laboratories or streams is for science majors. Our practical knowledge of the realities of child and family work is one of the strengths of our department. Academic activity is no substitute for that knowledge.</p>
Criteria	III.B.3	<p>Edit the text to read: "Provide evidence of teaching effectiveness and commitment to continuous improvement of teaching. Include, for example, engagement in professional development for teaching, program approaches to ensure quality, and/or recognitions, honors, and awards for excellence in the classroom as appropriate for your program. <u>Include specific reference to evidence of 'ensuring inclusive academic excellence for traditionally underrepresented students in the areas of student access, persistence, and graduation.'</u>"</p>
Criteria	III.B.3	<p>Program Quality, Affiliations/equipment/facilities, point 3 needs to be broadened: Existing: Describe how the program takes advantage of the unique natural environment available to students and faculty at HSU. Suggested: Describe how the program takes advantage of the unique local and regional natural, social, and cultural environment available to students and faculty at HSU.</p>
Criteria	III.B.3	<p>III-B-2 and 3 should include faculty efforts at accessibility such as ATI, accessibility training, and curricular changes.</p>
Criteria	III.B.3	<p>III-B-3 and III-C-4 seem extremely similar.</p>
Criteria	III.B.3	<p>We are not convinced that outstanding undergraduate teaching is clearly highlighted in the criteria. It may fall under "Mission." It may fall under "Student achievement." But there is no section under "Faculty," comparable to publication or service. If we wanted measures, we could use the university's students' evaluations of teaching. Or, we could use peer review letters.</p>

Comment Summary
May 3, 2008

Area	Section	Comments
Criteria	III.B.3	Items 3 and 4 under B. Faculty will be difficult to objectively measure.
Criteria	III.B.3	<p>The people who do the front line work in our field will tell you that in a heart beat. It is one thing to study the impact of home visitors on early development. It is quite another to have the skill to sit down with parents and help them problem solve and then walk into the college classroom and give students specific examples of how you put together your knowledge of current research and best practice with how you approached that particular family. Helping students learn this process is at the core of bachelors level education in our field. There is no place in your chart for identification of faculty involvement in these important activities. I've probably gone a little overboard here, but this is a very important and difficult issue. I suspect that ours is not the only department in which this might be a concern.</p>
Criteria	III.B.3	<p>Thank you for listening to my concerns. I really do appreciate the very challenging task that you have undertaken, and I do believe that this process is important. I look forward to further guidance and will attend the meeting on Monday.</p>
Criteria	III.B.3	<p>Under III.B.3., most of the evidence offered there is indirect evidence. It been suggested before that there are pieces of evidence that are available to us now, due to the use of the common student evaluation form, so that this section could be strengthened.</p> <p>The task force has discussed this section extensively. One of the difficulties encountered is that Appendix J places peer evaluation as the primary indication of teaching effectiveness. Another difficulty is that the new student evaluation form would only provide information for one year. Without a longer frame of reference, this data will not be useful.</p> <p>This draft does strengthen this section, and that is appreciated. Under program approaches to ensure quality, departments can provide examples such as a program of peer visits to class, evaluations of every course with student evaluations, and chairs conferring with faculty members receiving low scores on student evaluation, etc. There is room for doing some of these things, though they may not be a comparable as the task force wants.</p>
Criteria	III.B.3	* For III – teaching effectiveness - separate into categories: full and part time faculty

Comment Summary
May 3, 2008

Area	Section	Comments
Criteria	III.B.4	Edit the text to read: "Provide evidence for faculty mentoring of students. Include, for example, approaches to advising, directed study or research, and/or clubs or student professional chapters that involve faculty mentorship. <u>Include evidence of mentoring and advising that serves underrepresented students.</u> "
Criteria	III.B.4	Items 3 and 4 under B. Faculty will be difficult to objectively measure.
Criteria	III.B.5	***Please add a stand-alone measure of "teaching effectiveness" -- at least give it some stature, similar to App J and our campus values as the number one criterion for quality. Do not co-mingle it in #3 with commitment to continuous improvement of teaching" -- which by the way, how can you measure "commitment" to anything? Change it "evidence of improvement of teaching" perhaps??? Or get rid of it.
Criteria	III.B.i	The faculty achievements chart emphasizes traditional publish or parish scholarship and is very noticeable. The questions which follow that will provide information about the important work that faculty do in providing quality instruction and advising and committing to their own continuing professional development appears to be relegated to the status of "additional" information. As I review these questions I realize that the values and priorities of our department reflect a more even balance between these elements. The presentation format strikes me as discriminatory.
Criteria	III.C	*Curriculum – need to include diversity and accessibility. All input data should be thrown out because we don't have corresponding output data.
Criteria	III.C.2	Rewrite to something like: "Provide two examples of how you have used results of assessment of your program's student learning outcomes to adapt, enhance, or affirm your program's curriculum.
Criteria	III.C.2	Everyone is striving towards measurable student learning outcomes. This should be one way of measuring program quality and should be included. Each department has developed student learning outcomes and assessment work is being done. This should be a direct measure of program quality. III.C.2 addresses this, but it is very weak.
Criteria	III.C.3	If accredited, include a copy of your last accreditation evaluation report!
Criteria	III.C.4	(relevance and Innovation) are imprecise. This category needs precise evaluative goals other than just using technology in the classroom.
Criteria	III.C.4	III-B-3 and III-C-4 seem extremely similar.

Comment Summary
May 3, 2008

Area	Section	Comments
Criteria	III.C.4	<p>Provide evident through examples.....</p> <p>Please include language that prompts departments to address issues of diversity in their curriculum. "prepares students to embrace different cultural perspectives"</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Demonstrates a curriculum that is relevant, innovative, forward looking, responsive to changing trends, <u>equips students to function in a diverse, global context</u> (including use of current and emerging technology). (included in Mission & Vision)</p> <p>Llyn Smith/Jyoti Rawal Diversity Office x4502</p>
Criteria	III.C.6	<p>seems to measure "program demand in the CSU", not the quality of the curriculum. Move to that section.</p>
Criteria	III.C.6	<p>Concerns were expressed regarding III.C.6. "program uniqueness." Are other CSUs going through the same process that we are, and if so, they may choose to eliminate something that would make an HSU program more unique. It is a moving target. Programs should also be compared to regional programs, not just CSUs. The impact of the WUI program has had on HSU enrollment makes this important. In some disciplines, the HSU program may be the only one surviving in the region, beyond the borders of California.</p>
Criteria	III.C.7	<p>ADD: <u>List number of DCG courses certified in your program.</u></p>
Criteria	III.C.i	<p>Lack of complete WASC criteria in curriculum quality suggests a dual nature of preparation for these two standards. Either we are insincere about WASC goals, or they are relevant standards that we should use to evaluate curricular quality.</p>
Criteria	III.D	<p>possibly add to title here, "and Resources"</p>
Criteria	III.D.1	<p>Define center/unit/institute. We assume this includes local non-profit organizations.</p>
Criteria	III.D.1	<p>Affiliations. Change to: "identify program affiliations that add important benefits to your program" instead of first sentence.</p>
Criteria	III.D.1	<p>On the bottom of page 5 there is a section entitled "AFFILIATIONS/EQUIPMENT/FACILITIES" that mentioned that "Some academic programs are affiliated with on-campus or off-campus centers." I am the half-time developer/director of the Center for Educational Excellence, Collaboration & Inquiry that is housed within the School of Education (www.humboldt.edu/~edcenter). Is this an example of what should be included in this particular section?</p>

Comment Summary
May 3, 2008

Area	Section	Comments
Criteria	III.D.2	only mention of "resources" but no definition of it here. What does it mean, what should be described/listed here. Or, perhaps get rid of it here.
Criteria	III.D.2	As discussed at yesterday's Faculty Affairs Committee meeting, I would like to see the library resources mentioned under Part III.2.
Criteria	III.D.2	Facilities and Resources. Suggested wording is: 2. Facilities and Resources (including Information Resources) Provide a brief listing of your most important facilities, equipment and information/library resources, and describe the degree to which the current facilities, equipment and information/library resources affect program quality.
Criteria	III.D.3	Make this "Unique Natural/Rural/Cultural Resources" and revise the sentence of directions to correspond.
Criteria	III.D.3	We are concerned that a broadened category #3 will duplicate #1. Can we avoid redundancy, by editing the text to read " <u>Describe any additional ways (not reflected in 1 above) that your program engages with the unique natural, social, and/or cultural environment of our locale.</u> "
Criteria	III.D.3	(unique natural resources) positions humans as if they were not part of the natural environment. This category should be rewritten to include volunteer service and outreach in populated spaces.
Criteria	III.D.3	<p>Concerning III. 3 "Unique Natural Resources: Describe how the program takes advantage of the unique natural environment available to students and faculty at HSU"</p> <p>We agree with objections that the term "natural resources" is too narrow, and also that "takes advantage" is not always the right verb. We support the term "local" because this allows us to consider cultural and social resources. We prefer "local " to "regional" because "regional" is still rather physical and geographical and can sometimes mean the opposite of "local." We agree that the local environment in which we work requires specific treatment. In some cases this may require comparing perspectives learned here with experiences provided through fieldschools and international programs, certainly important components of the anthropology program, and HSU generally.</p> <p>Suggested wording: "Unique Local Environment: Describe how the program identifies and responds to the unique resources of the local environment as related to its disciplinary mission."</p>

Comment Summary
May 3, 2008

Area	Section	Comments
General		The point was made that it will be very difficult to compare such widely divergent programs, so the question of ranking must be separated from the question of what will be done with programs.
Criteria	III.D.3	Unique Natural Resources - we agree with the general discussion at both the Town Hall meeting and the Provost Council that the wording be made more general.
Criteria	III.D.3	We covered my (and others) reaction to #3 as being too narrow and unclear as to what you're seeking.
Criteria	III.D.3	On the middle of page 6 item #3 (Unique Natural Resources) that says "Describe how the program takes advantage of the unique natural environment available to students and faculty at HSU." WHAT DOES THIS MEAN? Please provide a few examples. Taken literally it would seem to unfairly advantage certain departments - especially those in CNRS.
Criteria	IV	We recommend there be no "other" category. The criteria that will be used should be stated at the onset. (One faculty member likened this category for earning 5 points for putting your name on your paper!)
Criteria	IV	"We find it offensive that high revenues is a criterion: we are not a profit-making entity." Gives preference to areas without labs or activities.
Criteria	IV	Efficiency should be considered separately from cost and revenue.
Criteria	IV	Clarify difference between IV and V: potential and budgets relationships
Criteria	IV	VI. What does "other" mean? Accreditation by an outside entity such as NASAD? Student achievement? Innovative programs? Workshops and Field Trips?
Criteria	IV.1	Add information about student retention in the major, and how many students change major TO this major. When students switch to this major, how many units do they have? How many units do student have when they graduate with this major? (Break that last number into subcategories: How many units for native HSU students who started their college careers in this major? How many for students who transferred into the major in sophomore year, in junior year, in "senior" year?

Comment Summary
May 3, 2008

Area	Section	Comments
Criteria	IV.1	As was mentioned in the April 21 meeting, the data that the university generates for section IV will be critical. My experience has been that HSU data is inherently unreliable. This also gets back to the problem of program vs. department report. In my experience, HSU generated data does not accurately count students or faculty workload according to programs as they are administered by departments. Departmental data across diverse programs does not present an accurate picture of what is actually occurring.
Criteria	IV.1	- question under Costs: what are "WTU (by option) -- wouldn't it make sense first to ask number of units required by option? Then ask number of WTUs required to teach the required units by option...
Criteria	IV.1	- Add as a "Efficiency" measure: number of graduates per FTEF per year
Criteria	IV.1	- unclear under Revenue: € "IRA" = meaning IRA funding received annually € What are "Instructionally Related Grants"? € "Grants and Contracts to P.I.s" -- to me, this does NOT represent "revenue" per se
Criteria	IV.1	If you are going to compute costs such as \$ per ftes or \$ per sfr, I think in order to get a clear picture, you need to get a \$ per major figure. Also, how do you mitigate against departments combining classes, making large GE sections, and teaching big overloads to mask the actual cost of educating their majors? If you are not going to ask pointed questions specifically for programs with small numbers of majors, I think the dollar per major figure is imperative.
Criteria	IV.1	At the bottom of page 6 under COSTS, REVENUES, and EFFICIENCIES I have concerns about programs like ours which are accredited by external agencies that demand a certain level of resources for accreditation. As such, it would seem that we are disadvantaged because we must be accredited in order to offer programs. Does that mean that HSU intends to either cut or not provide additional resources for externally accredited programs?
Criteria	IV.2	Add external benchmarking: What is the CSU average for this program for SFR as compared to the department's average for SFR? Add CSU comparison for other items in this section?

Comment Summary
May 3, 2008

Area	Section	Comments
Criteria	IV.2	<p>- see above, here again is required units in program/option – and include WTUs for each as well here</p> <p>- another interesting proposal: include "average number of units taken in program/option by graduates" -- amazing number of high #s compared to the required units...</p> <p>- unclear under "CSU Average for Program/Option unit" -- meaning what? "CSU average number of units REQUIRED for program/option..."</p> <p>- where is a measure of "retention" listed here? Those numbers are available and must mean something somewhere...</p> <p>4. CHANGE THIS TO: "How have you attempted to improve efficiency, reduce costs or increase revenue over the past X years": (then, allow respondents to pick and choose from a group of descriptors...</p> <p>THEN ASK about "Budget Cut Impacts" -- if you think you can actually get useful feedback. The real question, is, "Who cares" where we have been -- what we want to know is, WHAT WOULD IT TAKE TO MAKE MY PROGRAM BETTER! Go to "Potential" instead of belaboring the past...</p>
Criteria	IV.2	<p>In the middle of page 7, item #2 requests information about "Curricular indicators of efficiency." WHAT DOES THIS MEAN?</p>
Criteria	IV.4	<p>Under budget cut impacts, try to distinguish between internally-imposed moves toward greater efficiency and externally-imposed budget cuts.</p>
Criteria	Rubric	<p>We would like to suggest careful consideration of the scoring strategy in how it relates to the relationship between "quality" and "cost." Our concern is how the balance between "cheap" and "expensive" components of programs are distributed. Colleges, departments and individual faculty all have potential for pretty serious disgruntlement if they recognize themselves as work horses for someone else's pampered specialty. This observation is not a solution, but perhaps this aspect could be scheduled for a review fairly early on during implementation.</p>
Criteria	V	<p>The relationship between demand and potential are very important, reflects student values.</p>

Comment Summary
May 3, 2008

Area	Section	Comments
Criteria	V	Clarify difference between IV and V: potential and budgets relationships
Criteria	V.1.A	- I'm pretty experienced as dept chair, but I can't tell what "maximum capacity" means (i.e., I could define it in multiple ways as: empty seats in UD major classes, or, given the amount of equipment we have we're at max..., or...
Criteria	V.1.C	- sort of missing under 1. What have you done to maintain current enrollment levels (as well as, as you ask here, what have you done to increase enrollment
Criteria	V.2.A	Edit to read: "What opportunity does the program have for future expansion? <u>If relevant, discuss the ways in which such an expansion fosters our ability to realize goals of WASC Theme II.</u> "
Criteria	V.2.A	rewrite to: provide evidence of national and CSU trends and evidence for possible expansion
Criteria	V.3	define "resources" in "Response to Augmented Resources" (OE, faculty allocation, equipment, space... And on and on.)
Criteria	V.4	We recommend some opportunity to communicate what would be lost if a program were eliminated. This potential loss should be analyzed at both an HSU level and a CSU level.
Criteria	V.4	Same here, define "resources"
Criteria	V.B	<p>Section V seems uniquely problematic. Particularly V-4, which asks programs to identify their own strategic cuts, we believe this would smooth the way for administrative cuts, making it easy to shift budgetary responsibility onto programs.</p> <p>a. Morale, for example, is tied to budget cuts, but is hard to quantify. Perhaps the lack of candidates willing to run for university committees is one measure of low morale. We wonder if we are taking into account how budget cuts over the past three years already have had an impact?</p>
Criteria	VI	Other. This is where all the special attributes of a program should go such as diversity, responsibilities to the community etc.
Criteria	VI	include but do NOT give it any weighting -- provides too much "gaming" the system
Criteria	VI	*For the Other category – if departments don't supply then allow them to choose where the 5% will go.
Criteria	VI	*Other category – departments that capture something that no one else has. Should just have it be on top of so that they are not just duplicating what's already in the report.
Criteria	Weights	VI: typo (remove 'be" from first three boxes

Comment Summary
May 3, 2008

Area	Section	Comments
Criteria	Weights	<p>***Draft weightings: I'm boggled with this, even after I remove "Mission and Vision" as a screening device. First, this implies that each category will result in a "score" or number that is comparable in unit value for every other category, and thereby "weightable". Don't see any validity in that here -- except that every category could end up with "rankings" per category across all programs. But "rankings" obscure the true values.</p> <p>€ One alternative strategy: Just screen for "Mission," --- IN or OUT – then use equal status Demand, Quality and Costs/Efficiency and simply stack into "Low" "Medium" or "High" for each of those three categories. Collect a final "status" average for those three categories.</p> <p>Then pile each program into stacks of "Low Potential," "Medium Potential" and "High Potential".</p> <p>MUCH simpler, and you'd actually end up with clarity on "high demand, high quality and low cost/efficient programs with medium to high potential..." AND medium to high demand, medium to high quality and low to medium cost programs with low to medium potential... AND the also-rans in all categories.</p>