1. **How were members of the steering committee and the task groups selected?**

   (10/18/2012)

   The composition of the committees was designed to reflect Cal State East Bay as broadly as possible. The existing University Planning, Assessment and Budget Committee (UPABC) was enhanced with additional members to round out representation from across the campus to create the Steering Committee. UPABC includes the Chair of the Academic Senate (Mitch Watnik), the chairs of four primary Academic Senate committees, and representation of students and staff. The deans from the four colleges, the associate provost, and the AVP for APGS, and senior managers from PEMSA, Administration and Finance, and University Advancement were asked to serve on either the instructional or support task groups.

   Recommendations for faculty and department chairs were solicited from the Academic Senate chair, who conferred with the chairs of the primary Academic Senate committees in identifying well respected and thoughtful faculty and department chairs to serve. In addition, nominations were made from the college deans and senior executives on the campus.

   The Instructional Program Task Group includes 8 department chairs, 11 non-chair faculty and the faculty Director of the McNair Scholars Program. These 20 faculty consist of 6 representatives from CLASS, 4 each from CBE, CEAS and COS, and 2 from the library. The 6 representatives from CLASS are comprised of 2 representatives from the humanities, 2 from the arts and media, and 2 from health and human services. This Task Group also includes the deans of CLASS and COS, due to the number of FTES their colleges produce, and where General Education course are taught. Two faculty chair this committee, and they were selected by nominations from the task group membership.

   The Support Program Task Group includes representatives from the four campus divisions, plus four faculty members (one faculty from each of the four colleges). This Task Group is chaired by the deans from CBE and CEAS.

   Representatives from the Associated Students have been asked to serve on all three committees.

   **Related questions submitted after the response above was composed.**

   How much overlap is there with the Academic Senate? (11/5/2012)

   How were the committees selected? (11/5/2012)

   How are the teams chosen? I’d like to think the Senate was consulted in some way about representatives on these teams. (11/7/2012)

2. **What role does the 2008 Academic Plan play in this current process?** (10/18/2012)
The Planning for Distinction process is a logical step following the University’s adoption of its expanded mission statement, eight shared strategic commitments, and institutional learning outcomes in the Spring of 2012.

The 2008 Academic Plan, which was completed over five years ago, called for the growth and development of “programs of distinction”, but did not provide a framework by which to evaluate programs using a data-driven, comprehensive analysis. Planning for Distinction will provide for just such an analytical approach to support the next steps in implementing the 2008 Academic Plan.

Related questions submitted after the response above was composed.
Does Planning for Distinction supersede the strategic planning (11/5/2012)

3. What role will Academic Impressions play in East Bay’s prioritization effort? (10/18/2012)

The consulting firm has assisted the task groups in understanding the general model for the process, establishing operating guidelines for each group and identifying typical issues that arise during the course of a prioritization effort. They have indicated they would be available if any of the groups feels they can assist, but the process has now been turned over to the campus to manage and to own. The criteria and process we develop will be totally our own.

4. What is the campus’ current fiscal situation and how does that influence the prioritization effort? (10/18/2012)

CSU and CSU East Bay face significant financial uncertainties that coupled with the substantial budget reductions in recent years, make it impossible to “continue business as usual”. Past budget reductions have not been eradicated with the passage of Proposition 30. In order for the campus to provide the quality educational experience called for in our eight shared strategic commitments, we need to examine all of our activities and programs to insure that best practices are adopted and are supported by our university vision and mission.

5. Why now? (11/13/2012)

Universities presently exist in a time that is surely characterized by uncertainty, and a search for a steady state. It is a time, many view, as an opportunity to reshape higher education, and define, instill and support our basic mission; we are a public institution in service for the public good. With the decades that lay in front of us, we need to be engaged and participate in defining the shape of higher education in the 21st century, implementing innovative best practices where our new students will continue to be served with excellence in student-centered learning environments, along with our
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expanding role in community service, scholarship, and research. And in order to do this, it will require us to be courageous and ensure that we are investing our resources in support of our highest priorities and in our areas of distinction.

Related questions submitted after the response above was composed.
What is the end goal? (11/5/2012)

6. **Who will make decisions about eliminating academic programs? (10/18/2012)**

Any recommendations that affect academic programs or activities, which fall within the purview of the Academic Senate, will be considered by that body according to the Senate’s organizational practices and policies. It is also important to note that the results of the Planning for Distinction task force and steering committee deliberations will be to assign every program at our campus to one of several categories that identify those programs that warrant additional investment and support, those that would benefit from continued stable support, and those that require modification or adjustment. The task groups and steering committee are not responsible for implementing any of their recommendations.

7. **How will/might the outcome affect me and my job? (11/13/2012)**

As the Planning for Distinction process is focused on instructional and support programs, it is premature to consider any implications for individual employees (faculty or staff).

8. **How many layoffs will there be and when? (11/13/2012)**

As the Planning for Distinction process is focused on instructional and support programs, it is premature to consider any implications for individual employees (faculty or staff).

9. **Will tenured faculty lose their jobs as a result of the prioritization effort? (10/18/2012)**

The Planning for Distinction process has just begun and it is impossible at this point in time to predict the results of the task group work, or that of the Academic Senate. However, our tenure-track and tenured faculty are the core of our academic institution. History teaches us that faculty are highly adaptable; with the ability to develop new courses, new programs, and new avenues of scholarship over the course of their careers. It is inconceivable that this process would circumvent this adaptability.

Related questions submitted after the response above was composed.
What is the plan for how to handle any faculty layoffs as a result of down-sizing of specific academic programs? What would be the timing schedule? (11/7/2012)
10. Who will make decisions about what is cut or augmented on the support program side? (11/13/2012)

The Support Program Task Group will make recommendations to the Steering Committee. After its review the Steering Committee will forward recommendations to the President’s cabinet. The President will then direct the vice presidents to implement those recommendations that are determined to be in the best interest of the University.

11. How is program importance determined? (11/13/2012)

The purpose of the Planning for Distinction process is not to determine a program’s “value” but rather to categorize all programs according to a set of criteria developed by the task groups and related to the University’s mission, eight strategic commitments, and instructional learning outcomes.

Related questions submitted after the response above was composed.
How is program “value” determined? (11/17/2012)

12. What is the timeline? (11/5/2012)

The detailed schedule is being developed by each task group and the steering committee. However, it is likely that during the fall quarter the two task groups will be defining a program, developing and weighting criteria, gathering institutional data and creating a template for the departments to complete. The template will be shared with the departments during the winter quarter and are scheduled to be due back to the task groups before the end of February. During March, the task groups will review the materials submitted from the departments and develop recommendations. Those recommendations are scheduled to be submitted to the Steering Committee in March, with final recommendations going to the President’s cabinet in April 2013. After the President approves the recommendations, the report regarding academic programs will be submitted to the Academic Senate for action and the various vice presidents will begin implementation of the support recommendations beginning as early the 2013-14 academic year. Full implementation of recommendations is likely to occur over time depending on the recommendations.

Related questions submitted after the response above was composed.
To whom are the recommendations made? (11/13/2012)

Did you define what a program is? There are small things in an administrative unit that are crucial. (11/9/2012)

13. Is this only for the academic programs and faculty? (11/13/2012)
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No, this is a comprehensive review and evaluation of every program or activity on campus. It includes both academic programs and administrative services.

14. Are there meetings for this and do I have to attend? (10/18/2012)

We have scheduled college, library and division-wide meetings for any interested faculty and staff. You are not required to attend, but may attend any one of these events to hear about the process and get questions answered.

15. Is this a one-time process or something that will be integrated into regular department, division or program reviews and evaluations? (11/13/2012)

The data that will be compiled for this effort will be updated annually and will be used to assist with regular program reviews and evaluations and future resource allocation decisions.

16. What kind of guidance will non-academic departments be given to follow this process? (11/13/2012)

When the templates are delivered to the departments, training will be provided to assist with responding to the questions.

17. What is “distinction”? (11/5/2012)

Distinction is recognition of achievement or excellence. Identification of distinction comes from many sources, both internal and external to the campus.

Related questions submitted after the response above was composed.
Are we seeking distinction on its merits by itself (e.g. for marketing purposes?), or are we developing “distinction” by necessity since we cannot afford to support all programs? (11/7/2012)

18. Why was the Dickeson book/approach chosen for this effort? (11/5/2012)

Provost Houpis and CFO Wells, after attending a seminar to learn more about the process and determine if it would be an approach that could work for Cal State East Bay, recommended to the cabinet that the book serve as one resource for approaching a comprehensive review of the campus programs. The task groups and steering committee have already made several modifications from the book's approach, and the task groups are likely to make more. The approach is being modified to fit this campus.

Related questions submitted after the response above was composed.
I am concerned about some of the methods referenced in the Dickeson book. (11/5/2012)
19. Will this process be used to make budget cuts? (11/5/2012)

The process will result in the campus making informed, strategic decisions about resource allocation in the future, including resource increases and decreases.

20. Will online presence be criteria to judge programs and if they don’t have it will put them on the chopping block? (10/18/2012)

The instructional program task group will develop multiple criteria that will have varying weights. An online presence may be associated with one or more of the criteria, but no single criteria would be used to justify elimination of a program.

21. Are external reviewers involved? (10/18/2012)

No, however, some information from external sources will likely be used in the review, depending on the decisions made by the task groups and steering committee.

22. Where has program prioritization worked successfully and how was “success” determined? (11/5/2012)

Please refer to resources linked on the Planning for Distinction website for examples. Each university has developed its own criteria and detailed process.

23. What is the process? (11/5/2012)

Please refer to the Planning for Distinction website for detailed information regarding the process to be used at Cal State East Bay.

24. What effect will this have on staff workload? (10/18/2012)

Some staff will be asked or invited to contribute to the information for the programs in which they are involved. Individual staff members’ workloads will be adjusted to accommodate this work within their regular schedule.

25. The guidelines for the prioritization outlined online indicate that the process ought to be "demand driven," explaining that the demand should come from students and employers, primarily. What is the justification for allowing students, i.e. those without the benefit of a university education, to determine which programs ought to be offered or not? Surely, one cannot expect those who are still trying to figure out what they want to do with their lives to determine before they've been exposed to the range of ideas offered by a vibrant university which programs ought to be present and which not. Is it not the duty of the university itself to determine the curriculum by which the uneducated come to learn? Further, why should employers determine the contents of a
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university education? Does this administration intend for CSUEB to become a job-training institution rather than a place of higher learning? (11/7/2012)

The task groups and steering committee have not yet developed criteria to be used to guide the program review. The task groups are considering many factors as they draft the criteria and the university community will have a chance to comment on them when they are developed.

Related questions submitted after the response above was composed
How is the community we serve being addressed? Is attention being paid to students that don’t complete their degree at East Bay? (11/5/2012)

26. Can you post all the resources that the committees will be using? (11/5/2012)

In an effort to be as transparent as possible, the resources are on the webpage and will be updated as necessary.

27. Is there a way for the campus community to share resources with the committees? (11/5/2012)

Yes. Send your information to Lori Erdman and she can post it on the website.

28. Will this process recognize the need for teacher preparation as a priority?

The Instructional Task Group will come up with criteria and a weighting system. The campus community will have the opportunity to review the criteria and weighting and offer comments. You should stay informed so that you can influence decisions particularly when the groups are defining what a program is. Please note that a program does not necessarily equal a department or unit. Your feedback regarding teacher preparation would be useful here.

29. If you are not in the specific program, how can you be qualified to come up with the criteria for it? (11/5/2012)

Criteria developed by the task groups will be reviewed by the Steering Committee, which will include solicitation of campus feedback and comment concerning the proposed criteria.

30. What is staff involvement in the process? (11/5/2012)

There will be multiple opportunities for staff to have input. At each point along the way, when an initial decision is made to define a program, or establish the criteria and weighting, for example, those initial decisions will be posted on the web site. At the same time that initial decision is sent to the Steering Committee for affirmation. Staff
can comment on that definition and those comments will be shared with the Steering Committee and task groups.

Additionally, we will be strongly encouraging department and unit managers to involve staff in the responses that are provided on the program description template.

31. The faculty base is not reflective of our student population. (11/5/2012)

Faculty diversity could be one of the items used as criteria to rate the programs.

32. There is a lot of synergy between programs within a department, for example how a minor influences the major. How is this taken into account? (11/8/2012)

That is exactly what the task groups have to struggle to address. If we aggregate too many programs we can’t discriminate but if you disaggregate too much then there is too much detail. The process will entail developing qualitative criteria that will consider issues such as this. These qualitative criteria will provide an opportunity for a chair or director to describe the synergy between programs.

33. What relation will there be between this process and the normal academic review of programs? Are we ignoring other program reviews? (11/8/2012)

Our hope is that this process becomes part of a standard template for 5 year reviews for not just the academic side of the university, but the entire university.

34. Is the process of the task groups open for observers or is consideration given to have observers? (11/8/2012)

The task groups are still deliberating the process each will follow but initial discussions suggest that the meetings will be open until such time as the chair determines that deliberation is required and then the meetings will be open only to members of the task group.

35. Regarding program expansion, in light of these activities is there a recommendation to continue any plan for adding new programs? (11/8/2012)

Proposed programs should be treated as programs even if they do not yet exist.

Related questions submitted after the response above was composed.
Faculty are often depicted as resistant to change in the prioritization literature, but many faculty are, in fact, eager for innovations that will support the university’s mission. The prioritization process, however, implicitly asks faculty to defend the existing programs they engage in rather than to offer proposals for how they would innovate either departmental or programmatic operations, structures, or missions with a goal of
greater efficiency, effectiveness, and better fit to the community. Is there a parallel process through which truly transformative visions of the university and of programs are generated and considered? (11/17/2012)

36. In addition to filing out templates, will there also be an in-person meeting with the task group? (11/8/2012)

The task groups are still deliberating the process each will follow but initial discussions suggest that meetings may be held with specific programs as required to better understand the completed program template.

37. How do you envision the actual allocation of resources to be tied to this outcome? (11/8/2012)

Those programs that are recommended for additional resources will be considered by the cabinet during the annual budget process and recommendations for new funding will be forwarded to the President for approval.

38. What is the role of the deans? (11/8/2012)

The deans are given a set amount of resources for their college. The task group will make a recommendation that goes to the steering committee, then to the cabinet and the president for a final decision. We hope the dean will have influence on the decisions as to how changes are made in their college.

The process allows for reallocation that crosses units/ division, which could allow for more resources. Deans will see and approve the templates before they are submitted to the task group. They can help coach their respective chairs and directors in the process, and ensure the responses of their various academic and support units have the same standard of quality. We do need to keep in mind that we are talking about the entire university not just the academic side.

39. Where did the money for this process come from? (11/8/2012)

A&F paid for the consultants and support staff and materials. The consulting contract is a not-to-exceed amount of $48,000, which is likely to be less since the campus has taken over most of the work.

The Provost’s office bought the books that were distributed to the task group members, which was approximately $3,300

In keeping with current and past practice at East Bay, assigned time was offered to all faculty members serving on any of the committees. Release time or stipends for the faculty members of the steering committee and task groups will be funded from the
budgeted campus contingency. The cost of release time and stipends for this effort is estimated to be $310,000.

40. There is a lot of committee time and support for people to serve on these task groups. Is there support for department chairs? (11/8/2012)

Our hope is that a good portion of the data already exists at the institution and can be provided in the form that the task groups need. Hopefully much of this will be taken care of before departments get the template and do not have to gather quantitative data. The material that is in your 5 year review will have the salient points already available. The schedule is flexible though we are trying to hold to it. If in your review, you identify things that could be done differently to save time, the expectation is that task groups will be able to incorporate those changes.

41. Since the process might become competitive between instructional programs, is there a way to level the playing field as far as the information that is provided? (11/8/2012)

We are expecting the Dean to ensure that all departments are providing the same degree and quality of information. After the Dean’s approval, the completed template will go to the Instructional task group to review. After that review, the information goes to the Steering Committee to make sure there is consistency and continuity across the whole campus. Finally, it will go to the Cabinet for another review. There should be enough checks and balances in place to avoid the competition.

Additionally, all of the completed templates will be posted on the web so any interested individual from across the campus can review.

42. Will there be an opportunity to add additional information to the templates to better represent the trends of the department? (11/8/2012)

Faculty and staff in a department know it best and can provide representative data. There will be opportunities for open ended data. Interpretation of data and commentary of past and future trends will need to come from the various programs.

43. Is there any part of the university that will be left out? (11/8/2012)

No. All University programs are included. However, Associated Students Inc., a separate 501(c)(3) with elected students serving on the board, is not included in the review because of it’s separate legal status.

44. Is the assignment of the resource numbers to every program a part of the analysis? (11/8/2012)

This is an issue that the task groups must consider.
45. The website identified additional resources; will those be purchased and available for everyone? (11/9/2012)

The information was placed on the web initially so everybody could gain an understanding of the general concept and see where it comes from but it is becoming less relevant because the task groups at CSUEB are defining their own process.