Planning for Distinction
Instructional Program Task Group
Meeting Notes
January 11, 2013

1) **Review and approve meeting notes from Dec. 14, 2012 meeting**
   a. Ensure notes reflect the important distinction between the “GE office” and “GE program.”
   b. Also clarify “Freshman Program”. (The Freshman Program is covered in the GE office and need not be specifically included.)
   c. Clarify the language in the criterion on mission, commitments and ILOs to accurately reflect that ILOs are new and many departments have not yet had a chance to fully incorporate. Michael Lee to provide revised language.
   d. **The 12/14 notes have not yet been approved.**
      i. Changes will be made as discussed and the revised version will be circulated for approval.
      ii. **Once approved via email they will be posted on the web.**

2) **Review and discuss the revised program definition**
   Some time was spent reviewing the program definitions at other universities.
   a. Current definition: “An academic activity that generates SCUs and is required for degrees, credentials or certificates.”
   b. Academic Department Offices are not included since those were going to be evaluated with the Support Program task Group (SPTG).
      i. Note that “clerical” is not the same as “technical.”
      ii. There are some programs that are not tied to a specific academic department.
      iii. The uniqueness of each situation should be allowed.
      iv. Support resources should be included in the evaluation. Invite chairs of the SPTG to a meeting to discuss.
   c. Given the large number of “programs” that fall within the current definition, there is concern with how each program can get fair attention and be evaluated effectively.
      i. There are currently 444 programs, that includes 213 options. There is some duplication in the 444, which would lower the total by approximately 100.
         1. Could options be looked at in the context of the larger program or of the department? Or will there be the
accountability that every unit of review must go down to the option level?

a. **Options will be included but capturing that information should be done within the context of the larger program.**

d. The role of the dean would be to work with the department chairs to ensure the most accurate description of the program is provided to the IPTG.

e. The preliminary list of academic programs and options will go to the deans to have them identify the relationships between majors, minors, credentials and options. Seek input from the deans about ways the program definition could be best altered. The list will then come back to the IPTG for review.

f. Consider using the terminology “unit of review” instead of “program.”

g. Undergraduate and graduate programs should be kept separate.

h. The more refined level the task group can evaluate, the more valuable the information will be.

i. Given the governor’s budget proposal for the CSU, the Planning for Distinction process will help guide the allocation of any new resources coming to the campus.

3) **Continue the conversation about criteria**

a. Be sure to allow qualitative content in the report template.

b. Consider adding another criterion: “anything you weren’t asked that you want to add” / other.

   i. Reference spreadsheet that compares East Bay with Humboldt, Sacramento and Pomona. There is the most overlap with Humboldt.

   ii. Based upon suggestions from task group members, a consolidated grouping of criteria was presented:

      1. Consistency with the Mission, Commitments and ILOs
      2. Program demand
         a. Should include internal, external, and intrinsic
      3. Program quality
      4. Revenues, cost and efficiency
      5. Potential or opportunity analysis
      6. Additional information

   iii. It is suggested that the combined subcommittees go over these criteria again.
4) **New Items**
   a. The Associate Vice President for Planning, Institutional Research presented a data menu from which various data points could be selected to be included in the report template that is distributed to the departments.
      i. The data can be imbedded into separate documents depending on relevance.
      ii. Staff is already working on running the data for a sample of departments to see what the results yield. A small group of the task group could review the results to help narrow down the data menu.
      iii. External data is not available at the program level but more global trends could be provided.

**Tasks**
Subcommittees are to revise questions and measures for the consolidated criteria and develop a scoring rubric for the criteria. Next week, focus only on revising the questions and measures for the consolidated criteria.