



CALIFORNIA STATE
UNIVERSITY
E A S T B A Y

DATE: March 18, 2013

TO: Mitch Watnick

FROM: James L.J. Houpis, Provost and Vice President, Academic Affairs
Bradley Wells, Vice President, Administration and Finance/CFO

SUBJECT: Resolution 2012-13 FUFM 2
Program Prioritization Criteria

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bradley Wells", written over the name in the "FROM:" field.

President Morishita has asked us, as sponsors of the university-wide Planning for Distinction initiative, to respond to the above referenced resolution passed by the Senate on February 26, 2013.

As you know, 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 was enhanced with additional members to round out representation from across the campus to create the Planning for Distinction Steering Committee. The Steering Committee includes Dr. Mitch Watnik, Chair of the Academic Senate, the chairs of four primary Academic Senate committees, as well as students and staff representatives. Recommendations for faculty and department chairs to serve on the Instructional Program Task Group and the Support Program Task Group 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. In addition, the deans from the four colleges, the Associate Provost, the AVP for Academic Programs and Graduate Studies, and senior managers from Planning, Enrollment Management and Student Affairs, Administration and Finance, and University Advancement serve on the steering committee and the task groups.

The Instructional Program Task Group has been asked to establish a program definition, develop criteria and weighting for that criteria, create a report template that will be completed for all programs, and finally after reviewing those reports to formulate recommendations. The recommendations will ultimately be forwarded to the president's cabinet for review and as we have affirmed at various points during the past months, 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.

All members of the campus community, including the Academic Senate, have the opportunity to comment on the work of the committees at key points throughout the process. As information is posted on the Planning for Distinction web page, the campus community is notified and encouraged to comment either anonymously or via e-mail. Any comments received are considered by the task groups as they finalize their work. For example, the program definitions have been posted for campus comment since February 12, 2013 and we expect the task groups to post additional work shortly for comment by the campus community.

We believe this process provides appropriate opportunities for consideration and input from interested members of the campus community, including all members of the Academic Senate. In particular, the Instructional Program Task Group will seek input from the entire campus community on the proposed criteria before they are finalized. Members of the Academic Senate are encouraged to use this opportunity to comment on the work of the Task Group and help guide the process to a successful conclusion.