

**PRIORITIZATION AND RECOVERY STEERING COMMITTEE  
MINUTES  
August 30, 2007**

PRESENT: J. Almaraz, L. Alex, E. Barnes, D. Brum, S. Davis, B. Emerton, D. Freer, R. Fremont, S. Garver, H. Lujan, R. Kellner, B. Pepping, J. Self, S. Warrington

ABSENT: S. Monemi, M. Sancho-Madriz, J. Stallones

GUEST: President Ortiz

1. Message from President Ortiz

John Self has been asked to Chair the Steering Committee. Ed Barnes has agreed to be Co Chair.

President Ortiz welcomed the group and thanked each of them for their participation in the process.

Dr. Ortiz acknowledged that the Steering Committee has work ahead. The Academic Programs P & R Committee put out Phase I in the Summer. It was a bold statement regarding what the campus could become if we were to refocus and reorganize. The Phase I report can provide the basis for discussion. President Ortiz stated that it is clear that the reports make clear that the campus is under funded. The only currency that the university has is FTE.

The Support Programs P & R Committee has not yet submitted a document.

This group needs to start out the afternoon with how we are going to vet the groups. How to get the stakeholders, including the external community to provide feedback and make recommendations. The recommendations are needed by the end of January because it can have an impact on the 2008-09 State budget process. Dr. Ortiz applauded the Academic Programs P & R Committee. Unfortunately many have been ostracized because of their work. The report was a beginning rather than an end. The members of the committee worked as Trustees not as members of the department, college or constituencies. They were appointed as Trustees of the University. These recommendations make sense for the University. They did a good job and provided a good foundation.

Dr. Ortiz stated that Cal Poly Pomona is always being compared to Cal Poly SLO. This does not need to be. Cal Poly Pomona needs to determine the institution it will be now and in the future.

Academic Programs P & R is developing Phase II recommendations. This should come to the Steering Committee soon, as well as the Support Programs recommendation.

A question was raised about consultation with the Academic Senate. President Ortiz responded that the Academic Senate consultation will be part of the vetting process.

President Ortiz thanked the group for the work they are about to put in and look forward to the outcomes.

## 2. Introductions

John Self, Chair, stated that the decisions regarding the P and R recommendations have not been made. The recommendations are to be considered and vetted by the constituencies throughout Fall and part of Winter. Changes and modifications to the recommendations are expected. Some parts may be drastically changed. The feedback will form the Steering Committee recommendations to President Ortiz.

The Steering Committee consists of the Academic Senate Executive Committee, the President's Cabinet (minus the President), a staff representative and the ASI President. We have the unique opportunity to take Cal Poly Pomona and make it what it should be for today and the future -- rather than what it looks like through evolution.

The Trustee Committees have spent numerous hours working on the recommendations. This is a good foundation to begin our work.

It is expected that the Academic Programs Phase II and the Support Programs documents will be available in the next few weeks. This Steering Committee must produce a set of recommendations based on the Academic Programs Phase I and Phase II and the Support Programs documents. We will define what events are communicated and vetted. The process will be determined and a timeline established.

Dr. Self stated that the currency of the Steering Committee is honesty, communication and integrity. We need to consult with all constituencies and listen to all comments. Curtis Clark, Director, I & IT Web Development, will add the comments to the exchange server and the Steering Committee will all have access to the comments. Again, some of the comments will be radical and some will be practical.

Dr. Self commented that this will be a very time consuming process and if members can relieve themselves of other commitments should consider doing so.

## 3. Purpose

### a) Definition of Trustee

Chair Self asked that because the Steering Committee will be doing things that touch lives of faculty and student for years to come, that the group view themselves as Trustees. This does not mean individual biases; influences and perspectives should be discarded. They should be retained because they are essential to bringing the different perspectives to the group. We need to adopt the concept that the constituency is the university as a whole.

Confidentiality was discussed. At this point Chair Self asked that the meetings be treated in a confidential manner. This would mean that we take every step together and then publish information, documents and other items as soon as possible. We should be in agreement when the information goes public so that we can prevent premature information being given out. The idea is to make sure the information is discussed thoroughly and in final form before it is made public. Confidentiality is being asked only until ideas and decisions are in final form. The Steering Committee should be as public and transparent as possible. The steps should be documented along the way.

A question was raised about the Minutes. It was agreed that timing is important. The Minutes will have more value as a historic document.

Discussion ensued regarding transparency. The meetings cannot be perceived as secret meetings. Nothing can be secret. Faculty already are nervous regarding the Academic Programs P & R report and will want to provide their input. The point was made that the discussions with the constituents will provide valuable information needed for decision making.

Agreement was reached that the Minutes will reflect the discussion. If a topic is not fully discussed, the Minutes will reflect that the topic discussion began and further discussion with constituents and the Steering Committee is needed. When the discussion is concluded the Minutes will reflect the action or decision.

#### b) Timeline

President Ortiz asked that the recommendations be submitted to him by January 31, 2008.

There are 93 academic departments and 300 administrative departments.

Co Chair Ed Barnes explained why the January 31 date was important from a budget perspective. The CSU is in the midst of budget formation for 2008-09. The System Presidents and Staff are working on proposals to present to the Board of Trustees by the end of Fall. It is important that we have our information in January when the Governor makes his first pass at the State budget. The CSU is looking at fixing structural problems, catch up and get money back in the System. The bargaining agreement and the compact are all parts of the consideration for the budget.

It was pointed out that individual campus program do not directly impact the CSU budget. The only exception is buildings. FTE does play a major role. The compact is a legitimate issue. The comment was made that the references to salaries and bargaining should be left out of the discussions. These are well deserved salary increases and the CSU and other entities do benefit.

It was agreed that it is best to assume the CSU will receive compact funding for next year. If we make that assumption, any enhancements will be a plus.

Dr. Barnes stated that we have to use the FTE's we currently have, but we can reallocate and move around.

The reallocation of resources may mean more funding for some areas, neutral to some and less for others. However, we might, after deliberations, recommend that it doesn't make sense to cut back on weak programs; we should actually build up the weak programs. Chair Self asked that the Steering Committee look at this process as a clean slate -- reallocation of the programs as well as the funds.

#### How are we going to do this?

Herman Lujan, Interim Provost, presented a proposed timetable to get the discussion started. The timeline included department, college and university opportunities for consultation.

Dr. Lujan indicated that the purpose of the timeline is to achieve genuine consultation and the potential for a really solid program with shared responsibility. This timeline was put together based on work with the Deans. The Deans worked with the Department Chairs. These were reviewed twice. It is designed to coincide with the January 31 deadline.

In looking at the timetable, the point was made that there may not be enough time in late September to hit all the departments and have a town hall discussion. The department is the heart and soul of this process. Maybe that could be adjusted.

Chair Self asked the group to speak their mind and put their thoughts and ideas on the table for discussion.

The question was raised regarding the Academic Programs Phase I P & R Report. The report in June had departments missing and there were corrections needed. As a result of this, a number of faculty over the Summer did not give the document any consideration because they would deal with it later when the corrected and final report was done. The perception of some faculty/departments was that they would fix the report and there would be a corrected report. That would be the time to pay attention to the document.

Questions raised:

- When do we inform the university community that the report is complete and it is the final report?
- When will we have a final report from Support Programs?
- When will the campus community be given notice that the final document(s) are available?

The issue of how to reach the maximum number of constituents was discussed. It was suggested that the department meetings would reach the largest number of faculty. Also, department chairs meeting, college budget planning committees, and curriculum committees. This is where discussion will be taking place.

Also, since the Colleges have a meeting during Fall Conference, there should be some sort of information regarding the process. Everyone is present and we can put out our objectives and timeline for this committee's work. At the least, there could be a notification at Fall Conference that this is coming up and it will be on line and give a link. This would give the departments and colleges a heads up on the process.

A question was raised if there will be a corrected Academic Programs Phase I report. It was suggested that a corrected copy be posted on the Web.

A question was raised why the decisions have to be done by January since some of these are drastic proposals that could chart the course of the university. It was acknowledged that the President wants it by the end of January, but the Steering Committee needs time to review the information which could take the entire year. We have not yet seen the data. We cannot set timelines without the data.

Interim Provost Lujan stated that his timeline is the goal. He also added that the data should be in a condition that adds to your knowledge. He stated that the Academic Programs and Support Programs groups are working very hard and are your colleagues.

The Provost was questioned further regarding the need for more time. He stated that the budget building process is in January and it is the way business is done by the State of California. Further discussion ensued regarding the urgency of the timeline.

The point was made that the Academic Programs and Support Programs P & R Committees have been working for two or more years and we still do not have complete information. The Steering Committee is expected to start in September and finish in January. It affects the appearance of appropriate thoughtful consideration as to the decisions especially since we do not have the materials. It is hard to get a handle on how much work and to what detail is involved. After looking at the Academic Programs P & R Report it would be an ambitious task to finish it by January. If one unit is affected it could affect other units down the line. The recommendations underneath may be more efficient and successful but they may not be considered because of time and the domino affect. Do we set a timeline for something we only have less than a third of the information?

Chair Self pointed out that the concerns voiced are the reason that the information needs to come out quickly and accurately. He requested that the Steering Committee look at this process as we can do it, not as we cannot do it. If we find that it cannot be done as the process goes through, then we can readjust the timelines.

Clarification of the timeline was requested. Are we vetting all recommendations on the same timeline? When department and college is used is it for all entities? What are the differences between intercollege and university meetings?

The term unit was used to mean academic departments as well as support departments/units. There are recommendations that some colleges merge – the intercollege meetings are to discuss the merge issues only for the colleges and divisions that may merge.

The question was raised regarding where the Academic Senate is in the process. The President has assured us that this will go through the Academic Senate. We need to build it into the timeline.

The Senate can begin on those reports immediately and bring recommendations back.

The point was made that the Senate goes through the committees then to the Senate. At times committee reports have taken upwards to a year.

It was stated that the Senate is representative. The Executive Committee can speak for the Senate. Every member of the Executive Committee is on this Steering Committee. This was not the agreement with the President. The Executive Committee was informed that no matter what it would go to the full Senate before any recommendations were made. The Senate is free to make recommendations. The Executive Committee could speak for the Senate, but it was agreed that the recommendations would go to the full Senate.

Chair Self stated that it should go to the full Senate.

c) Who needs to be consulted:

The Steering Committee did not define the constituencies that will be consulted. In general all campus constituents, the Alumni, and the community need to be consulted. This item will need more clarification as the process proceeds.

d) How best to ensure consultation and collaboration

The point was made that some departments are on the chopping block, and we have gone through this, they will want an Executive Committee and Senate hearing. They want to make sure they have had the opportunity to speak to their colleagues and present their rationale. They want to do it themselves. Not the chair, dean or whoever else could do it. Problems occurred as the Academic Programs Phase I Report was placed on the web. The Senate Office received phone calls immediately reacting to the report. Chair Self thought it best not to act until the Senate had a strategy in place. We have that obligation to our constituents to give them an opportunity to be heard.

Chair Self stated that the Senate is a recommending body and this is what we will do. The Senate will be a constituency just like any other.

It was stated and agreed upon that the Prioritization and Recovery Steering Committee is the sole recommending body on this issue.

e) What does this look like:

A general consensus was reached that the department is a good place to start disseminating information. A message could be sent to the departments to inform them that the information will be available. The recommendations may not affect all departments but some departments will be severely impacted. The example of RTP was discussed. Contract and union issues are things that need to be considered as well.

The point was made that RTP is one issue that will need to be addressed. Discussion ensued regarding the possible impact merging departments/colleges might have on the RTP Process.

Chair Self suggested setting up a FAQ on the website. Questions about RTP would need to be posted and answered along with resources for information. The point was made that Dr. Areola is a resource in the framework of RTP and for contract information if needed. It was pointed out that Dr. Areola's information is important, but most RTP decisions will be a faculty decision

The Staff will have the same types of same concerns as the faculty.

Concern was expressed over the lack of students in the process. Some of it might be through their own doing, but there is concern about the way they have not been engaged. They need to be given same opportunity for questions and answers and conversations. This summer many students worked with Environmental Design to manage student concerns. If we are going to release the document, it is easy to see the role of the faculty and staff. The student role is not as clear. Make sure students know their role. It is clear the students are invited to participate. They are considered in the unit description.

A suggestion was made to conserve time, the Steering Committee members could offer to attend department meetings and listen to concerns. Discussion ensued.

The point was made that you can invite units/departments to convey their concerns and questions in writing.

Chair Self stated that the Steering Committee could take the approach to identify the units/departments most deeply affected and begin there. Some will not be impacted as much as others. Target those units/departments first.

It was stated that some of the units/departments will want to come to the Steering Committee and present their case. They will want to know their concerns are not filtered through another.

The point was made that decisions on academic colleges/departments have impact on many other areas, not just the department. It is how it affects the college, accreditation, curriculum, RTP, etc. These are big issues for students, faculty and staff.

f) Process/Strategy

Do we need to act on all the P & R and recommendations at this point? We know things at the top deal with the most impact on the University at this point. We could chop it into smaller pieces and it could be a trial run.

Suggestions were made that the Steering Committee identify the departments that are most affected. Focus on these departments first.

All units/departments will go through the process. The areas most impacted could have extra meetings and maybe the Steering Committee representatives could commit to attending a meeting and listening to their concerns.

The Steering Committee can look at the documents and review the most important. We would prioritize the immediate needs and tackle them. Also, identify and address other programs for the following years.

The point was made that we have no details yet.

The opinion was expressed that when you look at scope of implementation it is runs much deeper than it appears. It is encouraging to hear that two or three critical bold moves are being suggested. These are the ones in looking at all the data that make the most sense. Focus on those and the others could be deferred to another time.

The Steering Committee consensus was that they should prioritize what is for the best interest of the university. RTP is an issue that should be included.

A suggestion was made that the Steering Committee could look at five things on each report – Academic and Support.

(4) Timeline to receive and release reports form Academic Program Committee and Support Programs Committee

The Steering Committee has not yet received the Academic Programs Committee Phase II and the Support Programs Committee report. It is anticipated that the reports will be received in September. It was suggested that the information be available for Fall Conference. At the College and Department meetings a link could be provided so that the campus community can review the documents.

(5) Future meeting schedule

Meeting schedule proposed --\_The meeting schedule proposed was not approved due to time conflicts. The Steering Committee decided to meet on September 6 from 2- 4 p.m.

On September 6 the Co Chairs of the Academic Programs Phase one will discuss their rationale for the decisions. The Support Programs Chair will discuss their methodology in putting the report together. After the Support Programs Chair gives the presentation, then the Steering Committee will be given a draft document

Ron Fremont stated that the Support Programs document is in an advanced draft state. The entire committee has not reviewed the document. Once this is completed the report will be in final form.

A corrected version of The Academic Programs P & R Phase I Report is needed. It should the CSU Accessibility guidelines.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:40 p.m.