

**CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, POMONA**

**PRIORITIZATION AND RECOVERY STEERING COMMITTEE**

**MINUTES**

**October 22, 2007**

**Present:** Alex, Almaraz, Barnes, Brum, Davis, Delgado, Freer, Fremont, Kellner, Lord, Lujan, Monemi, Morgan, Pepping, Sancho-Madriz, Self, Stallones, Warrington, Yates

**Absent:** Day

**Guests:** K. Dickson, P. Rosenkrantz

1. Minutes

M/s/p to approve the minutes as written.

2. Phase II Presentation by Kip Dickson and Phil Rosenkrantz/ Q and A

Phil Rosenkrantz and Kip Dickson presented the Academic Programs Phase II report.

The first 18 pages are essential to understanding the next 200 pages.

Phase I was put into 11 recommendations.

Professors Rosenkrantz and Dickson stated that below are some of the challenges in completing the Phase II report:

- 28% budget cut over the last decade
- Advising
- Large number of students with a below 2.2 GPA.
- High faculty student ratio at the lower and upper division.
- Remediation
- Enrollment management
- New information on the Master Plan

The Committee placed the 94 programs in one of the categories below. The point was made that when there was both an undergraduate and graduate program in the same area one may be recommended for stable and one enhanced. Both did not get placed in the same category.

A brief explanation was given for each of the categories above.

The Steering Committee and Professors Rosenkrantz and Dickson discussed the following issues:

- Communication
- Leadership of the deans
- Master plan
- Systemic issues – the pressure to grow but not to reduce access as well as graduate students in four years
- Enrollment management
- Remediation – how to structure the curriculum for students who need remediation; the requirements in EO 665
- Demographics
- Reduced/Enhanced funding -- Where the money will come from for enhanced funding

The point was made that Phase I showed a cost savings. Professors Rosenkrantz and Dickson stated that the approximate savings is \$800,000. They were asked to detail the rationale on how they derived the cost savings; possibly as a thumbnail of the savings with the elimination three colleges.

Professors Rosenkrantz and Dickson state they would create an appendix that would identify the cost savings.

### 3. Information items

Academic Programs Phase II Report -- Chair Self asked the Steering Committee whether or not the Academic Programs Phase II report was ready to be posted on the public website.

The consensus was that the Academic Programs Phase II Report would be posted on the public website.

Trustee Issue – Chair Self proposed that the trustee issue and how the subgroups work be reconsidered. Previously it was agreed that the subgroup members would work as trustees and recuse themselves from their own affinities. It was suggested that the individuals with the expertise not recuse themselves from the subgroup when the topic is in their college/area; the subgroup and the steering committee would be better served with if they are included in the discussion.

The consensus was that the goal of the subgroup is for the three members to analyze and make a recommendation to the larger group -- whether it should be supported or not. The Steering Committee would make the final decision.

The consensus was that the members work within their affinities. If they should choose to recuse themselves, it will be honored.

Departmental Feedback – The question was raised whether feedback will be accepted from only individual departments or if there could be feedback from two departments as well.

The consensus was that the Steering Committee would take all feedback into consideration – single department/multiple department/ minority opinions/ individual opinions.

Retreat – The Retreat is scheduled on Friday, November 30, 2007. The location is Kellogg West.

Environmental Scan – Dr. Donald Coan will attend the October 29 meeting. Diane Cueno has requested that she, Kathy Street, Phil Rosenkrantz, and Kip Dickson be invited to the meeting. The Steering Committee agreed. Dr. Self will inform Dr. Cueno.

#### 4. Timeline

Changes were made to the timeline to clarify the times, dates and locations of the forums. A Support Programs forum was added on October 30.

Discussion ensued regarding how the forums would be conducted.

Brittany Yates and Doug Freer explained how the student forums were going to be conducted.

Discussion ensued.

One suggestion made was that the forums be set up by recommendation – both Academic Programs and Support Programs.

It was pointed out that the Phase II recommendations for the 94 departments for either discontinue/ merge/ stable/enhanced funding will not be considered in the forums. The departmental feedback is crucial for these recommendations.

The opinion was expressed that the Academic Programs recommendations 1 -11 are the structural and reorganization changes. Phase II is the data that supports those recommendations.

The consensus was that forums will be scheduled for the Phase I recommendations 1 – 11 for Academic Programs and the 19 Support

Programs Committee recommendations. Two forums will be scheduled for Academic Programs Phase I recommendations – recommendations 1-5 and recommendations 6-11.

The opinion was expressed that another recommendation regarding IT is needed. The Phase I report makes reference to IT being spread across the disciplines.

Consensus as not reached on the IT issue.

It was noted the Academic Senate should also be listed on the timeline.

The consensus was that after the changes were made to the Timeline it would be put on the public website.

5. Subgroup process

Chair Self announced the members of the six subgroups. No objections were voiced.

A Subgroup Deliverable/Outcome form was discussed.

The consensus was to use the form. Each subgroup will make a PowerPoint presentation. All of the presentations will be made public.

Ron Fremont volunteered to create a PowerPoint template for the subgroups to use.

6. Prioritize Recommendations

A suggestion was made to approach the recommendations by leaving stable funding as is and work with discontinue/merger and then the enhanced funding.

The opinion was expressed the subgroup needs to deal with any changes – stable funding with any kind of change – merger, one year and reevaluate, etc. or a department that wants to challenge stable funding to enhanced funding.

Discussion ensued.

The consensus was that all feedback must be considered regardless of the type of action recommended.

The point was made that the recommendations in Phase I, Phase II and Support Programs all needed to be divided. In Phase I and Phase II the

funding issues need to be considered and merged with the Phase I 1-11 recommendations.

The decision was made that this topic will be reconsidered at a future meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.