

Cal Poly Pomona Prioritization and Recovery Initiative  
Academic Program Recommendations 1-5  
Open Forum – Nov. 1, 2007 (Bronco Student Center)

**Steering Committee Moderator:** Let me explain what we are trying to do here today. Today is the first open forum to discuss the recommendations one through five from the academic program committee that was delivered to the steering committee just recently. And we are asking for feedback from you, at this forum here today. We're recording all of your remarks and we are going to have them transcribed and posted on our blackboard site hopefully within the next couple of days. In order to keep some order to all of this, we're going to limit your remarks to two minutes. Give everybody an opportunity to get up and speak, but I also want to encourage you to post written remarks. We have also on the blackboard site an opportunity for you to post remarks about what you think about the recommendations that have been made. Encourage you to work with your academic departments, and if your students, with your majors to share your thoughts and comments with them. And the departments can come back and make statements about what they think of the various recommendations. The Steering Committee is in the process of assembling input from all of our constituents. It's not our position today to explain why the recommendations were made, because they did not come from us. They came from the sub-committee that has been working for the last couple of years. So, if you do ask a question about why this recommendation even came about; we can't answer that for you. What we want to hear is what you think about those recommendations. That's the important element of what we're doing today. So, having said that, I think that John Self wanted to make a couple comments remarks here, and then we will get started.

**John Self:** I'm John Self; I'm the chair of the Steering Committee of the P and R process. And, I'd just like to say that first of all, we hear the students, staff and faculty of ENV and SFASE and AG. We hear the concern about the potential for disillusion for the college, and, we hear you. But, what we're doing about that to hear you even more clearly, is that we are starting a blackboard; it will either be up this afternoon or tomorrow at the latest, I'm crossing my fingers, and it will not only have recommendations one through twenty five, and you should become familiar which ones really affect you and your college, or your program, or you specifically, and go up there and comment on the recommendation. But also, we're adding, because we hear you, and we really truly want to hear your voice, your concerns and your logic behind why you have this passion about ENV especially, we've added ENV, SFACE, and AG to that discussion list so you can say what you're talking about. We also, some members of the Steering Committee are meeting Monday morning with Babette Mayor and other concerned faculty members and representatives of ENV, to talk about what other things we need to do to hear you. But what we're looking for is really rational, logical reasons behind your passion. And so that is what we are looking for, but we do hear you, and we are acting upon that. Thank you.

**Steering Committee Moderator:** Okay, so this is your time. I'd appreciate if you could when you come forward, if you could just identify yourself that would be very helpful. This, today, really is recommendations one through five in this room today is what we'd like for you to focus on. There's another session right now on six through ten. These were the first phase recommendations from the Academic Program Group. I think what you were referring to is the blackboard site with all of the recommendations. So if you could, if you want to talk about recommendations six through ten, then you're in the wrong room.

Cal Poly Pomona Prioritization and Recovery Initiative  
Academic Program Recommendations 1-5  
Open Forum – Nov. 1, 2007 (Bronco Student Center)

**John Self:** Downstairs.

**Steering Committee Moderator:** Correct. But if you want to talk in both forums, you can get up and talk here first and then move to the other one that would be perfectly acceptable. There's another forum next Thursday as well.

**Unidentified:** Are you doing like a time section for one, then two, then three, then four, then five, or do you have to say?

**Steering Committee Moderator:** It's two minutes. Two minutes per person you can talk on one through five all of them, you can talk about all of them, and it's not in any order necessarily.

**John Self:** And, if I may, if it looks like there's only seven people that want to talk and there's fourteen minutes, then we'll open it up so you can talk for three minutes if you want. But, yeah, one through five.

**Jerry Mitchell (Urban and Regional Planning):** I guess I'll start then. My name is Jerry Mitchell from Urban Regional Planning, and I'm in strong opposition to number four all though I think one, three and four are clearly related. Our program Urban Regional Planning has been rated in the top twenty five of the programs like us through out the Nation. But if this goes through, and I do not say this lightly, I say this with a lot of frustration and anger, our department is dead, we're gone. You've eliminated us if this goes through. I think it would be clear nationally for many of our colleagues to let us know this. That if we were put into a Mega College of Science, the University would be seen as not understanding and not supporting us. If you look at the letters from the American Planning Association, the American Institute of Certified Planners, there's strong professional opposition. Our accreditation would be greatly threatened by this. It'd be very difficult for us to get accredited if we are thrown out of design, no longer is here, and we're put into a College of Science. If we're not accredited as a professional program, we're dead, we're gone. We may as well, just pack it all in, because we're neither students nor faculty. We're also concerned about being put into a Mega Colleges small department. With a Dean that doesn't share our education paradigm. We'll be chewed to pieces in a few years if we're placed in another place. Already I think that our newest and our best are sharpening up their CD's and their looking to move. That's another way that we'll die, over time. So, if it's done, we're dead. That's my simple message today.

**Jean Gipe (College of Agriculture and the Apparel Merchandising Management Program):** Jean Gipe from the College of Agriculture and the Apparel Merchandising Management Program. I'd like to comment on number one and number two recommendation. Number one is the collapse of the three colleges into one. And my concern about that is related to what the polytechnic of this Institution is. And that is, polytechnic to me is applied in professional studies. And the University has always given a lot of visibility to those programs, because that is what this Institution is about. And by collapsing those colleges, you do a lot of things to decrease that visibility and the ability of the administrators to that program to accurately and responsively respond to professional concerns, needs, visibility in industry, the community, etc, etc. Number two, is moving the Apparel Merchandising Management to the College of Business. That was looked at when the program was created. I am one of the co-creators. I know what went into that. And because that program, really involves course work from

Cal Poly Pomona Prioritization and Recovery Initiative  
Academic Program Recommendations 1-5  
Open Forum – Nov. 1, 2007 (Bronco Student Center)

four different colleges, we looked at where was the best home for AMM. It was not in the College of Business, because curricular and industry stheticity wise were at the opposite ends of the spectrum. And so there are a lot of issues related with trying to take an industry specific program and put it some place that isn't of a mind set to do that exact same kind of thing. And so the Colins School exist, because they started in business and had the same issues we do and they needed to be somewhere else. AG is a very good place. We didn't stay there because there wasn't any place better to go; we stayed there because it was a good place for AMMHB. So,

**Hirsch Farberow (Urban and Regional Planning):** Hi, I'm Hirsch Farberow and I'm a Professor in Urban Regional Planning. And, I just wanted to also point out that we are very unique in the California State System. We're one of the two polytechnics, and we have to recognize this and protect this niche that we have here at Cal Poly. We're the oldest accredited Urban Planning Program in both graduate and undergraduate in the United States, West of the Mississippi. We've got to protect that. We've been proclaimed as a Center of Excellence. I don't believe you break up a Center of Excellence, and disburse it. You protect it and you even nurture it. In terms of accreditation, which Dr. Mitchell brought up, I believe that if we are moved into a larger college, or into a large accumulation of a college, that, we will probably maintain accreditation, at one level for a short period of time, and then it will dissolve. Right now we have the highest level of accreditation that any program can have in the United States. We will quickly go onto a probationary period, and then it will be gone. And it's going to cost us a lot of money to go through the accreditation process, three times as often as we do right now.

**Jeff Marshall (Geological Sciences):** Hi, I'm Jeff Marshall I'm an Associate Professor in the Geological Sciences Department. I want to express the very strong opposition of the Geological Sciences faculty, staff, and students too particularly recommendation number four. But also, several of the others that are related. The problem that we have, is what we see, is a very ill conceived concept for a new environmental sciences division under the Mega College that the others have mentioned here. Let's see if I can raise the microphone here, without causing a disaster. What is effectively happening is you're taking a lot of pieces of other units on campus that have very different academic traditions, very different realities in term of pedagogy, methodology, RTP and so on. And lumping them together with the idea of creating some sort of common environmental unit on campus, it's not going to work. Geological Sciences is, if you look at the document, we are one of the core departments of Natural Sciences. We're being removed from Natural Sciences and thrown into this Environmental Science grab bag. That will effectively kill our department and remove Geological Sciences from Cal Poly Pomona. It's basically ridiculous to imagine that comprehensive polytechnic University without a Geological Sciences program. This would also cripple the College of Science by removing one of the four core natural sciences. Chemistry, Biology, Physics and Geological Sciences are the four cornerstones of the Natural Sciences and we need to remain together. We share common methodology, pedagogy and that's my comment. Thank you.

**Art Hacker (Architecture):** My name is Art Hacker; I'm Emeritus Professor of Architecture here at Cal Poly. I am a former associate Dean of the College of Environmental Design, three time coordinator of the Graduate Program in Architecture, and I'm currently in the middle of the year of a five year FURP program. So, whatever happens here isn't going to affect me. I will be completely retired by the time anything goes into affect. None the less, what I really think of your report, I can't

Cal Poly Pomona Prioritization and Recovery Initiative  
Academic Program Recommendations 1-5  
Open Forum – Nov. 1, 2007 (Bronco Student Center)

say, it's unprintable, but I am opposed to it. I frankly think that virtually all of this report should just be shelved. I had to take a look at why my response to the report when it was first published, or made available, was so emotional, and why it remains emotional even today. And it's partly that the proposals undermine, in my mind, everything that Cal Poly stands for represented to me in the now, almost thirty years that I've been here. In particular, the College of Environmental Design was formed in the fall of 1970, which is relatively a few months after the first Earth Day, as some of you may remember. And with that represented, that Earth Day represented, the first flourishing of concern about environmental issues. And it was felt at the time that architecture, landscape architecture, planning programs, belonged together because they shared this common concern for the environment. We are now at a period where that interest and concern has mushroomed. It's huge. Issues of Global Warming, resource depletion, are all at the fore front of discussions and concerns today. And it seems to me that if I were an outsider and I watched a University eliminate a College of Environmental Design, or down grade a College of Agriculture, which has a huge role to play. That's two minutes? Oh? Well, then you understand where I'm going with this. It seems to be that's just a silly thing for the University to do and it would undermine its credibility. Could I make two more comments briefly? Come back, OK, I'll do that.

**Les Young (College of Agriculture):** Hello, I'm Les Young, the Associate Dean of College of Agriculture, and I am very much opposed to the recommendation number one from the P and R Committee. Basically, because if we merge, the College of Agriculture with Environmental Design and Science, it will diminish really the presence of agriculture here in Southern California. The College is really an outstanding comprehensive undergraduate program, which is the second largest in the state. We're talking about, we are it, as far as any other graduate program go. We represent twenty one million people down here in Southern California that are going to be out without agriculture literacy, without any kind of connection at all with the number one industry in the state, and that's agriculture. So, when you seek about merging it, and diminishing the importance of agriculture here in Southern California, it's going to be a very very difficult thing to overcome once we are merged and we become obscure, we have a diminished presence and we are going to have a lack leadership. Lack of leadership comes from, if we are put into a division of agriculture within a Mega College, whose are leader? Whose are champ that's going to be out there to represent us with industry, with donors, with alumni, with future students, our current students? This is a really thing, that really would be very very detrimental and I think very very negative for us and for all of us, all of us in Southern California would really suffer from this, of a consequence.

**Noel Vernon (College of Environmental Design):** Noel Vernon and I'm the Associate Dean of the College of Environmental Design. I've been in this role for the past fifteen years, fourteen years and a half at this point. So, I've seen a lot of changes here. For the College of Environmental Design, our faculty, our designers, planners, and artist; they are professionals. Our degrees typically end at the NFA or the MLA degree, MARC degree, we do not have PhD's in, accept in the Department of Urban and Regional Planning, is the basic terminal degree. We have a very different breed of cat. The people that we teach are generally highly creative, individualistic, and have a tremendous amount to give, but it is not science. It is design, and planning, and art. Very different institutional culture, and if we were split up and merged, I'm concerned particularly about the ability to support these programs and these faculty, these departments, and I have a concern for the continue to accreditation of the programs, obviously. But most importantly, I'm concerned for the quality of the education that these students will

Cal Poly Pomona Prioritization and Recovery Initiative  
Academic Program Recommendations 1-5  
Open Forum – Nov. 1, 2007 (Bronco Student Center)

get if the professional quality, professional designation of these programs is merged with programs that are not so dedicated and so designated.

**Allison Ruotolo** (Student, Ecological Sciences): Hello, my name is Allison Ruotolo and I'm a student with Ecological Sciences Department. And I am going to read a letter prepared by myself and fellow students within the department. This is our response to recommendations one, and especially four. The students of the Geological Sciences Department would like to impress upon members of the Steering Committee that placement of the Geological Sciences Department, under the division of Environmental Sciences, is detrimental to the students. The perception of students who graduate with ABF and Natural Sciences differs greatly from an Environmental Science Degree. In fact, it hinders employment opportunities and post bachelorette study. Students with an Environmental Science degree are viewed by geologic industry and graduate programs as not having fulfilled the rigorous Natural Science curriculum, with additional mathematic and science courses essential to the discipline. The methodologies utilized in Natural Sciences, especially differ from those employed in environmental sciences. Mainly, the scientific method and laboratory or field base research in contrast, is designed based in environmental studies. The current hard find face geology curriculum with sixty five percent science courses, parallel the other natural sciences and segregates geology from the average ten percent science based courses required by other departments included in the proposed environmental sciences division. Out of these statistics, would infer to decrease interest in subside in external demand. Our department, is thriving with expected to continue growth, increase financial support, student and faculty research and publication, and a significant increase in demand for science educated geologist. In fact, enrollment has increased from thirty five to forty four majors over the course of two year. A thirty four percent increase. The unit cornerstone of the Natural Sciences, geology is correctly found within the College of Natural Sciences as at all other California State Universities, as it should be a Cal Poly Pomona. Merging the Geological Science Department into an Environmental Science Division would jeopardize a unique program within a polytechnic academic environment. An environment that is sought after by many employers and taught at by this University. Thank you.

**Nancy Merlino (Ag Business)**: Hello, my name is Nancy Merlino from the College of AG and AG Business Department. I want to second what Less Young said about the College of Agriculture. We are so unique and we are so industry specific in everything that we teach in all our programs, that it does not seem feasible to put us in a huge group. It will definitely degrade some of our programs and we are very very concerned with that. I also want to bring up again our industry. How many millions of people we serve. And, if you take that college name away from us, you, we are now the second largest, and you will most likely, possibly, plummet us. And I don't think that's what Cal Poly is about. I believe that Kellogg started this University with agriculture as its number one. I would quickly like to respond to number two. Because I was the Associate Director of the MBA department in the late nineties. And I do not believe that AMM fits in the College of Business. Again, because of industry specific. The College of Business is awesome, but it is definitely broad and there is no industry specific taught there. AMM does not fit.

**Alex Hess (College of Agriculture)**: Hi, my name is Alex Hess. I'm AG Head Program Coordinator in the College of Agriculture. And, I'm still working to prepare some of the information because I am slightly reeling from the initial reports of the academic, beyond the one through five and further down.

Cal Poly Pomona Prioritization and Recovery Initiative  
Academic Program Recommendations 1-5  
Open Forum – Nov. 1, 2007 (Bronco Student Center)

One of the things I'm asking you guys in response, and hope it comes up in forum here today, is a discussion about the appropriateness of the findings found in the sub-committee. What I mean by that is, several flaws from the sub-committee have been noted, and as we proceed forward, those flaws have been highlighted and it's not about addressing those flaws, but about carrying it forward in the Steering Committee. So, I'm wondering, and this is a question to the Steering Committee, of how they are going to address the flaws that they found in the sub-committee work that they are carrying forward? It really hasn't been addressed in the process of, is the sub-committee reports even viable to continue, and if it is something that the senate is going to address, if the Steering Committee is going to address, or if that is going to be brought up in this process? So I am hoping that could be addressed in some matter right now, and brought up further as our discussions continue.

**Steering Committee:** Your feedback in this process is what we're asking for here, so if you are questioning the appropriateness of recommendations that were made by one of the other groups,

**Alex Hess (College of Agriculture):** No, I'm not, that process will continue and come forward. So, what I'm questioning is, the sub-committee report is, are you aware of any disconcerting information about how all of these, through the academic sub-committees, came forward? So, there assessments, the data collection, and the processes in which these recommendations stem from? Is there any problems with the report itself?

**Steering Committee:** None of us were a part of that process, so what we have from them is what you see. And that was the reports that they generated. So, what we need to hear from all of you, is where you are challenging the appropriateness of the recommendations that were, or the conclusions that were made during their assessment process, we want that kind of feedback from you. We're not rewriting the recommendations that were made by these other groups, we're not changing the recommendations, we're not adding to those recommendations. What we want to hear from you is why their conclusions, in your opinion, were not valid, based on the documentation that was presented to them.

**Alex Hess (College of Agriculture):** Okay, that makes sense and I appreciate it. What I was getting at is, was that if this is a sub-committee report, and that sub-committee is no longer here, and now we have a Steering Committee that wasn't on that, why do you need to accept the sub-committee report and continue the process that appears very flawed on the onset?

**Steering Committee:** Our answer to that is this is what we've been charged to do. Is to take the recommendations from the Academic Programs Committee and the Support Programs Committee, gather as much additional information as we can about those recommendations, and then decided which of those recommendations to push forward to the President. So, we've really been charged with looking at it all, not setting it aside, but looking at everything that currently exists in all of the feedback that we're soliciting here and all the written feedback that we're soliciting. I hope that helps.

**Martin Sancho-Madriz (Steering Committee):** I'm Martin Sancho-Madriz; I'm a Professor in the College of Agriculture and the Department of Human Nutrition and Food Sciences. The reason I'm talking, I'm also one of two senators that represents agriculture in the Academic Senate and I'm also the Vice Chair of the Academic Senate and you mentioned the Academic Senate and what are we

Cal Poly Pomona Prioritization and Recovery Initiative  
Academic Program Recommendations 1-5  
Open Forum – Nov. 1, 2007 (Bronco Student Center)

doing about it, and I just wanted to clarify that part of your first question. The Academic Senate, up to now, has not been involved in this process. The involvement that is happening now is first through the executive committee, in the sense, that the whole Executive Committee was appointed to be a Student Committee. For those of you who have not looked through the web page, the Steering Committee is composed of basically the Executive Committee, there's ten of us, and I believe there's nine administrators, which of course Deborah and a part of that Steering Committee. There is two exceptions from people of the Executive Committee, who couldn't be here because of other commitments, and they were replaced by people of those Colleges, but every college is represented in that Steering Committee through their Executive Committee Members of the Academic Senate. Right now we're part of this P and R Committee. My understanding of this is whatever recommendations come from the P and R Committee, Steering Committee, those are recommendations from the Steering Committee. Those are not recommendations from the Academic Senate. Last time we had a discussion in the Academic Senate about this, it was said that we actually are going to have to take whatever comes out of this in the Senate, and make our own recommendation on them, and following their current procedure that's in place in the Senate we should have a first reading and a second reading of those recommendations. So, I'm just clarifying because I've gotten a lot of questions regarding these also in the Senate, I think it would clarify for people who are asking the same things.

**Unidentified:** I just wanted to ask, so I understand that there was the initial committee that came up with the proposals and then now is your job is to collect feedback? But my interpretation of what you said so far is that the burden is being shifted on us to prove why the documents aren't valued or why there analysis isn't valid, and it seems to me that it would be best if both of the groups were doing analysis. So, if the Steering Committee, if you guys were responsible for looking through the documents and finding fault, and not just asking us to find fault with the documents. So, is that a correct understanding that the burden's been shifted to us to prove that it is a faulted document?

**Steering Committee:** The Academic Program group that was looking at three thousand pages of documents submitted by the different departments. There's no way that we can go back and review all the information that was provided by you to that group. What we're asking for is for you to, as was stated before, you submitted information and you feel that there were recommendations drawn from that information that are not valid, that don't make sense, that's the kind of feedback that we want from the Steering Committee from all of you. We want to hear from you why that recommendation does not make sense to you, or that that the conclusion that was reached by another group from data submitted by you, is not valid for the following reasons. That's essentially what we are doing. Its not so much we're pushing back on you, we need to hear it from you, as to why, what your opinions are of the recommendations that were presented to us by other groups.

**Steering Committee:** What we were asked to do, by the President, was to review the recommendations that were made by these two groups, the Support Group and the Academic Programs Group, and between the Executive Committee and the Academic Senate and Presidents Cabinet, was to ask for your feedback, from Cal Pony Pomona, and from our constitute groups off campus, as to what your feelings are towards the recommendations that were provided to let us know if they make sense, if they don't make sense. Certainly, we have our own opinion; clearly, we all have our own opinions. But, to ask us to go back and review all the documents that you submitted years ago, is not the process that we are engaged in right now.

Cal Poly Pomona Prioritization and Recovery Initiative  
Academic Program Recommendations 1-5  
Open Forum – Nov. 1, 2007 (Bronco Student Center)

**Unidentified:** I wasn't here when all of that took place, and so I am doing my best in doing very diligent work at going and checking this, and as I look at the reviews there's inconsistencies, there's statements that are out right wrong. They are using either the wrong names of programs or incorrect information. And there's a lot of flaws on the offset as well as outdated information from up to two years ago, so I m finding that. And I think some of that has come to light, throughout many of these, through this process, that it is already coming into light, that there are already quite a few flaws. So, I am doing my best to go backwards, but even going backwards to check inconsistencies between my program and how the recommendations flow to to the other programs, I don't have all the information. Some of the scoring data or what I have available to me is not enough to be able to clarify what exactly, for this committee, those errors. The data, and the numbers, and how they came up with those recommendations stops at some of the information that was given in the reports. It would take me just as long as the committee.

**Martin Sancho-Madriz (Steering Committee):** I also, Martin Sancho-Madriz again, I want to clarify that the committee, the Steering Committee, has not been given any additional information other then what all you have to available to you. In other words, we have the reports posted on line, that's what we have. For example, we don't have the scores. So, I don't know what the scores were for this program. So, we're working exactly with the same exact information you are working. That's basically what we have, and that's what we were told to do.

**Sam Friend (College of Environmental Design):** I'm Sam Friend from the College of ENV's Deans Office, I'm a staff member. That last comment you just made your working to make a decision on incomplete information. Did I hear you correctly?

**Unidentified:** On flawed information. Now that we've got that straight, I have a question. You're not going back to read any additional information. How do we know that you are going to take the time to actually read all of these comments you've requested? How are you going to catalog them? Are they going to be in public view? And, how do we know that you truly and fairly evaluated all the comments?

**Steering Committee:** What we've done is, we've broken the Steering Committee into groups of three, to evaluate all of the feedback that we receive on specific topics, and then we will make a presentation to the Steering Committee based on what we hear from you as to, if a recommendation is based on flawed data, you need to make sure that we know, that if the data changed from two years ago to today, or there's a major change that we need to know about, we need to hear about that from you. So, we will do everything we can to read all of the materials related to the recommendations that we're assigned to work on, as a group, discuss those things, read them independently, discuss those things, and then make a report back to the entire Steering Committee as to what we heard, and what we think of the recommendation that was made. That's what we are trying to do.

**Unidentified:** So, is there going to be an administrative record of all the comments made available to view? And how is it going to be organized, in what manner? By evaluation, by topic?

Cal Poly Pomona Prioritization and Recovery Initiative  
Academic Program Recommendations 1-5  
Open Forum – Nov. 1, 2007 (Bronco Student Center)

**Steering Committee:** Yes, the answer is anything. Everything that you submit is available will be available to everyone through the black board site that we have. All of the comments that are made by Steering Committee groups, and the presentations that we make will be done in a Power Point template that's available to everybody at the University to review, will be consistently done. So, you will see all of those comments will be available to all of you to review.

**Unidentified:** My one last question, is what if ninety five percent of all these comments are negative? Will you continue? What will be done then?

**Steering Committee:** We will continue. Our job is to analyze what we've got from those two sub-committees, and what we get from all of you. And I think there would be people who would argue with going by the weight of a vote, versus reading carefully and doing an analysis, which is what we are charged with doing. So, ninety five percent vote with no information for us to consider, would definitely not carry today. So, we want more then your opinions and feelings, you know just yes no, we want the reasoning behind it. And we appreciate that's what we are hearing today.

**K.G. (student, Food Science):** First of all, thank you for putting this together and it's kind of helpful that we get a chance to voice our opinions. My own comfortable level with this, oh yes, my name is K.G. and I'm from the Food Science Department with Doctor Sancho. My real comfort level with the P and R Committee here is that none of the suggestions that have been made are finalized. Nothing is going to be finalized for a while. My big issue, my real big issue is that this is a very much so a voting kind of everybody's opinion is heard, and everybody's opinion is put out. Here we are a bunch of ENV and AG people, and we make up about, not a very good percent of the College in total. So you will have us, the little people, talking and making our opinions and then; with our program we have fifty three people. That's a forty four percent growth in the last couple years. It isn't much, what you're looking at two years ago we were probably twenty seven people. We weren't big. But once, the only competing program with us Chapman College closed, we grew a whole lot. So, here's our program with fifty three people. Put us against a program like the engineering programs that have thousands of people. What's our vote compared to theirs? What's our word compared to theirs? What's this whole room of Environmental Design, AG people, Food Science, Nutrition, what not, going to stand and say, when you have everybody else saying something that, you know, what's our word, what are we worth?

**Steering Committee:** Thank you very much; I think you just proved my point about voting. That voting is flawed. When I was a professor, I would tell my students that the right answer is the answer that you can strongly defend. So, I think the comments that you are making here about the size of your programs, the growth of your program; you need to capture that, not only through the taping of this event, but through those written feedback forms so that we have the information to make a good decision. I think you for supporting my earlier comments about voting isn't really going to get us to the best possible decision. The facts are, and that's what we feel like we are getting to today.

**Unidentified:** So then, when, like the comments that were made before, the facts that we do have and the facts that you guys are looking at, you know, you have what you have, and your looking at what your looking at, and there's nothing that we can do about it now, but in the middle of a pool of words like you said, the voting process is going to be flawed, in the middle of that pool of words, are we

Cal Poly Pomona Prioritization and Recovery Initiative  
Academic Program Recommendations 1-5  
Open Forum – Nov. 1, 2007 (Bronco Student Center)

really going to stand out? That's my big concern. Even if I had all fifty three students come out and say something, are we really going to stand out or not? You know what I mean? That's my big concern.

**Steering Committee:** I don't think you should be concerned about that. We're going to absorb everything that we capture here and all the written feedback and we're going to consider what people have to say. Not how many people have to say, and maybe they'd be saying a lot the same thing. It's the information that we're going to carefully analyze and thoroughly consider. So, don't worry about your size.

**Gwen Urey (Urban and Regional Planning):** Gwen Urey, Urban and Regional Planning, I'm concerned about recommendation, many recommendations, but I want to speak especially to number four today. Number four would take Urban Regional Planning, which is in a small infinity based College now, we're what unites the four departments and the Wild Center together in that department is an interest in design, and it would cast us into almost every other college on campus, and separate us from each other, which I think would be very destructive, to our, to each of our abilities, because each of us as a department draws a lot of strength from our relationships with the other departments. And one of the things that's differentiates this relationship from other departments on campus, is where URP does have a lot of relationships. URP is very interdisciplinary; we have a lot of interaction with Civil Engineering. Right now I am working with somebody in Ethnic and Woman Studies on a service learning course. We are easily able to reach other departments on campus for some of the things that we want to do both in teaching and research, but when it comes to our design infinities, the design infinities is so grounded in pedagogy, and the pedagogy is so distinct, there is no other college on campus that has the studio paradigm, and our departments all share that. To casts us into different colleges where we all have to fight for our studio based design pedagogy would be very, I don't see how that creates efficiency, I don't see how it's learning centered, I don't see how it enhances anything. So, I think it would be very destructive with no pay off. This gets around to, I'm fighting for ENV, but I'm here with my brothers and sisters from the College of Agriculture and the two of us as colleges share a characteristic of being small. I think we're suppose to have an assumption that there are efficiencies of scale, and that a reason to put other departments into larger colleges and get rid of the small colleges, is that it's more efficient to have big units. But where is the evidence that demonstrates that on this campus? Where is the cost benefit analysis that shows where there would be savings? There would be a lot lost from these two small colleges.

**Debbie Lions (student, Food Science):** My name is Debbie Lions and I'm also a student in the Food Science Department. My concern is with the flaws that are openly stated in the recommendations, especially in with regards to numbers, because our program is very new, and like K.G. said, we started with twenty seven at the time when you were collecting data, and now we've got a forty four percent growth in these last two years. You said, don't be concerned about our size, but according to the recommendations, our size is why the recommendations for us to be disillusioned, is because of our size. So, I don't understand your logic in not being concerned with our size. Thank you.

**Jeff Marshall (Geological Sciences):** Jeff Marshall again from the Geological Sciences Department. I'm also a science college, College of Science representative on the Academic Senate and I want to chime in on this discussion about flaws in the process. As a member of the Academic Senate, I was

Cal Poly Pomona Prioritization and Recovery Initiative  
Academic Program Recommendations 1-5  
Open Forum – Nov. 1, 2007 (Bronco Student Center)

part of watching this whole process unfold over the last couple of years and I think like many of us, was kind of giving faith that this was going to be an open, transparent process that would represent all of us. But I think what we are reeling from, at the moment, is this sudden recognition that the committee that put the reports together represented a very very narrow view point on campus, and is putting forth a very narrow and ill conceived idea for how to restructure the University. I appreciate the fact that the Steering Committee has representation from across the University with the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate; I think that's an excellent idea. And, I think that your job is a very important job, but what we need to really consider here, is that the original process that put these documents together is flawed. There is flawed data, there's flawed interpretations, it's a bad process, a bad idea, its bad for our students, it's bad for the University, it's bad for the faculty. Thank you very much.

**Peter Kilduff (AMM):** Peter Kilduff, the Chair of the Apparel Merchandising and Management Department and I want to speak about item number two. The P and R Committee found that since Apparel Merchandising and Management has merchandising and management in the name, we there for belong in the College of Business and in a school of marketing. And that was the beginning and the end of their analysis. So, I'd like to tell you why we don't belong in a school of marketing. First of all, critical interdependencies in organizational orientation culture. Departments in the College of Business are organized according to functional specialization. And we are organized according to our market specialization a specialization in the apparel business. In the College of Business their focused on marketing specialization or operations management specialization, financial specialization. These basis for grouping bring about very different professional orientations. In a functional organization, specialization is intensified in the function, i.e. marketing, at the expense of specialization in the market, i.e. apparel. So, we believe that we don't fit because of these different specializations. What we would expect to see is if we are moved to the College of Business, that our program will be watered down as the emphasis is put on functional specialization and less on our specialization in apparel. We are not a Marketing Department. In fact, we embrace all the business functions. From business research, through design, product development, sourcing and procurement, operations and supply chain management, strategic management in marketing, financial management, and especially and importantly product, apparel product and process engineering. Clearly we embrace many of the functions found in a business school, but embrace additional functions that go beyond a business school in focusing on our specialization in the apparel business. Oh, am I out of time? This is one out of ten proposals for my department, so I hope you are going to give me time to finish.

**Steering Committee:** Okay.

**Unidentified:** I just wanted to give my feedback. I just wanted to second the idea that because we have become involved with the process so late, that it kind of makes the process invalid. And that also that I agree with what Professor Ronin said about, what's going to happen with the College of ENV is going to break up the learning environment and the community for the creative and artistic majors. Thank you.

**Valentine Issagoulyan (Urban and Regional Planning):** Valentine Issagoulyan from Urban and Regional Planning. I wanted to continue with what Cassandra Pruett was saying, that because we weren't involved early on, our opinions are going to be biased depending on the way the report was

Cal Poly Pomona Prioritization and Recovery Initiative  
Academic Program Recommendations 1-5  
Open Forum – Nov. 1, 2007 (Bronco Student Center)

written, and that our opinions aren't going to be as fully informed as they should be. So, my feedback to the committee would be, that maybe we need different ways of getting that data again. So maybe the P and R Academic and Support Committee should be here during these meetings. So, that if there is missing information, we can ask them directly, how did you come to this finding? What was the context? Since I can't get the information then, can you tell me now? So, finding different ways of changing the forum, so that we can get that data back.

**Christine Tran (student, Food Science):** Hi, my name is Christine Tran and I am a part of the Food Science and Technology Program. We just recently had a connection with Rosemeade High School. And which basically our club goes over there, gives presentations, and it's just, they are currently starting a program that has to do with the food industry. And the thing is, high schools are you know are basically our future and if we don't have this type of program then, to give like exposure, not necessarily for our major, but also for our school. The district actually choose Rosemeade High School to start this particular program. And the thing is that you know the majority of students at Rosemeade, Rosemeade is basically about like fifteen miles away, so it's a local high school, and the majority of the students will probably end up going to Cal Poly or any neighboring school. Their program at Rosemeade High School, they are in the process of receiving a grant due to our connection with Cal Poly. So, I just talked to the Chair last night about our situation, and they said that they willing to help, to help us with our program to continue it. All though, yes we are, a very small group, but they still would love to keep our connection with us. Because of this whole P and R thing, their possibly of being endangered of loosing their grant. So, that is basically what I have to say. And of course you know I will be updating the high school of our situation. Thank you very much.

**Steering Committee:** We want to acknowledge the presence of more members to the Steering Committee here, and we actually want to invite you here and sit in the front with the rest of us here. Professor Kellner and Professor Stallones, you guys, could you join us here in the front as well, we'd appreciate it. Stallones has to leave, Professor Kellner, she has to leave too. Okay, is there anybody else from the Steering Committee who came here? And of course, Ann Morgan who represents the Library and the Academic Senate.

**Sean del Solar (student, Urban and Regional Planning):** My name is Sean del Solar, fourth year senior at Regional Planning, knock on wood. I'm also the ENV College Center for ASI. We as students are extremely opposed to P and R and I don't need to give any more reasons then some of the reasons the Professors have, but talking about facts. Talking about this analysis based on facts. You don't need to go any further then the report. On page fourteen of the report, such in depth analysis, and I'm sure agriculture and science and everyone can be happy to know that ENV is going to be merged with each other and put in science, credit the Mega Department, because "it's in close geographical location to each other." So, it's on page fourteen of the report. I mean, can I request Colins School? I take a lot of classes up there, it's close, they have good food. But, you know, we're talking about the break up of a Design School. We are talking about one through five here. But, it goes as far away from graphic design, graphic design to business, can you imagine that? Businesses do not house in house people that do amazing design work. Design isn't a function of business. That aspect of design comes from, design from when businesses want great design, when anything happens in design that's amazing. Design comes out of design firms, and those people are creative and those people are kept isolated from some of this craziness that goes on. And that's true in this realm of

Cal Poly Pomona Prioritization and Recovery Initiative  
Academic Program Recommendations 1-5  
Open Forum – Nov. 1, 2007 (Bronco Student Center)

Urban Design. I work; I also am a part time employee of the City. I spend eighty percent of my time talking to Landscape Architects and Architects, continuously. It's a continuous cycle. Ed Capoli, one of the greatest things that we get is this completely synchronous program where we talk and go through the same process. I've lived in Mono Seto with architecture students, we took the same classes our freshmen year, we bonded, I know what goes on in the Architects mind. Thank you.

**Delia M. Wicker (student, Urban and Regional Planning):** I'm Delia M. Wicker of Urban Regional Planning and I particularly wanted to raise the issue of our situation as a professional school. I came to Cal Poly from practice, because of its excellent reputation. I serve in the Pineing Accreditation Board and I've been to several schools. And one of the things we do in the businesses and very much look at the neighbors and how well they work. And we have a reputation for working and bringing together the different disciplines. I think we will do very poorly; we will become invisible in a large school. And I don't think we can hold our room, and accreditation can be lost, and that would be a terrible lost for our graduates, both Alumni and future you know. Our reputation is on the line and I really ask you to reconsider, taking us away from that school. Thank you.

**Jerry Mitchell (Urban Regional Planning):** Jerry Mitchell, Urban Regional Planning. I just wanted to make one observation regarding burden of proof. Surely there is some burden of proof that has to be carried before you make change. The arguments you are hearing from all of us is that just on the face of it, in that report, certainly you can look at, is that the burden of proof is not met. There aren't any good reasons, there isn't any excellent evidence to show why any of this should go forward in terms of these first five, it just isn't there. And we feel a little put upon to be asked to develop anti evidence, if you will, or evidence ourselves, but clearly the process is also very flawed, which is something else that you can note, because all of the participation that should have occurred, all of the surveying that should have been done, of faculty and donors and professions out there, wasn't done, and now you're getting a great negative reaction at the very last minute. The process is flawed. They should have asked Geological Sciences and AG and ENV, if we felt that we should be affiliated with each other. Nobody ever asked that question. I think most of us feel, that we have great respect for each other, we'd like to remain friends though, and not be married into a Mega College at some point. So, it just, their just isn't evidence there and I think one other quick comment is, all of the programs that you are hearing from have been very indebt at staying up with the trends in their profession and in their field, and there has been no analysis of what these changes would do to all of our efforts in the last few years to keep up in our particular areas. I think that's very important too.

**K.G. (student, Food Science):** Forgive me, I like to talk. Once again, my name is K.G. from the Food Science Department. I want to, since this is the process, this is what we have to do, and we have to present our case and make ourselves stand out, I'm going to try to make Food Science stand out a little bit more to you. Two years ago, three years ago, four years ago, back in 1999, you could've asked somebody in this area and said you know anything about Food Science? And they told you oh your cocaine, your doing some nutrition, your doing something, which is exactly the idea that they had in the original committee that sat together and looked at Food Science and said, well, they might fit better with nutrition, they might work well with the Colins School, they might do this or that, so I am going to make it stand out to you here again. Again, make it for Food Science that you could see and understand which Doctor Armstrong which I am sure can present to you. Nutrition deals with everything after the food has been consumed; we deal with everything before it's been consumed. The

Cal Poly Pomona Prioritization and Recovery Initiative  
Academic Program Recommendations 1-5  
Open Forum – Nov. 1, 2007 (Bronco Student Center)

two processes are extremely different, are extremely separate, and everything that goes on here is very very different than everything else that goes on over there. So, here's Food Science for you. We stand here and we tell you that the Pumpkin Festival was in large part done through the help of food companies who are not looking for the nutritionalist, because food companies don't look for nutritionalist, they look for food scientist. Lipton, Unilever, Procter and Gamble, companies that are strictly looking for people who are going to process the food, who are going to engineer the food, who are going to make it easier to manufacture came and really supported Cal Poly, because of the existence of the Food Science Program. So, if we have to make ourselves stand out, here's a couple of things for you. Look at it, study it, find out what Food Science is because we're not nutrition. We're not the Colins School. One of the best things that I like about being a graduate from the Food Science Program, or coming out of the Food Science Program, is that I stand here and I have a minor in microbiology and I can look at chemistry, I can look at the Colins School, I can look at nutrition, I can look at all aspects of the food industry, and go out and be a very well rounded person, just because I stood and took classes with Doctor Sancho and others in that program. Our program is very interesting, our program is very different, our program has to exist, because fifteen hundred companies within a ninety mile radius are looking for us, and there's only so many of us. So, think about that. Thank you.

**Unidentified:** I will try to say the rest of what I had to in two minutes. Accreditation of the Apparel Merchandising and Management Department is based on apparel manufacturing. And we believe there be danger of this being watered down by being merging to the Business School. The professional demands of AMM and the College of Business are very different. We service demands in apparel, textiles, and related chemistry areas. We publish in different academic venues. The journals our faculty publish in are not recognized by the American Association Schools and Colleges of Business. So there for, any scholar of the output by AMM faculty will not contribute one iota to the accreditation requirements of the College of Business. I would ask you as a Dean in the College of Business, would you invest in AMM, if we're not helping you meet a key objective of your college? AMM will be a minnow in the College of Business. We have grown rapidly to two hundred and sixty students, but we will be small. I had the head of the Marketing Department visiting me yesterday; she was telling me it would be good for her retail faculty to teach our apparel retailing courses. We are going to be rationalized away and diluted; it will affect our accreditation, faculty morale and ultimately our enrollment. There'll be a shift in the critical interdependencies between Apparel Merchandising and Management and the departments in the College of Business who we have excellent working relationships with. Instead of the collaboration on external opportunities, the emphasis will shift to one of competition for internal resources. Something a previous speaker eluded too. So, rather than being somebody that they can collaborate with, on expanding our common boundaries, we will actually be constant internal competition for scarce resources within the College of Business. So, we believe that we really belong in the College of Agriculture, where there are very strong lifestyle interdependencies, supply chain interdependencies, between our programs and where the college has proven to be a place that has been supportive and is invested in our program. So I urge you to recommend that AMM stay in the College of Agriculture. Thank you very much.

**Noel Vernon (College of Environmental Design):** Noel Vernon again with a second comment on the College of Environmental Design. When we got the recommendations for funding, everyone will have noted that all though we are very small and we have almost no money, all of our programs were either considered outstanding and awarded extra funding, or considered to be very good as they are, and to

Cal Poly Pomona Prioritization and Recovery Initiative  
Academic Program Recommendations 1-5  
Open Forum – Nov. 1, 2007 (Bronco Student Center)

have their base funding continued. So in other words, it's not a question of the quality of the management that is at stake here. So it must be something else. And what we're hearing is that the reason that the college is to be dissolved is because; we are so good that everybody else really needs to be more like us. Which is very nice to hear. I am not sure I totally agree with it, that would be wonderful to think that, but the problem is that we have an institutional culture. We don't quite work that way, and that if we are split; some of our faculty already have told me that they have jobs in other places. And if the institutional culture changes, they won't want to be here any longer. And that, to us, after spending many years to bring these people in at the kind of salaries we can offer, and given them every kind of support, which does mean a lot of managerial hand holding, simply because we can't throw money at them. We are doing our very best with what we have, and have created a spear of excellence. Now we can give our excellence away in many different ways. And one of them would be GE classes in regenerated studies and insatiability that we would be able to offer for the entire University, we could assist as a college with bringing other faculty on board with sustainability and regenerative issues, if that were what the University wanted. But essentially, the idea of taking a college that has been superb in the quality of it's graduates, its alum's, it's faculty, it's existing students, it's enrollment; and I have to say we haven't done a bad shot at managing on no money, if you can go back and look at our budget over the years, at any rate, take a look and look at it from that perspective. Thank you.

**Manny Munels (student, Urban and Regional Planning):** Hi, my name is Manny Munels, I'm Urban Regional Planning student and I'm also a Senator Representative of the American Finance Association. I basically represent all the Pineing Schools in the state of California and Nevada. I've attended various conferences, pineing conferences throughout the years; one thing that our program stands out from the rest of the programs across the Nation is that we are designed based. Especially in Southern California. In Southern California you have three accredited programs, USC, UCLA and us. Both of them are policy based, we're designed based, which is what makes us stand out, which is also, we also have an undergrad accredited program, which is also the only one in Southern California, which also makes us stand out. By putting us and pushing us away from design, we're going to lose that edge. Also in accreditation and the program itself. Another thing too is, we are entering Global Warming, we are entering sustainable issues, if we dissolve the College of ENV, I mean we will have nothing to support no more. I mean the President is in favor of climate change, and by dismounting the College, we're not going to have that edge anymore. And that's it.

**Don Hoyt (AVP Research and Graduate Studies):** Hello. My name is Don Hoyt, I'm the Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies, and it seems to me that every time you have a, a tactic, there are cost and there are benefits. And what we've been hearing about here are what is perceived as the cost of creating this Mega College. And I'd like to focus on the part of the Mega College, the Environmental Division of that College that these programs would be moved into. And I think that's it really clear that there is tremendous interest in value in looking at environmental issues, sustainability, water, the environment. All of those things. And trying to create a critical mass where by a faculty and students can interact on those things, would be very much part of my role as APP research, because I think there is a lot of potential for funding and valuable scholarship there. But I'd like to suggest is that there may be another way of achieving that same thing. And that would be by creating funding and institute that, and offering the faculty an opportunity to propose a creation of three or four or five different institutes in areas where there is similar kind of overlap. For example,

Cal Poly Pomona Prioritization and Recovery Initiative  
Academic Program Recommendations 1-5  
Open Forum – Nov. 1, 2007 (Bronco Student Center)

there's a lot of interest in transportation logistics. And that could be contributed to by faculty and number of different departments. So I think that if, and we have a history of this working extremely well. When I first came to Cal Poly, we had the institute for cellular molecular biology that attracted faculty primarily from biology and chemistry. And out of that we became the first campus in the state to have a Biotech Major because our biologist and chemist were talking to each other. We didn't need to merge them into a single college in order to get the faculty together to have that creative thinking that led to that kind of thing. So, I think that the idea, the recognition of the value of getting this infinity in an environment together, the same objective could be achieved in another way, without having to pay all of the prices that these people have been talking about today.

**Jeff Marshall (Geology):** Jeff Marshall from Geology again. I'd like to follow up on Don's comments. I've already commented a couple of times on some strong internal reasons why programs within Science and Environmental Design and Agriculture are opposed to the Mega College and to, especially the internal structure that's being set up in that college. What I'd like to comment on right now are external reasons why it's potentially a poor idea for the University. I am a National Counselor on the Counsel for Undergraduate Research and I reviewed many research proposals that are for the National Science Foundation and other agencies. Proposals that are both focused on general undergraduate education, the CCLI program, the research experience for undergraduates program, as well as discipline specific proposals in my own field. And one of the first things I do when I review a proposal, is I look at the academic structure of the proposing, of the University and the position that the department sits in, that the faculty member sits in. And if I see a situation that is kind of a grab bag combination mixture of disciplines that brings together Design, and Science and Agriculture, things that have very little to do with each other, I'm going to look at that proposal negatively. But if I see very strong academic structure that emphasis's the particular academic traditions and pedagogies and so on of those individual organizations, I'm going to look at that proposal much more favorably. So I see the P and R recommendations, particularly one and four that we're concerned about, as potentially would reducing the ability of this University to attract external funding. We are going to cut down the creditability of all these programs from the outside. Thank you.

**Art Hacker (Architecture):** I'm still Art Hacker. I want to make two points. One is that I think the original committee, I will call it committee one, you guys are committee two, the committee mistakenly thought that fine tuning the University Organization Chart would create solutions to what are in fact leadership issues. If you look at the common problems that are identified like redundancies, space, enrollment management, I think those reflect a failure at an administrative level in the University. There not solved by sorting the colleges out. Secondly, the committee never provides a rational for reducing the number of colleges in the University. There's a kind of an assertion, that they should do so. The only two sentences that I could find in the reports that explain this say, the current organization structure was not helpful for dealing with the infinities, redundancies and opportunities identified, or one problem was trying to use the current seven college one school model. But they never describe the nature of the problem. Those are assertions. If you read carefully, report is full of those kind of assertions which masquerade as reasons. There are too many examples in the rest of the country, the rest of the world with Colleges which run with one undergraduate college. And on the other hand, there are some Universities that run with thirty nine or more independent Colleges and Halls. So somehow the process, the notion that we needed fewer colleges came into play. And I don't think that was part of their charge. I think what the Presidents of Cal Poly was trying to do in starting

Cal Poly Pomona Prioritization and Recovery Initiative  
Academic Program Recommendations 1-5  
Open Forum – Nov. 1, 2007 (Bronco Student Center)

this process, was to find some means for defining the focus, the direction, the uniqueness for energizing the campus that I think he rightfully perceived as having been a drift for too long. But this isn't it. I think that he was looking for a vision, and this report is very mundane in what it proposes. In fact, it creates a negative impact, because it is making a lot of people mad, and what we want is something positive. One comment, one sentence, the President needs to make a decision however; he's let this process go on for two years. I would suggest there's a convenient scapegoat, who is the former Pro-Go since he's not here and can't defend himself.

**Unidentified:** I would like to make a follow up comment to what Art said. I filled out the P and R form for AMM, because I was Department Chair at the time. And there was no question anywhere in any of the sections of the form that asked me whether I thought AMM actually would be better off in another college, or another configuration, or as part of a division or part of anything else. There were no question of that nature, eluded to anything of that sort. Trust me; I would have answered my questions very differently if I had understood that was under consideration in this process. And I think that every other department here would have done the same thing.

**Christine (student, Food Science):** Hi, once again my name is Christine and I'm from the Food Science Program. I've speaking on behalf on all of us. Actually, I would like to show everyone how many of us Food Scientist are here. So, I want you guys to raise your hands, stand up, stand up please. Yes, that's all of us right there. I'd like to mention two different things. First of all, we have these two really big events for our Food Science that will be occurring this year. So first there'd be College Bowl which is a Jeopardy type of game, asking a lot of Food Science questions. It's a big competition and it will be held this April. And because of him this is taking place at Cal Poly, so that's number one, so that's going to give a lot of exposure. Secondly we have another, our second event which is occurring in February, it's the S.C.F.T. C Southern California Food Technologist Conference. And basically, a lot of food companies will be arriving here at Cal Poly with guest speakers and what not. And again, the importance of these two events it shows like an image of our program, exposure of Cal Poly and this image wouldn't exist if we were merely an option of another program. So, again, thank you very much.

**Unidentified:** Well, as you know from the previous speaker I'm, last year I got nominated as the IFT Mouth to Mouth representative for the Student Association of IFT technologist which is on both a professional and students that are studying and work in the food industry, so it's organization. The core objective of IFTSA is to offset the development of future professionals dedicated to the technology of food. So that's like us, the students that are in Food Science. Since Cal Poly has the only undergraduate program here in Southern California, all though we're small, it is my duty as an area rep to promote Food Science. Not to, Cal Poly and other schools, and also I'm trying to promote it to the high schools also. And as noted before, our club the Food Science Society, we went to the Rosemeade High School to promote Food Science to them so they would come to our school or other schools, and please just please keep our program alive because we really really, since we are the only undergraduate program here at Cal Poly Pomona, if it goes away, then we don't have that, we don't have students that are interested in Food Science anywhere in California, Southern California. Please.

**Unidentified:** I promise this is the last time I talk. I just wanted to summarize everything for you at the Food Science program. Were' here, we really really care about our program, we love Doctor Sancho

Cal Poly Pomona Prioritization and Recovery Initiative  
Academic Program Recommendations 1-5  
Open Forum – Nov. 1, 2007 (Bronco Student Center)

for creating this program to begin with and we can not imagine not existing together. We are such a closed group, we such a close tight group, and if this program ceases to exist or becomes an option, like it used to be in the Food Nutrition program, for me, I'm graduating and it won't make a difference. But like, she mentioned there's other programs, high school programs, that are starting, based on this programs existence, they're starting little programs in there own high schools are saying look, there's a great Food Science program like this locally. Let's build on it. Let's go to it. We exist. We're good. We bring a lot of image to Cal Poly. We bring a lot of benefits to Cal Poly. We're here, I mean we're here and we care and we show, you see all of us here form the environmental groups, just Aggies, you see how much we care about this, you see how much we care that we exist, so as a final note on Food Science, I think a lot of us have to go for a class at one, we're here, and we exist and we care and we love our program and we don't want it to become an option in another major, we don't want it to go to another school. I really don't want the AG Cults to become part of anything else. The AG College is amazing. You need to go up there every once in awhile and see the kind of groups that we have up there. Not just Food Science, all these people that are here. Obviously they care and obviously they don't want this to happen. So if you having and word, and if you have anything to do with this, just make sure it doesn't happen. We want to exist; we want to be the program that we are, so go for it. Thank you.

**Martin Sancho-Madriz:** This is a matter of clarification; I just want to make sure that everybody knows that both Andrew and K.G. don't have to take anymore classes with me. However, I would like to say a few words as Director of the program, and I know that I'm a member of the committee, but there is no other Director of the Food Science Program and I just want to make a point. First of all, I didn't ask the students to come here. They organized themselves to come. The second is this, one of the recommendations specific for our program says that we should merge with another food program. Okay, well we are in the Department of Human Nutrition and Food Science. We share one Department Chair, one technician, one secretary, the same labs and our faculty teaches for both programs. How much more can we merge? That would be my question. Let me just add a few more thoughts, and that of course we will be writing this down, we are the only Bachelors of Science and Food Science Technology in Southern California. I serve in a National Approval Board for the Institute of Food Technologies where were one of about forty four programs in the United States, we are actually the first approved Culinology emphasis, we have a emphasis in our program, we got, and Debra knows about this, she used to be an undergraduate studies, we have the first Culinology Program approved in California, Fresno and Sanluis Obispo has copied us after our program came about and we are right now only one of about nine or ten Culinology programs in the United States. We have perhaps one of the most success rates, I keep track how many students graduate from my program, graduated with honors and all that, thirty eight percent of my graduates have graduated with honors, that meaning Cum Lauding or higher. And this are students that take math and chemistry and physics and tough courses that would give them grades, thirty eight percent graduating with honors. In addition to that, we have perhaps one of the most diverse programs in the University, to the point that where we were approached by the Kellogg Company and gave us a grant of twenty five thousand dollars to recruit minority students into our program. I can not let my student down since they all came here, and not say something about it. Again, I take my hat off of being on that committee, but I have to say something, I promise I won't talk anymore.

Cal Poly Pomona Prioritization and Recovery Initiative  
Academic Program Recommendations 1-5  
Open Forum – Nov. 1, 2007 (Bronco Student Center)

**Gwen Urey (Urban and Regional Planning):** Gwen Urey, Urban Regional and Planning. Faculty and students from Urban Regional Planning have come up here and told you about all of our interdisciplinary activities and how important it is for Urban Regional and Planning to be in a College of Design. I have a confession to make; it's really hard for us to actually create that interdisciplinary activity, even when we are in the same college. Simple things like the fact that architecture studios meet ten or twelve hours a week and planning studios meet six or eight hours a week, make it so when we try to schedule things together, it's really hard. But we've overcome those obstacles, so we do have an interdisciplinary foundation studio and we have programs like the India and China program where we have architects and urban planners in class together. If you put us, it's been really hard to do it, but we make it happen because it is so important, and you can see that the students really value it. If you put us in different colleges, it will be impossible.

**Hirsch Farberow (URP):** Hirsch Farberow again. I just want to reemphasize what Gwen just said. I'm the coordinator of the Freshmen Design Sequence. We take this quarter, three hundred and ten students from Architecture, Landscape Architecture and Urban Regional Planning and we teach them. We teach them with twelve faculty members, all coming from different disciplines. All coming from, all three of them coming from different disciplines. And I think the important thing is also to recognize is that if we were to look at the professions, most of the firms practicing architecture and landscape architecture and Urban Planning are practicing them together. There is rarely a firm of Urban Planning and Food and Nutrition. It just doesn't happen. We've got the model out there, we're doing a pretty good job with it, it's difficult as Gwen has pointed out, but we are accomplishing it. I'm the product of Cal Poly, I did an undergraduate in Urban Planning, I did a Masters Degree in Landscape Architecture and a Masters in Architecture and Urban Planning from UCLA, and I came back here for that final Masters in Landscape Architecture because of the interdisciplinary college, The College of Design and we can't lose it. It's too important.

**Ed Fonda (Animal and Veterinary Science):** Hello there. I'm Ed Fonda; I'm Interim Chair of the Animal and Veterinary Science Department in the College of Ag. And on behalf of my faculty and staff, I certainly want to voice our strong opposition for the first recommendation for reorganization of combining the Colleges of Ag and Science. In the twenty five years that I've taught at Cal Poly, I've never encountered such a poorly executed plan that so can profoundly affect our educational programs. The plan is basically severely flawed, because it's based upon two year old date, and it's also based upon a lack of understanding the integrated nature of our programs, and how we depend upon each other for the support of our programs. And yet, we analyze it based upon individual programs and what those specific programs did. If we create a Mega College, then all our merge is really going to do, is to diminish the importance of the applied sciences. From the standpoint of agriculture. And that's the basis. That is our basis, we are here to support this idea of learn by doing if you will, it's the polytechnic approach. And we're talking about experiential learning, and we don't think that we can carry out these different missions if we are merged together. But one of the other things that is really profoundly bothers me about this process, and I think it's flawed because of that, is how we are rushing to make these decisions. We spent two years in order to study this, and now within a matter of weeks, we are trying to analyze and approve if you will, or discuss essentially a process that can have such a profound affect upon the way we do business. Particularly without giving appropriate amount of time for our stakeholders. Not only internally to the University, but external to the University. The stakeholders that can have such a profound influence upon development, and the way they support our

Cal Poly Pomona Prioritization and Recovery Initiative  
Academic Program Recommendations 1-5  
Open Forum – Nov. 1, 2007 (Bronco Student Center)

program. We are not providing them any opportunity essentially for input. And so we're rushing to make a decision and I don't understand why we need to rush on this. This is too important, and we need to take the time to analyze this very very carefully and make sure that it is appropriately studied. So, that I would say without any appropriate evidence, what so ever, that this is going to improve the educational programs, the cost savings is insignificant that I don't think that we can justify a merger of the College of Science and the College of Agriculture. I think that what we have accomplished in the last fifty years can be undone within a matter of few weeks. And that's it, thank you.

**Sam Friend (College of Environmental Design):** Sam Friend from College of ENV Deans Office again. Okay, in the documents that stated that eight hundred thousand dollars would be saved by this reorganization. I'm not sure what University budget is, but this seems like an awfully small number. And I'm wondering, was it taken into account, this eight hundred thousand dollars that will be saved by this, that all the stationary would have to be reprinted, the changing of the directional signs would have to be done, revising of University catalogs, the names on the buildings would have to be changed, graduation would take longer, rental of more chairs would have to happen, and how our donor base would be affected by this. Because our donors do emotionally give to their, to the college. And we have a lot of donors that are attached to the College of ENV that have already stated we're putting this on hold until you guys decide if you are going to exist or not. I don't know if I was suppose to actually publicly say that, sorry, but I'm just wondering, was that taken into account on this drop in the bucket of eight hundred thousand dollars?

**Gill (student):** Good afternoon. My name is Gill from the ASA Rep Center, which is Arts Students and I want to really speak out and show that we are not in a sense pleased and or are clubs design and in Fine Arts are not agreeing with this kind of the dissolution of the department, in the ENV department, especially when we have the actual architecture, landscaping that supports and extremely important to our growth and for our careers to develop this and take in in Fine Arts and in Design. To have this type of stature and especially in architecture and landscaping and those big majors, that would further improve, develop a greater, to have a greater success in our career, especially in Fine Arts and in Graphic Design. So I really want to speak out, since I can't just sit there and just not say something.

**Brian Albini (student, Urban and Regional Planning):** Good afternoon panel, my name is Brian Albini; I'm a senior in the Urban and Regional Planning Department. On a side note I wanted to share an anecdote I heard this morning while discussing my arrival to the meeting today with one of my co-workers, whose daughter is seeking to apply to the College of Apparel and Merchandising. And her application is going to be in question, because of this process, and she is seriously considering whether to apply to Cal Poly because we're discussing these recommendations and its adverse affects to the colleges as a whole, and I wanted to put that in perspective and let you know about that. Thank you.

**Jon Phillips (Food Marketing and Ag Business):** Jon Phillips, Department of Food Marketing and Ager Business Management, College of Agriculture. With regard to the polytechnic nature of our University, I think that's important to maintain. I looked up the definition of polytechnic and it said instruction in many industrial arts. So, if we try to eliminate the small programs, we're reducing that emphasis on polytechnic. Further more, at our national conferences, you talk to the other agriculture economist and it's a matter of, so do you work in a College of Agriculture or a Department of

Cal Poly Pomona Prioritization and Recovery Initiative  
Academic Program Recommendations 1-5  
Open Forum – Nov. 1, 2007 (Bronco Student Center)

Agriculture? And, it's better to work in a College of Agriculture. A buddy of mine works at North Dakota State, he said that well while I was at South West Missouri State, it was a Department of Agriculture and the person with their office next time was working on elephants. Basically, it had nothing to do with agriculture. Unless perhaps you could strap a plow to an elephant or something like that. You could, part of the strength of the University is the diversity of programs that it offers. You look at the home page of University, and they say we've got sixty five Undergraduate Majors and twenty five Masters Majors, that makes that University sound strong. Of course you don't want to take it to the extreme, where you have a major with two people in it. But I think eliminating the small programs where they have fifty majors; I think that's to a detriment. It's eliminating the alternatives of the students, and basically if the purpose of it is to save money, I don't see the benefit to the students because I don't believe the tuition of the students is going to go down. So, I would oppose the merger of the College of Agriculture and also the elimination of the three programs and the College of Agriculture with Marketing and Ager Business Management, Agricultural Science and Food Science and Technology.

**Stephen Kim (student, URP):** Hi my name is Stephen Kim; I'm part of the Urban and Regional Planning. I'm a senior in the program. I just wanted to say how upset I am about this process that this is the sixth week, fifth week, and apparently this has been a process in a long time, I've been here for three years now and two years ago I want to know why students weren't involved in this process because me, myself, the reason why I choose to come to this University was the fact that the departments here are excellent and the colleges are excellent, they are all accredited, you know you can take your pick to Business to whatever, but also, I think that one of the drastic images that we are seeing is Design is a very different field that it requires a lot of creativity and I think dismembering the College of Environmental Design is, you are going to see a lack of creative solutions to deal with all these environmental problems you are seeing and I think science can only take us so far and acknowledging and addressing those issues, but actually coming up with solutions I think would be detrimental, for not only for our professional careers, as we have gone to professional conferences and seen that our program follows a suit similar to that of Harvard, MIT and some of the top Universities that deal with architecture and, sustainability is an issue. But if we are talking about coming up with solutions at University, I think utilizing those programs are important and I think that if you looked how sort of Design has been parts of it, I think in a business model, if you look at the Walt Disney company and issues with Pixar, you know Disney had a very strong cartoon animation base, but their sort of business model is seeking efficiency had that sort of failed them in the more recent issues and movies. So, you are looking at Pixar has a foundation in many of those, foundation in Disney. Culture and animation culture has sort of allowed it to thrive. And I think by sort of dismembering us, your allowing us to sort of fail as well.

**David Young (student, Landscape Architecture):** Hello, I'm David Young and I'm the American Society Landscape Vice President Student Chapter. There's a few things that I want to say. First of all, designers should be with a design school. Two, there's only three accredited programs in California, and we are the only one is Southern California. That's a really big deal. Everybody, every firm in Southern California knows of Cal Poly and if you change us, how is that going to affect us in the professional field? Two, the ENV College stands for the polytechnics mission statement, we learn by doing. We go on field trips, we have studios, we use our hands, we use our creativity. Three, if we

Cal Poly Pomona Prioritization and Recovery Initiative  
Academic Program Recommendations 1-5  
Open Forum – Nov. 1, 2007 (Bronco Student Center)

get moved with agriculture you are only reinforcing the negative stereotype that we are gardeners. We are not gardeners. We do, we don't do landscaping. We design landscapes.

**Kevin Peg (student, College of Science):** Hi, my name is Kevin Peg, I'm a Science Counsel President and I have a concern that's also shared with my Science Senator, Lisa, she's in the back right now. And since Cal Poly Pomona is mainly a commuting school, one of the ways we could communicate with students is to promote club activities. And if we merge with the colleges, clubs of extremely disciplines collide. And since there is one counsel per college, it would be a small number of individuals to manage a huge amount of clubs and students and if we diminish the number of colleges, we would lose that connection we have with our clubs.

**Robert Baden (student, Graphic Design):** I'm Robert Baden and I'm a freshman. I'm a Graphic Design major. I'd like to say that I am an artist; I'm not a business man. It's kind of insulting to say that Graphic Design is just another aspect of business. Since I've been here, I've noticed that it's really hard to meet people, I've also like with hanging out with other artist, I've realized that I need to meet other artist so that I can fill at home. I think that if you just take our school apart, then I'm not going to get that feedback, I'm not going to be able to meet people. I can barely meet people as it is. If you do that, that's just going to destroy anything that I have. I'm a freshman, and this is all I can actually look forward to. If you take that apart, what can I look forward to now?

**Unidentified:** Just one quick comment, again I'd like to echo what Don Hoyt said earlier. I think the appropriate venue for creating synergy on environmental issues and environmental problems between these distant disciplines, is through institute or a center that brings us all together, but not by lumping us all together into one academic division. It's not going to work.

**Peter Kilduff (AMM):** Peter Kilduff, I'd just like to comment on a few aspects of the process. The remind of the committee appeared to be one of trimming cost by removing unnecessary duplication and weak programs. Instead they conjured up a reorganization that demotes a number of Colleges to schools, in the process it proposes an entirely new set of organizational units, an extra tier of management, and it changes the role of College Deans and Department Chairs. And I think, yes it does. It's incredibly breath taking, and it's to save around one to two percent of the Universities budget and I think could be more easily done by altering thermostats and turning lights off at night. The conclusions have been reached without pulling any professional accepted strategic planning procedure, in which an environmental scan of opportunities and threats is accompanied by a comprehensive internal order. That's a comprehensive internal order. Determination of key objectives, the strategies to pursue those objectives, and then finally an appropriate organizational structure to fulfill them. This process has worked in kind of a reverse sequence. Let's start with an organizational structure and then let's do an environmental scan. Second, there's a lack of understanding within the community as we've heard of the programmatic professional organizational complexities and moving graphic design to marketing, for an example as well as AMM. I think there's a real danger in these kind of mergers that the orientation as I say changes from external opportunities to internal competition. And a classic danger of mergers is you get a two plus two equals three situation. Negative synergy. And Murphy's Law says that things will go wrong in any given situation if you give them a chance. The do diligence just has not been done to avoid Murphy's Law I believe.

Cal Poly Pomona Prioritization and Recovery Initiative  
Academic Program Recommendations 1-5  
Open Forum – Nov. 1, 2007 (Bronco Student Center)

**Alex Hess (Agriculture):** Alex Hess, College of AG, and that's one of the things why I came up here because we are hearing different assumptions that this was, instead of looking at ways to build bridges, it's about building Mega Colleges on the assumption that is going to be more efficient and save money. Earlier this week, on Monday, I was in this room when this committee presented the P and R to the students and presented it in a matter, that I was a little insulted by, my students came and felt a little bad because they are one of the programs that are going to be cut away like the fat, and that this would benefit the College and that it would save millions and millions and millions of dollars. Three millions in a row presented in that P and R discussion for the students. And so I was in the room when it happened, and my students reported back to me when they came to learn about the process of how they could get feedback. Now, obviously I'm sharing my frustrations in this, but that is something that this committee bringing it forward to the students and sharing what the students how they could give their feedback, and the students are reeling right now, and they are seeking my advice on how to handle the situation appropriately when it's affecting them so greatly.

**Brittany Yates (Steering Committee, ASI Vice President):** Yeah, Professor Hess, I know what you are speaking about. I think Doctor Freer statement was, on Monday was, there was the potential to save millions and millions and millions down the line. I don't think he was specifically saying this process in total is going to save millions. And then about the comment about, there was a student from ENV that said, so in actuality this process is trimming fat? And I recognize your students were here Tuesday at the other student open forum that we have, the goals of student open forums are again similar to today. Its not about to get our opinions on the recommendations, it's about to learn the process. So many students have no idea what the process is so the Power Point that you saw that Doctor Freer and I created, is to teach the students what is an academic program subcommittee. What is a support programs, and what is a steering committee. That's the idea of it. And we also, your students were concerned about what happened with Agriculture Science merges into the Graduate Program, these are things that Doctor Freer and I have taken back to Steering Committee, and we our selves are still reading the book, still learning about it as well. It's still so early in the game to make a statement what would potentially happen. I think it was just a miss communication what Doctor Fur had stated at the open forum.

**Steering Committee:** Are there any other comments? We started a little bit late in fairness to all of you that were waiting with us to get our technology working. We would certainly welcome any additional comments if you have them, and if not.

**Unidentified:** There's one big concern I have and that is that in huge colleges were going to loose champions, so in agriculture who's going to champion agriculture? The former Dean of Agriculture sits on the state Agriculture Board next to the Governor and other senior politicians. Who's going to do that in the future? And in these Mega Colleges, Deans are going to have such wide spans of control, they won't have programmatic expertise, and they simply wont' have the time to front up and be champions for individual program areas. I think it's a huge concern. Thank you.

**Steering Committee:** Okay, Well fist of all I want to thank all of you for coming today and expressing your opinions and concerns about the process. As I stated at the outset, as the Steering Committee we've been charged with reviewing the reports and asking for your opinions. As to the validity of the recommendations that were made, we will have another open forum next Thursday, a week from today

Cal Poly Pomona Prioritization and Recovery Initiative  
Academic Program Recommendations 1-5  
Open Forum – Nov. 1, 2007 (Bronco Student Center)

and again, I would encourage you to use other processes as well, such as written feedback for your departments in the processes I stated at the outset, we will read what you are submitting to us. We're listening to what you're telling us right now, and we've divided ourselves into groups of three that are focusing on certain elements. And I will tell you that there are six of us that are focusing on these first big recommendations that have been made for the very reason that they are very broad in scope and it's important to all of us. Again, thank you for coming today, expressing your opinions and I encourage you to do that.