

Cal Poly Pomona Prioritization and Recovery Initiative
Academic Program Recommendations 6-10
Open Forum – Nov. 1, 2007 (Bronco Student Center)

Ron Fremont (Steering Committee moderator): Start off by introducing myself. I am Ron Fremont. I am the Associate Vice President for University Relations. I serve on the Steering Committee of the Prioritization Recovery Initiative. I would like to welcome you for coming today and I would also like to start off by introducing the other members of the Steering Committee that are with us today. On the far right is Scott Warrington, who is the Vice President for University Advancement. Sitting next to Scott is Jared Stallones, Associate Professor in the College of Education and Integrative Studies. Becky Pepping, our staff representative from Procurement, and Sandy Davis, the Executive Assistant to the President, also a member of the President's Cabinet, who serves on the Steering Committee. As you should know, we are here today to talk about recommendations six through ten. This is a venue designated exclusively for those recommendations, so if you also want to speak to one through five, that is upstairs in the England/Evan rooms and you can split your time. You can spend it all with us. You can go spend time with them, however it best serves you. The open forums are just that, an opportunity for people to come together and speak to the Steering Committee and share their perspectives on the recommendations. This is one way that the Steering Committee is collecting feedback, part of our consultation process. The other is the written forum. Every department is asked to write a – their perspectives on the recommendations and write one report per recommendation, whatever you feel comfortable, and write only on the recommendations that you wish to speak to. We are looking for minority and consensus opinions and the details on how to fill out those forms are available on the website. Deadline on that is November 16. Things are happening very, very fast. I am going to give you a little bit of the ground rules and then allow you to ask some questions before we actually begin the process. Ultimately we are here today to listen to you and get your feedback. What we are doing is enabling anybody who wants to speak to a recommendation to step up to the microphone, introduce themselves, let us know what recommendation you want to speak to, and then make your statement. We are giving everybody two minutes. This is similar to the process that we had for the Support Programs Forum earlier this week. Becky is our official timekeeper and she will let you know when you are out of time. After you have spoken, please wait a moment. The Steering Committee may want to ask you a question as a followup. You will not be on the clock for that. And if there is no followup question you can return to your seat. We obviously do not have a capacity crowd today, so your interest in speaking to multiple recommendations is more than welcome. We just want to make sure that everybody has an opportunity to speak. Any questions about that? Pretty fair? Sir.

Unidentified: In light of minimal crowd here and the two hours of will you give more time than two minutes?

Ron Fremont (Steering Committee moderator): Well, what I would ask is take two minutes and then after everybody has gone if you would like to come back and speak to that for another two minutes, that would be okay. Does the – how does the committee feel about that? Then we are consistent. You should also know that we are recording this event and then we are looking to have this transcribed in a written format. It will be posted on the website so that even those individuals, your colleagues, who cannot attend the meeting today, can read what the discussion was. So this is a very, very public process. The forms that you will be filling out from the department base will also be made public so everybody can see the perspectives of what the individual departments say on the individual recommendations. Any other questions before we begin? I will share with you that the other day

Cal Poly Pomona Prioritization and Recovery Initiative
Academic Program Recommendations 6-10
Open Forum – Nov. 1, 2007 (Bronco Student Center)

when, you know, we have dedicated two hours for this. We did not take two hours for the 70 people that came to the support programs, and so, have at it. First person can step to the mike. Not everybody at once.

Tom Spalding (Kinesiology & Health Promotion): Okay, thank you for this opportunity. My name is Tom Spalding. I am the interim Chair of the Department of Kinesiology and Health Promotion and I am here to speak to Recommendation Ten. And I am here to report a consensus response to this recommendation. The KHP faculty – 100 percent of the KHP faculty is behind the response to this recommendation. We do not concur with Recommendation Ten with two exceptions. Our – we strongly are opposed to separating Exercise Science and Pedagogy and situating them in different academic units. The exceptions are we, however, agree with the recommendation to situate the KHP Department in the proposed College of Science, but it is critical that the department not be partitioned. The second exception is that we concur with – the second exception to our rejection opposition is we concur with the recommendation to eliminate Health Promotion Option. Our rationale for rejecting Recommendation Ten is that Kinesiology is about the interdisciplinary study of human movement. We study human movement from the perspectives of science, arts, and humanities. From the science – the sciences include natural and social and pedagogical sciences, so it does not make sense to partition the department because it would compromise the representation of the discipline on campus and that would have a very adverse effect on the professional development of our students, especially the pedagogical students who have to have a foundation in the science of exercise in order to be competent physical education teachers.

Ron Fremont (Steering Committee moderator): Okay. Questions from the committee?

Steering Committee: I have a couple of questions for you, Tom. So to clarify, did I understand you to say that the department has 100 percent consensus in what you just said?

Tom Spalding (KHP): That is correct. One hundred percent of the faculty including our lecturers concurs with the recommendations or the response to the recommendations that I just stated.

Steering Committee: Okay. And your response stated, if I heard you correctly, you would not oppose moving Kinesiology to the College of Science, but you would oppose splitting Exercise Science from Pedagogy, is that correct?

Tom Spalding (KHP): That is correct.

Steering Committee: Okay.

Tom Spalding (KHP): We believe that moving to the newly proposed College of Science would provide us an alignment of the Exercise Science with the sciences in the new proposed college and it would offer the opportunity for our pedagogy to join the teacher preparation side of the sciences.

Steering Committee: One last clarification. The – are you familiar with programs in which Exercise Science and Pedagogy are separated or is that – would that be an unusual move?

Cal Poly Pomona Prioritization and Recovery Initiative
Academic Program Recommendations 6-10
Open Forum – Nov. 1, 2007 (Bronco Student Center)

Tom Spalding (KHP): Thank you for that question. There is not a single example in the CSU system – in Kinesiology departments in the CSU system where Exercise Science is separated from Pedagogy, and there are approximately 21 Kinesiology departments in the CSU system.

Steering Committee: Thank you.

Ron Fremont (Steering Committee Moderator): I am sorry for the feedback (*noise*). Can we try to solve that? I would like to follow up and ask you about the faculty's decision to end health promotion. Could you clarify that a little bit?

Tom Spalding (KHP): The faculty feels that there are not sufficient faculty resources to adequately support that option. We think that health promotion is an integral supportive element to Kinesiology but at this time we do not feel like we have the resources to pursue that as an option.

Tom Spalding (KHP): I am afraid I do not have numbers right off the top of my head, but it is probably the – it is the smallest of the three options in our department.

Steering Committee: Question about student numbers

Tom Spalding (KHP): It is in the neighborhood of about 50 to 60.

Tom Spalding (KHP): If I can just add a little bit, keep in mind that there is an obesity epidemic occurring currently. Obesity has life threatening consequences in terms of diabetes and heart disease, for example, and the literature overwhelmingly shows that the best option for controlling weight is both exercise and diet, and both require changes in lifestyle. So health promotion is about helping people change their lifestyles. So we see health promotion as an important element in the department.

Don Hoyt (Research and Graduate Studies): Hello. My name is Don Hoyt and I am here to speak in my capacity as a member of the biology faculty and I would like to just share the experience that I have had. In 25 years of being on the biology faculty I interacted on many occasions with faculty from Kinesiology and I am – so I am speaking to the proposal to move Kinesiology to science. You had a faculty member who left about ten years ago who was an exercise physiologist. I cannot remember...

Audience: Ron Dietrich?

Don Hoyt (AVP Research and Graduate Studies): Yeah, Ron Dietrich. So Ron Dietrich was an exercise physiologist and I have also spoken with several of the current exercise physiologists or people in that area of kinesiology and a couple of junior faculty, Terry Brown and (*unclear*), who left Cal Poly in the last couple of years, and all of them just felt that they were in a very unsupportive environment, and I do not believe that that is the fault of Dean Way, because I think she tried heroically to staff that department and hire new faculty. I think the problem is the culture of the department and the culture of the college are just so different that the kind of research support facilities that the department needs are common in science and unprecedented in the College of Arts. And so I

Cal Poly Pomona Prioritization and Recovery Initiative
Academic Program Recommendations 6-10
Open Forum – Nov. 1, 2007 (Bronco Student Center)

think – and many of those faculty who have left spoke to me on an individual basis about just leaving kinesiology would they be accepted into the biology department if they were just to move as an individual faculty member. And the answer always was yes, but it was a difficult move for them to make. So I think that moving the Kinesiology Department to the College of Science would have many benefits. There are great collaborations possible between Biology and Kinesiology. We teach a couple of basic courses in human anatomy/human physiology that their students take and we could actually have – those courses could be taught by Kinesiology faculty. Biomechanists, for example, would be well prepared to teach the human anatomy class, and the – in the human physiology course— all right—could also be taught by their exercise physiologists.

Steering Committee: Follow up questions before I pass it down. Are you speaking in favor of the entire recommendation?

Don Hoyt (AVP Research and Graduate Studies): I cannot – I do not know enough about Kinesiology to speak to the issue of splitting and, you know, I think Tom has made a good case for not subdividing the department, but the proposal to move it to the College of Science—whether or not we adopt the proposal for the wholesale restructuring of all the colleges, I believe the department should be moved to the College of Science even without the complete restructuring of the – new creation of the kind of mega-science college that has been proposed. Which – so I think the department should be moved. I cannot speak to the value of splitting the department. It seems like the faculty are close to that.

Barbara Bromley (CEIS): I guess I cannot adjust that. Hi. I am Barbara Bromley. I am a faculty member in the Department of Education and currently the Coordinator of the Education Specialists' Credential Program here at Cal Poly Pomona. That is the program that offers the Special Ed Credential here. I guess my first question kind of ties into what some of the other folks have already been mentioning about the PE program and the Pedagogy piece of that. I think moving the Pedagogy piece to the School of Education seems inequitable given that the other Single Subject Credential Programs in your proposal remain in their academic content areas and I am not sure what the rationale is to move one Single Subject Credential Program into the School of Education without moving the rest of them. So I am not sure that the idea is a good one given that it is distinctly inequitable. Is that my two minutes? I will wait for the other thing for the next round. Thank you. My second question is that – has to do with moving the College of Education into class and then changing it from a college to a school. It is possible that the perception will be that by moving face first – changing it to a School of Education and then moving it into class is actually a step backwards for our program and indicates that the Credential and Master's programs in Education will be losing core leadership representation at various University-level organizations and committees. Since one of the University's core missions is to interact and integrate with K-12 education, it has the perception of looking a little odd that you would take away a college and make it a school. That looks like a step down, a step backwards. So I am wondering if the committee could respond by telling us a little bit about their rationale for why they made this decision or proposal.

Steering Committee: Thank you. You know, this question has actually come up and it requires some clarification. The Steering Committee cannot speak to why Recommendations are written the way

Cal Poly Pomona Prioritization and Recovery Initiative
Academic Program Recommendations 6-10
Open Forum – Nov. 1, 2007 (Bronco Student Center)

they are. That was done by the Academic Programs Committee and the individuals that are on the Steering Committee were not engaged in that process, so we would literally be making conjecture as to why they chose that. Our charge is ultimately to take a look at the, you know, to hear your feedback on the Recommendations as they are written and use that as part of our process.

Steering Committee: Barbara, could I ask you a question? The – you mentioned the Single Subjects Program when – programs when you talked about your position on the Kinesiology move.

Barbara Bromley (CEIS): Right.

Steering Committee: Does the – do you see the Department of Education, since it runs the Single Subjects Programs, does it not serve as sort of a broker between class and College of Science, College of Ag, and College of Business Administration in managing the Single Subject Programs?

Barbara Bromley (CEIS): You are talking about currently?

Steering Committee: Currently.

Barbara Bromley (CEIS): Yeah, I would agree with that.

Steering Committee: Would that be any harder to do as a School of Education within one of those Colleges?

Barbara Bromley (CEIS): Boy, that is a tough question. Again, I think my concern about transitioning—who knows a good word—to a school has to do with how that would impact our leadership representation on campus, and, you know, whether – I think there is a ripple effect there, or there could be. It is hard to predict because we do not know what the ultimate administrative structure would look like.

Steering Committee: I will ask you the same question I asked Tom. Do you know of any other CSUs in which the School of Education is located within a College that helps to do the work? I have not said that very clearly. Do you know of any other CSU that is organized in the way that this Recommendation proposes?

Barbara Bromley (CEIS): Not putting a School of Education into a College of whatever they are—thank you—Letters Arts, and Social Sciences. I actually made a list of all the CSUs and where their education programs are administratively. In those in which there is a School of Education that is within a college, they are either in – like for example, Chico, their School of Education is in a College of Communication and Education. Humboldt School of Education is in the College of Professional Studies. So they are affiliated with the college that they are a part of. I do not see that in the proposal that is here at Cal Poly, you know, class and College of Education are much more distinct, I think, differentiated content-wise.

Steering Committee: Thank you.

Cal Poly Pomona Prioritization and Recovery Initiative
Academic Program Recommendations 6-10
Open Forum – Nov. 1, 2007 (Bronco Student Center)

Steering Committee: I kind of wanted to follow up when you expressed concern about the perception of going from a college to a school.

Barbara Bromley (CEIS): Right.

Steering Committee: And I was on campus it must have been—it is less than ten years ago—when it was a school...

Barbara Bromley (CEIS): Yes.

Steering Committee: ...and it became a college.

Barbara Bromley (CEIS): I have been here that long here, yeah.

Steering Committee: Could you tell me about what happened externally as far as perception goes when you did that?

Barbara Bromley (CEIS): When we...

Steering Committee: When you went from a school to a college, how did you see that perception change in the – you know, internally and externally.

Barbara Bromley (CEIS): I think it made a huge difference. That is my personal opinion. It does elevate the status of the program and it does provide you with representation at a dean's level that we did not have before, and I think those things – well, it made an impact internally in terms of leadership representation on campus. And I think it also made an impact in our community that we serve in that students – we were more visible as a college, I think. And that increased our visibility.

Steering Committee: So you had a dean when you were a school.

Barbara Bromley (CEIS): That is right. We did. Yeah, well. Can I comment about the dean?

Steering Committee: Hold on. I know that Scott has a question.

Steering Committee: Thank you. Can you tell us maybe statistically what the difference – what difference was made when you went from being a school to a college? How was enrollment affected? Ranking, anything like that?

Barbara Bromley (CEIS): I do not think I can comment on any of that. I just do not have figures.

Steering Committee: That was really kind of a followup to Ron's question and your response. The point that I had – that I wanted to make earlier was that I wonder if perception – the perception issue is a change issue. Change is difficult. And I am very sensitive to perception because I – we do

Cal Poly Pomona Prioritization and Recovery Initiative
Academic Program Recommendations 6-10
Open Forum – Nov. 1, 2007 (Bronco Student Center)

marketing and advancement, that is part of what we do, and perception can be huge. But since my understanding was that this process, as it began a couple of years ago, was a cost – primarily driven by cost savings either by eliminating overlap in some cases or by increasing or enhancing efficiencies in others. I wonder if the perception issue might not be outweighed by the gaining of efficiency, kind of what is – what was pointed out earlier. Is there an efficiency, since you are now working with a couple of other colleges, being embedded in a college, would that help? And I think you partially answered that, but.

Barbara Bromley (CEIS): Yeah, and I do not think – I wish I had the crystal ball to know. If I could follow up to some of these questions about the issue of perception, which ties into my last comment, and that has to do with NCATE accreditation, the credential programs and graduate programs in education, there is a national accrediting body called NCATE and for the life of me right now I cannot remember what it stands for. But like other programs that we have here on campus that have accrediting bodies, whether it is engineering or business or whatever, it is a similar process where you have to document that you have met certain standards and that there is a certain level of quality to your programs. Cal Poly is just one of a few remaining CSUs who does not currently have NCATE accreditation and we have been told that Chancellor Reid wants all CSU education programs to have NCATE accreditation. There is a question about whether by moving into class and becoming a school if this would again offer the perception of reduced resources and leadership and affect the educational program's ability to adequately prepare for and achieve NCATE accreditation. The things that we hear are that if the reduction to a school results in a loss of resources, leadership, representation and the things that I have been talking about, that that could influence NCATE accreditation. And I guess that that was just my comment on it.

Steering Committee: I have one more question.

Barbara Bromley (CEIS): Okay.

Steering Committee: Are there ways in which the leadership of a dean who is from other discipline besides education might be insufficient for a School of Education?

Barbara Bromley (CEIS): Well – it – how much time do you have? It certainly helps – well, I cannot say that. I have to say that it is almost a requirement that the dean be knowledgeable about credentialing in California. It is probably one of the most complex, multi-layered systems that we have in this state. And credential programs, whether on our campus or on other campus, we have layers of hoops we have to jump through. Knowledge of the credential structure, knowledge of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing in Sacramento and how they work, knowledge about ongoing legislation, whether federal or state, which includes things like No Child Left Behind which is having a huge impact on our teaching program, as well as, you know, some of the local or state legislation that has come up in terms of teachers who are highly qualified and things like that. It is very difficult—and we have been through this, as you know, several times now trying to retrain and reeducate and reinform the dean that comes in who has no background in the systemic, system-wide issues of credentialing as well as best practices and pedagogy, you know, and then on top of that if you add the whole Ed Specialists Program, Special Ed, which is my area of background, that adds another layer and different

Cal Poly Pomona Prioritization and Recovery Initiative
Academic Program Recommendations 6-10
Open Forum – Nov. 1, 2007 (Bronco Student Center)

requirements, and there is a whole different set of state standards for folks in that credential program. So it is exceedingly difficult, I think, for someone to come in and attempt to understand all the implications of things that occur in a credential program. My I ask some questions?

Steering Committee: In the same way – I think so. Let me ask one other piece of it. What you are talking about is technical stuff and it is complicated but it, you know, it is not impossible. Is there a culture of teaching and teacher education and school life similar to the culture of kinesiology that we just discussed that would fit better in some other configuration than within a liberal arts type college?

Barbara Bromley (CEIS): Well, I think that that is probably the case but I would have to really think about that some more. Certainly there is a culture within the School of Education or College of Education just like any other program. It is hard to say what the implications are in terms of almost like culture clash is what you are discussing. I am not sure I could speak to that. It is an unknown.

Steering Committee: One more thing before we let you go and see if we have more questions and anybody else's comments. You have had interim leadership since the previous team left the university.

Barbara Bromley (CEIS): Correct.

Steering Committee: Okay. And so ultimately the model that you are living in now is similar to what the recommendation is.

Barbara Bromley (CEIS): That is probably true.

Steering Committee: Okay. Could you tell us how the College of Education Integrative Studies has worked within that model since the change?

Barbara Bromley (CEIS): I am not sure that I am qualified to give that information because I am not currently at the level where I interact a lot with the dean. I am not a chairperson of a program or a department. I am just trying to think. I think the issues that – the concerns that Jared brings up about, you know, the administrative people having a complete knowledge of the program and its implications is something that we continue to struggle with. I am not sure I am qualified to speak on anything else.

Steering Committee: It may not be a fair question. I think any interim situation is not necessarily a good indication of the way things would be under, you know, a more permanent – with a more permanent structure. I think interim anything is a terrible position to be in. I mean otherwise it is a good question, but.

Barbara Bromley (CEIS): If I could just add that, you know, I think what is different now is that there is only one dean that is stretched between two colleges and I am not sure that that would be the case if the proposal were to be completely implemented, that there would be some leadership for a school and so that the other person would not be stretched so thin. Sorry. Thank you.

Cal Poly Pomona Prioritization and Recovery Initiative
Academic Program Recommendations 6-10
Open Forum – Nov. 1, 2007 (Bronco Student Center)

Steering Committee: I know we have had some more people enter the room since we got started, but just to kind of refresh everybody that we are – that anybody who would like to speak to any of the Recommendations Six through Ten, we invite them to step up and take two minutes to the microphone and share your perceptions with the Steering Committee. That you are walking to the mike, Elaine, introduce yourself, and where you are from.

Alaine Daugherty (KHP): My name is Alaine Daugherty. I am a lecturer in the Kinesiology Department. I have been—oh boy. I have been a lecturer in the department for 18 years. I was also a graduate student in the program and took a lot of classes through the undergraduate program. My father was there for 40 years, so I have seen the department since I was born. To see a recommendation to split up what we are all about is really – I mean to me it really shows that there is not really an understanding of what the whole discipline is about because our whole program is integrated, and one of the things that – I mean I teach a lot in the activity program, but I also teach a lot in the general education program. Those were two of the issues that were brought up is the strength of the program. They were completely not even mentioned when they talked about splitting our department up. It was like we ceased to exist and we were actually, you know, designated as part of the strength of the program. But aside from that, you know, I am a former K-12 teacher. My Master's is in Exercise Science. I see the whole well-roundness of the program and I cannot imagine what it would be like. I think that any – if I were a student thinking about coming in, I would not choose Cal Poly if I was – had any interest in kinesiology because it is not served as a – it is a really integrated discipline, and the Recommendations, I believe, do not show any kind of understanding of that, to split Pedagogy, to split Exercise Science, to leave out, you know, the service that we do to the rest of the community in our activity program and in our general education program, it just – to me it just shows no understanding of really what we are all about.

Steering Committee: So how do you feel about moving the department to the College of Science, then?

Alaine Daugherty (KHP): If we are an integrated department, I think – for me the most important thing is that we stay integrated, we stay a whole. You know, if we stay a whole and we go over to Exercise Science and Exercise Science is able to really recognize that we are a whole department and that we are a well integrated, well functioning department together, I think that that is a very, very good option.

Steering Committee: So I am guessing, then, or assuming that if we – if other colleagues from Kinesiology speak in favor of – or in disfavor of splitting departments, unless it is said we assume that the move to science is generally acceptable? Is that the – okay.

Alaine Daugherty (KHP): That is pretty much what we have, you know, there has been a lot of coherence in the department on that feeling, yeah.

Steering Committee: Because I have – because Tom had said [overlapping voice] with the statements you made. Okay.

Cal Poly Pomona Prioritization and Recovery Initiative
Academic Program Recommendations 6-10
Open Forum – Nov. 1, 2007 (Bronco Student Center)

Alaine Daugherty (KHP): And, you know, I just want to say with our general education programs and with our activity we serve thousands of students every quarter. I mean it is – the volume of students that we serve through the campus and, you know, is our campus-wide mission, it is Cal Poly's mission is that we are co-curricular, we are integrated, we are serving the whole student. To split Kinesiology up, which we really serve the whole student in a lot of different ways, I do not think follows our university mission at all.

Steering Committee: We earlier heard a statement from the chair about health promotion. How do you feel about that?

Alaine Daugherty (KHP): Personally that is – I am sorry to see that happen, but I understand that that needs to happen, because again I think that we are an integrated – you know – but I – but if it comes down to that to save an integrated department, then that is what we need to do.

Steering Committee: Welcome back, Don.

Don Hoyt (Research and Graduate Studies): Well, thank you. I am wondering if.. I am wondering if, in, you know, the context of talking about kinesiology if it would be acceptable for me to comment on the – one of the proposals on the grad program in kinesiology, which has been proposed for termination.

Steering Committee: Is that in Recommendations Six through Ten? Or are you talking about...

Don Hoyt (Research and Graduate Studies): No, it is not in Six through Ten.

Steering Committee: Yeah. It is actually in the Phase Two Recommendations. The Steering Committee is okay?

Don Hoyt (Research and Graduate Studies): So – in this – now I am speaking as the AVP for Research and Graduate Studies. Number one, we are trying to grow both of those areas. That is my charge from the Provost. And elimination of graduate programs is not going to help us increase the representation of graduate students on this campus. We rank seventeenth among the 23 campuses in the percentage of graduate students that we have here. So I would see that as a step backwards. But it is also a step backwards in terms of research and potential for external funding, because particularly the exercise scientists have a good track record of getting grants and our ability to bring in really promising young teacher scholars—like there are a couple of them here in the second row—I think will be seriously damaged if we do not have a graduate program that they can look forward to working with graduate students and have those graduate students help them with their research. So I think the idea of eliminating that program is just exactly at the wrong time and will go against several important initiatives that we have under way.

Steering Committee: And this is specifically the graduate program in exercise science?

Don Hoyt (Research and Graduate Studies): In Kinesiology.

Cal Poly Pomona Prioritization and Recovery Initiative
Academic Program Recommendations 6-10
Open Forum – Nov. 1, 2007 (Bronco Student Center)

Steering Committee: In Kinesiology.

Don Hoyt (Research and Graduate Studies): But from a – and, you know, I understand the reason that the committee looked at the data and felt that the program was weak because the fact is that with this turnover that they have had in terms of faculty not staying much beyond getting tenure. There – it has been difficult. Barbara actually had to close down the program because there simply were not enough people in there to mentor the graduate students doing the theses that they need to do to – for their culminating experience. So it is understandable that the data look weak, but I think that if the program were – if the whole department were to move to science where the culture would be so much more supportive of that kind of scholarship and that – and where the resources are available, the dean of science by virtue of the other research projects that are funded in the department has more resources to invest in supporting the scholarship of these people. And I think that we could grow the research and the graduate program and kinesiology would thrive if it were to move to the College of Science.

Steering Committee: What is the – in your opinion, what is the reason why professors are leaving once they are tenured?

Don Hoyt (Research and Graduate Studies): Well, I – you know, I think that when it gets right down to the three people who I know who left it was – to some extent it was an individual choice. But I think that there was a certainly a common theme that they just felt that the resources that they needed to support their scholarship were just not available and that they were asking for things and looking for support and that there was not an understanding on the part of the administrators that they reported to. And I think there were times when they felt that the chair of the department did not – who was not an exercise scientist – did not understand. And I think that they also felt that the college had difficulty. My personal experience – we got a great big NIH grant in that department a number of years ago and I think that Barbara Way and her associate dean tried very, very hard to provide the resources that that program needed, and turned several rooms in – down there and the gym into research spaces that they were not before. But even the new faculty that are hired in there right now are having to rent space over across campus to accommodate their research. So it is really just the resources it takes to support research were just not something that was commonly provided in the college. So it was – they were asking for things that people did not understand. Whereas it is conventional. I mean it would be a no brainer with the dean of science that an exercise scientist needs a wet lab or a research lab or a space to do biomechanics and so forth. I mean those would be things that I think you would have additional resources to provide them, and, you know, just the indirect costs that are returned to the college are vastly different between science and arts. So that the resources would be there to help these people get what they need to get up and running. And I am not trying to be critical of Dr. Way because I think she has tried very hard to meet those needs; and as I said there was point at which she hired four or five new faculty all in – right about the same time because Tory came in – it was after Tory came in. It was – Darin came in and, yeah, Serge was the chair. And so I think she tried very hard to create that critical mass, but it just dissipated because I think it was just in the wrong place. So we can fix that by moving it to science.

Cal Poly Pomona Prioritization and Recovery Initiative
Academic Program Recommendations 6-10
Open Forum – Nov. 1, 2007 (Bronco Student Center)

Tom Spalding (KHP): Tom Spalding, Kinesiology and Health Promotion again. I just would like to follow up with Dr. Hoyt's comments and say that if Exercise Science and Pedagogy are split I think the university will be giving up significant opportunities for external funding, supporting graduate students, publications and scholarships. I am going to very strongly encourage my faculty to have a departmental focus, which I think they will be supportive of. I think that we can rally, for example, around obesity, that there are extensive opportunities for external funding in this opportunity, and Kinesiology is uniquely positioned due to our expertise in physical activity, in lifestyle changes, in stress management, in changing eating behaviors, to address issues like obesity; and with the Pedagogical faculty to then also address the very critical issue of childhood obesity. Many programs in childhood obesity are school and after school programs. Our pedagogy faculty have a lot to offer in contributing to the design of applied research programs to address these very critical societal needs.

Barb Garcia (KHP): Hi. My name is Barb Garcia. I am a part time lecturer. I work with Alaine and Terry and I am also a graduate from – of Cal Poly. I went through the Kinesiology Department with Specialty and Adaptive Physical Education for the Motor Development Clinic. And the idea that just the – trying to even understand tearing this department into different segments and relocating it and changing the way it functions is just – would be completely – to me become dysfunctional. I mean everything – everybody is a little bit dysfunctional in their lives, but that would make us way dysfunctional. And I taught at I-Poly for almost ten years and was very closely connected to kinesiology and I-Poly and we did a lot of work with the Pedagogy majors. We let them come in and teach our classes. I did a lot of work. We let them use them for studies. I mean they just – it was just a connection there. They were handy. They were there. They are teaching PE down there. It – you know, if that whole department is in flux, if it is not there, if it is not available, we are going to lose a piece of that first of all, and that is going to be—piggybacking on what Tom says, using that high school as a source for studying or working with childhood obesity, I mean it is such a natural place to begin. And I even worked at the charter school over here, the School of Arts and Education that our president's wife is on the board. I worked with them as well and they have the same connection. I mean they look to us for, you know, for assistance, for PE assistance, that kind of thing. They are looking – the community looks to us for that. And if I were coming in as a new student and I saw the department all torn apart in different pieces it would not make any sense to me. And a lot of our California State Standards are science based in Pedagogy now, very much science based, so putting Pedagogy over here and science over here is not going to make much sense. Really we go to a lot of the same classes as the health sciences, at least we did when I was here. So I just – this whole idea of pulling it apart and relocating and changing—it does not make any sense to me. It just does not make any sense to me. I do not know. One little voice does not mean much. But I walked through this whole process and, you know, it – I cannot imagine having it not be together, not be integrated as they have been saying, in one place. And we – oh. I am sorry.

Steering Committee: But all voices do count. Thank you.

Moustafa Moustafa (KHP): Moustafa, Kinesiology and Health Promotion. Actually I am an addition to Dr. Nuttler here. We have been hired just last year and we kind of the freshman in the department. And just coming this year and, you know, realizing the recommendation, to be honest with you, you know, I feel scared on how is this going to impact my professional development as a faculty member

Cal Poly Pomona Prioritization and Recovery Initiative
Academic Program Recommendations 6-10
Open Forum – Nov. 1, 2007 (Bronco Student Center)

within the KHP? I would like to thank Don Hoyt, you know, for bringing the graduate program to your attention, but three comments that I would like to make. First one is, you know, splitting Pedagogy and Exercise Science I believe, you know, some, you know, he made like a very compelling argument and he provided you with a very good rationale. In addition to this, okay, so I am not just going to repeat the same things, but in addition to this the move to the College of Science from – I would like to bring to your attention, you know, a perspective of collaboration. What kind of avenue that is going to be open for Exercise Science and Pedagogy faculty members to collaborate with the College of Science, okay, or with faculties from biology, chemistry, physics to either produce, you know, like proposal for external funding or advance the knowledge in our area? Okay. Just like a very quick example. My kind of research is to examine the end mechanism for the molecular biology mechanism by which certain diseases such as cardiovascular disease, obesity, hypertension, are developed in humans, and how can we prevent them? Or at least reduce the risk factors from those, you know, diseases? If I am, you know, incorporated within the College of Science I am going to have unlimited resources, okay. Next door I am going to have another faculty member from biology who might be interested in DNA application and we can collaborate together. Also I am going to have – okay.

Steering Committee: Did I get your name right?

Moustafa Moustafa (KHP): Yes. Mustafa.

Steering Committee: Good. We have been concerned about how some of this reorganization would impact recruiting faculty and students as well, but could you speak a little bit more about how you might have felt coming here if you knew this reorganization was in the mix?

Moustafa Moustafa (KHP): Okay. Is a very hard question, but just my first thought right now if I knew that there has been six faculty members who have been just recently hired and left within three to four years, I am not sure, you know, what my decision was going to be at that time of my recruitment. And if I knew also I am going to be coming here not having a lab until now and having to struggle, you know, back to my old school which I had my post doctor, you know, training to conduct my research so that I can publish three papers during the last year, you know, I am not sure. All of this is going to be taken into account and it might change my decision to come here instead of going to another, you know, school.

Steering Committee: Thank you.

Unidentified: You actually partially addressed what – the next comment that I wanted to make is in the Kinesiology Department being able to attract professors like Mustafa and like Jess and the exercise science is, I think, really obviously very important for a discipline and we have lost some, you know, in the last several years. And if Kinesiology does not exist as a discipline we are not going to be able to attract the caliber of some of the professors that we have now.

Cal Poly Pomona Prioritization and Recovery Initiative
Academic Program Recommendations 6-10
Open Forum – Nov. 1, 2007 (Bronco Student Center)

Tom Spalding (KHP): Tom Spalding again. I just want to speak to the issue of recruiting both faculty and students. If our graduate program is eliminated I cannot help but believe that that would have a very serious, adverse impact on our ability to recruit and retain high quality research-oriented faculty from research one doctoral granting institutions. Secondly, if Exercise Science and Pedagogy are split and situated in different academic units, I think that one of the consequences of that is that the Pedagogy component will lose its Kinesiology identity. And if that happens it will make it very difficult for Cal Poly to recruit physical education teacher students because the program will not be visible. Also, it will be difficult to manage the curriculum if Pedagogy and Exercise Science are partitioned and situated in different units. Because the Pedagogy curriculum is designed to prepare students to – for the single subject credential which the – the standards for which have been determined by the California Commission for Teacher Credentialing. If Exercise Science and Pedagogy are split then, it is possible that we will see drift in the curriculum and that maybe that the curriculums no longer speak to the California or the CCTC standards. And if our students are not able to get credentialed, they will not be employable in the state.

Andrew Metzger (KHP): Andrea Metzger, Kinesiology and Health Promotion, and I am the Single Subject Coordinator for Physical Education. And just – Tom is well aware and stated it well, but I just want to piggyback that. I believe that Pedagogy, the training of students for adaptive physical education and physical education, will almost guarantee to be eliminated without the combination of Exercise Science and Pedagogy because we are completely – we are very dependent on fulfilling the classes for the CCTC—California Commission on Teaching Credentialing. Through the Exercise Science side we – they work with us completely to fulfill the standards that we must meet. There are lot and it is amazing that we are actually able to do it with the faculty size that we have. But it is – I am just saying the same thing but saying not that it would be in danger, it would – from my perspective it would not exist.

Steering Committee: Thank you. Well, I am sure that everybody has had an opportunity and we want to remind everybody that next week we will do this over again. Please share that with your colleagues who may not have been able to attend.

Steering Committee: If there are no other comments, we are done.

Steering Committee: Thank you very much for coming.