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Abstract

The author of this project currently serves as one of the Student Associates of the Brock Center for Agricultural Communication and the Editor-in-Chief of both Ag Circle and PolyCulture magazines. This past year, she served as the student representative on the Advisory Council for the Agricultural Education and Communication Department. Additionally, the author has served as the Cal Poly Agricultural Communicators of Tomorrow (ACT) Chapter President and currently serves as the National Second Vice President of the organization. The author’s experience with all of these aspects of the Cal Poly Agricultural Communication program has guided in producing this report. The purpose of this report is to share insight and research, along with a collection of resources and recommendations to help the program continue to grow and provide students with the best learning opportunities possible. Current Brock Center Director, Megan Silcott, advised this Senior Project.
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Chapter One: Introduction

The Brock Center for Agricultural Communication was founded in 1986, with a mission to “create a bridge of communication among the agricultural industry, the media and the public” (Bylaws, 1992). The Brock Center serves as an opportunity for students at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, to practice skills in agricultural communication in a realistic working environment.

The Brock Center has evolved throughout its history at Cal Poly, in response to curriculum, faculty and industry changes. The center currently exists with one Director and four Student Associates who manage all activities. The primary function of the Brock Center is to produce Ag Circle magazine, a student publication of 1,500 copies distributed on campus and mailed three times annually. Magazines are mailed to every high school and college agricultural program in the state, every county Farm Bureau office, out-of-state university agricultural communication programs and a list of other program supporters.

Other current functions include managing a blog, hosting speakers and forums, and working on special projects, such as writing news releases and public services announcements for agricultural clients and visiting high school and elementary schools. In recent years, the Brock Center has also taken on the role of producing PolyCulture, an annual publication for the College of Agriculture, Food & Environmental Sciences (CAFES) to distribute at Open House. In the past, the Brock Center has helped in producing the newsletter for CAFE’s Swanton Pacific Ranch (Charter, 1986). This
spring, Swanton Pacific Ranch began printing a publication again and the Brock Center helped provide software support and writer recommendations.

Continuous changes in curriculum, faculty and industry create a need to constantly reevaluate the Center’s activities and accomplishments to ensure the Center stays true to its mission. The Brock Center’s structure is outlined by a set of bylaws. The bylaws require the Brock Center to have an Advisory Board of industry professionals. The Brock Center Advisory Board has not met since 2000 (Gearhart, 2008). However, the Agricultural Education and Communication Department at Cal Poly has an Advisory Council with an Agricultural Communication sub-committee, which meets annually and discusses the Brock Center activities, among other topics.

Although the department council evaluates the Brock Center’s activities, the Center could still use more feedback, guidance, direction and support to help it grow. Recreating and reviving the Brock Center Advisory Board would help the Brock Center stay true to its mission and provide students an even greater opportunity for experience in the agricultural communication field.

Furthermore, the Brock Center is intended to be a joint effort between the College of Liberal Arts (CLA) and CAFES. Currently, the decision-making processes regarding the Brock Center have been more reliant on CAFES, as outlined and discussed in Chapter Four.

**Statement of the Problem**

The Brock Center for Agricultural Communication is not currently following its bylaws, which require it to have an Advisory Board and to utilize cooperative efforts
between CLA and CAFES. The Ag Ed & Com Department Advisory Council is currently fulfilling the same duties as the Advisory Board should, but not in the same intended way. The Brock Center’s mission statement is not being fully addressed in current practices. *The problem is the lack of an Advisory Board and the limited collaboration between the CLA and CAFES does not hold the Brock Center accountable to maintaining its mission and does not provide enough support for the Brock Center to keep up with current industry issues and to reach its full potential in bridging the gap between the agricultural industry, the media and the public.*

**The Importance of the Project**

There is a need for communication professionals within the agriculture industry. Urbanization and technological advancement in the agriculture industry have led to a disconnection between farmers, ranchers, the media and the public. The goal of the Brock Center for Agricultural Communication is to “create a bridge of communication among the agricultural industry, the media and the public” (Bylaws, 1992). A separate Advisory Board, as outlined in the Brock Center bylaws, may help the Brock Center increase its impact. Furthermore, increased collaboration between CLA and CAFES may help the Brock Center better align with founder, Jim Brock’s vision and maximize its effectiveness.

**Purpose(s) of the Project**

The purpose of the project is to research the history and mission of the Brock Center, gather input from current and retired faculty, evaluate bylaw requirements and current practices, discuss the research and evaluations with administrators, and create a plan of
how to best help the Brock Center move forward. The overall goal is to help the Brock Center stay true to its mission, provide students with an even greater opportunity for real-world experience, and make a larger impact on intended audiences.

Objectives of the Project

1. To research the background and history of the Brock Center

2. To develop a strategy to best help the Brock Center move forward and realign with its mission

3. To complete the plan by meeting with faculty and administrators and including their recommendations

4. To create a list of specific recommendations for the Brock Center to move forward

Definition of Important Terms

- **Advisory Board** - Refers to a board of industry professionals whose sole purpose is to oversee the Brock Center and adhere to a set of guidelines. This board is outlined in the Brock Center bylaws, but does not currently exist. Instead, the Brock Center is currently utilizing a sub-committee of the Ag Ed & Com Department Advisory Council to fulfill these duties.

- **Ag Circle** - Refers to *Ag Circle* magazine, a student publication created by the Brock Center for Agricultural Communication three times annually

- **Ag Ed & Com Department** - Refers to Cal Poly’s Agricultural Education and Communication Department housed inside the College of Agriculture, Food & Environmental Sciences (CAFES).

- **Ag Ed & Com Department Advisory Council** - Refers to a group of 17 members who serve the Agricultural Education and Communication Department, along with two student representatives. Nine of the 17 members serve on a sub-committee designated to discussing the Agricultural Communication program, including the Brock Center.
• **Brock Center** - Refers to the Brock Center for Agricultural Communication, an office located at Cal Poly’s building 10, room 234. The office is funded by an endowment to the Cal Poly Foundation, referred to as the “Center” in the bylaws. See contact information in the Appendix.

• **CAFES** - Refers to the College of Agriculture, Food & Environmental Sciences

• **Cal Poly** - Refers to California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

• **Center Staff** – Refers to students or other individuals who may be asked to help Brock Center employees on a volunteer, consultant or employment basis, as outlined in the bylaws

• **Center Support** - Individuals, groups, associations, and public and private business entities actively involved with the Brock Center, as outlined in the bylaws

• **CLA** - Refers to the College of Liberal Arts

• **Director** - Refers to a current or past faculty member in the position of Brock Center Director. This position is referred to as Center Director in current bylaws and Center Adviser in previous bylaws.

• **National ACT** - Stands for the National Agricultural Communicators of Tomorrow organization

• **Social Media** - The use of Facebook, Twitter and other networking sites to promote awareness or support of a cause

• **Student Associates** - Refers to student employees at the Brock Center, referred to as “Center Associates” in the bylaws.

Summary

The project will explain the history and background of the Brock Center. It will provide a thorough analysis of the current status of the bylaws in relation to current practices. The project will include interviews and recommendations from current and retired faculty, as well as administrators. The final outcome will be a list of specific recommendations for the Brock Center to use in the future. The overall goal is to help the Brock Center stay true to its mission, provide students an even greater opportunity for real-world experience, and make a larger impact on intended audiences.
Chapter 2: Review of Literature

The Need for Agricultural Communication

Brock Center founder and western produce leader, James L. Brock said, “The greatest shortcoming agriculture has today is the lack of understanding by the balance of society,” (In Fond Remembrance, 1986). As stated in a Brock Center report dated 1988, “Communication has become a serious problem for agriculture, California’s No. 1 industry and the foundation of the state’s economy.” This statement remains true today. There is a need for communication professionals within the California agriculture industry due to the disconnection between the public and producers, negative media coverage and the current social trends regarding agricultural production methods.

Urbanization and technological advancement in the agriculture industry have led to a disconnection between agricultural producers, the media and the public. “Fewer than 2 percent of Americans farm for a living today, and only 17 percent of Americans now live in rural areas,” (USDA, 2012). The majority of the California population lives in urban areas (Census, 2007). Research shows the gap still exists between agricultural producers and consumers’ understanding of production agriculture (Doerfert, 2003). This physical disconnection and lack of understanding makes it difficult for the agriculture industry to communicate its message to consumers.

There has been a trend in California, in which some consumers are increasingly concerned about where their food comes from and how it is produced, processed and transported. These concerns are becoming more prevalent in proposed and enacted legislature. Recent examples include California’s Proposition Two: Standards for
Confining Farm Animals (passed in 2008) and Proposition 37: Mandatory Labeling of Genetically Engineered Food (failed in 2012). These two cases demonstrate the California public does have an opinion about agricultural practices, whether they understand the issues or not. The public is being asked to participate in decisions that greatly impact California agriculture production, so it is critical that messages are effectively shared.

As consumers are looking to connect with producers, more producers are starting to reach out to consumers as well. More farmers, ranchers and agricultural advocates are attempting to connect with consumers through campaigns like “Know a California Farmer” and “I Love Farmers…They Feed My Soul.” The agriculture industry is beginning to see they need to communicate their message and are looking for alumni who can do that. Additional groups include the AgChat Foundation founded in 2010, Farmers Fight founded in 2011 and the U.S. Farmer and Rancher Alliance founded in 2010.

These are all reasons for the growing field of agricultural communication, which includes lobbying, law, marketing, public relations, journalism and advertising. Agricultural communication was important when Jim Brock founded the Brock Center in 1986 and arguably, the need for agricultural communication is now at an all-time high.

The Cal Poly Agricultural Communication Program

Cal Poly began teaching agricultural journalism in 1977 through the College of Liberal Arts (Course Catalog, 1977-79). The program has since moved to the College of Agricultural Food & Environmental Sciences. The curriculum has shifted over the years and has grown to encompass other aspects of communication beyond journalism. In
2011, Agricultural Communication became a new major, where it had previously only been a minor. The creation of the new major will continue to help draw more students to the growing program. Today the Cal Poly Agricultural Communication program has enrollment of 111 freshmen students for Fall 2013 compared to 60 in Fall 2012. The Cal Poly Agricultural Communication program is unique in having an endowed center like the Brock Center to supplement its curriculum and coursework.

    Cal Poly became a chartered member of the National Agricultural Communicators of Tomorrow (ACT) organization in 1977. “The mission of National ACT is to build relationships among agricultural communication professionals and college students and faculty, to provide professional and academic development for members and promote agriculture through communication efforts,” (NACT, 2012). Members of the Cal Poly ACT Chapter travel to the Ag Media Summit each summer and to the Professional Development conference in the winter. Cal Poly ACT members also submit photography, writing and other works to the annual National ACT Critique & Contest in order to receive professional feedback and national recognition.

**The Brock Center for Agricultural Communication**

    The Brock Center for Agricultural Communication was founded in 1986, through the generosity of Jim and Martha Brock. The Brock Center serves as workplace for students to practice real-world skills in agricultural communication. “The center's operations are funded by resources from a $1.5 million trust established by the Brocks” (Brock Center Website, 2012).
Mission

“The mission of the Center, which carries the name of benefactors James and Martha Brock, is to create a bridge of communication among the agricultural industry, the media and the public. As a facilitator of this essential dialogue, the Center draws directly on the technical expertise of the College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences and the academic resources of the College of Liberal Arts. The Brock Center's prime focus is on the preparation of the professional communicators for California’s agriculture industry.” (Article II, Section A, Bylaws, 1992)

Bylaws

The current bylaws require the Brock Center to have an Advisory Board. Article V outlines the role, functions and composition of the board:

“The Center Advisory Board shall advise the college deans and the Center Director on major policy, plans and activities of the Center, and may assist in resource development and interaction with Support Associates. The board shall also serve as a consultative committee in the selection of a Center Director. The Center Advisory Board shall be composed of seven voting members: the Director as board chairperson; and six members chosen on equal basis by the deans of the colleges of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences and Liberal Arts. Members appointed by the deans shall serve staggered three-year terms. The Center Advisory Board shall meet at least once each year. Board meetings shall be held under guidelines adopted by the Board. A majority of the members
constitute a quorum. Supporting Associates may attend and participate in board meetings as non-voting members.”

**Current Activity**

One of the main functions of the current Brock Center is producing the *Ag Circle* magazine three times annually. The first issue of *Ag Circle* is dated November 17, 1978, which is before the Brock Center was founded in 1986. Historically, the Brock Center has pursued its goal by hosting forums and other events to bring awareness to agricultural issues. The Brock Center continues to do this today. The Center hosted a water issue forum and a motivational speaker in 2012. The Brock Center held a forum on February 27, 2013, in which panelists discussed meeting the standards of sustainable produce and dairy policy.

In addition to these activities, the Brock Center has continued to evolve and expand its outreach through video and social media. The Brock Center started a blog in December 2011 in order to increase the opportunity for students to share stories and discuss issues and ideas. The author presented information about the blog at the Association of American Agricultural Editors Association (AAAE) conference on May 21, 2013. The Brock Center hopes to continue to expand and improve in the areas of multimedia communication and web presence and present its work and findings at future conferences.

**Brock Center Advisory Council**

The Brock Center has benefited from both policy and industry advisory councils in the past. The roles of these councils have evolved with the needs of the Cal Poly
Agricultural Communication program and have responded to faculty and curriculum changes in both CAFES and CLA.

The structure and emphasis of the Brock Center Advisory Board and its role has shifted over the years. The most recent accomplishment of the board was laying the foundation to offer Agricultural Communication as a major. This process finally came to a completion in winter of 2011, when the new major became available to students; however, there was no Brock Center Advisory Board in place at that time.

Past Director, Richard Gearhart made a note in 2008 that, “The latest recorded meeting minutes of the Brock Center Advisory Board are dated October 20, 2000 and the group was working off the proposed Brock Center for Agricultural Communication Management Plan dated June 17, 1999 and drafted by College of Agriculture Dean Joseph Jen.” The management plan included an Industry Advisory Council, recommended by the Center Director. The proposed board was to consist of “members of the media and agricultural industry who have a strong interest in assisting the Center to efficiently perform its function.” The foundation was created for the council, but the involvement of its members has decreased. The Brock Advisory Council has now completely dissolved. Instead, the Brock Center has relied on a sub-committee of the Ag Ed & Com Department Advisory Council to provide guidance to the Director.

Current Need

The Brock Center needs an Advisory Board in order to fulfill the requirements of its bylaws and to continue to advance its role in “bridging the gap between the agriculture industry, the media and the public.” Current Cal Poly Agricultural Communication
Professor and Past Director, Dr. J. Scott Vernon said, “I think an industry advisory committee is critical to our success in remaining current, timely and relevant in agricultural communication.”

Additionally, recreating the Advisory Board in the manner dictated in the bylaws has potential to help the Brock Center to reconnect with both CAFES and CLA and increase effective collaboration. The Cal Poly CLA website notes the college has “a wider and somewhat uncommon opportunity to collaborate with multiple polytechnic disciplines.” According to the Brock Center bylaws, “the Center draws from the technical expertise of the College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences and the academic resources of the College of Liberal Arts.”

**Past Director, Jim Hayes**

The author and Current Director, Megan Silcott met with Founding Director, Jim Hayes on December 5, 2012 to gather information about the Brock Center’s history, to discuss its current status and to collect recommendations for the future. Jim Hayes provided recommendations for potential Brock Center Advisory Board members, concerns and reflections from the Brock Center’s past, and advice for moving forward.

Hayes made the following recommendations:

1. Reestablish a Brock Center Advisory Board of industry leaders who can help guide the Brock Center in both public relations and journalism efforts.

2. Increase outreach to the broader community; have an impact.

3. Conduct meaningful research and disseminate research to the public; have stature in the academic community.
4. Have a large impact; publicize the Brock Center itself.

5. Create an agreement between the two departments.

6. Clean up the website to make it more effective and a better representation of the Brock Center. (The Brock Center website was updated in Spring 2013.)

Full excerpts from the interview can be found in the Appendix.
Chapter 3: Materials and Methods

September 2012:

Author enrolled in AGED 460 and began the process of choosing senior project topic. After talking with Megan Silcott, Current Director of the Brock Center for Agricultural Communication, the author saw a need to evaluate the history, purpose and current status of the Brock Center in order to reevaluate its current progress and management. The author also saw a need to reconnect the Brock Center with industry professionals, who can provide feedback, suggestions and support.

October 2012:

The author conducted a Literature Review by looking through documents at the Brock Center. The author reviewed the bylaws along with past meeting agendas and notes. The center’s donor, Jim Brock wrote a book titled, In Fond Remembrance, which was also reviewed in order to get a sense of the center’s purpose and function when it was first established. Additional materials examined and observed include: the Cal Poly course catalog, articles from current events in the agriculture industry, the National Agricultural Communicators of Tomorrow organization, the Brock Center website and current Brock Center practices. The author also briefly discussed the history of the Brock Center with Dr. J. Scott Vernon, Richard Gearhart and Megan Silcott. The author conducted approximately 20 hours of research.
November 2012:

The author wrote Chapter One of the senior project. Using information from Chapter Two, the author was able to define five original objectives for the project, which were later revised.

These objectives were:

1. To research the background and history of past advisory boards
   a.) Past minutes
   b.) Bylaws
   c.) Personal interview with current and retired faculty

2. To evaluate what it would take to meet the requirements of the current bylaws

3. To develop a plan to revive the Brock Center Advisory Board

4. To contact potential board members and invite them to serve

5. Help create agenda items for the first meeting of the Advisory Board
November 10, 2012:

The author “friend requested” founding Brock Center Director, Jim Hayes on Facebook to begin dialogue with him and to set up a time to meet in person.

December 5, 2012:

The author and Current Director, Megan Silcott met with Jim Hayes to gather information about the Brock Center’s history, to discuss its current status and to collect recommendations for the future. The interview was voice recorded. See excerpts from interview in the Appendix.

January 31, 2013:

The author attended the annual Ag Ed & Com Department Advisory Council Meeting as a Student Representative. The author was able to see how the council currently functions. The author also participated in discussions and proposed the possibility of forming a separate Advisory Board for the Brock Center. See the Appendix for meeting minutes.

April 3, 2013:

The author developed a 15-question Survey Monkey online survey. The survey is titled Brock Center Feedback & Suggestions and it is designed to gather input from current students, alumni, Cal Poly faculty, other university faculty, advisory council members and other specific parties. The Brock Center Feedback and Suggestion survey is hosted on the Brock Center’s Survey Monkey account. The Brock Center upgraded to a Select Survey Monkey account in order to send surveys longer than ten questions and have more access to
the data collected. The author gathered feedback from the Current Director and made edits to the questions. The survey is organized into sections: You, Magazine and Blog, Workshops and Discussion Forums, Branding, Advertising & Reach, and Additional Comments and Suggestions. See Appendix to view the actual survey.

**April 5, 2013:**

The author compiled a list of all past *Ag Circle* editors and Brock Center Student Associates, organized by year. See Appendix. The author found this information by looking through all past issues of *Ag Circle* magazine, stored in the Brock Center.

**April 7, 2013:**

The author emailed Dr. J. Scott Vernon, Richard Gearhart and Megan Silcott with a list of all past *Ag Circle* editors and Brock Center Student Associates. The author asked for help gathering contact information for the past associates, in order to create a database. The database could be used to send Brock Center Feedback & Suggestions.

**April 8-12, 2013:**

The author received contact information for past Brock Center Associates. The author organized the contact information into an excel sheet. The excel sheet is still missing contact information for 37 of the 58 past Brock Center Associates.
April 10, 2013:

The author met with Past Director and current Journalism Professor, Richard Gearhart. The author discussed the current status of the project in order to gather feedback. The author showed Gearhart the Brock Center Feedback & Suggestions survey. Gearhart suggested not sending the survey out at this time and focusing the project more on reviewing the bylaws, discussing strategies to comply with the bylaws and creating a plan for future action. The survey can be sent out at a later date. Gearhart also suggested reviewing the Brock Center’s original charter, in addition to its current bylaws.

April 10, 2013:

The author met with Current Director, Megan Silcott. Silcott emailed Johannah Varland at the Cal Poly Corporation to request a copy of the original charter. Varland replied the same day with a scanned copy of the original proposal for the center, the original charter, past bylaws, memorandums regarding changes made to the past bylaws and the current bylaws. See Appendix for the documents.

April 12, 2013:

The author created a matrix comparing each sentence of the bylaws’ requirements regarding the Advisory Board with current practices using the Ag Ed & Ag Com Department Advisory Council.
April 15, 2013:

The author transcribed notes from the meeting with Jim Hayes. See Appendix for excerpts from the meeting.

April 17, 2013:

The author received feedback from Dr. J. Scott Vernon, Dr. Kellogg and Megan Silcott regarding the Current Brock Center Practices section of the Review of Bylaws Article V: Advisory Board and Current Practices matrix. The author used the feedback to make edits and prepare for a meeting.

April 19, 2013:

The author and Director collaborated to send an email inviting Dean Doug Epperson of CLA, Dean David Wehner of CAFES, Mary Glick, Journalism Department Head and Dr. William Kellogg, Ag Ed & Com Department Head to a meeting discussing the Center's Advisory Board and mission. The author was able to schedule a meeting with all available to attend but Dr. Kellogg.

May 17, 2013:

The author and Current Director met with Dean Doug Epperson of the CLA, Dean David Wehner of CAFES, and Mary Glick, Journalism Department Head. The author showed attendees the matrix she created to Review of Bylaws Article V: Advisory Board and Current Procedures. (See Chapter Four.) The author and Current Director led a discussion
and took notes from the attendees’ thoughts as to current action to be taken between the two colleges.

May 21-24, 2013:

The author attended the Association of American Agricultural Educators (AAAE) annual conference in Columbus, Ohio. The conference gave the author a greater perspective of how other university agricultural communication programs are evolving to meet industry needs and keep their programs current. This gave the author a greater confidence that having an Advisory Board solely focused on overseeing the Brock Center and providing support would be beneficial because there is much area for growth, improvement and research opportunities.

May 28, 2013:

The author met with CAFES Associate Dean of Undergraduate Programs, Richard Cavaletto. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the Open House magazine, in which the author served as Editor-in-Chief, while also serving as Editor-in-Chief for the Brock Center. The author suggested to Associate Dean Cavaletto that the Brock Center have a more limited role in producing the PolyCulture, the Open House magazine in the future. The author explained the Brock Center’s mission does not directly align with promoting CAFES through publications like the Open House magazine. The author further commented that saving time dedicated to the Open House publication would allow the Brock Center Student Associates and Director more time for outreach projects that enable the center to better “create a bridge of communication among the agricultural industry, the media and the public.”
May 29, 2013:

The author made revisions to Chapters 1 and 2. Most significantly, the author revised the project objectives located in Chapter 1. The objectives now are defined as:

1. To research the background and history of the Brock Center
2. To develop a strategy to best help the Brock Center move forward and realign with its mission, specifically with the Advisory Board
3. Meeting with faculty and administrators and including their recommendations to reestablish the Advisory Board
4. To create a list of specific recommendations for the Brock Center to move forward
Chapter 4: Results

Recommendations for Changes in Current Procedures

The result of this project is a collection of several recommendations from current faculty, retired faculty, current administrators and the author.

Advisory Council Suggestions

From attending and participating in the 2013 Ag Ed & Com Department Advisory Council annual meeting, the author has the following recommendations for a new Advisory Board:

- Discuss specific plans for making changes to realign with bylaws
- Provide feedback and recommendations on magazine content and layout
- Discuss and analyze only the Brock Center, which, enables the Ag Ed & Com Department Advisory Council sub-committee to focus on discussing the Agricultural Communication curriculum
- Inform members of the Brock Center’s history and current practices
- Gain industry support in expanding the role of the Brock Center
- Help the Brock Center become a resource hub for the industry to offer profitable projects (becoming more sustainable, project generation)
- Gather industry feedback about technology and editing processes applied
- Discuss the role of the Director and provide Director with guidance

See Appendix for minutes from the annual Ag Ed & Com Department Advisory Council Meeting on January 31, 2013.
Bylaw Review

After a thorough review of the Advisory Board section of the Brock Center bylaws, it seems that most of the requirements outlined are met or partially met by the current council. However, not all current procedures follow important guidelines with the same original intent. See matrix on page 27.

The matrix was reviewed at a meeting with the Journalism Department Heads and Deans of the CAFES and CLA on Friday May 17, 2013. The following recommendations were made:

• **CAFES Dean David Wehner**- Wehner noted that since Agricultural Communication has become a major, the number of students enrolled has grown. There are a historically high number of students today. Reestablishing a council focused only on the Brock Center would allow the Ag Ed & Com Department Advisory Council to focus more on issues with curriculum and other aspects of the growing program.

  Wehner also suggested the Brock Center have a role in creating newsletters for each department. This led to a discussion regarding the Brock Center’s mission, which does not directly include promoting CAFES. Then, Dean Epperson suggested a potential solution in having the Brock Center serve as a “resource hub” for project photographers, videographers, writers, designers and editors.
• **CLA Dean Douglas Epperson**-
  “The Brock Center is an opportunity to create more collaboration between the two colleges. … I am willing to do what it takes to promote collaboration.” Epperson provided an example that risk communication has recently become an area of collaboration between the CLA and the College of Science and Math. Epperson values the relationship between CLA and CAFES and would like to strengthen that relationship through the Brock Center. “We are at a point now where we can revision and repurpose,” Epperson said.

• **Journalism Department Head Mary Glick**-
  Glick joined Cal Poly as the Journalism Department Head in September 2012. Glick has learned much about the Brock Center in the past few months and was interested to learn more. She noted that reestablishing a Brock Center Advisory Board would be helpful in generating revenue to ensure the center is self-sustaining.

Ag Ed & Com Department Head, Bill Kellogg was not present at the meeting, but made the following recommendations at a separate meeting on June 3, 2013.

• **Ag Ed & Com Department Head Bill Kellogg**-
  Dr. Kellogg said he supports reestablishing the Brock Center Advisory Council and has personally served on the council in the past. “I’ve been involved with the Brock Center since I first came here in 1983,” Kellogg said. He believes the
council should consist of industry professionals who can provide guidance, direction and support.

The first step is for the Journalism and Ag Ed & Com Department to make recommendations for members and to present them to the college deans for approval, Kellogg said. Upon approval from the colleges, the Advisory Board member recommendations will be presented to the University President for endorsement. Dr. Kellogg met with the Agricultural Communication faculty the same day to begin discussing member recommendations. He said he would offer to help Mary Glick make member recommendations for the Journalism Department, if she needs help. Kellogg hopes the Advisory Board will be able to provide recommendations for Director qualifications, support for future community forums and long-term direction.

**Dean and Department Head Meeting Conclusion**

In conclusion, the following recommendation was made from meeting with the Deans and Department Heads:

The Brock Center should reestablish its own Advisory Board through collaboration between the CLA and CAFES. The board members may overlap with the Ag Ed & Com Department Advisory Council in some cases. The important difference is that the Brock Center Advisory Board will be focused directly on the center, which will allow for growth. The Ag Ed & Com Department and Journalism Departments will need to begin the process of reestablishing the Advisory Board by making recommendations for members.
Goals for the Brock Center Advisory Council

• Increase Collaboration between CLA and CAFES

A Brock Center Advisory Council can find ways to increase collaboration between the CLA and CAFES. One way to generate ideas on how to do this is to examine other Agricultural Communication programs across the nation and how they collaborate with their Journalism program.

• Define strategies to be used by the Brock Center

A Brock Center Advisory Council can develop and define strategies for the Brock Center regarding: industry research, magazines production, blog management, outreach activities, discussion forums and special projects for private entities, non-profit organizations and Cal Poly.
Chapter 5: Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

Summary

The Brock Center mission is to “create a bridge of communication among the agricultural industry, the media and the public.” The Brock Center has evolved throughout its history at Cal Poly in response to curriculum, faculty and industry changes. Continuous changes in curriculum, faculty and industry create a need to constantly reevaluate the center’s activities and accomplishments to ensure the center stays true to its mission. The best way to ensure constant evaluation and support for the Brock Center is to reestablish the Brock Center Advisory Council.

Conclusions

This report provides background regarding the importance of Agricultural Communication education, the significance of the Brock Center’s mission and the current status of the Brock Center.

Furthermore, this report is a collection of historic documents, notes and other resources. The Current Director can use this report to guide in creating a Brock Center Advisory Council. The reestablished Brock Center Advisory Board can use this report to guide them in evaluating and supporting the Brock Center. The reestablishment of the Brock Center Advisory Board (created through collaboration of the CLA and CAFES) will help the Brock Center to reach its mission. The Brock Center Advisory Board can develop and define strategies to for the Brock Center regarding: industry research, magazine production, blog management, outreach activities, discussion forums and special projects.
The Brock Center Advisory Council can find ways to increase collaboration between the CLA and CAFES. The Brock Center Advisory Council can help define the Director’s role. Finally, the Brock Center Advisory Council can find ways to increase financial revenue and work towards sustainability.

**Recommendations**

The author recommends that the Department Heads and Deans collaborate to form a new Brock Center Advisory Board immediately. The Agricultural Communication program should complete another evaluation of this nature every five years. The purpose of conducting this review again would be to compare the history and mission of the Brock Center with current practices to ensure the Brock Center stays true to its mission and provides students an even greater opportunity for learning. The author recommends using the same strategy to check bylaw requirements against current practices as part of the review process. Additionally, a second review should focus on more sections of the bylaws that have not yet been thoroughly reviewed.

Finally, the author recommends the Brock Center send out the Brock Center Feedback & Suggestions survey to gather feedback for the reestablished Brock Center Advisory Council to review and address at its first meeting.

The recommendations collected in this report will help to reestablish the Brock Center Advisory Council and ensure constant evaluation and support. The ultimate goal of this report is to hold the Brock Center accountable to maintaining its mission, keeping up with industry issues and reaching its full potential in bridging the gap between the agricultural industry, the media and the public.
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Brock Center Current Bylaws

Note: Sections specifically addressed in this report are highlighted.

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
BROCK CENTER FOR AGRICULTURAL COMMUNICATION
BYLAWS

The bylaws of the Brock Center for Agricultural Communication are operative within policy established by the Board of Trustees of The California State University and California Polytechnic State University.

Article I

NAME

The name of this organization shall be: The Brock Center for Agricultural Communication and is referred to in these bylaws as the Center.

Article II

MISSION & AUTHORITY

Section A. Mission

The mission of the Center, which carries the name of benefactors James and Martha Brock, is to create a bridge of communication among the agricultural industry, the media and the public. As a facilitator of this essential dialogue, the Center draws directly on the technical expertise of the College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences and the academic resources of the College of Liberal Arts. The Brock Center's prime focus is on the preparation of the professional communicators for California’s agriculture industry.

Section B. Authority

The Center was established by the university under campus administrative manual policy and practices. Its designation recognizes that the Center is one of those areas of
excellence in the university in which the application of knowledge requires special interdisciplinary effort. Such designation also indicates that the Center has the support of the entire academic community.

Article III
ASSOCIATIONS WITH CENTER

Section A. Center Associates

Employees and students of the university are eligible to be Center Associates under guidelines set by the Center Director in consultation with the Advisory Board.

Section B. Support Associates

Individuals, groups, associations, and public and private business entities actively involved with the Center are eligible to be Center Support Associates under guidelines set by the Center director in consultation with the Advisory Board.

Associates are encouraged to be active in the Center through program/project involvement and resource development efforts.

Article IV
ADMINISTRATION

Section A. Center Director

Management of the Center shall be the responsibility of a director, who shall have faculty rank within the College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences or the College of Liberal Arts, together with the education, experience and skill requirements determined by the Advisory Board.

The Center Director is responsible for:

1. providing administrative support for the overall daily operation of the Center;
2. planning, monitoring and accounting of the Center budget;
3. preparing and submitting annual and other required reports to the university; and
4. serving as an agricultural industry liaison.

The director is appointed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and reports to the deans of the colleges of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences and Liberal Arts. Major policy or program matters may be referred to the University Vice President for Academic Affairs.
Section B. Center Staff

The Center may engage center staff on a volunteer, consultant or employment basis to perform Center tasks, consistent with authorized projects and budgets.

Article V

ADVISORY BOARD

Section A. Role and Functions

The Center Advisory Board shall advise the college deans and the Center director on major policy, plans and activities of the Center, and may assist in resource development and interaction with Support Associates. The board shall also serve as a consultative committee in the selection of a Center Director.

Section B. Composition

The Center Advisory Board shall be composed of seven voting members: the director as board chairperson; and six members chosen on equal basis by the deans of the colleges of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences and Liberal Arts. Members appointed by the deans shall serve staggered three year terms. The Center Advisory Board shall meet at least once each year. Board meetings shall be held under guidelines adopted by the Board. A majority of the members constitute a quorum. Supporting Associates may attend and participate in board meetings as non-voting members.

Article VI

FISCAL AFFAIRS

Section A. Fiscal Year

The Center fiscal year shall be that of the Cal Poly Foundation.

Section B. Accounts and Audit

Center financial records shall follow University and Foundation budget accounting and audit practices.
MISCELLANEOUS

Section A. Dissolution

Upon dissolution, Center assets net of obligation shall be held in trust by the Foundation for the University

Section B. Amendments

Amendments to these Bylaws may be recommended to the university by the director or upon a two-thirds affirmative vote of the Advisory Board.

APPROVED:_______________________________________

for University

Effective Date: ______________________________________

RECOMMENDED BY:

_______________________________________
Director

_______________________________________
Advisory Board
Brock Center Original Charter and Amendments

California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo

MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 1, 1993
TO: Brock Board
FROM: Phillip M. Doub
SUBJECT: Fundraising

We have repackaged a marketing plan prepared for the Brock Center three years ago as follows:

TARGET MARKET:
To reach potential donors: 50 firms each in the Salinas, San Joaquin, and Imperial Valleys, and 50 firms in other areas of California. The ideal donor to the Brock Center has an annual gross income of over $500,000 and is involved in the production, distribution and shipping of fresh fruits, vegetables, and nuts.

OBJECTIVES:
- To increase awareness of the Brock Center in the produce industry from 12% to 50% by June 30, 1994.
- To obtain $50,000 worth of donations for the Brock Center by June 30, 1994.
- To obtain an additional $50,000 worth of donations by June 30, 1995.

STRATEGIC ACTION PLAN:

June 1993
- Hire a public relations firm to manage the campaign. Select a geographic area and plan a coordinated program of mailings, telephoning, and personal visits.
- Develop a list of Brock Center graduates located in the different geographic areas who will help with personal visits. Recruit two to three students who can also help with personal visits.
- Reserve space at the Western Growers Association and Produce Manufacturing Association conventions. Prepare a booth and identify personnel who will staff it.

September, 1993
- Begin campaign in the first geographic area.
- Every four months thereafter, begin in the next geographic area.

MESSAGE:
Our message is very simply what we have already done with the Food Safety Conference for Food Editors and the then annual Food Writing Awards. We are involved in Agricultural Communications and we will be represented by our product. Brock graduates and current students. If necessary, after the visit by students, administration and faculty can be used. The people we contact will need to be closely coordinated with departmental, college, and university fundraising efforts.

BUDGET:

July–October
Public Relations firm 100 hours at $50 per hour $5,000
Travel, telephone, and postage 2,000
Prepare booth 500

$7,500
BROCK CENTER FOR AGRICULTURAL COMMUNICATION
Policy Advisory Council

Wednesday, June 2, 1993
8:00 a.m.
Agricultural Building Room 241

Minutes

Members Present:  KAMM, AMARAL, DINGUS, DOUB, PAHS, KELLOGG
(8:12), HAVANAJIAN (8:22), LONG (8:20)

Guests Present:  [PROUT]

The Interim Director called the meeting to order at 8:10 a.m.
on Wednesday, June 2, 1993, in the Agricultural Erhart Building,
Room 241.

1. 1993-94 BUDGET AND RELATED ISSUES:
   Mr. Amaral provided members with handouts detailing the
   Brock Center budget status at May 31, 1993; a projection of
   budgeted expenses/revenue through June 30, 1993 contrasted
   with the approved budget for this year; and a proposed
   1993/94 budget for next year.

   Mr. Kamm noted that he had included $7,500 in the budget for
   the Marilyn Dome project and it was understood that the
   projected budget need for 1993/94 was a minimum resource
   need without benefit of knowing how the directorship would
   be actually managed next year.

   Discussion covered aspects of the budget, status of
   available cash, need for fund raising and the key aspects of
   the Dome proposal.

   Kellogg/Amaral MPU:
   Approved Phil Doub to contact Marilyn Dome to put together
   her proposal outlining a plan design to raise dollars to
   support the Brock Center for a maximum fee of $7,500.  Phil
   Doub to be liaison contact for the committee.

   Amaral/Dingus MPU:
   Approve the 1993/94 budget and recommend its adoption to the
   Deans of the College of Agriculture and the College of
   Liberal Arts.

2. BYLAWS REVISION:
   Ms. Long introduced the subject, briefly reviewing the
   history of this project.

   Considerable discussion ensued concerning the role of the
   Department Head in Journalism and the need for him/her to be
   specifically consulted in naming the Director of the Brock
   Center.
Members were asked to address any comments to Ms. Long and she would recirculate a revised copy of the bylaws addressing that issue.

Doubt/Amaral MPU:
Tentatively approve the bylaws as modified in the discussion. Barring any objection to the recirculated format, the bylaws would stand approved.

3. ADJOURNMENT:

No further business, Mr. Kamm adjourned the meeting.

Acting Secretary,

[Signature]

AL AMARAL

C: J. Jen
H. Sharp
TO: MEMBERS OF POLICY ADVISORY COUNCIL,
BROCK CENTER FOR AGRICULTURAL COMMUNICATION:
FROM: Herb Kamm, interim director, Brock Center
SUBJECT: Meeting of Policy Advisory Council

A meeting of the Policy Advisory Council of the Brock Center has been scheduled for Wednesday, June 2, from 9 a.m. to 10 a.m. in the Conference Room (241) of the Agriculture Building (#10).

The major agenda items will be:
- Fund-raising for the Brock Center
- Revision of the Center's bylaws

Your attendance is earnestly requested.

ML. Amaral - H. Kamm has changed the meeting to 8am
MEMORANDUM

To:        Brock Center for Agricultural Communication Advisory Board

From:      Bylaws Committee - Diane Long
           Bill Kellogg

Date:      May 20, 1992

File:      SPN-0

Copies:    Hayes/Sabol/Ribeau

Subject:   PROPOSED REVISIONS TO CENTER BYLAWS

The Bylaws Committee was charged with reviewing the present Bylaws (circa 1986), and proposing revisions, particularly with regard to Article IV - Administration, Section 1 - Director, to add an appropriate succession provision therein for the Center Director.

The committee met twice in April and decided upon a number of revisions that could strengthen the document and refine the structure of the Center. A number of cosmetic changes are proposed, none of which are substantive in nature.

The committee will present the proposed revisions at the June 4 meeting of the Advisory Board. This memorandum highlights the major changes.

Article II. This article has been restructured to restate the Center's mission and the authority for its existence.

Article III. The former article expressed a structure of membership by classes (faculty, staff, and students), and external associates. It is proposed that a more simplified "associates" structure be adopted, with details to be left to the Advisory Board to adopt. Under the proposed membership structure, there would be two classes of Center associates.

Article IV. The "Administration" provision has been rewritten to state the essential director qualifications, selection process, and responsibility and duties (Section 1), and how the Center is to be staffed (Section 2). Considerable detail has been deleted as being unnecessary, obsolete, or causing inflexibility.

Article V. This article reorganizes and simplifies previous provisions, and eliminates unnecessary detail. The Board size is retained at seven, but the director serves as a Board member and chair. Each dean makes three appointments to the Board.

Article VI. This article sets up an external advisory entity (council) composed of supporting associates and assigns a role now filled informally by the "Center consultants".
BROCK CENTER FOR AGRICULTURAL COMMUNICATION

BYLAWS

The Bylaws of the Brock Center for Agricultural Communication are operative within policy established by the Board of Trustees of The California State University and California Polytechnic State University. 

Article I

NAME

The name of this organization shall be: Brock Center for Agricultural Communication and is referred to in these Bylaws as the Center.

Article II

MISSION & AUTHORITY

Section A. Mission

The mission of the Center, which carries the name of benefactors James and Martha Brock, is to facilitate communication between the producers of food and fiber and the public. As a facilitator of this essential dialogue, the Center draws directly on the technical expertise of the School of Agriculture and the academic resources of the School of Liberal Arts. The Brock Center's prime focus is on the preparation of the professional communicators for California, where agriculture is the No. 1 industry; but the Center remains the only program of its kind in 12 Western states.

Section B. Authority

The Center was established by the University under Campus Administrative Manual policy and practices. Its designation recognizes that the Center is one of those areas of excellence in the diversity in which the application of knowledge requires special interdisciplinary effort. Such designation also indicates that the Center has the support of the entire academic community.
Article III
ASSOCIATIONS WITH CENTER

Section A. Center Associates

Employees and students of the University are eligible to be Center Associates under guidelines set by the Center director in consultation with the Center Advisory Board.

Section B. Support Associates

Individuals, groups, associations, and public and private business entities actively involved with the Center are eligible to be Center Support Associates under guidelines set by the Center director in consultation with the Center Advisory Board.

Associates are encouraged to be active in the Center through program/project involvement and resource development efforts.

Article IV
ADMINISTRATION

Section A. Center Director

Management of the Center shall be the responsibility of a director, who shall have faculty rank within the schools of Agriculture or Liberal Arts, together with the education, experience and skills requirements determined by the Advisory Board.

The duties of the Center director include:

1. Represent the Advisory Board and Support Associates' interests;

2. Represent the Center to the University and in external relationships with the Center;

3. Prepare and submit annual and other required reports to the University and to Center Associates; and
4. Provide administrative support for Center activities.

The director is appointed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and reports to the deans of the schools of Agriculture and Liberal Arts. Major policy or program matters may be referred to the University Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Section B. Center Staff

The Center may engage Center staff on a volunteer, consultant, or employment basis to perform Center tasks, consistent with authorized projects and budgets.

Article V
ADVISORY BOARD

Section A. Role and Functions

The Center Advisory Board shall advise the school deans and the Center directors on major policy, plans, and activities of the Center, and may assist in resource development and interaction with Support Associates. The Board shall also serve as a consultative committee in the selection of a Center director.

Section B. Composition

The Center Advisory Board shall be composed of seven voting members: the director as Board chairperson; and six members chosen on equal basis by the school deans from the faculty of the schools of Agriculture and Liberal Arts. Members appointed by the deans shall serve staggered three year terms.

The Center Advisory Board shall meet at least three times each year. Board meetings shall be held under guidelines adopted by the Board. A majority of the members constitute a quorum.

Supporting Associates may attend and participate in Board meetings as non-voting members.
Article VI
SUPPORTING ASSOCIATES COUNCIL

Section A. Role and Function

The Center director may organize and develop a council of Supporting Associates. The council shall assist the Center with resource development, long-range planning and agricultural community interaction.

Section B. Membership and Meetings

The Center director shall appoint Support Associates to the council. Council meetings shall be held at the call of the Center director.

Article VII
FISCAL AFFAIRS

Section A. Fiscal Year

The Center fiscal year shall be that of the Cal Poly Foundation.

Center financial records shall follow University and Foundation budget accounting and audit practices.

Article VIII
MISCELLANEOUS

Section A. Dissolution

Upon dissolution, Center assets net of obligation shall be held in trust by the Foundation for the University.

Section B. Amendments

Amendments to these Bylaws may be recommended to the University by the director or upon a two-thirds affirmative vote of the Advisory Board.
Memorandum

To: Warren J. Baker
   President

From: Malcolm W. Wilson
   Vice President for Academic Affairs

Subject: FORMAL ESTABLISHMENT OF THE BROCK CENTER FOR AGRICULTURAL COMMUNICATION

I am forwarding to you for formal approval a proposal for the establishment of the Brock Center for Agricultural Communication at Cal Poly. The proposal includes a description of the center, a set of bylaws, budget information for the current year, and assigned time for the director, Dr. James H. Hayes.

I believe the Agricultural Communication Center will serve Cal Poly well and I recommend your approval.

Approved:

Warren J. Baker
President

encl: Center Proposal and Bylaws
BYLAWS OF THE CAL POLY
BROCK CENTER FOR AGRICULTURAL COMMUNICATION
California Polytechnic State University

These bylaws are applicable within the authorization established by
the Board of Trustees of The California State University and the
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo.

ARTICLE I - NAME

The name of this organization shall be the Brock Center for
Agricultural Communication, referred to in these bylaws as the
Center.

ARTICLE II - PURPOSE AND POLICIES

Section 1 - Purposes

The primary purpose of the Center will be to support the multi-
disciplinary needs for education and applied research in
agricultural communication. The Center will foster interaction
between the University and all facets of the agricultural
community, consistent with the overall goals of Cal Poly.

Center members are faculty, support staff and students who have a
declared interest in agricultural communication and related
activities at Cal Poly.

Center associates are members of the agricultural community and
others who have a declared interest in agricultural communication
and related activities at Cal Poly and who have contributed to the
program of the Center through personal involvement, endorsement,
sponsorship and/or support.

The Center will serve as a vehicle for securing endorsement,
sponsorship and/or support to sustain agricultural communication-
related projects at the Center.

The Center will be financed primarily by grants, gifts and
contributions.

Section 2 - Policies

The policies of the Center shall be in harmony with the policies of
The California State University, the California Polytechnic State
University, San Luis Obispo, and the California Polytechnic State
University Foundation.
Section 3 - Dissolution

In the event the Center is dissolved, its assets remaining after payment of, or provision for, all debts and liabilities shall be distributed to the California Polytechnic State University Foundation in trust for the University.

ARTICLE III - MEMBERSHIP

Section 1 - Classes of Membership and Association

Only faculty, staff, and students of the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, and the California Polytechnic State University Foundation shall be members of the Center. The membership is defined as follows:

a. Faculty

Faculty members are those persons appointed by the University to faculty rank who elect to become members of the Center.

b. Staff

Staff members are those persons choosing to become Center members who serve the University or the Foundation in instruction or non-instructional capacities. Staff members have University or Foundation affiliation.

c. Students

Student members are those persons engaged in study at the University on either a full-time or part-time basis who elect to become Center members.

Section 2 - Admission to Membership

a. Eligibility

All interested faculty, staff, or students who desire can be associated with the Center.

b. Proposal of Members

Any member of the faculty or staff, or student engaged in any Center program may propose candidates for membership.
c. Acknowledgement of Membership

The Director of the Center shall acknowledge members, who will be identified by sequentially numbered membership cards signed by the Director and countersigned by an appropriate officer of the University.

Section 3 - Terms

The terms of members shall be indefinite, contingent on their involvement with the activities of the Center and determined by the Director.

Section 4 - Fees and Dues

There shall be no fees or dues paid by members.

Section 5 - Role of Members

Members are encouraged to participate in the activities of the Center. They may be involved in on-going programs, or may propose new programs to be implemented by the Center. If approved by the Advisory Board, these programs may receive Center support as necessary and feasible.

Members are expected to provide support to the programs of the Center and assist the Director in program development, fund raising and related activities.

Section 6 - Associates

a. Eligibility of Associates

Associates of the Brock Center for Agricultural Communication are individuals, groups, associations, corporations, private and public bodies who are related to the Center through personal involvement, endorsement, sponsorship or financial support.

b. Proposal of Associates

Any member of the Center may propose an individual, group, association, corporation or private or public body as an associate of the Center.

c. Acknowledgement of Associate Status

The Director of the Center shall acknowledge associates, who will be identified by sequentially numbered cards signed by the Director and countersigned by an appropriate officer of the University.
d. Terms of Associates

Terms of associates shall be determined by the Director.

e. Role of Associates

Associates are encouraged to participate in the activities of the Center. They may propose, and be involved in, Center programs. Associates are expected to support the programs of the Center and assist the Director in program development and fund raising.

ARTICLE IV - ADMINISTRATION

Section 1 - Director

The Center will be administered by a half-time director. The Director will be a faculty member who is appointed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs in consultation with the Deans of the School of Agriculture and the School of Liberal Arts, in consultation with the Journalism Department and the Policy Advisory Board of the Center. The nominal term of appointment is five (5) years. The appointment may be renewed at the discretion of the Dean and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The Director will serve on a released, assigned time or overtime basis, concurrently will hold a half-time teaching appointment in the Journalism Department and will be a member of the faculty of that department. The Director will report to the Deans of the School of Agriculture and the School of Liberal Arts through the Head/Chair of the Journalism Department. Any major policy or program consideration may be referred to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The Director will submit an annual report to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Deans of the School of Agriculture and School of Liberal Arts, financial supporters, the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies, Research and Faculty Development, the Head/Chair of the Journalism Department and the members of the Policy Advisory Board. The annual report will include a summary of:

(a) what was done
(b) who did it
(c) how it was financed
(d) future plans
ARTICLE V - POLICY ADVISORY BOARD AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The Policy Advisory Board of the Brock Center for Agricultural Communication is comprised of seven persons selected by the University to assist the Director in determining policy for the Center.

Six members of the Policy Advisory Board will be appointed by the Deans of the School of Agriculture and the School of Liberal Arts from nominations submitted by members through the Director. The Policy Advisory Board will include three members nominated from the faculties of departments in the School of Agriculture and three members nominated from faculties of departments in the School of Liberal Arts. Initial appointments of from one to three years may be used to stagger the committee membership, but nominal terms of office will be for three years. The Head/Chair of the Journalism Department or a designee will sit as a voting member of the Policy Advisory Board. The Policy Advisory Board will elect a chairperson from its members.

Section 2 - Powers and Duties

The Policy Advisory Board shall provide advice and comment on Center programs, shall engage in public relations and fund raising activities for Center programs, and shall provide overall guidance and direction to the Center.

Section 3 - Meetings

The Policy Advisory Board will meet at least five times a year to review Center programs and to provide general direction to the Center. The Policy Board may elect to meet for special purposes at any other times upon agreement of a majority of Board members.

Section 4 - Number Constituting a Quorum

A majority of members shall constitute a quorum.

Section 5 - The Director may appoint members or associates to an Advisory Committee to assist the Policy Advisory Board.

ARTICLE VI - FISCAL POLICIES

Section 1 - Fiscal Year

The fiscal year of the Center shall correspond to that of the Cal Poly Foundation.
Section 2 - Accounts and Audit

The books and accounts of the Center shall be kept by the Cal Poly Foundation in accordance with sound accounting practices, and shall be audited annually in accordance with Foundation policies.

Section 3 - Funding

Funding for the Center shall come from private sources, gifts, fees from Center conferences and workshops, and subscriptions to Center-generated publications.

ARTICLE VII - AMENDMENTS

These bylaws may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the members of the Policy Advisory Board present and voting at any regular or special meeting, provided that each member shall have received advance written notification of the proposed amendment. These bylaws also may be amended on recommendation of the Director, approved by the Head/Chair of the Journalism Department, the Deans of the School of Agriculture and the School of Liberal Arts and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
MEMORANDUM

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC
STATE UNIVERSITY
FOUNDATION
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

TO: Dr. Robert Lucas
Associate VP of Graduate Studies,
Research & Faculty Development

DATE: December 13, 1988

FROM: Thomas C. Davis
Sponsored Programs Administrator

FILE: 6004

GRADUATE STUDIES & RESEARCH

COPIES: J. Hayes
P. Schmidt
P 12/28

SUBJECT: Brock Center

We still have not received formal approval for the Brock Center, could you please let us know the status. We would like to transfer the funds in the originally established restricted gift account to the new center account as soon as approved.

Thank you.

Anne has been prepared to be sent
to the President. I believe we will have
his approval by the beginning of
next year.

ETC

12/14/88
California Polytechnic State University  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407  

BROCK CENTER FOR AGRICULTURAL COMMUNICATION  
RECOMMENDED BUDGET 1988-89  
(Account 6004)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Income</th>
<th>Recommended 1988-89</th>
<th>Estimated 1987-88</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance Forward</td>
<td>$44,480</td>
<td>$39,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Income</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL INCOME</strong></td>
<td><strong>96,230</strong></td>
<td><strong>61,578</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Proposed Endowment Account</td>
<td>&lt;25,000&gt;</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OPERATING INCOME</strong></td>
<td><strong>71,230</strong></td>
<td><strong>61,578</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LESS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1988-89</th>
<th>1987-88</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clerical Services</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Conference Honorariums</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies &amp; Materials</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel - Conference</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel - Development</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel - Director</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproduction Services</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Materials</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage - Program</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage - Development</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OPERATING EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td><strong>25,650</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,850</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Fee</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALANCE AT JUNE 30</strong></td>
<td><strong>$41,780</strong></td>
<td><strong>$44,473</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BROCK CENTER FOR AGRICULTURAL COMMUNICATION

Introduction

Communication has become a serious problem for agriculture, California's No. 1 industry and the foundation of the state's economy. As state Director of Food and Agriculture Jack Parnell put it recently in a statement to the Brock Center for Agricultural Communication:

The importance of California's agriculture needs to be emphasized and communicated to a public unaware of the vital role agriculture plays in our lives. Agriculture is the lubrication that keeps the state's economic wheels going and it's imperative to get that message across to our urban population. It is essential that those in agriculture show others how it contributes to our high standard of living. Our farmers and ranchers provide food at a price that allows us to have the greatest part of our income to spend on other items, unlike in many areas of the world where food is one of the most costly items of daily life.

Agriculture itself makes up approximately 20 percent, or $550 billion of the nation's gross national product. In California alone the $14.5 billion farm gate total generates an additional $53 billion in allied industries. Agriculture truly is the common denominator in determining whether this nation remains strong and viable. If we take agriculture out of this economy, we don't have an economy. Now is the time that we must learn to communicate this message--before it is too late.

From a national perspective, Gloria Cooper, managing editor of Columbia Journalism Review, writes:

Despite the fertility of the field, the subject of agriculture gets only skimpy coverage in the press, and those stories that do attract the attention of the media are frequently blighted by error and hype...
James Brock, benefactor of the Brock Center for Agricultural Communication, explains his concern this way:

Agriculture has become the most misunderstood industry in the country and the constant target for derogatory media content. Why not try to do something to improve agriculture's battered image with the balance of society? No substantial contribution had ever been made for this purpose and we saw an opportunity to, in our small way, do more good than through any other course we could imagine.

THE CENTER

The Brock Center for Agricultural Communication was established in October 1986 at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, after extensive consultation with farmers and ranchers, agribusiness people, leaders of farm organizations, legislators and representatives of government agencies and the academic community.

The name honors produce industry pioneer James Brock and his wife, Martha, who have established a unitrust of more than $1.5 million for the Center. The unitrust provides income to the Brocks for life. After their death, the remainder of the unitrust will go to the Cal Poly Foundation, creating a permanent fund for the Center. The Brocks also have made substantial contributions to interim funding.

The Center is a joint venture of the Cal Poly School of Agriculture and School of Liberal Arts. Its focus is determined by a six-member Policy Advisory Board. Current board members are Dr. James Ahern and Dan Block, Agricultural Management Department; Dr. Joe Sabol, Agricultural Education Department; Dr. Michael Faks, Speech Communication Department; Dr. Stan Dundon, Philosophy Department and Dr. Dianne Long, Political Science Department. The Center's executive officer is an acting director, James H. Hayes, who also is the interim head of the Journalism Department.

The Center's operating goals are to:

* Locate and attract prospective undergraduate students who demonstrate aptitude for communication and have an abiding concern for agriculture;

* Assist the university's schools of Agriculture and Liberal Arts in preparing these students to be effective professional communicators;
* Serve as a resource and vehicle for the continuing education of those in a position to promote the understanding of agriculture;

* Promote the professional development of university faculty through teaching, research and service to agricultural communication, and to

* Encourage the collection of resource information on agricultural issues in the university’s Robert E. Kennedy Library to serve agricultural communication students and faculty, media professionals, agriculturalists and the public.

THE JOURNALISM DEPARTMENT

Cal Poly has been turning out agricultural communicators for nearly four decades. Alumni of the Journalism Department hold key jobs as writers and editors of farm sections in newspapers, as publishers of farm magazines, in production agriculture, in posts in county and state agriculture agencies, boards and commissions and with the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Agricultural Journalism is one of four concentrations, or curricular options, offered by the department. It long has been one of only a dozen such programs in the United States and remains the only one of its kind in California. The concentration is exclusive; extensive recruiting in community colleges has increased it to only 20 upper division students in a total journalism enrollment of 250.

Demand for graduates cannot be filled. In fact, some Cal Poly agricultural journalists find they have job offers as a result of internships done during their junior and senior years. Upon graduation they often have their pick of several entry-level jobs.

The Journalism Department has a faculty of six with extensive academic and professional backgrounds, all of whom teach courses and advise students in the Agricultural Journalism concentration.

The department's other concentrations are News-Editorial, Broadcast Journalism and Public Relations. The department publishes Mustang Daily, with a $250,000 annual budget raised entirely by the sale of advertising. It is one of the few successful daily newspapers on American college campuses which is written, edited and published exclusively by students. The newspaper serves as a laboratory for all majors—including those in the Agricultural Journalism concentration.

The department also operates an FM radio station, KCPR. The news and public affairs programs of KCPR give Agricultural Journalism
students hands-on experience in radio broadcasting. Other
department facilities include 24-hour newspaper and radio wire
service from The Associated Press, a writing and editing
laboratory equipped with personal computers, access to
substantial collections of texts, documents and periodicals
pertaining to communications and to agriculture in the Robert E.
Kennedy Library, and active student chapters of the Society of
Professional Journalists/Sigma Delta Chi, and Agricultural
Communicators of Tomorrow (ACT).

THE SCHOOL OF AGRICULTURE

The School of Agriculture is a major educational resource for the
Brock Center for Agricultural Communication. Students in the
Agricultural Journalism concentration are required to take five
courses in departments of the school, typically Agriculture in
American Life (AG 301), General Animal Science (ASC1 230),
General Field Crops (CRSC 230), Elements of Food Processing (FDSC
230) and Introductory Soil Science (SS 121). Agricultural
Communication (Jour 205) also is required of all students in the
Agricultural Journalism concentration and typically draws majors
from all disciplines in the School of Agriculture.

The Brock Center has assisted several departments in the School
of Agriculture by designing flexible "packages" of courses which
can be offered to their majors who have special needs or
interests in communications training. These courses include
training in reporting and newswriting, editing, broadcast news,
magazine writing, public relations, advertising, journalism law
and photojournalism. Students taking these courses benefit
directly from the activities of the Brock Center as do students
from the Agricultural Journalism concentration.

Faculty from the School of Agriculture frequently serve as guest
experts, interview subjects and co-presenters for class sessions
of Agricultural Communications (Jour 205). Some also are
directly involved in the Brock Center as members of the Advisory
Board or benefit indirectly through such Center programs as the
dissemination of agricultural information and the enhancement of
the university's library holdings in agriculture.

THE ROLE OF THE AGRICULTURAL COMMUNICATORS OF TOMORROW

The Cal Poly chapter of ACT is one of 19 student chapters on
campuses across the United States affiliated with the national
Agricultural Communicators of Tomorrow organization. This
social, fraternal and professional club is chartered by the
university's Associated Students Inc. and the Student Council of
the School of Agriculture. It is advised by the acting director
of the Brock Center. Its 30 current members come from
Agricultural Journalism and the majors of Agricultural Management, Agricultural Education, Animal Science and Dairy Science. Members meet every two weeks, elect their own officers, levy dues, maintain their own treasury, hold social events and conduct workshops and professionally oriented field trips.

Club members serve as writers, photographers, editors, art directors and advertising salespeople for Ag Circle, a newsletter published twice each quarter which goes to all faculty and students in the School of Agriculture. This newsletter also is supported by revenue from the sale of advertising to ag-related firms in San Luis Obispo County.

In addition to Ag Circle, the Center is involved in the publication of a newsletter for the School of Agriculture's Swanton Pacific ranch project. As members of the agricultural communications club become more proficient as "desktop publishers" they are seeking opportunities to develop newsletters or larger publications for other audiences.

Members of ACT also served as staff for the Brock Center's first media conference on "Farm Chemicals and Food Safety" held in San Luis Obispo in May 1987. They already are involved in planning a second conference for agricultural communicators for May 1988.

**BENEFITS TO THE AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRY**

The Brock Center for Agricultural Communication already is serving the industry by:

* Training student journalists who have specialized in agriculture as undergraduates and will be exceptionally qualified for employment as farm writers, editors and broadcasters, as press officers for public agencies and private organizations, and as communicators in agribusiness and production agriculture;

* Facilitating graduate training at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and other institutions for students who demonstrate the aptitude and determination necessary to earn master's or doctoral degrees in agricultural journalism or mass communication. Graduates of these programs can be expected to provide academic and professional leadership for the next generation.

* Serving as an "interdisciplinary bridge" between the school of Agriculture and Liberal Arts and acting as a focal point for university efforts to assist the agricultural industry in improving communication with its publics.
* Giving media professionals vital new information on pesticide regulation through the first Brock Center conference on "Farm Chemicals and Food Safety."

* Planning similar conferences in San Luis Obispo for 1988 and the years beyond in which agricultural writers, editors and broadcasters can have face-to-face contact with the experts on major public issues such as pesticide regulation.

Appreciation of these efforts to enhance agricultural communication is apparent in the recent endorsement of--and generous gift to--the Brock Center by the California Farm Bureau Federation. A letter from CPBF President Henry Voss puts it:

With the shrinking of the farm population in California, knowledge of agriculture in urban areas is constantly reduced and a gap exists between the two communities.

The California Farm Bureau Federation has made a major commitment to provide agricultural information to the urban population as a means of promoting understanding. We know that communicating with a population of 24 million people is a Herculean job and we know that we cannot do it alone.

It is with this background that I inform you that the California Farm Bureau Board of Directors applauds the concept of the Brock Center for Agricultural Communication that has been established at Cal Poly. The Board took official action endorsing the Center at its September 1987 meeting in Sacramento and followed that with approval of a financial contribution at our recent meeting in October.

In December, the Center received the endorsement of the Western Agricultural Chemicals Association, Rep. Tony Coelho (D-Calif.) and the Agricultural Council of California. Writing in his widely read "Farmer's Corner" column, Leland H. Ruth, president of the Agricultural Council said:

Because communication has become one of agriculture's most serious problems, it's critical that the industry do more to increase and enhance information for the general public.

Given the concern today about health, safety and the quality of life, it is important that agriculture have communication specialists who are poised, informed, aggressive and capable of responding confidently and quickly to the public's need to know.
Jim Hayes Interview Notes

Interview with Founding Director, Jim Hayes

The Brock Center was founded in 1986 with Jim Hayes as Director. Here are a few excerpts from the conversation author, Jennifer Ray and Current Director, Megan Silcott had with Jim Hayes on December 5, 2012.

Recommendations for Potential Brock Center Advisory Board Members

Clark Biggs- Retired Public Relations Director for California Farm Bureau
“Farm Bureau ought to be represented. It would seem to me the largest, most important agricultural organization.”

Len Richardson – Former Editor of California Farmer magazine
“A good friend, brilliant man. … I would try to get Len. I think he’s on the advisory board for Davis. We used to compete with Davis.”

Robyn Rominger – Former Writer for Len Richardson

Marnie Cotter- Runs her own agriculture news organization in Fresno and works for Mark Looker at the California Almond Board. She is an alumna of the program.

Concerns for the Brock Center

“One thing that concerns me is the dichotomy between public relations and traditional journalism. PR people are by nature activists and they are promoting a point of view. Traditionally newspaper people were so uncomfortable with that kind position that they would not even tell people which political party they belonged to, and a lot of that has faded. But, they used to be very objective, or try to be. So they would print both sides and not just one.”

“Mr. Brock, Jim, who left the money for the foundation, Jim and Marty. Jim was very much an activist. He would have applauded I Love Farmers and anything else that is along that line. He wanted me to be more activist and I was on the other side of the fence and wanted to be more objective in coverage of agricultural issues.”

“So, most of the time I spent during the several years I was running [the Brock Center] was involved with Food Safety because it was an issue we could both agree on. Now even that, food safety gets dicey now because if you have e-coli and it comes out of somebody’s lettuce patch, the first guy on the scene is a lawyer and the second one is a PR man trying to say that there are no bugs.”
Memories of Jim Hayes

“He [Jim Brock] lived in Oxnard in a very modest home. The only concession it had their wealth was a swimming pool indoors and that was because Jim had arthritis and other conditions that would be helped by daily bathes in the pool. [The pool] wasn’t a big one.”

“Jim was quiet and ponderous and very thoughtful. He thought a lot, a long time before he said anything. What he said usually made good sense. He made his money in the produce industry. He was a lettuce grower, a grower, a broker and a shipper. And he made it.”

“In that business you make as many enemies as you make friends. I went down once to give a talk at Buellton or some place down there ... All I had to say was ‘Jim Brock’ and they were up-in-arms. They didn’t like him. So, he was a hard man. I mean, he was a good farmer and a good businessman, but antagonist. He had a cane that looked like it was cut out of a tree trunk. When he’d get agitated, he’d bang the cane on the ground.”

“He had approached President Kennedy, who was the University President and suggested that he wanted to give the money. Kennedy wanted to see the money directed to Journalism because Kennedy had been the Department Head in Journalism.

Reflections of the Brock Center’s Early Years

“There was some competition. It was never out in the open, between the ag school and the College of Liberal Arts. And the only reason I wanted to see Journalism involved... I thought journalism had a lot of failings. It was a weak department, still is. It’s had a lot of problems and it was not cohesive, nor was there any agreement with those people about what should happen with the center or whether it should be created or not. They just wanted to have a piece of it. And I wrote a letter or an email to Mary Glick, the new Head of the Journalism Department, which Mary and I are supposed to have a meeting with Richard Gearhart in January, postponed because I wasn’t feeling good.”

“In outlining what our conversation might be, they wanted to talk about the Brock Center. I pointed out, I’ll send you a copy of it... One thing it stressed is that Journalism had a perfectly good, functional Ag Communication program called that before Ag Ed ever got into the picture, but they killed it. They changed their curriculum, which had been newspaper journalism, broadcast, radio, TV, PR and ag journalism (it was called ag journalism, not ag communications).”

“Interestingly, I was hired in 1969 to do two things for [then Journalism Department Head] Kennedy. One thing was to make Mustang Daily a daily newspaper, a five-day a week. (It had been 3-days a week and they called it daily. He was embarrassed.) The other thing was to beef up the Ag Journalism program because I had a background in newspaper journalism, but had done a lot of ag writing. I’d been a farm editor and I had experience in that direction so he thought that I could do that. And it took a lot of time. Mustang was very easy, but the ag thing I was battling uphill. All but two of the faculty
when I got there had some tie to ag. The three oldest men in the department, John Healy and Vince Gates and Loren Nicholson, all had some tie to agriculture.”

“When a new crop of people came in, they decided they didn’t want those concentrations anymore. The chief architect of the change was Randy Morse who was Department Head for years. He literally forced the destruction of the concentrations and they all took the same basic courses. It was killing the golden goose as far as I was concerned. I was fighting it all the time. I finally got so sick of journalism that I moved my office over to the Earhart building and spent the last three years of my time at Poly in a lonely outpost out there. For a while I was the Interim Department Head and the head of the Brock Center at the same time, which was silly. But, two of the guys had been on sabbatical, one in England and the other in China. When they came back they said, ‘Which one do you want: Brock Center or Journalism?’ I said, ‘I wanna stay in the ag building.’”

“And Richard Gearhart, when he was a student, he would work late at night. I would find him sleeping out there on the floor outside my office. I find him sitting out there all the time studying. He’s a nice guy… The guy who had the office next door was a cowboy and we got along well.”

**Advice for Improving the Brock Center**

“You put your finger on one, its relations with the industry. That’s probably paramount. A center that is truly useful has outreach and goes beyond the academic to reach the broader community. And it should have an impact. We did on food safety. We had a conference that involved some of the top names in the business and cut some new ground.”

“Another thing it should have is research. If it’s going to have stature in the academic community, it ought to have meaningful research. Gary Beall was a Poly graduate who was in ag communications all his life. He and I did two research projects together in the last year I was there. He took one to Australia and did very well with it. In fact, Beall, he’s, I don’t think he’s retired now from Davis. He would be interested in at least advising you about the advisory committee.”

“Dissemination of ag information to the public and food safety is critical. We did some very ordinary research, but I think that’s essential. Although, its hard to do at Poly, because there is no graduate program as such or there are now, but what you need is a bunch of doctoral candidates if you’re going to get any research done. That we don’t have.”

“Those two things: I think [the Brock Center] ought to have a big footprint. It ought to publicize itself above all things. It’s got a good start since you came…”

“There wasn’t always an agreement in Ag Education about the Center and what the role of a center and ag communication was going to be. There was some jealousies there, or at least uncomfortable tensions.”
“One thing: Go to the website and clean it up. At least clean up the dead ends and update the contact information.”

“There were a lot of allies in Foundation when Jim was there. They were crucial to my success. … I had to spend a lot of time seeking money.”
Ag Ed & Com Department Advisory Council Current Members

Note: Members of the Agricultural Communications sub-committee are highlighted.

Agricultural Education and Communication Department
2013 Advisory Council

Mr. Jim Aschwanden
Mr. Aschwanden is a recognized leader in agricultural education in the State of California. He has served as the Executive Director of the California Agricultural Teachers’ Association for more than a decade. He was an instructor in the public schools, followed by service as a member of the Galt Joint Union High School District. He just finished an appointment as a member of the California Board of Education. (Appointed 1993)

Mr. Greg Beard
Mr. Beard is the Regional Supervisor of Agricultural Education for the California Department of Education. He serves as the technical assistance consultant for the area spanning from Los Angeles to San Jose. He is the regional advisor to the South Coast Region FFA. He is a graduate of Cal Poly. (Appointed 1996)

Mr. Bob Heuvel
Mr. Heuvel is the State Supervisor of Agricultural Education and Home Economics for the California Department of Education. He graduated from Cal Poly. He was an agricultural educator at Gonzales High School, followed by several years working as a community college instructor. He later became the regional supervisor for southern California. (Appointed 1995)

Mr. Mark Looker
Mr. Looker is the President/CEO of Looker Communications Consulting. He and his family reside in Modesto, California. He graduated from Cal Poly with a degree in 1976. His current clients include the Western United Dairymen and the Almond Board of California. Mr. Looker has been, and continues to be, a great asset to the students working in the BrockCenter for Agriculture Communication. (Appointed 1980)

Mr. Danny Silva
Mr. Silva is the Professional Development Coordinator for Computer-using Educators, Inc. Danny has also been an Agriculture Teacher, Technology Coordinator, and Administrator. He is an active CUE Lead Learner, a Google Certified Teacher, and Google Apps Education Certified Trainer. Mr. Silva has led multiple Google Teacher Academies around the world as part of CUE’s Lead Learner team. He
maintains an educational blog at iteachag.com and co-hosts his own "Small School, Big Tech" podcast. Danny and his wife Wendy live in Madera, CA with their two children Cayla and Jacob. (Appointed 2012)

**Ms. Patricia Stever Blattler**

Mrs. Blattler is the Executive Director of the Tulare County Farm Bureau. Upon graduating from Cal Poly, she earned her teaching credentials. Following student teaching, she began her career with the California Farm Bureau in Sacramento as a regional liaison in 2000. She later moved to Tulare as the Executive Director of the county organization. She was appointed by the Tulare County Board of Supervisors to a term on the Tulare Workforce Investment Board. (Appointed 2011)

**Mr. Steve Knudsen**

Mr. Knudsen is the Communication and Development Coordinator for the Sonoma County Farm Bureau. He earned an undergraduate degree in Food Science from Cal Poly. He received his M.S. degree in Agriculture in 2006. He served as the Director of Communication for the International Agri-Center in Tulare before taking his current position. (Appointed 2011)

**Mr. Steve Arnold**

Mr. Arnold is a former president of the SLO County Farm Bureau (1995-1997). Steve has served as a Farm Bureau director since 1989. He and his wife, Debbie, own and operate Pozo Valley Vineyard. The family vineyard produced its first harvest in 1998 with varietals including Merlot, Zinfandel and Cabernet Sauvignon. The Arnolds also manage a commercial cow/calf herd at the ranch. Steve is a Class 20 graduate of the California Agricultural Leadership Program. Steve was selected as the . Mr. Arnold serves as the Farm Bureau Board liaison to the public lands advisory committee. (Appointed 2011)

**Mr. Steve Gomes**

Mr. Gomes began his career in education while serving as a high school agriculture teacher in the Merced Union High School District. He obtained his administrative credentials and served as the Principal at Hilmar High School, and then as Superintendent of the Planada Elementary School District for 4 ½ years before being elected Superintendent of the Merced County Office of Education in 2010. Mr. Gomes is also a graduate of the California Agricultural Leadership Program. (Appointed 2011)

**Mr. Dan Sutton**

Mr. Sutton is the General Manager of the Pismo Oceano Vegetable Exchange located in Oceano, California. Originally from Clovis, California, Dan attended Cal Poly and received his Bachelors of Science Degree in Agribusiness, with an emphasis in farm and ranch management. Upon graduation,
Dan started his career with Pismo Oceano Vegetable Exchange (POVE) as plant manager. POVE is a grower-owned vegetable cooperative with 2,000 acres in production agriculture. Dan was responsible for overseeing the cooling operations. He is responsible for all federal, state and county issues on behalf of the cooperative. Dan directly oversees 40 employees in sales, marketing, accounting, safety and production. He interacts with harvest and production crews, educating and training on food safety regulations and policies. Dan has been with POVE for ten years. Mr. Sutton is currently a member of Class 40 of the California Agricultural Leadership Program. (Appointed 2011)

Ms. Jeanette Trompeter

Ms. Trompeter currently serves as the evening anchor, and Executive Producer, of KSBY-TV in San Luis Obispo. She is a Cal Poly graduate. Ms. Trompeter originally began her career in San Luis Obispo, and then moved to Des Moines, Iowa, and Minneapolis, Minnesota, while working as a news anchor/reporter. She was raised in the farming community of Capitola, California, and has a strong background in agriculture. (Appointed 2011)

Mr. Mark Anglin

Mr. Anglin is currently the Dean of Agriculture Environmental Science and Technology at Modesto Junior College. He earned his undergraduate and Master's Degree from Cal Poly. Mr. Anglin has been an agriculture teacher for more than 30 years. MJC is a leading agriculture community college in California, and has a staff of nearly 20 faculty and staff members devoted to agriculture instruction. His facilities recently underwent a multi-million dollar expansion to become the Ag Center for the Central Valley. Mr. Anglin oversees several state and federal grants focused on agricultural education. (Appointed 2012)

Mr. Mike Albiani

Mr. Albiani has been teaching agriculture for the past 27 years. He is currently the agriculture Department Head at Elk Grove High School. He earned his Bachelor's Degree from California State University- Fresno, and his teaching credentials from UC Davis. In 2005, Mr. Albiani was selected as the “California Agri-Science Teacher of the Year.” In the same year, he was honored as the “State Star Advisor”. He serves as the current State Secretary for the California Agricultural Teachers' Association. He is a member of the Sacramento Fair Auction Committee, and is involved in the livestock industry owning registered Shorthorn cattle. (Appointed 2013)

Mr. Dick Piersma

Mr. Piersma has taught agricultural education at the high school level for 23 years. He currently is an agriculture
teacher at Hilmar High School. He earned his Bachelor's Degree, and teaching credentials from California State University- Fresno. Mr. Piersma earned his Master's Degree from California State Polytechnic University- Pomona. Mr. Piersma is a recognized expert in agricultural mechanics in the state of California. He is a past President of the California Agricultural Teachers’ Association where he was recognized as a "Teacher of Excellence." Mr. Piersma is a member of the California FFA Association Adult Board of Directors.

(Appointed 2013)

Mr. Richard Quandt  
Mr. Quandt is the President and General Counsel of the Grower-Shipper Association (GSA) of Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo Counties. The Grower-Shipper Association of Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo Counties is a non-profit organization representing the interests of more than 160 Central Coast farms involved in the production and transport of edible and ornamental crops. GSA represents many segments within agriculture, from row crops to cut flowers to shipping to labor. He has served 32 years with the organization. Mr. Quandt earned his Bachelor's Degree

He is a frequent guest speaker for Cal Poly classes.

(Appointed 2013)

Mr. Carlos Castaneda  
Mr. Castaneda is Principal Owner of Castaneda and Sons, a farm labor contracting company. He has been associated with the company since 1993. The firm does business in San Luis Obispo and Santa Barbara County. Mr. Castaneda attended Cuesta College, and has completed courses through Cal Poly's Continuing Education program. He is a member of Class 36 of the California Agricultural Leadership Program. Mr. Castaneda currently serves as a Board member for the United Way Santa Barbara County, is the Vice President of the San Luis Obispo County Farm Bureau, and is the Vice Chairman of the California Farm Bureau’s Labor Committee.

Ms. Kendra Santos  
Ms. Santos is the Director of Communications for the Professional Rodeo Cowboys Association (PRCA). Ms. Santos attended Cal Poly earning a BS in Journalism in 1984, and an MBA in Business Administration in 1986. As PRCA Director of Communications, Kendra oversees all PRCA press efforts, including the ProRodeo Sports News magazine, ProRodeo Souvenir Program, PRCA Media Guide, the editorial end of ProRodeo.Com (official
website of ProRodeo) and the press operation at Rodeo’s Super Bowl, the Wrangler National Finals Rodeo. In addition to many national and international mainstream publications, Kendra has contributed cowboy stories over the years to virtually every Western magazine on the market, including Western Horseman, Heartland USA, America’s Horse, American Quarter Horse Journal, The Ketchpen and Persimmon Hill.

Serving a One-Year Term (Student Representatives on the Advisory Council)

Christine Woodman  Christine completed her student teaching assignment at Nipomo High School this past fall semester. She is currently serving as our department’s Graduate Assistant for the winter and spring quarters. Christine earned her Bachelor’s Degree in Agricultural Science.

Jennifer Ray  Jennifer is a senior Ag Communication major (she was the first Ag Communication major in the new degree program!). Jennifer is a Brock Center Associate, Editor of the Ag Circle magazine, and has been a student leader in the Ag Communicators of Tomorrow (ACT) student organization—currently serving as a National ACT officer.

BK3513
Advisory Council Annual Meeting Minutes

January 31, 2013
Notes from the Agricultural Communications Breakout Group

• The Brock Center bylaws stipulate a meeting of advisory members should take place annually and the charter states the faculty rank of the director can be determined by the advisory committee.
• Journalism alums and faculty as well as the new chair, Mary Glick shared their department is looking to reinvent itself and define what the curriculum can do to look like and cater to a polytechnic university.
• Mr. Arnold (Arnold) asked about broadcasting programming and where students have access within the departments.
• Mr. Gearhart (Gearhart) said the future of digital communications is changing with new risings of industry/equipment interest which creates new collaborations.
• Mrs. Stever Blatter (Blatter) said she’s hiring out of ag com field yet her hires are being asked to perform mostly ag com duties and act as jack of all trades but they are not prepared for basic communication skills from other departments.
• Dr. Vernon shared newsletters from AGC 407 and that discipline-specific interests need follow up fields.
• Dan Sutton (Sutton) shared the way we communicate is changing directly as face to face talk is taking the form of texting phrases. There seems to be a new foundation but frankness of communications and the hurdle to adapt is growing.
• Vernon mentioned Dr. Wolf’s study on ten soft skills.
• Gearhart said Journalism minor could help service soft skills as Polytechnic.
• Mark Looker (Looker) asked if there’s going to be a Mustang Daily as students aren’t picking up the paper. So where do we put our resources?
• Jennifer Ray (Ray) said more people want to write for Ag Circle than we have space for and from a variety of majors. They’re looking to get more students involved. Her senior project includes...
the history and bylaws of the Brock Center. She and Megan Silcott met with Mr. Jim Hayes over lunch and talked about the structure of the Brock Center and its future.

• Kendra Santos (Santos) said she used to work for Randy Bernard and she was the only non-ag major (JOUR) on the Rodeo Team. She networked with ag students, was taught UPI style and walked into an AP style job. She would have gladly been an Ag Com major then because the College of Ag was where she got her connections.

• Arnold echoed the comments on work ethic lacking in young generations from Santos.

• Blatter stated our program is the exception to work ethic and exemplary.

• Vernon stated many work to get through school in our programs.

• Sutton said we’ll need to adapt to millenials.

• Gearhart said the fundamentals and ethics in new communications are yet to be created.

• Sutton said basic skills of people like wood working are basic core skills.

• Richard Quandt (Quandt) said he’s frustrated with regulators, decision makers and other groups defining our role as evil agribusiness. The industry needs to define itself and have common support for the ag industry.

• Vernon said he knows of more jobs than we have grads for but they’re not in CA. Often first ag com jobs are out of state first year and they return to CA in their second career at a higher level and pay. Poly is the only west coast school with an ag com reputation.

• Carlos Castaneda (Castaneda) complimented Mr. Quandt for his service to the agriculture industry. He said Cal Poly is in the heart of a lion’s den and there is great misinformation out there. To let students get exposure to ag issues and the industry as a positive, not a negative light gives them an opportunity to publicize the industry. And that HSUS and mom groups don’t understand beyond the great commercials they see. There’s a need for the background to communicate well.

• Vernon said more students get exposed to our programs equals helpful and engaging people outside ag students. We need to ask good and tough questions no matter the side or the job.
• Arnold said it's too bad this major didn't happen 20 years ago. RFD TV is preaching to the choir.
• Gearhart said there's a great marketing opportunity for Cal Poly that compounds itself even if it's the same industry.
• Vernon said RFD can expose west coast agriculture to the Midwest.
• Blatter shared the gap of already employed but needing soft communication skills would pay to learn through short courses or workshops by the department.
• Vernon said the model could be IRTC and GRC with self-supporting paid programs.
• Blatter said Cal Ag Leadership type folks would invest in continued ag ed courses.
• Looker said Know a CA Farmer and the CA Ag Com Coalition as potential participants and collaboration.
• Ray mentioned the blogger tour she participated in and the lack of effectiveness despite the good organization, there wasn't much follow up from participants so we don't know the reach.
• Looker said messaging isn't consistent with a know a farmer but it's a good idea.
• Quant stated trade groups would utilize social media training.
• Vernon said we could walk through in a year, a training seminar by this department for maybe 20 Farm Bureau employees.
• Vernon added there's a need for an upper division maybe 300 level journalism course.
• Arnold said his family is inactive on Facebook for political reasons as recommended by the county supervisor staff.
• Looker said Western-Grower headed the Know a CA Farmer site but no driving force any longer and clients don't want to blog.
• Sutton said marketing groups report a shift in clientele of social media. Everyone's on it, making your audience the same as your normal circle. The concept has merit. There's a site that monitors real time terms and can help direct or respond immediately to topics of choice on all platforms which can help put messages out in proper timing with good responses.
• Blatter said the Past President's Roundtable of 50-70 yr olds is still not able to set up or do emails. There's a need for traditional communications for a large demographic.
• JOUR Chair Mary Glick returned and shared people reach constituents more readily. Public relations program includes half ag students, and half in the reporting class too. The department needs “tentacles” throughout the university. They need to revamp into integrated marketing with audience analytics, data management, equipping tools to tell stories across media and no longer print class but interactive and broadcasting to tell stories in different ways.
• Arnold asked ethics in courses and Glick answered yes.
• Glick said she has a capstone media class that requires multi-media projects, tools, uses and successes.
• Vernon shared web traffic and revenue generation at KSBY can be examples for media studies
• Santos said the separation of roles in Journalism is gone and the need to keep business doors open and sponsors vs ad sales and contracts. She has a concern for such a specialized degree as Ag Com but Vernon and Silcott responded with the opportunities and past successes.
Brock Center Feedback & Suggestion Survey

Brock Center Feedback & Suggestions

You

Help us understand your perspective of the Brock Center.

**1. My connection to the Cal Poly Brock Center is: (Select all that apply)**

- [ ] Cal Poly Faculty
- [ ] Other University Faculty
- [ ] Past Brock Center Director
- [ ] Department Advisory Member
- [ ] Alumni
- [ ] Past Brock Center Associate
- [ ] Current Ag Communications/Ag Science Student
- [ ] Current Journalism Student

Other (please specify)

[ ]

Next
Brock Center Feedback & Suggestions

Magazine & Blog

Please visit our most recent issue of Ag Circle magazine: http://issuu.com/brockcenter/docs/agcirclespring2013

Our blog can be viewed at: http://brockcenter.wordpress.com/

2. What changes would you like to see to the Ag Circle magazine? (Select as many as apply.)

- Increase Length
- Decrease Length
- Change the Page Size
- Other (please specify)

3. What changes would you like to see to the content of Ag Circle magazine? (Select as many as apply.)

- More stories about Cal Poly
- More Ag Issue stories
- More How-To stories
- More Feature Stories
- More Consumer-Appealing Stories
- More Technical Stories
- No Changes
- Other (please specify)

4. What suggestions do you have for the content of the Brock Center Blog? (Select as many as apply.)

- More posts about Cal Poly
- More Ag Issue posts
- More How-To posts
- More Video Posts
- More interaction with other ag blogs
- No Changes
- Other (please specify)
5. Please rank the following potential workshops/seminars in order of your preference. (1-12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Workshop/ Seminar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adobe Photoshop (Photo Editing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Adobe InDesign (Designing Layouts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Adobe Illustrator (Creating Graphic Elements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Adobe Dreamweaver (Web Design)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Writing for Your Audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>How to Make the Most Out of a Job Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>How to Interview a Story Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Professional Roundtable for Student Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Continuing Education (For industry professionals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Basic Photography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Business Etiquette/ International Business Etiquette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Participation in Agricultural Lobbying (Legislative and Regulatory Issues)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. How many workshops/seminars would you like to see per year (not including discussion forums)?

- [ ] 1
- [ ] 2
- [ ] 3
- [ ] 4
- [ ] 5

7. Would you be willing to pay for these? How much?

[Box for input]

8. Currently, the Brock Center hosts one annual forum on a current agricultural topic. How many discussion forums would you like to see per year (not including workshops/seminars)?

- [ ] 1
- [ ] 2
- [ ] 3
- [ ] 4
- [ ] 5
9. Please rank the following potential discussion forums in order of your preference. (1-13)

- Food Safety
- Agricultural Globalization
- Regulations
- Ag Lending/Appraisal
- Labor Issues
- Holistic Management
- Water
- Natural Resources/Energy
- Real Estate
- Sustainability/ Agriculture Ethics
- Policy/Legislation
- Ag Law, Estate Planning, Inheritance Tax, etc.
- Nutrition

Brock Center Feedback & Suggestions

Branding, Advertising & Reach

10. If the Brock Center sold the following merchandise with their logo, what items would you consider purchasing? (Select as many as apply.)

- Coffee Mug
- T-Shirt
- Notebooks/Notebooks
- Other (please specify)

11. Write-in (optional): What could the Brock Center do to improve its professional image as a center for student learning and a means of bridging the gap between agriculture and the media?

12. 2012/2013 Ag Circle Advertisers include: Agriculture Liquid Fertilizer, Carolina Evangelo Communications, Gallo Winery, JB Dewar, Mission Produce, PRP Companies and Yosemite Farm Credit.

Do you have suggestion(s) for long-term advertisers? If yes, please list any suggestion(s) here:


13. Ag Circle magazine is distributed on campus and at trade shows. It is also mailed to every county Farm Bureau office, every agricultural high school and college program in California and a small list of farms. Copies are also mailed to other universities with agricultural communications programs.

Write in: (optional) Where else would you recommend Ag Circle be distributed?

14. Do you have suggestion(s) for creative ways to fund increased magazine distribution? If yes, please list any suggestion(s) here:

15. Please feel free to use this space to share additional comments, feedback or suggestions for the Brock Center (optional). Thank you for taking our survey!
Past *Ag Circle* Editors & Brock Center Student Associates

Note: The Brock Center holds a copy of this database, which includes contact information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Additional Year(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anna (Newlander) Negranti</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheryl Athenour Flores</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missy (Arnold) Hansen</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Schlotter</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbie Dutcher</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Goulding</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy White</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Criswell</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Cekola</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Albertoni</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Gimenez</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie Bettencourt</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Bradley</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindi Floyd</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Chuck</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wade Meneses</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Dias</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny (Midtgaard) Derry</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Brockmeyer</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meredith (Rehrman) Ritchie</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz Magill</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabrina Allen</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keri (Greenberg) Frank</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1994, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloe Hunt</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marytina Marshall</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celeste Jones</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Tenter</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Colacchia</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleen Walsh</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1999, 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Nilsen</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley McLaughlin</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Quinn</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiffany (Rausser) Moffatt</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Dodson</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth (Ritter) Gianini</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Garcia</td>
<td>2000-2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharlene (Swaim) Garcia</td>
<td>2000-2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobie Head</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandy Alvera</td>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonnalee Henderson</td>
<td>2003-2004, 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth (Sequeira) Souza</td>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsey Liebig</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan (Sodersom) Richey</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Konschak</td>
<td>2007-2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexis (White) Negranti</td>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindy (Burris) Derohan</td>
<td>2008-2009, 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiana Escobar</td>
<td>2009-2010, 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Pannone</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Jones</td>
<td>2010-2011, 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrie Isaacson</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Coultas</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesie Friend</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Meneses</td>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandy Brasil</td>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Pires</td>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Brock Center Website Home Page & Contact Information

The Brock Center for Agricultural Communication

The Mission: The mission of the Brock Center for Agricultural Communication is to create a bridge of communication between the agricultural industry, the media and the public.

Contact Us

Brock Center for Agricultural Communication
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407
805.756.6106
brockctr@calpoly.edu
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