I. Preparatory: The meeting was called to order at 3:10 pm.

II. Minutes: none.

III. Communication(s) and Announcements: New senators for 1995-96 were introduced.

IV. Reports:
   A. Vice President for Academic Affairs: Dr. Koob announced that Cal Poly has offered to take an additional 400 FTE next year with a support rate of $2,000 per student.
   B. CFA: George Lewis announced that CFA offered to take the Chancellor's Office last best offer to a faculty vote. The offer was declined.
   C. ASI: Tara McQuerrey will be ASI's representative to the Academic Senate next year.

V. Consent Agenda: none.

VI. Business Items:
   A. Resolution on Change of Grades: MSPU to approve this resolution.
   B. Resolution on CAGR Land Use: MSPU to approve this resolution.
      A revised draft of the Resolution on College of Agriculture Land Use was distributed to senators at the start of the meeting. Vice President Lebens made a presentation on the history over a four-year period culminating in the selection of site for a football stadium. An overview summarized the current campus plan thereby providing some of the justification behind the decision. He noted that the selection process began in May, 1991 as an Architecture class project (including help from faculty and a local architecture firm). The class proposed eight alternative sites.

      The Campus Planning Committee was asked for reactions to these proposals but none was forthcoming. At the end of the summer, a two-sentence response was received from the College of Agriculture which stated that none of the eight sites were acceptable.

      In the meantime, a great deal of time was spent working with the campus' consulting firm to create a land use diagram driven by the principle of orderly planning of campus growth to address instructional needs.

      The current plan was first developed in 1992. Before it came out, there were meetings with the College of Agriculture. The college was not supportive of the plan. In March 1993, there again were lots of meetings with the CAGR. In May 1993, the plan went to the Campus Planning Committee where it passed unanimously. An Academic Senate representative, and the Deans of both CAGR and CAED are members of the Campus Planning Committee.

      In March 1994, ideation drawings for the athletic facilities went to the Campus Planning Committee and they were approved unanimously. In subsequent meetings, the CAGR remained opposed but, as Lebens pointed out, the Campus
Planning Committee is responsible for planning based on needs of the entire university. The floor was then opened for questions and comments.

- What are the other alternatives? Response: The rodeo arena, others in the general area where the Crops Unit is as well as north and slightly east of the Crops Unit.
- It was noted that Dean Jen was not present at the meeting of the Campus Planning Committee when the vote was taken in favor of the site selected. Therefore, the vote was unanimous but not reflective of the CAGR viewpoint.
- Lebens noted that there has not been a CAGR land use committee in operation until recently but he's not sure that it would have made a real difference because the Campus Planning Committee tried to look at the university as a whole.
- What campus resources (i.e., faculty) have been used in coming to this decision? Faculty from CAED and Architecture graduates in the local area.
- Information about the soil located at the selected site was shared. It was noted that this is Class I soil (i.e., prime farmland). Additionally, the underlying soil is a clay similar to that upon which Colorado State University built a similar structure. It has proven to be a poor choice in that Colorado State has had to repair cracks in the structure at least five times. Another report cited that prime farmland such as that under discussion must be used to provide food and fiber. Therefore, one can argue that to use such land for some other reason is morally wrong.
- How is it that building a stadium is going to support the curriculum of the university. Response: I want to be clear. Our fundamental driver is curricular needs, but that doesn't mean that every decision relates directly to this.
- The stadium at this site would be a stand-alone, but it is also located in the vicinity of private houses and would probably be very disruptive for that area. Response: It is stand-alone to a degree. We anticipate grassstop parking and eventually a shuttle to a campus parking structure. The San Luis Obispo Community Development Department is represented on the Campus Planning Committee. It's representative has had his initial reservations addressed to his satisfaction.
- I don't think that the CAED supports building this on prime land. Both current members of the Campus Planning Committee have told me that they don't support this.
- Who will pay for upkeep of the facility. Response: The university will have to structure an endowment to cover for the maintenance just as is happening for the Performing Arts Center.
- Academic Senate agenda documents show that the CAGR has been registering complaints for quite some time.
- Background from CAGR is attached to the April 11 agenda. This material states that 30 percent of prime farmland is being taken away without replacement.
- A paper trail on this issue goes back to a Fall 1991 memo written by Joe Sabol.
- Was there an alternate site on the periphery considered? Response: Given the response from CAGR, the answer is no.

A friendly amendment was made to change the first Resolved clause as follows:

*RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recognize this as a curriculum issue; and be it further...*
RESOLVED: That as a curriculum issue this negatively impacts university instruction; and, be it further...

C. Resolution to Amend AB 93-1, Cal Poly Sexual Harassment Policy. MSP to move this to a second reading. MSP to approve the resolution.

D. Resolution to Approve Policy and Review Procedures for Discontinuance of an Academic Program. MSP that this proposed resolution be referred to the Program Review and Improvement Committee with a request that it comment on the document.

VII. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 5:00pm.