ACADEMIC SENATE
Academic Senate Agenda
April 11, 1995
UU 220 3:00-5:00 p.m.

I. Minutes: Approval of the March 7, 1995 Academic Senate minutes (pp. 2-3).

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
   A. Academic Senate elections results for 1995-1996 (pp. 4-5).
   B. Nominations are being received for the Academic Senate positions of Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary for 1995-1996. Please call the office for a nomination form (x1258).

III. Reports:
   A. Academic Senate Chair:
   B. President's Office:
   C. Vice President for Academic Affairs' Office:
   D. Statewide Senators:
   E. CFA Campus President: report on the status of CFA-CSU bargaining.
   F. Staff Council Representative:
   G. ASI Representatives:

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Item(s):
   A. Resolution to Expand Form 109 to Include Diversity-related Activities: Terry, chair of the Personnel Policies Committee, second reading, (pp. 6-8).
   B. Resolution to Amend CAM 411 Requirements for Completion of Minor Degree Programs: Clark, chair of the Curriculum Committee, first reading (pp. 9-11).
   C. Resolution on Change of Grades: Freberg, chair of the Instruction Committee, first reading, (pp. 12-15).
   D. Resolution on CAGR Land Use: Hannings, caucus chair for CAGR, first reading (pp. 16-24).

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment:
ACADEMIC SENATE MEMBERSHIP 1995-1996

(The individuals whose names are printed in bold type are newly elected senators for the 1995-1996/7 term. The remaining individuals are continuing senators whose terms end in June 1996.)

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE (7 senators)

Academic Senate
Lund, Michael
Warfield, David
Bermann, James
Hannings, David
Lord, Sarah
McNeil, Robert
Ruehr, Thomas

Animal Science
Crop Science
Agricultural Engineering
Ornamental Horticulture
Home Economics
Crop Science
Soil Science

Research Committee
VACANCY

University Professional Leave Committee
VACANCY

COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTURE AND ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN (5 senators)

Academic Senate
Smith, Gerald
Berrio, Mark
Day, Linda
Turnquist, Ed

Landscape Architecture
Architectural Engineering
City & Regional Planning
Construction Management

Research Committee
Lakeman, Sandra

UPLC
Faruque, Omar

Architecture
Landscape Architecture

COLLEGE OF BUSINESS (5 senators)

Academic Senate
Bertozzi, Dan
Burgunder, Lee
Geringer, Michael

Business Administration
Business Administration
Management

Research Committee
VACANCY
VACANCY

UPLC
VACANCY

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING (7 senators)

Academic Senate
Alptekin, Sema
LoCasico, James
Nalvi, Mahmood
Dana, Charles
Kolkailah, Faysal
Lo, Chien-Kuo (Kurt)
Wheatley, Patrick

Ind & Manufacturing Engineering
Mechanical Engineering
Electrical Engineering
Computer Science
Aeronautical Engineering
Civil and Environmental Engineering
Computer Science

Research Committee
MacCarley, Arthur

UPLC
VACANCY

Electrical Engineering
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COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS (9 senators)

Academic Senate
Hampsey, John English
Mott, Stephen Graphic Communication
Ryujiin, Donald Psychology and Human Development
DeLey, Warren Social Sciences
Fetzer, Philip Political Science
Martinez, William Foreign Languages and Literatures
Scriven, Talmage Philosophy
Spiller, William Music
Weatherby, Joseph Political Science

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS (8 senators)

Academic Senate
VACANCY
VACANCY
VACANCY
Cook, Gayle Physics
Farrell, Gerald Mathematics
Greenwald, Harvey Mathematics
Lewis, George Mathematics
Rogers, John Statistics

PROFESSIONAL CONSULTATIVE SERVICES (4 senators total, 1 from the Library and 3 from other areas)

Academic Senate
Lutrin, Sam Student Life & Activities
Brown, Johanna Library
Fryer, Ann Disabled Student Services
Stanton, George Psychological Services

UNIVERSITY CENTER FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (1 senator)

Academic Senate
VACANCY

STATEWIDE ACADEMIC SENATE (3 statewide senators)

Gooden, Reg Political Science (one-year term)
Kersten, Timothy Economics (three-year term)
Hale, Thomas Mathematics
Adopted:

ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

AS-95/
RESOLUTION TO EXPAND FORM 109 TO INCLUDE
DIVERSITY-RELATED ACTIVITIES

Background: The importance of diversity to Cal Poly is recognized in its Strategic Plan. One of the tenets of the section on diversity speaks to the need to increase the number of underrepresented students, faculty, and staff members. Cal Poly's record in increasing the percentage of underrepresented students while increasing the average SAT score of new students has been successful.

Unfortunately, a shrinking number of total faculty (a decrease of over 29% from fall '89 to fall '92) has precluded the possibility of increasing substantially the number of underrepresented faculty. The result is that many underrepresented students are disappointed when upon matriculating here find few faculty of their own ethnic background or race.

As a result, faculty from underrepresented groups find themselves advising and mentoring students even though they are not officially assigned as advisees. Presently they may receive no recognition for this in Form 109.

Other faculty having a special interest in promoting diversity through service to the university or students also presently may receive no recognition on Form 109. They too ought to be recognized for this important effort if Cal Poly is to attain its goals set out in the Strategic Plan.

WHEREAS, The University is committed to diversity; and
WHEREAS, Faculty members are encouraged to become more involved in promoting diversity; and
WHEREAS, The Cal Poly Strategic Plan has defined diversity in a broad fashion; and
WHEREAS, Diversity-related activities may be found in any of the existing areas of teaching, scholarship, and University/community service in which tenure-track faculty are required to show competence; and
WHEREAS, The Cal Poly Equal Opportunity Advisory Council has proposed that diversity considerations become part of the retention, promotion, and tenure (RPT) process; and
WHEREAS, The 1993 Academic Senate Diversity Summer Task Force endorsed the Equal Opportunity Advisory Council's proposal;
WHEREAS, The recognition of diversity-related activities may be considered in any of the four categories of Form 109; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That faculty members be recognized for their diversity related activities; and, be it further
RESOLVED: That Form 109 be revised so as to include diversity related activities among the optional factors in category three.

Proposed by the Academic Senate Personnel Policies Committee
February 2, 1995
I. **Teaching Performance and/or Other Professional Performance:** Consider such factors as the faculty member's competence in the discipline, ability to communicate ideas effectively, versatility and appropriateness of teaching techniques, organization of course, relevance of instruction to course objectives, methods of evaluating student achievement, relationship with students in class, effectiveness of student consultations, and other factors relating to performance as a teacher. (Include results of Student Evaluation Program.)

II. **Professional Growth and Achievement:** Consider such factors as the faculty member's original preparation and further academic training, related work experience and consulting practices, scholarly and creative achievements, participation in professional societies and publications, professional registration, certification and licensing.

III. **Service to University, Students and Community:** Consider such factors as the faculty member's participation in academic advisement, co-curricular activities, diversity-related activities, placement follow-up, co-curricular activities, department, college and university committee and individual assignments, systemwide assignments, and service in community affairs directly related to the faculty member's teaching area, as distinguished from those contributions to more generalized community activities.

IV. **Other Additional Factors of Consideration:** Consider such factors as the faculty member's ability to relate with colleagues, initiative, cooperativeness, dependability, etc. and any other relevant factors.
WHEREAS, The intention of CAM 411 was to prevent students from obtaining major and minor degrees from the same degree program, and

WHEREAS, CAM 411 is currently creating an inequitable situation for students who cannot obtain minor degrees in different degree programs under certain circumstances, therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That CAM 411 be amended as follows:

411. A major and a minor may not be taken in the same discipline degree program. Units taken for completion of the minor may not be counted to satisfy requirements for courses in the "major" column of the student's curriculum sheet.

Proposed by the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee
February 21, 1995
MEMORANDUM

Date: October 12, 1994

To: Jack Wilson, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Bob Thompson, Agribusiness; Ken Scotto, Animal Science;
      John Connely, Computer Science; and Larry Gay, Industrial Technology.

Subject: Minors at Cal Poly

There is a rule in CAM that states:

"Units taken for the minor may not be counted to satisfy requirements for courses in the "Major" column of the student's major curriculum sheet."

This rule was introduced to prevent a student from obtaining a minor in the same subject area as his or her major. However, several departments around campus now place courses in their "Major" columns that are from other departments. If these courses are required for a minor, a student cannot count these courses toward that minor and, in some cases, may be barred from getting that minor.

Examples of this problem are:

1.) the 1994-97 Animal Science curriculum lists an Agribusiness Concentration in the Courses in the Major column. Since almost all the courses in the Agribusiness Minor are listed, an Animal Science student choosing this Concentration cannot obtain the minor while students from other majors in the College of Agriculture can. This problem applies to a lesser degree to Ornamental Horticulture, Agricultural Science, and Dairy Science majors.

2.) the Computer Science Minor includes three courses that are listed in the Courses in the Major column for Management students pursuing a Management Information Systems Concentration. Also, Electrical Engineering students have this problem with two classes under the Computer Architecture Track of the Computer Science Minor.

3.) the Packaging Minor can contain up to three courses required in the Food Science Major column and two courses required in the Industrial Technology Major column.

Courses listed in the Support or General Education columns can be counted toward a minor. What possible difference should it make to the granting of a minor where a required courses is listed in the student's major curriculum?
We are hoping that the Curriculum Committee of the Academic Senate consider deleting this troublesome rule. It has created many problems for students, department heads, minor coordinators, and evaluators who have spent hours trying to circumvent it through course substitutions and petitions for special consideration. The rule engenders inflexibility, inefficiency, and unfairness, and we urge that prompt action be taken to abolish it.

If the members of the Curriculum Committee have any questions or would like the authors of this memo to attend a meeting, please contact us at our respective extensions: 5009; 2419; 7179, or 2058. Thanks.
WHEREAS, The current policy for change of grades (AS 384-92), enacted by the Academic Senate in 1992, has met the goals of the original resolution in the vast majority of cases; and

WHEREAS, Small numbers of exceptions to this policy do occur which require administrative decisions; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Registrar, acting on behalf of the University and with the support of the Academic Senate, will record grade changes beyond the one year time limit when a documented administrative or university error has occurred, and the Office of Academic Records has received evidence supporting the exception; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That a subcommittee of three faculty representatives to the Instruction Committee will meet quarterly with the Registrar to review those cases which exceed the time limits of AS 384-92, are not administrative or university error, or are not clearly documented; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the faculty subcommittee will prepare a response regarding the case to be communicated to the college and department by the Registrar.

Proposed by the Academic Senate Instruction Committee
February 10, 1995
Adopted: April 14, 1992

ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

AS-384-92/IC
RESOLUTION ON
CHANGE OF GRADE

WHEREAS, Title 5 of the California Administrative Code, Sections 40104 and 40104.1 authorize the Chancellor and the individual campuses to designate and assign grades for academic work; and

WHEREAS, CSU Executive Order 320 (dated January 18, 1980) specifically provides mechanisms for faculty and students to ensure that their rights and responsibilities regarding the assignment of grades are properly recognized and protected; and

WHEREAS, CSU EO 320 authorizes and assigns responsibility for providing policy and procedures for the proper implementation of the aforementioned principles; and

WHEREAS, According to CSU EO 320, "faculty have the right and responsibility to provide careful evaluation and timely assignment of appropriate grades"; and

WHEREAS, Such grade assignments are presumed to be correct, and it is the responsibility of anyone appealing an assigned grade to demonstrate otherwise; and

WHEREAS, Every instructor, when assigning grades, strives for equity to all students, and in the absence of compelling reasons, such as instructor or clerical error, prejudice or capriciousness, the grade assigned by the instructor of record is to be considered final; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate Fairness Board has been established for the primary purpose of hearing grievances regarding student challenges to grades assigned; and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly has never developed a policy or procedures as provided for in CSU EO 320; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the university recognize the prerogative of faculty to set standards of performance and to apply these standards to individual students; and be it further
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RESOLVED: That the university will seek to correct injustices to students, while also believing that the instructor's judgement at the time the original grade is assigned is superior to a later reconsideration of an individual case; and be it finally

RESOLVED: That the following policy and procedures be adopted to apply to changes of grade:

POLICY

All course grades are final when filed by the instructor of record in the end-of-term course grade report. A student may request a change of grade under the conditions identified in the following paragraph. Such a request must be made no later than the end of the seventh (7th) week of the Fall, Winter, or Spring term following the award of the original grade.

A change of grade may occur only in cases of clerical error, administrative error, or where the instructor reevaluates the student's original performance and discovers an error made by the instructor or an assistant in calculating or recording the grade. A change of grade shall not occur as a consequence of the acceptance of additional work or reexamination beyond the specified course requirements.

Changes of Authorized Incomplete and Satisfactory Progress symbols will occur as the student completes the required course work, and therefore such action does not normally require a request for a change of grade on the part of the student. Any other request for a change of grade will not be considered after one year from the end of the term during which the grade was awarded.

PROCEDURES

1. Every instructor is required to file assigned grades using the end-of-term course grade report. Each student will be notified by mail of the grades earned during the term, and these grades will become a part of the official record. As these course grades are considered final when filed, any changes in the filed
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grades must follow these procedures.

2. A student may request a change of grade no later than the end of the seventh (7th) week of the Fall, Winter, or Spring term following the award of the original grade. If the instructor determines that there is a valid basis for the change, a Change of Grade form shall be used to notify the Records Office. These forms are available in department offices, and shall not be handled by the student. If the instructor determines that there is not a valid basis for changing the grade, and denies the student's request, that decision is final. The student may then file a petition with the Fairness Board on the basis of capricious or prejudicial treatment by the instructor.

3. In the event a Change of Grade form is completed and signed by the instructor, the form will contain a note identifying the reason for the change.

4. Any change of grade initiated after the end of the seventh (7th) week of the following regular term will be approved only under extraordinary circumstances. Any such request will carry an explanation of such circumstances, and will be signed by the instructor, department head/Chair, and the dean before acceptance by the Registrar. "Extraordinary circumstances" shall be defined as, but not limited to, the following conditions and circumstances, and the student shall provide documentation of: (1) personal illness, (2) family emergency, and/or (3) inability to communicate with the instructor prior to the end of the seventh (7th) week following the regular term of instruction.

5. Once a degree is awarded, no grade changes will be made after sixty (60) days from the date the grade report was mailed to the student.

Proposed by the Academic Senate Instruction Committee
February 25, 1992
Revised April 7, 1992
WHEREAS, The campus administration has chosen to site the proposed football, soccer, and baseball facilities on the prime agricultural land located south of Highland Drive between Highway 1 and the railroad tracks; and

WHEREAS, The College of Agriculture has used this land for 90 years as prime laboratory space for teaching many of its classes in several of its departments; and

WHEREAS, The College of Agriculture faculty, department heads, staff, and dean have protested the uses of this prime agriculture land since the site selection process was begun three years ago; and

WHEREAS, The College of Agriculture has only 86 acres of prime agriculture land on campus and this project would build on 28 acres of it, and the adjacent 10 prime acres planted with mature citrus and avocado trees would become unusable; and

WHEREAS, This site is not served by utilities, is separated from the main campus by a railroad track, contains an environmentally sensitive creek ecosystem, cannot share existing parking, and raises compatibility issues related to access, noise, glare, and traffic congestion that have not been adequately evaluated; and

WHEREAS, There are several other sites available that are more convenient to the campus core, have parking available, and are much less disruptive to the curriculum in the College of Agriculture, and the College is willing, and has been willing, to cooperate on the use of these and other sites; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recognize this as a curriculum issue that negatively impacts the College of Agriculture's ability to perform its educational mission; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recommend to the President that another more appropriate site be chosen for the proposed athletic facilities: one that has less of a negative impact on the ability of the College of Agriculture to fulfill its mission within the University.
TO: Frank Levens, Vice President
Finance and Administration

FROM: Joseph J. Jen, Dean
College of Agriculture

cc: Warren J. Baker
Members of Campus Planning Committee

SUBJECT: CAMPUS MASTER PLAN

The College of Agriculture is troubled by the campus master plan presented by your office at the President's Council on May 17, 1993. More specifically, we are referring to the two parcels of Class I land near Highway 1 which have been used for student field laboratories for crop production but are labelled recreation areas on the presented master plan. The CAGR Council discussed this matter and agreed unanimously to send you this memorandum.

We appreciate your involving the CAGR in the planning process of the master plan. The CAGR pledged total cooperation with you and the Planning Committee and appreciate that the Committee has agreed to the total replacement policy on moving existing facilities. We have provided soil analyses of the total campus acreage for your use. We have expressed our great concerns for your plan to convert the two parcels of land from student field laboratory usage to recreation area at each and every meeting. We walked out of these meetings with the understanding that you and your committee understood the importance and essential needs of the above two parcels of land to our students, faculty and programs, and that your consultants would look to north campus for recreation areas. The plan you presented on May 17, 1993 made no revision on the matter, therefore, we are left with no alternative but to register our grave concerns on record by way of this memorandum.

The University has nearly 6,000 acres of land, but only limited Class I soils suitable for agricultural student field laboratories. We must keep these limited areas to practice our "learn by doing" philosophy for our student education. Although we recognize the need for recreation areas for the campus, we are highly disturbed by the fact that your committee placed recreation areas at a higher priority over student field laboratories in agriculture. We sincerely hope that you will reconsider the campus master plan on this particular issue.

The above are the united views of all of us signed below:

Joseph E. Sabol, Assoc. Dean
Stephen F. Angley, Head, CH
Glenn R. Casey, Head, AgEd
Phillip M. Dobb, Head, AnSc
Edwin H. Jaster, Head, DSc
Norman H. Pillsbury, Head, NRM
Barbara P. Weber, Head, HE
From: DI637 --CALPOLY  
Date: 27 Aug 93 11:04:30 PDT  
From: <DI637 AT CALPOLY>  
Cc: <DU521 AT CALPOLY>  
Subject: Uncl: land use  
In-Reply-To: note of 27 Aug 93 10:41:57 PDT from <DU521 AT CALPOLY>  
From: Joe Jen  
Dean, College of Agriculture  
Bob: The CAGR agrees to nearly all the proposed plan by the Campus planning committee with one exception. We have repeatedly air our concern of the plan to take two parcels of class I soil land near highway 1 to be converted to recreation area. These lands are currently used for student projects and filed laboratories. In one of CAGR council, all department heads, associate deans signed a memo and sent to Vice President Frank Lebans to request the planning committee reconsider that particular issue. We had suggested that either the recreation area can be moved to land north of campus where the soil is not suitable for crops or the university can obtain additional class I land suitable for crops to move our student project and filed laboratories. We did not understand why the committee insists on using the limited class I land for recreation area in place of student field laboratory and do not provide an alternate piece as replacement. In my initial meeting, I emphasized that CAGR will be fully cooperative to campus land use plan. My only request is that if the plan call for using the land that we currently use for student instruction or faculty/staff development purposes, a replacemt land and cost of moving our current facilities be provided to CAGR. President Baker, Frank and all in attendance agreed that this is a good guideline and will resolve the land use questions in the long run. In short, I hope I answered your question. Frank can probably give you another viewpoint on this issue. If needed, I shall be happy to meet with you two to reach an agreement on this matter.

---Joe---

END OF NOTE
January 27, 1995

To: Warren J. Baker, President
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, California

cc: Joe Jen
Jack Wilson

From: John H. Harris, Professor
Natural Resources Management Department

Subject: Siting of the Proposed Football Stadium

I have four concerns for the specific choice of sites. The first involves the perceived lack of concern for primary agriculture land. The soils on the proposed site are classified Class I, the very best agriculture lands. Students taught in the Soils Department, Natural Resources Department, City and Regional Planning Department, Landscape Architecture Department are taught to select other lands than these where possible as the "best" use of this land is for agriculture. It seems that we do not pride ourselves in doing what is best for the land when making this decision. Are there not other agriculture lands of higher classification (less suited to agriculture) also suitable for development?

The second concern that I have involves a perceived attitude that specific agriculture lands are NOT the same as a chemistry lab, an architectural design studio, an engineering design and testing lab, etc. A great deal of the agriculture land is a TEACHING LABORATORY. We should make a deliberate effort to treat the development of "key" agriculture lands in a similar manner as bulldozing a building used for laboratory purposes. I realize that growth is inevitable. My concern is the perceived lack of importance placed on the laboratory experience for the College of Agriculture students in their respective major courses. In the "Year of the Curriculum", I think that you are sending very depressing news to the faculty in the College of Agriculture with recent comments concerning development of agriculture lands. Many of the faculty depend upon the seeing and doing on these lands to make the educational experience complete, meaningful, and with the desire for excellence for their students. Teaching is why almost all faculty are here at Cal Poly.

The third concern that I have is the perception that reduction of size of various agriculture fields or land uses is easily accomplished. The amount of planting has an economy of size factor for production
profit and the appropriate amount and type of equipment and labor to maintain this production. In many cases, because of our concern for teaching, the College of Agriculture has purposefully not maximized their economic production return. The downsizing of fields in an arbitrary manner will only make this worse. The maintenance of fields is highly dependent on both equipment and labor. Equipment size in agriculture is predicated on a certain planting on the land. You make it either difficult with existing equipment, or increase your labor costs appreciatively as you go to smaller and smaller units. There is an economy of size in agriculture production that we should not ignore. I perceive that this has not been considered in recent dialogues. The idea of farming fields distant from Cal Poly would involve additional equipment, personnel, and traveling time that seems to further ignore the realities of economic feasibility and the ability to effectively supervise these operations by the faculty.

The fourth concern that I have involves the cumulative impact of land-use decisions. A parking lot here, a research complex there, a football stadium here, a road there, etc. are all single item land-use decisions. What is the vision for our open space lands? What is the tapestry for agricultural lands? For each of our single decisions, have we pulled out a "key" thread that blurs a potential vision or makes it different? What is our vision for these agricultural lands? I have not seen or heard this clearly articulated. A land use plan is not a vision. Seemingly, all land-use decisions ought to be placed against this vision to see if it is desirable. Are we destabilizing these lands for present or future uses?

I realize that development on College of Agriculture lands is not sacred. I feel that the importance of TEACHING ON THE LAND has not sufficiently been weighted in the decision-making process.

The topic of the importance of LABORATORY TEACHING ON THE LAND needs to be an ongoing topic between you, planning staff, curriculum bodies, and the Dean of the College of Agriculture.

My concerns stem most from the perceived tone of recent dialogues and the perception that we do not have an articulated vision of our agriculture land.

I hope that you perceive my comments to be given in a positive spirit.
Best wishes in your efforts to mold Cal Poly into an EXCELLENT university.
MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 11, 1995
FILE: LandUseComm
TO: John McCutcheon, Director of Athletics
FROM: Ken Scott, Chair
The Land Use Committee of the College of Agriculture

SUBJECT: Reconsideration of the Rodeo and Sheep Sites for the Athletic Facilities

We would like to propose that you give serious consideration to locating the athletic facility on the 37 acres currently occupied by the Rodeo Arena and the Sheep Unit (Site 5). We realize the current site (Sites 1 and 2) is in the Master Plan and that you have invested 1 1/2 years into specific planning for that site. But Sites 1 and 2 represent 50% of the prime agricultural land we have on campus. From our perspective, the use of these sites for athletics is an irreplaceable loss in our efforts to educate students in the agricultural sciences.

We are recommending Site 5 for the following reasons:

- There is approximately 15 acres of existing parking. The Master Plan also includes two proximal parking structures.
- Less external agency approval would be needed for the new site. The existing site will certainly include approvals from City of San Luis Obispo, Cal Trans, Fish and Game, and Department of Water Resources (Clean Water Act).
- All utilities are available on the new site, whereas the existing site has only electricity. The existing site also has one of our two deep irrigation wells. If the well is replaceable, the estimated cost would be $35,000–$45,000. This well supplies one third of the water for the whole farm. In addition, when Mustang Village expanded, Doug Gerard committed this well as a water source for their fire protection systems.
- The cost of moving the existing sheep and rodeo facilities is not too high. The College of Agriculture would consider participating in the cost of moving these facilities.
- Seemingly, access to the new site is better than the existing site choice. Highland and Grand would feed the existing parking lots plus California would feed into the two new parking structures. There is also better proximity to the existing campus core and the Athletic Department.
- The existing site could be left as agricultural land which, given the urban density and Highway 1 frontage, would seem to be an advantage.
- Relocation of the stadium site would have minimal negative impacts on the CAGR livestock programs and have considerable positive impacts on our crop programs. It preserves accessible lands for faculty and students to study the urban-ag interface. Current plans include high density enterprises using sustainable agricultural practices.

We feel the entire campus community would benefit by locating the proposed athletic facilities at Site 5 instead of Sites 1 and 2.

Attachments
MEMORANDUM

To: Warren J. Baker, President
From: George Gowgani, Department Head, Crop Science Department
Copy: Frank Lebens, Joe Jen

Date: February 10, 1995

Subject: Athletic Facilities and Farm Land

The recent move to Division I provides an exciting and challenging scenario for our football program. Most CAGR faculty and staff are supportive of Cal Poly athletics and understand the need for upgraded facilities to meet NCAA requirements for Division I teams. However, the Crop Science Department is quite concerned over the planned location of a new athletic facility on our fields C28 and C29. To the casual observer, it may appear that these fields are simply producing alfalfa hay, a relatively low-value commodity on expensive real estate. A closer look reveals the true value of this land.

The real value of the crop lands near the campus core lies in their proximity to our classrooms. These fields are essentially our field laboratories, heavily used by classes in entomology, insect pest management, weed science, agronomy, plant pathology, as well as horticulture, soil science, and natural resources management. Though the alfalfa is actually grown by a small number of enterprise project students, who themselves are learning a great deal, the fields service hundreds of other students and faculty each quarter. The proximity of this prime agricultural land to our laboratory and lecture rooms enhances the quality of learning simply because students can walk or bike to the fields in a three-hour lab period. We have completed our academic training at well-known Land Grant universities such as Purdue, Illinois, Oregon State and others. In none of these fine universities with strong agriculture programs are campus farms as available to undergraduate students as at our campus. Generally only faculty and graduate students spend time on campus farm land, and this is usually associated with their research. We have a chance at Cal Poly to go against the Land Grant trend and show a real commitment to preserve our prime agricultural land near campus for teaching.
We understand the need for optimizing the use of all campus facilities (including land) in these times of declining or static resources. To this end, our department has recently formed a Land Use Task Force to evaluate our practices on all land under our control. We are working closely with our Farm Director, Phil Doub, as well as the CAGR Land Use Committee which was formed in Fall 1994. Recent plans include the proposed building of a permanent campus farmer's market on Highland Avenue across from Field C29. We are also considering new uses of fields C28 and C29 to involve other CAGR departments and take advantage of the environmental sensitivity of these sites.

In short, we would like you to seriously consider the stadium site location proposed by the CAGR Land Use Committee (Ken Scott’s memo of January 11, 1995). We are aware that this committee has recently consulted with both John McCutcheon and Robert Kitamura and plans to meet on February 10 with Frank Lebens. This interaction is healthy and will build trust and support between the CAGR and central administration.

Thank you for your consideration of this issue.