

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93407
ACADEMIC SENATE

MINUTES OF THE
Academic Senate Executive Committee
Tuesday, November 5, 1996
UU 220, 3:00-5:00 p.m.

Preparatory: The meeting was opened at 3:13 p.m.

Members and Guests present: Bill Amspacher, Phil Ashley, Joe Biggs, Les Bowker, Johanna Brown, Margaret Camuso, Chris Clark, Leslie Cooper, Juan Gonzalez, Harvey Greenwald, John Hampsey, Myron Hood, Dan Howard-Greene, Glenn Irvin, Hal Johnston, Bob Kitamura, Richard Kransdorf, Frank Lebens, San Lutrin, William Martinez, Steve McShane, Anny Morrobel-Sosa, Sam Reed, Chuck Sleeper, Jim Zetzsche, Paul Zingg

- I. Minutes: None.
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
- III. Reports:
 - A. Academic Senate Chair: no report
 - B. President's Office: no report
 - C. Provost's Office: no report
 - D. Statewide Senators: no report
 - E. CFA Campus President:
 - F. Staff Council representative: Cooper reported that the Staff Council is working on resolutions regarding "The Consultative Process" and "The Sale of Alcohol on Campus".
 - G. ASI representative: Reed (representing ASI Board of Directors and CAED) gave report of discussion by ASI regarding Credit/NoCredit Resolution. While ASI values GE&B, they believe that hiring companies will be more concerned with GPA of student's major courses. Regarding exploration, ASI feels that the excellent student will not challenge themselves if Cr/NC is abolished. There is a belief that students will take the easiest courses, regardless of Cr/NC. Regarding unit load - since there are now no free electives, the student will take a longer time to graduate if the student opts to take a Cr/NC class. The ASI believes that the students are ultimately responsible to get what is necessary out of a class. The reason for apathy by the students is not Cr/NC, it is lack of motivation by the teacher. Reed announced an open invitation to anyone interested in expressing reasons for the Cr/NC decision to attend the ASI Board of Directors meeting at 7 p.m. on 11/6/96.
 - H. IACC representative: no report
 - I. Athletics Governing Board representative: Brown reported that there will be meetings next week with subcommittees regarding accreditation of the athletics program.

J. Other:

IV. Consent Agenda

V. Business Item(s):

A. Committees:

1. **Academic Senate committee vacancies:** Greenwald reviewed list of people named to various committees. Johnston questioned the validity of establishing a quorum on email. Greenwald reminded the group of the agreement that was reached at the last meeting (to vote via email).
2. **University-wide committee vacancies:** Greenwald reminded group of vacancies that still exist on various committees.
Greenwald announced the five candidates for the two positions on the CAM Review and Revision Process Committee, and asked for options to select. Martinez suggested to have two votes - one to narrow the field to three candidates, and the second vote to select the top two vote getters. Bowker spoke to recommend Gary Epstein. Biggs spoke to recommend Ken Riener. Morrobel-Sosa spoke to recommend Ken Riener and Stacey Breitenbach. Lutrín spoke to recommend Bob Walters. Gonzalez spoke to recommend Bob Walters. First Vote: top three vote getters were Reiner, Walters and Epstein. Second Vote: top two vote getters were Reiner and Walters.

Special Item: During tallying of CAM Review and Revision Process Committee votes, Amspacher spoke to Reed's ASI report. Amspacher disagreed with the statement that "teachers need to motivate students", and felt that "teaching/learning is a two-way street". Amspacher requested that these comments be taken back to the ASI Board of Directors. Welch had joined the meeting after the report had been made, so Greenwald briefed Welch on same. Welch reiterated the invitation to attend the next ASI Board of Directors meeting.

VI. Discussion Item(s):

- A. **Enrollment:** Zingg reported that at this time of the year, all campuses are asked to submit enrollment proposals for the following year to the Chancellor's office. The Chancellor's office then takes the data, reviews it, and discusses it with the campus. Cal Poly has concerns on overenrollment. Discussions have taken place at various levels.

Two scenarios have been developed. (1) Deans have proposed no growth beyond this academic year. Cal Poly would keep the same target as this year, however we would be fully funded. The difference between target and actual, this year, was about 600 students. Under this scenario, the only growth next year and beyond would occur in the summer quarter. (2) Second scenario is a compromise between 1 and 3% growth over target (approximately 1.8%). Under this scenario, the difference in target would be fully funded.

Several issues were discussed. The CSU is currently overenrolled by several thousand students, many of which may not be "full qualifiers". Approximately 9,000 have not fulfilled the entry level Math or English requirements. Another issue is Proposition 209. If it passes, there may be an immediate effect on the admissions policies at Cal Poly. Cal Poly is the most aggressive campus in the system with regard to building of a new class with all the elements of diversity. If Proposition 209 passes, Cal Poly essentially has two choices. (1) The university could expect Proposition 209 to be challenged and tried in court, in which case the university could choose to ignore the law. (2) As advised by university legal counsel, Cal Poly could choose to recognize the law immediately, cease and desist the way we recognize race and gender in admissions policies, and build a new admissions policy which recognizes geographic and socioeconomic diversity.

Hampsey requested clarification of fully funding overenrollment. Zingg recalled the scenario 3 years ago, which was a "classic unfunded mandate" of accepting new students mid-year (in essence, changing target). Hood questioned whether Proposition 209 would be recognized immediately, or on January 1, 1997. Zingg responded that university legal counsel advised to treat this as immediate. Zingg also indicated that the university is trying to find a way to accommodate the principles of diversity, while obeying the laws. For example, under Proposition 209, Cal Poly may not be able to participate in the awarding of scholarships based on race or gender. Hood questioned who decides what Cal Poly's interpretation will be. Zingg responded that it will be a combination of university legal counsel and the Long Beach legal counsel (Chancellor's office). Martinez questioned whether there will be financial aid available. Zingg responded that there are 34 FTE students on financial aid now. Bowker asked for clarification of the "calendar year". Zingg stated that it would be Summer 96 through Spring 97. Johnston questioned how the departments would get financing for summer quarter. Zingg indicated that the departments would have to negotiate with their dean. Johnston then asked if there is pressure from Academic Affairs and agreement from the deans on summer funding. Zingg responded in the affirmative.

- B. **Athletics Complex:** (4:00 p.m. Time Certain) Lebens introduced Chris Clark (Fugro West, Inc.), who prepared the Environmental Impact Review. Lebens indicated that last year a presentation was made to the Academic Senate. Since that time, an alternative site has been identified, and the Environmental Impact Review has been extended through November 29, 1996. Kitamura referred to a Master Plan which was prepared some years ago, which included Mott Gym, the Track Area, the Sports Complex, the Football Stadium, the Baseball Stadium, the Softball Stadiums and various Fields. Phase I would include the relocation of the Sheep Unit to Cheda Ranch. The identified site is approximately 30 acres. Darden and Associates (Fresno) will start on the design soon. The EIR is out for comments through November 29, 1996. Construction is anticipated to begin during summer 1997, with completion approximately 1 year later. Morrobel-Sosa questioned whether the matching dollars would really be available. Lebens replied that he was confident that the City will come through on their part of the agreement. Lebens indicated that there were several options if the City did not

participate. One option would be to cut down on the number of fields to be built. A second option would be to delay part of the stadium seating. A third option would be to cut access to the City and their programs. Martinez questioned if adequate parking was available, and whether it was necessary to move the Sheep Unit. Lebens pointed out existing parking adjacent to the proposed site, and indicated that CAGR Land Use Committee is still reviewing the need to move the rodeo unit.


Clark elaborated on the EIR. As far as water resources, there would be significant impact on drainage. Water quality and pesticide use would have to be monitored. Turf management practices would be implemented. Impact to bioresources would include the horse track, irrigated pastureland, and two artificial ponds which provide wetland and wildlife habitat. EIR recommends protection of resources, barriers to keep people out of sensitive areas, and realignment of some fields. There is no evidence of Chumash sites in the proposed area. Historical value would be lost with the moving of the rodeo grounds (built in 1950's) and the sheep unit (built in 1938, which qualifies it for a historical site). Pastureland would be lost. No faults were found to present geologic hazards. No significant impact to public services, sewer, or water availability. Some potential hazardous substances were located by aero hangar. When looking at the impact to traffic and circulation, it was determined that most activities at the Sports Complex would occur "after hours", with large events occurring on nights and weekends. Phase II would include the Football Stadium. Traffic and circulation could be managed with traffic control practices. Air quality would be affected during construction. Noise was determined not to be a significant factor, with the only areas relatively near the area being the university dormitories and the Bishop's Peak area.. Only a few areas would have major viewing corridors.

Question and Comments: Kransdorf indicated that he had many letters from faculty expressing concerns about the Sports Complex. Kransdorf read several excerpts from the EIR regarding long-term impacts. Greenwald questioned as to which areas to cut back on if the City backs out. Lebens responded that there would have to be further review before an answer was formulated, and that environmental concerns assuredly be considered. Amspacher commented that he hoped that communication with the CAGR Land Use Committee would be more clear in the future. Amspacher also questioned who will provide the additional water necessary for the complex. Kitamura indicated that Cal Poly would be providing the water. Amspacher further questioned what the policy would be for parking permits and facilities upkeep and personnel. Lebens indicated that Cal Poly is working on details of a parking plan with the City, and that the university would take care of the facilities upkeep and personnel. Kitamura demonstrated that in some cases facilities were actually being replaced (i.e. the softball area by the Foundation Warehouse would be returned to CAGR, and the baseball field by Building 13 would be returned to facility use). Morrobel-Sosa's questioned the availability of the EIR for public viewing, and was told that the EIR is available in the Library Government Document's Room, the Library Reserve Room and Second Edition. Ashley expressed concern over the biological effects of the project, and elaborated on how many classes use the

ponds, and the types of rare birds that use the ponds. Ashley recommended a buffer of at least 100 yards between the ponds and fields. Hampsey asked who decided how many fields were actually needed. Sleeper responded that this number was based on the number of programs that would actually use the facility, the number of times needed, the dollars available for such a project, etc. Bowker commented on the importance of the reservoirs. Zetzsche commented that the smell of the two large swine lagoons had not been considered very carefully. Lebens responded that the project intended to employ the methods currently in practice at the dairy. Martinez questioned if alternative sites had been considered. Clark indicated that the least environmental impact would be to renovate Mustang Stadium and the current fields, which would necessitate that the Baseball team continue to play at Sinsheimer. Gonzalez expressed concern that there are relatively few areas for students to engage in intercollegiate, intramural and recreational sports, and that there is currently some pressure not to use City and Recreational Sports facilities. Bowker questioned if there was a plan to move the Irrigation Institute. Lebens replied "no". Amspacher commended Kransdorf for his honesty. Amspacher also commented that unfortunately, agriculture historically loses (agricultural units will be forced to move if the smell does become a problem).

VII. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Submitted by:


Leslie Cooper
Academic Senate