

<p>Academic Senate April 7, 2009</p> <p>Present: Bell, Bender, Bice, Black, Brown, Campbell, Cogan Bailey, Colnic, Covino, C. Davis, S. Davis, DeVries, Dunham-Filson, Eudey, Filling, Flores, Garcia, Hall, Hejka-Ekins, Heredia, Hight, Jones, J. Mayer, M. Mayer, Morgan-Foster, Nagel, Nainby, O'Brien, Peterson, Petratos, Petrosky, Senior, Silverman, Sniezek, Tan, Taniguchi, Thompson, Tuedio, Werling, Young</p> <p>Proxy: Dieter Renning (Manrique)</p> <p>Guests: Dean Nael Aly, Lelia DeKatzew, Vice Provost Diana Demetrulias, Brian Duggan, Dean Roger McNeil, Sari Miller-Antonio, Dean Daryl Moore, Dean Gary Novak, Antonio Rios-Bustamante, John Sarraille, Dean Carolyn Stefanco, AVP Ted Wendt, Kou Yang</p> <p>Diana Bowman, Recording Secretary</p>	<p>3/AS/09/UEPC—Amendment to 7/AS/05/UEPC—Academic Affairs Committee for Student Petitions, UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED</p> <p>4/AS/09/SEC—Recommendation to University Budget Advisory Committee, APPROVED</p> <p>5/AS/09/FAC—Faculty Policy on Student Recording of Classes, FIRST READING</p> <p>6/AS/09/SEC—AB 390, FIRST READING</p> <p>7/AS/09/UEPC—BA in Ethnic Studies, FIRST READING</p> <p>Risk Management Survey of Facilities and Functions, DISCUSSION</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting: Tuesday, April 28, 2009 2:30-4:30 pm., JSRFDC Reference Room</p> <hr/> <p>Minutes submitted by:</p> <p>Betsy Eudey, Clerk</p>
--	---

1. Call to order
2:36pm

2. Approval of Agenda
No changes suggested. 7a should be from FAC, it will be changed in the minutes.

3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of March 17, 2009

No suggested changes

4. Announcements

Student Union has started first ever spring lecture series. Fliers were distributed with various dates and event titles. ASI elections start tomorrow – Wed and Thurs 8-7.

Duggan reminded all about the online learning forum on Wednesday April 8, 12-1:30 in MSR 130. Panelists include Betsy Eudey, Mark Groebner, Tom Carter, and John Mayer. The Provost is providing a light lunch. Duggan also reminded all that the Technology Fair will be held on April 29th, 10-2 in MSR.

Petrosky announced that the Human Resource Management Human Resource Games team won the regional competition in Boise this past weekend.

Nagel announced that CFA will have an all-campus budget meeting tentatively scheduled for April 30th to discuss stateside budget issues, upcoming elections, and the local budget problems. More information is on the way.

Taniguchi announced that on April 24 and 25 our campus is hosting the Phi Alpha Theta Northern California conference for a competition where students give papers. The social is Friday night, and the competition is on Saturday. This is a great day to see great student work.

Dean Stefanco announced that on Wed April 8th the College of Humanities and Social Sciences will have its first lunchtime seminar presented by Jake Myers who will be talking about the book he wrote during his sabbatical.

Dean Novak announced that the university received a Fulbright scholar in residence award and will host two European scholars in

behavioral psychology. One in fall, another in spring. They will be living in the Village and participating as a pseudo-faculty in residence.

Thompson announced that Academic Senate and General Faculty ballots will go out on Monday April 20th – he reminded faculty to encourage colleagues to vote.

Thompson also noted some guests, including Lilia de Katzew, Kou Yang, Antonio Rios Bustamante, and Dieter Renning who was here for ERFA.

Thompson noted that supposedly we didn't get enough of the stimulus money and so there will be a greater reduction. Covino said that we have not received enough stimulus money to avoid a \$50 million cut to the CSU, which is about a \$1.2 million cut to our campus. That will be added to our projected shortfall for next year which brings the total to about \$6.2 million. Thompson asked if the planning was already preparing for this, and Covino responded that \$6.2 million is about 10% so that is in one of the scenarios submitted by the Vice Presidents.

5. Questions about Committee Reports

None.

6. Action Items

a. 3/AS/09/UEPC—Amendment to 7/AS/05/UEPC—Academic Affairs Committee for Student Petitions

Petrosky reminded all that we are making changes to the committee structure to reflect that we now have six colleges and at their request to remove counseling faculty to forestall any conflicts of interest. No revisions have been made since it was last here. Passed unanimously.

b. 4/AS/09/SEC—Recommendation to University Budget Advisory Committee (sense of senate)

Filling reported that the resolution went to SEC and there was a change in the last sentence of the rationale. The term “structural deficit” was changed to “structural deficit/budget gap.”

Nagel offered a friendly amendment to add a resolved clause “that the AS of CSU Stanislaus urge the UBAC to consider cuts to classes and part time faculty only as a last resort.” There was an objection. It was moved as an amendment by Nagel and seconded by O'Brien. Nagel said that the only proposal that has been under consideration by UBAC is across the board cuts to the academic divisions, and at a 7% budget cut that would result in upwards of 220 classes being cut next year, and that scenario was a rosy picture. He thinks that UBAC should consider how that affects mission, progress to graduation, workload of remaining faculty, faculty morale, and the university's overall well-being over the long term. O'Brien says that as faculty that to try to keep classes and part-time cuts to a minimum should not only be our purview but our goal.

Tuedio wanted to clarify whether this amendment served to shift the focus away from the budget gap/structural deficit to a different statement altogether about cuts. Following the path of this shift, this seems to be two different issues that should stand before us on their own and not together. He questioned if issues are being substituted. Thompson noted it's an additional clause in the same resolution.

Dunham-Filson noted that the amendment privileges some over others, which means that staff could get cut first since classes and faculty are a last resort. This doesn't seem right since staff were first to be cut last time. S. Davis asked if we hadn't already prioritized items in a separate resolution, and this appears to put enhanced attention to one item at the expense of the other three. Thompson indicated that we did pass a resolution of budget priorities.

Nagel didn't mean it as at the expense of staff, but to have UBAC seek other means to more creatively close the budget gap. In response to S. Davis' point, it is addressing UBACs current consideration of the budget gap rather than budget priorities in general. Dunham-Filson noted that we may be setting precedent then for the senate setting priorities, and some of these should go directly to UBAC.

Covino wanted to second S. Davis and Dunham-Filson, believing that the prior resolution stresses what this is intended to express. This statement on behalf of the senate implicitly does ask UBAC to look at staff cuts that might otherwise not be considered. And having just come from UBAC, that committee is considering a range of possibilities that are under discussion.

Eudey supported the essence of this resolution in terms of wanting to take a strong look at cutting courses, who is or not teaching courses, and the main resolution did that. There are good national articles being written now indicating that schools are being short sighted if we cut courses quickly and don't try to preserve faculty. But she stated she doesn't intend to vote for this resolution because it puts additional constraints on UBAC beyond the intention of the original resolution.

Sarraille is not sure what he would vote, but he does think that we should not be assuming that we have some sort of trade-off where it's a matter of staff or lecturers. No one should draw such conclusions at this juncture. He encouraged all to keep an open mind about the resources that may be drawn upon and what is possible.

Colnic mentioned urging UBAC to be creative, and avoiding cuts. Perhaps reworking language expressing that urgency to be creative to avoid cuts to classes and personnel. That potentially waters it down but gets the theme across fairly well. Tuedio would vote against the amendment but would speak to a relationship between the concern raised and the original proposal. If there is a way to extend our commitment to closing down this gap, in the future the revenue stream we reclaim should be put into restoring classes and faculty where

we can show a reasonable need to fill it. This is the only place we should engage in deficit spending because we get a return in serving students, and the enrollment growth gives us standing.

Tan thinks that in UBAC they are currently looking at closing the gap within one year. This is why we are facing the devastating scenarios that include cutting classes and other items. At the moment they are not considering closing the gap over more years, and we need to put that on the table. If they have begun to look at this option there would be lesser cuts to faculty, Stockton, etc. We have to bring this to UBAC because they are looking to close the whole gap now. Tan wants Senate to pass the resolution because it's very important for everybody.

A vote on the amendment proposed by Nagel failed by voice vote. A vote on main motion passed by voice vote.

7. First Reading Items

a. 5/AS/09/FAC—Faculty Policy on Student Recording of Classes

It was MS Hejka-Ekins/S. Davis

Be in Resolved: That the Academic Senate approves the attached Faculty Policy on Student Recording of Classes.

Rationale: A policy ensuring the intellectual property rights of an instructor's classroom pedagogy needs to be protected. Further, disabled students have special needs that require them to utilize learning tools that instructors need to accommodate. This policy ensures the instructor's property rights, while meeting the needs of disabled students prescribed by law.

Discussion:

Hejka-Ekins said the discussion began last year in FAC and arose out of a gap in attention to having a policy statement about recording classes. This policy tries to ensure the intellectual property rights of the instructor over their pedagogy but we also have to be aware of and abide by the needs of disabled students that may require them to have learning tools to obtain the information they need in the classes. The policy strikes a balance between these. FAC conferred with Lee Bettencourt to make sure that disability student policies were being followed. The policy indicates that recording is not allowed. Suggestions are given as to how to address this in the syllabus. Faculty can choose to allow limited recording under particular situations if stipulated in the syllabus. Sample language is offered to ensure they have control over their classroom instruction. The exception is given to students who are registered with DRS and are approved for this accommodation by law. The policy outlines the DRS policy and offers a sample Audio/Video Recording Agreement that may be used to formalize the conditions under which recording may occur. The agreement is on the DRS website. This was an attempt to make the intellectual property rights of faculty primary but give disabled students some access to classroom learning devices.

S. Davis wanted to appreciate the fine work of Lee Bettencourt and FAC. This strikes a fine balance between the provisions of ADA which runs back to 1990. S. Davis had two questions. First, how will it be disseminated, how will we inform students on the restrictions on their ability to record; and second, how will it be enforced? Hejka-Ekins will disseminate this to the faculty so that they put things in the syllabus so that it alerts them to the issues.

Novak said that there are contradictions here between what is quoted in the last paragraph "recording can only be made" and above in 2. He noted that the policy only allows students registered with DRS to record, but then in item two it looks like it's a contradiction if faculty can allow other students to make recordings.

Nagel said maybe the resolution should have resolved clauses about where it should be published. In an information question, it says that students registered with DRS can be an exception, does the student have an obligation to inform the faculty member. Hejka-Ekins responded that the student will have a form from DRS that says that an accommodation should be made.

Morgan Foster wanted to address enforcement. It should be in the student handbook and it is then it is also on the web. If a student violates this, they can be referred to Student Affairs for a violation of student conduct. The policy is intended to provide faculty with latitude to provide recording, but why would it be a problem to allow students to record. Privacy of other students in class may be violated if there is an allowance for filming.

C. Davis says there is currently a form that allows for audio-recording.

Duggan had the opportunity to talk with Chau Pu Chiang when working with FAC on this. His staff routinely records students in the ITV classroom, and these are made available to students in that class. He wanted to be sure that the senators know that this does occur and no language should creep into this that prevents OIT from taping the classes. Hejka-Ekins thought that because this has taken a year to get to here to deal with this aspect of student recordings, that if we wanted to be more extensive to deal with distance issues that we would want to get this part done first and do a second round that is more inclusive to broaden it for those concerns. It seemed like too big a bit to do all at once, but it does need to be addressed in the future.

Dunham-Filson wanted to know what brought this about, has there been an issue with it. Hejka-Ekins said that we didn't have a clear policy against it, and it seemed it needed to be addressed. They had examples from different campuses including Fullerton, and wrote the recording policy and also realized we needed to deal with the disabled aspect of it. Eudey stated she referred this to FAC. At the time there were several cases where faculty members were losing their jobs or put on probation because of students postings on YouTube. There is also a privacy issue for students and the use of their images or their ideas are captured by others without their permission.

Eudey was surprised to find we didn't have a policy in place, and encouraged the creation of one as a proactive protection. There are lots of rights issues involved, and many ways for students to make recordings without anyone knowing. She's not aware of anyone on this campus having had problems with recordings, but we should have a policy in place. There are recording issues overall we have to deal with eventually.

Tuedio is still confused about whether there is a contradiction. Is the audio/video policy making a statement that they are not allowed to record? He didn't understand the second point – it doesn't seem to be tied to the disability resource issue since that's dealt with in the next section. Hejka-Ekins responded that the instructor has the leeway to decide if they will prevent recording or allow limited recording.

DeVries said that in the disability language, students would have no way of knowing who is part of the DRS program.

Nainby says the instructor latitude seems to be setting up the constraints. One thing that it implies is that the only ones who need protection are faculty. But even though video is more obviously intrusive to establishing privacy, if the instructor allows audio recording it may still violate the privacy rights of students. We may just want a policy that protects students' rights with both video and audio recording by not allowing it without DRS approval.

Nagel says that this addresses student recording of classes and not faculty recording. Perhaps we also need a policy regarding faculty recording of classes. There is nothing in this policy that prevents him from recording his own classes, and posting them to YouTube.

Morgan Foster said it is important to get clarity, and to address how this might also reach to student, faculty, etc. She has some suggestions to work on the language that would allow it to be consistent. From Morgan-Foster's read of it she thinks that the intent is completely legitimate.

Heredia stated there needs to be different policies in place for faculty and students. However, there should be an exception because there are a lot of students who do sit in a class who don't always understand things and want to go back to review the material.

Colnic has 2-3 questions. First, can we as instructors deny disabled students the right to have the lectures recorded under the ADA? The response was no. Colnic noted then that 1 and 2 only apply to all other students besides disabled students, and they have to sign the forms. Second, given all the recording devices available and not wanting to be a police officer, are we concerned with recording or the dissemination of the recordings? Maybe we should focus on the dissemination as much as recordings themselves because we don't want them on other sites, but if they want to use them for themselves, we likely can't stop them.

Tuedio said this should be directed to dissemination since this is related to faculty property rights most directly. There is a conflict between the privacy of those students who achieve the right to record if they are the only ones who are entitled to, because they don't need to self-identify and we cannot go in that direction with the policy from an ethical standpoint.

Petratos knows of professors who record their own lectures, and point the camera toward themselves, not the students. Students *and* faculty have rights. If faculty do something silly to break the law, and one of the students took a video home and posted it online, what would happen? If as a faculty member he was to do that to a student he would be in trouble. It should go both ways.

Garcia says the policy proposed already covers those issues. It may not be distributed to others is in the policy already. Duggan thinks that dissemination is key here. There is value to review notes or recordings to reinforce understanding. In streaming video, we have classes where over 1000 viewings are made of classes they've attended. There's value to view lecture material even if not distributed improperly.

Bender initially thought if you were disabled no matter what your disability is they could record, but we're really talking only about a small number of students who need the accommodation of video of the lecture. In that case it wouldn't be difficult to follow up with the student. It's not just that any disabled student can record.

Eudey stated she likes the policy because it lets faculty decide if they want to allow recording, and if so under what conditions. Faculty can set classroom policy in a way that allows protection for the student and faculty privacy rights or faculty can say not under any conditions can students record. Other accommodations are made only for those with a documented disability. DRS is very diligent and they don't do anything without paperwork so there will be oversight so we can know who is eligible. The policy does cover dissemination of recordings.

Tuedio noted that there is no recording except what is in number two or for disabled students. But if a faculty member says you can only do that if you have the DRS exception, then we're drawing attention to a student with a disability. Thompson thinks that the idea of focusing on dissemination means that the student may record the class in any manner that they want? Are we telling faculty that students can record a class by any means they want, recorders, bark carving, is it really that the class can be recorded in any way that the student chooses?

S. Davis said that we have a procedure for student note-taking, and it seems that we can ask DRS to assist with recording so that student privacy is protected. Young is thinking from a learner's perspective and that people learn in different ways, and it's hard to fully embrace a policy that absolutely could prevent the opportunity for folks other than the students registered with DRS to record.

M. Mayer indicated that if we're not doing what we're supposed to be doing, we should be outed. If we're doing what we're supposed to be doing, why shouldn't we allow students to record classes. Not allowing recording is protecting those not on the up and up.

Heredia can name times when in Senate people fell asleep and there is no policy saying that recording that cannot be done. Do we need a policy for all locations? Heredia added if you start dictating policies, you would have to create policies that could affect what students can and cannot do.

Tuedio supports the point Young made. Student learning is our mantra around here and we say everything is supposed to improve student learning and it's clear to Tuedio that there are students who would benefit from recording class sessions and having been there while it was happening and he at least wants a policy that allows that determination. Some faculty might not want this to be open to students who actually could benefit from it, and he can't understand why it's the case. Do we need a policy, or do we need to think about how to work with our exposure? We live in a YouTube world but also in a university where students learn in different ways.

DeVries wondered if we wanted to set a time limit on future debates. Thompson said he was going to indicate that we had one person left on the list and then would close discussion.

Dunham-Filson first thought the policy was to protect the faculty's instruction from being used without their permission, but can't we just change it to say that recordings are acceptable but are not to be used in an appropriate manner that way we're putting the concern that students who post can be brought before a student board and if it's a faculty member who is sleeping it can be brought to the Provost?

Thompson noted that additional questions can be sent to FAC. Please forward to Hejka-Ekins.

b. 6/AS/09/SEC—AB 390

It was MS Eudey/Filling:

Be it Resolved: That the Academic Senate California State University, Stanislaus support AB390, Marijuana Control, Regulation, and Education Act; and be it further,

Resolved: That the Senate direct the Office of the Academic Senate to communicate this resolution to the Chancellor, the President, the Faculty, and local members of the state legislature.

Rationale: The proposed legislation would provide a significant source of new state revenues (estimated at \$1.3B/year) while at the same time reducing state expenses for enforcement against minor drug offenses. The combination of revenues and reduced expenses will provide increased funds for other state services. The regulation program would also specifically direct funding for drug abuse prevention programs. Associated Students, Incorporated, the representative body and official voice of students at CSU, Stanislaus, supports AB390 (Resolution SR0809-06).

Discussion:

Eudey indicated that ASI voted to support AB390 and asked AS to consider doing the same. The resolution is here to respond to this request from ASI. Filling noted that *the Economist* and *Rolling Stone* and increasing numbers of researchers and politicians support this idea of legalizing marijuana. Filling thinks that as the majority of those in prisons are there for marijuana, it's time to change.

Nagel asked to clarify that the resolution would include the resolved and rationale statements only, and not the supplemental materials included in the agenda. That was confirmed.

Morgan Foster is not sure that if this were to be passed it would result in significant revenue. It strikes her that it's naïve to think that the current underground sale and distribution won't continue to occur via black market systems if legalized. Tuedio questioned whether we were debating in a first reading. Thompson noted he was giving some latitude.

Sarraille indicated that when they repealed prohibition there was less demand than for bathtub gin. Some people will compete effectively with those who are trying to smuggle it in from other places. S. Davis asked if the resolution should directly show our support for the ASI resolution.

Peterson had not discussed this with her department, but she agrees that in the past deregulation has increased revenue, and that as students have chosen this as a paper topic over the years she has learned that part of it is the taxes, but part is the social benefits in terms of safer products. Many receive tainted substances that are more dangerous to their health and society suffers the cost associated with death from using the tainted products. There is a market, and it's clear that we have not reduced use but the nature of the use.

Nagel remembers an oath of allegiance to the state of CA that says he's upholding the laws. Is there concern that supporting this is counter to the laws?

Heredia noted that she abstained on this issue as an ASI senator. She's not sure it's an issue that faculty should participate in this. She

thinks our time could be spent doing something more educational.

Sarraille didn't instigate this, however he believes things are connected. This is not about faculty trying to get dope legalized so we can smoke doobies on campus, this is seriously an effort to fund the CSU. We are in hard times and we're trying to find a way to get the state out of a hard problem. There are things going on that just doesn't make sense and we want the government to stop acting foolishly and maybe this is one of those things. We need everyone to think of any way to help this institution and further the cause of education in CA. We are in big trouble and need to think outside the box. Think of something and get us out of this pickle.

Bice said the Math Department members wondered why we're discussing this in the first place. Several colleagues wonder if this will create an image problem if we support this bill, won't there be a community perspective of us as pot-heads? Will this cause people to stop supporting us? One colleague asked why we're discussing this, don't we have something better to do? Bice understands why this ties in, but so far the department isn't interested in this topic.

Peterson would support this personally because it comes from the students and it's a way to reduce funding for prisons, law enforcement, etc to find more resources. It's good the students are looking for new ways. We used to have an active and successful hemp industry in California for textiles, construction, etc. but because of anti-drug polices that option was taken away from our farmers. There is an Ag industry interest in growing hemp.

Filling noted that beyond the economic stuff, as Edward Said said, people in the university act as public intellectuals. It is our job to think about these sorts of things, so be it. They painted Columbus as a crackpot too. Thompson said to send further comments to him for SEC to consider.

c. 7/AS/09/UEPC—BA in Ethnic Studies

It was MS Petrosky/S Davis

Be it Resolved: That the Academic Senate endorses the Proposal for the Bachelor of Arts in Ethnic Studies Degree Program; and be it further

Resolved: That, following approval by the President, this be forwarded to the Chancellor's Office for fast-track approval in anticipation of a Fall 2010 start date.

Rationale: Responding to the increased enrollment of diverse students and in recognition of the extraordinarily important role that diversity plays in the mission and vision of CSU, Stanislaus, the Department of Ethnic Studies has designed a major that showcases the diversity of California's Central Valley. This major has been designed with an integrated curriculum that addresses the Chicana/o, Asian American, and African American experiences. It has an interdisciplinary scholarly framework. In its curriculum, the major addresses the rapid growth of ethnic and immigrant communities within the state and the greater national context. The major will afford students in these communities the opportunity to learn about themselves and about their community's contributions to the US socio-historical and cultural fabric. The objective of the Ethnic Studies major is to offer all students the opportunity to learn about the perspectives of diverse ethnic groups through those groups own voices and through their world view. The major in Ethnic Studies will provide students with the skills to understand and appreciate our richly diverse and complex social space in California's Central Valley and beyond. It will train students to function as culturally sensitive citizens and professionals. It will also help fill the demand for educated professionals who can best understand and serve the needs of these communities. Our current global economy requires employees to have not only technical/vocational skills, but also competency in relating to diverse cultures and economies.

Discussion:

Petrosky noted that on March 12 UEPC discussed and supported it. While he would like to extol the virtues of the proposal, he turned the floor over to Lilia de Katzew to speak to the proposal.

DeKatzew noted that she is grateful that the major has gone through this long journey and gotten to here. It has taken almost 3 years. This was a labor of love and passion. Midway through Ethnic Studies lost the tenure-track African Americanist position, they got the position reinstated, and were back on track. DeKatzew distributed a handout summarizing the major. The department believes this is important for CSU Stanislaus, It provides an array of professional opportunities in business, commerce, health, education, political economy, public administration, psychology, law, social sciences, and community organizations and services, and parallels the vision and mission of the university in that it frames and speaks to diversity of CA's central valley. This major also will distinguish this institution, as it is the only one in the state of its kind. The major speaks to our institution itself since it's an Hispanic serving institution, with 26.5% of the population Hispanic. The core of the rationale is that this kind of a major will provide the students understanding and appreciation of our diverse social space in California's central valley. A core mission is to train the students to function as culturally sensitive citizens and culturally literate professionals. Even in the circumstance we find ourselves in this valley, there is a demand for educated professionals who can understand the needs of diverse communities.

DeKatzew noted that there is an abbreviated catalog description and list of requirements included in the handout. There are two tracks, socio-cultural emphasis in ethnic minority families and socio-political focus on ethnic experiences. Students can choose which track to pursue. Each track requires them to address the full range of ethnic experiences.

Miller-Antonio noted that the elective units are drawn from many disciplines around the college to add breadth and depth and choice. DeKatzew said that in terms of budgetary requirements, they don't need anything new for the major. They understand the budgetary

constraints, and they believe they have enough faculty, four faculty, three tenured and one tenure-track, that they will be able to offer the core and some of the other courses as well. That is one of the strengths of the major. Noticeably absent is the Native American experience, and hopefully with the success in the future they might be able to request and be able to justify a Native Americanist position that could perhaps be a joint position with another department to make it more cost-effective.

Renning asked if there were adequate library resources for the major. DeKatzew said yes, and that the library has been supportive. At this point the resources are very much adequate. Nagel asked about whether there were other CSUs with an Ethnic Studies degree, and if they can project the number of majors since these are related – how competitive will this major be for the department and college? DeKatzew replied that it's the only major between Sacramento and Los Angeles. They did a survey and they projected enrollments from within the University and from community colleges, and the percentages were high. They also gave out surveys to potential employers and the results were quite positive.

Taniguchi noted that history has a US immigration and ethnicity class that is not included in the major and they're wondering why. Also, one of the comments was that there is an emphasis on Chicano and Mexican Americans, but wondered why other Spanish-speaking people were not included. Taniguchi also saw numbers of students who wanted to transfer to CSU Stanislaus, but the percentage seems to be inflated given the small percentage of students who transfer to our campus. DeKatzew said that the history class had been discussed with Weikart, and the Ethnic Studies faculty think they do bring the immigration experience within each course and she can provide history with a rationale for that decision. Regarding the focus on the Chicano/Chicana experience, DeKatzew reviewed a response the department had offered to UEPC regarding that issue. Currently 96% of the Hispanic students on campus identify as Mexican American, and this is the largest population if Hispanics in the Central Valley. Other groups are included in the curriculum, but we're focusing on Chicano/as because of the statistics. Regarding the third point, they are not doing a demographic study of the statistical bridge to the university, but a statistical analysis of those students who would consider taking an ethnic studies major if they were to come to this university. They are asked if they would consider coming to the university and if you were coming would you consider the ethnic studies major.

Novak doesn't have the full major in front of him. He wondered if they had added courses from outside of the college in the electives. None are included at this time. Thompson ended discussion and encouraged additional comments to be sent to Petrosky.

8. Discussion Item

a. Risk Management Survey of Facilities and Functions

DeVries asked this to be added because the planned observing night was canceled. He understands liability issues, but the way it was handled in this case was terrible. He would have wanted the assessor to talk to him or the College of Natural Science Environmental and Safety Committee and feels as though he was under double secret probation, and when he asked what other facilities were under review he was not given a straight answer. If we are going to have facility reviews and policies related to public facilities and public events, these should be discussed in senate. There are kids here for the Easter egg hunt, crowds at athletic events, and De Vries doesn't know why the observation night was targeted. He still has no news on what is going on.

Covino said that De Vries should please always feel free to talk to him if he has concerns. There is no plot against the observatory. At the last observatory tour everyone was surprised by the high turnout – hundreds of people. The president was at that event, and later at a meeting with the VPs he expressed appreciation for and concern about observatory tours – are these controlled, how are they monitored, how is safety being handled, what is our capacity? These are all reasonable safety and access questions that are addressed in other events that we hold repeatedly, but that haven't been addressed here. Covino had already talked to Dean McNeil about future events to set up clarity for future events so that safety and security would be secure and then was surprised when it was announced at senate that another event had been scheduled. The president was not yet satisfied that we had processes in place that assured safety and security. He asked at a meeting with VPS if we could hold off on that event until he and Police Chief Jaureguy and Bob Gallegos could address how it goes and think about all of the possible risks connected with it. At the same time they can also talk about other sites on campus that may or may not invite public access but which the public does access and address issues there as well. Covino contacted the Dean and asked that the event be held off until there was a chance to do the kind of analysis and develop protocols to ensure safety in the future.

DeVries says that the administration has contacted him repeatedly to oblige tours, events, etc but when this came up no one contacted him directly. In other cases, there is direct outreach to him. When there was a problem they didn't come to him. To this point he has not been talked to about this situation. The issues with the observatory have been going a long time, and the idea for the start was that there would be public observing nights, and DeVries thinks this was handled in a rude and difficult way. He doesn't think any future public events or faculty doing these kinds of events should have to go through arbitrary administrative requirements or policy changes. The wall between faculty and administration needs to come down. When he heard there were issues, he talked to assistants in the advancement/outreach office and didn't hear any information back. He has tried to be proactive, and the only way he knew something was happening was because of planning another event.

McNeil took responsibility for information breakdown. The information did not get to DeVries face to face because DeVries was not in the office when he first came by. He doesn't want to limit faculty initiative to have events, but we need university assistance to put on the best event possible. He apologizes for the information breakdown, and noted that some of those issues would have been resolved before there were questions as to whether or not the university wanted this to happen. The observatory is a great way for the university to reach the public, especially the younger ones.

DeVries would like to refer this to SEC for an ongoing policy. Thompson said SEC would add this to the agenda.

Filling is curious because the college and campus have safety bodies who typically are working on this kind of issue – are they working

on this? Covino replied that the President intends to meet with Chief Jaureguy and Gallegos to discuss this and related issues. It either has happened or will happen. Filling asked why he hasn't talked to the college or campus safety committee? Covino said he's initially talking to those others. Dunham-Filson says it's not only rude, but we've had these before, why is it coming up now? Is it because it's a new building and more are interested? How long between these two events was there before this discussion was brought forward? She's sure that as an astronomer he schedules events when things happen in the sky, he can't just postpone for a few days.

Heredia asked the faculty policy for doing events, since DeVries mentioned something about an Easter egg hunt. There are many forms done in a specific order for ASI to hold this event. Is there an event form, maybe there should be one so that it can be looked at by the higher ups so this doesn't happen again.

9. Open Forum

none

10. Adjournment