

Building a Public Ivy

-

Sonoma State University

1994-2007

A Study of Student Racial Diversity and Family Income at SSU Compared to Other
California State Universities

By Peter Phillips

Research by Nelson Calderon, Sarah Maddox, Carmela Rocha

And

The Spring 2008 Investigative Sociology Class at Sonoma State University:
Ashley Aldern, Reham Ariqat, Elizabeth Bourne, Nate Bradley, Niki Brunkhurst,
Meredith Carey, Lea Carre, Kimberly Copperberg, Erica Elkington, Erin Garnett,
Keri Kirby, Tara Loch, Lisa McKee, Patricia Ochoa, Phillip Parfitt,
Kelsey Percich, Nina Reynoso, Juana Som, Miasha Terry, Ruby Virelas,
Nicholas Vos, Daniel Wyatt

Funding for this Study came from California Faculty Association (CFA) SSU Chapter,
CFA State Affirmative Action Council, and SSU Center for Community Engagement

SSU Professor Rick Luttmann Provided Math Consultation

Abstract

Sonoma State University (SSU) has recently achieved the status of having the whitest student population of any public university in the State of California. In addition, SSU has the wealthiest freshmen of most, if not all, four-year public universities in California. Research shows, that beginning in the early 1990s, the SSU administration specifically sought to market SSU as a public ivy institution—offering an ivy-league experience at a state college price. Part of this public ivy packaging was to advertise SSU as being in a destination wine country location with high physical and cultural amenities. These marketing efforts were principally designed to attract upper-income students to Sonoma County.

Motivation for these changes was to turn SSU into a residential campus, increase the SSU donor base, and improve time-to-degree efficiency— all measures of success encouraged by the California State University (CSU) Board of Trustees and the CSU state-level administration.

To achieve the desired outcome of becoming a wine-country public ivy the SSU administration implemented a dual program, that included a special admissions screening arrangement using higher SAT-GPA indexes than the rest of the CSU system, and recruitment at predominately white upper-income public and private high schools throughout the West Coast and Hawaii.

The resulting lack of diversity and the allocation of resources away from the instructional mission of the University contributed to 74 percent of the SSU faculty voting no confidence in the President in 2007.

A survey of students of color at SSU describes continuing incidents of racial discrimination and generally less racial comfort on campus compared to students of color at the two closest CSU universities.

Table of Contents

Page 4:	Introduction
Page 5:	SSU diversity and the North Bay Region
Page 6:	CSU Whitest Campus Changes 1994-2007
Page 7:	SSU Freshmen Income Changes 1994-2007
Page 8:	SSU Family Incomes compared to CSU and UC
Page 9:	SSU Administrative support for diversity
Page 10:	Academic Success at SSU Compared to CSU
Page 11:	Building a Public Ivy at SSU
Page 12:	Green Music Center and the Public Ivy Mystique

Page 15	SSU Special Admissions Program
Page 17:	SSU Focused Recruitment in High Income Schools
Page 20:	Cal Poly SLO Diversity Recruitment Efforts
Page 21:	Minority Student Comfort Levels at SSU
Page 24:	SSU Faculty Response to Lack of Diversity
Page 26:	SSU Diversity in Context of the CSU System
Page 27:	SSU Recruitment Data by County for the years 2001 and 2007
Page 36:	Bibliography

Tables and Charts

Table 1: Student Diversity 1994-2007 Comparison SSU to CSU System wide

Table 2: Race and Ethnicity Distribution of the Whitest CSU Campuses 1994-2007

Table 3: Percent of Known White Students at UC campuses in 2007 compared to SSU

Table 4: Incoming SSU Freshmen Student-Reported Family Incomes for Years 1994, 2000, and 2007

Table 5: SSU Freshmen Family Income Compared to CSU General Family Income in 2000

Table 6: SSU freshmen family income levels compared to Cal Poly Pomona and University of California San Diego

Table 7: SSU Freshmen Family Income Compared to Cal Poly 2004

Chart 8: CSU 2006 System wide 4-Year Graduation Rate, 6-Year Grad Rate and SAT

INTRODUCTION

A multi-ethnic and culturally diverse experience on university campuses in the US is a strongly held value and considered an important segment of a college education. (Bollinger 2007, Hu & Kuh, 2003, Chang, Denson, & Saenz, 2006, Guinier & Torres, 2007.) A continuing analysis of higher education racial balance and class equity is an ongoing subject of social justice research in many academic disciplines. Since the Civil Rights movement and 1960's campus unrest, much progress has been made on increasing minority and low-income access to colleges in the US. Public universities, and to a degree private universities, across the country annually assess their progress toward building socio-economic and racial equity. It is rare to see a public university that has effectively reversed this trend and deliberately tried to increase student wealth and maintain a non-diverse student population.

Since 1994, the students at Sonoma State University (SSU) have become the whitest and most likely the richest campus in the entire California State University (CSU) and University of California systems. From 1994 to 2007 CSU system wide increased diversity by 9%, with white students reaching a low of 44% of the entire student body. Yet there was almost no change in ethnicity at SSU during the same time period.

Table 1.

	1994	1997	2004	2007	% Change
<u>Sonoma State University</u>					
Native American	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%
Asian/Pacific Isl	5%	6%	6%	6%	+1%
Black	4%	3%	2%	3%	-1%
Latino	10%	11%	12%	12%	+2%
White	79%	79%	79%	78%	-1%
<u>CSU System Wide</u>					
Native American	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%
Asian/Pacific Isl	20%	21%	23%	21%	+1%
Black	7%	8%	7%	7%	0%
Latino	19%	22%	25%	28%	+9%
White	53%	48%	44%	44%	-9%

How can it be that given the changing demographics of the state of California that the SSU campus has remained essentially the same for the past fourteen years? This study will examine the past practices of the SSU administration regarding recruitment and admissions and compare the continuing lack of diversity to other CSU campuses. As part of this study interviews were conducted with one hundred and two students of color at three San Francisco Bay Area CSU campuses to analyze the comfort levels and feelings about diversity on and between the campuses. Additionally, we researched the sites visited by SSU recruiters in 2001 and 2007 to determine the focus of SSU's high school

outreach efforts. We examined State Of California Department of Education data to compare the diversity of schools visited and schools neglected by SSU. And finally, we reviewed the socio-economic impacts of the SSU special admissions program that was in place during most of the period studied and how this special admissions program was encouraged by the CSU administrators and CSU trustees for the purpose of building an elite “public ivy” residential campus in the San Francisco North Bay region.

Sonoma State University and the North Bay Region

One explanation for the lack of diversity at SSU has been the claim that SSU reflects the ethnicity of the local region, and that SSU is a rural campus located in a predominately white northern California county for which minorities simply choose not to attend. While it is true that Sonoma county was 72 percent white as of 2006 (Sonoma County 2006) it is equally true that Sonoma county’s largest minority group Latinos, at 20 percent of the total population, is only 12 percent of SSU students. So, while the SSU campus is somewhat reflective of the diversity of the North Bay region, the reality is that Sonoma State University recruits and draws from the entire State of California. In 2008, according to the “About SSU” webpage at: <http://www.sonoma.edu/university/>, 80 percent of the freshmen and 55 percent of the junior transfer students come from outside the North Bay region.

It may well be that some minority students choose not come to SSU because the region is predominately white, but this doesn’t explain how other predominately white regional CSU campuses have managed to make progress on diversity. Since 1994 the other most-white CSU campuses have become more diverse. CSU Humboldt and CSU Chico, the two whitest campuses in 1994, have both decreased the percent of white students attending, while SSU has remained the same. (See Table 2)

That the SSU administration is sensitive to this lack of diversity is evident by how SSU reports race on campus. The SSU website claims that white students represent 66.8% of the total student body. To establish this figure, SSU includes 13.02% of the students who decline to state ethnicity as part of the total thereby making the white student levels look lower than what they actually represent. There is no reason to assume that the decline-to-state are any less white than the overall known rate of 78 percent. Frank Tansey, former SSU dean of admission and later Associate Vice-president for admissions through 1998, reported in an interview that the decline-to-state students were undoubtedly “mostly white.” (Interview Tansey 11/13/08)

If we include 78% of the decline-to-state students as white in the campus totals, then the actual estimate of white students at SSU would in reality be closer to 85 percent of the total student body. We believe that this would even be more likely since the passing of proposition 209 in 1996. Some white students still believe the myth that minorities receive special undeserved privileges and therefore are not declaring their ethnic status as a reaction to this perception of minority advantage. (Taylor, 2003)

Whatever the exact percentage of white students at SSU it is clear that not only has the campus remained mostly white for the past 14 years, but that somehow the campus has attracted more white students from throughout the state than other similarly located rural CSU campuses.

Table 2:

Race and Ethnicity Distribution of the Whitest CSU Campuses 1994-2007

Campus	1994	1997	2004	2007	% Change
<u>Sonoma State</u>					
Native American	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%
Asian/Pacific Isl	5%	6%	6%	6%	+1%
Black	4%	3%	2%	3%	-1%
Latino	10%	11%	12%	12%	+2%
White	79%	79%	79%	78%	-1%
<u>CSU Chico</u>					
Native American	2%	2%	2%	1%	-1%
Asian/Pacific Isl	5%	5%	7%	7%	+2%
Black	3%	3%	2%	2%	-1%
Latino	9%	11%	12%	14%	+5%
White	82%	80%	78%	76%	-6%
<u>CSU Humbolt</u>					
Native American	3%	3%	3%	3%	0%
Asian/Pacific Isl	4%	4%	5%	5%	+1%
Black	2%	2%	4%	5%	+3%
Latino	8%	10%	10%	14%	+6%
White	83%	81%	78%	73%	-10%
<u>CSU San Marcos</u>					
Native American	1%	2%	1%	1%	0%
Asian/Pacific Isl	6%	8%	13%	13%	+7%
Black	4%	4%	3%	4%	0%
Latino	16%	19%	23%	25%	+9%
White	73%	67%	60%	57%	-16%

SSU has a higher percentage of white students than all the University of California campuses as well. The most white UC campus in 2007 was UC Santa Barbara at 55.4% of the known students. Therefore, SSU is now the whitest 4-year public university in the entire state of California.

Table 3: Percent of Known White Students at UC campuses in 2007 compared to SSU

<u>Campus</u>	<u>Percent White</u>
SSU	78%
UC Berkeley	37.6%
UC Davis	39.9%
UC Irvine	28.2%
UCLA	37.5%
UC Merced	28.8%
UC Riverside	21%
UC San Diego	34.7%
UC San Francisco	45.6%
UC Santa Barbara	55.4%
UC Santa Cruz	54.2%

Not only has SSU attracted more white students to our North Bay Sonoma county campus, but also the freshmen students have increasingly higher family incomes on average than other CSU campuses. SSU freshmen students with family incomes over \$150,000 have increased by 59 percent since 1994 and freshmen students from families below \$50,000 have declined by 21 percent (2007 dollars). In 2007, 48.7 percent of freshmen came from families with over \$100,000 income.

Table 4:
Incoming Freshmen Student-Reported Family Incomes for Years
1994, 2000, and 2007
(Adjusted for inflation to constant 2007 dollars) (1.)

Income Categories	1994	2000	2007
0 - 25	9.0 %	6.5 %	8.0 %
25 - 50	15.7 %	11.5 %	11.7 %
50 - 75	19.0 %	17.7 %	16.7 %
75 – 100	19.5 %	19.2 %	14.9 %
100 – 150	20.2 %	21.6 %	21.6 %
150 – 200	7.5 %	12.0 %	12.2 %
200 – 250	3.3 %	6.2 %	5.2 %
250 - ∞	5.4 %	5.3 %	9.7 %

The Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at UCLA administers the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) freshman survey to some 400 participating universities. Most CSU campuses do not participate, or are involved irregularly, in the annual CIRP survey of freshmen. The survey includes estimated family income for incoming freshmen and has been available at SSU for several years.

SSU freshmen family income levels are substantially higher than CSU statewide averages. The only income data on the entire CSU system comes from a 2000 study conducted by The Social and Behavioral Research Institute at California State University, San Marcos. The study surveyed some 2000 CSU students at all campuses and came up with family income levels. Table 5 reports this data compared to SSU Freshmen income levels for the year 2000.

Table 5:

SSU Freshmen Family Income Compared to CSU General Family Income in 2000

\$ Categories	0-24,000	24,000-48,000	48,000-72,000	Over 72,000
SSU	6.3%	11%	16.0%	66.7%
CSU	19.6%	29.7%	20.5%	21.2%

Table 6 displays the SSU freshmen family income levels compared to Cal Poly Pomona and University of California San Diego, two other campuses where CIRP data is available for 2007. Table 7 shows the comparison between SSU and Cal Poly SLO for the year 2004.

Table 6:

	Sonoma State University	CSU Pomona	UC San Diego
Less Than – \$25,000	8.0 %	16.9%	19.8%
25 – 50	11.7 %	23.0%	20%
50 - 75	16.7 %	19.6%	15.6%
75 – 100	14.9 %	13.0%	11.3%
100 – 150	21.6 %	16.1%	15.6%
150 – 200	12.2 %	5.4%	6.9%
200 – 250	5.2 %	2.6%	4.4%
250 - ∞	9.7 %	3.4%	6.4%

Table 7:

SSU Freshmen Family Income Compared to Cal Poly in 2004

	Under \$25,000	Over \$100,000
Cal Poly SLO	20.9%	24.3%
SSU	7.8%	43.29%

Without the full data for income levels on all public campuses in California it is not possible to conclude with full certainty that SSU is now the richest public university campus in California. SSU does have a higher percentage of freshmen from families over \$100,000 than does University of California at Santa Barbara, which would lead us to believe that SSU is likely the richest public university in the state of California, but we cannot be completely sure from the data available. However, the data does show that SSU is whiter than all other CSU and UC campuses and is most likely richer than most, if not all, of the public universities in the entire state. Exactly how this lack of ethnic and income diversity was achieved at SSU is the primary question for the rest of this study.

SSU Administration Declares Support for Diversity

The SSU administration has consistently articulated support for greater diversity on campus for the past decade and half. President Armiñana has publicly advocated for support of diversity on the SSU campus at least a dozen times since 1992.

Declarations of Support for Diversity At SSU by President Armiñana

“We need to continuously pursue the goal of diversifying the University. I would like to work even more closely with area schools and junior colleges that are attended by significant numbers of minority students to attract that student to SSU. We must manage our enrollment to best fit our mission, programs and size and to achieve a diverse and regional student body.” (Fall 1992 Convocation)

“.... Increasing diversity at all levels--student, faculty, and staff--is a goal that requires our unflagging commitment and constant effort.” (Fall 1993 Convocation)

“There is also concern about the ethnic diversity of the students. Although statistically we do better than the region we serve, that is not good enough. The reasons for diversity at a university are complex and intricate. Easy, simple, sustainable solutions are not available. Nor is reducing our admissions standards. The activities, which create greater diversity, must include recruitment of students, faculty and staff; housing; financial aid; advising; academic and social support. What will attract students to this campus from every ethnic group, color, gender, age, and persuasion is what Chancellor Reed calls a “culture of quality.” In the months to come our efforts and activities to increase and sustain diversity will be high in our priorities.” (Spring 1999 Convocation)

“The vision for Sonoma State University is a community-focused public university, relatively small, increasingly residential and diverse, with a liberal arts and sciences core and specialized and professional studies.” (Spring 2002 Convocation)

Along with a continuing affirmation of diversity as a core value at SSU by the campus President, the SSU website’s diversity vision statement is supportive as well:

Diversity Vision Statement:

<http://www.sonoma.edu/diversity/>

We at Sonoma State University strive to create a campus climate in which the will to build trust among people - and groups of people - is widely shared, and opportunities for enhancing diversity and a sense of community are encouraged and supported. We stand committed to fostering and sustaining a pluralistic, inclusive environment that empowers all members of the campus community to achieve their highest potential without fear of prejudice or discrimination.

Academic Success at SSU

In 2006, SSU was ranked among the top five CSU campuses for SAT scores. SSU was second highest for four-year graduation rates and in the top six CSU campuses for over all graduation levels. From 1999 to 2006 SSU’s six-year graduation increased from 43.8% to 50.8%— a 15% gain.

Chart 8: CSU 2006

	4-Year Grad. Rate	6-Year Grad Rate	SAT	
California Maritime Academy	43.4		53.8	1,080
Sonoma State University	22.2		50.8	1,045
CSU-Stanislaus	20		50.1	970
Cal Poly-San Luis Obispo	19.9		66.9	1,220
CSU-Chico	17.4		53.5	1,040
San Diego State University	17.4		58.3	1,080
CSU-East Bay	16.3		43.3	945
CSU-Fullerton	14.4		49.1	990
CSU-Bakersfield	14.1		41.5	940
CSU-San Bernardino	12.4		44.3	890
Humboldt State University	12.2		44.2	1,065
CSU-Fresno	12		45.5	960
CSU-Long Beach	11.7		47.8	1,015
San Francisco State University	11		42.4	1,010
CSU-Los Angeles	10.6		34.8	895
Cal Poly-Pomona	10.2		48.3	1,040
CSU-Monterey Bay	9.6		35.6	1,000
CSU-Northridge	9.2		40	950

CSU-Sacramento	8.7	42.1	965
CSU-San Marcos	7.6	37.8	985
San Jose State University	6.7	41.4	1,010
CSU-Dominguez Hills	6.3	32.9	845

Source: <http://www.collegeresults.org>

The examination of the above data suggests that SSU is academically in the top third of the CSU campuses for both SAT admissions standards and time-to-degree. While SSU's six-year graduation rate is now 50.1 percent, in 1989 the rate was actually slightly higher at 51 percent. The graduation rate dropped sharply to 43 percent in 1991 and has gradually climbed back to the over 50 percent rate over the past decade and half.

Source:(http://www.sonoma.edu/aa/ir/ret_gr_rates.shtml)

Building a Public Ivy

Sonoma State University's President Ruben Armiñana came to campus in 1992. Part of President Armiñana's immediate effort for campus improvement was to support the idea that SSU was a special "beta site" approved for innovation by the Chancellor's office.

"The idea of this University as a "beta site" for the CSU is taking hold, both here on campus and in the Chancellor's Office, and we are already seeing some results.""I strongly recommend that the Academic Mission Committee developing ideas for the beta site consider as the highest priority the discussion of ways to improve the retention and graduation of our students." (Spring 1993 Convocation)

"There are a number of initiatives that we must now pursue actively. As you well know, the formulas are gone and we must invent new structures. As a beta site we can and must consider new ways of meeting our mission--continuously reinventing and reinvesting.... Foremost is the implementation of Enrollment Management at SSU. We simply cannot continue to operate "business as usual" based on the old, now-irrelevant assumptions of times gone by. ... We must move from admissions controls to managing our enrollment whereby we determine the number and type of students we admit based on a clear definition of our academic programs and the student's needs and skills. Our goal is to establish an enduring relationship with each student--from application to graduation and throughout his or her lifetime as an alum." (Fall 1993 convocation)

In the spring of 1996 the notion of SSU as a beta site become instead the idea of SSU as a "public ivy." The term public ivy was originally developed by Richard Moll in his 1985 book "Public Ivys: A Guide To America's Best Public Undergraduate Colleges and Universities," in reference to universities that offer an ivy league experience at a public state university cost.

The Public Ivy Speech Spring 1996 (President Ruben Armiñana)

“In my previous convocation address this past August, I shared with you the outline of the Sonoma State University vision and strategies. I am delighted to report that it was well received by most, and questioned--as it should be--by some. I was especially pleased that the term "California's public ivy" was accepted, not as a marketing slogan, but as description of what we can be: "the public university of choice for undergraduate education."

"Public ivy," as a term, has the advantage of being both concise and pithy, and therefore preferable to the other alternatives now in use such as "public liberal arts college" or "public private." ... However, some of you have expressed concern that in the mind of some listeners, "public ivy" translates into a campus for wealthy white students only—the kind of campus that once existed among some of the "private ivies." By the way, those private ivies have also changed and now the student bodies are significantly diverse.

Faculty concern for the term public ivy continued and the SSU administration stopped openly using the term a few years later. The underlying assumption for marketing SSU as a public ivy has clearly been retained by the SSU administration. The campus website in 2008 describes SSU as; “the only California university that is a member of the Council of Public Liberal Arts Colleges, the prestigious group of 25 universities and colleges across the nation that are often described as the “Public Ivies.” (2008 SSU Website; <http://www.sonoma.edu/university/>)

The Green Music Center Announcement and the Public Ivy Mystique

In an effort to further market SSU as an upper-income destination campus, President Armiñana announced plans in the fall of 1997 for building the Green Music Center. The Music Center was presented as becoming one of the great concert halls of the world and would be modeled after Seiji Ozawa Hall at Tanglewood in Massachusetts (the summer home of the Boston Symphony Orchestra).

“This past summer Marne (President’s Wife) and I attended a seminar on liberal education at Troutbeck, New York, and one evening we attended two performances at Tanglewood. I became very interested in their newest facility, Ozawa Hall. This hall, which seats about 1,200 people, opens its front doors to allow people seated on the lawn to enjoy the musical performance, many of them also enjoying a picnic. We were among those seated on the lawn while enjoying and feeling very close, both visually and auditorially, to a chamber trio.

I came home lauding the Tanglewood facility and wondering if a similar facility could be built at Sonoma State University to enhance our music and arts programs, especially the choir. Any new facility on campus must match the academic plan of the university and it should be a mark of distinction and excellence. A performance center, similar to the one at Tanglewood, would meet these criteria.

Sonoma State University can capitalize on its ideal location. We are at the entrance to the wine region, one hour north of San Francisco and major airports, and we enjoy excellent weather most of the year, which allows us to hold many events outdoors. Because of this combination of factors, the University would be able to offer programs, which would attract activities that match the academic interests of the institution while producing additional revenues...here at SSU we have some comparative advantages that could be of great value to us. The major rule of real estate is location, location, and location, and we have it. First, we are one hour from Union Square in San Francisco, if the traffic is good, and there are now better plans for the expansion of US 101 than in previous years. Second, we are in a population basin of 4 million with two major airports. Third, SSU is now in the middle of the wine region; driving north you see vineyards as soon as you pass Petaluma. This is a new development. When I came here only 5 years ago, you had to be near the Russian River and Windsor before you encountered a vine. Being in the wine growing area adds to the mystique of our environment. And what better complements the romance of wine than music, theatre, and dance? Who could imagine a more time-honored combination? And last, we have excellent weather in the summer and throughout most of the year. Tanglewood and many other facilities have hot and humid weather with lots of insects flying around, while our weather is temperate and relatively bug-free. We have a wonderful location and we are a most attractive university. Let's use it to our advantage.

.... The facility could have multiple uses: a summer arts festival to attract people from all over the western part of the country, but mostly from the Bay area; a summer home of symphonies, chamber and jazz concerts; or a site for conferences such as Syllabus, Critical Thinking, and others.” (Fall 1997 Convocation)

It is clear from the statements, “Being in the wine growing area adds to the mystique of our environment, and what better complements the romance of wine than music, theatre, and dance?” that the SSU administration was thinking of SSU as a sophisticated upper-income destination university for students from families with interests in the mystique of wine, theater, and intellectual pursuits.

The naming of new apartments for SSU Freshman and sophomores built during the past decades reflects the wine country image with names like: Tuscany Village, Beaujolais Village, Sauvignon Village and Verdot Village.

SSU website description: “Beaujolais Village was completed in Fall 2003, and is the first of two phases to be constructed. The village's Mediterranean style architecture design is appealing and attractive. The tiled roofs and neutral exterior color allow for versatile decor and landscaping and the stucco exterior helps keep the buildings cool. There are five three-level buildings with exterior corridors giving an airy and open feeling to the structure. ...Each of these apartments is approximately 1135 square feet. Some interior features include modern kitchen Corian countertops and black and chrome appliances (overhead microwave/convection oven combination units, dishwasher and full refrigerator), laminated wood flooring in the kitchen and dining rooms, solid surface dining and living room tables, radiant floor heating, cable television connections in the living and bedrooms, and wall sconces for lighting in the living rooms.” (<http://www.sonoma.edu/sas/reslife/villages/Beaujolais>)

Andre Bailey, a SSU recruiter from 1994-2000 described the marketing emphasis coming from the SSU administration in the mid-90s as, “we are no longer Sonoma

State University but we are now Sonoma, rolling hills and vineyards, —we became a wine country image, Falcon Crest and Dynasty like.” (Interview 10/19/08)

Former SSU-CFA President Victor Garlin described the public ivy transition period. “Ruben’s (Armiñana) vision of the campus was to convert SSU from a commuter college consisting of transfer students, re-entry women, and veterans, into a four-year residential campus or “real college.” (Garlin Interview 10/20/08)

Frank Tansey stated that the push for SSU to become a public ivy was really at the time coming from Dan Farish the Provost and Vice-president for Instruction. (Interview 11/13/08)

Sonoma State University 2008-09 / 2012-13 Strategic Plan released in March 3, 2008 describes the reasons for the transition at SSU as follows:

“In the past, CSU campuses were intended to concentrate on “Service Areas.” Sonoma State University’s Service Area included the counties of Sonoma, Marin, Mendocino, Napa, Lake, and Solano. Starting in the early 1990s, the demographic trends in this area meant that the size of the college-age population was insufficient to support the enrollment level needed to maintain SSU as a viable institution. Only about one in three of the high school graduates in our service area, and in California, have completed the course requirements for UC and CSU entrance. The number of eligible students in our service area grew gradually during the 1990s. In the early 1990s about 52% of our enrollment came from our service area, primarily from Sonoma County (35%). Sonoma State University had a small first-time freshman class (662 in 1990). The number of transfer students from Santa Rosa Junior College, our primary feeder college, has remained stable since 1990, at about 450 students. This meant that in order to grow, SSU had to increase the freshman class. This led to the University’s decision to target its student outreach efforts to a statewide audience. Targeting students who lived too far to commute meant becoming a predominantly residential campus. That implied building residence halls and other facilities to serve residential students. Full-time residential students are typically traditional-aged students (i.e., recent high-school graduates). That also required the development of co-curricular programs geared to supporting the transition from high-school to college.”

In order to achieve the desired transition for SSU to become a strong resident public ivy campus Frank Tansey, Dean of Admissions, was charged with raising the freshmen admissions to 1000 students in the mid-1990s. “By the time I left (1998) we were admitting up to 1,000 freshmen and then I could still say that we offered “small classes and face-to-face contact,” Tansey said. “But now they can’t deliver on it,” he added.

According to Tansey, Chico, Cal-Poly-SLO, Humboldt and SSU were all designated statewide schools by CSU state level administration. All the rest of the CSU campuses could live off their local populations without much effort. We could have easily had 2,000 freshmen, but we didn’t have enough housing. “I favored the traditional two-person college dorm room,” Tansey stated. “But the administration wanted to build dorms that could double as conference housing,” he added.

SSU now offers housing to 2,500 students and has more high-end villages under construction with increased amenities like private rooms with baths.

SSU transitioned in the 1990s from being a state college, working class, local-transfer campus, to being a sophisticated upper-income, “safe,” residential university for students from families with interests in the mystique of wine, theater, and intellectual pursuits.

SSU Special Admission Program

SSU started a special admissions program in 1994. “The goal was to draw a larger applicant pool from a state-wide market...to admit the best class we possibly can.” (Report to the Statewide Academic Senate 1997). SSU screened freshmen applicants at an admissions index of 3200 instead of the CSU standard admissions index of 2900. Thus SSU raised the SAT-GPA screening index to find more highly qualified students. During the first three years of the special admission period SSU increased its application pool by over 20% and expanded the freshmen class from 664 to 821 students. The special admissions program was marketed as a way to increase diversity at SSU, however actual enrollments did not increase diversity.

Tansey also claimed that CSU Humboldt in the 90s had 90% more professional recruiters than SSU and a significantly higher budget for recruitment. “We were starved for money to do our recruitment,” Tansey said. So the SSU special admissions program was set up to give more flexibility by accepting applications for a longer period of time. “We wanted flexibility so we could look at students more holistically.” “We had seventeen different levels of filtering including, income, race, gender, location, GPA, and SAT,” Tansey asserted. A more residential campus was appealing to women students and their parents as SSU was seen as a “safe” campus, Tansey added. We did a lot of our recruiting through direct mail from College Board mailing lists, he said.

The transition to more highly qualified applicant pool happened gradually at SSU. The average Freshmen GPA went from 3.18 in 1992 to 3.28 in 1997, and the SAT rose from 1022 to 1051, where it remains today. These changes did not go unnoticed by the SSU administration.

“We are one of the premier campuses in the CSU. Applications for next fall are extremely strong and of high quality. The freshman applicants have an average GPA of 3.37 with SAT scores of 1078. Among these applicants, we have 206 who have a GPA of 4.0 or higher. Our retention and graduation rates continue to improve.” (Spring 1997 Convocation President Armiñana)

“We now are sharing the top rank in freshman retention in the CSU with Cal Poly San Luis Obispo. “Media coverage of SSU has increased significantly, including being mentioned in Kiplinger’s Personal Finance Magazine of March 1997 (pp. 113-114) as follows, ‘A handful of public institutions function in many ways like small private colleges--schools such as Mary Washington in Virginia, St. Mary’s in Maryland and Sonoma State in California. Before you plunk down a dollar in a private school these wonderful schools are worth a look.’” (Fall 1997 Convocation)

“...It is nice to learn that we recently have been ranked #3 by U.S. News & World Report--tying with Humboldt State University--in the Top Regional Public Schools of the West. (Fall 1998 Convocation)

Building a public ivy and having a special admission program that focused on higher SAT GPA scores for admission did not increase diversity at SSU. From 1994 to 2004, when the special admission program was discontinued, the number of white students stayed exactly the same while the CSU system in general declined in whites by 9 percent. What the special admissions program did achieve however was to significantly increase the family income levels for incoming freshmen.

Throughout the United States, college admissions staffs know that by increasing SAT-GPA screening levels you raise the overall income and reduce the diversity of the applicant pool. Extensive research shows that the primary correlation of SAT is to race and socio-economic status and not to performance in college. “Standard tests like SATs correlate far better with socioeconomic status than with students future performance in school...” (Guinier & Torres, 2002 p. 268) “The correlation between SAT scores actually predicting success in college is only 30%.” (p.272)

Fully aware of the unchanging demographics at SSU and the continuing whiteness of the campus, both the CSU Academic Senate and the SSU Academic Senate voted in 1999 for SSU to discontinue its special admission program. The statewide senate representing all CSU campuses passed resolution AS-2454-99/AA that stated, “Resolve that the Academic Senate CSU conclude that existing data do not demonstrate any improvement in the enrollment of ethnic minority students at Sonoma State University during the duration of the admissions experiment, and be it further resolved that the Academic Senate of the California State University urge the Chancellor to terminate the Sonoma State University admission experiment effective Fall 2000....Sonoma State University’s admission experiment is the first differential campus admission policy that is not justified by a campus having more qualified applicants than can be accommodated (a state of impaction).”

The CSU chancellor Charles Reed declined to accept the CSU Senate recommendation and allowed the SSU administration to extend the special admission program well into the 2000s. SSU has now declared itself an impacted campus, whereby it continues to use a higher CSU admissions index for admittance than the standard statewide CSU eligibility index.

So while SSU remained predominately white, the income for freshmen from families with over \$150,000 annual income increased by 68 percent from 1994 to 2000. Certainly, the SSU admission experiment, while not accomplishing its articulated goals of increasing diversity, firmly helped moved SSU into becoming a campus with significantly more financially well-off students than other CSU campuses.

The availability of wealthy alumni and richer donor families did not go unnoticed by the SSU administration. President Armiñana made numerous statements that indicated a goal of and success at building increased donor fund raising capabilities.

“I believe we have agreed that we want to retain some of the important characteristics that distinguish this university from the rest of our CSU sister institutions, such as our relatively small size and student-centered approach to education. In order to retain those characteristics, we must be able to definitively and statistically make the case that we need to be different and we deserve to be different--because we are better...” (Spring 1994 Convocation)

“We cannot solely depend on state funds to meet many of our needs especially since capital bond issues are doubtful for the next few years; therefore, we must find new ways to do business. We are actively pursuing other private mechanisms, including fundraising, to finance the land acquisition and construction of faculty and staff housing, student apartments, a University Center, the Information Center, and energy conservation and efficiency projects. These capital projects are important to the future of Sonoma State University and we must find ways to make them realities shortly.” (Spring 1995 Convocation)

“Our long term goal at Sonoma State University is to increase private contributions to a 20% level of the General Fund allocation by the year 2000....This path is rooted in the belief that we must create our own opportunities, financing, and collaborations. Clearly, the State of California will not be able to meet our needs or provide the financial resources to fulfill our vision of excellence and distinctiveness. Our strategy depends on our willingness and ability to invest in ourselves and in this university.” (Fall 1995)

The first comprehensive annual drive for alumni and campus employees has been completed with a considerable increase in donors and contributions. Endowment funds have increased to \$13 million and now SSU has the ninth largest endowment of the 23 CSU campuses. We ranked 10th among the CSU campuses in total support, ahead of many campuses much larger and older. Alumni relations’ activities have been developed, including programs to increase contact with our alumni and to build membership in the association.

A focus campaign for the Information Center has been launched with a major endowment gift of \$5 million by Charles and Jean Schulz.”(Fall 1996 Convocation)

Our endowment has doubled every two years for the last decade. The endowment, which totaled \$400,000 ten years ago, has grown to \$19 million today.” (Spring 1997 Convocation)

SSU now ranks 12th nationally among all public master’s degree institutions and 283rd among all universities nationwide in our fundraising. We are the smallest university to be ranked in the top 20 and the second youngest. We also rank 8th among all CSU campuses. (Fall 1998 Convocation)

It is unlikely that the special admission program was the exclusive reason for the huge gain of family income at SSU and the continuing whiteness of the campus. So what other factors helped SSU become the whitest public university in the state of California, and most likely the richest campus as well? To answer this question we need to examine the specifics of high school recruitment efforts by the SSU administration for the past 14 years.

Focused Recruitment In High Income Predominately White Public and Private High Schools.

Andre Bailey was one of the two principle recruiters during the first five years of the special admissions period. “Higher income areas were the primary focus of our

recruitment,” Bailey said in an interview on October 19, 2008. “If you wanted to go into a low-income school you had to do it on your own by scheduling around the other high income sites,” he added. Bailey explained how when he wanted to schedule a bus from San Francisco East Bay high schools to come to SSU for a visit, “I was questioned about who would be on the bus, and told to include private high school students as well.” “We couldn’t just do public schools, private schools had to be included,” he added. Bailey went on to say that, “we didn’t want to place any information in print for the CSU counselors conference, but would discuss our admissions pool in general, leaving out the specifics of the higher index screening levels.”

We researched the socio-economic and ethnic compositions of the school districts and high schools for which SSU sent recruiters in 2001 and 2007.

Results from 2001 and 2007 Recruitment Survey of SSU Targeted High School Campuses (Full charts on each District are available in Appendix A)

In 2007, 50% (25 out of 50) of the high schools visited by SSU recruiters had a higher population of white students that the County average, but perhaps more significant for SSU diversity concerns is that 74% (37 out of 50) of the public high schools visited in 2007 had a lower percentage of children using the Free and Reduced Price Meal program than the County averages.

A glaring example of SSU focused recruitment in upper income high schools is Carmel High School located in Monterey County. The county education data reports that white students make up only 18.5% of the total student population in the district. However in 2007, the only high school visited in Monterey County by SSU recruiters was Carmel High School, which has a white student population of 80.7 percent.

Another example of selective upper-income white campus recruitment in 2007 is of the two of the high schools visited in Sacramento County each had a population of white students that was significantly higher than the county average. SSU recruiters visited San Juan School District and Elk Grove School District, but avoid the much higher ethnic Latino and Black populations Sacramento and Del Paso School districts.

In addition to the 50 public high schools visited in 2007, twelve private schools were visited—all but one were Catholic. SSU actually spent more time recruiting in private high schools than in the entire Los Angeles County school system.

SSU recruiters did visit eleven difference high schools in mostly low-income high minority areas in LA County in 2001 and 2007. However only four of these high schools were visited in both years.

In 2007 SSU staff conducted recruitment in Hawaii on November 8, 9, 13,14,15, and 16 for high school college fairs in Honolulu, Maui, Kauai, Hilo and Kona. Also in 2007, during the primary recruitment period September 10 to November 16, SSU spent sixteen days recruiting in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Hawaii.

Private Schools Visited in 2007 By SSU Recruiters	
School	Type
Bishop O'Dowd High School	Catholic

Cathedral High School	Catholic	
Cathedral High School	Catholic	
St. Francis High School	Catholic	
Crespi High School	Catholic	
Pomona Catholic High School	Catholic	
Santa Margarita Catholic High School	Catholic	
Mater Dei High School	Catholic	
Sherman Indian High School	Reservation	
Junipero Serra High School	Catholic	
St. Joseph High School	Catholic	
St. Patrick/St. Vincent High School	Catholic	

In 2001 approximately 61% (27 out of 44) high schools visited had a higher population of white students that the County averages. In addition to the 44 public high schools visited, 11 private schools (10 Catholic) were visited as well.

Private Schools Visited in 2001 by SSU Recruiters	
School	Type
St. Paul-St. Vincent High School	Catholic
Bishop Manogue High School	Catholic
St. Francis High School	Catholic
Jesuit High School	Catholic
Mater Dei High School	Catholic
St. Joseph High School	Catholic
Junipero Sierra	Catholic
Sherman Indian High School	Reservation
Damien High School	Catholic
Servite High School	Catholic
Chaminade High School	Catholic

Whitest and Richest Public High Schools Recruited by SSU in 2001 and 2007

Granada High School, Livermore,	White Students: 68.9%, Low income: 9.4%
Union Mine High School, El Dorado,	White Students: 83.5%, Low Income: 17.7%
Mira Costa High School, Mira Costa,	White Students: 65.9%, Low Income: 2.1%
Carmel High School, Monterey County,	White Students: 80.7% Low Income: 9.6%
Luguna Beach High School, Orange Co.,	White Students: 82.8% Low Income: 4.0%
Oakmont High School, Roseville,	White Students: 65.2% Low Income: 21%
Rio Americana High School, Sacramento	White Students: 74.5% Low Income: 13.4%
Carlsbad High School, Carlsbad,	White Students: 64.5% Low Income: 13.4%
Newbury Park High School, Ventura,	White Students: 67.9% Low Income: 9.4%

These nine high schools are all outside the traditional SSU service area. So not only does SSU tend to conduct recruitment at the whitest-richest high school districts in California, but also within school districts SSU recruiters tend to visit the whitest and richest campuses within those districts as well.

Cal Poly San Luis Obispo (SLO) like SSU is a CSU campus designated for statewide recruitment. However, Cal Poly SLO is somewhat more diverse than SSU even though they are located in a similar mostly white county (SLO County 84% white 2006, Sonoma County 72% White 2006)

Campus Diversity 2007 Percent of Known Respondents

	Native Amer.	Asian	Black	Latino	White
SSU	1%	6%	3%	12%	78%
SLO	0.9%	12.7%	4.1%	12%	72%

In 2003, Cal Poly SLO developed a group of partner-high schools whereby they conduct extensive outreach and onsite visits each year. Nineteen of twenty of these high schools are campuses with a significant majority of students of color with high numbers of low-income families. The SLO recruiters worked extensively with these schools:

High School	County	Percent White	Low-Income
James Logan	Alameda	18.3%	35.7%
Calexico	Imperial	.9%	71.9%
Wasco	Kern	12.1%	68%
Dorsey	LA	.4%	62.8%
Garfield	LA	.3%	97.6%
Laces	LA	29.7%	31.7%
Westchester	LA	7.2%	30.4%
Alisal	Salinas	1.7%	80.6%
Salinas	Salinas	39.4%	18.9%
Coachella	Riverside	1.1%	67.6%
John W. North	Riverside	26.3%	40.7%
Perris	Riverside	16.2%	50.8%
Luther Burbank	Sacramento	7.5%	65.1%
Eitwanda	San Bernardino	34.5%	10.2%
Cabrillo	Santa Barbara	60.2%	18.3%
Lompoc	Santa Barbara	34.5%	46.3%
Santa Maria	Santa Barbara	12.9%	36.6%
Fremont	Santa Clara	27.7%	17.5%
Fairfield-Suisun	Solano	36%	27.8%

SSU Recruitment Summary Analysis

For fourteen years the SSU administration has conducted a focused recruitment effort aimed at attracting richer freshmen applicants. From the evidence presented, we have to conclude—despite on-going calls for greater diversity by campus administrators—that this was a sustained effort that resulted in continuing SSU as a significantly non-diverse campus. Not only were the SSU recruiters restricted to where they could conduct out reach, but the selection of private high schools, out of state schools, and richer white public schools as the primary focus for recruitment confirm that this was a deliberate multi-year project. This focused recruitment effort combined with the higher SAT-GPA screening levels resulted in making SSU the whitest and most likely the richest public university in the state of California.

SSU Minority Comfort Levels Compared to Neighboring CSU Campuses

SSU students from the spring 2008 Investigative Sociology class conducted face-to-face interviews with 102 minority students on three CSU campuses to assess the student comfort levels and other issues of diversity. Students at San Francisco State University, CSU East Bay, and Sonoma State University, were interviewed. The interviews were taped, transcribed, and coded for similarities of concerns and issues. While SSU has remained at the same level of diversity for the past 14 years, the other local CSU campuses have become increasingly diverse.

Table 9: Campus **1994** **1997** **2004** **2007** **% Change**

Sonoma State University

Native American	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%
Asian/Pacific Isl	5%	6%	6%	6%	+1%
Black	4%	3%	2%	3%	-1%
Latino	10%	11%	12%	12%	+2%
White	79%	79%	79%	78%	-1%

San Francisco State University

Native American	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%
Asian/Pacific Isl	34%	37%	40%	35%	+1%
Black	8%	8%	7%	7%	-1%
Latino	12%	14%	15%	18%	+6%
White	45%	40%	37%	39%	-6%

CSU East Bay

Native American	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%
Asian/Pacific Isl	26%	29%	39%	34%	+8%
Black	13%	15%	13%	15%	+2%

Latino	12%	13%	15%	17%	+5%
White	48%	41%	33%	33%	-15%

Students interviewed were asked their comfort levels on campus in terms of their race. Question: What is your overall comfort level on campus in terms of your race?

- a. Very Comfortable
- b. Comfortable most of the time
- c. Mixed comfort levels
- d. Somewhat uncomfortable
- e. Very Uncomfortable

Results:	SF State (n-44)	East Bay (n-30)	SSU (n-34)
Very comfortable:	64.6%	62%	32.4%
Com. Most	23.7%	37.6%	47.0%
Mixed	11.4%	.04%	17.6%
Somewhat	00%	00%	3.0%
Uncomfortable	.03%	00%	00%

While about two thirds of the students interviewed at SF and East Bay reported being very comfortable all the time regarding their race, at SSU less than one third made such a statement.

Interviewers also ask the question: Do you feel that the campus administration, staff and faculty support diversity on campus? On a Five-point scale ranging from Completely to Not at all the results were as follows:

	SF	East Bay	SSU
Completely	38.6%	47.7%	18.2%
Most of the time	27.4%	41.0%	54.4%
Sometime	22.7%	11.0%	21.1%
Occasionally	6.8%	0.03%	6.0%
Not at all	4.5%	00%	0.3%

Again the responses for SSU students of color were somewhat lower than the other SF Bay area campuses in asserting that the campus staff and faculty were completely supportive of diversity at SSU.

Sample SSU Student Interview Responses:

Question: Have you experienced racial discrimination or racism on campus?

African American: “ Sometimes when my friends and I walk around in a big group , people look at us weird. We’re not gang bangers or anything, we’re all clean cut and are going to college, what’s there to be scared of?”

Asian: “ Yes, most of racism is indirect because the perpetrators are cowards and scared to be outright racist.

Latina: Yes, I often feel disrespected in class by the comments that other students make about my identity/culture.

African American: “Not personally, but one of my friends has. He was walking home from one of his night classes and was walking through the dorm buildings. There was a group of kids standing on one of the patios, he passed and they started yelling racist remarks at him. He told them to F-off. But they just kept taunting him, I’m guessing to see what he would do. However, he was the bigger man, maybe because there was a group of them and he couldn’t really do anything because he was by himself, or maybe he was the bigger man because he didn’t want to add fuel to the fire by talking to these ignorant people.”

Asian: “I have experienced racism on campus. When my friends and I would practice dancing in the quad. I would see people point and laugh at us. I see mocking the music and bobbing their heads. And these people didn’t look like they had the hip-hop style. Just recently, I heard a couple of students’ advertisement for student president got vandalized by some white hicks or skinheads. Whoever did this are F-ing disrespectful A-holes. This is why our campus needs to be more diverse, so they can educate these F-ing pricks about other cultures. Sorry racism shit pisses me off.”

African American, “Well, I’m Black man in America. I’m kind of, how would you say it, set up to fail. I’m taking all these GE classes that gave these crazy statistics about young black men being in prison. I look around at all the people on campus and not too many of them look like me. Sometimes I just wonder why there aren’t any more ethnic people on campus. Sometimes when I’m with a group of my black friends we get weird looks. So I guess, um....sometimes I’m comfortable and other times I’m not. “

African American: I get stared at because of how I look, some people avoid talking to me just because I wear baggy jeans and bright colored shirts, which doesn’t mean I’m any different from you. I think it’s odd that people are intimidated by me. I guess I would say that racism is more hidden on this campus, it’s more like something people here think about, but not something they would act on really.”

Latina: “Yes, not too long ago, one of my sorority sisters was being harassed by her sweet mates, who left her racist notes throughout her dormitory. In order for a campus population to be open minded, the campus faculty/staff must show support and knowledge towards diverse communities.”

Question: Do you feel your campus is racially diverse?

Asian: Our campus is overwhelmingly white and overwhelmingly female. There are also not really that many people of color. If you walk around campus most of the people you will see are white.” I’m not sure if race is really addressed at this campus. Everyone can see that our campus is almost completely white. However, the freshman class under me looks like it is following the same pattern. It doesn’t look like the admin is really interested in supporting diversity. They seem to be just going with the flow of what has been going on for years here.”

African American “Ha ha ha, no way, almost everyone is white on this campus”

Asian: “Racially diverse!, No...turn around, this school is almost all white. We live in a place where the majority are the minorities and the whole country would be the same in the future, or so I think. Does the administration, No, ..staff and faculty I would say yes.”

Latino: “ I feel that there is that acceptance of other backgrounds, but it is not consistent enough to make me feel like everyone would want to come here. It s just that the population is mostly white, upper class.”

Latina: “ I always did a mental counting. I was always aware of how many white students, black students, Asian and Mexican students in the classroom. Sometimes it was just me and all white students. SSU is trying to progress, I think, but they do still need to be more diverse.”

African American: “ Nope, like I said before, there aren’t many minorities on campus. Most of the people are white, I’d say that the campus is like 80% white, it’s crazy!. I think it is very important, I think that our school would be so much better if it were more diverse. I go to SF State all the time and I look at the people on their campus and I love it. You can find every type of person there. You can’t find that here.”

From the thirty-four face-to-face interviews of students of color completed in the spring of 2008 by SSU Sociology students, it is clear that there is a common awareness of the lack of diversity at SSU and ongoing incidents of racism by students of color. The overall comfort level for minority students at SSU is certainly more edgy than the closest CSU campuses in the SF Bay Area.

Concerns on diversity were echoed by the WASC visiting team in their report on their visit to SSU on March 12-14, 2008. The WASC accreditation committee in their report stated:

“SSU has undertaken a variety of recruitment and outreach strategies that express a well-crafted Diversity Statement, these efforts appear not to have had a substantial impact on yield, retention, and the quality of campus life for underrepresented students. That is, such efforts appear not to be “held to account” as a means of ensuring even greater effectiveness in the future....SSU adopted and widely disseminated its Diversity Statement in 2005 and has implemented a range of outreach and recruitment efforts aimed at making its student body, faculty, and staff more reflective of the increasing diversity of California and the nation. One such initiative is the planned addition of affordable faculty and staff housing that should help attract diverse employees to the high-cost housing market of Sonoma County. Other initiatives target elementary and secondary schools in diverse local communities as well as potential students statewide. Nonetheless, increases in numbers of students and faculty from underrepresented groups have been modest over the past 3-5 years. The University might benefit from additional pragmatic, inexpensive strategies for the recruitment and retention of diverse faculty that have been effective at other public California institutions.”

Faculty Response to Lack of Diversity at SSU

Faculty concerns regarding diversity were a key issue in the spring 2007, when faculty voted by 74 percent to declare no confidence in the SSU President. Professors Susan Moulton, Noel Byrne, and Birch Moonwoman, prepared a statement during the summer of 2008 as Members of the Academic Senate ad hoc committee addressing continuing problems with diversity on campus.

“The apparent lack of commitment to diversity by the University’s senior administrators is of grave concern to many members of the University community... current campus support for diversity as compared to ten year ago reveals the elimination of staffing, programs and support services including:

- Elimination of the campus-wide Educational Equity Committee mandated to assess programs and services that support the recruitment, retention and graduation of students from diverse groups.
- Transfer of affirmative action oversight from Academic Affairs to Human Services. This change has resulted in a narrowed focus, reduced support to search committees for hires, and a staff with considerably less experience in affirmative action requirements and the elimination of on-site training programs for faculty, staff and students (as mandated by a settlement agreement with the Office for Civil Rights of the U.S. Department of Education).
- Elimination of the Intercultural Center and the Women’s Resource Center. Although a new Center was established for Gender, Culture and Sexuality, it has a broader scope (and now includes issues of sexual diversity) but less staffing, a fact that affects programming in collaboration with instruction. There has also been a shift in focus from providing a range of support services and programs to merely supporting programming by student clubs. No state support is offered to this center.
- Replacement of long-standing members of the Campus Climate Committee, in particular those with a strong and vocal commitment to diversity programs. Specifically those persons whose concerned comments were referenced in the 2004 WASC Letter were replaced by the administration without consulting the faculty.
- Elimination of the Teacher Diversity Program and Project Quest, both of which served students from underrepresented backgrounds who were considering careers in teaching.
- There have also been reductions in funding for programs that historically have supported campus diversity, evidence of a failure to align funding or the support required by law in this critical area.”

While faculty concerns about the continuing lack of diversity at SSU remains high, CSU system wide decision makers do not reflect these concerns.

SSU Diversity in Context of the CSU System

The twin goals of becoming a public ivy and expanding the SSU donor base have contributed to the continuation of SSU's status as a predominately white and increasingly wealthy-campus. Decisions on where to recruit, how to control admissions, and the development of a country-club set of amenities, are mostly made on campus by SSU administrators. We therefore conclude that SSU administration has, for the past 14 years, sought to build SSU into being a wealthy wine-country residential campus. The result of these efforts has been to maintain a predominately white student population at SSU.

Support for making SSU a public ivy also came from two CSU chancellors and the CSU trustees as well. We must recognize that President Armiñana and other SSU administrators have been acting in accordance with policies and encouragement of the trustees and chancellors. CSU presidents are evaluated on successful fund raising, time-to-degree, and control of their campuses. So despite votes of no confidence by faculty, trustees continue to support presidents who raise money and build efficiency of service for the CSU customers. What better way to expand donor support for your campus than to recruit students from upper income families? What better way to build campus time-to-degree efficiency than to use higher CSU screening index to recruit more capable students—students who do not have to work and go to college at the same time.

CSU Chancellor Reed approved continuation of the SSU special admissions process well after both the SSU Academic Senate and the CSU Faculty Senate voted to discontinue the practice. The CSU trustees have supported SSU administrative policies and even gave the SSU president a raise after the vote of no confidence by the faculty. We can only conclude that the trustees openly support the creation of a country-club-like campus in the Sonoma county wine country, along with the building of a \$120 million dollar world-class music center.

It seems that governor-appointed trustees, who are responsible for the management and policies within the CSU statewide system, are supportive of maintaining a predominately rich "safe" public ivy campus within the CSU system as a place for white upper-middle class families to send their children whereby parents won't have to guess who is coming home to dinner.

Appendix A

SSU Recruitment Date by County for the years 2001 and 2007 Combined (Using 2007-2008 District Data)

Alameda County

- * County includes 407 schools; 27 School Districts
- * Only one high school was visited in the Alameda County located in the Livermore Valley JUSD which ranks 5th out of 27 school districts for the highest population of white students in Alameda County

County, District, or High School	African American	Asian	Hispanic or Latino	White (Non-Hispanic)	Free & Reduced Price Meals	UC/CSU Eligible Students
Alameda County	15.8%	20.2%	28.4%	24.5%	37.2%	6,355
Livermore Valley USD*	3.0%	5.7%	24.2%	30.1%	21.5%	458
Berkeley USD	27.7%	7.3%	16.5%	30.1%	40.5%	637
Fremont USD	4.8%	45.7%	15.3%	22.8%	19.9%	1,260
Oakland USD	36.2%	45.7%	15.3%	6.2%	69.0%	688

*Visited by Sonoma State Recruiters

The school districts of Berkeley, Fremont, and Oakland had more students that were UC/CSU eligible and yet they were skipped over. Other districts such as Hayward USD and New Haven USD have almost as many eligible UC/CSU students as Livermore Valley JUSD, but were also passed over. Normally, SSU recruiters attend the East Bay Consortium annual college recruitment fair in October. The East Bay Consortium is the primary organization providing information about college enrollments and scholarships for East Bay high schools. In 2008 SSU reserved a table, but failed to send a recruiter to the fair.

Contra Costa County (Using 2007-2008 Data)

- * County includes 265 schools; 19 School Districts
- * Two high schools were visited in the Alameda County, in San Ramon Valley USD and Liberty USD; Contra Costa County's average white student population is 41.5%

County, District, or High School	African American	Asian	Hispanic or Latino	White (Non-Hispanic)	Free & Reduced Price Meals	UC/CSU Eligible Students
Contra Costa County	11.3%	8.7%	27.6%	41.5%	33.4%	4,499
San Ramon Valley USD*	2.3%	18.9%	4.8%	62.1%	2.0%	1,100
Liberty Union High*	9.0%	3.1%	28.8%	53.6%	16.1%	418
West Contra Costa USD	23.2%	9.8%	45.1%	11.2%	63.1%	582
Antioch USD	21.3%	5.1%	33.7%	25.9%	45.1%	309

* Visited by Sonoma State Recruiters

West Contra Costa USD is the largest school district in Contra Costa County with 30,830 students in 65 schools. It also happens to have a very high minority student population and is second in the county for students enrolled in the Free and Reduced Price Meals program.

Fresno County (Using 2007-2008 Data)

- * County includes 331 schools; 40 School Districts
- * Only one high school was visited in Fresno County, Hoover High School in Fresno USD
- * Fresno USD is by far the largest school district Fresno County with 108 schools. Only one high school was visited and it was Hoover High School

County, District, or High School	African American	Asian	Hispanic or Latino	White (Non-Hispanic)	Free & Reduced Price Meals	UC/CSU Eligible Students
Fresno County	6.6%	10.6%	56.4%	22.7%	65.9%	3,515
Fresno USD*	10.8%	14.0%	58.7%	14.7%	79.6%	1,492
Hoover High School*	12.2%	14.6%	42.7%	27.9%	53.2%	133
Fresno High School	10.5%	10.7%	62.6%	14.0%	84.6%	133
McLane High School	8.7%	26.5%	55.4%	7.6%	86.5%	153

**Visited by Sonoma State Recruiters*

Herbert Hoover High School ranked 18th out of 108 school districts for the highest population of white students in Fresno USD, the largest school district in Fresno County and the only high school visited. There were many high schools with a more diverse population and a student population more reliant on the “Reduced/Free Price Meal” Program such as the above noted Fresno High School and McLane High School.

El Dorado County (Using 2007-2008 Data)

- * County includes 73 schools; 17 School Districts
- * Only one high school was visited in El Dorado County located in the El Dorado USD, Union Mine High School.

County, District, or High School	African American	Asian	Hispanic or Latino	White (Non-Hispanic)	Free & Reduced Price Meals	UC/CSU Eligible Students
El Dorado County	1.5%	2.7%	13.5%	74.8%	23.0%	821
El Dorado USD*	0.9%	2.6%	7.0%	81.8%	10.9%	708

**Visited by Sonoma State Recruiters*

There really aren’t any school districts in El Dorado County to compare to El Dorado USD. Only two districts in El Dorado County meet or surpass the California average for African American students, one district meets or surpasses the state average for Asian and Hispanic students. Only three school districts in El Dorado County surpass the California state average of 50.9% for students who are enrolled in the Free and Reduced Price Meals program; the rest of the school districts fall significantly short of this number. These numbers show that this county is fairly wealthy and has an extremely high population of white students compared to the state average. El Dorado High School Union has the largest number of schools, ten schools with a total of 7,280 students; 708 of which are UC/CSU eligible.

Humboldt County (Using 2007-2008 Data)

- * County includes 93 schools; 35 School Districts
- * Only one high school was visited in Humboldt County located in the Eureka City USD, Eureka High School.

County, District, or High School	African American	Asian	Hispanic or Latino	White (Non-Hispanic)	Free & Reduced Price Meals	UC/CSU Eligible Students
Humboldt County	1.7%	3.0%	10.2%	65.9%	49.5%	203
Eureka City USD*	2.4%	7.2%	11.5%	57.2%	58.7%	64
Eureka Senior High**	1.9%	7.5%	10.0%	62.9%	44.1%	64

*Visited by Sonoma State Recruiters

Eureka High School is a typical high school in Humboldt County, if anything it has a slightly lower white student population. In 2007/2008, the entire county only had 203 UC/CSU eligible students, 64 of those were students at Eureka High School.

Los Angeles County (Using 2007-2008 Data)

- * County includes 2,017 schools; 86 School Districts
- * Eleven high schools were visited by Sonoma State University, all located in different districts.

County, District, or High School	African American	Asian	Hispanic or Latino	White (Non-Hispanic)	Free & Reduced Price Meals	UC/CSU Eligible Students
Los Angeles County	9.6%	7.7%	62.4%	15.4%	59.2%	35,080
Azusa USD*	2.0%	0.8%	88.3%	6.6%	71.9%	122
Bonita USD*	3.7%	3.6%	29.4%	40.0%	21.9%	250
Claremont USD*	7.6%	10.0%	28.4%	40.9%	26.2%	287
El Monte USD*	0.5%	17.6%	77.6%	3.2%	81.0%	533
Hacienda LaPuente USD*	1.4%	13.3%	77.3%	5.1%	57.6%	423
Las Virgenes USD*	1.8%	6.7%	6.4%	79.4%	3.3%	463
Los Angeles USD*	10.9%	3.7%	73.0%	8.8%	69.3%	13,503
Manhattan Beach USD*	1.5%	6.7%	4.3%	67.9%	1.8%	479
San Gabriel USD*	1.7%	43.2%	38.4%	10.4%	54.9%	169
Walnut Valley USD*	3.3%	56.0%	19.4%	13.7%	7.0%	0
Whittier UHSD*	1.3%	1.6%	81.8%	13.3%	47.6%	756
El Rancho USD*	0.4%	0.4%	96.3%	1.3%	61.4%	198

*Visited by Sonoma State Recruiters

- * While LA county seems to be an area where SSU actually recruited in some highly diverse low-income schools, only four High Schools were actually visited in both 2001 and 2007. It should also be noted that overall the time spent in LA area by SSU recruiters was far less than time spent either out of state or in private high schools inside California.

Monterey County (Using 2007-2008 Data)

- * County includes 126 schools; 25 School Districts
- * Only one high school was visited in Monterey County located in the Carmel USD, Carmel High School which ranks 3rd out of 25 school districts for the highest population of white students in Monterey County.

County, District, or High School	African American	Asian	Hispanic or Latino	White (Non-Hispanic)	Free & Reduced Price Meals	UC/CSU Eligible Students
Monterey County	2.8%	2.4%	70.0%	18.5%	64.2%	1,060
Carmel USD*	0.9%	2.5%	12.9%	75.9%	10.9%	80
Monterey Peninsula USD	8.4%	6.6%	40.8%	27.7%	54.6%	210
Salinas UHSD	2.7%	1.5%	79.0%	11.7%	59.9%	490
North Monterey County USD	1.3%	1.4%	70.3%	24.3%	58.6%	115

**Visited by Sonoma State Recruiters*

Monterey County has an average Hispanic or Latino student population of 70% and 64.2% of its entire student population is registered for the “Free and Reduced Price Meals” program. But Sonoma State only visited one high school in Monterey County, which had a significantly higher population of white students than the county average and only 10.9% of its students were enrolled in the Free and Reduced Price Meals program.

Napa County (Using 2007-2008 Data)

- * County includes 51 schools; 6 School Districts
- * Only one high school was visited in Napa County located in the Napa Valley USD, Vintage High School. This is by far the largest district in the county with 37 schools.

County, District, or High School	African American	Asian	Hispanic or Latino	White (Non-Hispanic)	Free & Reduced Price Meals	UC/CSU Eligible Students
Napa County	1.9%	1.7%	44.4%	38.3%	41.2%	315
Napa Valley USD*	2.0%	1.9%	43.0%	37.8%	40.0%	294

**Visited by Sonoma State Recruiters*

Orange County (Using 2007-2008 Data)

- * County includes 601 schools; 28 School Districts
- * Four high schools were visited in Orange County.

County, District, or High School	African American	Asian	Hispanic or Latino	White (Non-Hispanic)	Free & Reduced Price Meals	UC/CSU Eligible Students
Orange County	1.7%	13.6%	44.4%	33.8%	40.0%	12,304
Fullerton JUSD*	2.2%	18.4%	47.2%	24.1%	16.3%	988
Laguna Beach USD*	1.0%	3.2%	7.4%	83.6%	5.5%	130
Orange USD*	1.5%	9.7%	45.3%	36.8%	35.9%	692
Tustin USD*	2.5%	14.6%	42.0%	34.6%	33.5%	450
Anaheim UHSD	2.7%	10.8%	57.5%	16.1%	51.1%	1,217
Gardin Grove USD	0.9%	29.8%	53.6%	13.2%	65.1%	918
Santa Ana USD	0.7%	2.7%	92.3%	3.3%	80.3%	565

**Visited by Sonoma State Recruiters*

Three of the four districts visited by Sonoma State had a higher white student population than the Orange County average, but perhaps more important is the number of students enrolled in the Free and Reduced Price Meals program. The average in Orange County is 40% student enrollment in the program, but all of the school districts visited by SSU fell short of this. There were several districts that had a high population of students that were UC/CSU eligible that were not visited. These were also districts that had a high population of students enrolled in the Free and Reduced Price Meals program.

Placer County (Using 2007-2008 Data)

- * County includes 115 schools; 18 School Districts
- * Three high schools were visited in Placer County in three different districts.

County, District, or High School	African American	Asian	Hispanic or Latino	White (Non-Hispanic)	Free & Reduced Price Meals	UC/CSU Eligible Students
Placer County	2.1%	4.2%	12.5%	70.5%	20.9%	1,564
Roseville JUSD*	3.3%	5.7%	10.2%	69.8%	18.1%	755
Rocklin USD*	1.3%	4.9%	7.9%	70.4%	12.6%	255
Tahoe-Truckee JUSD*	0.3%	0.7%	29.9%	66.2%	30.5%	144

** Visited by Sonoma State Recruiters*

Riverside County (Using 2007-2008 Data)

- * County includes 115 schools; 18 School Districts
- * Five high schools were visited in Riverside County in five different school districts.

County, District, or High School	African American	Asian	Hispanic or Latino	White (Non-Hispanic)	Free & Reduced Price Meals	UC/CSU Eligible Students
Riverside County	7.4%	2.6%	55.7%	27.8%	52.2%	6,036
Jurupa Valley USD*	3.2%	1.2%	75.6%	17.6%	66.2%	308
Perris USD*	9.4%	1.5%	62.6%	23.3%	53.0%	288
Val Verde USD*	17.1%	1.6%	68.3%	7.8%	64.7%	109
Corona-Norco USD*	5.9%	5.5%	48.7%	33.1%	39.9%	686
Palm Springs USD*	5.2%	1.0%	70.6%	19.3%	68.5%	287

- * *Visited by Sonoma State Recruiters*
- * Of the Six High Schools in Riverside County visited by SSU recruiters in 2001 and 2007, only two were visited both years.

Sacramento County (Using 2007-2008 Data)

- * County includes 391 schools; 18 School Districts
- * Three high schools were visited in Sacramento County in three different school districts.

County, District, or High School	African American	Asian	Hispanic or Latino	White (Non-Hispanic)	Free & Reduced Price Meals	UC/CSU Eligible Students
Sacramento County	15.3%	13.0%	24.5%	38.2%	50.0%	4,345
Natomas USD*	25.1%	12.9%	27.9%	22.5%	44.0%	N/A
Elk Grove USD*	18.1%	18.6%	20.5%	26.0%	45.6%	1,440
San Juan USD*	7.5%	4.4%	16.4%	66.7%	35.6%	1,316
Sacramento City USD	20.8%	20.6%	32.1%	21.0%	64.9%	979

**Visited by Sonoma State Recruiters*

In 2001 and 2007 Sonoma State recruiters visited three school districts in Sacramento County. Sacramento County is a very diverse county with 50% of its students registered for the Free and Reduced Price Meals program. All three districts visited were below the average for students enrolled in the Free and Reduced Price Meals program. The largest district in the county is Sacramento City USD, which was not visited, 64.9% of its students are enrolled in this program. Sacramento City USD also has 979 UC/CSU eligible students, Natomas USD (which was visited) has zero UC/CSU eligible students.

San Bernardino County (Using 2007-2008 Data)

- * County includes 535 schools; 35 School Districts
- * Only one high school was visited in San Bernardino County

County, District, or High School	African American	Asian	Hispanic or Latino	White (Non-Hispanic)	Free & Reduced Price Meals	UC/CSU Eligible Students
San Bernardino County	10.4%	2.8%	56.4%	24.0%	56.3%	5,901
San Bernardino City USD*	16.3%	0.8%	67.5%	10.9%	81.4%	443
Fontana USD	7.2%	1.3%	82.4%	6.7%	66.4%	575
San Bernardino High School*	17.1%	0.5%	71.9%	7.7%	83.2%	53
Arroyo Valley High	15.8%	0.3%	76.7%	3.9%	79.9%	108

- * *Visited by Sonoma State Recruiters*

San Bernardino County is one of the largest school districts visited by Sonoma State. It is a fairly diverse County with 56.3% of its students enrolled in the Free and Reduced Price Meals program. Unfortunately only one high school was visited. There were plenty of other districts and other high schools within the visited school district that had students that were UC/CSU eligible and yet Sonoma State only made a quick appearance in San Bernardino County.

San Diego County (Using 2007-2008 Data)

- * County includes 737 schools; 44 School Districts
- * Three high school was visited in San Diego County

County, District, or High School	African American	Asian	Hispanic or Latino	White (Non-Hispanic)	Free & Reduced Price Meals	UC/CSU Eligible Students
San Diego County	7.0%	5.4%	44.0%	34.5%	46.1%	11,791
Carlsbad USD*	2.3%	5.7%	22.6%	60.5%	18.9%	362
Grossmont UHSD*	8.5%	2.2%	28.0%	52.8%	32.0%	1,752
Sweetwater UHSD*	4.5%	2.0%	72.3%	10.5%	43.1%	1,968
San Diego USD	13.5%	8.7%	44.3%	25.4%	62.6%	2,568

- * *Visited by Sonoma State Recruiters*

San Diego County is another large county that Sonoma State did not spend much time in, out of 737 schools only three were visited. Placer County has only 115 schools and yet it also had three different school districts visited, so it was essentially giving it the same attention as San Diego County despite having less students that were UC/CSU eligible. Placer also only had an average of 20.9% of its students registered for the Free and Reduced Price Meals program. San Diego USD was not visited despite having the largest number of UC/CSU eligible students. It also had more students enrolled in Free and Reduced Price Meals program than the other districts that were visited in San Diego County.

San Mateo County (Using 2007-2008 Data)

- * County includes 177 schools; 25 School Districts
- * Only one high school was visited in San Mateo County

County, District, or High School	African American	Asian	Hispanic or Latino	White (Non-Hispanic)	Free & Reduced Price Meals	UC/CSU Eligible Students
San Mateo County	3.9%	11.8%	34.7%	32.6%	32.9%	2,188
San Mateo UHSD*	2.7%	23.3%	23.6%	38.1%	9.9%	1,029
Sequoia UHSD	5.2%	5.2%	42.0%	40.1%	36.0%	793

*Visited by Sonoma State Recruiters

Sonoma State only visited one high school in San Mateo County in a school district that only has 9.9% of its student population registered in the Free and Reduced Price Meals program.

Santa Clara County (Using 2007-2008 Data)

- * County includes 395 schools; 33 School Districts
- * Three high schools in three different districts were visited in Santa Clara County

County, District, or High School	African American	Asian	Hispanic or Latino	White (Non-Hispanic)	Free & Reduced Price Meals	UC/CSU Eligible Students
Santa Clara County	3.1%	25.2%	36.6%	25.1%	35.3%	7,910
Fremont UHSD*	1.9%	50.2%	12.7%	31.0%	9.5%	1,562
East Side UHSD*	4.0%	27.0%	47.5%	10.8%	37.9%	1,819
Gilroy USD*	1.3%	2.8%	67.8%	19.4%	56.8%	100

*Visited by Sonoma State Recruiters

Solano County (Using 2007-2008 Data)

- * County includes 106 schools; 7 School Districts
- * Only one high school was visited in Solano County

County, District, or High School	African American	Asian	Hispanic or Latino	White (Non-Hispanic)	Free & Reduced Price Meals	UC/CSU Eligible Students
Solano County	19.6%	4.0%	27.9%	31.9%	38.5%	1,280
Travis USD*	15.2%	5.0%	15.1%	43.9%	19.7%	108
Fairfield-Suisun USD	22.8%	5.5%	32.5%	26.7%	43.7%	479

* Visited by Sonoma State Recruiters

Sonoma State only visited one high school in Solano County and that was Vanden High School in Travis USD. This school district is literally right next to Fairfield-Suisun USD. It is

less than ten miles between Vanden High School and Armijo High School, which is located in the Fairfield-Suisun USD and had 144 students that were UC/CSU eligible but was not visited.

Sonoma County (Using 2007-2008 Data)

- * County includes 180 schools; 41 School Districts
- * Two high schools were visited in Sonoma County

County, District, or High School	African American	Asian	Hispanic or Latino	White (Non-Hispanic)	Free & Reduced Price Meals	UC/CSU Eligible Students
Sonoma County	2.4%	3.7%	34.2%	53.6%	35.0%	1,587
Windsor USD*	1.3%	2.0%	38.2%	51.5%	34.8%	59
Sonoma Valley USD*	0.9%	1.6%	45.1%	49.5%	35.5%	142

**Visited by Sonoma State Recruiters*

Ventura County (Using 2007-2008 Data)

- * County includes 216 schools; 22 School Districts
- * Two high schools were visited in Ventura County

County, District, or High School	African American	Asian	Hispanic or Latino	White (Non-Hispanic)	Free & Reduced Price Meals	UC/CSU Eligible Students
Ventura County	2.0%	4.2%	48.4%	39.4%	39.8%	2,196
Conejo Valley USD*	1.6%	8.6%	18.2%	67.1%	13.4%	N/A
Ventura USD*	1.8%	2.5%	40.1%	46.2%	38.9%	397
Moorpark USD	1.5%	5.0%	35.2%	49.5%	27.4%	284
Oxnard UHSD	3.1%	2.5%	68.9%	18.4%	41.4%	733

**Visited by Sonoma State Recruiters*

Only two schools were visited in Ventura County out of its 216 schools. Both of the school districts visited had white student populations that were much higher than the county average and both had fewer students enrolled in the Free and Reduced Price Meals program than the county average. Oxnard UHSD had 733 UC/CSU eligible students and Moorpark USD had 284 students that were UC/CSU eligible.

Yolo County (Using 2007-2008 Data)

- * County includes 62 schools; 6 School Districts

* Only one high school was visited in Yolo County

County, District, or High School	African American	Asian	Hispanic or Latino	White (Non-Hispanic)	Free & Reduced Price Meals	UC/CSU Eligible Students
Yolo County	3.4%	8.7%	39.8%	42.6%	43.1%	699
Woodland Joint USD*	1.1%	4.7%	57.3%	31.5%	49.3%	160
Pioneer High School*	0.6%	7.8%	51.3%	36.9%	35.3%	110

*

*Visited by Sonoma State Recruiters

Footnote #1: Information on SSU Income Chart from page 7:

The raw data for this analysis was obtained from the office of Rose Bruce at SSU. This data used the same categories for each year and did not adjust for inflation. However, according to the US Bureau of Labor Statistics, there was 40% inflation from 1994 to 2007 and 20% from 2000 to 2007, so inflation adjustment was necessary in order to obtain a valid comparison.

When an income category from the original data set, adjusted for inflation, then spanned two or more of the 2007 categories, the students were apportioned between them in proportion to the size of the overlap. Admittedly this assumes that students are homogeneously distributed through an income category. This is almost certainly not the case, but in the absence of any other information it is the only reasonable alternative.

Rick Luttmann, 24 October 2008, prepared table 4.

Bibliography

Bailey, Andre, Interview on SSU Campus, 10/19/08, Notes on file with author.

Bollinger, Lee. (2007), Why Diversity Matters, *Educational Digest*, Vol. 73 Issue 2, P 26-29

Chang, M. J., & Denson, N., & Misa, K., & Saenz, V. (2006). The Educational Benefits of Sustaining Cross-Racial Interaction among Undergraduates [Electronic version]. *The Journal of Higher Education*. 77.3, 430-455.

Garlin, Victor, Interview in Navato, 10/20/08, Notes on file with author

Guinier, Lani, Gerald Torres, The Miner's Canary, Harvard university Press, 2002

Higher Education Research Institute, The American Freshman: Thirty-Five Year Trends, 1996-2001, UCLA, December 2002, Cooperate Institutional Research Program, CIRP

Hu, S., & Kuh, G. D. (2003). Diversity Experiences and College Student Learning and Personal Development [Electronic version]. *Journal of College Student Development*, 44.3, 320-334.

Moll, Richard. 1985. The Public Ivys. Canada: Viking Penguin Inc.

Report to the Statewide Academic Senate Sonoma State University Admission Experiment 1994-1997, Copy on file with author

Report Of The Wasc Visiting Team Capacity And Preparatory Review Sonoma State University, March 12-14, 2008 , Paul Gaston-Chair, Nalsey Tinberg-Assistant Chair, Desdemona Cardoza, Cecile Lindsay, Terry Wildman

Sonoma County Economic & Demographic Profile, 2007-2008
www.sonoma-county.org/EDB/pdf/2007/2007_sonoma_profile.pdf

Steele, Shelby, (1989). "The Recoloring of Campus Life: Student Racism, Academic Pluralism, ad the End of a Dream." *Harper's Magazine*, February, pp. 47-55.

Tansey, Frank, Interview in Santa Rosa, CA, 11/13/08, Notes on file with author.

Taylor, Stuart Jr. Myths and Realities About Affirmative Action, *National Journal*, 4/12/2003, Vol. 35, Issue 15, p. 1125