

# Senate Minutes

September 27, 2001

## Abstract

Agenda and Minutes approved. Unit Change for Math Department approved. Report from the Chair. 120 Unit BA policy approved. Compensation for lecturer's tabled indefinitely. Resolution in Support of Human Rights approved with amendments. Report from President and Associated Students.

Present: Rick Luttmann, Noel Byrne, Phil McGough, Peter Phillips, Susan McKillop, Victor Garlin, Wanda Boda, Debora Hammond, Catherine Nelson, Charles Merrill, Dale Trowbridge, Derek Girman, Duane Dove, Edith Mendez, Heidi LaMoreaux, Leilani Nishime, Perry Marker, Raye Lynn Thomas, Renee Deorsey, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Susan Garfin, Scott Miller, Steve Winter, Tim Wandling, Remy Heng, Travis Tabares, Laura Sund, Art Warmoth, Michael Litle, William Poe, Susan Moulton

Absent: Gillian Parker, Heather Smith, Sunil Tiwari, Bernie Goldstein, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth.

Guests: Veronica Daube, Rebecca Gilbert, Jacqueline Boman, Dennis Harris, Nancy Burrington, Rose Bruce, Elaine Sundberg, Judith Hunt.

Meeting began 3:08

## Report of the Chair of the Senate - Rick Luttmann

R. Luttmann – I have several things - first we are currently balloting for lecturers seats on the Senate. You should have a ballot in your mailboxes. The deadline is next Friday. At our next Senate they will be joining us. Some members of our academic community have gotten together to create a University Forum dealing with the terrorism issue. Next Monday it will be starting in front of the Student Union, and on Thursday and Friday will have a more structured format from 12-3 in the Alumni Amphitheater. It is possible that on Friday it maybe moved to Zinfandel. Please let your students know and we hope you will participate.

**Correspondences:** None.

## Consent Items:

Approval of the Agenda - *Approved*

Approval of Minutes - *Approved* with minor changes

Unit Change for Math Department – attachment - *Approved*

## BUSINESS

120 units BA report and procedures, 2<sup>nd</sup> reading

R. Luttmann - Since the last time there's been some discussion at the Executive Committee and Art Warmoth asked to be able to present a substitute motion.

A. Warmoth – There are two items in your packet - one requesting higher than 120 BA degrees. I agree that is what is on the table. I'm proposing a substitute motion also in your packet. There's a typo and when I sent this out I didn't know the exact number of units of the Computer Science department wanted. They have since asked for 124 units. I move that the motion in your packet be substituted for the motion on the table.

W. Poe – Second.

R. Luttmann – We can now discuss whether to substitute this motion.

P. McGough – Is there a reason why this doesn't specify how department that want above 120 units would go about it.

A. Warmoth – We agreed that subsequent changes would go through the regular review process. Those now in existence have already been approved at higher unit values. Students still need to complete their GE and major requirements in order to graduate. I want to clarify the situation with Global Studies. There may be some cases where they need more than 120 units, but it is possible to graduate with 120. We recognize programs with already higher values. Future changes will go through normal review process.

D. Dove – This only contains those who recently indicated they want it continue with higher unit loads?

A. Warmoth – Yes, within this semester. Rick identified the departments with over 124 units so we could see where it was an issue. I've contact all affected that I know of and made sure they wanted to continue.

D. Dove – I have reservation about the Department of Business. We believed it was mandated, and didn't think we had option. So we're at a different process.

A. Warmoth – Is it a BS degree? In most cases it is BS degrees that have a rationale for an increased number of units. If it is a BS program, it would be acceptable to indicate that situation with the BS in Bus Administration. It can be referred back to the department and would get expedited.

R. Luttmann – This calls to attention to one matter. One BS was on list at a 128 unit degree, but had 14 units of electives. There were a number of majors with higher than 124 able to reduce the number of electives without eating in to the major requirement. The intention of EPC is that there was no exception, they were not automatically granted for that situation, but as Art says the departments still have the right to propose changes. We haven't acted on this yet, and it is possible to amend this.

W. Poe - I'd like to remind the Senators that under old rules the BS and BFA could have had up to 132 units and they are under greater constraints. There is no provision for them, very few electives are remaining.

L. Nishime – Does this also apply to integrated programs where students get their teaching credential? In AMCS we have one of those programs that is over those units values.

A. Warmoth - No, but both the requirements would be for both the teaching credential and degree, whatever it takes to do both. Unless Business' request has the exact number of units you want to have, let the motion go through as it and ask EPC to look at it.

D. Girman - Looking at this list of majors - are these new adjusted numbers?

A. Warmoth – Yes, this is what was communicated to EPC. I should mention that what I am saying is that departments who have decided that their majors would have some electives in addition to minimum degree requirements is a position a department could take.

D. Girman - Are these numbers exactly accurate?

A. Warmoth - If this passes if any want to adjust these figures - that would go through EPC and the Senate. At this point we are more interested in supporting what departments want to do than be restrictive. The word from Susan McKillop is that the Chancellor does not want to mess with rationales.

**Vote on whether the new motion is substituted - *Approved***

**Vote on 120 unit BA degree motion – *Approved***

### **Policy on 120 Unit Bachelor's Degrees**

Pursuant to Title 5, Education, of the California Code of Regulations, the Academic Senate authorized the award of bachelor's degrees upon completion of 120 units, provided students have completed all GE and major requirements for their degree, beginning with December 2001 graduation.

The following majors have previously been approved by the Senate at a higher unit value and have communicated the need for a higher minimum unit requirement to the Office of Academic Affairs:

Bachelor of Fine Arts (B.F.A.)	132 units
B.S. in Biology	123 units
B.S. in Geology	123 units
B.S. in Kinesiology	124 units
B.S. in Nursing	124 units
B.S. in Physics	124 units
B.S. in Computer Science	124 units

These minimum unit requirements will continue to apply. Future changes in General Education and major requirements must follow established campus procedures.

### **Compensation for Lecturers on the Senate, 2<sup>nd</sup> reading**

R. Luttmann - This is the proposal that came back from FSAC. We do have a plan of bringing lecturers on the Senate. Lecturers have always been eligible to serve, but now we have 3 seats specifically for lecturers. Please notice there are three clauses to this motion. Basically it recommends that lecturers be given one WTU.

W. Boda – Is that per semester or year?

R. Luttmann - Per semester. Is there any objection to putting down per semester to clarify that?

No objection were voiced.

C. Nelson - If we pass all three it's my understanding regardless of whether our total WTUs are increased that we are obligated to take these units out of the existing pool of 54 units.

R. Luttmann - The Senate recommends that.

C. Nelson - I thought we, the Senate, were the ones who decide.

R. Luttmann - Usually it is a recommendation to the Executive committee.

W. Poe - In my memory the units assigned to Senate officers have been negotiated between the Executive committee and the Provost. It hasn't been a Senate decision.

C. Nelson - If we pass this first clause, is the Executive committee obligated to allocate one unit per semester.

R. Luttmann – I don't see the word obligated.

C. Nelson - Do you have any concerns about the recommended language?

P. McGough - For me you're raising an interesting point. The Senate recommends that the Executive committee take 6 of 54 units away from where they are currently allocated. We were told it is unlikely that the pool will increase this year.

C. Nelson - That's my understanding. Units will be taken away.

R. Coleman-Senghor - My objection is that this is an unfunded mandate. If we find the money then money can be specifically designated. The Executive committee will have the power to dispose of resources as it sees fit. We don't have much money. Each year we have to decide which committee is really doing work, what do we do if we have more people on the Senate. How do we discriminate that it is extra to what they do beside teaching. It is an unfunded mandate, if this Senate passes an unfunded mandate it is an unsound philosophical way of doing things.

**T. Wandling - I like to put in a clarifying amendment that we add in the first resolved after recognized by the assignment *by the Senate Executive committee.***

**Seconded.**

**Amendment - *Approved.***

V. Garlin - This motion may handle my concern. I remind the Senate that just having constitution and bylaws, the Executive committee does not have authority, doesn't act over the Senate. It acts for the Senate. It is not a policy making body, it's not appropriate for the

Senate to make the Executive committee do anything. It could delegate the job of distributing release time in negotiation with administration. This motion makes clear that the job of the Executive committee is to allocate release time for lecturers. If this is passed, it would be the duty of the Executive committee to make that distribution.

P. Phillips – Are you saying clause two should be deleted? Is that what you are saying?

V. Garlin - I don't think it is necessary now. It's clear instruction to the Executive committee now.

P. Phillips- In the Executive committee a couple of things came forward. This only applies to this year and the second semester. The funding is about \$5000, however, the Provost was quite clear that money would not be available. Also Administrators were not sure whether lecturers could be compensated in terms of the contract, most people thought it is not a problem in the contract, but that's not how the administration sees this. We may never see funding in this regard and we may need to take it from the 54 units we currently have. Maybe we should table it at this point to get clarification.

J. Hunt – I'm hampered somewhat as I was not a party to the conversation where Bernie said it might be a problem. I don't see any problem. It can't be release time. It would be one unit of assigned time. I don't see a difficulty doing it, funding is another issue.

W. Poe - People sit on the Executive committee as representatives of the Senate and as Chairs of committees. I sit as a representative of FSAC. I question whether we are subject to instruction by the Senate particularly regarding release time for senate officers. It has never been the Senate, but the Executive committee.

A. Warmoth – This jurisdictional conversation is interesting, but on a practical level if we think it is a good thing to ask the Administration to give us units, we should do it. If we think it is a good idea, are we willing to take it out of our current allocation? If we are willing do that do we start next semester - that impinges on allocations already given out - or do we wait until fall to implement the resolution. It is useful to get guidance from the Senate.

V. Garlin - If there are not contractual problems and Judith says there are no problems, the only question is can you get more assigned time to incorporate this new relationship and if we can't, do we want to reallocate. Who will do that - the Senate or the Executive committee? I don't see that there needs to be any conflict between the Executive committee and the Senate on this matter. I agree with Art that this is probably not the place to discuss jurisdiction. Clearly neither the Constitution or ByLaws deal with this question. It is no problem for the Senate to instruct the Executive committee how they would want to proceed on this matter. The Executive committee does not have sole jurisdiction on this matter.

W. Boda - How do other universities do this? I'm curious about how it is accomplished at other campuses.

R. Coleman-Senghor - Can we not look at assigned time? How do we handle that? It should not be substantially different in assigned time, the mechanism should come from Structures and Functions. If in fact we do assigned time, how has assigned time worked in the past? Assigned time is not a new entity, it's no different. We don't have a mechanism that would

be sent back to FASC, but still there's not enough money. Is the Executive committee that body that determines how money there is for the senate to distribute?

**P. McGough – I move that this be tabled. I'm not sure how we could vote on it. Unless you have a sense of how units will be used, there is no context for this discussion.**

R. Luttmann - Is this motion to table this matter indefinitely?

P. McGough- Yes.

**Vote on tabling compensation for lecturer's serving on the Senate indefinitely -  
*Approved***

C. Nelson - Point of order. If we wish to bring this back how do we do that?

W. Poe -Move to take the motion off the table.

### **Resolution in Support of Human Rights - Peter Phillips, 1<sup>st</sup> reading - attachment**

P. Phillips - Across the state various Senates are passing resolutions about the tragedy that occurred on September 11<sup>th</sup>. I felt it is very important to recognize our commitment to human rights in this society and in the U.S. Bill of Rights such as the safety of persons, due process, freedom from verbal and physical attack due to ethnicity or religion. This is something we believe. It is important for a University like ours to reaffirm these values publicly, not only share with students but the public at large.

P. McGough - What happened on September 11<sup>th</sup> was so large. We're all just beginning to deal with it. I've never read the Declaration of Human Rights and I'm not sure how the Constitution applies.

S. McKillop – I have a small point. There's a typo – states should be capitalized.

S. Winter – This is not meant as disrespect, but how was this motion vetted prior to coming to the Senate. How does this fit the purpose of the Academic Senate?

P. Phillips - Over the years this body has passed resolutions on the Vietnam War and the military on campus. We are a consultative body. We are intellectuals and should make a statement.

R. Luttmann – I have sent around other Senate resolutions via Senate-Talk.

**T. Wandling – I move to waive the first reading.**

**Seconded.**

**Vote to waive first reading - *Approved***

V. Garlin – I think all of you are or should be familiar with our Constitution. All of the us, as you know, we require all graduates to have a course or pass an exam in the Constitution. How this relates to our Constitution, one is war powers. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights was Eleanor Roosevelt's greatest achievement. It was enacted in 1948 by the

General Assembly. I'm not familiar with it and am happy it is passed around and we can look at it. I don't think any one around this table would take exception to the Declaration of Human Rights. Peter's resolution is fair and balanced. The only part that raises a contentious discussion is the suggestion that the events of September 11<sup>th</sup> be met by this county by some mechanism other than war. It calls for other mechanisms. I happen to support that point of view. Our university is the proper place for conversation about these issues such as will happen with the three day university forums. The question of our relevance to the affairs of this university is beyond discussion. We ask that the U.S. deal with the attack and not people and it is a way to show our respect of the rights of ethnic and religious minorities who may be at risk. I hope you will support this resolution.

W. Poe – I strongly support this. The Bill of Rights are clearly threatened and the U. S. is a signatory of the Declaration of Human Rights. It speaks to issues that are current, the right of people in this county to not be attacked. We can continue as children of the Enlightenment to seek justice through accepted legal channels.

T. Wandling - I strongly support this and would be proud to be part of body that adopts this. As far as objections to making this kind of statement, we need to get past the rhetoric. It says very much what I'm feeling.

R. Coleman-Senghor – I speak against this proposal. It's very clear that we are looking at human rights issues. We need to figure out how we can address the needs of our citizens. There are two Whereas I reject. Some cool heads are planning what our response will be. There are people who are very wounded, who think a military response is an appropriate response, even if the military protects human rights. I think that if this resolution goes forward it should go forward based on Article 10 of the Declaration of Human Rights. We also can protect our selves as individual and as the state.

S. Miller – I'm of the same mind as Bob. I don't know the rules of war, but clearly if one believes as many do that what happened on September 11<sup>th</sup> is an act of war, isn't the Universal Declaration of Human Rights moot? In rule of war? What happens then to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. If there is a different way to argue for what happened on September 11<sup>th</sup> as not an act of war, then the U.S. must respond to it as an act of justice under all the principles of the legal system.

E. Mendez – I support the resolution. I'd like to see the typo corrected. I also support where "terrorist perceive injustice" taken out. I would support it either way, I'm not making a motion.

D. Trowbridge – In terms of retaliation, I'm not sure there is a U.S. law that we talking about changing, maybe an executive policy. We should be correct.

W. Boda – I'm mixed about it. Do we really have the right to make statement for all of Sonoma State? Are we forcing our opinion on people who don't feel that way? Am I really representing all constituencies of the university? Personally I have right to do it, but it's not right to say it for all about September 11<sup>th</sup>.

P. Phillips - There was a law that forbade U.S. assassinations for political purposes. Clearly there is an element in the government that says we need to do away with that. It is an overt threat to Afghanistan and Iraq and anyone else not on our side. We need to make a statement. Images and statements have been very overt and very strong in the Senate for

war retaliation. There is no discussion about how terrorists perceive injustices, they really do want an over reaction. That has not been presented. As scholars we need to say this important point that needs to be said. It is being ignored in the media.

C. Nelson – There are times when we need to say where we stand. If this is a situation were the Senate wants to make it, the Senate should do that. In 1976 an executive order was signed by Gerald Ford which banned assignation as a political tool. Would Peter be willing to do without the whereas that have been objected to?

S. McKillop – From an old Statewide Academic Senator the only thing that really counts are the resolved, not what you say in the whereas - we just debate the resolution. We need to discuss the resolved. The argument we are having is educational but moot.

T. Wandling - We can act on this. Speaking to the question of war, we are not dictating national policy. War is allowed in our Constitution. It allows for us to have this conversation.

R. Coleman –Senghor – Susan’s point is well taken. The language is not going to be limited in the publicity. The resolved clauses in both of those documents justify the resolution. This will be sufficient and contained in the resolution. I support this statement without those whereas. People are being persecuted and assaulted because of ethnic and religion origins. The document doesn’t speak to that. I do not want to speak against the spirit of your resolution. If you change those whereas, then I would be a more enthusiastic supporter.

**D. Dove – I move to remove whereas paragraphs 5 and 6.**

M. Litle – I support that change. I agree with the spirit of it, and would love to debate. I offer a friendly amendment that our job as an institution is to ask the difficult questions of why, which those debates would clarify. We have a dedication to truth. What motivated the attacks, what other outcomes, the spirit of inquiry should be in there somewhere. It’s one of those no statements with no positive statement in it.

**V. Garlin - I wonder if we could divide the question.** I’d like to better understand why there are objections to the first whereas. I could vote to take out the first whereas. Taking out the second whereas pulls out the eye teeth of the resolution, to resolve our differences without war. War is not rooting out terrorism. That’s a debatable issue. Peter is correct there in terms of facts and the dates. If we take those two out it states let’s go to war and let’s not persecute the people whose ethnic and religious beliefs are the same and the people we are going to war with.

R. Luttmann - You made a proposal to divide the question. Would you make a formal motion?

**V. Garlin – Yes, so moved.**

**Seconded.**

R. Luttmann – We can now debate that matter. Whether to divide the question.

T. Wandling - Point of clarification. How does this work?



R. Luttmann – Duane’s motion is to delete paragraphs 5 & 6 of the whereas. By doing we can vote separately.

**S. Miller – I call the question on that.**

**R. Luttmann - So we’ll vote on whether we shall divide the question.**

**Vote - *Approved***

W. Poe - I urge the Senate not remove one without the other. It is important to the resolved clauses that these be here. It is not gratuitous information. It may be that some terrorists act for other reasons. Certainly from what we know about terrorists is that they act out of perceived injustice. It is also the case that the vast majority want an over reaction. One of the main purposes of that bit of information is that it lends strength to the resolution not to over react. It’s a key piece of logic.

R. Luttmann – We can vote on whether to remove the 5th whereas - Yes takes out the whereas, no leaves it in.

**Vote to take out 5<sup>th</sup> whereas statement – *Failed***

W. Poe – I have a similar argument about this clause. Executive orders have the force of law.

S. Miller- Is this an accurate statement then? If this law specifically applies to heads of government, heads of state, does it even apply?

R. Coleman-Senghor – It seems to me that what we are saying has the effect of not allowing any kind of killing. We might want to think about that for a long time.

P. Phillips - This clause is specifically related to Article 10 about criminal charges and having a trial. That is exactly what is meant by that clause in this resolution. It’s not forbidding war. We clearly think there are people in the government who say lets go out and kill them and hire a contractor to do this, just if we think they are guilty.

A. Warmoth - I don’t think this resolution prohibits military action. As a resolution clause it is a stirring statement for due process and human rights.

R. Luttmann – Now we are voting about whether to take out the 6th whereas clause – If you are in favor of removing vote yes, if not vote no –

**Vote on removing the 6<sup>th</sup> whereas - *Failed, with 5 abstentions.***

R. Luttmann – The resolution stays the way it was proposed.

**R. Coleman-Senghor – The 6<sup>th</sup> identifies the people we want to protect as terrorists. Do you see that? I’d like to make a motion to amend it to say “Whereas: Groups and individuals in the United States have harassed and killed U. S. citizens and residents because of perceived ethnic and religious origins.”**

**Seconded.**

**P. Phillips – I could accept that as a friendly amendment.**

**R. Luttmann – Any objection?**

**No objection.**

D. Harris – Is it the intention of the Senate to understate the number of victims?

P. Phillips – I'm happy to make it 6500.

Accepted.

**Vote on amended Resolution for Human Rights - 23 Approve, 2 Oppose, 3 Abstentions.**

**Resolution in Support of Human Rights  
Sonoma State University Faculty Senate**

Whereas: On September 11, the United States suffered a horrendous terrorist attack taking the lives of over 6500 innocent victims.

Whereas: This terrorist act was a blatant violation of Article 3 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights where by "Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person."

Whereas: The United States is a signatory to the Declaration of Human Rights and by law is obligated to respect its provisions.

Whereas: Article 10 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights provides that "Everyone is entitled in full equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, in the determination of his rights and obligations of any criminal charge against him."

Whereas: Terrorists act from perceived injustices, and desire an overreaction from the powerful that results in expanded hatred from whole populations.

Whereas: Elements in the United States are threatening retaliation on whole countries and desiring to change U.S law to allow contracted killings without trial.

Whereas: Groups and individuals in the United States have harassed and killed U.S citizens and residents because of perceived ethnic or religious origins.

Resolve: That the Academic Senate of Sonoma State University reaffirms support for the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Bill of Rights of the U.S. Constitution.

Resolve: That all individuals in the United States respect the right of individuals to be free from verbal and physical attacks because of their ethnic or religious origins.

Resolve: That acts and procedures of the United States government in the process of seeking justice for terrorist acts follow the principles and intent of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the United States Constitution.

**P. Phillips – I move that we recommend that our Statewide Senators take this to the Statewide Senate and put it on the floor there.**

**Second.**

**Vote to recommend Statewide Senators put the Resolution on Human Rights on the Statewide Senate floor - 21 Approved, 3 Opposed, 2 Abstentions.**

S. McKillop – I question that as we will not meet again until 30<sup>th</sup> of October. Is it alright to wait until then or should we transmit it to the Executive committee?

P. Phillips – It will go to all the Senates around the state.

## **REPORTS**

### **President of the University - (R. Armiñana)**

R. Armiñana - It's been requested that I talk about enrollment and enrollment management policies. I'm glad to do that briefly. I'm happy to say as of census time we have an FTE count of 6582 against target 6450. Therefore we're 132 over our annualize target of 2%. This puts us in a good position. There will be around a 1 - 2% melt down between now and the end of the year. I am confident we will meet target. There are 7590 students taking an average unit load of 13 units. I was concerned at convocation that we would be 132 below target and due to the good work of many people, we are above. In terms of the system the report is, as of yesterday at a phone meeting with the Trustees, the system is 2.3 % above the 4% agreed target we had with the Legislature and the Governor. That means the 2.3 is viewed in terms of the annual number. So we have 7000 students here in the system above target. That represents \$45 million dollars that is not at this moment supported by state compensation. All campuses have made or exceeded target except Hayward and San Francisco State. Some campuses are exceeding by 5, 6, or 7%. These are mostly in the southern part of the state such as Fullerton and Long Beach. Clearly students are here, Tidal Wave II is here and we can expect that next year the numbers will be equally strong, if not stronger. As we all know higher ed is cyclical to the economy. If the economy continues on its present course the numbers will be larger. Allow me to move to enrollment policy. At the present time, as expected, SSU is under an agreement with the Chancellor's office for this year which basically gives us two things - the 2 months enrollment window, that had been extremely useful to us. Our EOP and our local students tend to come in later rather than early. That two month rather than one month has helped us. We accepted all transfers who met the basic CSU requirements. We accepted all EOP who meet requirements. We have a higher standard at the freshman level for students not from the local area as a way to control the number of students at the freshman level. That has worked very well and will continue.

P. Marker – Can we get an update on the remodel for Salazar hall? Are we on track and when is it going to be completed?

R. Armiñana – We are very much on track and hope to have it available next fall. It's a very important issue with our classroom needs and laboratory needs. More important is the

remodel of Darwin. It's a challenge to transfer the activity of Darwin somewhere else. That building is essential to that.

R. Luttmann – Isn't there a shortfall of finances?

R. Armiñana - Yes, we have a plan for that. We have out additional money on cooling equipment which is about a million more, but you recoup that in a fairly short period of time and will receive comfort, efficiency and a more healthy environment.

P. Phillips- The socio-economic status of the freshman class increased a great deal in terms of higher income students and declined for lower income. This changes the nature of the student body, it makes SSU more elite in the sense of wealth and there are many correlation's established that could verify that high status students have higher GPA and SAT scores. Other than controlling for admissions for freshman I don't understand the rationale for continuing high SAT and GPA levels for freshman. I've participated in this body and the State Senate and both have passed resolutions which asked to return to standard admission levels at this university.

R. Armiñana – We are again in full compliance with the Trustees and the Chancellor approved our management policy and I intend to continue.

M. Litle – The Student Affairs committee has grave concerns about it. It tends to decrease students from low income school districts. We object to the policy for various reasons. Key is the historical function of state colleges to provide access to low income students. Raising admissions in using these scores tends to exclude low income districts and includes middle class students going to schools with a poorer tax base. This is counter to the policy which the Provost has worked on to be highly diverse campus including rich and poor. There are a high number of cases that show that high GPA and SAT scores do not predict success in college. For a win-win solution we suggest EOP efforts and recruitments be targeted in school districts more aggressively.

R. Armiñana – We have increased recruitment in those areas that you describe, such as south central Los Angeles. Those are worthwhile efforts.

M. Litle - Do you think we can increase that effort? EOP was very successful this year.

R. Armiñana – It is a worthwhile effort and should continue.

V. Garlin – Could you be more specific about what enrollment objective this policy seeks. There's the problem of over applications. I would like to hear the purpose of the policy. I understand the consequences.

R. Armiñana – Let me clarify a couple of issues. We had more applications, it is not a problem of applications. It was a problem of turning the applications into yield. That problem is overcome. There are lots of variable for that. Housing is a very serious concern. Believe me no matter how wonderful we are academically, for most students the major decision is do they have a place to sleep. Our messages on housing last May were a little scary. Lots of other issues, bit of inexperience, knowing how the numbers were, lack of focus. A lot of that is turned around. I suspect we will be again in a position where numbers are going to be growing. Even this year where we thought we had a problem, we are doing quite well. The point is we need to control enrollment. I can't have an institution

teaching very large numbers of student when we don't receive compensation for them. I'm responding to your message. The area to control is at the freshman level. One tool given to campus is to increase a bit its acceptance standards. This is typical of San Luis Obispo. I think you will see this in campuses that you have not seen before. You have to use the tools that the system gives you. That's the tool to control enrollment and not bring in an overly large freshman class, one you cannot house or have courses for. In terms of socio-economic diversity, the new Cal Grant program has not been thoroughly utilized. It's the most generous state program in the nation and gives entitlement to every student that meets the criteria. A report that appeared in the Chronicle of Higher Education said for some reason that program is not fully utilized. The problem in many schools is that in lots of those schools the number they send to any institution of higher education is very low. The counselors are not good at advising. Clearly there is a mechanism for students of need, we need to make the program better known and better utilized. I have to use the tools at our disposal.

V. Garlin - I share your desire that we not teach students we do not receive funding for. I'm sure all of us want to have an appropriate size of the student body. There is concern that this campus be exposed to a wider variety of soci-economic levels. SLO also has the highest per capita income of the entire CSU student body. There is a strong correlation between scores on standard tests and income on the other. This is not a new revelation. How is the institution addressing the result of the policy which is the increase of the socio-economic status of the incoming freshman class, so as to not create imbalances.

R. Armiñana – We are increasing our recruitment in these areas. Again you have to use the tools available to you. The state of California does not allow you to discriminate between applications based on income levels. That's the only tool we have. We have programs like EOP and we accept all those students. They are admitted under general CSU standards. We cannot deny admissions based on higher or lower income levels.

R. Coleman-Senghor – Would you speak to YRO. There are 3 questions. Will we have it?

R. Armiñana - Probably yes, depending upon the funding available and that we will know about more in January per the Governor's proposed budget, if it includes funding. If no funding we will not have it.

R. Coleman-Senghor - Assuming we will have YRO – Can you comment on the expected FTE?

R. Armiñana – The first year about 151 FTE, basically the number of FTE that has been part of summer school.

R. Coleman-Senghor – Would you comment on the FTE we need to meet in total and the funding.

R. Armiñana – You will get 150 X \$6000 only for the semester, which is the same amount in terms of marginal cost as a fall or spring student.

R. Coleman-Senghor – A professor teaching will be annualized on 10 percent. If you get \$70,000 a year when you teach a course, you will get 10%?

R. Armiñana – That still has to be negotiated. Compensation is negotiated.

R. Coleman-Senghor – I ask you if we would have sufficient funds to run a summer school taught by full time faculty.

R. Armiñana - Yes.

S. McKillop – I want to make it clear. Is it that we accept all transfer who are CSU eligible, and all EOP that are CSU eligible, and all local that are CSU eligible? Then we are talking about grade difference.

R. Armiñana - You have quoted me totally properly. The higher standards apply at the freshman level.

**Provost/Vice President, Academic Affairs - (B. Goldstein)**

No report

**Vice President/Admin. and Finance - (L. Furukawa-Schlereth)**

No report.

**President of the Associated Students - (R. Heng)**

R. Heng – I turn the floor over to Travis Tabares.

T. Tabares – Bernie asked us to help with the university forums. I'll be doing some advertising at the event this weekend. We'll put it in the paper to announce it to students. We'll use more banners, we are working with Chuck Rhodes in the Resident Halls. We appreciate faculty supporting that we go.

**Chair-Elect of the Senate - (N. Byrne)**

No Report

**Statewide Senators - (S. McKillop, P. McGough)**

No report

**Chairs, Standing Committee - (Moulton, Warmoth, Poe, Litle)**

Committee Chairs passed.

**Items from the Floor – None**

**Good of the Order - None**

**Adjournment - 5:06**

*Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom*