



THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR

BAKERSFIELD

July 13, 2016

CHANNEL ISLANDS

To The California State University Community:

CHICO

Earlier this year I received the report of the *CSU Task Force on the Advancement of Ethnic Studies*. I thank California State University, Bakersfield President Horace Mitchell, who chaired the task force, along with 22 task force members comprised of students, faculty and administrators for their thoughtful and comprehensive effort. The report is available at: <http://www.calstate.edu/AcadAff/ethnicstudiesreport.pdf>.

DOMINGUEZ HILLS

EAST BAY

FRESNO

In the final charge I asked the task force to: 1) provide an overview of the origins and histories of ethnic studies programs in the CSU within a national context; 2) identify faculty and student enrollment trends in campus' ethnic studies offerings (particularly over the past 8-10 years); and 3) propose systemwide recommendations that are responsive to the mission of the CSU and to the needs of our students, California, and society in general. I was seeking an examination of our degrees, majors, minors and concentrations, along with an assessment of the resources, staffing, administrative infrastructures, and cost-effective approaches that promote program quality and inclusive excellence.

FULLERTON

HUMBOLDT

LONG BEACH

LOS ANGELES

MARITIME ACADEMY

MONTEREY BAY

While our original timeline to conclude this work in 2014 was overly ambitious, I now receive the report with gratitude and optimism. The issues it addresses are central to how the CSU fulfills a portion of its mission, in as much as we are committed to preparing students for a global, multi-cultural society. The report offers 10 broad recommendation categories that include 47 specific recommendations.

NORTHRIDGE

POMONA

SACRAMENTO

SAN BERNARDINO

Campus autonomy and shared governance with respect to the role of faculty in designing curriculum and academic programs cannot be usurped by this report, but can be informed by it. **Thus, I ask the campuses to engage in robust discussion of the report during the 2016-17 academic year.** I further ask that campuses implement, as appropriate, specific recommendations to strengthen the institution in the context of the mission, priorities and campus culture. I acknowledge that implementing recommendations must take into account student interest and the reality of working within the finite resources available.

SAN DIEGO

SAN FRANCISCO

SAN JOSÉ

SAN LUIS OBISPO

During the annual summer conference that I host with each president, I will require information in July 2017 on campus programmatic and staffing actions influenced by this report. That compendium will be made available to the larger CSU community during fall term 2017. I will also review progress on increasing the tenure density and diversity of our faculty during the summer conferences.

SAN MARCOS

SONOMA

STANISLAUS


In our work to eliminate achievement gaps, increase graduation rates, and more fully achieve inclusive excellence, we can learn from the research and scholarship of our faculty across many disciplines, including ethnic studies. As a learning organization we will benefit from research-enriched explorations that inform how we can make our curriculum more relevant, our pedagogy more responsive to cultural differences, and our community more welcoming and inclusive. In this regard, I will engage the Academic Senate in discussion of their interest in designing a future Academic Conference on inclusive excellence and preparing students to prosper in a global multi-cultural society. The biennial systemwide Academic Conferences are funded by the Chancellor's Office.

The report contains two specific recommendations for my consideration as Chancellor.

- The first recommendation (Recommendation 2.2) asks that my office commit to fund over time 50 positions in ethnic studies for the system, to be matched by campuses. It is inappropriate for the Chancellor to dictate academic hiring requirements to campuses. Rather, in keeping with the standard campus faculty hiring process, campuses shall determine their top priorities. These campus determinations shall give due consideration to the guidance contained in this report in the context of their academic and non-academic strategic priorities, including further diversifying the faculty *writ large*.
- The second set of recommendations (Recommendations 10.1-10.3) focus on maintaining the moratorium that has been in place for the past 2-1/2 years with respect to changes in ethnic studies programs and departments, particularly faculty reductions. I accept the task force recommendations to maintain the moratorium during AY 2016-17 for review, discussion and response to the report, and lift the moratorium effective July 2017. I also expect that any campus decisions regarding the status and administrative design of ethnic studies departments and programs will take the report's contents into consideration. But the ethnic studies report should not constrain the regular academic planning process of each campus, rather it should be one factor that informs the planning.

I again would like to express my deepest gratitude for the thoughtful, inclusive deliberations that resulted in this report. I look forward to the impact of its contents on the work of the California State University campuses.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Timothy P. White". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Timothy P. White
Chancellor

**Report of the
California State University Task Force
on the
Advancement of Ethnic Studies**

January 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

From the Chair	iii
Acknowledgements	vi
Executive Summary	1
I. Introduction	6
A. The Task Force Charge	6
B. Impetus and Initiative	7
C. The Chancellor's Response	7
D. The Work of the Task Force	8
II. Ethnic Studies: An Overview	10
A. Definition	10
B. History	11
C. The Relevance of Ethnic Studies	12
D. Structural Disadvantages Confronting Ethnic Studies	15
III. Survey Findings	19
A. Descriptions of Ethnic Studies Units	19
B. Types of Diversity/Ethnic Studies Requirements	26
C. Histories of Struggles to Initiate, Maintain or Grow	26
D. Faculty Appointments and Financial Support	26
E. Student Enrollments and Faculty Student Ratios	27
IV. Challenges	27
A. Insufficient Resources	28
B. Operational or Administrative	29
C. Campus Governance	29
V. Best Practices	30
A. Curriculum Innovation	30
B. Curriculum/Program Renovation	31
C. Recruitment/Retention/Graduation	32
D. Outreach/Alliance Building	32
E. Policies	32
VI. Conclusions	35
VII. Recommendations	37
References	43
Appendix A: Charge for the CSU Task Force on the Advancement of Ethnic Studies	44
Appendix B: California Legislative Black Caucus (LBC) Resolution ACR 291 (Weber)	45
Appendix C: Letter of Introduction and Invitation from CSU-Wide Ethnic Studies Council to Meet with Chancellor White	48
Appendix D: Academic Senate of California State University AS-3164/AA/FA (Rev) "In Support of Ethnic Studies in the California State University"	50
Appendix E: California Faculty Association Letter of Support (8/9/13)	54
Appendix F: Task Force Questionnaire	56
Appendix G: Data Summary of the Quantitative Survey Results	66
Appendix H: Defining Elements of an Ethnic Studies Course and Curriculum	92
Appendix I: Sample Rubric of Student Learning Outcomes for Ethnic Studies Courses	94

From the Chair



CSU Bakersfield

Office of the President

Mail Stop: 33 BDC
9001 Stockdale Highway
Bakersfield, California 93311-1022
(661) 654-2241
(661) 654-3188 FAX
www.csub.edu

January 30, 2016

Chancellor Timothy P. White
Office of the Chancellor
The California State University
401 Golden Shore
Long Beach, CA 90802-4210

RE: Report of the CSU Task Force on the Advancement of Ethnic Studies

Dear Tim:

I am pleased to present to you, on behalf of its members, the Report of the CSU Task Force on the Advancement of Ethnic Studies. After your appointment of the Task Force in January 2014, we held our initial meeting on January 31, 2014, followed by twenty-two in-person, conference-call and sub-committee meetings over the subsequent twenty-three months. The methodology used by the Task force to carry out your charge is presented in the Report. We stand ready to provide any additional information and/or clarification you might request.

Recent incidents of incivility on college and university campuses, such as the University of Missouri, highlight the important of institutional attentiveness and response to individual cases of incivility and to campus climate issues. In the case of the University of Missouri, a set of circumstances led to the resignation of the Columbia campus chancellor and the system president.

Ethnic studies has a critical role to play in realization of the CSU mission, with a particular focus on, "To prepare students for an international, multi-cultural society." We believe that educational requirements and campus cultures grounded in Ethnic Studies and other forms of diversity education and appreciation can make significant differences in our students' understanding of how multiple world views intersect in our local, national and global societies, and how to anticipate and address some possible consequences of the diversity of perspectives and lived experiences among members of our society.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to engage in this important first-time work which provides approaches at the campus and CSU system-wide levels to advance ethnic studies. We look forward to your consideration of our findings and recommendations and your resulting response. We offer our continued services in the successful implementation of these recommendations. It has been my privilege and honor to chair this Task Force of outstanding CSU faculty, students, staff, and administrators in responding to your charge.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Horace Mitchell".

Horace Mitchell, Ph.D.
President

Enclosure

c: CSU Task Force on the Advancement of Ethnic Studies

Task Force Members

Chair		
Horace Mitchell, Ph.D.	President	CSU Bakersfield
Members		
Melina Abdullah, Ph.D.	Chair, Department of Pan-African Studies	CSU Los Angeles
Scott Andrews, Ph.D.	Coordinator, American Indian Studies Program,	CSU Northridge
Teresa Carrillo, Ph.D.	Professor, Latina/Latino Studies	San Francisco State University
Linda España-Maram, Ph.D.	Professor, Asian American Studies	CSU Long Beach
Mildred Garcia, Ed.D.	President	CSU Fullerton
Devon Graves	Chair, California State Student Association (2014-15)	Cal Poly Pomona
Taylor Herren	President, Associated Students, Inc. (2014-15); Chair, CSSA (2015-16)	Chico State University
Elliot Hirshman, Ph.D.	President	San Diego State University
Ellen Junn, Ph.D.	Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs	CSU Dominguez Hills
Maulana Karenga, Ph.D.	Professor and Chair, Africana Studies	CSU Long Beach
Loretta Kensinger, Ph.D.	Academic Senate CSU Professor, Women's Studies	Fresno State
Christine Lovely, J.D.	Vice President, Human Resources	Sacramento State
Kenneth Monteiro, Ph.D.	Dean, College of Ethnic Studies	San Francisco State University
Boatamo Mosupyoe, Ph.D.	Chair, Department of Ethnic Studies and Professor of Pan African Studies	Sacramento State
Marcos Pizarro, Ph.D.	Chair, Mexican American Studies	San Jose State University
Anthony Ross, Ph.D.	Vice President for Student Affairs; Associate Professor, Applied and Advanced Studies	CSU Los Angeles
Craig Stone, MFA	Professor of American Indian Studies and Art	CSU Long Beach
Edward Sullivan, Ph.D.	Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Research & Resources	Office of the Chancellor
Leslie Wong, Ph.D.	President	San Francisco State University
Karen Yelverton-Zamarripa, MPA	Assistant Vice Chancellor, Advocacy & State	Office of the Chancellor
Executive Staff		
Sabrina Sanders, Ed.D.	Assistant Director Student Programs, Academic Affairs	Office of the Chancellor
Ron Vogel, Ph.D.	Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Vice Provost	Office of the Chancellor CSU Los Angeles
Evelyn Young Spath, Ed.D.	Executive Assistant to the President	CSU Bakersfield

Acknowledgements

The Task Force is grateful to the many faculty, department chairs, program directors, coordinators, deans, academic senate chairs, and presidents throughout the California State University system who contributed their time to disseminate and/or respond to the survey questionnaire and draft report within the limited time constraints of the academic calendar. We acknowledge and appreciate those who shared their data, stories, histories, and experiences. We were encouraged throughout this endeavor by the overwhelming support for the work of the Task Force. We in particular thank the Academic Senate CSU, California Faculty Association, California State Student Association, CSU-wide Ethnic Studies Council, and the California Legislative Black Caucus for their respective resolutions and letters of support for the work.

We thank Marsha Hirano-Nakanishi, Ed.D., Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Research, for her contribution as a member of the Task Force before her retirement, and Michelle Kiss, MPA, Director of Special Projects, Academic and Student Affairs, for her service as a member of the executive staff before her reassignment to serve the Board of Trustees. Our data analysis and visualization benefitted greatly from the contributions of Kris Krishnan, Ed.D., Assistant Vice President for Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment at CSU Bakersfield and Umadevi Senguttuvan, Ph.D., Data Analyst/Researcher at the Cesar Chavez Institute at San Francisco State University. We appreciate the graphic design skills of Kelsey Magnusen Klemme, Marketing Communications Coordinator in the Office of the Chancellor.

Foremost, we thank CSU Chancellor Timothy White for his composition of, and charge to, the Task Force, which brought together our distinguished members and capable staff in an excellent, collaborative effort of often impassioned dialogue, common ground, respectful disagreement, enlightened exchange, and extended deliberation as we completed this important and historical document.

Executive Summary

I. Background

The California State University Task Force on the Advancement of Ethnic Studies was established in the context of a series of interrelated historical and ongoing conversations and initiatives in the academy and community around critical concerns about the status, state, sustainability, development and future of ethnic studies in the CSU system and the country. These conversations and initiatives especially focused on policies and practices that aid in the development, sustainment, and advancement of ethnic studies, or that disadvantage and lead to the dissolution of ethnic studies. They also focused on ways to move forward in a collaborative and cooperative spirit in the interest of the students, the disciplines, the university and the communities they serve.

The immediate impetus for the formation of the Task Force was an initiative launched by the Department of Africana Studies at CSULB around these issues. That initiative expanded to include other ethnic studies units, students, faculty and staff, and their colleagues on the CSULB campus and other CSU campuses. It also involved community leaders, activists, organizations and institutions on the local and national level through e-mails, calls, petitions, meetings, rallies and social media. In addition, the Academic Senate of the California State University, the California Faculty Association and the CSU-wide Ethnic Studies Council issued statements of support for ethnic studies as essential to the university's realizing its mission of providing a quality education for the effective functioning of students in a multicultural society and world. Moreover, the CSU-wide Ethnic Studies Council requested a meeting and met with CSU Chancellor Timothy P. White to discuss these critical issues. Finally, the California Legislative Black Caucus (CLBC) and colleagues became involved in the conversations and initiatives and passed a resolution reaffirming the vital importance of ethnic studies in the educational mission of the state and the need to maintain those departments and programs as an essential part of higher education. The CLBC also met with Chancellor White in a cooperative spirit of common ground interest in advancing ethnic studies as a vital part of the university's educational mission. In order to create a climate of goodwill and to facilitate a more effective and productive conversation and work, Chancellor White instituted a moratorium (pause) on negative changes or actions to any ethnic studies unit or program.

II. The Chancellor's Charge

In January, 2014, Chancellor White formed a state-wide CSU Task Force on the Advancement of Ethnic Studies. Its task was to identify, review and make recommendations concerning critical issues, policies and practices which impact the status, perceived and real value, functioning, sustainment and advancement of ethnic studies in the context of their role in the mission of the university to provide a multicultural quality education which enables and enhances students' ability to function and relate effectively in a multicultural global society. Chancellor White charged the Task Force to focus on the portfolio of CSU programs under the broad rubric of "ethnic studies" which includes:

- African American Studies/Africana Studies/Pan African Studies
- Asian American Studies
- Chicano Studies/Latina-Latino Studies
- Native American Studies/American Indian Studies
- Multicultural Studies.

In fulfilling the objective of the advancement of ethnic studies, the Task Force was charged to do three (3) basic things:

- 1) provide an overview of the origins and histories of ethnic studies programs in the CSU within a national context;
- 2) identify the faculty and student trends in the campus' programs, particularly over the past 8-10 years; and
- 3) propose system-wide recommendations responsive to the mission of the CSU and the needs of our students, California, and society in general. This includes examining our degrees, majors, and minors/concentrations as well as the resources, staffing, administrative infrastructures, and cost effective approaches that promote change without sacrificing program quality or inclusive excellence.

The Task Force, chaired by President Horace Mitchell, California State University, Bakersfield, included a wide range of stakeholders—faculty, students, academic leaders, four campus presidents, a representative from the CSU Academic Senate, and members of the CSU-wide Ethnic Studies Council. As directed by the Chancellor's charge, the work of the Task Force focused on the portfolio of CSU academic programs under the broad rubric of ethnic studies including the four historically defined racialized core groups named in the charge. The Task Force held its first meeting on January 31, 2014 and worked within this foundational framework while being constantly attentive to intersectionalities, grounds of common interests and ongoing possibilities of collaborative initiatives designed and implemented in the advancement of ethnic studies.

To complete its charge, the Task Force conducted a critical review of the literature and relevant CSU and professional documents. Moreover, the Task Force constructed a survey instrument to elicit responses from ethnic studies faculty and units across the CSU system to document their histories and struggles. In addition, the Task Force sought to retrieve and critically review data regarding their faculty and budgetary support, student enrollment patterns, their perceived institutional challenges and best practices and strategies developed to sustain and advance ethnic studies.

Some of the key findings of the survey were:

- 1) There is wide-ranging and varied support for the sustainment and advancement of ethnic studies.
- 2) Student interest in ethnic studies has grown while resources have decreased.

- 3) Resources have decreased disproportionately for ethnic studies.
- 4) Ethnic studies faculty report they spend more time interacting with students, an assertion which is supported by a comprehensive national study.

III. Defining the Charge of Advancement

In engaging the concept and practice of the advancement of ethnic studies as the central goal, the Task Force understood and framed its work and recommendations around the dual meaning of advancement as both an expression of agency and of collaborative and merited support. For to advance is to engage in both actions of moving forward and being brought forward in development and growth, of rising and being raised in position, value and importance, and of progressing and being promoted as vital to the mission and meaning of a quality multicultural education. This translates, above all, as a collaborative capacity building which ensures and enhances ethnic studies' sustainability, vitality and ongoing development and thus its capacity to fulfill its central role in the CSU mission of providing students with an education essential to effective functioning in the multicultural society and world in which they live.

In completing its work, the Task Force constantly was aware of and sensitive to the fact that it had to develop a framework for presenting its findings and recommendations that encouraged the widest possible embrace and serious action toward their implementation. This called for articulating ideas, understandings and findings which the survey and its analysis yielded, while being sensitive in their presentation to building support for suggested courses of action and respecting the concerns colleagues in various positions might have as well as the differing institutional contexts in which they work. Again, the Task Force understands and engages this project as a collaborative effort involving the CSU and all its campuses and is committed to creating common ground as the project moves forward.

IV. Recommendations

The Task Force makes ten (10) recommendations which engage and address a wide range of issues critical to the advancement of ethnic studies. These recommendations are directed toward the CSU system as well as each university within the system allowing for specific and varied approaches to how these recommendations are interpreted and implemented. They assume a general system-wide and campus-level commitment to ethnic studies as an essential component of a quality multicultural education. Within this understanding, the fundamental assumptions, findings and recommendations of this report allow for various ways to engage and implement these recommendations according to the context of each campus while working within this proposed collaborative framework.

Also, within this collaborative understanding of the concept and practice of the advancement of ethnic studies and rightful sensitivity to collegial concerns, the recommendations of the Task Force are focused on five overarching objectives: (1) capacity building, (2) campus climate, (3) community engagement, (4) collaboration, and (5) further study. The majority of the concerns and objectives are around capacity building and include recommendations for recognition of collegial disciplinary deference, essential hiring, curriculum development, and best practices. However, the other concerns and objectives form with capacity building an integral whole and are essential to the concept and practice of the advancement of ethnic studies.

Recommendation 1: Ethnic Studies General Education (GE) Requirement—Make ethnic studies a GE requirement throughout the CSU system.

Recommendation 2: Essential Hiring—Increase and maintain regular and consistent hiring in ethnic studies in order to ensure its vital sustainment and strategic growth.

Recommendation 3: Curriculum Development—Support curricular development in ways that strengthen ethnic studies departments and programs, increase enrollment and open access to a wider range of students and curricular options.

Recommendation 4: Advising Support—Revise and strengthen advising practices on and off campus and on on-line systems to reflect the university's valuing ethnic studies as vital to its educational mission.

Recommendation 5: Campus Climate—Aid in fostering and creating a climate conducive to reaffirming ethnic studies' central role in diversity and equity initiatives as they relate to people of color.

Recommendation 6: Community Engagement—Strengthen and expand initiatives on community engagement and partnerships.

Recommendation 7: Best Practices—Build on and expand best practices of both ethnic studies and the various universities of the CSU, incentivizing the embrace and use of these practices through providing and supporting appropriate resources, policies and programmatic initiatives.

Recommendation 8: CSU-ESC Collaboration—Establish a formal relationship with the CSU-wide Ethnic Studies Council in the CSU's ongoing effort to advance ethnic studies and realize its mission of providing a quality multicultural education.

Recommendation 9: Further Study—Conduct system-wide and campus level 360° diversity/equity assessment examining the unique challenges and contributions of ethnic studies, its related academic and campus life initiatives and future promises.

Recommendation 10: Continued Moratorium —Maintain the moratorium on any negative changes to ethnic studies departments and programs during the period of the review, discussion and response to this report.

V. Conclusions

It is a firm conviction and the considered judgment of the Task Force that if these recommendations are acted on, with appreciation of the urgency and cogency of the concerns and needs identified, it will not only contribute significantly to the advancement of ethnic studies, but also greatly benefit students, their communities, society and the university in its mission of providing a quality education which we argue is by definition a multicultural education which has ethnic studies as an indispensable and central part of it. In addition, implementation of these recommendations would reaffirm the CSU system's identity and role as the central site of the origins, development, and advancement of ethnic studies. The Task Force assumes and affirms that the Chancellor's Office can facilitate and lead the efforts in the advancement of ethnic studies through *policy*, *resources* and *programmatic initiatives*. Also, it is important to state that the report recognizes that even as each campus embraces and draws from the recommendations and state-wide framework for the advancement of ethnic studies, it will also bring these recommendations in line with its own campus mission, priorities and culture. However, the CSU can and must play a leading and facilitating role in the advancement of ethnic studies as both a result of its historical legacy and its continuing responsibility to meet the complex and constantly changing realities and needs of our students, communities, society and world. Indeed, the Chancellor's leadership in this project of shared interests, collaborative work and mutual benefit is key to its embracement by the university community and its success.

I. Introduction

In January, 2014, California State University Chancellor Timothy P. White appointed a system-wide task force on ethnic studies, later titled the CSU Task Force on the Advancement of Ethnic Studies (Task Force), to identify, review and make recommendations concerning critical issues, policies and practices related to the status, value and advancement of ethnic studies in view of their significant historical and continuing role in the university's achievement of its mission of providing students with a multicultural quality education which enables them to function effectively in a diverse multicultural society and world. The Task Force, chaired by President Horace Mitchell, California State University, Bakersfield, was composed of faculty, students, academic leaders, campus presidents, and representatives from the CSU-wide Ethnic Studies Council.

A. The Task Force Charge

To fulfill the purpose of the advancement of ethnic studies, Chancellor White charged the Task Force to:

- 1) provide an overview of the origins and histories of ethnic studies programs in the CSU within a national context;
- 2) identify the faculty and student trends in the campus' programs, particularly over the past 8-10 years; and
- 3) propose system-wide recommendations responsive to the mission of the CSU and the needs of our students, California, and society in general. This includes examining our degrees, majors, and minors/concentrations as well as the resources, staffing, administrative infrastructures, and cost effective approaches that promote change without sacrificing program quality or inclusive excellence (Appendix A).

The focus of the Task Force's work, as directed by the Chancellor's charge, was on the portfolio of CSU programs under the broad rubric of ethnic studies including: African American/Africana Studies/Pan-African Studies/Black Studies; Asian American Studies; Chicana-Chicano/Latina-Latino Studies; Native American Studies/American Indian Studies/Indigenous Peoples Studies; and Ethnic Studies. It is important to note here that the essential focus of this study is ethnic studies in the context of the university's commitment to diversity. The Task Force recognizes and supports inclusive concepts of diversity, embraces and engages intersectional realities and wide ranges of situated scholarship, and affirms its commitment to creating and sustaining spaces to reaffirm the voices and value of various diverse groups in the shared effort to build a truly just and good society. And likewise in this regard, it is self-consciously aware of the need to recognize intersectionalities and interrelationships without conflating the various diversities and denying each their own uniqueness.

B. Impetus and Initiative

The impetus for the development of the CSU Task Force on the Advancement of Ethnic Studies was the initiative launched by the Department of Africana Studies at California State University, Long Beach, in response to a proposal to change its status and structure from a department to a program. The department and its students, faculty and staff initiated a series of conversations and actions on campus and in the community to bring attention to the issue, raise concerns about the state and future of ethnic studies on campus and throughout the statewide system and build support for the withdrawal of the proposal and the collaborative development of alternatives that would strengthen and advance ethnic studies rather than downgrade and dismantle them. Other ethnic studies units, students and colleagues on the CSULB campus and on other campuses in the area, as well as numerous community activist groups and institutions, joined in and expanded the discussion and actions. Also, support and participation in the initiative came from national and international sources through e-mails, calls, petitions, and social media postings.

These conversations and actions opened up a larger statewide discussion on campuses and in communities concerning the role of ethnic studies in contributing to the university realizing its mission and the value it brings to all California. Responding to the Africana Studies initiative and the concerns of constituents throughout the state, the California Legislative Black Caucus (CLBC) raised these concerns with the Chancellor and introduced Resolution ACR 271 (Weber) in the California Assembly Higher Education Committee to affirm the vital role and value of ethnic studies in providing a quality education for California students, especially in the CSU system (Appendix B). It also supported the continuation of Africana Studies departments and programs in California's institutions of higher education. The resolution was approved unanimously in committee and won approval also in the General Assembly.

In addition, the CSU-wide Ethnic Studies Council, representing ethnic studies departments and programs on 22 campuses, joined the initiative and reaffirmed the critical role and value of ethnic studies and sought a meeting with the Chancellor to discuss ways to address shared concerns of collaboration, as well as policies to sustain and advance ethnic studies (Appendix C).

C. The Chancellor's Response

The Chancellor responded to these concerns by requesting a moratorium on changes that would alter the status of the Department of Africana Studies while a system-wide review would be conducted to gain a better understanding of the status and development of ethnic studies in light of current conditions. In addition, he requested that the moratorium extend statewide to all other ethnic studies departments and created a task force on ethnic studies by bringing together the constituent groups of representatives from across the state in January 2014 to address these concerns, ascertain the status of these units, and explore ways to support and advance ethnic studies. On March 21, 2014, the Academic Senate of California State University passed AS-3164/AA/FA (Rev) "In Support of Ethnic Studies in the California State University" to affirm the importance of ethnic studies to the university's mission and to endorse the work of the CSU Task Force on the Advancement of Ethnic Studies (Appendix D). Also, the California Faculty Association pronounced support, reaffirming the essential value of ethnic studies to the CSU mission, and offering testimony in support of ACR 271 at the California Assembly Higher Education Committee (Appendix E).

Chancellor White initiated the discussion by reflecting on how we position ourselves with the body of knowledge to meet the needs of our students and the future. He posed the following questions: When students leave the CSU, 5-10 years from now, what experience with ethnic studies do we need to provide them? How does a student's experience in ethnic studies integrate with the experience of a math, engineering, science, technology, etc. major? Is ethnic studies integrated into general education? He went on to stress the need for the CSU Chancellor's Office to be clear around goals of accountability while supporting the needs of the campuses to have their own autonomy.

D. The Work of the Task Force

The work of the Task Force on the Advancement of Ethnic Studies began and was conducted with a self-conscious sensitivity to the relationships it may have to allied academic areas, hoping this report serves and informs their potential investigation, but does not attempt to speak for them in the following ways. First, the report is not about all areas or disciplines that study race or ethnicity as subject. It is the study of race and ethnicity anchored in the histories and philosophies, from the perspective of and in the service of the community-based needs, of people of color, i.e., ethnic studies. It will address the intersectionality of race and ethnicity with gender, sexuality, disability, and other areas from the perspective of ethnic studies; however, will not speak about or for allied disciplines such as women, gender, LGBTQ¹, disability or other social justice-based disciplines, or other disciplines that take the characteristics as subject of study. Following from this, the report respects the range of diversities and social justice-based approaches to them; however, the report is not a discourse on diversities as a whole. The Task Force does hope this report serves and informs other potential investigations, but, in the tradition of social justice-based studies, it does not attempt to speak for others.

One of the first steps the Task Force took was to develop a survey tool to qualitatively assess the background and history of ethnic studies in the CSU through a 27-item questionnaire sent to each identified campus ethnic studies department or program (Appendix F). We identified CSU ethnic studies departments and programs by combining information from the Chancellor's Office with a list of self-identified units that had participated in prior system-wide meetings of the faculty-led CSU-wide Ethnic Studies Council. We sent out 49 questionnaires and received back 47 completed surveys, which is an excellent 96% return rate, with at least one response from each of the 22 campuses of the CSU with ethnic studies departments or programs. The completed surveys with five narrative questions at the end provided an extensive amount of historical data collected on behalf of the programs/departments throughout the system. The survey was designed to gather qualitative assessments of the histories and experiences of the varied ethnic studies departments and programs in the CSU but stopped short of being a comprehensive, quantitative collection of data (See Appendix G for the quantitative data summary). As we consider potential implementation of the Task Force recommendations, the Task Force anticipates a need for further data collection and analysis to be completed locally by each campus. This report is based on a qualitative overview of ethnic studies system-wide and does not attempt to prescribe local solutions.

¹ Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer.

The Task Force drew heavily from the data, analyses and assessment provided in the 47 completed surveys, making the surveys one of the foundations for the report. Once the Task Force received the completed surveys, we began a group analysis, deliberation and writing process in face-to-face meetings and discussions, conference calls, email exchanges, and regular writing committee and Task Force meetings. We looked for thematic patterns and illustrative examples that helped us to understand and tell both the collective and particular stories of ethnic studies in the CSU.

Finally, in May 2015 we submitted a complete draft of the report and recommendations to all CSU presidents; the Chancellor's Office executive staff; ethnic studies department chairs and program directors; the CSU-wide Ethnic Studies Council; all CSU faculty; provosts and vice presidents for academic affairs; vice presidents for student affairs; the ASCSU; deans; Associated Students campus presidents; and the California State Student Association, with a request to provide suggestions for possible changes to the document. We received 111 responses from faculty members (including retired and emeriti faculty), department chairs, program directors, Academic Senate members, staff, students, alumni, and community members. The feedback was overwhelmingly positive and affirming of the report's findings and recommendations, and supportive of the proposal to take definitive action system-wide to advance ethnic studies in the CSU. Many of the responses were remarkably thoughtful and detailed, involving critical concerns of institutional context, program content, resources, and collaboration. Additional important questions raised concerned the report's parameters and scope; the relationship of ethnic studies to other diversity studies; campus curricular practices; and issues of intersectionality and proprietorship. In addition to prompting further discussion of the critical issues, the responses received helped the Task Force to anticipate some of the more practical aspects of implementation of the recommendations and reaffirmed our original position that those decisions are best made at the most local level possible in accordance with the authority structures and cultures of each campus as well as the CSU system.

A great deal of research, reflection and philosophy went into the preparation of the report that emphasizes the mission of the California State University:

- "To advance and extend knowledge, learning, and culture, especially throughout California.
- To provide opportunities for individuals to develop intellectually, personally, and professionally.
- To prepare significant numbers of educated, responsible people to contribute to California's schools, economy, culture, and future.
- To encourage and provide access to an excellent education to all who are prepared for and wish to participate in collegiate study.
- To offer undergraduate and graduate instruction leading to bachelor's and higher degrees in the liberal arts and sciences, the applied fields, and the professions, including the doctoral degree when authorized.

- To prepare students for an international, multi-cultural society.
- To provide public services that enrich the university and its communities” (California State University).

The *Report of the CSU Task Force on the Advancement of Ethnic Studies* provides the context of ethnic studies and its relationship to the academy, a history deeply rooted in the CSU to prepare students for the increasingly multiethnic, multicultural society and an analysis of the challenges that ethnic studies faces within the system. The closing comments call upon best practices, Task Force recommendations, and a call to build on the system’s commitment to advance ethnic studies for the students of the CSU.

II. Ethnic Studies: An Overview

A. Definition

Ethnic studies is the interdisciplinary and comparative study of race and ethnicity with special focus on four historically defined racialized core groups: Native Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans, and Latina/o Americans. It may appear in various institutional forms:

- 1) as a single discipline and department or program;
- 2) as a combined administrative unit with multiple departments or programs; and
- 3) as distinct disciplines and departments or programs conceived and referred to as a shared initiative.

Moreover, recognizing ethnic studies distinctions and differences in its four core groups and associated disciplines: Native American Studies, African American Studies, Asian American Studies and Latina/o Studies, it is defined by several interrelated similarities.

First, ethnic studies, as a single discipline or the four core group disciplines conceptually engage as a combined and interrelated field of study, is defined by its primary focus on race and ethnicity, as distinct from other disciplines that engage this as one among many subjects. Secondly, its scholarship and teaching are grounded and centered in the cultures, concrete-lived conditions, and living histories of peoples of color. Thus, thirdly, it has an explicit commitment to linking scholarship, teaching and learning to social engagement (service and struggle), social change, and social justice. In this process, it advocates and generates cooperative and collaborative initiatives between campus and community, i.e., between the university and the core group communities, and the larger society.

Ethnic studies’ methodologies place strong emphases on the critical study and support of the agency of peoples of color, and thus is concerned with how they conceive, construct and develop themselves, create and sustain culture and meaning and engage in self-affirmation and opposition in resistance to societal oppressions of varied forms. It, thus, is also concerned with a critical understanding of the impact of the continuing histories and current conditions of oppression and resistance to conquest, colonialism, physical and cultural genocide, enslavement, segregation, lynching, racism, and various racial and racialized forms of social and structural violence, domination, degradation and destructive practices.

Drawing from historically rooted and constantly developing intellectual traditions of each core group and engaging bodies of relevant knowledge across disciplines, ethnic studies is committed to methodological practice that is interdisciplinary, comparative, intersectional, international and transnational. It therefore explores the interrelatedness and intersection of race and ethnicity with class, gender and sexuality and other forms of difference, hierarchy and oppression. And it also engages transnational and global issues, appreciating the four core groups' identities and situations as diasporic communities, and as members of American society which has shaped and shapes so much of world history, and producing scholarship on the national and global import and impact of these interrelated realities.

Finally, ethnic studies is defined by its initial and continuing commitment to create intellectual and institutional space for the unstudied, understudied, marginalized and misrepresented peoples of color, spaces in which their lives and struggles are the subject of rigorous, original and generative scholarship, their voice and systems of knowledge are given due recognition and respect, and they are supported intellectually and practically in their struggles to push their lives forward and cooperate in building a truly just, equitable, democratic and multicultural society.

B. History

Ethnic studies inserts itself in the history of the academy and the country as a reflection and result of interrelated intellectual, institutional and community struggles. Rooted in both struggles in the communities and on campus, ethnic studies began as an academic and political demand growing out of the social struggles of the 1960s and 1970s and the student movements, especially those of peoples of color. The 1960s was a time of heightened resistance and demands for freedom, justice and equality in both society and the academy. Beginning in the communities of color against the racist structure and functioning of society, students, faculty, staff, and community activists took the struggle to the academy, defining it as a key institution in the larger system of coercive institutional practices. They defined the university as a microcosm of the race, class and power relations in society and thus, it was seen as unresponsive to the needs and aspirations of Native Americans, African Americans, Asians Americans, and Latinas/os. Here the students also linked knowledge and power, the issue of unequal access and opportunities, invisibility, marginalization and misrepresentation as standard university practice toward peoples of color and launched struggles to alter and end this state of things.

At the heart of early student demands were issues of: a relevant education which served the interests of their communities; rightful and adequate representation; the end of the Eurocentric character of the curriculum; recruitment and admission; respectful and equitable treatment of students of color; and the development and institutional establishment of disciplines which would teach and engage in varied ways the histories, cultures and current issues confronting the peoples of color. Here also student and community activists linked education to community service and struggle and called for the university's acknowledgement of the role of racism in the structure and functioning of the education process and an end to it. Moreover, there was a strong emphasis on the emancipatory relevance and role of education in both the struggles of resistance and the search for solutions to problems posed by the oppressive society.

It is within this context that at San Francisco State University, for example, other student organizations of color joined with the Black Student Union under the umbrella organization, the Third World Liberation Front, to struggle to establish Black studies and ethnic studies in the academy. Reflecting a common concern for students of color and ethnic studies, they crafted demands that served as a model and impetus to continue the struggle for Native American studies, Chicano/Latino studies, and Asian American studies. Similar initiatives were undertaken throughout California, but also spread nationally. The first ethnic studies units in the United States date back to 1968. From 1968, universities in California through student demands and struggles developed ethnic studies units in different forms. Some institutions like San Francisco State created a school, which later became a College of Ethnic Studies. Other institutions' separate and autonomous ethnic studies units became departments or programs, while others like Sacramento State University formed a department constituted by different ethnic studies programs. These varied distinct and combined ethnic studies departments and programs focused on and fostered interdisciplinary scholarship, discourse and projects of national and international scope and import. The development of ethnic studies in California represents an historical comparative advantage for the CSU system as a leader in the field. This historical advantage offers opportunity for CSU to secure its leadership in quality education by advancing ethnic studies in the shared interest of preparing students to function effectively and contribute significantly to a multiethnic multicultural society and world.

C. The Relevance of Ethnic Studies

As a central aspect of its stated mission, the California State University affirms that it is committed:

1. "To prepare students for an international, multi-cultural society."
2. "To prepare significant numbers of educated, responsible people to contribute to California's schools, economy, culture, and future."
3. "To provide public services that enrich the university and its communities" (California State University Mission Statement).

Within its statement of practices and policies to accomplish its overall mission are several stipulations that apply well to its commitment to this goal and by extension its commitment to ethnic studies as an indispensable part of this educational program. These particularly relevant stipulations include the CSU's affirmations that it:

1. "Seeks out individuals with collegiate promise who face cultural, geographical, physical, educational, financial, or personal barriers to assist them in advancing to the highest educational levels they can reach."
2. "Serves communities as educational, public service, cultural, and artistic centers in ways appropriate to individual campus locations and emphases."
3. "Encourages campuses to embrace the culture and heritage of their surrounding regions as sources of individuality and strength."

4. “Recognizes and values the distinctive history, culture, and mission of each campus.”
5. “Promotes an understanding and appreciation of the peoples, natural environment, cultures, economies, and diversity of the world.”
6. “Encourages free scholarly inquiry and protects the University as a forum for the discussion and critical examination of ideas, findings, and conclusions.”
7. “Offers degree programs in academic and applied areas that are responsive to the needs of the citizens of this state” (California State University Mission Statement).

The various CSU campuses embrace these policies and practices in their own ways, but reaffirm their commitment to prepare students to live and function effectively in a culturally diverse society by cultivating understanding of and respect for the diverse history, heritage and culture of American society as well as an essential global awareness.

Within this context, several critical questions arise. First, how does the university understand the critical role ethnic studies plays in accomplishing these central goals? In other words, how does the university conceive and correctly understand the essential and ongoing value of ethnic studies as a continuing and complex grounding, enrichment and expansion of the educational program and process? Also, how do ethnic studies departments and programs demonstrate their value to the university, our communities, society and the world? In a word, how does ethnic studies create an educational context and conversation in which diversity is engaged as both idea and reality?

Chancellor Timothy White has asserted that we must measure what we value rather than value what we are asked to measure. This emphasis leads to the conclusion that the value of ethnic studies can be measured by the role they play and the value they have in three major overarching areas: the ethical, intellectual, and social.

The value of ethnic studies lies first in their ethical and intellectual insistence on an educational philosophy, practice and process that:

- respects the human person in the concrete particular cultural life in which she and he are rooted and values their particular knowledge, experience and capacity to contribute to an enriched and enriching process of learning, teaching and relating;
- respects each people and culture as a unique and equally valid and valuable expression and way of being human in the world; and
- respects each culture’s capacity to serve as a critical source of reflective problematics, i.e., sites of ideas, values, insights, practices and problem-solving in human life central to the educational process.

Secondly, ethnic studies brings several initiatives which enrich, expand and deepen diversity in the educational program and process, offering essential contributions to:

- humanity's self-understanding through the critical engagement of current and enduring issues through varied perspectives and practices of the different peoples of which it is composed—moving away from a mono-cultural conception of humanity, world and human knowledge;
- society's understanding itself in more critical and expansive terms, not only from its best ideas and practices and central documents, but also from the best ideas and practices of those whose experiences differ and include underrepresented presence and perspectives;
- development of essential and ongoing proposals and policy initiatives toward the just, democratic and multicultural vision and promise it poses for itself in the ethnic studies stress on the social generation, use and usefulness of knowledge and transformative social engagement;
- reaffirmation of the value of critical thinking and contestation as essential modes of learning, as distinct from the authoritative allocation of knowledge which omits, excludes and fosters single and narrow notions of the good, the right, the beautiful, the truthful and the possible;
- the university's achieving its claim and goal to value diversity and teach the truth as expressed in its motto "vox, veritas, vita" (i.e., speak the truth as a way of life). For both diversity and truth are defined by an actual inclusiveness in both life and learning, presence and multiple ways of knowing which form the university's best conception of itself.

The social value of ethnic studies lies in its aiding the university in:

- truly preparing the students for the multicultural and global society and world in which we live;
- modelling and prefiguring the society and world in which we want and deserve to live;
- responding to the just historical and ongoing demands of ethnic students to recognize and respect their cultures and lives as proper terrains for intellectual study;
- providing a truly multicultural education which is essential to creating the just and good society and world committed to values and practices which are respectful of persons in all their diversity, democracy, civility, cooperativeness, equity, justice and interdependence.

There has been a growing base of evidence demonstrating the value of exposure to demographic and cultural diversity in the classroom on intellectual achievement and ability to interact positively in a multiethnic world. For example, in a broad-based review by Sleeter commissioned by the National Education Association, diversity by ethnicity among student bodies is associated with being more cross-culturally aware and accepting, especially for White students (16). More diverse classrooms promote more complex discussions, complex thinking and more interaction among participants. In later life, more diverse learning environments are associated

with more “democratic” values such as valuing interactions across diverse groups (Sleeter 16). Though research specifically on the impact of ethnic studies curricula is more recent, Sleeter reports there is growing evidence that taking ethnic studies in K-12 is related to better academic performance in both the ethnic studies courses and non-ethnic studies courses, extending to improving retention and graduation rates of students of color (8). There is preliminary evidence from studies at one CSU campus that college students who enroll in ethnic studies courses are more likely to persist in school and graduate (Deiter, 2015; Reyes, 2015). Ethnic studies is important for students of color, yet in some ways are found to have an even greater lifetime impact on White students (Sleeter 18).

D. Structural Disadvantages Confronting Ethnic Studies

During the conversations that occurred which led to the formation of the Task Force, the following issues were raised. There are several structural disadvantages which tend to problematize and impede the continuing vitality, development and advancement of ethnic studies. *Structural disadvantages are policies and practices that create unfavorable conditions and constraints and thus hinder ethnic studies in operation and impact.*

Among these are the additional expectations of ethnic studies faculty by students, peers, community, and the administration, as reported in the surveys which create an extensive demand for service that faculty in other departments do not have. Examples of this are the expectation of: serving on campus committees to diversify the composition of the committee; working with campus climate committee, student services, recruitment, outreach and cultural student groups with their respective populations; being the face and voice of the ethnic studies departments or programs to the corresponding community; functioning as role models and mentors to any and all enrolled students from the corresponding ethnic group. This service is made more onerous by the fact that it is in addition to service to the academic and the professional; and it is not given appropriate recognition, consideration or support.

While structural disadvantages for ethnic studies in the CSU vary depending upon the particular campus and specific departments and programs, there are trends that impact most ethnic studies programs and departments in the CSU. Additional expectations of ethnic studies faculty, lack of acquired wealth/resources and political networks, inability to teach general education courses that meet Title V American institutions and oral communication basic skills general education requirements, inability to have a general education requirement for an ethnic studies course and the lack of visibility of ethnic studies in public education in the state of California are several structural disadvantages that impact ethnic studies in the CSU.

On *some* campuses ethnic studies faculty often comprise the majority of faculty of color from the four traditionally disenfranchised ethnic groups in the United States. These ethnic studies faculty often have the additional expectation of serving on campus committees to diversify the composition of the committee creating a demand for service that faculty in traditional departments do not have.

Ethnic studies faculty in the CSU report they often perform functions that are expected of them as ethnic studies faculty; however, this often becomes a structural disadvantage when the expectation is greater than that of their peers, and not supported adequately, with required resources, and additional duties are not recognized or identified as part of the retention, promotion, and tenure process. Ethnic studies faculty often are expected to work with, and actually see and understand this as part of their role, campus climate committees, student services, recruitment,

outreach, and academic and cultural student groups within their respective ethnic populations. In addition to these expectations, chairs of ethnic studies programs, and in many cases the ethnic studies faculty, are expected to be the face of the ethnic studies program to the corresponding ethnic community at community/cultural events. This is in addition to service to academic and professional organizations that would count as service in a tenure process.

Additionally, ethnic studies faculty report they often are expected to function as role models and mentors to any and all enrolled students from the corresponding ethnic group. Often students from a particular ethnic group will seek out a professor from the same ethnic group and/or a professor of ethnic studies to mentor or advise them even if they never intend to take a course in ethnic studies.

The additional time to perform these unofficial duties generally is not identified as part of the scope of work for an ethnic studies professor, does not count for much during the tenure process and is not compensated. These reported additional contributions by CSU ethnic studies faculty are similar to the results found in a national study examining 13,499 faculty at 134 colleges and universities, which found “[f]irst, faculty of color employ a broader range of pedagogical techniques than their White counterparts and interact more frequently with students than their White counterparts. Second, greater structural diversity among faculty leads to an increased use of effective educational practices” (Umbach, 317).

Furthermore, ethnic studies departments and programs often are disadvantaged structurally in the CSU as they are newer departments and programs that do not have the endowments, structural advantages and campus political networks that the larger traditional departments have developed over time.

As the CSU has a shared governance process to define general education policies on each campus, we see a variety of ways that general education requirements disadvantage smaller departments and programs. Two structural disadvantages that are evident at particular campuses are how general education requirements for a course on ethnic diversity in the United States can either support ethnic studies departments or dissuade students from taking ethnic studies courses altogether.

The second structural disadvantage to ethnic studies in general education courses in the CSU is in the variation of which courses meet the Title V general education requirements on particular campuses. Campuses with stable ethnic studies departments and programs often offer courses that count toward these Title V requirements. However, campuses where ethnic studies have seen a decline of support in the CSU are often ethnic studies departments and programs that are not allowed to offer courses that meet these Title V requirements. In some instances, larger traditional academic departments hold a monopoly of particular categories of the Title V general education requirements and part-time faculty and graduate students generally teach these courses.

Another structural disadvantage to ethnic studies is the relative lack of visibility and familiarity of ethnic studies disciplines to the average student entering the CSU. As students in California are exposed to many of the traditional disciplines offered in the CSU in their K-12 educational experience (such as math, history, speech/communication, English or art), most students are unaware that they could earn a degree in ethnic studies. Student advisors, faculty and staff who are often products of the same educational system as our students where they were

never exposed to an ethnic studies course often share this unfamiliarity with the value of ethnic studies disciplines in the CSU.

This lack of visibility becomes a structural disadvantage when student-advising processes privilege the larger and more familiar departments over smaller ethnic studies departments and programs. Often students in ethnic studies degree programs “discover” ethnic studies when they take a course and become aware that you can actually minor or major in ethnic studies. This structural lack of visibility for ethnic studies can be found in student advising processes either in-person, on-line or with the new e-advising process that are currently being implemented at Long Beach and other CSU campuses. While this new e-advising process has the potential to be designed to help with visibility issues for ethnic studies, the recent implementation at CSULB privileged large traditional departments making ethnic studies invisible to students using the e-advising system. Students’ designing their programs that wish to include a minor in Native American studies will not be able to see it in the new e-advising system until all of the other departments are imputed into the system.

In addition, there are several other institutional structures, practices, policies and processes which tend to disadvantage ethnic studies departments and programs:

- tendencies to favor larger departments in funding and other support; in hiring; and in selection for appointment in various service, administrative, representative and, other college and university opportunities and projects;
- applying common policies of hiring, enrollment, etc., to ethnic studies departments and programs without due flexibility, although they can never compete with or achieve the same numerical targets larger departments and programs do in meeting a single set of criteria;
- the expansion of the concept of diversity to include various forms of difference which again favors larger, “traditional” departments; and greatly reduces ethnic studies’ former share of enrollment and access to students in this area without adequate attention given to this disadvantaging development;
- on most campuses, the exclusive monopoly History and Political Science have on Title V areas of instruction, although at CSU Northridge these areas are open to ethnic studies. This denies us access to a critical source of enrollment and expanded multicultural exchange with the student population;
- the exclusive monopoly Communications has on oral communication on many campuses denies ethnic studies the right to teach a course in an important field of ethnic studies disciplines which has an ample ancient and current body of literature in communications practice and theory; there is no intellectual reason not to include oral communication in ethnic studies; indeed, it is taught in Pan-African and Chicana/o Studies at CSU Northridge. This also denies access to a critical source of enrollment and expanded multicultural exchange with the student population;
- the tendency to use diversity as a reference of laudable self-assessment rather than providing the policy, program and budget to support capacity building, collaboration and cooperative projects which make it an essential element in the concept and practice of

quality education. Indeed, our position is that quality education by definition requires, and is, a multicultural education;

- premature cancellation of classes before students have a chance to register. Many of our students tend to register later due to several factors, i.e., finance and financial aid issues, schedule juggling because of working, uncertainty etc., and the tendency to try first required and *advisor recommended* courses and then enroll in ethnic studies courses;
- micromanagement of the number of courses ethnic studies can teach and restricting offerings to classes with prior high numbers, effectively undermining the ability to offer new courses to keep the curriculum current and vital, and to cultivate an expanded interest of students in ethnic studies courses, major and minor;
- using the hiring of Black and other ethnic-identified faculty outside ethnic studies departments as a preferable or adequate commitment to diversity which tends to lessen attention to and divert attention from the need to hire within ethnic studies departments to sustain and help maintain their integrity, currency and vitality. Such practices tend again to favor large and “traditional” departments at the expense of ethnic studies;
- favoring and supporting faculty collaborations which create unequal relationships with “traditional” departments and reduce or eliminate attention to capacity building for ethnic studies departments and programs as central to the educational project and university mission;
- promoting directly or indirectly initiatives to collapse ethnic studies into structures in ways that violate discipline and departmental or program integrity, create unnecessary contentions, and deny or diminish real distinctions in curricular content, methodology, intellectual sources, paradigms and practices, and modes and commitment of community engagement;
- preference given to the department of English in composition in matters of funding and developing assessment and collaboration models and allocation or sharing of course offerings, etc., concerning composition, although ethnic studies departments and programs played a shared founding role in the conception and development of composition on campus, serve a vital role in teaching students with various different home languages, and are engaged by the university in an expressed concern for diversity without the equal regard, support and inclusion this requires;
- an advising process and practices that tend not only to favor non-ethnic studies, but also actively disfavor ethnic studies in training of advisors, recommendations or suggestions by advisors on classes to take and not to take; the development of media; and materials which include course examples to take to meet requirements or take electives and which does not include adequate ethnic studies examples; failure to introduce and pose Africana studies and other ethnic studies courses as equally valid options for general education, electives, majors and minors on campus and for other colleges and universities as well as in pursuit of careers; and

- tendencies to approach diversity as a minimal maintenance principle on campus and a public relations project for community and society, rather than engaging it as a principle and practice vital, even indispensable, to a quality education with compelling ethical, intellectual, institutional and social dimensions—and thus worthy of the policy, budget and programmatic initiatives it requires.

In spite of these structural disadvantages, attention to the university’s best practices would offer needed alternatives and lay the basis for a thorough-going reconceptualization and more constructive approach to the university’s commitment to diversity and the advancement of ethnic studies. By best practices, we mean those practices that have been demonstrated to be successful in the CSU.

III. Survey Findings

In order to address its charge, the Task Force examined relevant literature in the field, professional documents, and CSU documents. In addition, the Task Force constructed a survey instrument to elicit responses from ethnic studies units across the system to document the histories of individual units, their struggles at their inception to the present, data regarding their faculty and budgetary support, student enrollment patterns, their perceived institutional challenges and the best practices and strategies that they have developed. This statewide initiative facilitated our research, enriched our exchange and gave firm grounding to our ultimate conclusions.

A. Descriptions of Ethnic Studies Units

Forty-seven academic units from twenty-two of the twenty-three CSU campuses responded to the Task Force survey. As Table 1 shows, twenty-nine of the responding academic units were departments; twelve were programs; and the remaining respondents were a college, concentration, division, and a minor. Table 2 lists the responding academic units by campus.

Table 1.

Status of Responding CSU Ethnic Studies Academic Units

	Unit Type	Number	Percentage
	Department	29	61.7%
	Program	12	25.5%
	College	1	2.1%
	Concentration	1	2.1%
	Division	1	2.1%
	Minor	1	2.1%
Total		45	95.7%
	Missing	2	4.3%
Grand Total		47	100.0%

Table 2.

Status of Responding CSU Ethnic Studies Academic Units by Campus

Campus	College	Conc.	Dept.	Div.	Minor	Missing	Program
Bakersfield							
Black Studies Minor					1		
Concentration in Chicano/a Studies		1					
Channel Islands							
Chicana/o Studies Program							1
Chico							
Multicultural and Gender Studies							1
Dominguez Hills							
Asian Pacific Studies							1
Chicana/o Studies Department			1				
Department of Africana Studies			1				
East Bay							
Department of Ethnic Studies			1				
Fresno							
Africana Studies							1
Asian American Studies							1
Department of Chicano and Latin American Studies			1				
Fullerton							
African American Studies Department			1				
Asian American Studies							1
Chicana and Chicano Studies Department			1				
Humboldt							
Critical Race, Gender and Sexuality Studies			1				
Long Beach							
American Indian Studies Program							1
Chicano & Latino Studies			1				
Department of Africana Studies			1				
Department of Asian and Asian American Studies			1				
Los Angeles							
Asian and Asian American Studies Program							1
Chicano Studies			1				
Department of Pan-African Studies			1				
Monterey Bay							
Humanities and Communication				1			
Northridge							
American Indian Studies Program							1
Asian American Studies			1				
Chicano Studies Department			1				
Pan African Studies Department			1				
Pomona							
Ethnic and Women's Studies Department			1				

Campus	College	Conc.	Dept.	Div.	Minor	Missing	Program
Sacramento							
Department of Ethnic Studies			1				
San Bernardino							
Ethnic Studies Minor Program							1
San Diego							
Africana Studies			1				
American Indian Studies			1				
Department of Chicana and Chicano Studies			1				
San Francisco							
Africana Studies			1				
American Indian Studies			1				
Asian American Studies Department			1				
College of Ethnic Studies	1						
Latina/Latino Studies			1				
San Jose							
Asian American Studies						1	
Department of African American Studies			1				
Department of Mexican American Studies						1*	
San Luis Obispo							
Ethnic Studies Department			1				
San Marcos**							
Ethnic Studies Department							1
Sonoma							
American Multi-Cultural Studies (AMCS), Chicano and Latino Studies (CALS), and American Multicultural Studies Department			1				
Department of Chicano & Latino Studies			1				
Stanislaus							
Ethnic Studies Program (Dept. of Anthropology/Geography/Ethnic Studies)							1
Grand Total 47	1	1	29	1	1	2	12

*Data from response submitted as of May 2015 when the data report was run. San Jose State Department of Mexican American Studies submitted a revised response that includes data missing in the original response (e.g., its status as a department).

**After the original data report was run, a January 2016 communication indicates the American Indian Studies program at San Marcos has become a department.

The forty-seven units consisted of ten African American/Black Studies, eight Asian American, twelve Chicano/Latino, four Native American and thirteen Multiethnic Studies departments, where multiethnic units were typically either units that combined a mix of the ethnically defined disciplines or they were comparative without specifically being defined by the ethnically defined disciplines (Table 3).

Table 3.

Ethnic Focus of California State University Ethnic Studies Units

Ethnic Focus	Number	Percentage
African American	10	21%
Asian American	8	17%
Chicana-o/Latina-o	12	26%
Native American	4	9%
Multicultural	13	28%
TOTAL	47	100%

The units reside in various schools/colleges across the system (Table 4). Thirty-eight of the forty-seven have always been in the unit/college in which they currently reside. Nine have changed units/colleges. Three initiated this change from within the unit and six were reorganized from outside their unit.

Table 4.

College/School Wherein Responding CSU Ethnic Studies Academic Units Reside

College/School	N	%
Arts and Letters	1	2%
Arts and Sciences	1	2%
College of Arts and Humanities	3	6%
College of Arts and Letters	2	4%
College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences	3	6%
College of Behavioral and Social Sciences	1	2%
College of Education and Integrative Studies	1	2%
College of Ethnic Studies	4	9%
College of Humanities	3	6%
College of Humanities and Social Sciences	3	6%
College of Humanities, Arts, Behavioral, Social	1	2%
College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences	1	2%
College of Liberal Arts	5	11%
College of Natural and Social Sciences	2	4%
College of Social and Behavioral Science	1	2%
College of Social Sciences	5	11%
College of Sociology and Interdisciplinary Social	1	2%
Ethnic Studies	1	2%
Natural and Social Sciences	1	2%
School of Arts & Humanities	3	6%
School of Social Sciences and Education	1	2%
Social & Behavioral Sciences	1	2%
Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies	1	2%
Multiple Schools	1	2%
TOTAL	47	100%

Interestingly, about two-thirds of all of these units were formed by 1970 with the remaining being formed at a rate of about one every two years or so (Table 5).

Table 5.

Year in which California State University Ethnic Studies Units were Established (Current Name as Listed in the Data)

Year	Unit and University
1968	<p>African American Studies Department Fullerton</p> <p>Africana Studies San Francisco</p> <p>American Indian Studies Program Long Beach</p> <p>Chicana and Chicano Studies Department Fullerton</p> <p>Department of African American Studies</p> <p>Department of Mexican American Studies San Jose</p>
1969	<p>American Indian Studies San Francisco</p> <p>Asian American Studies department San Francisco</p> <p>Chicano & Latino Studies Long Beach</p> <p>Chicano Studies Department Northridge</p> <p>College of Ethnic Studies San Francisco</p> <p>Department of Africana Studies Long Beach</p> <p>Department of Asian and Asian American Studies Long Beach</p> <p>Department of Chicana and Chicano Studies San Diego</p> <p>Department of Pan-African Studies Los Angeles</p> <p>Latina/Latino Studies San Francisco</p> <p>Pan African Studies Department Northridge</p>
1968/69	<p>Chicano Studies Los Angeles</p> <p>Africana Studies San Diego</p>
1969/70	<p>Department of Ethnic Studies Sacramento</p>

1970

Africana Studies

Fresno

Chicana/o Studies Department

Dominguez Hills

Critical Race, Gender and Sexuality Studies

Humboldt

Department of Chicano & Latino Studies

Sonoma

Department of Chicano and Latin American Studies

Fresno

Ethnic and Women's Studies Department

Pomona

Ethnic Studies Minor Program

San Bernardino

Multicultural and Gender studies

Chico

1971

American Multicultural Studies Department

Sonoma

1973

American Indian Studies

San Diego

Ethnic Studies Program

(Dept. of Anthropology/Geography/Ethnic Studies)

Stanislaus

1976

American Indian Studies Program

Northridge

1983

Department of Ethnic Studies

East Bay

1990

Asian American Studies

Northridge

1992

Ethnic Studies Department

San Luis Obispo

1994

The Department of Africana Studies

Dominguez Hills

1996

Asian American Studies

Fullerton

2001

Ethnic Studies Department

San Marcos

2005

Asian and Asian American Studies Program

Los Angeles

2008

Chicana/o Studies Program

Channel Islands

**Date
Unknown**

- Asian American Studies**
San Jose
- American Multi-Cultural Studies (AMCS)**
- Chicano and Latino Studies (CALS)**
- Native American Studies (NAS)**
Sonoma
- Asian American Studies**
Fresno
- Asian Pacific Studies**
Dominguez Hills
- Black Studies Minor**
- Chicano/a Studies Concentration**
Bakersfield
- Humanities and Communication**
Monterey Bay

Twenty-nine have achieved departmental status, 38% of which were departments by 1971 and 45% by 1973. Four did not provide start dates for their departmental status and only two have lost their departmental status, one in 1985 and one in 2012. Sixteen report that significant historical changes were made along the course of their development with six reporting recent or current changes.

There was similar variety across units regarding the number and range of course offerings. Thirty-nine of the units report offering bachelor of arts, seven master of arts, forty-five minors, seven certificates and four other degrees (Figure 1).




Figure 1. Ethnic studies degrees and other program types offered in the CSU.

The number of courses offered by each unit ranged from only two to 163 per year with a median of 28 in 2003-2004, and from four to 104 courses per year with a median of 36 in 2013-14. Sixty-six percent of these courses offerings on average (median) were general education (range eleven to one hundred percent) in 2003-2004, and fifty-five percent (range eleven to one hundred percent in 2013-2014). Eighty-one percent of the respondents reported they were unable to offer some courses and fifty-five percent reported discontinuing some of their courses. Twenty-eight percent, a little more than one quarter, reported they had proposed general education courses that were rejected.

B. Types of Diversity/Ethnic Studies Requirements

Ninety-one percent, all but four respondents, reported that their campus has some form of a multicultural or diversity requirement. Of the four who reported that there was no requirement, three of the respondents were on campuses where another respondent had reported that there was a requirement, indicating that one or the other was in error. This could be verified independently; still, apparently almost all campuses have some form of requirement. Five respondents reported that their campus had a specific ethnic studies requirement.

Twenty-seven (64%) of the respondents reported that the definition of diversity on campus had been expanding. Of the twenty-seven, twenty-three (85%) reported that this expansion of diversity had impacted their units. This portion of the survey does not provide any indication of whether that expansion of the definition has had a positive or negative effect on their unit, though data in some of the qualitative responses may shed light on the complexity of responses.

C. Histories of Struggles to Initiate, Maintain or Grow

Approximately two-thirds of the units report that the establishment of their units met some resistance when being established, with over 50% reporting moderate to extreme resistance, with the most frequent response being extreme resistance. A similar pattern is expressed regarding resistance to maintaining the unit or improving it, with the noted difference that more report resistance, but the typical response here is that the unit met moderate resistance.

D. Faculty Appointments and Financial Support

Examining faculty (FTEF) appointments data we find the median tenured/tenure track allotment across the CSU was four-and-a-half faculty (range of zero to twenty-four) in 2003-2004 and rose slightly to a median of four-and-a-half by 2013-2014 (range zero to twenty-four); Most reported no use of full-time lecturers in either 2003-2004 or 2013-1014 (median of zero, with a range of zero to three and zero to thirteen, respectively). The median number of part-time lecturers increased over the same period from two to four (range of zero to thirty-three, and zero to thirty-six, respectively).

Examining the budget allocations and faculty allocations across time is complex. Because many units did not report reliable budgetary data, we must primarily rely on faculty allotments as measured in full-time equivalent faculty (FTEF) units. This is a fairly strong measure of the unit's financial strength. Still, all campuses have received dramatic cuts over the past decade and therefore it is only expected that many ethnic studies units may have also experienced such, as simply their fair share of such cuts. The question for this report, then, is whether ethnic studies units fared better, worse or the same proportionately compared to the economic situation at their home institutions. For this assessment, we computed the proportion of the Academic Affairs

budget allocated to the ethnic studies unit across the years. This comparison controls for differential budget sizes and budget cuts across institutions, and also for cuts to their overall campus budget because it compares departmental budgets to the budget within which they reside, the Academic Affairs budget. We calculated the proportion of the Academic Affairs FTEF that the ethnic studies units received each year using 2008 as a baseline because that was when the major cuts hit most campuses. Setting that baseline to 1.0, increases above 1.0 indicate that the ethnic studies unit received a greater proportion of the academic affairs FTEF than it had in 2008, while a number less than 1.0 means that the unit received a smaller proportion of the academic affairs FTEF. From the profiles generated from these comparisons, we found that of the four years sampled for each of the 18 units that reported faculty data, ten (55%) of the ethnic studies units received a smaller proportion of their campuses FTEF during this period, while eight (44%), have grown, some only marginally while others more significantly.

E. Student Enrollments and Faculty Student Ratios

Student enrollments were variable across campus and can be reviewed in detail in Appendix G, the quantitative data summary. The critical question for this report was whether enrollments were rising or declining relative to faculty availability. This is best measured by the student faculty ratio (SFR). Eighteen campuses report an increase in SFR while four report a decrease and two were approximately stable. In a closer examination of the relationship between campus's faculty complement and student enrollment, student enrollment and faculty complement are generally positively correlated such that sixteen (16) units report a positive relationship between student enrollment and faculty positions, wherein the more faculty the greater the enrollments, while only two units report a negative relationship between faculty and enrollments with the remainder showing relationships that are too weak to be conclusive.

IV. Challenges

Ethnic studies faces a number of different challenges ranging from insufficient resources to lack of culturally competent faculty and staff, limited influence in governance, and inadequate support for meaningful collaborations with the communities that ethnic studies units serve. The top four challenges mentioned in the responses were:

1. insufficient resources to sustain ethnic studies units;
2. uncompensated and undercompensated work by ethnic studies directors and chairs;
3. inability of ethnic studies units to offer the number of courses needed to maintain the integrity of their programs; and
4. denial of authorization to replace faculty when they leave, retire or die.

This section will review the challenges described and detailed in the responses to the following survey questions:

15. "Do you experience other operational/administrative limitations/challenges? Explain."
16. "How have hiring practices by the university/college affected the vitality and development of your unit? Explain."

20. “Does your unit have other challenges in terms of budget support? Explain.”

21. “List what you consider to be the most significant challenges your unit has confronted in the last 10 years.”

It should be noted that the responses in this study come only from those faculty in ethnic studies units that have survived and do not include voices from those units that have been discontinued.

A. Insufficient Resources

Not surprisingly, funding was the most common challenge from the past ten years cited by the ethnic studies units. That complaint was found across all departments at all CSU campuses. Faculty reported that there is not enough money to provide the necessary classes, programming, recruiting, advising, and community relations. While this is a common concern of some other academic units, particularly other small and non-traditional units, ethnic studies programs face funding challenges that most other programs do not. This is especially true in terms of high levels of expectations for advising and mentoring from students, and collaboration and support from their respective communities. Several CSU campuses have centralized academic advising, which means fewer (or no) course reassignments for student advising in departments. While this may be an obstacle not peculiar to ethnic studies programs, students of color are very likely to seek ethnic studies faculty members for that advising and mentoring regardless of institutional support for those activities. And ethnic studies faculty members are possibly more likely to provide that advising and mentoring even when it is uncompensated, which creates workload and compensation inequities. The community stakeholders also expect faculty members (and students) to be involved in a host of activities and events, placing additional funding and workload pressures on the programs and their faculty members.

While some ethnic studies programs reported a shortage of institutional support from their schools, there was very little comparative reporting done; that is, specific examples of how other departments received more support. Some of the funding complaints voiced in the survey could be the product of program size rather than discipline; larger programs tend to have more power and resources than smaller programs, regardless of the discipline. This is true within ethnic studies, and at least one respondent in the survey felt that the two largest ethnic studies programs on that campus received more support than the others. This advantage is particularly true for large departments with monopolies on specific Title V general education requirements. One respondent was specific, though, and reported a case in which a large non-ethnic studies program was given preference over an ethnic studies program, despite the two programs making similar requests and demonstrating similar needs.

One question ethnic studies in the CSU should ask itself: Do its faculty members perform their “extra” duties because of their own personal and professional expectations, or are these institutional expectations? If the CSU depends upon its ethnic studies programs to provide an extra-academic benefit, such as recruiting and retaining students of color, then those programs should be funded for that purpose. As it stands now, ethnic studies programs tend to be supported as if they were like any other academic program; that is, they depend upon a model that recognizes only class-funding formulas and not funding for the other activities described above, and this is further problematized by funding formulas that reward larger departments over smaller ones. Ethnic studies programs *are* like other programs in the CSU, in that they provide a rigorous and

beneficial education in legitimate disciplines to all students; but they often have an additional mission that too often is not funded accordingly.

Among the responses concerning program budgets, only one unit mentioned particularly successful or innovative funding efforts and this was a Native American unit that had developed a solid relationship with local sovereign tribal nations by developing curriculum and programming relevant to California Indian peoples.

B. Operational or Administrative

Some of the concerns about the budget relate specifically to operational or administrative limitations. These challenges were the focus of question 15 where the top three responses included the lack of a sufficient budget to sustain the unit, the uncompensated work expected of and performed by ethnic studies directors and chairs, the inability of ethnic studies units to offer the number of courses needed to maintain the integrity of their programs. Other responses alluded to the lack of adequate numbers of culturally competent staff and faculty and the limited ability to influence campus governance to benefit ethnic studies units.

C. Campus Governance

Included in the “campus governance” complaint is the concern about general education alignment and management. Most ethnic studies programs greatly depend upon general education courses for their enrollments, and some programs cited changes during the past ten years in general education requirements that negatively impacted them. Several of the individual challenges can be traced to campus governance and the lack of funding for recruiting and retaining students and the presence of tenure-track faculty members to advise and mentor students.

Several ethnic studies programs reported the same problem: the lack of course reassignments for program directors. Without course reassignments, a director must fulfill the program’s bureaucratic requirements on top of teaching and in addition to advising and recruiting students and maintaining relations with the community. In some instances, the director is the only tenure-track faculty member in a program; there is no one with whom to share the responsibilities of program administration and development. The lack of support for program directors is part of a larger pattern at different campuses which can be seen as a negative feedback loop. In other words, a program which is small receives minimal administrative support (such as a lack of course reassignments for the director); that lack of support translates into no growth in enrollments or development of curriculum. Since recruitment and retention are not supported; new or replacement faculty lines go to large or growing programs, so the small program is in danger of losing the tenure-track faculty members with which it started. The loss of tenure-track faculty members translates into even less program stability, which results in even less support from the university administration.

Some ethnic studies programs voiced a funding concern that their funding did not improve equitably with other departments when the financial crisis subsided. The funding issue connects closely to the next most reported concern, campus governance. When cuts were made during the financial crisis, some ethnic studies programs felt they were unfairly targeted, and then when funding levels improved they were still subject to austerity measures. In addition, some programs cited general campus governance concerns, such as premature cancellation of classes even before the start of the enrollment period and not being consulted on important decisions related to

their management. Challenges in hiring were cited by many ethnic studies units with difficulty in having lines renewed when faculty members left, retired, or died.

V. Best Practices

Over the past 40 years, ethnic studies units in the CSU have been doing many things to sustain themselves as well as to grow, develop, and constantly advance. In a persistent march forward, a remarkably varied collection of programs, departments, and initiatives have developed what we are calling “best practices,” actions that have contributed to the advancement of ethnic studies. This section provides an analysis of the best practices reflected in the survey responses from almost 40 ethnic studies entities from across the CSU. The prompts are:

24: “In 500 words or fewer, please provide an example of innovative strategies undertaken by your unit, such as changes in curriculum, degrees, collaborations/partnerships, centers or programs that are helping to sustain or expand your unit.”

25: “In 500 words or fewer, please list institutional activities, support, actions or policies you think would have the most positive effect on advancing ethnic studies on your campus.”

27: “In 500 words or fewer, please add any other comments that you consider to be relevant regarding the advancement of ethnic studies.”

For question 24 which asked for examples of innovative strategies that help sustain or expand ethnic studies, we received 37 responses that varied widely and had great overlap. For purposes of a summary overview, we categorized the 37 responses into four (4) rough categories, including:

1. Curricular/Pedagogical Innovation/Collaborations
2. Curriculum/Program Renovation
3. Recruitment/Retention/Graduation
4. Outreach/Alliance Building

A. Curriculum Innovation

There was overwhelming agreement that one of the primary hallmarks of ethnic studies is to develop curriculum in response to the needs of the community. Sixteen (16) respondents directly articulated this as a strategy but many others spoke around this point by advocating for community-related strategies including community service learning, “relevant” curriculum, and engaged research and scholarship. The goal of developing cultural competencies in students to serve under-served communities emerged as a model. Although not all the units used this specific language, one of the different ways of articulating the strategies that work is an underlying common practice of linking curriculum to responsibility to community. Ethnic studies pedagogy is strategically based on the belief that our students should be able to offer their community support and leadership in order to promote economic development, education, health and wellness, and political empowerment. Student are expected to develop an area of expertise in the community they are studying in order to promote that community’s interests, as well as the language, culture, art, and knowledge systems that characterize the community. One of the most unifying aspects

of ethnic studies is the common practice of creating curriculum in response to the needs of under-represented communities.

In the responses we received, the link between community and curriculum is strengthened in many ways. One commonly repeated strategy (14 times) was to develop some form of community service learning (CSL). The most successful implementation of CSL involved course credit; close collaborations between community groups, students and faculty; and seemingly many hours of work on all sides. In one instance, a fully developed CSL program is supported by a faculty member fully dedicated to a three-unit online CSL course, which runs in conjunction with linked “content” courses taught by other faculty members. This arrangement allows for a more viable integration of CSL into a number of upper-division courses in a way that does not put the sole burden of administering the CSL program on the shoulders of the faculty members who volunteer to develop CSL options in their courses. The extra support of a paid faculty member teaching the separate CSL three-unit course makes the whole CSL endeavor more manageable for all involved and allows stability and continuity of the CSL program.

Community-focused curriculum drives some of the other effective strategies, including a common effort to teach from the epistemological foundations of the specific communities and to draw from the community’s scholarly and artistic work in the form of books, articles, critiques, analysis, music, art, and creative expressions used in the classroom, as reported. Respondents described new ways of learning involving music, spoken word, gardening, visual arts, and hands-on and collaborative activities. They talked about developing writing intensive courses, online classes, and courses taught in languages other than English. They promoted the use of new technologies and tools such as Peermark, TurnItIn, Wiki tools, ilearn, discussion boards, blogs, online and hybrid classes along with faculty training in technology. In both the materials and the activities of ethnic studies classes, there were many different ways that respondents made the point that a greater integration of the community at all levels is a winning strategy.

B. Curriculum/Program Renovation

The most frequently cited strategy in this category was to increase the ways in which ethnic studies courses fulfill requirements, mainly through general education, but also in majors, minors, and certificates. Units with the most stable and steady enrollment are often the units that offer the highest proportions of general education-certified courses. Getting general education status for ethnic studies courses is a common strategy, along with other general education-related strategies, including creating more lower-division courses so that students become aware of the program early in their academic career, creating a specific ethnic studies requirement in general education, and submitting ethnic studies courses for multiple general education overlays, including, for example, courses that can simultaneously fulfill the general education requirements for diversity, social justice, and global perspectives overlays in addition to their designation as either an arts and humanities or social science course (See Appendix H for sample elements of an ethnic studies course and curriculum and Appendix I for a sample rubric of student learning outcomes for ethnic studies courses). Some units described a strategy of creating new minors, concentrations, certificates, or career-focused pathways through existing majors. Four (4) programs mentioned developing a pathway for prospective teachers and two (2) mentioned a specific health-service pathway.

Other programmatic developments include moving some classes out into the community, offering master of arts programs and post-graduate professional development courses, and developing ethnic studies concentrations within existing master of arts programs. Under the

category of “renovation” there is a varied list of strategies that have worked, but many have, at their core, a movement toward a more central role for ethnic studies as the basis for a relevant education in a state as diverse as California.

C. Recruitment/Retention/Graduation

A third category of strategies focuses on the role of ethnic studies in recruiting, retaining and graduating students. Many of these strategies involve streamlining graduation requirements so that students can double count ethnic studies units with general education and/or other degree programs. Once those pathways are created, they should be coupled with intensive advising, mentoring and support to students. Some of the units found a great benefit to allocating space for student organizations, developing relations with office of student services, and promoting the use of technology to increase the reach and efficiency of channels of communication with students.

D. Outreach/Alliance Building

The final category focused on how ethnic studies has been successful in doing outreach and building alliances with the community. Many activities are behind the uniquely strong connection between ethnic studies and the community, including outreach through social media, programming, community events, scholarships, collaborations with other departments and programs, and networking with alumni outreach to alumni and other stakeholders.

We grouped responses for question 25, which requested survey respondents to list institutional activities, support, action or activities which they think would have the most positive effect on advancing ethnic studies on their campus, into three (3) categories: policies, institutional support, and campus climate. We analyzed essay answers and gleaned specific recommended actions from the text, which would advance ethnic studies in the CSU.

E. Policies

The policies that would advance ethnic studies, which were identified in their frequent occurrence from the responses, are:

- redefine/reexamine the rhetoric of “diversity” (in various forms, including “human diversity”) which currently is too broad and waters down the centrality of race and ethnicity as a major component in the discourse of diversity;
- embed ethnic studies and specific ethnic studies in the general education and Pathways program;
- open Title V to include ethnic studies courses as options; and
- stop practices like premature cancellations and low or late allocations for courses which discriminate against ethnic studies and other small programs.

Of the total 25 responses, the most urgent need (21 responses) was for institutional policies which called for a more concrete definition of race and ethnicity as critical components of “diversity” and as such embed ethnic studies and specific ethnic studies courses in the general education and Pathways programs, including opening up Title V to include ethnic studies courses as options. Implementation of these policies would advance ethnic studies in terms of healthy enrollments but

more importantly, in terms of educating CSU students about the diverse experiences and social realities of members of US society as well as the global community of the 21st century.

1. Institutional Support

Types of institutional support that would advance ethnic studies, which were identified in their frequent occurrence from the responses, are:

- 1.1 budget allocations, including tenure-track hires and staff;
- 1.2 training advisers in ethnic studies courses and more accurately counting and accounting for double majors in ethnic studies and then making the figures available on campus data systems;
- 1.3 support of on-campus ethnic studies student and faculty events and activities as well as community outreach (particularly in efforts of recruitment and then retention of students of color); and
- 1.4 compensate faculty (which could be release time) to develop/revitalize ethnic studies courses and programs, which include mentoring students and junior faculty. Mentorship is crucial to students and faculty of color and ethnic studies could be further advanced in terms of retention of students and faculty if this practice was institutionalized as part of the process.

Of the total 39 responses, the most urgent sole need (14 responses) was for staff and tenure-track hires with advising and supporting ethnic studies-sponsored events both on and off campus coming in with a combined 16 responses.

2. Campus Climate

Issues associated with campus climate which would advance ethnic studies, identified in their frequent occurrence from the responses, included:

- 2.1 recognition and respect of colleagues and their contributions to academe and the life of the university; recognition that ethnic studies is a vital field of inquiry and integral to the education of CSU students; and
- 2.2 cooperation and collegiality from other departments, including traditional disciplines, to collaborate with courses and develop programs with ethnic studies as double majors or minors.

These factors would mutually benefit all parties in terms of enrollments and enrich curricular offerings.

Question 27 was a final open-ended prompt which asked respondents for additional comments they considered to be relevant regarding the advancement of ethnic studies. Twenty-seven (27) units responded with broad-ranging statements and observations. In many ways, the

responses reiterate and further emphasize what CSU faculty who teach in ethnic studies have already stated as key factors necessary to advance ethnic studies: the need for resources, including a workable budget for staff and tenure-track positions and a campus climate encouraged by the Chancellor's Office and on-campus administrators which recognizes the importance of ethnic studies as a discipline and ethnic studies courses as central to students' education and to the CSU's mission. The most pressing issue to be addressed in terms of advancing ethnic studies, with a combined 15 responses, is the promotion of an awareness and recognition of ethnic studies led by the Chancellor's Office and on-campus administrators.

Responses to Question 27 also signaled exciting new directions for growth and development in ethnic studies. Some respondents described initiatives already underway while others imagined what might be possible with growth and expansion. Three collectively imagined examples of future possibilities for ethnic studies include:

- 1) Develop more curriculum and research regarding Language, Linguistic Diversity and Language Rights. All four of the historically racialized core groups bring a wealth of linguistic diversity to the academy. Ethnic Studies courses on language and language rights could take full advantage of our largely bilingual and multilingual student population from the four historically and other racialized groups, while converting what has been cast as a deficiency into the comparative advantage that bilingualism or multilingualism actually is.
- 2) Develop curriculum, methodologies, and research focused on equity. With the advent of "big data" and the seemingly unending possibilities to use technology to collect and graphically represent data, there is a need in ethnic studies to develop both quantitative and qualitative methods to take full advantage of the possibilities that these advances present. A methodological focus on equity could involve anything from developing concepts and thoughtfully-constructed measures to developing new ways of collecting data from a more diverse population and more representative sources. It could also involve developing technical skills such as mapping, creating indices and scorecards, or graphically representing equity of distributions and outcomes.
- 3) Develop teacher preparation programs in order to move California toward the possibility of a high school Ethnic Studies requirement along the lines of the recent models of the Los Angeles, Sacramento and San Francisco Unified School Districts (SFUSD), three of the largest districts to adopt an Ethnic Studies requirement. As a state, California is woefully unprepared for this new possibility and Ethnic Studies students are the natural constituency for newly-developed teacher prep programs with competence in Ethnic Studies. For example, a recent evaluation study of the ninth grade ethnic studies course developed by SFSU and SFUSD has demonstrated that this ethnic studies course was seen as intellectually valuable. Moreover, "...assignment to this course increased ninth-grade student attendance by 21 percentage points, GPA by 1.4 grade points, and credits earned by 23. These surprisingly large effects are consistent with the hypothesis that the course reduced dropout rates and suggest that culturally relevant teaching, when implemented in a supportive, high-fidelity context, can provide effective support to at-risk students" (Dee and Penner 2).

The three possibilities for growth detailed here offer a partial glimpse into an imagined future in which Ethnic Studies is a vital and growing component of the CSU system.

VI. Conclusions

The CSU, birthplace of modern ethnic studies, maintains some level of ethnic studies on all but one of its campuses. The presence of ethnic studies across the CSU ranges in strength and complexity from single programmatic initiatives housed in other units staffed by as little as less than one full FTEF of lecturer faculty time to multiple vibrant departments and even one college housing over 40 FTEF. Though virtually all report that their birth and development were met with significant institutional resistances and challenges, all but two reported weathering attempts to downgrade their unit status (e.g. downgrading from department to program). Though ethnic studies units diminished in size at more than half of the campuses, ethnic studies has continued to function on all but one of the campuses at some level and have been resilient in the face of challenges. On some campuses, resistance has even given way to additional support and growth.

Specifically, respondents to the survey reported an unusually high consensus that their units were regularly experiencing attack or challenges that affected their existence. The qualitative remarks indicated a disappointment in the level of institutional recognition, respect and collegiality one might expect for faculty and programs to flourish. For example, across the CSU, respondents report that information about ethnic studies in materials, online and through outreach or advising is generally inadequate. Some even report disparaging or devaluing remarks by campus leadership. Similarly, where leadership publicly communicated an understanding and appreciation of the value of ethnic studies, faculty experienced this as helpful. Again, though challenged, the faculty's importance of their mission to the students and often times the activist support of their students and communities sustained them when their campuses did not. In contrast, the most robust units were more likely to report institutional and public support from campus leadership, as well as support and partnerships with their students and respective communities, even if they also reported having experienced trying times as well.

Contrary to a common impression held prior to this study, the data in this study demonstrate that student interest and enrollment are not waning in ethnic studies but rather increasing. Specifically, the data in this study demonstrate that the student-faculty ratio in ethnic studies courses is rising, indicating a higher student enrollment per class offered. However, although interest is rising, enrollment may drop wherever the number of faculty is insufficient to accommodate increased interest. Therefore, it is important for the CSU and its campuses to address expanding student interest as part of advancing ethnic studies as a necessary component in the student's education as vital to the university's realization of its mission.²

A key reasonable conclusion gleaned from the responses related to faculty and student interest and enrollment in ethnic studies is that perceived decline in enrollments in ethnic studies, where they were reported, may be primarily a function of fewer faculty to offer ethnic studies courses rather than a lack of student interest. A reasonable explanation for this decrease in faculty might be that faculty numbers in general have decreased across most academic areas and most campuses in the CSU because of budget cuts over the same period. The decline in ethnic studies faculty did contribute to decreases in course offerings, but when ethnic studies faculty totals are measured as a proportion of the total faculty in their respective academic affairs units, we found that not only were ethnic studies faculty numbers decreasing generally along with their campus faculty totals, but their share of the overall campus faculty complement decreased, indicating that campuses have decreased ethnic studies faculty more dramatically than their general faculty pool.

² See Brown 1-4.

This has occurred despite the fact that ethnic studies units were already generally small and vulnerable. In fact, their small sizes may have made it difficult to notice that macro-level cuts were having disproportionate effects on the micro-unit level. There is some additional evidence that limited advising and advertising of ethnic studies options may also be limiting enrollment potential.

The academic vitality of ethnic studies units varied significantly. The most vigorous units were generally better resourced, particularly with a greater number of faculty members. The size and vitality were not necessarily predicted by the size of the campus or the campus's demographic diversity. For example, the larger more diverse campuses also varied greatly in the size and vibrancy of their ethnic studies units from housing a college with relatively larger departments or housing relatively large departments across several colleges, to large campuses that supported only small departments, programs or units embedded in other disciplinary departments.

There was a relationship between patterns of institutional best practices that appeared to support the vitality of the more robust units where strong total enrollments appeared to be most prevalent. The more robust ethnic studies units teach a range of general education offerings, Title V courses and other required courses. These are the same courses that drive enrollments in many other non-ethnic studies units, for example the mandatory critical thinking, communications, writing, history, and government classes also fuel enrollments in philosophy, communications, English, history and political science departments. Campuses have a long tradition of growing and sustaining other valued non-ethnic studies programs by relying on a balance of majors/minors and general education enrollments. In addition to the previously mentioned departments and more dramatically, for example, some CSU campuses provide mathematics and physics departments more faculty positions than these departments have majors, based primarily on their value as part of general education or their fundamental value across science education. Similar consideration could and should be provided to ethnic studies if the campus sees the full potential of ethnic studies to inform the education of a modern well-rounded graduate prepared to compete and succeed in a multi-ethnic America and world.

Though not assessed completely by these surveys, using responses across various qualitative data and additional analysis, the Task Force was able to clarify some reasons for the apparent paradox that some respondents found their campus's expanded interest in the range of human diversity as beneficial while some found it to be a challenge. It appears that most appreciate their campus's expanded understanding of human diversity across a range of characteristics beyond race or ethnicity and the intersectionality of these areas. They see the growth of related equity and social justice based studies such as women, gender, sexuality, disability and other associated studies as a sign of the success of enriching the academic canon. However, some reported two primary concerns. First, they were concerned when the institution did not distinguish studies of race and ethnicity generally, i.e. any discipline that studied race and ethnicity as object, and ethnic studies, where the studies must be anchored in the histories, philosophies, questions and compelling needs of those studied, and where those studied are active participants in the studies themselves. Second, some were concerned when their institutions treated one form of diversity as interchangeable with any other, treating disability studies, ethnic studies, LGBTQ studies, or women and gender studies as interchangeable, implicitly reducing them to a form of "other" studies, when each deserves significant study in its own right.

Ethnic studies units celebrated and encouraged the range of unique developments of ethnic studies units across the system experiencing the variation as strengthening the discipline. They continue to expand their curricula to include a range of cutting edge additions to the discipline from technical and popular culture. The discipline also is evolving from the studies of emergent

areas based on the studies of the intersectionality of ethnicity with other demographics, while still maintaining its own disciplinary identity and core values and respecting the contributions of associated disciplines which also may share academic studies of these intersectionalities from their own disciplinary and interdisciplinary lenses. Since this report intentionally focuses on ethnic studies, the Task Force hopes this report is helpful to all ethnic studies areas. In addition, it encourages programs studying ethnicity and race, as well as related areas, not included in this report to utilize and engage in similar examinations and conversations and hopes some of our findings will be useful in that conversation.

Finally, though all programs demonstrated areas where they could be stronger, we note that generally the CSU maintains a fundamental strength and strategic advantage in its national standing in ethnic studies despite challenging times and clear examples of some units in desperate need for immediate assistance. The CSU should take full advantage of this continued strength and invest in regaining its position as the unequivocal leader in ethnic studies and related studies.

VII. Recommendations

Having studied survey responses that identified concerns and needs as well as best practices of forty-seven (47) ethnic studies departments and programs across the CSU system, the Task Force makes the following recommendations. Each of these recommendations is a vital part of the whole and thus suggests a comprehensive approach in order to be most effective in efforts to advance ethnic studies. These recommendations are directed toward overcoming structural disadvantages and building on best practices within the CSU system as identified and studied, as well as laying a foundation for engaging issues and initiatives concerning the long-term ongoing advancement of ethnic studies.

In presenting its findings and recommendations, the Task Force has been duly attentive to:

1. identifying courses of action that would advance ethnic studies and the university mission while respecting the autonomy, opinions, interests and concerns of all involved;
2. articulating clear and compelling concerns and needs expressed in the survey and study in ways that assist in building and encouraging the widest possible endorsement from all concerned;
3. proposing recommendations that could be implemented in a relatively short time as well as those which would require more time and point towards more comprehensive and innovative actions in the ongoing advancement of ethnic studies; and
4. given the above considerations, framing the findings and recommendations in ways that increase and ensure they encourage and influence significantly the course of action determined to best serve the interests of the university, students, their communities, and society.

It is within this context and understanding that the Task Force makes the following recommendations:

Recommendation 1: Ethnic Studies General Education (GE) Requirement - Make ethnic studies a GE requirement throughout the CSU system.³

- 1.1 Reaffirm that a modern high-quality education demands intellectual familiarity with the content of, and critical analysis grounded in, ethnic studies.
- 1.2 Reaffirm that ethnic studies is defined by its primary focus on peoples of color, on race and ethnicity, as distinct from other disciplines that engage these focal areas as one of many subjects of study.
- 1.3 Reaffirm that ethnic studies is further defined by its initial and continuing commitment to creating intellectual and institutional space for generative scholarship on peoples of color, their attentiveness to their voice and systems of knowledge, and for exploring policies and initiatives to support and serve communities of color.
- 1.4 Reaffirm the disciplinary leadership role of ethnic studies faculty, in partnership with colleagues, in the certification of ethnic studies GE courses based on an ethnic studies student learning outcomes rubric.⁴

Recommendation 2: Essential Hiring - Increase and maintain regular and consistent hiring in ethnic studies in order to ensure its vital sustainment and strategic growth.

- 2.1 Hire faculty, staff and support personnel regularly and consistently in order to maintain essential stability, quality, vitality, and continuity and to meet ongoing developmental needs and the cutting-edge demands of the disciplines.
- 2.2 Allocate monies from the Chancellor's office for hiring 50 faculty members in ethnic studies across the system with a matching contribution from Presidents to incentivize and support regular and consistent hiring.
- 2.3 Continue to hire persons of color in other departments and programs, but not as a substitute or zero sum policy for hiring in ethnic studies departments and programs.

³ There are strategies mentioned in the best practices section that allow for an ethnic studies requirement within the existing GE patterns and 120 semester unit requirements.

⁴ The Task Force acknowledges that a range of colleagues have expertise in the study of race and ethnicity from many perspectives, we also acknowledge that there are colleagues with ethnic studies expertise in departments and programs other than ethnic studies. The Task Force also respects that curricula are built with consultation with colleagues across campuses. Though we find no policy to guide this practice, we encourage the long-standing tradition in the academy that colleagues would offer deference in these consultations regarding ethnic studies curricula in an analogous fashion to that afforded other areas. For example, all colleagues are invited to consult, however, colleagues with little expertise in the content area tend to give some professional deference to those with expertise, and those with expertise typically offer professional deference to faculty in the program(s) or department(s) that steward the curricular field under consideration. In the case where a campus has no faculty with relevant expertise, we recommend again the tradition of inviting in experts from other campuses to assist in shaping the new curriculum and advising on the successful hiring of experts.

Recommendation 3: Curriculum Development - Support curricular development in ways that strengthen ethnic studies departments and programs, increase enrollment and open access to a wider range of students and curricular options.

- 3.1 Expand access to Title V, American institutions and oral communications, throughout the CSU system as it is the case on several campuses now.⁵
- 3.2 Support the establishment of ethnic studies teaching institutes to meet needs of public school teachers who are beginning to teach ethnic studies mandated by an increasing number of boards of education.
- 3.3 Support the establishment of ethnic studies institutes for research, scholarship and creative activities.
- 3.4 Provide support for faculty in ethnic studies if their advising and mentoring workload is disproportionately heavy due to an inadequate number of ethnic studies faculty and faculty of color.
- 3.5 Support the disciplinary leadership role of ethnic studies faculty, in partnership with colleagues, in the writing of ethnic studies rubrics for student learning outcomes (SLO) in determining which courses meet those requirements.

Recommendation 4: Advising Support - Revise and strengthen advising practices on and off campus and on on-line systems to reflect the university's valuing ethnic studies as vital to its educational mission.

- 4.1 Recognize the importance of revising and strengthening of ethnic studies advising as important to recruitment, application and admission.
- 4.2 Recognize the importance of adequate ethnic studies advising to increasing rates of retention and graduation as well as ensuring timely graduation.
- 4.3 Revise and strengthen diversity training of advisors and develop teaching technologies, media and materials which include ethnic studies in visible and significant ways and pose them as valid options for GE's, electives, majors and minors on campus and for other colleges and universities as well as in pursuit of careers.

Recommendation 5: Campus Climate - Aid in fostering and creating a climate conducive to reaffirming ethnic studies' central role in diversity and equity initiatives as they relate to people of color.

- 5.1 Engage in a formal assessment of campus climate concerning this issue and appoint a senior level official to address its findings.
- 5.2 Use these findings to inform ongoing strategic planning.

⁵ Title V does not prohibit requirements from being met in ethnic studies courses designed to meet such requirements. This is evidenced by campuses that allow ethnic studies to meet Title V requirements. Therefore, the prohibition or non-allowance of ethnic studies department and programs to teach Title V courses is a campus-based practice independent of Title V requirements.

- 5.3 Institute interrelated initiatives to encourage collaboration and joint planning and programs to create and support the context for the appreciation and engagement of ethnicity and ethnic studies as an enriching and valued diversity in the educational process.

Recommendation 6: Community Engagement - Strengthen and expand initiatives on community engagement and partnerships.

- 6.1 Increase incentives and initiatives for community-based research.
- 6.2 Encourage and support policy development in the interest of communities served.
- 6.3 Strengthen relationships and partnerships with local communities and compensate labor-intensive activities of ethnic studies departments and programs in this regard.
- 6.4 Increase support for community learning and engagement.
- 6.5 Support the work of ethnic studies departments and programs with local school districts that are integrating ethnic studies into their curricula.

Recommendation 7: Best Practices - Build on and expand best practices of both ethnic studies and the various universities of CSU, incentivizing the embrace and use of these practices through providing and supporting appropriate resources, policies and programmatic initiatives.

Program Building

- 7.1 Practice hiring and evaluation of ethnic studies faculty by faculty in ethnic studies field within the concerned department or program and within the CSU based on values and skills criteria grounded in the field of ethnic studies, analogous to departmental hiring, tenure and promotion criteria as utilized by other fields on some campus, as allowed within the context of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA).
- 7.2 Provide adequate and equitable compensation/release time for chairs, directors and faculty to develop and revitalize ethnic studies programs and courses.
- 7.3 Expand and establish ethnic studies access to teaching Title V and oral communication courses in the CSU system as is practiced already on some CSU campuses.
- 7.4 Create a specific ethnic studies requirement in GE that is certified based on an ethnic studies rubric developed and certified by faculty in the disciplines of ethnic studies.
- 7.5 Create ethnic studies majors, minors, and certificate programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels and create ethnic studies post-graduate certificate programs for professionals.
- 7.6 Move away from the practice of premature course cancellation and low or late allocations for courses which disadvantage ethnic studies and other small programs.
- 7.7 Double count ethnic studies units with GE and/or other degree programs.

7.8 Promote the use of technology to increase the reach and efficiency of channels of communication.

7.9 Increase advising, support and mentoring to students in ethnic studies.

Community Engagement

7.10 Incentivize development of curriculum centered on the needs of the community, expertise in communities of color, community leadership, and the challenge to develop cultural competencies to serve under-served communities.

7.11 Support community service learning through appropriate work load allocations and in the RTP process.

7.12 Support community-engaged research.

7.13 Hire from presidents' offices community-specific liaisons where strategic objectives demand it.

7.14 Coordinate community events to strengthen ties with communities of color and increase staff support to facilitate and sustain this.

7.15 Recognize within this context the unique and special status Native American communities have with the state and federal governments and to ensure proper representation and effective participation of Native American groups in realizing the university's mission.

Recommendation 8: CSU-ESC Collaboration - Establish a formal relationship with the CSU-wide Ethnic Studies Council in CSU's ongoing effort to advance ethnic studies and realize its mission.

8.1 Establish a relationship which would serve as a clear indication of the value the CSU places on ethnic studies as an integral part of the conception and carrying out of its mission to prepare students for global and multicultural society and world and enrich the learning and lives of students, their communities, the university, society and the world.

8.2 Establish a relationship which would also serve as an important indication of the value the CSU places on ethnic studies scholars' central role in providing best advice on ethnic studies issues in which they are rooted and in which they do their primary work.

8.3 Establish a working relationship which produces and models the cooperative and collaborative practices key to building and sustaining the intellectual and relational context and initiatives for a truly multicultural quality education.

Recommendation 9: Further Study - Conduct system-wide and campus level 360° diversity/equity assessment examining the unique challenges and contributions of ethnic studies, its related academic and campus life initiatives and future promises.

- 9.1 Conduct further studies in order to address in greater detail the needs, challenges and aspirations of ethnic studies and its contributions to the CSU and the CSU's national leadership.
- 9.2 Conduct a more detailed study to augment and expand this report to continue to identify and articulate the unique contribution of ethnic studies, the contribution of other related academic programs and extra-curricular diversity programs and their optimal inter-relationships.
- 9.3 Conduct a more detailed ongoing systematic institutional data collection on both ethnic studies and other equity and social justice initiatives to insure that the CSU and its campuses regularly and accurately assess progress, and engage in informed and continued innovation and leadership in the advancement of ethnic studies and other equity initiatives.

Recommendation 10: Continued Moratorium - In order to encourage and create the climate for continued growth and advancement of ethnic studies in the CSU, maintain the moratorium on any adverse changes to ethnic studies departments and programs during the period of the review, discussion and response to this report.

- 10.1 Maintain the moratorium to foster the optimal climate conducive to free, frank and full discussion without apprehension concerning possible negative changes.
- 10.2 Maintain the moratorium to avoid rendering the report and its recommendation irrelevant by actions contrary to the spirit and intention of the report on the advancement of ethnic studies.
- 10.3 Maintain the moratorium so that the report and recommendations can be assessed and acted on based on their own merit without changes in ethnic studies departments and programs, which might prejudice or prevent decisions and proposals directed toward the advancement of ethnic studies, which is the central purpose of the report.

It is a firm conviction and the considered judgment of the Task Force that if these recommendations are acted upon in a manner consistent in the best interest of the local context appreciation of the urgency and cogency of the concerns and needs identified, it will not only contribute significantly to the advancement of ethnic studies, but also greatly benefit students, their communities, society and the university in its mission of providing a quality education which we argue is by definition a multicultural education which has ethnic studies as an indispensable and central part of it.

References

- Brown, Sarah. "Diversity Courses are in High Demand: Can they Make a Difference?" *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 7 Jan. 2016: 1-4. Web. 7 Jan. 2016.
- California State University. *The Mission of the California State University*. California State University, April 2009. Web.
- Dee, Thomas and Penner, Emily. *The Causal Effects of Cultural Relevance: Evidence from an Ethnic Studies Curriculum*. Stanford Center for Education Policy Analysis. Jan. 2016. Web. 12 Jan. 2016.
- Deiter, Darryl. Unpublished report. Personal communication. San Francisco State University. 2015.
- Reyes, Belinda. Unpublished report. Personal communication. San Francisco State University. 2015.
- Sleeter, Christine. *The Academic and Social Value of Ethnic Studies: A Research Review*. National Education Association. 2011. Web.
- Umbach, Paul. "The Contribution of Faculty of Color to Undergraduate Education." *Research in Higher Education* 47.3 (2006): 317-345. Print.

Appendix A: Charge for the CSU Task Force on the Advancement of Ethnic Studies

Charge for the CSU Task Force on the Advancement of Ethnic Studies

January 31, 2014

..... The work of the Ethnic Studies Task Force will focus on the portfolio of CSU programs under the broad rubric of ethnic studies:

- African American Studies/Africana Studies/Pan African Studies/Black Studies
- Asian American Studies
- Chicana/o Studies/Latina-Latino Studies
- Native American Studies/American Indian Studies/Indigenous Peoples Studies
- Ethnic Studies

To fulfill the purpose of the advancement of ethnic studies, the Task Force will:

1. Provide an overview of the origins and histories of ethnic studies programs in the CSU within a national context.
2. Identify the trends in the campus' programs within the context of institutional support and the national climate, particularly over the past 8-10 years.
3. Propose system-wide recommendations that are responsive to the mission of the CSU and to the needs of our students, California, and society in general. This includes examining our degrees, majors, and minors/concentrations as well as the resources, staffing, administrative infrastructures, and cost effective and equitable approaches that sustain and advance ethnic studies while enhancing program quality and inclusive excellence.

The work of the Task Force shall commence in January 2014, and consist of two phases. Phase one will begin by exploring the universe of issues at hand *writ large*, and refine its initial charge to a narrower, actionable focus that will lead to recommendations. This refined charge will be reviewed by campus presidents, the statewide academic senate, leadership in the Chancellor's Office, and the California State Student Association (CSSA) to ensure that it has broad acceptance. Once the charge is finalized, the Task Force membership will determine if its composition is suitable for the vetted charge, and if necessary, make a request to the Chancellor for adding an additional member or two to the Task Force.

During the second phase, the Task Force will carry out the final charge with an eye to having a draft report completed by the end of May. The draft report will be posted for broad input by any interested individuals in the CSU or from the communities we serve. The input will be reviewed by the Task Force for consideration and the final report will be submitted in the fall term, 2014.

**Appendix B: California Legislative Black Caucus (LBC) Resolution ACR 291
(Weber)**

AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY AUGUST 19, 2013

AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY AUGUST 05, 2013

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE— 2013–2014 REGULAR SESSION

ASSEMBLY CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

No. 71

Introduced by Assembly Member Weber

(Coauthors: Assembly Members Bradford, Brown, Hall, Holden, Jones-Sawyer, and Mitchell Mitchell, Achadian, Alejo, Ammiano, Atkins, Bigelow, Bloom, Bocanegra, Bonilla, Bonta, Buchanan, Ian Calderon, Campos, Chau, Chávez, Chesbro, Conway, Cooley, Dakle, Daly, Dickinson, Eggman, Fong, Fox, Frazier, Beth Gaines, Garcia, Gatto, Gomez, Gonzalez, Gordon, Gorell, Gray, Grove, Hagman, Harkey, Roger Hernández, Jones, Levine, Linder, Logue, Lowenthal, Maienschein, Medina, Melendez, Morrell, Mullin, Muratsuchi, Nazarian, Nestande, Olsen, Pan, Patterson, Perea, John A. Pérez, Quirk, Quirk-Silva, Rendon, Salas, Skinner, Stone, Ting, Waldron, Wiecekowsky, Wilk, Williams, and Yamada)
(Coauthor: Senator Wright)

July 03, 2013

http://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201320140ACR71&search_keywords=

Relative to Africana studies.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

ACR 71, as amended, Weber. Africana studies programs.

This measure would formally endorse the invaluable work of California's Africana studies programs, and their faculty, staff, and students. The measure would recognize the leadership provided by the beneficiaries of those programs, and would support the continuation of Africana studies programs in California's institutions of higher education.

DIGEST KEY

Fiscal Committee: NO

BILL TEXT

WHEREAS, The academic discipline of Africana studies encompasses research, scholarship, and programs that analyze and reflect the experiences and contributions of African natives and African Americans; and

WHEREAS, Formal Africana studies programs and departments at California's universities resulted from student-led movements dating back to the 1960s. These movements included demonstrations and student protests, where students, faculty, and community members demanded university courses relevant to them and their communities; and

WHEREAS, Since the 1960s, Africana and Black studies have been the academic and intellectual extension of the Civil Rights Movement; and

WHEREAS, The formalization of Africana studies increased awareness of the need for faculty, students, and staff from diverse communities in California's universities; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Nathan Hare, known as the father of Black studies programs in the United States, was the department chair of the nation's first African American studies academic program in 1968 at San Francisco State University.

Following a similar pursuit, faculty members including, but not limited to, Carrol Wayman, Vernon Oaks, Norman

Chambers, Shirley W. Thomas, Shirley N. Weber, and Harold K. Brown developed the first Black studies program at San Diego State University in 1972; and

WHEREAS, In addition to offering the first African American studies program in the United States, the California State University has nine programs statewide as well as seven ethnic and gender studies programs leading to undergraduate and graduate degrees; and

WHEREAS, Over 400 students chose to major in African American studies for fall of 2012 and another 200 in gender or ethnic studies; and

WHEREAS, The University of California campuses at Berkeley, Davis, Riverside, Irvine, Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara offer undergraduate degrees in one of African American studies, Black studies, or Afro-American studies; and

WHEREAS, Africana studies is comprised of several disciplines, including art history, humanities, political science, behavioral science, and history; and

WHEREAS, Africana studies, known in some departments as Black, Pan-African, or Afro-American studies, encompass the origin, history, culture, experiences, heritage, achievements, and contributions of African natives and African Americans; and

WHEREAS, Africana studies, a respected academic field, has fostered the development of professional organizations, institutionalized departments, research journals, award-winning publications, and other related programs across the United States; and

WHEREAS, Departments, programs, and related projects in the field of Africana and Black studies promote constructive communication and collaborative efforts among diverse groups, and encourage respect, understanding, appreciation, equality, and dignity among all groups; and

WHEREAS, The study of the roles, contributions, and achievements of African natives and African Americans provides a rich and in-depth perspective for understanding California and United States history; and

WHEREAS, Africana and related studies incorporate the influence of African natives and African Americans on the California education system and on America's diverse racial and ethnic groups; and

WHEREAS, Africana studies and related academic disciplines promote a view of ethnic groups as significant contributors to the history and diversity of California and the United States history; and

WHEREAS, Africana studies has been the model and inspiration for other ethnic, gender, and social education programs throughout the United States; and

WHEREAS, The continuation and expansion of Africana studies within our state's educational system would encourage students to analyze and synthesize information with a global perspective; and

WHEREAS, Support for postsecondary Africana studies departments, programs, and related projects, including financial support, will allow for the continued guidance and teaching of a new generation of students who will enrich and contribute to California policy, education, and government; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, the Senate thereof concurring, That the Legislature of the State of California formally endorses the invaluable work of California's Africana studies departments, programs, and related projects, and their faculty, staff, and students; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of California also recognizes that the leadership provided by the beneficiaries of these programs has contributed greatly to the academic rigor, prominence, and distinguishing qualities of California's colleges and universities and the vitality of other public and private institutions, including the California state government; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of California supports the continuation of Africana studies departments, programs, and related projects in California's institutions of higher education; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the Regents of the University of California, the Trustees of the California State University, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, and the author for appropriate distribution.

Appendix C: Letter of Introduction and Invitation from CSU-Wide Ethnic Studies Council to Meet with Chancellor White

May 21, 2013

To: Dr. Timothy P. White, Chancellor California State University (CSU)

From: CSU-wide Ethnic Studies Council

Subject: Report from the CSU Forum on the Status of Ethnic Studies and a request to meet

As we end another impressive year for the California State University System and its campuses, we write to 1) introduce ourselves, 2) report the outcome of an historic gathering, 3) *ask for a system-wide moratorium on changes to current Ethnic Studies programs*, and 4) *request a meeting with you* in order to offer our leadership in the CSU's endeavors regarding strengthening Ethnic Studies and also strengthening the CSU's position as a leader in fully accessible, relevant, and socially just public education.

California is one of the most ethnically diverse states where Whites who are not also Hispanic constitute less than half of the population, Asian Americans represent about 13% of the population, African Americans about 6% and Latinos almost 40%. Future projections indicate that the Asian American and Latino populations will continue to increase. These ethnic demographic shifts are occurring at a time when California appears to be limiting its overall ability to educate its diverse population and to provide it with relevant education.

These statewide political and fiscal trends fly in the face of both demographic reality and the mission of the CSU <http://www.calstate.edu/PA/info/mission.shtml>. That mission promises accessible, high quality education to "all who are prepared for and wish to participate in collegiate study"...and "to prepare students for an international, multi-cultural society." Likewise, these trends challenge the corresponding values of Ethnic Studies and the movements that created it, which pledge to work for equal access to higher education and the creation of a relevant education that serves the real needs of California's student population and their home communities. Thus, faculty leaders in Ethnic Studies from across the CSU have united to collectively and enthusiastically recommit to CSU's leadership in advancing relevant, high quality and accessible public education for all Californians who desire it.

To this end, representatives of the California State University Systems Ethnic Studies Programs met to discuss the state of Ethnic Studies, related higher education priorities and the leadership role that Ethnic Studies faculty can play in the re-ascension of relevant quality public higher education. Over 100 individuals expressed interest in the meeting and its outcome, 100 individuals registered, and 72 were ultimately able to attend the full day meeting. Those in attendance represented 16 campuses and a range of ethnic studies programs: e.g., Africana/Pan African; American Indian/Native American; Arab, Muslim Ethnicities and Diasporas; Asian American; Central American; Chicana/o and Latino; Race and Resistance; and, Ethnic Studies, generally.

The group examined various topics and issues relevant to programs at specific campuses, to related academic specialties across the CSU, and to issues common across Ethnic Studies programs. These conversations were deeply informed by their concerns about how the student populations and the communities we serve may be impacted by projected changes in higher education.

All were concerned with how budget and policy choices could harm or even potentially end Ethnic Studies at various campuses. Still, the primary discussion was forward looking, presuming a commitment to the continuation of Ethnic Studies and its role in the future of the CSU and public higher education in

California. The full range of notes is available. Today we wish to share seven key areas that were determined to be central for all of Ethnic Studies throughout the California State University System.

1. Establish a CSU-wide Ethnic Studies Council
2. Support a major Higher Education Access Initiative that would promote successful college preparation, recruitment, admission and graduation between K-12, community colleges and the CSU.
3. Create and define assessment tools and metrics for higher education to include values of Ethnic Studies and community assessments of all academic areas.
4. Reaffirm and re-evaluate the principles, paradigms, and categories of Ethnic Studies in order to promote self-reflexivity and growth in the field.
5. Establish/recognize unique epistemological perspectives of Ethnic Studies to advance multiple approaches to Ethnic Studies.
6. Recognize Ethnic Studies at the forefront of the CSU mission making it more central to the success of the institution.
7. Re-affirm and re-evaluate the intellectual activist tradition of Ethnic Studies to insure its relevance and usefulness to our communities.

The group will reconvene this fall semester to continue actions in these areas. We experience an urgency as campuses of the CSU and presumably the system itself may be making important decisions about the future of public higher education generally and Ethnic Studies specifically that could benefit from our input. *In order to best assist in future planning we are asking you, and, by way of copy of this communication, all campus presidents, to respect a temporary moratorium on any pending or future changes that might diminish their Ethnic Studies programs until we can have this historic and promising conversation.*

The CSU-wide Ethnic Studies Council works as a community of scholars by consensus. For efficiency of communication we have asked Dean Kenneth Monteiro to coordinate our conversations among members of the group and with others. Thus, his office will contact you to discuss your availability to meet early next Fall. We thank you in advance for your consideration, and look forward to working together to strengthen the CSU and our collective roles in public higher education.

- cc. CSU Campus Presidents and Provosts*
Deans of Colleges of Humanities, Social Sciences, or Ethnic Studies*
Members of the CSU-wide Ethnic Studies Council*
*copies are being delivered through email lists and, hence, individual addresses do not show in this communication.

**Appendix D: Academic Senate of California State University AS-3164/AA/FA (Rev)
“In Support of Ethnic Studies in the California State University”**

**ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

AS-3164-14/AA/FA (Rev)
January 23-24, 2014

IN SUPPORT OF ETHNIC STUDIES IN THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

- RESOLVED:** The Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) commend Chancellor White for convening a task force to study Ethnic Studies in the California State University (CSU), and for instituting a moratorium on changes to Ethnic Studies programs; and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU endorse the efforts of the CSU Task Force on the Advancement of Ethnic Studies; and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU urge CSU campuses and the Office of the Chancellor to vigorously support the growth and development of Ethnic Studies by providing adequate funding and support; and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU urge that changes in status made to Ethnic Studies departments or programs only occur in consultation with campus Ethnic Studies faculty and through established campus curricular review processes; and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That ASCSU encourage campuses to evaluate Ethnic Studies programs, as we evaluate all academic programs, by recognizing their academic merit and educational and societal value rather than purely financial considerations; and be it further
- RESOLVED:** The ASCSU commend the California State Legislature for adopting Assembly Concurrent Resolution 71 – Relative to Africana Studies (2013) which expressed support for the continuation of Africana studies departments, programs, and related projects in California’s institutions of higher education, and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the CSU Board of Trustees, CSU Chancellor, Timothy P. White, CSU campus Presidents, CSU campus Senate Chairs, CSU Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs, California Faculty Association, CSU Ethnic Studies Council, California State Student Association and Members of the California State Assembly and Senate.

RATIONALE: This resolution expresses support for the scholarly discipline of Ethnic Studies in the CSU. Ethnic Studies is important to the mission of the CSU to “prepare students for an international, multicultural society” and “promote an understanding and appreciation of the peoples, natural environment, cultures, economies, and diversity of the world”. Ethnic Studies offers students the opportunity to study the historical development and social significance of race and ethnicity in the United States, and to develop the skills and knowledge necessary for success in an increasingly diverse environment. This is

particularly important in California, where the population is already more far more ethnically diverse than the rest of the U.S. (California Budget Project, 2013) And the CSU student body is the most diverse in the country (<http://www.calstate.edu>). It is important that the CSU be committed and responsive to, and reflective of, the communities we serve.

The development and maintenance of ethnic studies is also an ethical responsibility of universities. In the United States we have a history of maintaining our silence about the history and oppression of minority voices. Indeed, numerous content analyses of textbooks (Sleeter, 2011) have found an ongoing marginalization of scholarship by and about African Americans, Latino/as, Native Americans, and Asian Americans. Ethnic studies provides alternative narratives through scholarship and teaching, and scholarly resources and expertise to traditional academic departments who may lack the resources or faculty to provide it for themselves. In addition, recent incidents of discrimination and racism on CSU and other university campuses in California illuminate the continued need for pedagogies on campuses that address equity and social justice and the relevance of Ethnic Studies in the 21st Century.¹

There is also substantial evidence that Ethnic Studies is beneficial for students. A 2011 review of research on the value of ethnic studies published by the National Education Association found that, “there is considerable research evidence that well-designed and well-taught ethnic studies curricula have positive academic and social outcomes for students...both students of color and White students have been found to benefit from ethnic studies” (Sleeter, 2011, p. 20). For underrepresented minority students, ethnic studies courses are associated with positive changes in student achievement and attitudes towards learning (Sleeter, 2011). And there is evidence that minority students in such programs have improved academic skills and graduation rates when compared to their Anglo counterparts, at least in high school (Camarota and Romero, 2009). This is of signal importance, given the CSU’s emphasis on closing the achievement gap between underrepresented minority students and white middle class students, and increasing retention, graduation, and overall academic success for underrepresented minorities.

Further, Ethnic Studies is an important part of the CSU’s academic history and legacy. The very first ethnic studies program in a U.S. university was in the California State University system at San Francisco State University in 1969. Ethnic studies emerged following a student-led strike in 1968 by students, faculty and community members who expressed the need for a “relevant education”: courses and pedagogy that would enable members of traditionally marginalized groups to learn about the active contemporary and historical roles they have played in U.S. society. Since that time, the scholarly discipline of ethnic studies has developed and expanded such that almost every university in the United States has one or more academic departments that focus on the study of historically underrepresented ethnic groups. The concerns that ethnic

studies programs addressed have also contributed to the vibrant fields of women's studies, LGBT Studies, working class studies, disability studies and other academic disciplines that address and support social justice.

The ASCSU is particularly concerned by administrative decisions without faculty input that could threaten the status of Ethnic Studies programs throughout the CSU. In keeping with prior ASCSU resolutions about programmatic changes (See AS-2596-03/FA; AS-2918-09/AA; AS-2997-10/FGA) this resolution emphasizes the need for adherence to campus curricular policies and procedures and reasserts the need for faculty consultation in the particular instance of Ethnic Studies programs or departments. Any decrease in the CSU institutional commitment to Ethnic Studies is a decrease in the CSU institutional commitment to diversity and the marginalization of these disciplines.

Given the vital role that Ethnic Studies Departments have in fulfilling the mission of the CSU and preparing students to confront the complex challenges created by social and economic diversity in the 21st century, the CSU as a whole and individual campuses should reaffirm and expand their commitment to maintaining the status and resource base of Ethnic Studies departments and programs. The convening of a system-wide taskforce to study Ethnic Studies in the CSU is a good first step in this direction.

¹ The following news stories tell of recent incidents on California campuses:

USC, UCLA Student Leaders Team Up to Combat Racism on Campus

Both schools received derogatory fliers riddled with profanities and racist and sexist slurs

<http://www.nbclosangeles.com/news/local/USC-UCLA-team-up-to-combat-racism-on-campus-and-in-the-community-246217381.html>

UC Berkeley Student Senate Condemns Culturally Appropriated Events Following Frat's Quinceañera-Themed Party

<http://www.universityherald.com/articles/4750/20131002/uc-berkeley-student-senate-condemns-culturally-appropriated-events-following-frats.htm>

Report released on San Jose State hate crime allegation

http://abclocal.go.com/kgo/story?section=news/local/south_bay&id=9418345

References:

California Budget Project (www.cbp.org/pdfs/2008/0808_bb_demographics.pdf) 2008

Cammarota, J., and A. Romero. (2009). The Social Justice Education Project: A critically compassionate intellectualism for Chicana/o students." In W. Ayers, T. Quinn, and D. Stovall, eds., Handbook for Social Justice Education. New York: Routledge.

Sleeter, C.E. (2011). The Academic and Social Value of Ethnic Studies. Washington, D.C.:National Education Association.

AS-2596-03/FA: Program Suspension/Discontinuation/Dissolution

<http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Resolutions/2002-2003/documents/2596.pdf>

AS-2918-09/AA (Rev): Reaffirming the Need for Consultation in Campus-based Program Reduction, Suspension, and Elimination <http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Resolutions/2009-2010/documents/2918.pdf>

Academic Senate CSU
Page 4 of 4

AS-3164-14/AA/FA (Rev)
January 23-24, 2014

AS-2997-10/FGA (Rev): Call for Consultation on Institutional Restructuring or Redesign Initiatives
<http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Resolutions/2010-2011/documents/2997.pdf>

Approved Unanimously – March 21, 2014

Appendix E: California Faculty Association Letter of Support (8/9/13)



980 9th Street, Suite 2250, Sacramento, CA 95814 • (916) 441-4848 • cfa@calfac.org • www.calfac.org

August 29, 2013

President Mohammad Qayoumi
San Jose State University
One Washington Square
San Jose, CA 95192

Dear President Qayoumi,

The California Faculty Association's Council for Affirmative Action and Board of Directors are writing to you out of a deep concern for an emerging pattern on a number of campuses within the CSU—an initiative to drastically cut existing race and ethnic studies departments or to merge them into larger departments. To our knowledge these efforts have either already started or are being considered at San Jose State, CSU Bakersfield, and Long Beach State to name but a few.

While it may seem tempting to try and find campus "efficiencies" in the name of austerity, there are larger issues at stake here. We believe that those issues must influence decisions that have a significant social and political impact.

In this particular historic moment our nation has come face to face with the fact that life and death issues of race still plague our country. The outcome of the Zimmerman trial, the outrage that followed it, the fact that the President of the United States has spoken frankly about the impact of our failure to grapple with issues of race, all highlight the important role that universities can play in creating positive social change.

Indeed, ethnic studies departments in the CSU are at the forefront in leading students to balanced, critical, and open discussions of racial and ethnic matters that, unfortunately, have yet to be resolved in the US, as the Zimmerman trial and verdict so clearly indicated.

These departments deliver the university's interest in diversity as a core principle and practice, not only by serving majors and minors but also by fulfilling students' GE requirements in cultural diversity and critical thinking, among other areas. Quite frankly, these departments educate students in the cultural literacies required if they are to be effective leaders capable of addressing the complicated social and cultural issues that are a part of an increasingly diverse U.S.



Moreover, ethnic studies departments supplement academic support services in the CSU by providing models, advisers, and mentors to students of color and other students. Additionally, these departments provide vital links to the diverse communities the CSU serves and from which it draws students, faculty, staff and financial resources.

Now is not the time to be shrinking or burying academic curriculum that takes on these critical issues. Instead we must commit ourselves to helping all of our students wrestle with the reality of race in America and aspire to create a better society for all of us.

We cannot allow the notion of austerity to undermine our responsibility to our students and to the role we play in creating a more just society. The events of recent months should be a wakeup call that the small savings that could be realized by cutting and subsuming these departments would have a huge long term cost.

The California State University is better than this. Given the diversity of our students, we should take a leadership role in providing the kind of education that will help our students be part of the solution to our country's struggle with issues of equity. We call on each campus president, the Chancellor and Board of Trustees of this great system to view these programs (and others) not as impediments to efficiency, but rather as opportunities to help us all live up to the best in ourselves and in our history.

We ask that you declare a moratorium on further program changes until an assessment of the programs and their impacts can be conducted. In the case of the proposed changes in the Department of Africana Studies at CSU, Long Beach, Chancellor White has requested a two-year postponement until such an assessment can be conducted. We agree with the Chancellor's decision and ask that the same consideration be extended to these other programs as well. We also ask you to consider holding campus wide discussions on the issues raised by the Zimmerman verdict so that we can turn this tragedy into a teachable moment. This is an opportunity for the greatness of the California State University system to be realized.

We have attached a copy of a recently passed Assembly Concurrent Resolution supporting the continuation of Africana studies programs in California's institutions of higher education.

In solidarity,


Lillian Taiz, CFA President


Cecil Canton, CFA Associate VP Affirmative Action

Cc: Chancellor White

Appendix F: Task Force Questionnaire



**DATA COLLECTION ON THE BACKGROUND AND HISTORY OF
ETHNIC STUDIES IN THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

This questionnaire is designed to collect data on the portfolio of California State University (CSU) programs under the broad rubric of ethnic studies to provide an overview of the origins and histories of ethnic studies in the CSU.

- 1. Name of unit: _____
- 2. Chair/Director/Coordinator: _____
Title: _____
Email: _____
Phone number: _____
- 3. Campus: _____
- 4. College/School: _____
(i.e., School of Humanities, College of Arts & Sciences, etc.)
- 5. Has your unit always been in this college/school? ___ YES ___ NO

If you responded YES, skip to question 5.

If NO,

- a. What was/were your prior college/school affiliation(s)? _____
- b. In what year(s) did the change(s) take place? _____
- c. Was/were the change(s) initiated inside or outside the unit? ___ Inside ___ Outside
- d. In the past 20 years, how many times has your unit been merged, moved, and/or restructured?

Please explain:

6. Unit status:
(Please check one)

- Department
 Program
 Other (specify): _____

7. Please provide the year of the following events in your unit's history:

	Year	Unknown/ Does not apply
When was the unit first established?		
If your unit is a department, in what year did it become a department?		
If your unit was a department and lost its departmental status, in what year did this occur?		
Were there other historical structural changes?		
Are there any current, recent, or ongoing proposals and/or discussions to alter your unit?		

Please explain any or all of the above:

8. Degree offerings:

	MA	BA	Minor	Certificate	Other
Do you offer (select all that apply):					
Have any been discontinued? If so, in what year?					

Please explain changes:

9. Curriculum /course offerings:

	2013-14	2008-09	2003-04
How many courses do/did you have on the books?			
What percentage of courses did you teach?			
What percentage of the courses taught meet /met GE requirements?			

a. Were there courses you were unable to offer? ___ YES ___NO
 If YES, please explain.

b. Were there courses that were discontinued from your catalog? ___ YES ___NO
 If YES, please explain.

c. What impact do you think your inability to offer courses has on your unit?

10. List the courses in your unit that meet general education requirements and the specific requirements they meet: (Please add more rows, if necessary.)

Course Title(s)	GE Requirement(s) met

a. Are there GE courses that you have proposed that have been rejected? YES NO
If YES, please explain.

11. Is there a multicultural or diversity requirement on your campus? YES NO

a. What is the unit requirement? _____

b. Is the requirement concurrent with other GE requirements?

c. Have there been changes over time that have impacted your program? YES NO
If so, please explain.

d.

	Yes	No
Do classes in your unit satisfy this requirement?		
Do courses in non-ethnic studies units satisfy this requirement?		
Is there a specific requirement to take at least one ethnic studies course?		
Is there a specific requirement to take at least one ethnic studies course offered by your program?		

e. At some CSU campuses there has been a redefinition of "diversity" and an expansion of the classes that meet that requirement. Has this occurred at your campus? YES NO

If so, have these changes impacted your unit? ___ YES ___NO
 If so, how?

12. Regarding Faculty:

	2013-14 AY	2003-04 AY
How many tenure-track faculty lines do/did you have in your unit?		
How many full-time lecturers do/did you have in your unit?		
How many part-time lecturers do/did you have in your unit?		
How many of your tenure-track line faculty are joint appointments?		
What percent of your class offerings were taught by tenure-track faculty?		
How many tenure-track faculty are/were assistant professors?		
How many tenure-track faculty are/were associate professors?		
How many tenure-track faculty are/were full professors?		
How many tenure-track faculty hires did you request?		
How many tenure-track faculty hires were approved?		

a. Does your unit have faculty who are borrowed or obtained through other arrangements?
 ___ YES ___NO If YES, please explain (i.e., How many? From what source are they paid?)

13. Regarding Chair/Director/Coordinator:

	2013-14 AY	2003-04 AY
How many units of reassigned time are/were provided to your Chair/Director/Coordinator?		
Does/Did the Chair/Director/Coordinator receive Chair compensation?		
How does/did the level of Chair support received compare with that of other academic units (e.g., higher, lower, about the same)?		

Please explain.

14. Regarding Administrative Support:

	2013-14 AY	2003-04 AY
Does/Did your unit have designated administrative support?		
How many administrative support staff does/did your unit have? (Please indicate if support staff is shared.)		

a. Is/Was the level of administrative support provided to your unit sufficient? ___ YES ___ NO
 If NO, please explain.

15. Do you experience other operational/administrative limitations/challenges? ___ YES ___ NO

If YES, please explain.

16. How have hiring practices by the university/college affected the vitality and development of your unit?

17. On a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 is "no resistance at all" 5 is "extreme resistance," was there any resistance to establish, maintain, or improve the unit?

	1 No Resistance	2	3	4	5 Extreme Resistance	Don't know/ Decline to state
Establish						
Maintain						
Improve						

a. Briefly describe in 500 words or fewer what the issues were in your university; arguments and actions you took to establish, maintain, or improve your unit; and the results of these efforts. (Please attach a separate statement as Attachment "A.")

18. Please provide the following data which cover the past ten years:

a. Your Unit

YEAR	FTES	FTEF	BUDGET ALLOCATION
2004			
2005			
2006			
2007			
2008			
2009			
2010			
2011			
2012			
2013			
2014			

b. Your Unit

YEAR	# of majors	# of minors	# of graduates
2004			
2005			
2006			
2007			
2008			
2009			
2010			
2011			
2012			
2013			
2014			

c. Campus-wide FTES and FTEF

YEAR	FTES	FTEF	ACADEMIC AFFAIRS BUDGET ALLOCATION
2004			
2005			
2006			
2007			
2008			
2009			
2010			
2011			
2012			
2013			
2014			

19. Does your university provide you with other sources of funding, excluding faculty and staff allocations from the institutional budget (i.e. IRA, O&E, etc.)? YES NO
If YES, please explain.

20. Does your unit have other challenges in terms of budget support? YES NO
If YES, please explain.

21. List what you consider to be the most significant challenges your unit has confronted in the last 10 years.

22. Are there institutional structures, practices, policies or processes that tend to disadvantage ethnic studies? YES NO
If YES, please explain.

23. List what you consider to be the most significant accomplishment(s) for your unit in the last 10 years.

24. In 500 words or fewer, please provide an example of innovative strategies undertaken by your unit, such as changes in curriculum, degrees, collaborations/partnerships, centers or programs that are helping to sustain or expand your unit. (Please attach a separate statement as Attachment "B.")

25. In 500 words or fewer, please list institutional activities, support, actions or policies you think would have the most positive effect on advancing ethnic studies on your campus. (Please attach a separate statement as Attachment "C.")

26. Please list student organizations, clubs or programs that are associated with your unit or advised by faculty in your unit. (Please attach a separate statement as Attachment "D.")

27. In 500 words or fewer, please add any other comments that you consider to be relevant regarding the advancement of ethnic studies. (Please attach a separate statement as Attachment "E.")

If this form was completed by someone other than the person identified in Item #2 on page 1 of this document, please provide the following information:

Name:	
Title:	
Phone Number:	
Email:	

Please identify a secondary contact person.

Name:	
Title:	
Phone Number:	
Email:	

THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO COMPLETE THIS SURVEY. IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS, PLEASE CONTACT DR. RON VOGEL AT 562-951-4624 OR RVOGEL@CALSTATE.EDU.


Appendix G: Data Summary of the Quantitative Survey Results

**Data Summary of the Quantitative Survey Conducted for the CSU
Task Force on the Advancement of Ethnic Studies**

Submitted by Umadevi Senguttuvan, Ph.D.
Spring 2016

Supported and under direction of the Cesar Chavez Institute,
San Francisco State University
Director: Belinda Reyes, Ph.D.

Total Number of Participants = 47¹



Participant Title	Frequency	Percent ²
Asst/Assoc/Professor	13	27.7
Chair	19	40.4
Coordinator/Director	9	19.1
Administrator	6	12.8

¹ San Jose Department of Mexican American Studies submitted a revised response that included data missing in the original response (e.g., department status).


² Percentages may not always add up to 100 as the numbers are rounded off.

3. Name of Campus

	Frequency	Percent
Bakersfield	2	4.3
Channel Islands	1	2.1
Chico	1	2.1
Dominguez Hills	3	6.4
East Bay	1	2.1
Fresno	3	6.4
Fullerton	3	6.4
Humboldt	1	2.1
Long Beach	4	8.5
Los Angeles	3	6.4
Monterey Bay	1	2.1
Northridge	4	8.5
Pomona	1	2.1
Sacramento	1	2.1
San Bernardino	1	2.1
San Diego	3	6.4
San Francisco	5	10.6
San Jose	3	6.4
San Luis Obispo	1	2.1
San Marcos	1	2.1
Sonoma	3	6.4
Stanislaus	1	2.1

Region (Computed)


	Frequency	Percent
South	26	55.3
North	21	44.7
Total	47	100.0



Units and their History


6. Type of Unit

	Frequency	Percent
Department	29	61.7
Program	12	25.5
Other	6	12.8
Total	47	100.0



Unit Focus (Computed)

	Frequency	Percent
African American	10	21.3
Asian American	8	17.0
Chicano Latino	12	25.5
Native American	4	8.5
Multi-cultural	13	27.7
Total	47	100.0



5. Has your unit always been in this college/school?


	Frequency	Percent
No	9	19.1
Yes	38	80.9
Total	47	100.0

5a-d. Units that experienced change (n = 9)

Prior Affiliation	Year of Change	Initiated Inside/ Outside	No. of times experienced change in the past 20 years
College of Social and Behavioral Sciences		Inside	1
1) School of BSS, 2) Institute for Liberal and Interdisciplinary Studies, 3) College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, 4) Undergraduate Education and General Studies (VPAA), 5) Graduate and International Studies, 6) College of Behavioral and Social Sciences (present location)	2011	Outside	6
Interdisciplinary Studies	unsure 1980's	Outside	3
College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences (CLASS)	1993	Inside	3
College of Professional Studies	1980	Inside	0
College of Arts & Sciences	2011	Outside	
College of Arts, Letters and Sciences (through 2006-07); College of Humanities and Social Sciences (2007-2012); College of the Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (2012-present).	2007 & 2012	Outside	2
College of Social Work		Outside	3
College of Behavioral Science	1993	Outside	1


7a. In what year was the unit first established?

	Frequency	Percent
1968	5	13.5
1969	12	32.4
1970	8	21.6
1971	1	2.7
1973	2	5.4
1976	1	2.7
1983	1	2.7
1990	1	2.7
1992	1	2.7
1994	1	2.7
1996	1	2.7
2001	1	2.7
2005	1	2.7
2008	1	2.7
Total	37	100.0
Missing	10	



7b. In what year did it become a department? ³

	Frequency	Percent
1968	3	12.0
1969	6	24.0
1971	2	8.0
1972	1	4.0
1973	1	4.0
1974	1	4.0
1976	1	4.0
1981	1	4.0
1983	1	4.0
1988	1	4.0
1990	2	8.0
1993	1	4.0
1994	2	8.0
1997	1	4.0
2005	1	4.0
Total	25	100.0
Missing	4	



³ One unit (San Marcos American Indian program) has become a department since the collection of this data.

7c. If your unit was a department and lost its departmental status, in what year did this occur?

	Frequency	Percent
1985	1	50.0
2012	1	50.0
Total	2	100.0

7d. In what year were there other historical structural changes?

	Frequency	Percent
1978	1	6.3
2004	1	6.3
2005	1	6.3
2007	3	18.8
2009	1	6.3
2012	1	6.3
Yes, But Don't Know	8	50.0
Total	16	100.0

7e. Are there any current, recent, or ongoing proposals and/or discussions to alter your unit?

	Frequency	Percent
2005	1	16.7
2010	1	16.7
2011	1	16.7
2012	2	33.3
2014	1	16.7
Total	6	100.0

8. Degrees Offerings

	Frequency	Percent	Any Discontinued?
			Frequency
BA	39	83.0	3
MA	7	14.9	4
Minor	45	95.7	2
Certificate	7	14.9	3
Other	4	8.5	21



9. Curriculum/Course Offerings

	2013-2014			2008-2009			2003-2004		
	N	Median	Range	N	Median	Range	N	Median	Range
No. of courses on the books	40	36	4-104	37	34	4-167	33	29	2-163
Percentage of courses taught	27	66%	11%-100%	23	70%	11%-100%	23	69%	11%-100%
Percentage of courses taught meeting GE requirements	28	66%	1%-100%	29	53%	1%-100%	25	55%	1%-100%

9a. Were there courses you were unable to offer?

	Frequency	Percent
No	9	19.1
Yes	38	80.9
Total	47	100.0

9b. Were there courses that were discontinued from your catalog?


	Frequency	Percent
No	22	46.8
Yes	25	53.2
Total	47	100.0

10. Number of courses in unit that meet GE requirements

N	Mn	SD	Median	Mode	Range
44	15.36	11.93	11.5	7	1-51

10a. Are there GE courses that you have proposed that have been rejected?

	Frequency	Percent
No	34	72.3
Yes	13	27.7
Total	47	100.0



11. Is there a multicultural or diversity requirement on your campus?

	Frequency	Percent
No	4	8.5
Yes	43	91.5
Total	47	100.0

11. Is there a multicultural requirement on your campus?
(Computed by Campus)

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	19	86.4
No	1	4.6
Disagreement among responders from same campus	2	9.0
Total	22	100.0

11a. What is the unit requirement?


	Frequency	Percent	Mn	SD
3	23	63.9		
4	6	16.7		
5	2	5.6	3.75	1.25
6	4	11.1		
8	1	2.8		
Total	36	100.0		

11b. Is the requirement concurrent with other GE requirements?

	Frequency	Percent
No	4	8.5
Yes	39	83.0
Total	43	100.0

11c. Have there been changes over time that have impacted your program?

	Frequency	Percent
No	13	30.2
Yes	30	69.8
Total	43	100.0



11d1. Do classes in your unit satisfy this requirement?


	Frequency	Percent
No	1	2.3
Yes	42	97.7
Total	43	100.0

11d2. Do courses in non-ethnic studies units satisfy this requirement?

	Frequency	Percent
No	5	11.6
Yes	38	88.4
Total	43	100.0

11d3. Is there a specific requirement to take at least one ethnic studies course?

	Frequency	Percent
No	38	88.4
Yes	5	11.6
Total	43	100.0



11d4. Is there a specific requirement to take at least one ethnic studies course offered by your program?

	Frequency	Percent
No	39	90.7
Yes	4	9.3
Total	43	100.0

11e1. Has there been a diversity redefinition at your campus?

	Frequency	Percent
No	15	34.9
Yes	28	65.1
Total	43	100.0

11e2. If so, have these changes impacted your unit?

	Frequency	Percent
No	4	14.3
Yes	24	85.7
Total	28	100.0

12. Faculty Details

How many tenure-track faculty lines do/did you have in your unit?

	N	Mn	SD	Median	Range
2013-2014	43	5.34	4.82	4.5	0-24
2003-2004	36	5.76	5.08	4.0	0-25

How many full-time lecturers do/did you have in your unit?

	N	Mn	SD	Median	Range
2013-2014	36	1.22	3.01	0	0-13
2003-2004	31	0.61	0.95	0	0-3

How many part-time lecturers do/did you have in your unit?

	N	Mn	SD	Median	Range
2013-2014	42	5.47	6.45	4	0-36
2003-2004	31	4.46	6.37	2	0-33

How many of your tenure-track line faculty are joint appointments?

	N	Mn	SD	Median	Range
2013-2014	38	0.76	1.10	0.5	0-5
2003-2004	28	0.89	1.06	0.5	0-3

What percent of your class offerings were taught by tenure-track faculty?

	N	Mn	SD	Median	Range
2013-2014	38	48%	26	47.5%	0-100%
2003-2004	25	60%	26	56.0%	0-100%

How many tenure-track faculty are/were assistant professors?


	N	Mn	SD	Median	Range
2013-2014	42	0.99	1.31	1	0-7
2003-2004	32	2.11	2.52	1.5	0-12

How many tenure-track faculty are/were associate professors?

	N	Mn	SD	Median	Range
2013-2014	42	1.82	1.65	1	0-5
2003-2004	30	1.29	1.49	1	0-5

How many tenure-track faculty are/were full professors?

	N	Mn	SD	Median	Range
2013-2014	41	2.51	3.19	2	0-18
2003-2004	32	2.53	2.51	2	0-11



How many tenure-track faculty hires did you request?

	N	Mn	SD	Median	Range
2013-2014	38	1.38	1.02	1	0-3
2003-2004	27	0.74	0.90	0	0-3

How many tenure-track faculty hires were approved?

	N	Mn	SD	Median	Range
2013-2014	36	0.59	0.79	0	0-3
2003-2004	26	0.38	0.75	0	0-3

13 of the 27 units that requested for tenure-track faculty hires in 2013-14:

- 7 (25.9%) were approved the number of tracks requested
- 18 (66.7%) were approved less number of tracks than requested
- 2 (7.40%) were approved for more number of tracks than requested

Of the 13 units that requested for tenure-track faculty hires in 2003-04:

- 5 (38.5%) were approved the number of tracks requested
- 8 (61.5%) were approved less number of tracks than requested

12a. Does your unit have faculty who are borrowed or obtained through other arrangements?

	Frequency	Percent
No	26	55.3
Yes	21	44.7
Total	47	100.0

Chair/Director/Coordinator

13a. How many units of reassigned time are/were provided to your Chair/Director/Coordinator?

	Frequency	Median	Mode	Range
2013-2014	43	3	3	0-24
2003-04	38	3	3	0-15

13b. Did the Chair/Director/Coordinator receive Chair compensation?

	2013-14		2003-04	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
No	12	25.5	15	31.9
Yes	35	74.5	32	68.1
Total	47	100.0	47	100.0

13c. How does/did the level of Chair support received compare with that of other academic units (e.g., higher, lower, about the same)?

	2013-14		2003-04	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
About the Same	23	48.9	16	53.3
Lower	12	33.3	14	46.7
Higher	1	2.8		
Total	47	100.0	30	100.0

14. Administrative Support

14. Does/Did your unit have designated administrative support?

	2014-2013		2003-2004	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
No	4	8.5	11	23.4
Yes	43	91.5	36	76.6
Total	47	100.0	47	100.0

14. Shared Staff

	2014-2013		2003-2004	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
No	34	72.3	39	83.0
Yes	13	27.7	8	17.0
Total	47	100.0	47	100.0

14. Was the level of administrative support provided to your unit sufficient?

	2014-2013		2003-2004	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
No	29	65.9	32	72.7
Yes	15	34.1	12	27.3
Total	44	100.0	44	100.0


15. Do you experience other operational/administrative limitations/challenges?



	Frequency	Percent
No	11	23.4
Yes	36	76.6
Total	47	100.0

17. Experience of Resistance

On a scale of 1 (No Resistance) to 5 (Extreme Resistance)

	N	Mn	SD	Range
Was there any resistance to establish the unit?	33	2.97	1.66	1-5
Was there any resistance to maintain the unit?	41	2.68	1.29	1-5
Was there any resistance to improve the unit?	41	3.17	1.30	1-5





19. Does your university provide you with other sources of funding?

	Frequency	Percent
No	16	35.6
Yes	29	64.4
Total	45	100.0

20. Does your unit have other challenges in terms of budget support?

	Frequency	Percent
No	11	24.4
Yes	34	75.6
Total	45	100.0

22. Are there institutional structures, practices, policies or processes that tend to disadvantage ethnic studies?

	Frequency	Percent
No	6	13.3
Yes	39	86.7
Total	45	100.0

Correlation between FTEF and FTES

Correlation Range	Number of Units
.70 or above	8
.40 to .69	8
.30 to .39	1
.20 to .29	3
.01 to .19	2
-.01 to -.19	1
-.40 to -.69	2
Total	25

Student to Faculty Ratio (SFR) = FTES/FTEF



No. of units with both FTEF & FTES responses = 24



Overall 4 units present with SFR that is lower in 2013/2014 compared to 2004

One or two units show stability

The remaining 18 units present with SFR that is higher in 2013/2014 compared to 2004, albeit with fluctuations

SFR plotted by size






FTEF Trends



Proportion = (Unit FTEF/Campus FTEF)*100


2008 proportion was selected to be the base year.

2008, 2009, 2010, and 2013 proportion values were divided by 2008 proportion value. That is, 2008 was set at 1. Values for 2009 to 2013 that are above 1 denote increase in proportion compared to year 2008; values below 1 denote decrease in proportion compared to year 2008. Units with missing values are not presented here.

Of all possible time points (2009-2013), 42.5% had an increase in FTEF proportion and 57% decreased in FTEF proportion compared to 2008.







Appendix H: Defining Elements of an Ethnic Studies Course and Curriculum

Since the Task Force acknowledged that there are a range of disciplines that consider ethnicity and race in their curricula, the following defining elements are offered as a suggested foundation for considering whether a course is being conceived and constructed specifically for an ethnic studies curriculum:

Upon successful completion of courses in Ethnic Studies, students should be able to demonstrate:

1. understanding of Ethnic Studies as a discipline and interrelated group of disciplines, i.e., Native American Studies, African American Studies, Asian American Studies, and Latina/Latino American Studies which create intellectual and institutional space in which the lives, histories, creative and intellectual traditions, cultures and struggles of peoples of color/ethnic groups are the subject of rigorous, original and generative scholarship;
2. the ability to analyze and articulate the core concepts of the discipline including race, racism, racialization, racial stratification, white supremacy, ethnicity, ethnocentrism, Eurocentrism, colonialism, decolonization, enslavement, genocide, diasporic communities, equity, indigenous sovereignty, resistance, and liberation;
3. knowledge of the interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary methodologies of ethnic studies which explore the interrelatedness and intersection of race and ethnicity with class, gender, sexuality and other forms of difference, hierarchy and oppression;
4. an effective grasp of how the varied ethnic communities conceive, construct, develop and sustain themselves, their identities, their cultures, and their inter-relationships as people of color, and engage in self-affirmation and resistance to various forms of oppression;
5. the ability to identify and discuss a broad range of theories, perspectives, methodologies and frameworks of ethnic studies used in scholarly and popular literature, media and everyday discourse;
6. intellectual grounding in the creative and intellectual traditions of one or more of the ethnic groups studied: Native Americans, African Americans, Asian American, and Latina/Latino Americans, and others;
7. understanding of the impact of the continuing histories and current conditions of oppression and resistance to conquest, colonialism, physical and cultural genocide, enslavement, dispossession, segregation, social and institutional violence, racial disparities and global inequality;
8. understanding of and ability to discuss the rationale and ethics of Ethnic Studies' explicit commitment to linking scholarship, teaching and learning to social engagement (service and struggle), social justice and social change; and

9. the ability to integrate classroom learning and knowledge to gain lifelong skills in understanding, analyzing and engaging issues of race and ethnicity in scholarly spaces, mass media, literature, art, music, science, the work place, societal institutions and other areas of life, with an increased respect for diversity, equity, social justice, and social change.

Appendix I: Sample Rubric of Student Learning Outcomes for Ethnic Studies Courses

The Task Force recognizes that many may need to apply the “Guiding Principles for Developing Ethnic Studies Courses” to the creation of rubrics compatible with GE guidelines. These rubrics tend to be simplified and more general than the deeper considerations that may have guided their creation, taking portions of the thinking applied to the curriculum being assessed. Thus, we offer one such simple rubric, not as prescriptive but as an example of how one might distill collegial collective thinking about the guiding principles into a brief rubric.

The following is offered as a sample rubric.

After completion of an Ethnic Studies course, students will be able to:

Student Learning Outcome	Assignment/Activity
1. Effectively evaluate the core concepts of Ethnic Studies, including race, racism, racialization, racial stratification, white supremacy, ethnicity, ethnocentrism, Eurocentrism, colonialism, decolonization, enslavement, genocide, diasporic communities, equity, indigenous sovereignty, resistance, and liberation;	
2. Articulate knowledge of how the varied ethnic communities conceive, construct, develop and sustain themselves, their identities, their cultures, and their inter-relationships as people of color, and engage in self-affirmation and resistance to various forms of oppression;	
3. Demonstrate an understanding of the impact of the continuing histories and current conditions of oppression and resistance to conquest, colonialism, physical and cultural genocide, enslavement, segregation, social and institutional violence, racial disparities and global inequality.	
4. Connect classroom learning and knowledge to gain lifelong skills in analyzing and engaging issues of race and ethnicity in scholarly spaces, mass media, literature, art, music, science the work place, societal institutions and other areas of life, with an increased respect for diversity, equity, social justice, and social change.	