Dear President Conoley,

Attached please find the campus feedback collected by the Academic Senate, including our in-person senate vote, the summary of feedback on our campus-wide anonymous survey, and feedback form specific units: The Colleges of Health and Human Services, Business, the Arts, and Natural Sciences & Mathematics; the Ethnic Studies Department Chairs, and the Jewish Studies Program.

Sincerely,

Jessica Zacher Pandya
Chair, Academic Senate
Professor, Liberal Studies & Teacher Education
College of Education
CSU Long Beach
Academic Senate: 562-995-8572
Academic Senate Clicker Survey 2-27-20

Yes/no question votes on the floor of the senate, by voting senators (taken 2/27/20)

a. Question #1= Yes-35 No-23
b. Question #2= Yes-20, No-37
c. Question #3= Yes-23, No-32

At CSULB, 560 people responded to the survey: 385/69% faculty; 13/2% students; 22/4% administrators; and 135/24% staff. Survey responses (on yes/no votes and in qualitative responses) show mixed thoughts on campus; while respondents seem in favor of the Ethnic Studies content and requirement, they were wholly against legislative interference in CSU curriculum. In what follows below, we list the numerical responses for the yes/no questions and then sample representative responses for each of the five open-ended questions.

CSULB Academic Senate Feedback Survey Summary

Does our campus want a **systemwide** 3-unit lower-division requirement in Ethnic Studies as described in AS-3403-20/AA? 289/59% **Yes**, 200/41% **No**

Does our campus want a **systemwide** upper-division “reflective element” requirement in Ethnic Studies as described in AS-3403-20/AA? 242/51% **Yes**, 231/49% **No**

Does our campus support a broader **systemwide** 3-unit Diversity/Social Justice requirement (which would include courses in ethnic studies as well as those that examine race and ethnicity, class, gender, sexuality, religion, spirituality, national origin, immigration status, ability, and/or age)? 310/67% **Yes**, 150/33% **No**

**Q1 Ethnic Studies Student Learning Outcomes: Sample Responses (198 comments)**

Support outcomes (83): “This work is ESSENTIAL for students. I highly urge CSU to be on the right side of history and vote this in.”

Critiques of SLOs as too narrow (26): “These are very narrow and specific learning outcomes. Many of these topics could be approached in a way more relevant to the specific student majors (e.g. in STEM majors or in business) that could benefit from having more contextually specific discussions adapted to specific environments the
students are more likely to face. Separately, if mandating specific student courses on a university-system level, the most critical need than ethnic studies is for students is financial literacy, given the high and increasing student debt.”

Do not support because of opposition to specific learning outcomes (20): “Learning outcomes as specified will be near impossible to assess adequately.”

Do not support because of opposition to the content (28): “Students need to focus their time on campus on topics that are relevant to their degree, not social issues.”

Do not support because legislative interference is wrong (21): The bill denies the university and its faculty academic freedom and responsibility to determine course choice and content for students.”

Do not support because of GE interference/overload (20): “While we support the wonderful ideas behind this initiative, this is not the way to add additional requirements for our students. It would be best to incorporate these classes into existing coursework that we have (spread through the curriculum) as opposed to adding additional classes for students. Alternatively, each campus could determine what classes currently cover this requirement and find a solution. To continue with our move towards decreasing time to graduation, we need to carefully consider the addition of any class- and consider what gets dropped to compensate. Please let us serve our students. We spend so much of our time thinking about how to facilitate student success.”

Q2 about ES Requirement Structure (3 units LD in GE & UD “reflective element”) (158 comments)

Support (45): The dual requirements are reasonable, and mirror the expectations of lower division "foundation" courses being revisited through upper division GEs prior to graduation.”

Questions and concerns about structure and definitions (35): What does "reflective element" mean? That term seems extremely vague.”

Do not support UD requirement (15): “There should not be an upper-division requirement. This will negatively impact high unit majors, such as engineering and natural sciences, to keep to the 120-unit cap and accreditation requirements. It is very less likely that the topics can be integrated into the major requirements in those majors. The campus should also consider resources, such as faculty expertise, funding, and class availabilities, that may affect the implementation of these new requirements and may affect student timely graduation.”

General do not support (49): “I do not support a 3-unit requirement focused solely on ethnic studies.”
No legislative interference (14): “No government intervention in higher education.”

Q3 ES and Subject Matter Expert (SME) Faculty be Included in ES Course Review (172 comments)

Support (61): The courses can be and should be evaluated by the ethnic studies department and they will determine if the course meets the minimum requirements for the AS 3403-20. This will ensure that all areas are being reviewed, implemented and taught to the students.”

Support but concerns about workload and cultural taxation (17): “This is extremely important. But, it is also a clear example of cultural taxation on faculty who are already often doing more service than average, and often are from small departments. How will this crucial work be compensated?”

Concern about who decides who is a SME? (23): “Does this suggest that classes outside of Ethnic Studies will be considered for their potential to meet the SLOs? In that case, what is the ‘subject matter’? Would a class on the Harlem Renaissance potentially fulfill one of these requirements? Such a class would necessarily explore African American history and artistic expression. Who is the ‘subject matter expert’ for such a topic?”

Do not support because curriculum review should not be different (30): All matters of curriculum evaluation and approval should move through the usual campus committees and processes. Category B, C, and D GE courses are approved by the GEGC committee, not by faculty in those areas. Privileging one set of faculty in curricular decisions is a bad precedent to set. This also preferences faculty by their departmental placement rather than faculty with expertise. Since a goal of the university should be that there are faculty with a variety of expertises in every department, such a requirement further isolates faculty and treats social justice around issues of ethnic studies as in the providence of only one group of faculty, rather than as a big tent.”

Do not support (35): “Absolutely NOT! First, individual academic senates should decide. The faculty should decide. Second, no other subject matter has such privilege and requirement.”

Do not support because of legislative interference (6): “Each campus should determine how it approves curriculum. It definitely should not be imposed by state government.”

Q4 General Potential Campus Impacts (141 comments)

Support, because the requirement will increase understanding (51): “The potential impact of an Ethnic Studies Requirement will give the campus community the ability to understand other ethnic backgrounds. The community will gain experience on how to engage and support each other. Be mindful of how other peoples experience have an
impact on the world around them. Learn the truth about history and polices and how it impacts specific groups of people.”

**The requirement will be polarizing (7):** “Impact will also be on collegiality on campus with faculty and majors pitted against each other and lack of respect and trust among each other.”

**Campus infrastructure is inadequate (12):** “I think there are infrastructure concerns. Perhaps there is a strategic plan for how this could work at our university, but if feedback is being solicited from everyone, then I feel like without that context of what the plan is, I'm mostly thinking of the concerns I have about how this would actually get rolled out.”

**This is legislative interference (12):** AB 1460 is an *extremely* dangerous bill. Not because of the specific contents mandated but because it opens a Pandora’s box of legislative interference with the curriculum. If Sacramento can legislate this, what else can they legislate? More to the point, if Sacramento gets into this business, what will Austin or Montgomery be up to? Faculty should oppose AB 1460 on principle.

**The requirement will impact faculty hiring (4):** “Faculty hiring in other programs will be curtailed to deal with this requirement.”

**Unaware of student acceptance of the requirement (6):** “feel not well informed about the acceptance of ethnic studies as a voluntary subject. If it rates exceptionally low amongst students this proposal would be directed against actual student interest. Since I don't know it is extremely hard to make a reasonable decision at this moment.”

**Concerns about impacting the GE program or adding units (29):** “Current students following prior GE patterns are required to meet the Global Issues and Human Diversity requirements, which double-count with other GE categories or major requirements. Would these course requirements function in the same way?”

**Disagree with the learning outcomes (20):** “This feels very narrow and does not encompass all of the other social justice issues that are being experience in society today.”

**Q5 Any other comments (44 total comments)**

**Strongly support (13):** “I strongly support a system wide requirement as well as AB 1460. I believe such a requirement will help our students develop the critical thinking skills that are necessary to successfully navigate an increasingly diversifying society. Further, ethnic studies can help students cultivate an analytical understanding of race and ethnicity that can lead them to challenge structural inequality and their own and other's stereotypes about people of color, leading to the creation of a more just world.”
Strongly support in connection to CSULB’s Mission (2): “Having an Ethnic Studies requirement places value on the University’s mission and its commitment to racial and ethnic diversity. Great direction.”

Do not support because of the violation of academic freedom (11): “The approach to curriculum development should be comprehensive and bottom up, not top down, and determined by the faculty in the major, then the college, and then the university. Here it is not even the university/campus, but the system senate, and more egregiously the legislature that is legislating curriculum piecemeal for all of CSU. It will do permanent damage to curriculum in the majors and on campus. Campus Autonomy is critical. Indeed, in my opinion, major and college autonomy should be paramount. Anything else will hurt the very students that the state senate and the legislature are purporting to help. Really bad idea!!”

Concern about cost to students in $ or degree changes (5): “This seems to be an excellent idea but I am concerned about adding units, time to degree, and increased costs to students. Embedded may work better.”

Concerns about GE self-governance and campus leadership (5): “The CO, Board of Trustees, Campus Presidents are out of touch with the future. You all need to step down.”

General Objection (8): “Strongly object to adding these.”
The College of Health & Human Services

College of Health and Human Service Feedback Regarding the ASCSU Ethnic Studies Resolution

The College of Health and Human Services prepares students to work with people across nearly all sectors of our community. Thus, preparing students to work with and be part of a diverse population is essential to every CHHS degree program. We wish to express our gratitude for the opportunity to provide feedback on the ASCSU Ethnic Studies Resolution. We regret that broad-based campus feedback was not sought before now and that such feedback did not inform the actions of the legislature or the ASCSU Ethnic Studies Resolution. What follows is an outline of the CHHS feedback.

a. We do not believe university curriculum should be legislated and for this reason, we oppose this measure.

b. Nearly all CHHS programs are accredited. Many programs must meet accreditation requirements for students to be eligible for professional credentialing and licensure. As a result, many CHHS programs are high-unit and have little to no room for additional units. Thus, this measure will increase unit count, time to graduation, and cost for many CHHS students. There will also be overall costs and we believe added costs will have implications for current university programming.

c. We respect and value the expertise of faculty in CHHS fields of study and we believe that CHHS faculty should have the responsibility for assessment of all student learning outcomes in their programs.

Therefore, we answer “NO” to the first two questions on the ASCSU ES feedback form, and “yes” to third with the stipulation provided:

   a. Does your campus want a 3-unit statewide lower-division in Ethnic Studies as described in AS-3403-20/AA?
      A: NO

   a. Does your campus want a system-wide upper-division “reflective element” in Ethnic Studies as described in AS-3403-20/AA?
      A: NO

   a. Does your campus support a broader system-wide 3-unit Diversity and Social Justice requirement (which would include courses in ethnic studies as well as those that examine race and ethnicity, class and gender, sexuality, religion, spirituality, national origin, immigration status, ability, and/or age)?
      A: YES, but not as 3-unit required course.

Other feedback provided below addresses CHHS degree program needs for compliance should AS-3403-20/AA pass.
a. AB 1460 as amended only mandates one three-unit course and explicitly states that it should not add time to graduation. For this reason, we do not believe the resolution or any other resulting actions should include additional requirements.

b. To meet AB 1460, CHHS believes the proposed student learning outcomes are too narrow and must be broadened to enable their incorporation into existing GE and/or within the existing required curriculum.

c. If a body separate from the college is designated to evaluate/assess related SLOs, we believe this body should include representatives from each academic college and not consist exclusively of Ethnic Studies faculty alone.
The College of Business

A Summary of Elicited Feedback on Ethnic Studies Resolution from College of Business (COB)

Submitted by COB Senator Chailin Cummings

Responding to a call from the Academic Senate about gathering feedback from each college on the Ethnic Studies Resolution, I asked the Associate Dean, Faculty Council, Undergraduate Program Committee, and representatives on GEGC from the College of Business to share their viewpoints on the following elements, which are summarized as follows.

- **“The specific Ethnic Studies Learning Outcomes (Section A)**

  Generally speaking, many support the Ethnic Studies topic to be specified in terms of learning outcomes, as opposed to 3-unit classes. However, given that learning outcomes (Section A) are too narrow and technical to enable faculty to include two of them in their courses, students may have to take an additional 3-unit upper-level course in Ethnic Studies in the end. Thus, the specific Ethnic Studies Learning Outcomes (Section A) should be re-evaluated and broadened to be more meaningful.

- **The 3-unit lower division requirement and upper division “reflective element” (Section B)**

  The lower division implementation is fine for our freshmen, provided there are enough classes offered. One concern is with students with AD-T (Associate Degree for Transfer) status. We are supposed to graduate them in 60 units. As this is a CSU requirement, it is not included in the curriculum required of AD-T students at their community colleges. It is recommended only. As to the scale of the problem, we enroll about twice as many transfer students as freshmen, and about 75% of our transfer students are AD-T.

  The upper division “reflective requirement” would create the same issues we had with the campus-specific graduation requirements. The upper division requirement specifies that two of the learning outcomes 2-5 should be covered at the upper division. We don’t have a course in the major that would address the learning outcomes.

  We’ll have issues with students not being able to graduate on time, or waiving students out of our own required courses in order for them to have time to complete this new requirement. This means we will likely have to cut curriculum in the major to accommodate the upper division requirement.

  As it is, we are already trying to make classes in the major double count for the categories B, C, and D upper division requirements. We have yet to get our category D course approved. This means that as of now, our students will have to take a category D course outside the college.
The evaluation of courses by ethnic Studies Faculty (Section C)

The language in the document talks about explicit inclusion of ethnic studies faculty and subject matter experts. Many believe that course evaluation should be done by a committee, including ethnic studies faculty, especially if we are talking about double counting courses in the major. The group that evaluates courses should be somewhat diverse and include people from the colleges attempting to add courses in this area, not merely ethnic studies professors.

General potential campus Impacts of an Ethnic studies requirement

In the short-term, we would anticipate bottle necks for our freshmen students. As it is, we have difficulty finding classes for them in certain GE categories. A more permanent concern is that we will likely have to cut curriculum in the major to accommodate the upper division requirement. There are conflicting demands and constraints put on our program. On one hand, we are to graduate our transfer students in 60 units, on the other, university and CSU requirements are imposing requirements increasing student unit loads and impinging on the subject matter in the major. For COB, this is of special concern to our Accountancy students. Their future employers expect certain content to be taught and we already have streamlined the program dramatically.
Concerning AB 1460 – Ethnic Studies Course Requirement

The purpose of Assembly Bill 1460, to require that each campus in the California State University system offer courses in ethnic studies and that all students attending the CSU be required to complete a three-unit course in Ethnic Studies to graduate is a commendable one. Unfortunately, the bill as drafted codifies the existing institutionalized discrimination in the CSU system into law.

In Section I (b) of the bill, Ethnic Studies are defined as “an 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 and Latino Americans.” As such, it excludes, by definition, all other Ethnic Studies programs in the CSU, including Jewish Studies. As such, it continues a decades-long system of discrimination in California higher education against Jewish Studies, isolating it from other Ethnic Studies programs.

I wish to note in passing that this limited definition of “Ethnic Studies” also short changes other ethnic groups besides Jewish Americans, such as Arab and Middle Eastern Americans and South Asian Americans, whose experiences are not included in the four areas privileged by the current framework.

While many Americans assume that Jews are only a religious group, in fact, most Jews, including most American Jews, see their Jewish identity as primarily a matter of ancestry and culture (62%), while only a minority see it primarily as a matter of religion (15%). See, Pew Research Center, A Portrait of Jewish Americans (October 2013). Jews are not the only group where ethnicity and religion overlap (see, e.g. the Druze and Armenians). Treating Jews as only a religious group imposes upon them a European Christian model that distinguishes between religion and ethnicity and makes it difficult to study any socio-cultural situation where they might overlap.

In fact, Jewish Studies can be defined as "the discipline which deals with the historical experiences, in the intellectual, religious, and social spheres, of the Jewish people in all centuries and countries." Arnold Band, Studies in Modern Jewish Literature (1966). Jewish Studies not only includes religious thought but also economic and social relationships, as well as cultural products and practices. The study of the religion of Judaism is only a subset of the wider field of the study of Jews.

In 1969, the same year that the Association for Jewish Studies was founded, faculty and students at San Francisco State University established what is now the College of Ethnic Studies. From that time until now, that campus has defined “Ethnic Studies” as limited to Africana Studies, Chicano/a-Latinx Studies, Asian and Asian American Studies, and
American Indian Studies. This list, defined by the campus politics of the late 1960s, remains unchanged to this day, as reflected in CSU Chancellor Timothy White’s 2016 report on Ethnic Studies in the California State University system.

The current definition of Ethnic Studies is trapped in a limited conception held by some activists in the late 1960s; it is time California moved into the 21st century and broadened its definition to include the other ethnic groups who make a home here in California.

For ten years, I have approached the various Ethnic Studies Departments and Programs at California State University, Long Beach and have asked to partner and collaborate with them regarding the threats and challenges all our Ethnic Studies programs are facing, only to be rebuffed each time. The arguments against inclusion of Jewish Studies boil down to anti-Semitic stereotypes of Jews as a “successful, model minority” in America, who do not face significant prejudice or discrimination. Such stereotypes reflect a lack of understanding of the American Jewish experience, modern anti-Semitism, and of contemporary American racism.

As late as 1944, most Americans (according to Gallup polls) identified American Jews as the greatest internal threat to the United States. Jews were regularly excluded from residential neighborhoods by racially restrictive housing covenants around the country and here in California, faced quotas designed to limit their admission to American colleges and universities, and were regularly denied employment and public accommodation.

While general rates of anti-Semitism declined significantly in the United States over the course of the 1950s, Jews continued to be discriminated against, including here in California. For example, the first president of CSULB, F. Victor Peterson, refused to hire any Jews as faculty. Even today, Jews continue be disproportionately targeted for hate crimes here in California. Even though Jews make up only 3% of the population of California, they are the victims of 11.8% of hate crimes here. In fact, Jews are the fourth largest group (in absolute numbers) targeted by hate crimes in California, after African Americans (25.9%), LGBT (24.1%), and Latinx (14%).

Jews occupy a particularly dangerous place in the imagination of contemporary racists: a kind of secularized demonic force bent on destroying the white race. American and European racists have embraced the delusion of a “Great Replacement” conspiracy by Jews to bring in Muslim and non-white immigrants in order to eradicate whites. This is why the neo-Nazis marching in Charlottesville, Virginia in 2017 chanted “Jews will not replace us.” This was the ideology that motivated the shooter who carried out the massacre at the Tree of Life synagogue in Pittsburgh in October 2018, as well as the shooter who attacked the synagogue in Poway in April 2019.
Simply put, one cannot understand contemporary American or European racism and white nationalism and ignore the critical roles that anti-Semitism and Jews play in the construction and pervasiveness of racial supremacist ideology. By excluding Jews and Jewish Studies from Ethnic Studies, CSU students will be denied the resources to confront the dangerous forces threatening our communities. In short, by not understanding who Jews are, or how anti-Semitism works historically and culturally, the current Ethnic Studies model disempowers our students and encourages anti-Semitism to fester.

While the project of requiring an Ethnic Studies course for graduation in the CSU is an admirable one, it should not achieve this goal by reifying a discriminatory structure that excludes Jews and Jewish Studies.

Dr. Jeffrey C. Blutinger
Barbara and Ray Alpert Endowed Chair in Jewish Studies
Director, Jewish Studies Program
California State University, Long Beach
The College of the Arts

From faculty representing the Dance Department:
I share concerns that the curriculum at CSULB should not be legislated by the state. I don’t argue with the importance of ethnic studies education; that said, the faculty senate should be working with department leadership and their faculty members to decide how best to educate students. For example, students pursuing engineering degrees will not easily find a way to add a 3 unit Ethnic Studies course unless it is part of their required lower division GE coursework.

It is unclear to me how the “reflective element” will be instituted. Is this a 3 unit upper division course or is it a component within an existing and appropriate course? It sounds like we may be adding 6 units of required content.

My largest concern relates to who is authorized to teach the proposed Ethnic Studies SLOs? If it is only Ethnic Studies faculty than 1) we dismiss the expertise of many faculty whose lines are in other disciplines, but whose research focuses on issues of race, gender, class, oppression, inequality, indigenous studies, etc.; 2) how will the campus fund the FTE to teach these courses, and what will go unfunded as a result.

From the COTA Office of the Dean:
We are not comfortable representing a COTA faculty view through a statement we may make, which we feel should come directly from the faculty.

However, as deans and administrators of COTA, we would say:
  o We affirm the importance of CSULB students understanding issues of diversity, race and ethnicity;
  o However, we also affirm that curricular matters should remain the purview of the faculty and not be imposed by legislative action;
  o We are concerned about AS-3403-20 as a precedent of curriculum, both in terms of process and structure, being dictated by legislature and not by faculty.
  o In particular, we are concerned about very specific SLOs being included in this mandate.

We fully realize that feedback is being solicited, but these SLOs are not arising through campus faculty discussions.

Other concerns include how these additional 6 units will fit within our already very robust GE requirements. We are unsure about how an “overlay” would actually work with such specific learning outcomes.

Naturally, if adopted, the discussion of GR will need to shift to accommodate the change.

The office included this clarification in a later email:
Just to clarify our comments—we are concerned about the implementation of this in our GE but the intent of the policy (if approved) is not to add units to degree. I just wanted to clarify that in case our comment about “additional 6 units” are misunderstood.
1. **Does your campus want a **systemwide** **3-unit lower-division requirement in Ethnic Studies as described in AS-3403-20/AA?**

   Yes. The CSULB Ethnic Studies Chairs support a systemwide, 3-unit lower-division requirement in Ethnic Studies in the context of AB 1460.

2. **Does your campus want a **systemwide** upper-division “reflective element” requirement in Ethnic Studies as described in AS-3403-20/AA?**

   Yes. The CSULB Ethnic Studies Chairs also support this requirement in the context of AB 1460. An upper-division requirement enables us to accommodate transfer students entering campus at the upper-division level. This requirement would also allow us to work collaboratively with other colleges to cross-list and offer relevant courses.

3. **Does your campus support a broader **systemwide** 3-unit Diversity/Social Justice requirement (which would include courses in ethnic studies as well as those that examine race and ethnicity, class, gender, sexuality, religion, spirituality, national origin, immigration status, ability, and/or age)?**

   No. If this proposal implies a substitution for the Ethnic Studies requirement, we do not support it. This substitution would dilute the intent of the AS resolution as well as the law (i.e., AB 1460).

Additionally, we believe that a central aspect of the implementation of the ethnic studies requirement, described in AS-3403-20/AA, is that these courses be defined and approved by faculty from the Ethnic Studies programs and departments. More specifically, approval of ethnic studies courses to meet the requirement must be made by a committee where Ethnic Studies faculty serve as subject matter experts and comprise the majority of the committee members.
The College of Natural Sciences & Mathematics

Our main college feedback is that we oppose legislative interference in our curriculum. In addition, legislative interference regarding who can approve curricula is particularly concerning.

While we consider understanding human diversity an important educational outcome for our students, we are concerned that the overlay of ethnic studies on the GE may create a scheduling problem for our students. This is of particular concern for us as our long sequences of required math and science courses mean that our students need maximum flexibility in choosing GE’s, particularly in sophomore and junior years. While overlay of human diversity courses on GE does not necessarily increase the required units, it does limit scheduling flexibility and would, on occasion forcing our students to take an extra semester for graduation. Based on the chaos we faced with the GE math redesign due to EO1110, we additionally fear that the timeline on these issues will compound the problem.