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March 21, 2022

Robert Horwitz
Chair, UC Academic Senate

Re: (Systemwide Senate Review) Proposed Revision to Senate Regulation 424.A.3

Dear Chair Horwitz,

At its meeting on March 3, 2022, the Executive Board reviewed the proposed revision to Senate Regulation 424.A.3 and the range of divisional feedback. A majority of Executive Board members voted to endorse the proposed revision with the suggestion to consider an on-campus option for first-year students to fulfill the requirement if they could not do so at their high schools and the creation of an independent subject area of ethnic studies.

Sincerely,

Jessica Cattelino
Chair
UCLA Academic Senate

Encl.

Cc: April de Stefano, Executive Director, UCLA Academic Senate
    Shane White, Immediate Past Chair, UCLA Academic Senate
February 24, 2022

To: Jody Kreiman, Chair  
UCLA Academic Senate  

Re: Senate Regulation 424.A.3 - Ethnic Studies requirement for UC admission  

Dear Chair Kreiman,

At its meeting on February 11, 2022, the UCLA Committee on Diversity Equity and Inclusion (CODEI) reviewed and discussed the proposed revision to Senate Regulation 424.A.3, which deals with the addition of an Area “H” Ethnic Studies course to the existing A-G requirements for first year admission to the University.

The proposed revision to 424.A.3 indicates its course satisfaction by a document appended to the proposed revisions, entitled A-G Ethnic Studies Course Criteria, authored by a UC Faculty Workgroup on A-G Ethnic Studies and approved by the BOARS on November 5, 2021. This workgroup included a 6 member writing team of faculty in: History (1), Education (1), Teacher Education (1), Critical Race & Ethnic Studies (1), Ethnic Studies (1), and an undergraduate student. The Workgroup faculty members included 12 faculty and 2 students, in the following disciplines: Critical Race & Ethnic Studies (1), Ethnic Studies (2), Ethnic Studies-Chicano / Latino Studies (1), Chicana/o Studies (2), Native American Studies (1), Asian American Studies (2), African American & African Studies (1), Education (1), and one undergraduate and one graduate student (no major or discipline identified).

The BOARs document outlined the proposed revision to 424.A.3 A-G piggy-backing Ethnic Studies: “At least one-half year of an ethnic studies course among the minimum 15 A-G courses required. High School courses across the A-G subject areas may be eligible for approval for UC’s ethnic studies requirement. Courses focused on a single group as well as courses focusing on multiple groups are acceptable.”

The Course Criteria & Guidance, Course Content Guidelines, and Skills Guidelines are proposed in the appended document from the Workgroup. These latter 3 sections are taken principally from the Ethnic Studies Model Curriculum adopted by the State Dept of Education on March 18, 2021, from the sections on “Defining Ethnic Studies” and “The History of Ethnic Studies,” both of which focus on reductive “commonalities across the four disciplines, and prioritize Race and Racism as the primary motive content of Ethnic Studies.

We should also keep in mind four points about the Model Curriculum: (1) the Ethnic Studies High School Graduation Requirement may be satisfied in one of several ways, only one of them being the piggy-back on A-G subject requirements; (2) the Ethnic Studies Model Curriculum is for K-12 curricular reform that is age appropriate and so for the UC purposes is contextualized within a secondary framework; (3) single group or multi-group courses may satisfy the graduation requirement; and (4) the State curriculum is not the only specification of the course content, as school districts have long adopted similar courses, some of which have been accepted to meet the A-G requirements.

As proposed by BOARS, the Subject Area H-Ethnic Studies is supposed to align with a new ethnic studies graduation requirement for California K-12 without adding to the total number of required courses to the existing A-G pattern. It is useful to compare these to those proposed for the Inter-segmental articulation and transfer requirements to see the similarity. As with the discussion about the Ethnic Studies articulation revisions, we felt that in the spirit of the educational reform intended by the State
that there should be an independent unit (full year course) for the Ethnic Studies requirement, and at a minimum there should be a Recommendation of a one year (unit; course), rather than one semester, given the intent of the Model Curriculum was a K-12 reform, spearheaded by a high school graduation requirement. It would also be in synchrony with the proposed Ethnic Studies Inter-segmental articulation requirements (SR428).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>424.A.3. Specific Subject Requirements</th>
<th>428 Subject Requirements for Inter-Segmental articulation &amp; transfer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The following subject requirements must be satisfied through the completion of approved courses of study as provided in Bylaw 145.B.5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. History/Social Science, 2 units. One unit of world history, cultures, and historical geography; and, one unit of US History or one-half unit of US History and one-half unit of Civics or American government. (Am 17 June 2009)</td>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Mathematics, 3 units. Four are recommended. Must include the topics covered in elementary and advanced algebra and two- and three-dimensional geometry. (Am 17 June2009)</td>
<td>Math Concepts and Quantitative Reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Science, 2 units. Three are recommended. Must provide basic knowledge in at least two of the fundamental disciplines of biology, chemistry, and physics. (Am 17 June2009) (Am 10 April 2019)</td>
<td>Physical and Biological Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Language other than English, 2 units. Three are recommended. Both units must be in the same language. (Am 17 June 2009)</td>
<td>Language other than English proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Visual and performing arts, 1 unit. Must be a single, year-long course in dance, drama / theater, music, or visual art. (Am 17 June 2009)</td>
<td>Arts and Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. College preparatory elective, 1 unit. Additional approved a-f courses beyond the minimum required, or courses that have been approved specifically in the ‘g’ subject area (Am 17 June 2009)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. At least one of the courses used to satisfy the specific requirements of Paragraph A.3.a-g of this Regulation must be an approved course of study (one-half unit) in Ethnic Studies.</td>
<td>1 semester of Ethnic Studies (Defined by the Disciplinary prefix of African American Studies, Chican@ Studies (Latin@ Studies), Asian American &amp; Pacific Islander Studies, or Native American Studies).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The UC has tremendous influence in the high school academic curriculum, and has committed to becoming a Hispanic Serving Institution in all comprehensive campuses. This is the least we can do in
helping the State and its school districts in these curricular reforms. We also suggest BOARs consider an option of treating Ethnic Studies as a subject onto its own (for example being satisfied in Subject Area G: College Preparatory Elective of one unit; course; year) provided the operational definition of Ethnic Studies be the 4 “Foundational Disciplines” mentioned in the Preface to the Curriculum:

“The Ethnic Studies Model Curriculum will focus on the traditional ethnic studies first established in California higher education which has been characterized by four foundational disciplines: African American, Chicana/o/x [sic] and Latina/o/x [sic], Native American, and Asian American and Pacific Islander studies. The focus on the experiences of these four disciplines provides an opportunity for students to learn of the histories, cultures, struggles, and contributions to [US]American society of these historically marginalized [sic] peoples which have often been untold in US history courses. Given California’s diversity, the California Department of Education understands and knows that each community has its own ethnic make-up and each demographic group has its own unique history, struggles, and contributions to our state.” (ESMC, Preface, p. 5)

The Ethnic Studies Model is an attempt at diversifying the curriculum as the state’s enrollment continues to diversify.

### CA Ethnic distribution of public school students: 2019–20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Students Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American not Hispanic</td>
<td>324,496</td>
<td>5.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>30,282</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>575,067</td>
<td>9.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>146,501</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>3,381,198</td>
<td>54.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>27,195</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White not Hispanic</td>
<td>1,381,737</td>
<td>22.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races Not Hispanic</td>
<td>243,372</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None Reported</td>
<td>53,153</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,163,001</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CA Ethnic distribution of public school teachers: 2018–19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Male Teachers (N)</th>
<th>Female Teachers (N)</th>
<th>Total N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>1,579</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4,203</td>
<td>13,664</td>
<td>17,867</td>
<td>5.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>3,458</td>
<td>4,708</td>
<td>1.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>17,756</td>
<td>47,148</td>
<td>64,904</td>
<td>21.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>3,705</td>
<td>8,293</td>
<td>11,998</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (not Hispanic)</td>
<td>49,590</td>
<td>138,639</td>
<td>188,229</td>
<td>61.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races, Not Hispanic</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>2,160</td>
<td>2,985</td>
<td>0.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>3,965</td>
<td>10,310</td>
<td>14,275</td>
<td>4.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82,040</td>
<td>225,430</td>
<td>307,470</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition, especially considering the college preparatory nature of the A-G requirements, there should be a concentration in synchronizing (articulating) with UC lower division courses, and specifically the Introduction to Chicano Studies, African American Studies, American Indian / Native American Studies, and Asian American and Pacific Islander Studies courses, as this is where the Disciplinary Paradigm is initially presented didactically and inductively. These courses are controlled by these departments and will display similarities and differences between the four disciplines, without struggling to "unify" or reductively define them to "common competencies," or the western-centric impulse to “minoritize” or "marginalize" them as the single "other" even as “people of color.” This is also consistent with the Ethnic Studies Model Curriculum: “this model curriculum has been written to include information on the foundational disciplines in ethnic studies, and affords local educational agencies the flexibility to adapt the curriculum to address the demographics and diversity of the classroom. The adaptations should center on deepening or augmenting, rather than scaling down any of the four disciplines.” (ESMC, Preface, p. 5; emphasis added). We should also keep in mind that the State is in the process of developing a Native American Studies Model Curriculum:

An act to add Section 51226.9 to the Education Code, relating to pupil instruction. [Approved by Governor October 9, 2017. Filed with Secretary of State October 9, 2017.] legislative counsel's digest: AB 738, Limón. Pupil instruction: Native American studies: model curriculum. Existing law requires the adopted course of study for grades 7 to 12, inclusive, to include, among other subjects, the social sciences. Existing law requires the State Board of Education, with the assistance of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, to establish a list of textbooks and other instructional materials that highlight the contributions of minorities in the development of California and the United States. Existing law establishes the Instructional Quality Commission and requires the commission to, among other things, recommend curriculum frameworks to the state board. This bill would require the commission to develop, and the state board to adopt, modify, or revise, a model curriculum in Native American studies, and would encourage each school district and charter school that maintains any of grades 9 to 12, inclusive, that does not otherwise offer a standards-based Native American studies curriculum to offer a course of study in Native American studies based on the model curriculum.

Given the demographic changes in the state, it is not out of the question that in the near future, there should be a model curriculum for each of the 4 “foundational disciplines” currently defining Ethnic Studies, replacing or yet again redefining Ethnic Studies as a multiple-ethnic comparative field rather than a forced “single discipline.” With the California population and the student enrollments being overwhelming Chicano@ and Latin@, there is concern that Ethnic Studies not be understood as “one size fits all” by focusing on commonalities, as opposed to BOTH the commonalities as peoples “similarly situated” within the US, AND the uniqueness of each community / people, histories and cultures, as outlined in the section entitled Chapter 1 – “Eight Outcomes of K-12 Ethnic Studies Teaching,” largely based on Carlos Cortés’ (Emeritus Professor, Chicano Studies, UC Riverside) essay “High School Ethnic Studies Graduation Requirement, State of California, Suggested Basic Curriculum Principles,” dated June 26, 2020, which amongst each of the 8 expected or determined outcomes talks about mutual respect and attention to the similarities AND differences between and amongst the four groups. The 8 outcomes are: (1) Pursuit of justice & equity; (2) Working toward greater inclusivity; (3) furthering self-understanding; (4) Developing a better understanding of others; (5) Recognizing intersectionality; (6) Promoting self-empowerment for civic engagement; (7) Supporting a community focus; and (8) Developing interpersonal communication.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>California Total population, 2020 Census</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>39,538,223</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>15,579,652</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not Hispanic or Latino:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White alone</td>
<td>13,714,587</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American alone</td>
<td>2,119,286</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native alone</td>
<td>156,085</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
<td>5,978,795</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone</td>
<td>138,167</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race alone</td>
<td>223,929</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>1,627,722</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Hispanic” Origin by National Origin / Ancestry, California, 2014 (in 000) (CPS)</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>US Born</th>
<th>Foreign Born</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>12,560</td>
<td>85.90%</td>
<td>8,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central American</td>
<td>1,357</td>
<td>6.03%</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South American</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>1.55%</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>2.77%</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Hispanic</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>14,990</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>9,616</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. We support the addition of a seventh subject area H – Ethnic Studies, for the A-G Admissions Requirements. As in our previous discussion on the proposed revisions for the Inter-Segmental Articulation of Ethnic Studies, we discussed the naming of the area as “Ethnic Studies” debatable, but given its use in legislation and CSU organization (e.g., CSU Council of Ethnic Studies), we felt it should not be the point of contention in the discussion. We noted that there is no single definition of Ethnic Studies, and so how it would be defined and satisfied in the transfer curriculum, and we believe this applies to the proposed H subject area in the A-G requirements and the high school graduation requirement, that is more important.

2. When we reviewed the BOARS-2 Inter-segmental Articulation Ethnic Studies revision document the Committee was pleased to see that the Ethnic Studies Subject Area H now carries its own units requirement. We support that the Ethnic Studies Subject Area for Admission (424.A.3) also require independent units, leaving cross-listing an option, to be consistent with recommendations. In addition, especially considering Community College transfers (where admission does not require a high school diploma), the articulation between the University and High School Ethnic Studies courses should prioritize the University lower division courses, specifically the Introduction to Chicano@ Studies, African American Studies, American Indian / Native American Studies, and Asian American and Pacific Islander Studies courses, as this is where the Disciplinary paradigm is initially presented didactically and inductively. These courses are controlled by these departments and will display similarities and differences between the four disciplines, without struggling to "unify" or reductively define them to "common competencies," or the western-centric impulse to minoritize them as the single "other." If there is an “Ethnic Studies” prefix, then a required course content criterion should be that it explicitly cover all 4 major groups reflected as
the subject matter of each of the four foundational disciplines and the unique paradigmatic foundations of each discipline.

3. The four disciplines may also have spoken to Curriculum and Instruction, like Chican@ Studies. Chican@ Studies as Pedagogy involves curriculum as subject matter, and instruction as the interactive process of teaching and learning and its founding document, *El Plan de Santa Bárbara: A Chicano Plan for Higher Education*, speaks to both of these.

From the standpoint of an organized curriculum, Chicano Studies means the formal, institutionalized, and dynamic study of Chicano culture in all of its diversity and unity. (CCHE, 1969:40)

The *Plan* instantiated a basic question in this approach, that the discipline believes still stands today.

A fundamental question to answer in organizing a Chicano Studies curriculum is: should the curriculum focus exclusively on the Chicanos, or on his/her interaction with Anglo institutions? In our view, while the latter focus is unavoidable, the primary focus should be on the Chicano experience. Only in that way can the Chicano understand his/her self, and then the world in which he/she lives. (CCHE. 1969: 41)

This was not an “either-or” question, but a statement of priority, with a rationale in curricular goals and learning theory, and a recognition that anti-Mexican, western-centric schooling creates low self-esteem, negative self-concepts, and an assimilationist destruction of the cultural strengths of our students. This Chican@ Studies pedagogy required both new learning, and repair work.

A Chicano Studies curriculum organizes the Chicano experience, past and present, in accordance with established cultural categories. The unity of Chicano being is based, in large part, on the Chicano heritage or la herencia del ser chicano. La herencia Chicana, as it contributes to the shaping of an individual Chicano’s personality through the living, or experiencing, of Chicano culture, produces dialectically a sense of community. *Thus, in the teaching of Chicano Studies, formal study is designed to influence the student’s personal experience, or identity, and by so doing reveal to him/her, either by showing him/her or eliciting from him/her, the diverse aspects of his/her self and of his/her community.* Chicano Studies should produce, among other things, understanding of one’s self, of one’s people, and of one’s cultural traditions.

It follows that Chicano Studies are not only academic courses, delimited to a purely abstract or rationalistic experience, but rather they encompass much more. Chicano Studies seek to socialize the Chicano student by providing him/her with the intellectual tools necessary for him/her to deal with the reality of his/her experience. *The critical dialectics of Chicano Studies are the individual and culture which produces identity and new culture; the individual and community which produces social action and change.* Chicano Studies mean, in the final analysis, the re-discovery

---

1 Curriculum can be distinguished or studied in 4 ways: (formal curriculum, which is the legally required subject matters in K - 12 schools established by States; Informal curriculum which is what students learn inside and outside of the classroom as a result of the school interactions, climate, culture; Null curriculum, which is generally what is not taught because it is not included in the formal curriculum; and a special case of the null curriculum which is legally termed Compulsory Ignorance which specifies prohibited subject matter in the schools.)
and the re-conquest of the self and of the community by Chicanos. (CCHE, 1969:40; Emphasis added).

Chican@ Studies teaching sought to be different – in content and instruction – implicating a bilingual student, learner-centered pedagogy. Because we tend to teach how we were taught and how we prefer to learn, we have struggled to understand, elaborate, and achieve this goal. California has also adopted English only propositions, and anti-bilingual education laws. Most of us have been taught in our US public schooling entirely in English, through an Anglo, white, Euro-centric curriculum. So, not only do we need to learn about the broader Chican@ history and culture, de la perspectiva nuestra, chicana, that we have been denied in the schools, but also how to most effectively teach in a culturally relevant manner (see Macías, 1974).

Cortés (1973) identified 4 obstacles to the teaching of the Chicano experience in public schools that in large part still continue today: (1) the persistence of stereotypes of Mexicans (and the stereotypes of others as well); (2) inadequate textbooks and curricular materials regarding Chican@s; (3) a general lack of knowledge of the Mexican American past & present; and (4) a rigidity of “traditional” (Anglo-American, Euro-centric) frames of reference for examining the Chicano experience. Cortés (1973:185) identified 5 of these invalid frames of reference: “(1) the idea that U.S. history is an essentially unidirectional east-to-west phenomenon; (2) the attempt to explain the Chicano experience by labeling it ‘just like’ the experiences of Blacks, Native Americans, or various immigrant groups; (3) the view of the Chicano experience as essentially homogeneous, with most Mexican Americans following a single stereotyped historical pattern; (4) the concept of the ‘awakening Mexican American,’ arising from a century-long siesta; (5) the attempt to explain the Chicano experience by presenting a parade of Mexican heroes and individual Mexican-American success stories.” The negative stereotypes and the invalid rigid frames of references are particularly important when we speak of an alternative image and exploratory concepts / frames in Chican@ Studies with la perspectiva chicana.

There were three “correctives” recommended by Cortés (1973) for Chican@ Studies Teaching strategies: (1) Critical analysis applying a chicano perspective/perspectiva chicana as part of a multi-ethnic perspective analyzing, challenging, and attempting to eliminate stereotypes (images), and prejudice (ideas); (2) Selective use of Chicano supplementary materials; and (3) Constant use of local community resources, with strong emphasis on oral investigation (also known as tapping into Chican@ funds of knowledge) (Cortés, Carlos. 1973). The latter was integrated with what became known as Service Learning, and has been known to be successful. The UCLA César E. Chávez Department of Chicana & Chicano Studies, was named in 2006 as the first Engaged Dept at a Research 1 University by the National Campus Compact for the work done in Barrio Service Learning.

Our rationale for this [barrio] service-learning requirement was reinforced as we discovered that the research on service-learning indicated a significant effect on college retention and completion (Bringle & Hatcher, 2002). In addition, we found other benefits had been documented. A national, longitudinal study of more than 22,000 undergraduate students indicated that service participation showed

...significant positive effects on all 11 outcome measures: academic performance (GPA, writing skills, critical thinking skills), values (commitment to activism and to promoting racial understanding), self-efficacy, leadership (leadership activities, self-rated leadership ability, interpersonal skills), choice of a service career, and plans to participate in service after college. These findings directly replicate a number of recent studies using different samples and methodologies. Performing service as part of a course (service-learning) adds

Page 7 of 14
DMS 8
significantly to the benefits associated with community service for all outcomes except interpersonal skills, self-efficacy, and leadership. Positive results for the latter two outcomes were borderline (i.e., p < .05). (Astin, Vogelgesang, Ikeda, & Yee, 2000, p. ii)
(Source: Macías & O’Byrne, 2005:196-197)

Cortés (1973), identified alternatives to the five rigid Anglo-centric frames of reference in his call for teaching:

(1) Use the “Greater America” concept instead of just the east to west approach to US history, that includes an additional southern to north perspective to the “US Southwest.” One must add the notion of a large mexicoyotl culture area covering México and Aztlan contributed in (see Forbes, 1973a, especially the chapter “Mexican approach to US History” which describes a 6,000 year presence, influence, and interactions in the region).

(2) The teaching of the Chicano experience suffers from misguided attempts to describe & explain Chicanos by superficially similar & simplistic experiences of other U.S. ethnic groups, as "just like" those of Blacks, Native Americans, or various immigrant groups. The Chicano experience does have certain similarities with the experience of each of these groups, but there are salient differences which invalidate a simple "just like" approach.

(2.1) Like Blacks, Native Americans, and Asian Americans, but unlike European immigrant groups, Chicanos can rightfully attribute part of their sufferings to racial prejudice.

(2.2) Like Native Americans, but unlike Blacks, Asian Americans, or European immigrants, Chicanos were 1 of the 2 major ethnic groups which established large-scale societies prior to the coming of Anglos, & through military conquest, became aliens in our own land.

(2.3) Like European and Asian immigrants, but unlike Blacks or Native Americans, Chicanos have seen their numbers increased in the 19th & 20th centuries by a flow of free immigration.

(3) “In examining the Chicano experience, the social studies teacher must avoid not only simplistic ‘just like’ depictions, he must also reject another equally convenient, but equally distorting traditional frame of reference – the view of the Chicano experience as essentially homogeneous, with most Mexican Americans following a single stereotyped historical pattern. Instead, the teacher should adopt a third exploratory concept – the great internal diversity of the Chicano experience and the Chicano people.” (p. 188)

(4) “Since the 1846 conquest, Chicanos have established a long activist heritage of resistance against Anglo discrimination and exploitation. Therefore, in examining Chicano-Anglo relations (and they should be examined in social studies classes), the teacher must avoid the trap of using a simple active Anglo (exploiter-discriminator) and passive Chicano (exploited-discriminated against) model. Moreover, although discrimination, exploitation, and resistance are essential aspects of the Chicano experience, they comprise only part of it. These themes should not be permitted to monopolize the study of the Mexican-American past. The Chicano experience is a unique composite of a vast variety of human activities. By using the ‘history of activity’ exploratory concept, teachers can help eradicate the distortions produced by the purveyors of ‘the awakening Mexican American’ and ‘the siesta is over’ image.” (p. 190)

(5) “While applying the ‘history of activity’ concept, the social studies teacher must avoid the limitations of still another commonly used but distorting frame of reference – the attempt to explain the Chicano experience simply by presenting a parade of Mexican heroes and individual Mexican-American success stories.... However, the teaching of the Chicano experience often becomes little more than the display of posters of Emiliano Zapata, Pancho Villa, Benito Juárez, and Miguel Hidalgo or an extended exercise in ‘me too-ism’ – the listing of Mexican Americans who have ‘made it’ according to Anglo
standards. The essence of Chican@ experiences is the masses of Mexican-American people, not heroes nor ‘me too’ success stories. The social studies teacher should focus on these Chicanos, their way of life, their activities, their culture, their joys and sufferings, their conflicts, and their adaptation to an often hostile social environment. Such an examination of the lives of Mexican Americans can provide new dimensions for the understanding of and sensitivity to this important part of our nation's heritage, which cannot be shown by sanitized Chicano heroes or ‘successes’.” (p. 191)

Chican@ Studies teaching also recognizes the different “audiences” represented in our classes.

(1) For many raza students, what Chican@ Studies teaches is about self-education, and requires much reflection. It also serves as a counter-narrative to the negative imaginary stereotypy of Mexicans in the United States. In doing this Chican@ Studies recognizes the diversity of the subject people especially regards Indigeneity, genders, sexualities, and the multilingual promotion of Indigenous languages as well as the colonial languages of Spanish and English in Chican@ Studies.

(2) Chican@ Studies classes are becoming more attractive to non-Raza students. For the non- raza minoritized students, we must provide for the information that will save many of them from the prejudice that often, but not exclusively, arises from the compulsory and willful ignorance imposed by the US school system, understanding the difference in positionality between students of these other Group studies (including other Latin@ subjects) and students who are Anglo-white.

(3) Those who enjoy white privilege today and protect this system – especially if as haters – need to be challenged in our intellectual version of “stand your ground” or, as our version of academic freedom, whether it is teaching bilingually, in Indigenous languages, or about the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo.

This is just one example of the motive forces that established Chican@ Studies departments in the UC, CSU, and Community Colleges in California and throughout the country, and that gave rise to a disciplinary paradigm called la perspectiva chicana. Again, as an example, Chican@ Studies scholarship with a Chican@ perspective, then requires four Necessary Dimensions (History: Historicize; Context: Contextualize, Power: Politicize; and Indigeneity: Indigenize) to reflect la perspectiva chicana. It also must deal with four Big Ideas as it relates to the social control and power distribution in the United States (Race; Class/Political Economy; Culture; and Sex/Gender/Sexuality), equally, holistically, intersectionally, sequentially and cross-currently, all specific to the subject. In combination with three Grand Questions of Who are we? What is our material situation in the world? And What do we do about it? This is paradigmatically called the Chican@ Perspective or la perspectiva chicana of Chican@ Studies.

More broadly, reflecting the history and context of the community educational activism, particularly the 1968 Chican@ high school Blowouts, there were four “legacies:

(1) At the elementary and secondary schooling great energy has been invested in the languages of instruction, as well as language subject areas, in establishing bilingual schooling; culturally relevant & multi-cultural schooling; Spanish for Spanish speakers (or Heritage language instruction) (Macías, 1974; Díaz, 2017).

(2) Chican@ Studies at the three levels of schooling, but especially in colleges and universities, as one of several strategies promoted by Chican@ communities and movement efforts to
improve schooling for Chican@s; to respond to the Walkout demand to “teach our history and culture,” and especially knowledge production.

(3) More radically, the Chican@ community also pursued the development of *alternative institutions* of schooling at the elementary, secondary and tertiary levels (e.g., Valdez, 1974; Macías, et al., 1975). Lastly,

(4) The *diversification* of the teaching force and the professoriate, and the diversification of the student bodies in higher education by increasing the admissions, enrollments, graduation rates, teachers and staff hiring of Chican@s to the general population parity of the school’s service area.

A similar approach could be taken from the point of view of the other groups. The conceptual approach to Ethnic Studies taken by the proposed revision to SR 424.A.3, implies a paradigmatic similarity between the four disciplines, as if they all came to be in the Third World Strike, and deal with the same thing, only differing in the "population" centered in the discipline, which reduces the respective subject "people" to a demographic and returns us to the western centric approach to the study of these peoples as "objects" or "dependent variables" in the US curriculum. As a focus on the subject matters of these four disciplines, their multiple subjectivity is centered as an independent variable in the study, research, and teaching. This is the biggest epistemological difference, for example, between the Social Science study of the "population" and the centering of the people in these four disciplines (e.g., Chican@ "populations"/peoples and Chican@ Studies).

4. There is an added editorial suggestion, consistent with our previous review of SR 428, that Ethnic Studies be *disciplinarily* defined, especially regards course content guidelines. This would mean that the primary term for the disciplinary study of Mexican-origin peoples is Chican@ Studies, and not Latina/o/x Studies. There are specific study areas, and for some, emerging disciplines, in Puerto Rican Studies, Central American Studies, even Latino Studies, but they have different subjects and scopes of study, primacy of concepts, and disciplinary histories. In the disciplinary naming of departments and degree programs, Chican@ Studies is distributed across a much greater number of campuses, and degree programs than the other fields of study, especially in undergraduate academic majors as opposed to minors, across the state and the country. For example, in 2011, there were 28 Community Colleges in California (out of 106), with Chican@ Studies (18), Latino Studies (1), Ethnic Studies (7), and other related fields (2). Chican@ Studies is the only one of these overlapping fields that has over 12 doctoral programs across 8 states as of 2015, and there are more coming on line, partly because the Mexican origin population is also distributed through all the 50 states, and partly because it, like Puerto Rican (Boricua) Studies, has a more than 50 years history in the academy, while Central American Studies, and Latino Studies were created post 2000, and are still trying to get their disciplinary feet on the ground, with campuses sometimes refusing to grant departmental status to them, as happened here at UCLA a couple of years ago when students and faculty demanded a department of Central American Studies, and it was denied by the Chancellors office, and so Chican@ Studies helped incubate a minor in the field in anticipation of its "growth" and possible departmental independence. There should be conceptual clarity between the "populations" centered and the disciplinary departmental organization of these fields. The CSU document proposed revisions that aim to be "Expanding and being more consistent in the use of descriptive language referring to populations and fields." It is certainly appropriate in reference to the populations but much less so to the fields, disciplines, and departments. Chican@ Studies is also related to Indigeneity, which distinguishes the standpoint away from European Colonialists (Hispanics, Latins).
5. This naming and la perspectiva chicana have also been at the center of the compulsory ignorance law in Arizona, which attempted to eliminate Ethnic Studies from the state on the basis that it was teaching hate between groups, but was only targeted and enforced against Chican@ Studies / Raza Studies, it seems because it allegedly was undermining Western Civilization. The federal court litigation that followed the elimination of Chican@ Studies at the Tucson School District (and which was threatening higher education in Arizona), was determined to be unconstitutional by the Court because it was motivated by an impermissible "anti-Mexican animus" (Gonzalez v Douglas, 2017 (August 22), Memorandum of Decision, Case No. CV 10-623 TUC AWT; Acosta v. Huppenthal, 2012).

The ink was hardly dry on the California Ethnic Studies Model Curriculum, when the conservative Californians for Equal Rights Foundation, filed suit against the State for recommending sample lessons from the Tucson, Arizona School District’s highly successful Raza Studies / Chican@ Studies secondary school program.

The Californians for Equal Rights Foundation, which also is fighting local school districts for including what it calls critical race theory, claimed in a lawsuit Friday that the state is violating the Establishment Clause of the state constitution, which prohibits the state from supporting a religion. “Our clients have a religious objection to the Aztec prayer and they do not want their children chanting the Aztec prayer, being asked or pressured to do so, or risking ostracism if they refuse,” wrote Robert Weisenburger, one of the plaintiffs’ attorneys, in a letter to the state superintendent on Aug. 26. The lawsuit, filed in San Diego County Superior Court, calls for the state to remove the alleged Aztec prayer from its model ethnic studies curriculum, which is a nonmandatory, sample ethnic studies curriculum offered by the state.

The lawsuit takes issue with words of affirmation and a chant that the state’s ethnic studies curriculum encourages schools to use. The affirmation is based on “In Lak Ech,” a Mayan philosophy that means, “You are my other me.” The state curriculum includes a reference to a poem that playwright Luis Valdez wrote about In Lak Ech: “You are my other me, if I do harm to you, I do harm to myself, if I love and respect you, I love and respect myself.” The poem is frequently included in ethnic studies programs. (San Diego Union Tribune, 09-09-2021)

A settlement in the case (Californians for Equal Rights Foundation, et al. v. State of California, et al., Case No. 37-2021-00037896) was reached quickly by the California State Dept of Education, removing references to In Lak Ech, and Ashé.

Although state officials denied the lawsuit’s allegations, they agreed to the settlement last week to avoid further litigation costs, according to the settlement agreement. State officials are not admitting any liability. State officials also said in the agreement that they believe the deletions would be consistent with their “long-standing commitment to ensuring appropriate treatment of religion in a secular public education context.” The settlement requires that state education officials notify all school districts, charter schools and county offices of education of the deletions. The state must also refrain from encouraging the use of the affirmations and advise all public schools that none of the model ethnic studies curriculum should be used as a prayer or religious act. The state education department also will pay $100,000 for the plaintiffs’ attorneys fees. In exchange, the plaintiffs will dismiss the lawsuit. (Los Angeles Times, January 18, 2022)

The failure to successfully defend the recommendations in the California Ethnic Studies Model Curriculum by the State indicates a concern regarding their understanding of the content and Chican@ Indigeneity,
particularly their agreement to communicate with the California school districts that they should not use these sample lessons.

Jack Forbes (Professor Emeritus, Native American Studies, UC Davis), a member of the Powhatan nation (which initially greeted the Jamestown colonists in 1607), grew up in El Monte, California, amongst Mexicans, has indicated that he had referenced the US Southwest as “Aztlán” in the early 1960s, before it was popularized in 1969 by the Chicano Movement’s *Plan de Aztlán*. He has written extensively on the Indigenous hemispherically, and has founded several significant Indo-Chicano schools, and the Native American Studies Department at the University of California, Davis. The argument regarding the Indigeneity of Chican@s was made by Jack Forbes (1973) in *Aztecas del Norte*, especially in chapter 2, entitled “The Mexican Approach to US History.”

(1) Mexican approach to US history is a 6,000 year history of Toltecyyotl - Mexicoyotl, or the Mexican influence, cultural diffusion, within the broad cultural area of what is now the US Southwest, Aztlán.

(2) 22 examples of cultural diffusion, pre and post 1609: CORN in bat cave (1370 BC); three sisters (corn, beans, squash); Nahuatl as lingua franca pre christian era, and during colonial period, especially with bilingualism; Architecture; great temple pyramids (Missippian cultures); trade; temple mounds; ceramics; copper ornamentation; metallurgy; mosaic mirrors; painting; mexican style art; religion; clay figurines; etching; religious political outlook of meso-America; socio-political organization; ornaments & tools of stone, pottery, & shell; stone making; sky-scraper monkeys; making ceremonial ball courts; irrigation systems; clothing; copper bell.

(3) “Mexican” prior to 1821, referred to Nahuatl-speaking people, and so to the language; in the 16th century one had to be Nahuatl-speaking to be Mexican, then Aztec or Aztec-related, or under the influence of the Aztecs. Since 1821, it also referred to people of the nation state México, including other non-Nahua peoples (such as Tarascans, Mayas, Mixtecs, Yaquis). (18)

(4) Mexicanization of Spanish & Spaniards, English and Anglo-Americans, linguistically & culturally. (29)

(5) Azteca is a person of Aztlán or the [US] “Southwest.” (13)

(6) Aztecas del norte compose the largest single tribe or nation of Anishinabeg (Indians) found in the US today. (13)

(7) Like other Native American groups the Aztecas of Aztlán are not completely unified or a homogeneous people (Mexican Americans; United Statesians; Chicanos; Mexicanos; Hispanics). But, all have “one common denominator: they all possess Mexican Anishinabeg (Indian) descent to some degree.” (13)

(8) Thus, mexicanismo is ultimately the central core element in the self-definition of all Chicanos, Mexican Americans, Hispanics, and so on.” (13)

(9) A considerable number of Spanish-surnamed people in Aztlán are descended from native “southwestern” Anishinabeg who were enslaved or converted by the Spaniards, or who inter-married with Mexicans. This reinforces the Chicanos’ feeling that they are natives of Aztlán rather than immigrants from México, which sometimes leads to friction with Mexicans who view México as the homeland. (14)

(10) Chicanos or Mexican Americans constitute a significant group for research purposes, especially on processes of universal importance like culture change, acculturation, racial mixture, assimilation, and national liberation.

(11) It is hoped this essay will serve to bring greater recognition to the Mexican aspect of the North American heritage. 6,000 years of influence demand attention, not in some area of foreign
study, but as an integral part of US history. The heritage of Anahuac, in its Indigenous, Hispano-Mexican, modern Mexican, or Mexican American manifestations, is a living part of the past, present, & future of the US. (29)
(Forbes, 1973a)

The education available from each discipline regards each group is necessary for our state policy makers as well as students, and the settlement to this antagonistic lawsuit is an example of the weaning of the curricular content and learner-centered instruction embodied by each of these disciplines, and goes against the intent of the legislation to provide culturally relevant education for all students.

In Texas, the controversy has been mixed. It appears that around 2005, there was a legislative mandate that a Mexican American field of study be formed at each public higher education institution. Mexican American Studies was also included as part of the higher education Common Core Curriculum, in which courses in 2 year and 4 year colleges are assigned the same numbers, content, and credits, allowing for easier transfers to four year colleges. The Texas Foco of the National Association for Chicana & Chicano Studies initiated a campaign in 2015, to establish Mexican American Studies in 100 school districts in the state. Also, in 2015, "The Texas Legislature passed a resolution declaring May 1, 2015, ‘Mexican-American Studies Day’." (Planas, 2015).

At the same time, there has been resistance to Chican@ Studies by the Texas State Board of Education, which has gained some measure of success in restoring the primacy of the western-centric, White-Anglo curriculum in their 1836 Project (Remember the Alamo), and in changing the name of Chican@ Studies to Mexican-American Studies within their high school curriculum framework, and in their articulation efforts between Community Colleges and 4 year institutions which were centered on Mexican American Studies courses in the two segments. In the minds of Texas officials, these naming and definitional "tweaks" were more acceptable to them as they fit the "immigrant frame" within their comfort zone, that Mexicans are just another immigrant group that must assimilate to succeed.

We are not suggesting that Chican@ Studies be the only disciplinary / departmental prefix identified in the Ethnic Studies proposed revisions document. We are strongly pointing out that there are different educational histories of the four disciplines qua groups that beg for individual visibility and respect for their uniqueness within the academic disciplinary pluralism that is being required by the State, and not confused with identity politics of a post racial, post Mexican state of affairs. The California legislation that mandated an Ethnic Studies requirement for graduation, was in part motivated by the Arizona case. The Arizona anti-Mexicanists are following the issue in California, and so the UC should keep this in mind, lest we fall into the same anti-Mexicanism politics as Arizona and Texas, in revising this Admissions requirement. Grounding it across inter-segmental and first year admissions in the four disciplines would provide for greater strength in pursuing this educational reform, as was done when the National Association for Chican@ Studies provided an amicus brief to the litigation challenging the Arizona law.

In consideration of anti-ethnic studies laws in other states, we also recommend BOARS consider an on campus option for meeting this H Subject Area Admission requirement on campus for non-resident students and international students.

6. The CSU Council of Ethnic Studies statement approved by the CSU Academic Senate has much merit, and was fashioned by much discussion and debate and struggles, involving an Ethnic Studies Advancement Task Force that reviewed the history of these departments since their inceptions in 1968 (and as reported in 2017). One of the more difficult topics of discussion was to identify the commonalities
of the four disciplines without reducing, dismissing, or distorting each of their differences and uniqueness, and separate disciplinary histories. This, we believe, is the reason for identifying the departmental prefixes as the indicia for meeting the articulation Ethnic Studies requirement in the CSU. As the four disciplines are distinguishable from each other, it was important to ground the definition of Ethnic Studies in these four disciplines. We suspect these common core competencies will change, be adjusted, and paradigmatically be refined, clarified, within each discipline over time, in order to better consider the use of the term Ethnic Studies, which, in general, has been eschewed at UCLA for over 50 years, because it has been used in the UC system as a way of reducing resources to each discipline, or shifting the central focus of each discipline, or preventing the disciplinary growth through inter-departmental programs, or in other ways redefining and redirecting the growth of the component disciplines withholding departmental status or comprehensive degree programs.

We suggest each of the UC campuses look at Academic Pluralism in assuring there are independent Departments and comprehensive degree programs in each of these disciplines to meet the State's public needs in these areas. In regards the goal of having every UC campus as a "Hispanic Serving Institution" (HSI), this requires consideration of respecting the various fields of study (Chican@ Studies, Central American Studies, Puerto Rican Studies, and Latino Studies) that serve the diverse "Hispanic population" and students, proportionately, respecting the unique case of Mexicans / Chican@s in the state, the region, country, and the northern continent of the hemisphere. This includes consideration of making the UC a bilingual institution in English and Spanish, teacher certification in each discipline in concert with the Bilingual, Culture & Language Acquisition Development (BCLAD) credential already in existence, and expand its epistemology of indigenous languages for language revitalization.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this policy. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at reynaldo@chavez.ucla.edu or the Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Analyst, Lilia Valdez at lvaldez@senate.ucla.edu.

Sincerely,

Professor Reynaldo F. Macias, Chair
Committee on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion
UCLA Academic Senate
February 16, 2022

To: Jody Kreiman, Chair, Academic Senate

From: Li Cai, Chair, Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools

Re: Systemwide Senate Review: Proposed Revision to Senate Regulation 424.A.3

At its meeting on February 11, 2022, the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools (CUARS) reviewed the Proposed Revision to Senate Regulation 424.A.3. The proposed revision involves the addition of at least one-half unit of an Area “H” Ethnic Studies course among the minimum 15 A-G requirements for freshman admission to the University. Area H aligns with a new Ethnic Studies requirement for California K-12 without adding to the total number of required courses in the A-G pattern.

Members recommended that the existing A-G requirements continue to be designated as such, and that the University refrain from using the “Area H” designation to avoid confusion. To better assist counselors and students in understanding the requirements, members encourage the development of explicit guidelines and dedicated resources.

Noting wide gaps in A-G availability across California, some members also commented that the requirement may pose challenges for students and teachers from certain school districts. It was suggested, from a pedagogical standpoint, that the expectation that qualifying courses must fulfill all the content and skills guidelines may be unrealistic. Some members noted that the requirement may further complicate comparisons of applicants applying from states that explicitly prohibit certain content in their Ethnic Studies curricula.

Thank you for the opportunity to opine. If you have any questions, please contact me via the CUARS analyst, Julia Nelsen, at jnelsen@senate.ucla.edu.

CC: Jessica Cattelino, Vice Chair/Chair-Elect, Academic Senate
April de Stefano, Executive Director, Academic Senate
Julia Nelsen, Committee Analyst, Undergraduate Council
Peter Petersen, Vice Chair, Undergraduate Council
Shane White, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
January 21, 2022

To: Jody Kreiman, Chair, Academic Senate

From: Kathleen Bawn, Chair, Undergraduate Council

Re: Systemwide Senate Review: Proposed Revision to Senate Regulation 424.A.3

At its meeting on January 7, 2022, the Undergraduate Council reviewed the Proposed Revision to Senate Regulation 424.A.3. The proposed revision involves the addition of an Area “H” Ethnic Studies course to the existing A-G requirements for freshman admission to the University. Area H aligns with a new ethnic studies requirement for California K-12 without adding to the total number of required courses in the A-G pattern.

While members consider the interest in Ethnic Studies to be important and laudable, several noted that the inclusion of Area H may inadvertently disadvantage non-resident and international student applicants, who would may not be able to meet the requirement at their local schools. Some members pointed out that the requirement appears to mandate high schools to teach curriculum that may not be offered outside of California, and that is in effect illegal in certain states which have banned the teaching of ethnic studies from certain theoretical perspectives (e.g. critical race theory).

Thank you for the opportunity to opine. If you have any questions, please contact me via the Undergraduate Council’s analyst, Julia Nelsen, at jnelsen@senate.ucla.edu.

CC: Jessica Cattelino, Vice Chair/Chair-Elect, Academic Senate
April de Stefano, Executive Director, Academic Senate
Julia Nelsen, Committee Analyst, Undergraduate Council
Peter Petersen, Vice Chair, Undergraduate Council
Shane White, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
December 2, 2021

Dear Colleagues,

I am forwarding for systemwide Senate review the attached revision to Senate Regulation 424.A.3. The revision was proposed by the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) and creates an A-G ethnic studies requirement for freshman admission to the University by adding Area “H” to the existing A-G requirements. Area H asks that at least one course high school students use to satisfy another A-G area be an approved course of study (one-half unit) in Ethnic Studies. The addition of Area H aligns with a new ethnic studies requirement proposed for California K-12 without adding to the total number of required courses in the A-G pattern. High schools will have until 2030 to develop eligible courses.

In addition to draft language for revisions to Senate Regulation 424.A.3, BOARS has approved A-G ethnic studies course criteria and guidelines. The criteria were developed by a faculty workgroup and establish UC’s expectations for Area H.

Please submit comments to the Academic Senate office at SenateReview@ucop.edu by March 22, 2022 to allow us to compile and summarize comments for the Academic Council’s March 30 meeting. As always, any committee that considers these matters outside its jurisdiction or charge may decline to comment.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have additional questions.

Sincerely,

Robert Horwitz, Chair
Academic Council

Cc: Senate Directors
Executive Director Baxter

Encl.
ROBERT HORWITZ, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

RE: A-G Ethnic Studies Requirement

Dear Robert,

Last year, the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) approved adoption of an A-G ethnic studies requirement for admission to the University of California, effective 2030 (enclosure 1). At that time, BOARS also submitted draft language for revisions to Senate Regulation 424, which governs A-G subject areas. The UC Office of the President (UCOP) then convened a UC faculty workgroup of experts in the field to establish academic expectations for such a requirement. At its November 5, 2021, meeting, BOARS approved the enclosed course criteria and guidance for the A-G admission requirement in ethnic studies (enclosure 2).

We ask that both the draft revisions to SR 424 and the proposed ethnic studies criteria should be sent for endorsement via the systemwide review mechanism.

Thank you for your support,

Sincerely,

Madeleine Sorapure
BOARS Chair

Encls.

cc: Members of the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS)
Executive Director Baxter
MARY GAVAIN, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

RE: New Subject Requirement for UC Admission for Graduates of Secondary Schools in California: Ethnic Studies

Dear Mary,

The Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) has consulted with student activists and representatives from the systemwide office of Graduate, Undergraduate, and Equity Affairs regarding a new subject requirement for UC admission for graduates of secondary schools in California which focuses on ethnic studies. As you know, the California State University recently added an ethnic studies requirement for undergraduates, and considerable public interest in expanding ethnic studies curricula exists. After lengthy deliberation, BOARS voted unanimously to amend the California high school subject requirements (Senate Regulation 424.A.3) with a non-additive one-semester course that emphasizes ethnic studies. As the enclosed justification details, this change is intended to better prepare students to engage with the diverse student body at UC and the general California population. It conforms with the spirit of AB 331, and emphasizes that ethnic studies is required, not optional. Because it is non-additive, students will still be able to pursue their specific academic and extra-curricular interests, should they not overlap. The proposal schedules implementation in 2030, allowing all California high schools to develop courses.

Accordingly, we propose the following new subsection to SR 424.A.3:

h. At least one of the courses used to satisfy the specific requirements of Paragraph A.3.a-g of this Regulation must be an approved course of study (one-half unit) in Ethnic Studies.

We ask the Council’s support for this change, and in leading the systemwide review process ahead of ratification by the Academic Assembly. Meanwhile, BOARS will continue to work with GUEA to convene a panel of faculty experts to develop academic standards for articulation.

Feel free to contact us with any questions or concerns.

Thank you,
Eddie Comeaux  
BOARS Chair  

Encl.  

cc: Members of the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS)  
Executive Director Baxter  
GUEA
424.A.3. Specific Subject Requirements

The following subject requirements must be satisfied through the completion of approved courses of study as provided in Bylaw 145.B.5.

a. History/Social Science, 2 units. One unit of world history, cultures, and historical geography; and, one unit of US History or one-half unit of US History and one-half unit of Civics or American government. (Am 17 June 2009)


c. Mathematics, 3 units. Four are recommended. Must include the topics covered in elementary and advanced algebra and two- and three-dimensional geometry. (Am 17 June 2009)

d. Science, 2 units. Three are recommended. Must provide basic knowledge in at least two of the fundamental disciplines of biology, chemistry, and physics. (Am 17 June 2009) (Am 10 April 2019)

e. Language other than English, 2 units. Three are recommended. Both units must be in the same language. (Am 17 June 2009)

f. Visual and performing arts, 1 unit. Must be a single, year-long course in dance, drama/theater, music, or visual art. (Am 17 June 2009)

g. College preparatory elective, 1 unit. Additional approved a-f courses beyond the minimum required, or courses that have been approved specifically in the ‘g’ subject area. (Am 17 June 2009)

h. At least one of the courses used to satisfy the specific requirements of Paragraph A.3.a-g of this Regulation must be an approved course of study (one-half unit) in Ethnic Studies.
Proposal for A-G Ethnic Studies

Proposal

Amend the California high school subject requirements (Academic Senate Regulation 424.A.3), commonly known as A-G requirements, with a non-additive one-semester course that emphasizes ethnic studies:

Require at least one-half unit of an ethnic studies course among the minimum 15 A-G courses. High school courses across A-G subjects may earn an Ethnic Studies designation if they align with UC's ethnic studies course policy, to be determined by a UC faculty ethnic studies workgroup.

Ethnic studies is the critical and interdisciplinary study of race, ethnicity, and indigeneity with a focus on the lived experiences and perspectives of people of color. It centers the knowledge, narratives, and intellectual scholarship of racial or ethnic groups, including how groups define and experience social, cultural, and political forces and their connections to gender, class, sexuality, and other intersections of identity. Ethnic studies provides culturally relevant pedagogy that helps students develop inclusivity by fostering understanding of diversity, connecting students with their community, and giving them the tools to identify and change the institutional structures that perpetuate inequity.

This proposed new requirement is intended to better prepare students to engage with the diverse student body at the University of California and the general California population.

Background

BOARS voted unanimously in November 2020 to amend Academic Senate Regulation 424.A.3 to require ethnic studies for freshman admission. The proposed requirement promotes the importance of ethnic studies without requiring additional A-G courses beyond the minimum 15. It supports that ethnic studies can be taught in all subject areas and allows flexibility in how students may fulfill the requirement.

The proposed A-G ethnic studies requirement aligns with the recently signed AB 101, requiring completion of a one-semester ethnic studies course beginning with high school students graduating in 2029-30. Students can satisfy the ethnic studies high school graduation requirement by completing an ethnic studies course approved as meeting the A-G requirements. California districts such as Los Angeles Unified School District (USD), Compton USD, San Francisco USD, and Santa Ana USD already have ethnic studies graduation requirement policies.

Along similar lines, the California State University (CSU) has already started implementing ethnic studies as required by AB 1460. Starting with the 2021-22 academic year, CSU must provide ethnic studies at all of its campuses. CSU must also include ethnic studies as an undergraduate graduation requirement beginning with the graduating class of 2024-25. To align CSU and UC’s common Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) with the new CSU ethnic studies graduation requirement, UC has proposed and developed criteria for an ethnic studies IGETC subject area in collaboration with CSU.2

A study on California high school students conducted by UC Irvine Professor Emily Penner and Stanford Professor Thomas Dee published in the flagship journal of the American Educational Research Association found that taking ethnic studies had a positive and significantly large causal effect on at-risk students’ academic outcomes, highlighting the importance of culturally relevant pedagogy.3 Along similar lines, a more recent study showed positive longer-term impacts on underrepresented students from taking ethnic studies classes offered in San Francisco USD, including increased measures of engagement throughout high school (e.g., attendance) and the probability of postsecondary matriculation.4 Christine Sleeter and Miguel Zavala’s research on the impact of ethnic studies supports the positive value of ethnic studies for students of color and white students.5 By requiring all future UC applicants to take an ethnic studies course, UC can uplift the outcomes of students of color and change the institutional structures that perpetuate inequity.

Recommendations for A-G Ethnic Studies Course Criteria

A UC ethnic studies faculty workgroup was convened to make recommendations to BOARS regarding course criteria and guidance that will be circulated for UC systemwide faculty review along with BOARS’ proposal for a new A-G ethnic studies requirement. The criteria aim to:

- Establish UC’s expectations for all A-G courses approved for the ethnic studies subject requirement to ensure they embody the foundational values of the field of ethnic studies;
- Shape course content based on guiding principles regarding what A-G ethnic studies courses, teaching, and learning will achieve; and
- Identify the repertoire of skills that students will develop for critical analysis and engagement with, and transformation of, society and the world.

---

2 The IGETC ethnic studies proposal to amend Academic Senate Regulation 478 is undergoing a separate systemwide review process that is expected to conclude by December 2021.


UC’s A-G ethnic studies criteria will ultimately serve as a high-level guiding document for the primary target audience of those preparing and submitting new A-G courses to UC: K-12 ethnic studies educators, high school counselors, and school/district administrators.

**Timeline**
The next steps for the proposal for both the A-G ethnic studies requirement and the course criteria are:
- A 90-day UC systemwide faculty review, providing feedback to Academic Council and BOARS
- Review by Academic Assembly
A-G Ethnic Studies Course Criteria
Approved by BOARS, November 5, 2021

A-G Ethnic Studies
At least one-half year of an ethnic studies course among the minimum 15 A-G courses required. High school courses across the A-G subject areas may be eligible for approval for UC’s ethnic studies requirement. Courses focused on a single group as well as courses focusing on multiple groups are acceptable.

Course Criteria & Guidance
All A-G courses approved for the ethnic studies subject requirement will embody the foundational values of ethnic studies, a field that emerged from grassroots struggle. These values are grounded in the interdependence between holistic humanization and critical consciousness:

● Holistic humanization upholds and manifests the values of love, respect, hope, solidarity, and experiential knowledge of communities of color.
● Critical consciousness is the ability to recognize and understand racialized oppressive social and political conditions and to act to change those conditions.

Courses approved for the ethnic studies requirement will need to satisfy both the course criteria for the relevant A-G subject area and all of the following criteria specifically for ethnic studies:

1. Critically approach histories, realities, and legacies of racism in the content area of the course.
2. Center anti-racism and anti-racist solidarity throughout the course.
3. Center communities of color from their self-determined perspectives, experiential knowledge, culturally sustaining practices, and expertise. Critically examine claims of “objectivity,” “neutrality,” and “freedom from bias.”
4. Examine racialization as a historical and ongoing structural/systemic process.
5. Include as prior knowledge and teach how “race” is a social construct through the history and theory of racial formation.
6. Explain how the teacher will use ethnic studies pedagogy throughout the course.
7. Equip students with the theoretical tools and vocabulary essential to ethnic studies analysis.

Course Content Guidelines
In addition, courses meeting the ethnic studies requirement will address each of the following guiding principles, even if in varying degrees. A-G ethnic studies courses, teaching, and learning will do the following:

CENTER an understanding of Indigeneity, routes, and roots through acknowledgement that the course takes place on stolen, unceded land of ____ Native Peoples and in spaces forged through labor, paid, unpaid, and underpaid. This is taught through anti-racist and anti-colonial liberation, cultural work, self-worth, self-determination, and the holistic well-being of the widest conceivable collective, especially Native people and people of color.

CREATE and honor anti-colonial and liberatory movements that struggle for social justice on global and local levels. Engage in the critical study of struggles, locally and globally, against systems and ideas that attempt to divide and conquer people.
### CULTIVATE

Communities that foster, acknowledge, and value the relationships of Indigenous and all communities of color for their survival. Place high value on Indigenous knowledges, worldviews, and epistemologies, and those of other communities of color.

### CRITIQUE

Histories of imperialism, dehumanization, and genocide to expose how they are connected to present-day ideologies, systems, and dominant cultures that perpetuate racial violence, white supremacy, and other forms of oppressions.

### CHALLENGE

And examine how multiple oppressions and identities intersect (e.g., race, ethnicity, class, gender, culture, nationality, sexual orientation, belief-system, history, language).

### CONCEPTUALIZE

And create spaces that embrace the idea that racial and ethnic groups are not monolithic and model the joy, knowledge, agency, strength, and endurance of Indigenous and People of color communities.

### Skills Guidelines

Because ethnic studies requires that students develop a repertoire of skills for critical analysis and engagement with and transformation of society and the world, approved courses will support them, as critically conscious intellectuals gaining varying levels of mastery, to do the following:

1. Identify, analyze, contextualize, and corroborate sources, with attention to epistemologies, histories, explicit and implicit biases, insider and outsider perspectives of all course materials and objects of study (i.e., books; articles; films; primary documents; artwork; media; websites; archaeological “finds”; scientific and mathematical theories, methods, and “discoveries”; mathematical applications, etc.).

2. Recognize and interrogate power and oppression at ideological, institutional, interpersonal, and internalized levels.

3. Analyze and assess the impact of systems of power and oppression—including empire, white supremacy, white supremacist culture, anti-Blackness, anti-Indigeneity, racism, xenophobia, patriarchy, classism, ableism, belief systems, ageism, anthropocentrism—across race, class, gender, sexuality, disability, and other intersections of identity.

4. Critique dominant narratives of power and their claims to neutrality, objectivity, color-blindness, freedom from bias, and meritocracy in order to examine their harm to Indigenous and other communities of color.

5. Develop leadership, community participation, publicly engaged research, communication, praxis, and other skills to address and dismantle systems of oppression and dehumanization in the many forms in which they appear (i.e., anti-Blackness, xenophobia, ableism, heteropatriarchy).

6. Participate in Indigenous, Black, and people of color-centered histories, knowledge systems, and pedagogical practices that challenge traditional Western educational approaches and practices.

7. Cultivate critical hope, community care, relational accountability, and self-determination for past,
present, and future generations.

8. Nurture community engagement in order to foster anti-racist futures and solidarity across communities.
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