

**Report of the
Ethnic Studies Requirement
Review Committee**
July 18, 2002

Table of Contents

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Executive Summary | 2 |
| I. Introduction | 5 |
| A. Committee Members | 5 |
| B. Charge to the Committee | 6 |
| C. The ESR Review Process | 6 |
| II. History of the Ethnic Studies Requirement at UW-Madison | 7 |
| III. Findings and Specific Recommendations | 9 |
| A. Courses | 9 |
| B. Students | 10 |
| C. Instructors | 14 |
| D. Advisors | 16 |
| E. Administration | 17 |
| IV. Conclusion: A Proposal to Revise the ESR | 20 |
| A. Recommendations for Revision | 20 |
| B. Discussion | 20 |
| Bibliography | 22 |
| Appendices | 23 |
| A. Diversity Studies in a Larger Context | 23 |
| B. Survey of Requirements at Other Institutions | 25 |

Executive Summary

The Ethnic Studies Requirement Review Committee (ESRC) has reviewed and evaluated UW-Madison's Ethnic Studies Requirement (ESR). Because the evidence indicates that having such a requirement yields positive academic and campus climate outcomes, we conclude that the requirement should be retained, but with modification. Our recommendations are as follow:

A. Revisions to the requirement

After extensive consideration and deliberation, the committee recommends replacing the existing statement of the UW-Madison Ethnic Studies Requirement with the following:

The University of Wisconsin-Madison is committed to fostering an understanding and appreciation of diversity, in the belief that doing so will:

- better prepare students for life and careers in an increasingly multicultural U.S. environment,
- add breadth and depth to the University curriculum, and
- improve the campus climate.

One of the University's overarching goals is to infuse the curriculum in all disciplines with diversity, including those where traditionally it has been absent. The Ethnic Studies Requirement (ESR) is one of several key elements in reaching this goal. This is a requirement that all students take a 3-credit course that considers ethnic/racial minorities in the U.S. Because issues of ethnic identity and religion are often intertwined and cannot easily be separated, courses that focus on religion may, where appropriate, fulfill the ESR.

All courses that the implementation committee approves as satisfying the requirement must provide evidence that a majority of the course material:

- focuses on the increasingly multicultural aspects of life in U.S. society, and/or
- provides a critical examination of discrimination against ethnic/racial minorities in the U.S., and/or
- focuses on the history, experience, or cultural traditions of ethnic/racial minorities in the U.S.

The committee further recommends that the name of the requirement be changed to better reflect its goals and coverage. The committee suggests the name *Ethnic/Racial Diversity in the U.S.*¹

B. Timing of the Requirement

Students should be encouraged by advisors (and others as appropriate) to fulfill the ESR during their first two years of study. Advisors should work with students to ensure that they choose a course at a level that is appropriate for them.

¹ Please note that although we recommend changing the name of the requirement, for the sake of simplicity we will continue to refer to it throughout this document as the "Ethnic Studies Requirement" (or ESR).

C. Courses and Pedagogy

- Number of courses: The University should expand the number of e-courses available, especially small classes for first-year students. Development of additional ethnic studies courses outside of the ethnic studies programs, as well as outside of Letters and Science should be encouraged.

Furthermore, the University should provide additional faculty lines and resources for ethnic studies departments and programs so that the service they perform in providing courses that satisfy the ESR does not negatively impact their ability to provide strong academic programs for majors and other advanced students.

- Size of courses: While we stress the importance of small e-courses, the University should take steps to ensure that large e-courses have an adequate number of TAs and any other needed support.

- Breadth requirements of e-courses: The University should make it easier for students to take more e-designated courses by making more courses available that also satisfy other undergraduate requirements.

- Development of new courses: The University should provide incentives in the form of funding or teaching releases to develop new e-courses and to allow departments to offer e-courses on a regular basis. Curricular development assistance to instructors could include assistance with syllabus development, consultation about pedagogical methods, etc. The University should also better publicize funding opportunities for course development.

- Pedagogy: Instructors should continue to explore pedagogies that embrace a variety of learning styles. This is especially important in courses that consider potentially controversial and emotionally charged issues like race and ethnicity.

D. Implementation and Administration

- Publicity: To minimize any student frustration and/or misperceptions about the ESR, the University should regularly publicize it to students and the campus community at large, explaining why it exists, what its goals are, and what kinds of courses satisfy it. Explanatory materials about the ESR should be provided to advisors (including SOAR advisors) as well. In addition, the University should implement a systematic method of informing department chairs and instructors about the requirement, the criteria, and the fact that they are offering such a course in much the same way that they currently receive reminders about Comm B and QR B courses each semester.

- Oversight: A faculty or academic staff member with appropriate expertise should be designated as the Ethnic Studies Coordinator for the campus, and should be available to consult with instructors who are interested in developing an ethnic studies course or introducing more

multicultural elements to the curriculum. This person could also be charged with campus education about the ESR and publicizing resources and funding opportunities.

- **Review of e-courses:** We recommend regular periodic review of e-courses at the departmental level. Furthermore, departments and instructors should be advised to review e-courses with the goal of removing the e-designation from courses for majors and other advanced courses, or to add prerequisites to such courses to ensure that only students who are adequately prepared enroll.

- **Implementation of the revised requirement:** A campus-wide Ethnic Studies implementation committee, composed of representatives from undergraduate schools and colleges across campus, should be charged with the job of reviewing existing and new courses for purposes of meeting this requirement. Administrative support for the work of this committee should be housed in the College of Letters and Science as is currently the case for other components of the General Education requirements. L&S would be charged with keeping the list of approved Ethnic Studies courses up to date, informing academic departments and instructors about the ESR on an on-going basis, and working with issues related to course access.

To facilitate implementation of the new guidelines, we recommend that new course proposals be reviewed under the new guidelines as soon as the revised requirement is enacted, and that all current e-courses be allowed to continue to meet the requirement during a transition period.

- **Assessment:** We recommend that the ESR undergo periodic assessment at least every ten years.

I. Introduction

A. Committee Members

In February 2000, Phillip R. Certain, Dean, College of Letters and Science, at the request of Paul Barrows, Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs, appointed a committee to review UW-Madison's ethnic studies requirement (ESR). The members of the committee (hereafter, the ESRC) were:

- Tom Archdeacon (L&S/History)
- Nelson Balke (CALS/Agronomy)
- Stacey Lee (SOE/Educational Policy Studies)
- Consuelo Lopez-Springfield (L&S Administration)
- Monica Macaulay (L&S/Linguistics)
- Cathy Middlecamp (L&S/Chemistry)
- Richard Ralston (L&S/Afro-American Studies)
- Bill Steffenhagen (CALS Administration)
- Nancy Westphal-Johnson (L&S Administration)
- Lydia Zepeda (SOHE/Consumer Science)

Professor Ralston was appointed chair of the committee.

Consuelo Lopez-Springfield was later replaced by:

- Alicia Chavez (Dean of Students)

Student appointees added by the ASM were:

- Rebecca Mueller
- Miriam Hall
- Carl Camacho

Other participants included:

- Eden Inoway-Ronnie (Provost's office), who joined many of our deliberations on a voluntary basis.
- Leah Olson (an undergraduate student), who served as secretary/member for the Committee's meetings.

Professor Ralston went on sabbatical leave in AY 2001-2002, and Professor Balke was appointed as chair. During this second year, the committee consisted of:

- Nelson Balke (CALS/Agronomy)
- Monica Macaulay (L&S/Linguistics)
- Cathy Middlecamp (L&S/Chemistry)
- Bill Steffenhagen (CALS Administration)
- Nancy Westphal-Johnson (L&S Administration)
- Lydia Zepeda (SOHE/Consumer Science)

Student members during the second year included:

- Katrina Flores, a student intern working with Vice Chancellor Barrows, who joined the Committee as secretary/member for Fall 2001.
- Miriam Hall, who continued to attend through Fall 2001.
- Selena Kohel, who was appointed by the ASM in Fall 2001, but was not able to attend until January 2002.

B. Charge to the Committee

The charge to the ESRC as transmitted by Dean Certain derived from UW-Madison Plan 2008, UW-Madison's update of the original 1988 Madison Plan to enhance campus diversity: "Now in our tenth year of the Ethnic Studies Requirement, it is time to step back and evaluate how well we have done, and to determine what needs to be changed to achieve its purpose more effectively. The criteria for defining which courses adequately fulfill the Ethnic Studies Requirement need to be reviewed. The responsibility for developing and offering courses meeting the Ethnic Studies Requirement needs to be spread more evenly across Letters and Science and extended to other Schools and Colleges as well."

C. The ESR Review Process

Dean Certain and Vice Chancellor Barrows expected the ESRC charge would take a minimum of two semesters to fulfill. In fact, it has taken over five semesters to come to a full understanding and appreciation of the many difficult aspects of this issue. From its initial meeting in March 2000 through June 2001, the ESRC held 16 meetings. These included interviews with campus experts (Dean Certain; Professor Bernice Durand, former L&S Curriculum Committee chair; Eden Inoway-Ronnie, UW-Madison academic planner in the Provost's office and student historian of the ESR in Educational Policy Studies; and Andrea-Teresa Arenas, former student member of the Vice Chancellor-appointed Steering Committee on Minority Affairs and currently special assistant in the office of UW System Vice President for Academic Affairs), separate meetings by Chair Ralston with the University Assessment Council and Vice Chancellor Barrows, and consultation with Directors of CIC African-American studies programs in Chicago.

During that first phase, the committee sought assessment funds for surveying and interviewing purposes. On June 14, 2000, then-Provost John Wiley committed \$20,000 for these purposes, and matching funds were provided by the offices of Vice Chancellor Barrows and Dean Certain. The Committee then contracted with the UW-Madison Center for Learning Through Evaluation, Adaptation and Dissemination (hereafter, the LEAD Center), led by project director Baine Alexander, to design a two-stage survey for UW-Madison students taking e-designated courses in Semester II, 2000-01, conduct interviews with faculty, staff, and administrators responsible for implementing the ESR, and provide a written report on the findings.

During Fall 2001 the ESRC met weekly, primarily to discuss various drafts of sections of the LEAD report *University of Wisconsin-Madison's Ethnic Studies Requirement: Enrollment*

Patterns and Instructor, Student, and Advisor Perspectives. Numerous questions arose and further information was requested from LEAD (such as a breakdown of student responses by gender and by class standing). Clarifications of the data, how they were collected, and further calculations permitted the committee to assess the reliability and generalizability of the data. Where questions remained, the committee chose to not use those data to support conclusions. During Spring 2002, the ESRC again met weekly, finalized recommendations, and drafted the final report.

II. History of the Ethnic Studies Requirement at UW-Madison

The Ethnic Studies Requirement grew out of concerns symbolized by an incident in May 1987, in which the Phi Gamma Delta fraternity (known as the “Fijis”) put up a large caricature of an “island native” as part of their “Fiji Island” theme party. The Black Student Union issued a statement denouncing this as racist, and demanding that the University take action to prevent such behavior from recurring. They and several other organizations (the Pacific and Asian Women’s Alliance, the Chicano Graduate Student Organization, and Union Puertorriqueña) formed the Minority Coalition in June of that year.

In July 1987, then-Acting Vice Chancellor Phillip Certain appointed and charged the newly formed Steering Committee on Minority Affairs to examine six areas outlined in his July 15th letter to committee members. The Steering Committee comprised L&S faculty, several graduate and undergraduate students from the schools of Education, Law, and L&S (including members of the Minority Coalition), and academic staff from Engineering, Student Life, Admissions, and Academic Support Services.

The Steering Committee, chaired by undergraduate student Charles Holley, issued what became known as the “Holley Report” on December 1, 1987. Among several recommendations, the Holley Report maintained that “[t]he University must implement a mandatory six credit ethnic studies course requirement; and create and develop various Ethnic Studies Programs. These measures will recognize the contributions of ethnic minorities of American society and promote cross-cultural understanding and respect among the entire student body.” After considering the capacity for the campus to meet such a requirement based on using existing courses, the L&S Curriculum Committee recommended a more broadly defined array of courses that could be used to meet the requirement and reduced the requirement to three credits.

During 1987 another committee, the Faculty Senate Committee on Academic Affairs of Minority/ Disadvantaged Students (MDC), chaired by Professor Truman Lowe, was also working on issues of race and ethnicity. This committee presented and filed its annual report at the November 1987 meeting of the Faculty Senate. Among other recommendations, the MDC report called for creating a list of courses with “an ethnic cultural and human relations focus.” The MDC went on to recommend that “a list of these courses be developed and distributed to appropriate advising units across campus and that all students be advised to include one or more in their undergraduate education” (UW-Madison Faculty Document 725, November 2, 1987).

In February 1988, at the behest of Chancellor Donna Shalala, the Madison Plan was published, Recommendation VII of which proposed an ethnic studies requirement for UW-Madison. The purpose to be served by the addition of this requirement for all undergraduate students was “to help them more easily recognize, understand and appreciate cultural differences.” The Madison Plan also called for the creation of a discrete, multidisciplinary course on “understanding other cultures.” Meanwhile, the UWS administration and other UW campuses were moving along a similar path under a plan called Design for Diversity.

On April 18, 1988, the L&S Faculty Senate adopted a three-credit ethnic studies requirement, as part of the existing breadth requirement for B.A. and B.S. degrees “to be effective for all students entering the College for the first semester of the 1989-90 academic year,” with the following three goals:

- (a) increase students’ understanding of and capacity to value the unique cultural and ethnic backgrounds and contributions of groups not integrated into the mainstream;
- (b) facilitate understanding of what it means to live in a society which may display hostility to the individual on the basis of stereotypes of fundamental, frequently unalterable characteristics of race, religion, sex, or national origin;
- (c) equip students to respond constructively to problems of our increasingly pluralistic American society.

In determining the courses that could be used to satisfy the requirement, the L&S document adopted the following criteria:

- (a) the study of the experience of discrimination by some ethnic, racial, or religious group so affected in American society; or
- (b) the thorough examination of aspects of the culture and historical experience of an ethnic, racial, or religious group that remains on the margin in the United States; or
- (c) the study of discrimination, cultural differences, and ethnicity in other settings in ways which help in the understanding of cultural and ethnic problems in the United States.

During the AY 1988-89, the L&S Curriculum Committee, chaired by Bernice Durand, considered about 150 possible courses being taught or under development to fulfill the ESR. On May 10, 1989, the committee released a list of 95 courses approved as “e”-designated courses, of which 60 were expected to be offered the following year and could enroll 5,500 to 6,000 students. This met the target of accommodating the expected 5,000 first-year students in e-designated courses in a given year. Thus, the three-credit ethnic studies requirement became part of the BA/BS degree requirements in the College of L&S in September 1989.

Other UW-Madison schools and colleges subsequently adopted the L&S ESR and e-designation, except for the School of Education certification programs, which have their own requirements based on Department of Public Instruction code points.

In May 1994, as part of the university-wide General Education requirements, the UW-Madison Faculty Senate approved a three-credit ethnic studies requirement for all incoming

freshmen and transfer students that incorporated the intent and course description contained in the April 18, 1988, L&S Faculty Senate document.

In May 1998, *Plan 2008: Educational Quality Through Racial and Ethnic Diversity* (hereafter UWS Plan 2008) was issued and adopted by the UW Board of Regents. UWS Plan 2008 puts UW-Madison at odds with the type of e-designated course requirement currently recommended for the UW System campuses. UWS Plan 2008 says, “The three-credit graduation or general education requirement for course work in African American, Hispanic/Latino, Asian American and American Indian topics continues unchanged. Courses on international issues, or on topics related to women or to gay, bisexual, lesbian, transgender groups or the economically disadvantaged complement this ethnic studies requirement. They are not substitutes for it. Additional institutional course requirements may also be developed to complement this requirement, thereby enhancing the educational experience for students.” As can be seen by comparison of this to the L&S Faculty Senate criteria listed above, the UW System requirement is considerably more narrow than the UW-Madison one.

III. Findings and Specific Recommendations

Overall, our research shows that the ESR has played a valuable role in increasing awareness of diversity on campus, that students are generally positive about the requirement and the specific course that they take to fulfill it, and that the courses are academically challenging and substantive. Therefore our first recommendation is as follows:²

R-1: The ESR (in some form; see §IV.A) should be retained.

At the same time, the findings indicate that the ESR needs modification and strengthening. This section contains discussion of our findings and recommendations based on those findings, while in the next section we make a proposal for reworking the requirement as a whole. (All recommendations are collected and summarized in the Executive Summary at the beginning of this document.)

Please note that although one of our recommendations is that the name of the requirement be changed. However, for the sake of simplicity we will continue to refer to it throughout this document as the “Ethnic Studies Requirement” (or ESR).

A. Courses

GENERAL: The criteria adopted by the L&S Faculty Senate in 1988 have been followed consistently by the L&S Curriculum Committee in determining which courses meet the requirement. However, as with all other course designations of which we are aware (breadth, Comm B, etc.), the e-designation, once assigned, stays with a course permanently (absent a departmentally initiated de-certification). This creates a risk that after a period of time a given

² Our recommendations are numbered R-1, R-2, etc., for ease of reference. They are collected, reorganized, and summarized in the Executive Summary at the beginning of this document.

course may evolve in such a way that it no longer satisfies the intent of the requirement, but still bears the e-designation. We see several reasons that this might happen, for example: (a) an instructor might make changes to the content of a specific course, (b) a new instructor might take over an existing course, or (c) the course might not be taught for several semesters, resulting in a change of focus or scope when it is brought back into a department's regular rotation. Because of these possibilities, we suggest the following:

R-2: Regular, periodic review of all e-courses should be held at the departmental level.

COURSE AVAILABILITY: It is our impression that space in courses that fulfill the requirement has been consistently adequate, but just barely so. As of June 2001, a total of 189 e-courses had been approved by the L&S Curriculum Committee as meeting the Ethnic Studies Requirement. Of these, 124 e-courses were taught at least once between Fall 1998 and Spring 2001 (LEAD Report, Table 4). Thus, 65 e-courses were not taught during this 3-year period. In AY 2000-01, the 115 e-course occurrences enrolled 7,282 students, but approximately 10,000 close-outs were also reported (this number, we caution, is based on ISIS reports, which were not completely accurate at that time). We address course availability again below.

TIMING: It appears that the original intent of the requirement was that students satisfy the ESR in their first or second year in order to provide a building block for future coursework and to improve campus climate. Of the 124 e-courses taught Fall 1998 – Spring 2001, 36 were open to freshmen, mostly at the 100- and 200-level (LEAD Report, Table 5). However, limitations on course spaces and/or course-taking patterns lead to more upper division than lower division students being registered for e-designated courses (LEAD Report, Tables 18 and 28). Accordingly, we make the following recommendation:

R-3: Students should be encouraged by advisors (and others as appropriate) to fulfill the ESR during their first two years of study, and this should be facilitated by development of sufficient courses (and spaces in those courses) at the appropriate levels.

This recommendation has implications for course availability, advising, and pedagogy. See the Instructors, Students, and Advising sections for further discussion.

DISTRIBUTION: Of the 124 e-courses taught Fall 1998 – Spring 2001, 113 were taught in the College of L&S, and another 7 were cross-listed in L&S (LEAD Report, Table 8). Five other colleges/schools taught 4 or less e-courses. Within L&S, 84 of the e-courses were taught in, or were cross-listed with, one of the five ethnic studies departments/programs (LEAD Report, Table 11). The remaining 40 e-courses were taught in 18 non-ethnic studies departments. Recommendations for more equitable distribution of e-course instructional workload are provided in R-9 and R-10.

B. Students

The LEAD Center was also commissioned to survey students about the Ethnic Studies Requirement. They developed survey instruments to be administered to students in 25 out of the 51 e-courses offered in Spring 2001. The original purpose was to compare responses before and

after taking an e-designated course. However, the construction of some of the questions in the initial survey instrument was problematic, and the end of semester instrument was revised accordingly. Therefore, our recommendations involving students are based mainly on the findings of the (revised) end of semester survey, since comparability of responses was not possible.

Two major caveats are noted by the ESRC in weighing these results. First, a preferred sampling design would have been to sample all 51 courses rather than selecting a subset to sample. The 25 courses do appear to be fairly representative in terms of class size, but we have no data with which to assess how representative they were in terms of instructor or class quality. Second, while females are more likely to be in e-designated courses (57% as opposed to 42% male and 1% unknown), the end-of-semester sample over-represents females beyond this distribution (66% female, 33% male and 1% unknown). That is, females were more likely to respond to the survey than males. Since an analysis of the results by gender show that female respondents tended to be more positive towards the ESR than males, this implies that the results reported reflect a somewhat more positive outlook on the ESR than if the results were weighted to reflect the actual gender composition of the ESR enrollments. In order to overcome these problems, the ESRC felt that only the strongest results from the second survey should be used.

In general, the findings indicate that ESR courses compare favorably to other courses on campus. The majority of students said that e-courses are actually better than average. Specifically, the LEAD Student Perspectives on the Ethnic Studies Requirement [LSPESR] report (Table 65) shows that 55% of the students rated the ESR course they were in as better than average or one of the best, while about 29% said it was average, and only 16% said it was below average or one of the worst. Thus, 84% said that their e-course was average or better. In other words, it would appear—on average—that e-courses improve the quality of students' academic experience at the UW.

In terms of workload, e-courses appear to be similar to other courses on campus (LSPESR, Table 66). 46% of students said that e-courses have an average workload, while 25% said the workload was higher than average. Only 29% said the workload was less than average. Thus, e-courses are not easy credits—they are similar to other courses in terms of academic demands on students.

Students did not report that they had difficulty getting into e-courses; only 8% of those taking their first e-course reported that they took that particular course because it was the only one that they could get into (LSPESR, Table 55).

Students generally had a favorable view of the ESR: 65% of those taking their first e-course were supportive, while about 79% of those having taken prior e-courses were supportive (LSPESR, Table 70). Overall, 83% of first-timers were neutral or supportive, while 94% with prior e-courses were neutral or supportive. In most cases their attitude became even more positive towards e-courses after taking the course. Self-reported changes in attitudes about e-courses at the end of the semester (LSPESR, Table 71) indicate that the majority of students had no change in attitude or were more positive about such courses (84% of first-timers and 95% of those with previous e-courses).

While most students viewed the ESR favorably, a small number were angry or hostile. Their viewpoints showed up most clearly in the comments that they wrote for the end-of-semester survey. About 22% (174/779) of the students included comments, and of these about 18% (31/174) were quite candid in expressing strong negative opinions. Some students called the requirement “unnecessary”, “a waste of time” and/or “absolutely ridiculous”. Others stressed that they would not have taken such a course if they had not been forced to. Some students offered suggestions, such to “monitor those classes VERY closely” to be sure that the intentions of the ESR are being met. Another student pointed out that the class size was too big to get a “deeper sense of the injustices of the world”. While these opinions represent neither the majority of the students nor the majority of the comments, they nonetheless indicate that some degree of student unrest exists in regards to the requirement.

Most of the students felt that the course they took provided them with useful information and skills. Roughly 2/3 of the students said at the end of the semester that the class improved their ability to analyze inequalities based on racial difference (LSPESR, Table 72). The courses on average were somewhat less effective at challenging their assumptions about race or ethnicity and changing their perceptions about race relations in the US; however, the majority did feel the courses accomplished this (58 and 53%, respectively).

The findings also demonstrated a need for the ESR and were indicative that the course fills at least some of that need. Before taking any e-courses, between 43 and 65% of students felt that they had little or no knowledge about different aspects of race relations, or the history, socioeconomic conditions, or contributions of minorities in this country (LSPESR, Table 73). After taking an e-course, the majority of students reported gains in several aspects of awareness. These ranged from 55% reporting gains in knowledge about the cultural and scientific contributions of racial/ethnic minorities in the U.S. to 82% reporting gains in knowledge about the history of one or more racial/ethnic minority in the U.S. (LSPESR, Table 74).

E-courses also appear to have a positive impact on climate. Before and after responses (LSPESR, Tables 77 and 78) indicate that students were more likely to think about ethnic diversity and the experiences of those in a different ethnic group, more likely to talk to their friends about diversity, more likely to seek information, and more likely to interact with people outside their racial/ethnic group after taking an e-course.

Such positive impact on climate reinforces R-2 above: “Students should be encouraged to fulfill the ESR during their first two years of study.”

Given that the students were generally positive towards e-courses, one might question whether it is necessary to have a requirement at all. That is, would students take an e-course without being required to? The survey indicated that the requirement was not necessary for most students, but 29% said that they would not have taken an e-course were it not required (LSPESR, p. 77). Although this is a minority of students, this indicates that nearly a third of the students would not take an e-course if they were not required to. Given the quality of the courses, the need, and the seeming impact, this would not support doing away with the requirement. At the

same time, this also implies that most students do not consider the ESR to be onerous, and most would want to take an e-course anyway.

While the three-credit requirement appears to have positive impact, it does appear that more is better. Comparing those with no prior e-credit and those with prior e-credit, in general the latter group are more positive about e-courses (LSPESR, Tables 68, 70), much less likely to report a negative change in attitude about the ESR over the semester (LSPESR, Table 71), indicate greater gains in skills from the courses (LSPESR, Table 72), and report greater impact on engagement in race/ethnicity related behaviors, implying improvement in climate (LSPESR, Table 77). There is, however, an issue of self-selection in these results, in that only those who wanted to do so took further e-course(s). Thus one cannot necessarily conclude that more is better for *all*. Since the benefits appear to be greater for those interested in taking e-courses beyond the one-course requirement than for those taking their first e-course, one implication is that students should be encouraged to take more e-courses if they are interested, and that impediments to doing so should be removed. We therefore recommend:

R-4: Since most students appear to be positive or neutral towards e-courses, and since the courses yield positive academic and campus climate outcomes, the University should make it easier for students to take more e-designated courses by making more courses available, especially those that also satisfy other undergraduate requirements.

The student questionnaire also included a space for students to write additional comments if they so desired. The LEAD Center's report makes a number of observations based on these comments. They noted that "students varied in their perceptions on whether a requirement for all students was appropriate for a university," adding that "Most students felt that increasing racial/ethnic diversity on campus and reducing prejudice were important issues; however, students differed in the extent to which a requirement of all students could bring about change."

The report also noted that many of the comments were geared towards the specific course that the student took, and said that students "wanted to see more courses in a larger number of departments and schools" and that "some students felt that the offerings of e-designated courses [were] arbitrary." This reinforces R-1, R-3, R-4, and R-10, as laid out above.

The comments also demonstrated that some students were not sure what the purpose or goal of the requirement is.³ For example, a statement along the lines of *'I am not a racist and making me take this class was insulting'* indicates an unfortunate misperception that the requirement is intended to be a "cure" for racism rather than an opportunity for expanding students' horizons. Other comments, however, indicated a good understanding of the reason for the requirement, e.g., *'I loved this course, and the ESR is a good tool for increasing awareness of diversity on this campus. Please strengthen it!'*

The report noted that other students thought, presumably because of the name of the requirement, "that the purpose of the ESR was to study ethnic groups," and several comments objected to the groups chosen for study, reasoning that 'ethnic' does not necessarily mean

³ Due to Human Subjects restrictions, we cannot provide direct quotes. Thus the quotes given are paraphrases of actual comments written by students.

‘minority’, e.g., *‘I liked this course, but why are only some groups (African-Americans, Asian-Americans, etc.) eligible, instead of all groups (Irish-Americans, German-Americans, etc.)?’*

We caution that the issue of self-selection arises again in this section of the report, and so we cannot draw firm conclusions from these comments about trends in student attitudes towards the ESR. Nonetheless, these comments do provide further evidence for R-3 and R-10, as well as for the following recommendations:

R-5: To minimize any student frustration and/or misperceptions about the ESR, the University should regularly publicize it to students and the campus community at large, explaining why it exists, what its goals are, and what kinds of courses satisfy it.

R-6: The name of the ESR should be changed to better reflect its goals and coverage. The committee suggests the name Ethnic/Racial Diversity in the U.S.

R-7: Instructors should continue to explore pedagogies that embrace a variety of learning styles. This is especially important in courses that consider potentially controversial and emotionally charged issues like race and ethnicity.

C. Instructors

The assessment by the LEAD Center included hour-long interviews in Spring 2001 with 21 of the 72 instructors who had taught at least one e-course in Spring, Summer, and/or Fall of 2000. Thirteen of these instructors taught courses that were linked with ethnic studies programs or departments. The sample of 21 included 19 faculty members and two lecturers.

The majority of the instructors who were interviewed by the LEAD Center had very little knowledge about the ESR. Only those who had developed a course specifically for the ESR or who had formally sought ESR approval for a course seemed knowledgeable about the requirement. The remaining instructors had varying degrees of knowledge about the requirement.

Some instructors felt that they should be more informed about the ESR and the criteria for designating a course as satisfying the requirement. These instructors felt that this would improve their teaching and give them a better idea of why students might be taking their course, and how they might best approach it. Others did not feel that they needed to be informed and did not believe that the e-status of their course was relevant to or should influence their teaching in any way.

New instructors sometimes found out about the existence of the requirement and the fact that they were teaching an e-course after the fact and often by accident.

To address the above issues, we recommend the following:

R-8: The University should implement a systematic method of informing department chairs and instructors about the requirement, the criteria, and the fact that they are offering such a course in much the same way that departments and instructors currently receive reminders about Comm B and QR B courses each semester.

In addition, these facts reinforce the need for our first recommendation (R-1), above.

The LEAD Center instructor interviews also explored the impact of the ESR on ethnic studies programs and departments, and challenges faced by instructors in teaching courses that satisfy the ESR. Teaching e-courses was seen as a double-edged sword by instructors in these programs and departments. On the one hand, instructors supported the mission of the requirement; they felt that they were contributing to knowledge and critical thought about ethnic and racial issues, and they could see the benefits of increased enrollments in their courses. On the other hand, teaching so many e-courses was seen as a burden since it consumes so much faculty energy and time, and makes for an overwhelming service requirement for the programs. Instructors also expressed concern that the administration is sending a message that issues dealt with in e-courses are only relevant to ethnic studies departments and programs since the courses are so concentrated there instead of being spread more broadly across the curriculum. Many instructors reported that even in intermediate and advanced level ethnic studies courses intended primarily for majors there are many students taking the course only to fulfill the ESR, and feel this has a negative impact on the level of the course and on the sophistication of discussion possible.

To address these issues, we recommend the following:

R-9: The University should encourage development of additional ethnic studies courses outside of the ethnic studies programs, as well as outside of Letters and Science. This will not only make it evident that the requirement is relevant to many areas of study across the University, but will also relieve some of the burden on ethnic studies programs.

R-10: The University should provide additional faculty lines and resources for ethnic studies departments and programs so that the service they perform in providing courses that satisfy the ESR does not negatively impact their ability to provide strong academic programs for majors and other advanced students.

R-11: Departments and instructors should be advised to review e-courses with the goal of removing the e-designation from courses for majors and other advanced courses, or to add prerequisites to such courses to ensure that only students who are adequately prepared enroll.

Another item of discussion for instructors teaching ethnic studies courses was that those who teach very large e-courses face special challenges and burdens, and feel that their contributions do not seem to be particularly recognized or valued. These instructors also recounted the unique challenges inherent in teaching topics related to sometimes highly sensitive issues of race that many students feel (rightly or wrongly) they already understand. They also discussed the challenges resulting from teaching students with widely divergent academic backgrounds, the

presence of hostile and/or disinterested students, and the relative lack of ethnic diversity in the classes themselves.

To address these issues, we offer the following recommendations:

R-12: Encourage the development of small class opportunities for e-courses, especially for first-year students. This is an opportune time to institute such a recommendation, given the Small Class Initiative and the Freshman Interest Groups.

R-13: Take steps to ensure that large e-designated courses have adequate Teaching Assistants and related support that allows for a positive and beneficial small section experience within these courses.

R-14: Provide curricular development assistance to instructors of e-courses. Such assistance could take the form of release time to develop new courses, assistance with syllabus development, consultation about pedagogical methods, etc. In addition, the University should better publicize funding opportunities for course development such as those offered by the UW-System Institute on Race and Ethnicity.

D. Advisors

Academic advisors at UW-Madison include members of the academic staff, faculty, and in some cases graduate and undergraduate students. Some advisors have served for over a decade; others rotate in and out of the positions. Individual advisors are located in all corners of the campus, including in academic departments, Deans' offices, the Multicultural Student Center, the Athletic Department, the Academic Advancement Program, the TRIO Program, and MAPS. In addition, advisors may be grouped together to carry out a specific function, e.g., the Cross-College Advising Service (CCAS). As a part of CCAS, undergraduate peer advisors are also located in University Housing units.

As one might expect, advisors play a key role in explaining the ESR to students, advising them on when to take an e-course, and helping them to select a course. As they interact with students, advisors may also find themselves in the position of explaining or interpreting specific course requirements. (Some departmental advisors, however, probably have few, if any, conversations with students about the ESR.)

Advisors also serve as a source of grass roots knowledge about the ESR. They are likely to get unsolicited feedback from students about the requirement itself, about any difficulties students experience in enrolling in courses that meet this requirement, and about the nature of the courses that students take. Thus, given both the number of advisors and their day-to-day contact with students, the committee decided to gather information about their experiences and knowledge regarding the ESR.

The LEAD Center conducted a limited survey of advisors, sending a questionnaire to those on a cross-campus email list for advisors and others called the AdvisorLink. Fifty-five of these

individuals responded. Of these, 75% were academic staff, 14% were faculty, and 11% were graduate students. Just over half of the respondents worked for the College of Letters and Science, from which the majority of ESR courses are offered. The other respondents were employed across six other colleges or schools, the Athletic Department, and campus-wide advising programs. The overwhelming majority (86%) advised students at all undergraduate levels.

The LEAD Center's survey showed that advisors learned about the ESR in their training; through UW-Madison, College, School, and departmental materials; from colleagues; and/or from their own experiences as students at UW-Madison. Of the respondents, 63% learned about the requirement through two or more of these sources, and 91% of the advisors surveyed reported that they had an understanding of the ESR goals and/or intent. These respondents were asked their level of agreement with the following statement: "The Ethnic Studies Requirement is achieving its goals." In response, 39% agreed or strongly agreed, 9% disagreed or strongly disagreed, and of particular note 52% were neutral or did not know. These findings have implications for how the ESR is being presented to students.

The survey confirmed that most advisors do explain the ESR (87% said they do so somewhat frequently to very frequently), but that the ones who do explain it do not necessarily explain it to all of their students. Over half of the respondents explained the ESR to their students only when asked to do so. The survey also confirmed that students commonly ask advisors their opinion as to which e-course to take, as well as, "Why is it important to take an ESR course?" and "Why do I have to take any required courses?"

Overall, two issues were troublesome: (1) the lack of knowledge on the part of some advisors about the ESR, and (2) the difficulty that first and second year students have in getting into e-courses. In regard to the former, the LEAD Center reported, "The advisors who responded to our survey vary greatly in their familiarity with the ESR goals and criteria and in their perceptions of the ESR." They called for the criteria and goals of the ESR to be "better distributed, communicated and understood in a common way throughout the UW advising community".

Based on these findings, the ESRC recommends the following:

R-15: The University should regularly provide explanatory materials about the ESR to advisors (including SOAR advisors), explaining why it exists, what its goals are, and what kinds of courses satisfy it.

R-16: Advisors should work with students to ensure that they choose a course at a level that is appropriate for them.

R-17: The University should expand the number of e-courses available. This can be encouraged by providing incentives in the form of funding or teaching releases to develop new e-courses (cf. R-9) and to allow departments to offer e-courses on a regular basis.

E. Administration

As described above, the original UW-Madison Ethnic Studies requirement was adopted by the College of Letters and Science and subsequently adopted individually by all other undergraduate schools and colleges of the UW-Madison campus, except for the School of Education certification programs which have their own requirements based on Department of Public Instruction code points.

Because these requirements were well established at the point when the ESR became part of new University-wide General Education requirements implemented in 1996, no new or changed administrative or curricular structures were put in place to govern the ESR. This was identical to the treatment of the General Education breadth requirements, but markedly different from the structures set up for the Communication and Quantitative Reasoning requirements.

The implementation process for a new ESR should draw upon the procedures adopted for these other General Education requirements, as follow: The first step in that implementation called for the review of many existing courses as well as new courses that were developed specifically to meet the requirements, and so special implementation committees consisting of faculty members from across the campus were set up. Since the volume of course proposals has naturally reduced since the initial implementation, these committees have subsequently been supplanted by one-person faculty liaisons supplemented when necessary by ad hoc committees. Initial approval of courses meeting these requirements is handled within this structure and is outside the purview of the L&S Curriculum Committee. These faculty members are seen as campus resources for developing courses to meet the requirements, and assist students and many campus units with questions related to course placement, transfer credit, and the like.

Ultimate approval for Communication and Quantitative Reasoning courses rests with the University Academic Planning Council; this governance body has designated the College of Letters and Science to serve as trustee for the University-wide General Education requirements. L&S submits an annual progress report and list of course approvals to the Council. L&S has also designated a considerable portion of a senior staff administrative position and part of a support position to oversight of the requirements and has also established a faculty/academic staff advisory body for General Education issues. This structure is similar to the General Education administrative structure in place at many other universities.

Thus, the proposed changes in the ESR (see §IV.A), and the need to expand course offerings beyond Ethnic Studies programs as well as beyond the College of Letters and Science leads us to recommend the following structure for administration of the requirement:

R-18: A campus-wide Ethnic Studies implementation committee, composed of representatives from undergraduate schools and colleges across campus, should be charged with the job of reviewing existing and new courses for purposes of meeting this requirement.

R-19: Administrative support for the work of this committee should be housed in the College of Letters and Science as is currently the case for other components of the General Education requirements. L&S would be charged with keeping the list of approved Ethnic

Studies courses up to date, informing academic departments and instructors about the ESR on an on-going basis, and working with issues related to course access.

R-20: A faculty or academic staff member with appropriate expertise should be designated as the Ethnic Studies Coordinator for the campus, and should be available to consult with instructors who are interested in developing an ethnic studies course or introducing more multicultural elements to the curriculum. This person could also be charged with campus education about the ESR and publicizing resources and funding opportunities.

R-21: To facilitate implementation of these new guidelines, we recommend that:

- (a) new course proposals be reviewed under the new guidelines as soon as the revised requirement is enacted, and
- (b) all current e-courses be allowed to continue to meet the requirement during a transition period.

R-22: We recommend that the ESR undergo periodic assessment at least every ten years.

IV. Conclusion: A Proposal to Revise the ESR

A. Recommendations for Revision

R-23: After extensive consideration and deliberation (as summarized in §IV.B), the committee recommends replacing the existing UW-Madison Ethnic Studies Requirement (as embodied in the motion adopted by the Faculty Senate in 1988) with the following:

The University of Wisconsin-Madison is committed to fostering an understanding and appreciation of diversity, in the belief that doing so will:

- better prepare students for life and careers in an increasingly multicultural U.S. environment,
- add breadth and depth to the University curriculum, and
- improve the campus climate.

One of the University's overarching goals is to infuse the curriculum in all disciplines with diversity, including those where traditionally it has been absent. The Ethnic Studies Requirement (ESR) is one of several key elements in reaching this goal. This is a requirement that all students take a 3-credit course that considers ethnic/racial minorities in the U.S. Because issues of ethnic identity and religion are often intertwined and cannot easily be separated, courses that focus on religion may, where appropriate, fulfill the ESR.

All courses that the implementation committee approves as satisfying the requirement must provide evidence that a majority of the course material:

- focuses on the increasingly multicultural aspects of life in U.S. society, and/or
- provides a critical examination of discrimination against ethnic/racial minorities in the U.S., and/or
- focuses on the history, experience, or cultural traditions of ethnic/racial minorities in the U.S.

B. Discussion

The ESR was put into place in response to a specific event (the "Fiji" episode) on the UW-Madison campus that many found to be racist. Thus the first impetus was for a requirement that would address issues of race and ethnicity as they affected life at UW-Madison. As discussed above, the requirement evolved to cover a much broader range of issues. Specifically, sex and religion were included, and the geographical coverage was widened to include "other settings" which could be interpreted as bearing on issues in the U.S. To some extent this broadening was for purely pragmatic reasons: the committee whose job it was to implement the requirement realized that there simply would not be enough classes to satisfy the narrower statement of it.⁴

⁴ The fact that the original ESR was broadened because of the lack of courses that would satisfy the narrower version supports our recommendations R-4, R-6, R-7, and R-16.

Our recommendation involves a return to the narrower conception of the requirement. This is based in part on our findings showing widespread ignorance about the requirement and its purposes. We believe that the current breadth of the requirement creates a lack of focus and consistency in the realization of its goals. While issues of sex/gender, religion, and disability, as well as international aspects of discrimination are important and fully worthy of study, we have concluded that one 3-credit requirement cannot successfully be called upon to adequately educate students about all of these issues. One size does not fit all in this particular case. We further believe that the narrower version of the requirement which we have recommended above will ensure that students receive a more consistent education, and will better accomplish the goals of the University as stated in UW's Plan 2008.

A second and complementary required course that covers some of the issues omitted in our proposed revision warrants further investigation. While we might view a two course requirement as an ideal solution to the problem of breadth described immediately above, we note three inherent limitations: (1) it is doubtful that enough courses could be developed and enough seats provided to satisfy such a dual requirement, (2) there would be opposition from several schools/colleges on campus; the argument being that the requirements of their professional sequence or major preclude a two-course requirement, and (3) some students who had a negative view of the current requirement did not change their opinion after taking the course; indeed, their attitude toward the requirement tended to become more negative. However, we do not feel that it falls under the purview of this committee to propose a second requirement and so leave the issue for future study.

Finally, we realize that adoption of this revision would initially result in a decrease in the number of courses that satisfy the requirement. However, as has been discussed throughout this report, we believe that our recommendations for a more targeted requirement will make it more effective than the current requirement is, both pedagogically and in creating a more inclusive climate on this campus. This result mitigates any temporary reduction in the number of courses at the beginning of its implementation.

Bibliography

Please note: This list of references is not in any way meant to be exhaustive, but merely cites some of the works that we consulted in reviewing issues that have to do with the ESR.

Banks, J.A. 1996. Multicultural Literacy and Curriculum Reform. In Turner, et al. (eds.), pp. 101-107.

Birkel, Lane F. 2000. Multicultural Education: It Is Education First of All. *The Teacher Educator* 36(1): 22-28.

Chang, Mitchell. 1999. Measuring the Impact of a Diversity Requirement on Students' Level of Racial Prejudice. <<http://www.diversityweb.org/Digest/W00/research2.html>>

Darder, A. 1996. Creating the Conditions for Cultural Democracy in the Classroom. In Turner, et al. (eds.), pp. 134-149.

Dei, George J. Sefa. 2001. Rescuing Theory: Anti-Racism and Inclusive Education. *Race, Gender, and Class* 8(1):139-161.

Housman, Mordechai. 2002. Judaism: Race, Religion, or Ethnicity? <<http://www.beingjewish.com/identity/race.html>>

Hughes, Michelle, Rick Anderson, Julie Harms Cannon, Eduardo Perez, and Helen A. Moore. 1998. Campus Racial Climate Policies: The View from the Bottom Up. *Race, Gender, and Class* 5(2):139-158.

Humphreys, Debra. 1999. The Impact of Diversity on College Students. <<http://www.reznet.com/diversityunltd/articles/article3.htm>>

Lawrence, Vanessa J. 1997. Multiculturalism, Diversity, Cultural Pluralism... *Journal of Black Studies* 27(3): 318-334.

Palmer, Betsy. n.d. The Impact of Diversity Courses: Research from Pennsylvania State University. <<http://www.diversityweb.org/Digest/W00/research.html>>

Payne, Charles R. and Benjamin H. Welsh. 2000. The Progressive Development of Multicultural Education before and after the 1960s: A Theoretical Framework. *The Teacher Educator* 36(1): 29-48.

Turner, C., M. Garcia, A. Nora, & L.I. Rendon (eds.). 1996. *Racial and Ethnic Diversity in Higher Education*. Needham Heights, MA: Simon and Schuster Custom Publishing.

Wright, B. 1996. American Indian studies programs: Surviving the 80s, thriving in the 90s. In Turner et al. (eds.), pp. 170-175.

Appendix A: Diversity Studies in a Larger Context

The ESRC devoted some of its time to reviewing literature on the pros and cons of Ethnic Studies requirements in order to become acquainted with current thinking on the topic. In what follows we briefly discuss a few of the most salient issues covered in that literature. (The bibliography at the end of this report provides our sources. It should not, however, be seen as exhaustive.)

- **HISTORY:** The push for multicultural literacy and curricular reform within the last forty years has been in part a result of the changing demographics of the United States population. The original missions of most schools are no longer adequate for this new population, in that they have traditionally downplayed or even negated the contributions of such populations to U.S. society. Our educational system is also not prepared to handle conflicts which may occur due to these demographic changes, as numerous racial incidents on campuses illustrate.

Civil unrest that occurred in the 1960s and 1970s resulted in the development of ethnic studies courses and departments. The most visible participants of this civil unrest were women and African Americans, who wanted a curriculum that was more inclusive of their histories and achievements. One solution instituted by many college campuses was the ethnic studies course requirement, while another has been an attempt to infuse the entire curriculum (in practice, mainly in the humanities and social sciences) with perspectives from other groups.

- **COVERAGE:** Ethnic studies course requirements (as discussed throughout this report specifically with respect to UW-Madison) are subject to various shortcomings. Particular courses may or may not cover more than one ethnic group. If they only cover one ethnic group, is it realistic to say that the students who took those classes are multiculturally literate? Even if ethnic studies classes do cover a broad spectrum of differences, is it fair to say that students who took them are now multiculturally literate given the short amount of time that was probably allotted to each group? How many groups should be included? Which groups should be chosen, and how are they chosen? Who gets to choose?

- **AGAINST AN ESR:** Ethnic Studies requirements are seen by some as taking away from the already existing curriculum. Those holding this view believe that such courses favor special interest groups, and that a more standard curriculum is generic and all-encompassing. Opponents also claim that ethnic studies courses lack academic rigor and content. Others worry that they could create more divisions than already exist by their focus on particular groups in opposition to others, while yet others believe that such focus actually undercuts an attempt to infuse multiculturalism throughout the curriculum.

- **IN FAVOR OF AN ESR:** Proponents of ethnic studies courses, programs and/or content believe that these are a positive addition to the curriculum that give a more inclusive and accurate look at the history and people who make up U.S. society. Requirements like the ESR can aid in resistance to racist thought and practices. They can also help students to examine their own belief systems as well as to better understand the society they live in and events in that society. Research shows that a welcoming campus climate is a critical factor in recruitment and

retention of minority students, and proponents of requirements like the ESR believe that such requirements improve campus climate.

- **PEDAGOGY:** The point has been made that teachers must be actively involved in creating an environment conducive to differences and similarities inherent in a multicultural classroom. In order for this to be accomplished, teachers themselves must first obtain multicultural literacy. Teachers should acknowledge that the current manner in which education is conducted is not inclusive of the wide array of students contained in today's classroom, and assess their own philosophy of teaching. Teachers should investigate their personal assumptions, prejudices and biases about culture, especially those that may hinder an accurate assessment of students' academic performance or classroom behavior, and should learn more about the communities of the students in their classrooms.

Developing multicultural literacy requires more than learning content knowledge about other groups. Research, service, support organizations, recruitment, retention, teaching strategies, and the classroom environment need to be considered in achieving multicultural literacy. Critical thinking skills should be taught and encouraged.

Appendix B: Survey of Requirements at Other Institutions

A subcommittee of the ESRC (Balke and Hall) reviewed similar requirements at universities belonging to the Consortium of Intercollegiate Cooperation (CIC), which is composed of the Big 10 schools plus the University of Chicago, and the UW-Madison Peer Group of universities. In addition, UW-Stout and the University of Maryland were included, resulting in a total of 18 universities surveyed. Information was gathered from the “Diversity in Higher Education” website (<http://www.diversityweb.org>) and from websites of the individual schools. Comparisons to the current UW-Madison ESR and to the UW-System Plan 2008 ESR in regard to breadth of the requirements were made based on titles of courses listed as meeting a school’s requirement.⁵ A summary of findings follows; more detailed information is included below that.

GENERAL PROFILE: Of the 18 schools reviewed, nine require one course, five require two courses (UW-Stout requires two or three courses, depending on the content of the courses), and four have no requirement at all.

EXTENT OF REQUIREMENT: UW-Madison is one of nine schools which have a diversity requirement for all departments on campus. Of the nine schools which do not have a campus-wide requirement, four require it only for a Liberal Arts degree, one requires it only for a degree in Social Work, and four have no requirement.

SUBJECT MATTER: All schools with a requirement have Race/ Ethnicity (R/E) as their core subject. At over half the schools, courses dealing with Gender (G) or Sexual Orientation (SO) are acceptable, as is Disability (D) at two schools. Therefore, at those universities accepting multiple topics, a student could fulfill the requirement without having taken an R/E course.

TIMING: Of the 14 schools requiring diversity courses, only two (Purdue and UMN-TC) directly encourage taking the courses before the end of the sophomore year. Northwestern makes its diversity requirement a part of its freshman seminar, thereby making it a first-year requirement.

GEOGRAPHICAL EMPHASIS: Five schools require one course emphasizing national diversity. Three additional schools require one course with national and one course with international emphasis. The requirement at six campuses can be fulfilled with courses emphasizing either national or international diversity.

Specific information on a number of universities follows:

Michigan State University’s “Diversity Requirement” is incorporated into its Integrative Studies Requirements. Most courses approved for the Integrative Studies in Arts and Humanities Requirement and the Integrative Studies in the Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences Requirement bear a “diversity designation” of N, I, or D. N identifies courses that emphasize national diversity; I courses that emphasize international and multicultural diversity; D courses that emphasize both. To meet the Diversity Requirement, a student must take a combination of

⁵ Analysis for this appendix is based on website information as of April 2001, and, thus, may not be up-to-date for every school.

Integrative Studies courses with at least one course from two different diversity designation groups.

Ohio State University's "Social Diversity in the U.S." requirement is one component of its "Diversity Experiences" requirement. The other required Diversity Experiences are one course in "International Issues Non-Western/Global Focus" and one course in "International Issues Western Focus (non-U.S.)". Ohio State also has a one-credit, freshman "University Survey" course that contains some "content on living in diverse communities"..

University of Illinois' "Cultural Studies" requirement has two components. A student must take one course in "Cultural Studies: Non-Western/U.S. Minority Culture(s)" and one course in "Cultural Studies: Western/Comparative Culture(s)". However courses meeting the former component are placed into two subcategories: "Non-Western Culture(s)" and "U.S. Minority Culture(s)." Thus, a student can meet the "Cultural Studies" requirement without taking a course in the "U.S. Minority Culture(s)" subcategory.

UCLA appears to be the only UC campus that does not have a diversity requirement. Although debated in the 1990's, the UCLA Academic Senate has repeatedly rejected proposals to enact such a requirement. UCLA's policy since 1993 has been to encourage incorporation of multicultural content in all courses rather than establish a specific requirement. The success of the policy is highly debated.

UW-Stout has a three-tiered categorization of its Ethnic Studies (ES) courses. Category A contains courses pertaining to U.S. minorities. Category B contains courses more broadly related to U.S. culture, including U.S. history, folklore, government, and gender issues. Category C contains even broader courses on topics such as world religions, music, disabilities, and sociology. A student has six options for meeting the ESR:

1. Two ES-A courses
2. One ES-A, one ES-B
3. One ES-A, two ES-C
4. One ES-B, two ES-C
5. Three ES-B
6. Two ES-B, one ES-C.

Thus, either two or three courses must be taken depending upon the categories chosen.

University of Minnesota-Twin Cities requires courses from both its Cultural Diversity (predominantly U.S.) and International categories for BA degrees. In addition, courses from both its Environment and Citizenship Ethics categories are required.

Indiana University requires two courses; either two courses from the "non-western" (U.S. minorities or international emphasis) category, or one "non-western" and one "western" (mostly western civilization) course. Thus, a minimum of one "non-western" course must be taken, but two non-U.S. courses could be taken to fulfill the requirement.

University of Michigan has been very active in development of ESR-type courses. In 1993 faculty incentives for course development were discussed. However, updated information is not available on the Web (www.diversityweb.org, under the school name), so at this time we do not know if any faculty incentive was implemented, or what its results might have been. Michigan has been active in offering faculty workshops for course development, as well as other forms of faculty and student resources tied specifically to curricular change.