

# **Proposal for a Diversity Requirement within the College of Letters and Science**

Submitted to the Undergraduate Council  
by its Subcommittee appointed to Develop a Diversity Requirement

As Endorsed or Approved by:

CODEO (the Academic Senate Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity); 12-13-02)

Chancellor's Advisory Group on Diversity; 1-22-03

GE Governance Committee; 4-28-03

College FEC; 5-12-03 (for development and faculty vote in AY2003-04)

## **1. Summary**

The following proposes to institute a one-course diversity requirement entirely housed within the recently reformed General Education Program in the College of Letters and Science.\* A careful review of the courses approved for General Education in Spring 2002 indicates that a substantial percentage of courses in both the Arts and Humanities Foundation Area and the Society and Culture Foundation Area carry significant "diversity content" as defined below (although that determination, to be definitive, would have to be made within the framework of GE Governance). On this basis, we believe that this requirement will have little immediate effect on overall student enrollments within the current framework, simply because, on average, students taking General Education are much more likely than not to be already satisfying and even greatly exceeding the requirement. Nevertheless, for reasons detailed below, we believe that instituting what is already current practice at UCLA, as a requirement, is an important step to take at this time.

## **2. Background**

UCLA is currently the only UC campus that does not have a diversity requirement. Nevertheless, our GE curriculum includes one of the most impressive slates of diversity courses currently offered within the UC system, addressing issues of diversity within a wide range of disciplines and across a variety of perspectives. How such courses were developed is succinctly summarized in a document prepared in November 2001 by Karen Rowe (Chair of the Faculty Executive Committee, College of Letters and Science) and Judith Smith (Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education):

In the early 1990s, the Academic Senate opposed establishing a campuswide undergraduate requirement in "American Cultures and Diversity." Instead, a series of resolutions was passed recommending that issues involving ethnic and gender diversity be merged into the existing curriculum. Additionally, the resolutions recommended that an annual report be given to the Academic Senate on university efforts to achieve the goal of incorporating "multiculturalism" into the curriculum (Academic Senate Resolutions of May 18, 1993). The resolutions were not focused specifically on "American Cultures" (thought to be too narrow) but on "multicultural

---

\* The Subcommittee originally proposed a two-course requirement, with the option of an upper-division course, but both the GE Governance and College Faculty Executive Committees voted to support a one-course requirement. The current proposal conforms to the version supported by GE Governance and the College FEC.

interactions” and the student’s ability to analyze concepts and multicultural issues from differing perspectives.

In Fall of 2001, when the reform to General Education was about to be put to a faculty vote, ASAC and other student groups on campus campaigned against the reform on the basis that it did not contain a diversity requirement. The student leadership met with Karen Rowe, David Rodes (Chair, GE Governance), and Raymond Knapp (Chair, Undergraduate Council). Assurances were given to the students at that time that the reformed General Education could easily accommodate a more broadly based diversity requirement than what the students were recommending. Further research, after the reform was approved and implemented, has shown this to be true (see below).

Across a series of meetings in Fall 2002, the Diversity Subcommittee looked carefully at the diversity requirements of other UC schools, and at the various ways diversity has been defined at UCLA and elsewhere. Unsatisfied with many features of the diversity requirements adopted by other UC campuses, we developed our own, following UCLA’s carefully developed language describing diversity (see Section 3 below). In formulating this proposal, we have defined diversity carefully but broadly, and deliberately left the extent of each course’s engagement with issues and perspectives of diversity somewhat vague (“focuses in a central and substantial way”). We believe that this language empowers a committee grounded within each Foundation Area to develop more specific guidelines as necessary, so as to evaluate individual courses and to work with departments who wish to attain diversity standing for particular courses. We also investigated carefully, to be sure that the proposal was practical in its demands; for this, the groundwork had been well-laid by the work of the previous spring.

As part of the process of approving courses for inclusion in the new General Education, sponsoring departments were requested to identify and explain the specific ways each particular course satisfied at least some of the guidelines for General Education at UCLA; among the eight categories listed was “diversity.” As each course was reviewed by the appropriate work group in early 2002, these claims and explanations were carefully scrutinized and confirmed, along with other criteria, through a careful examination of the syllabus. In most cases, the reviewing team gave very clear indication of whether the claims being made seemed justified or not. As part of our committee’s work, each course in the Arts and Humanities Foundation area and Society and Cultures Foundation area was again carefully reviewed, and in a large majority of cases we agreed with the assessment of the work group. The table below summarizes our findings (see also Appendices B and C), detailing how many courses in each category (or, in some cases, across categories) would satisfy the requirement as given later in this report. Note that the committee did not examine the courses in the Scientific Inquiry Foundation area; while some of these probably satisfy the diversity requirement, most would not, so that the potential contributions from this Foundation area would only slightly enhance the findings summarized below.

Courses in the **Society & Culture** Foundation Area (69 courses examined, including 12 cluster courses; 10 courses were unavailable for examination)

- 39 courses (59%) made an obviously good case for meeting the diversity requirement (including 6 cluster courses)
- 17 courses (25%) would need to strengthen the case, but could potentially meet the diversity requirement (including 4 cluster courses)
- 10 courses (19%) probably would not meet the diversity requirement (including 1 cluster course)

Courses in the **Arts & Humanities** Foundation Area (100 courses examined, including 6 cluster courses; 2 courses were unavailable for examination)

- 52 courses (52%) made an obviously good case for meeting the diversity requirement (including 3 cluster courses)
- 35 courses (35%) would need to strengthen the case, but could potentially meet the diversity requirement (including 1 cluster course and 13 English 88 courses)
- 13 courses (13%) probably would not meet the diversity requirement (including 1 cluster course)

Courses listed in **both** Arts & Humanities and Society & Culture Foundation Areas (27 courses; 5 were unavailable for examination)

- 19 courses (70%) made an obviously good case for meeting the diversity requirement
- 8 courses (30%) would need to strengthen their case, but could potentially meet the diversity requirement
- No courses seemed likely to fail to qualify to meet the diversity requirement

Clusters courses in either or both areas (6 full-year courses)

- 9 course credits (56%) made an obviously good case (6 S&C credit & 3 A&H)
- 5 course credits (31%) made a potentially good case (4 S&C & 1 A&H)
- 2 course credits (13%) probably would not meet the requirement (1 S&C & 1 A&H)

In sum, including those courses available for examination, with 27 overlapping courses (not counting cluster courses)

- 60% of the S&C courses already make good cases, with 24% maybes
- 55% of the A&H courses already make good cases, with 36% maybes
- 56% of clusters credits (S&C or A&H) already make good cases, with 31% maybes

Considering that the proposed requirement affects only 10% of the total GE requirement (3 A&H courses, 3 S&C courses, and 4 SI courses), we are well satisfied that the requirement can be easily met within the existing framework, and indeed is probably already being met by the vast majority of students.

### 3. The Diversity Requirement

The diversity requirement helps to ground students in the realities of a multicultural, transnational, global society, and provides tools for studying the complexity of diverse communities defined by characteristics such as race, ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic background, religion, sexual orientation, age, and others. As part of – but not in addition to – the existing General Education requirement, students must take one course in any of the three GE foundation areas (Foundations of Arts and Humanities, Foundations of Society and Culture, and Foundations of Scientific Inquiry) that focuses in a central and substantial way on issues, theories, and methods relevant to analyzing and understanding inter-group dynamics and diversity in its broadest sense. (See Appendix A for proposed modification to Senate Regulations.)

### 4. Rationale

As stated, this requirement is not likely to have any discernable immediate effect on student behavior. Nevertheless, we strongly believe the requirement should be instituted, for central reasons that are at once practical (A) and in accordance with UCLA's stated principles (B), and secondarily to document and institutionalize those principles in a public way (C).

- A. The Undergraduate Council has been charged with the task referenced above, to deliver “an annual report ... to the Academic Senate on university efforts to achieve the goal of incorporating ‘multiculturalism’ into the curriculum (Academic Senate Resolutions of May 18, 1993).” To date, the Council has never done so, in part because it has not seemed practical to review those efforts systematically. Now we have at last done so, at least within those courses recently approved for General Education. Additionally, we have at our ready disposal the means to maintain the high level of engagement with the stated goal of incorporating diversity within the curriculum, by taking advantage of the committee and review structures currently in force for General Education; moreover, this should not appreciably increase the work load of the committees and reviewers involved, since, as noted, committees last spring made credibly accurate judgments concerning this issue as part of their general purview.

Thus, by implementing this proposal and relying on our already existing committee and review structures, the Undergraduate Council will make good on its obligation to monitor diversity within the undergraduate curriculum across an appropriately broad base, without having laboriously to duplicate the work already being done, albeit toward somewhat different ends.

- B. UCLA has long sought to approach the issue of diversity within courses grounded in a particular discipline, as elaborated in the report quoted above. This has seemed to many at UCLA an approach superior—and more appropriately diverse—to that of our sister campuses, which have tended to develop courses focusing more narrowly on diversity as such, less flexibly defined. Thus, diversity as studied in our courses has taken a broad range of perspectives on the issue, and long tended to reflect both UCLA's position within the multicultural society of southern California and the United States' position within the world. It is especially important to address diversity within the university setting that UCLA provides, with not only a diverse faculty and student body, but also an unusually close proximity among its constituent schools.

We have judged diversity to be an important part of the education we offer our undergraduates, who leave UCLA to enter a world torn apart by its inability to manage differences among its constituent populations. Those who enter business and the professions (law, medicine, etc.) are,

according to many studies, better equipped to succeed in today's world if they have studied diversity. Issues of diversity now permeate endeavors of artists as surely as they do the studies of those working in the humanities and social sciences. Scientists and engineers, who ostensibly must focus on matters of material fact, must do so within an increasingly unstable world, making it imperative to consider carefully to what ends their work will be put.

It has occasionally been suggested that diversity is not something that can or should be taught at a university. This line of argument assumes that diversity is largely experiential, that it has no history, no particular modes of discourse, no particular philosophical or psychological ramifications, no particular application within and across disciplines. But, of course, it has all of these things, which can and should be taught. And the job of teaching diversity should be done where it can be done most effectively: at a university, as part of a core curriculum. As with literacy and quantitative reasoning, understanding diversity has become an essential element of an undergraduate's education.

- C. That UCLA has not, like the other campuses in the UC system, developed a diversity requirement has made it particularly vulnerable to the charge that it has remained insensitive to the world around us. Like the view that UCLA has done nothing to “give something back” to Los Angeles—a perception that last year’s “UCLA in Los Angeles” campaign tried to correct—the notion that UCLA does not teach diversity is both false and widespread. Few who campaigned for a diversity requirement in Fall 2001 could have realized just how extensive and broadly based our teaching in this area is; indeed, this committee was itself shocked to discover that extent, as detailed above. In the current political climate, when undergraduate admissions have come under increasing scrutiny over related issues, it is foolish to hide this particular light under a bushel. Moreover, simply pointing out that we do in fact teach diversity will seem to many looking in from the outside (and to many on the inside, as well) to be an evasion, since the established currency in this market has long been a diversity requirement.

We have the opportunity—without increasing ours or our students' workload, without requiring faculty to develop new courses or departments to be penalized for not developing “diversity” courses—to make it clear to everyone that we not only teach diversity, but also teach it within an academically sound framework, within what may well be the most diverse diversity curriculum anywhere.

## **5. Implementation**

Implementation of this requirement, following ratification, will require the following:

- A. a means to identify courses within the current GE offerings that carry diversity content.
- B. after a preliminary discussion of standards within each foundation area, a review of current offerings by GE governance to determine which courses should carry this designation. This process may involve, in some cases, additional discussion with sponsoring departments, who may be asked to provide additional rationale, or, more rarely, to reconfigure the course if they wish for it to carry this designation.
- C. a system for monitoring students' satisfaction of this requirement
- D. some attention to this issue during the review of GE.

## **Appendix A: Proposed Change to Senate Regulation 458D**

The candidate must complete the College general education requirements, which consist of 10 courses (a minimum of 48 units) in the following three foundational areas. One of these 10 courses must be either an approved lower division seminar or second Writing II course in an appropriate foundational area. Additionally, one of these courses must carry diversity credit. The College will publish a list of approved courses that fulfill these requirements. [Previously Amended 11 Feb 02]

**Appendix B: Preliminary Assessment of Diversity Credit for Arts & Humanities Foundation Area**

<b>Good Case Already Made</b>	<b>Further Documentation or Development Needed</b>	<b>Probably Will Not Qualify</b>
Applied Linguistics and TESL 101W		
Art History 50*, 54*, 55A*, 55B, 56A, 56B	57	
Arts and Architecture 10		
Chicana and Chicano Studies 10A		
Chinese 50		
Classics 10*, 20*, 30*, 185	51A*, 51B*, 148	
Comparative Literature 1A, 1B, 1C, 1D, 2AW, 2BW, 2CW, 2DW, 4AW, 4BW, 4CW, 4DW		
Design   Media Arts		10
East Asian Studies 60, 60W, 61*		
English 80, 95C	85, 88A-M, 90	10A, M40
Film and Television 106C, 108, 112	106A, 106B	
General Education Clusters 20 (1A&H), 22 (1A&H) 24 (1A&H)	21 (1A&H)	71 (1A&H)
French and Francophone Studies 14, 14W, 60		
Germanic Languages 56*, 58, 100C*, M122		50B
History 8A*, 8AH*, 9A*, 11A*, 11AH*		

---

\*Also counts for Society and Culture

<b>Good Case Already Made</b>	<b>Further Documentation or</b>	<b>Probably Will Not</b>
-------------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------

	<b>Development Needed</b>	<b>Qualify</b>
Honors Collegium 51		18, 38W, 41W, 60, 76*
Indic 60		
Italian 50B	42A*, 42B*, 50A	
Japanese	50, 60	
LGBTs 114*		
Linguistics 2		1, 10
Music		15
Music History 5, 8, 45, 135A, 135B, 135C, M136, M137*, 150	132, 134	
Near Eastern Languages and Cultures 10, 50B*, 50C, 110	10W*, 50A*, 130	
Philosophy	4, 5, 6*, 7, 8, 22, 22W	1
Russian 99A*	25, 25W, M40*, 99B	
Scandinavian Section 50, 50W		
Southeast Asian Studies 1*, 99		

**Totals:**

Arts and Humanities only:

52 (52%)	35 (35%)	13 (13%)
----------	----------	----------

Cross-Credited (Society and Culture / Arts and Humanities):

19 (70%)	8 (30%)
----------	---------

---

\*Also counts for Society and Culture

**Appendix C: Preliminary Assessment of Diversity Credit for Society & Culture Foundation Area**

<b>Good Case Already Made</b>	<b>Further Documentation or Development Needed</b>	<b>Probably Will Not Qualify</b>
Afro-American Studies 5		
American Indian Studies 10		
Anthropology 9		
Applied Linguistics 101W		
Art History 50*, 54*, 55A*		
Asian American Studies 10, 20		
Chicana and Chicano Studies 10B		
Classics 10*, 20*, 30*	51A*, 51B*, 148	
Communications Studies 10		
East Asian Studies 61*		
General Education Clusters 20 (2S&C), 22 (2S&C), 24 (2S&C)	21 (2S&C), 80 (2S&C)	M1 (1S&C)
Geography 3	4	
Germanic Languages 56*, 100C*	70, 135	
History 1A, 1AH, 1B, 1BH, 1C, 1CH, 2C, 4, 8A*, 8AH*, 8B, 8BH, 8C, 8CH, 9A*, 9C, 9CH, 10A, 10B, 11A*, 11AH*, 13A, 13B, 13C, 20, 21, 22	2B, 9D, 9E, 11B, 11BH	2D, 3A, 3B, 3C, 3CH, 3D
Honors Collegium 147		20, 58, 63, 76*
Italian	42A*, 42B*	
LGBTS 114*		

---

\*Also counts for Arts and Humanities

<b>Good Case Already Made</b>	<b>Further Documentation or Development Needed</b>	<b>Probably Will Not Qualify</b>
Music History 137*		
Near Eastern Languages and Cultures 50B*	10W*, 50A*	
Philosophy	6*	
Political Science	10, 20, 40	
Russian 95A*	M40*	
Sociology	1	
Southeast Asian Studies 1*		
Women's Studies 10		

**Totals:**

Society and Culture only:

39 (59%)	17 (26%)	10 (15%)
----------	----------	----------

Cross-Credited (Society and Culture / Arts and Humanities):

19 (70%)	8 (30%)
----------	---------

---

\*Also counts for Arts and Humanities