Dear Colleagues:

I write in favor of the undergraduate diversity requirement to allow UCLA become the university of all Southern Californians rather than a relic of the past.

I also think that this matter should have remained decided by the College of Letters and Sciences since it affected only their students.

I hope you all will vote in favor.

....Shane Que Hee, Professor, Dept Env Health Sci, Fielding School of Public Health and UCLA Center for Occupational & Environmental Health, Feb 17 2015
Pro statement on the Diversity requirement

Joseph Rudnick
Dean, Division of Physical Sciences

The UCLA Academic Senate has responded favorably to a petition to hold a vote open to all Academic Senate members on the diversity requirement for undergraduates in the College of Letters and Science. In light of this development I would like to explain the basis of my support of the requirement.

The “Foundations of Scientific Inquiry” component of our General Education requirement obliges all UCLA undergraduates to take two courses in the Physical Sciences and two courses in the Life Sciences. In addition, at least one of those four courses must have a laboratory component. This is one of the most stringent of such requirements on any campus of the University of California. There is a reason why we at UCLA take this imperative so seriously. Given the import of many of the most pressing questions that must be addressed by the citizens of this country—including climate change and its effects, the origin and control of various diseases, nuclear power and nuclear arms—a grounding in science and an understanding of the nature of scientific inquiry is an essential component of the education of an informed citizenry. Without this education, our graduates will be ill equipped to distinguish conclusions based on rigorous and repeated testing from unsupported conjectures and wishful thinking. They will not be able to participate properly in the kind of discussion and decision making that is essential to the future of our society.

Similarly, our graduates are now entering a world in which diversity is a fact of life. They can expect to be a part of a workforce consisting of people from a variety of backgrounds, cultures and world-views. If they are unprepared to communicate with, cooperate with and provide leadership to people who do not share their life experiences, then they will find themselves at a profound disadvantage as they make their way through life. Furthermore, our society will be deprived of citizens who are able to engage in the kind of meaningful exchanges that underlie a properly functioning democracy. Just as a proper introduction to the nature of the scientific enterprise is an irreplaceable component of a complete education, an exposure to rigorous scholarship on diversity is essential preparation for life in the world that awaits our graduates.
Pro Statement for the Undergraduate Diversity Requirement

Written 10/27/14

The con argument does not address the importance or rationale for the need for the Diversity Requirement. As much as we would like to believe that UCLA uniformly provides an intellectual and social environment that embraces differences and prepares students for an increasing diverse nation, there is evidence that this is not the case. Some looked at the results of the UC Campus Climate survey and were buoyed by the finding that "75% of all respondents were comfortable or very comfortable with the climate for diversity in their department/work unit/academic unit/college/school/clinical setting, while 10% were uncomfortable or very uncomfortable.” But this means that 1 in 10 people are uncomfortable with the climate for diversity. And guess who those people are? “Underrepresented minority respondents and multi-minority respondents were less comfortable with the overall climate and the workplace climate than were white respondents and other people of color. White respondents were more comfortable with the climate in their classes than were other racial groups.” This means two things – (1) we are not meeting the needs of students from underrepresented groups in creating an inclusive environment, and (2) members of the majority are not recognizing this problem.

Efforts such as the Diversity Requirement are supported by research showing that these pedagogical efforts to promote a scholarly understanding of issues of diversity can improve campus climate and intergroup relations (Chang, 2002; Laird, Engberg & Hurtado, 2005) as well as student well-being (Denson & Chang, 2009) and learning outcomes (Laird, 2005). Thus, not only do we have a moral obligation to students from underrepresented backgrounds to improve campus climate, we also have access to solutions and tools for doing so.

Amended 03/05/15

The petition filed by 59 senate faculty (mostly from well-represented groups) to overturn the previous decisions (of the Legislative Assembly, the Undergraduate Council, and the senate faculty in the College of Letters and Science) is another callous attempt to silence the voices of students from underrepresented groups and the faculty who support them.

Anna Lau
Department of Psychology
PRO STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF THE MOTION

My first reaction when I heard last fall about the new College Diversity Initiative was, “What? What could possibly be the point of another vote when the one we had just two years ago in 2012 had been defeated?”

I thought I understood some of the arguments against the proposal – there already were too many undergraduate course requirements, progress to a degree could be affected, there is no proven value to such courses, it would “force-feed” undergraduates material they have no interest in, it could waste faculty resources and students’ time and money, there is no need since we live in a “post-racial” society. But after reading through the new diversity proposal and doing some research on my own, I found no credible support for any of those suppositions.

A perusal of mass media on any given day reveals the extent to which violence and other conflicts at home and abroad derive from cross-cultural and cross-class assumptions, prejudices and misunderstandings. Among our responsibilities as UCLA faculty is to help diminish narrow, egocentric worldviews that come from a lack of understanding and empathy for people different from ourselves.

A recent article in the Scientific American by Victoria Plaut, “3 Myths Plus a Few Best Practices for Achieving Diversity,” reports on a spate of recent studies demonstrating that “unconscious” racial, ethnic and gender bias can have profound effects on behavior, and that “merely caring about diversity is not enough” to overcome biased thinking. This is why so many U.S. institutions of higher learning, including all of the UCs except for UCLA and UC Merced have diversity course requirements.

But can classroom-based diversity education help ameliorate the sorry state of affairs beyond campus settings? Extensive empirical research shows that courses that introduce undergraduates to diversity concepts and issues contribute
demonstratively to cognitive development, openness to having one’s views challenged, ability to cooperate across differences and work through controversial issues, civic engagement and the amelioration of racial, ethnic and gender-based tensions.

There are more prosaic reasons for our undergraduates to become more cognizant of diversity issues. A 2010 survey by the Association of American Colleges and Universities on the competencies employers seek in recent graduates found a large majority wanted graduates to have “knowledge of human cultures and the physical and natural world.” Furthermore, the National Science Foundation and National Institutes of Health now require that a variety of categories of research proposals specify how diversity will be incorporated or addressed.

As to whether students’ progress to degree will be affected, the diversity initiative proposal indicates that it would not, based on its assessment of demand and seat capacity from nearly 100 syllabi submitted in summer 2014 by interested faculty. In addition, Chancellor Gene Block has committed resources for developing additional diversity-related courses.

In fact, the entire UCLA administration has demonstrated deep support for this initiative. Moreover, the College-wide elected Faculty Executive Committee, the Faculty of the College for Letters and Science, the Undergraduate Council, and the elected representatives of the Legislative Assembly voted it on favorably.

I urge you to do the same and vote for the College Diversity Initiative.

Adapted from “College Diversity Requirement would promote unbiased thinking,” Daily Bruin, posted October 23, 2014.

Browner is a research professor in the Center for Culture and Health of the Semel Institute for Neuroscience and Human
Behavior, and in the Departments of Anthropology and Gender Studies.
Dear Colleague,

I would like to post a statement in favor of the diversity requirement. The college has approved the diversity requirement, because the Moreno report has convincingly shown that there is a difference in experience of the atmosphere on campus between various groups of people. While one person may experience campus life and the interaction between faculty staff and students as cordial, others clearly perceive it as uncomfortable or even hostile. The difference is convincingly linked to whether one is part of a minority or not. Such intangible circumstances are very hard to address, but making students, staff and faculty aware of how group processes work, through history, psychology, or my own field, archaeology, will be an important first step in realizing that these different perceptions are real, and based in tacit, often unconscious biases which we all have. Addressing this explicitly in the class room from a number of different perspectives will help. Now that the full senate is asked to vote, I would argue that senate members in other schools should show their respect and support for the college decision and vote “yes”.

Willeke Wendrich
Joan Silsbee Chair of African Cultural Archaeology
Prof. Egyptian Archaeology UCLA
Dept. of NELC / Cotsen Institute of Archaeology
397 Humanities Building
415 Portola Plaza
PO Box 951511
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1511
+1 310 206 1496
wendrich@humnet.ucla.edu

Director Center for Digital Humanities
Editorial Director Cotsen Institute Press
Editor-in-chief UCLA Encyclopedia of Egyptology http://uee.ucla.edu/
Co-director UCLA Fayum Project http://www.archbase.com/fayum/
Digital Karnak: http://dlib.etc.ucla.edu/projects/Karnak
AEGARON: http://dai.aegaron.ucla.edu/
We urge our colleagues to vote in favor of the diversity requirement for students in the College of Letters and Science. First, it is good for our students’ education and careers. We live in a globalizing world, a defining characteristic of which is that diverse populations encounter one another in increasingly unexpected ways: We see this in the changing nature of our student body. Our students’ ability to navigate society and prosper in their careers will depend on their capacity to negotiate this diversity. Second, as documented in the Moreno Report, UCLA has a poor track record in practicing diversity. The UCLA community remains plagued by discrimination: Some 4,000 of our members have personally experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive and/or hostile conduct related to race, gender or sexual orientation, most recently, very publicly, with the anti-Jewish statements surrounding the recent election to the Undergraduate Students Association Council. California state officials are holding UCLA accountable for its failures in the area of diversity, and now the global readership of the front page of the New York Times are aware of our shortcomings in this regard. Third, almost two thirds of UCLA students want such a requirement—sensing its importance for their education and for the campus climate. Fourth, diversity works: In our own 35 years in the US academy, we have seen again and again how a more diverse student body is a wiser one, when people are willing to engage and learn across difference: Diversity does indeed breed excellence. Fifth, UCLA, a leader in so many ways, is an embarrassing laggard in diversity education, both in the UC system and nationwide. Finally, using an ancient, unrevised and arcane sentence in the university bylaws to potentially reverse the careful and deliberative due process of university governance in an unprecedented way sends the wrong message: That entrenched opponents of diversity are willing to go to any length to prevent it.

Professors Eric Sheppard and Helga Leitner, Geography Department
I’ve spent most of my career documenting the added value of learning in a racially diverse educational environment. When I conducted my first study over two decades ago, I didn’t expect to find anything. Now the research evidence supporting the educational benefits associated with diversity are overwhelming. I know, however, that this evidence is unconvincing for some people. Even for me, it only really hits home in the classroom.

My first academic job was teaching at an institution that was into its third-year of requiring all freshmen to take a course that addressed the dynamics of race in the U.S—a very specific diversity course requirement. I taught one of those courses every semester for two years. I typically began the course with a show of hands of those who were only there to fulfill this requirement—invariably 80% of the students. I ended with a show of hands of those who had learned something revealing and meaningful about the world and society—invariably 100%. Most began the course never having heard of certain landmark U.S. Supreme Court decisions such as "Plessy" and only about half had heard of "Brown." Even fewer had heard of Japanese American Internment in WWII, and still fewer had heard of the Chinese Exclusion Act. They explored this history and considered seriously how it shaped present circumstances. I was shocked by how little they knew and pleasantly surprised by how much one course helped them become more comfortable and facile engaging in these issues.

If the course had not been required, might those students still have learned this history to help them engage our nation’s pressing problems? Perhaps, but this institution chose not to leave it to chance. Instead, it embraced the responsibility to educate students in ways that increased their potential for improving the social and political fabric of our society. Given how scary little students knew when they started the course, I’ve become a strong supporter of such requirements and would urge others to give it a chance. The risks associated with not passing this requirement are much greater than with passing it.

Respectfully,

-MJC-

Mitchell J. Chang, Ph.D
Professor
Higher Education and Organizational Change
University of California, Los Angeles
Graduate School of Education & Information Studies
3127 Moore Hall, Box 951521
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1521
(310)825-0504/office; (310)206-6293/fax
http://pages.gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/chang/
Pro Statement

Vote **YES** because UCLA undergraduate students want a diversity requirement. 63% of UCLA undergraduates have voted in favor of a diversity course requirement, showing strong support for this initiative.

Vote **YES** because UCLA desperately needs to improve campus climate. Climate surveys show 24% of faculty, staff, and students have experienced exclusionary, offensive or hostile conduct based on race, gender or sexual orientation. We must act to change this statistic.

Vote **YES** because extensive peer-reviewed research shows diversity content courses can reduce prejudice and increase civic behaviors. Adding an undergraduate diversity course requirement is a critically important step in helping UCLA improve campus climate, particularly at the undergraduate level.

Vote **YES** because the College of Letters and Science undergraduate curriculum needs to join the 21st century. All UC campuses, except Merced and UCLA, have diversity requirements in their undergraduate curriculum. The School of Arts and Architecture has already adopted a diversity requirement at UCLA.

Vote **YES** because teaching about diversity in higher education is mainstream. The majority of U.S. 4-year colleges and universities have diversity course requirements as part of their undergraduate curriculum. National surveys show 71% of U.S. residents believe diversity education on college and university campuses is important.

Vote **YES** because Corey Hollis, the Director of Academic Advising indicates that the college diversity course requirement will have absolutely no impact on time to degree.

Vote **YES** because Bob Cox, Director of Enrollment Planning and Academic Performance Analysis indicates that there will be more than sufficient seat capacity to launch the requirement beginning with the 2015 freshman class.

Vote **YES** because Executive Vice Chancellor Scott Waugh as stated that adopting the college undergraduate diversity course requirement will have no impact on the funding or any other resources that support existing general educational requirements across the Arts, Humanities or Sciences.

Vote **YES** because overturning the positive votes of the students, Faculty Executive Committee, College Faculty, Legislative Assembly and Undergraduate Council will undermine the foundations of shared governance at UCLA, creating a governance crisis.

Vote **YES** because having faculty from outside the College dictate what College of Arts and Science faculty should teach College undergraduates is anathema to the sacrosanct principle of curricular autonomy of UCLA academic units. UCLA academic units should decide the curriculum for their students without outside interference.

Vote **YES** because Jackie Robinson, Arthur Ashe, Ralph Bunche, Antonio Villaraigosa, Anna Lee-Fisher, Sheila Kuehl, Tom Bradley, Yvonne Brathwaite Burke, have created an enviable legacy of diversity leadership at UCLA. We should embrace, celebrate, and continue their legacy.

Vote **YES** because the College undergraduate diversity requirement was approved through an open, democratic process. Overturning the vote of the students, FEC, Undergraduate Council, College Faculty and Legislative Assembly will cause irreparable damage to UCLA’s reputation, impacting our place of leadership in the Los Angeles community, California, nationally and potentially internationally. UCLA should not be seen as the anti-diversity UC campus.
Dear Professor Garrett,

As Associate Dean of Academic Programs for the Division of Life Sciences in the College of Letters and Science, I am in charge of handling issues and initiatives relevant to our undergraduate curriculum. Consequently, I am familiar with the various requirements and challenges our students face, and am writing you to express my unqualified support for the adoption of an undergraduate diversity requirement in the College. This additional requirement has my strongest endorsement given the fact that the students favor it, and data have demonstrated that exposing students to diversity related issues in their courses leads to a more inclusive and welcoming campus environment. UCLA is out of step with our sister institutions within California and across the nation, most of which have in place some sort of diversity related component within their undergraduate curriculum. I sincerely hope that we can uphold the positive votes that have already been made in favor of the diversity requirement.

Sincerely,

Blaire Van Valkenburgh
Associate Dean of Life Sciences for Academic Programs
Professor, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology
Terasaki Life Sciences 2163
University of California, Los Angeles
610 Charles Young Dr. E
Los Angeles, CA 90095-7239
ph. (310) 794-9398  fax (310) 206-3987
email bvanval@ucla.edu
Dear Professor Neal Garrett,

This is a pro statement, in favor of the college undergraduate diversity requirement. Diversity education is standard in the UC system, and standard nationwide, and in fact, the College Faculty and Legislative Assembly already voted to approve it.

In addition, as you are undoubtedly aware, UCLA has been featured multiple times prominently in the national news recently, with unflattering headlines about discrimination on many different levels: by students, by faculty, by staff and by administrators. (Just yesterday UCLA was featured on the front pages on the New York Times regarding discrimination). Multiple and extensive studies have shown that diversity education works, reducing prejudice and increasing civic behaviors. It seems clear we as a campus will benefit from diversity education.

Sincerely,
Pamela Yeh
Assistant Professor
Ecology and Evolutionary Biology
UCLA
Dear Secretary of the Division, Professor Neal Garrett, and the UCLA Campus Faculty:

The Statement below is pro the establishment of the undergraduate diversity requirement in the College.

As the former Chair of the Undergraduate Council in the UCLA Academic Senate for two years in 2009-2011, I observed firsthand the critical importance of enhancing diversity on the campus at all levels. In 2015, I now strongly support and am very much pro the establishment of the undergraduate diversity requirement in the College. It is now time to make this important curriculum change on the UCLA campus happen. Please join with me and vote pro the establishment of the undergraduate diversity requirement in the College.

Sincerely,

Joe Watson

Joseph B. Watson, Ph.D.
Associate Dean, Graduate Division
Professor of Psychiatry and Biobehavioral Sciences
David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA
58-258B Semel Institute for Neuroscience
760 Westwood Plaza
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1759
jwatson@mednet.ucla.edu

IMPORTANT WARNING: This email (and any attachments) is only intended for the use of the person or entity to which it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged and confidential. You, the recipient, are obligated to maintain it in a safe, secure and confidential manner. Unauthorized redisclosure or failure to maintain confidentiality may subject you to federal and state penalties. If you are not the intended recipient, please immediately notify us by return email, and delete this message from your computer.
I write in enthusiastic support of an undergraduate diversity course requirement in the College of Letters and Sciences. I enthusiastically voted in support of this in the College-wide vote and I urge others to vote in the Campus-wide vote. My reasons are as follows.

First, our students WANT an undergraduate diversity requirement. If there’s anything I’ve learned while working with our talented undergraduates is that we should listen to them. They’ve been telling us for years that they believe we need an undergraduate diversity requirement. The need for this, and indeed the need for them to tell us this, became even more clear after the publication of the Moreno report.

So, second, I believe that UCLA NEEDS an undergraduate diversity requirement because I believe that this sort of curriculum could favorably improve climate issues on campus. This diversity requirement need not be onerous or increase time to completion. Indeed, detailed analyses have shown that existing courses can fulfill the requirement. Of course, once initiated, additional courses will be developed. Since College students are expected to take GE courses from different divisions, such a requirement need not increase time to completion.

Third, I believe that it is a mark against UCLA that all other UC campuses (excluding Merced) have a diversity requirement. At UCLA, the School of Arts and Architecture has a diversity requirement. Thus, the UCLA College—the unit that trains the vast majority of our undergraduates—stands pretty much alone in the UC system in not having one. This is, frankly, embarrassing. It gets even worse when one compares UCLA to other 4-year colleges in the United States, the majority of which have diversity requirements. In a time when we realize the value and economic benefits of diverse workplaces, by not having a diversity requirement, UCLA is failing to prepare our students to thrive in the workforce. A diversity requirement is a first step towards addressing this serious lacunae and preparing our students to thrive.

Finally, I believe that the process by which this positive College vote was taken to the entire campus for a re-vote is flawed. The University should not be able to reverse a College decision. UCLA units, all of them, must have the autonomy to make curricular decisions relevant to their units. The role of other academic units should be advisory not regulatory. Thus, by bringing this to a full university vote, I believe that the spirit of self-governance is violated.

In conclusion, I support the College Diversity Requirement because it is wanted, needed, and it will not be onerous. UCLA stands alone in not having one. Reversing a positive College vote would send a clear and chilling message to our campus community, and indeed world, that UCLA doesn’t care about diversity and is failing to address climate issues that were raised in the Moreno report. And, it would send an equally chilling message about curricular autonomy (or the lack of it) that our units have. Voting no on this would be a sign of disrespect to College faculty and students. Voting yes on this would be a sign of support and respect of College faculty and students. I urge all to join me and vote yes on this important issue.
Daniel T. Blumstein
Professor & Chair
Department of Ecology & Evolutionary Biology
Professor Institute of the Environment & Sustainability

621 Charles E. Young Drive South
University of California
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1606

Phone: (310) 267-4746
Fax: (310) 206-3987

Blumstein Lab: http://www.eeb.ucla.edu/Faculty/Blumstein

The Marmot Burrow: http://www.marmotburrow.ucla.edu/

Marmot Minutes (blog): http://marmots-ucla.blogspot.com/

Professor of Sociology Aaron Thompson, and co-author (with Joe Cuseo) of a book on *Diversity and the College Experience*<http://www.usnews.com/education/blogs/professors-guide/2009/08/12/why-does-diversity-matter-at-college-anyway> lists eight reasons why diversity is important in college: According to Thomson, it 1) Expands worldliness; 2) Enhances social development; 3) Prepares students for future success; 4) Prepares students for work in a global society; 5) Increases knowledge base (“research consistently shows that we learn more from people who are different from us than we do from people that are similar to us”); 6) Promotes creative thinking; 7) Enhances self-awareness; 8) and enriches the multiple perspectives offered by [...] education. These are all legitimate and compelling reasons, supported by research.

But what this brief glimpse into Thompson & Cuseo’s work does not show is what happens when diversity is not “taught.” When diversity is not taught, when critical thinking is put on hold, and not vigorously exerted to understand difference, we become distracted, we tend not to listen, and we tend not to see. It is easier to see and understand people who are like “us.” It is more comforting, certainly, and less challenging, to listen to old, familiar, reassuring “truths.” And it is also much more dangerous.

Since the Moreno Report came to our Graduate Council table last year (I was then Chair of GC), I have been pondering how frantically and anxiously we try to reassure ourselves that incidents like the ones brought up in the Moreno Report are “only” “isolated” incidents. When colleagues point out again and again, that in “their” unit, in “their” Division, these things don’t happen, I am torn between feeling happy (for them, and for us), and remaining utterly unconvinced: in order for even “isolated” incidents to happen, there needs to be a breeding ground, insidiously, invisibly (not quite) growing and thickening. If we don’t see it, it is because our eyes are not as open as they should be, and then our voices are not as loud as they could be, and our minds cannot be as alert as we need them to be. Worst still, by closing our eyes, and lowering our voices, and mollifying our intellects, we do the same thing to the eyes, voices, and intellects of students. When students come to our campus, it is our moral and
intellectual responsibility to vigorously shake the complacent fundamentals of (pseudo)knowledge, a knowledge often precariously built upon sameness, instead of resting firmly on difference. Students themselves know that, to their credit, and that is why they have fought long and hard for a diversity requirement. I see all the “technical” and administrative difficulties that come along with instituting a wide-reaching curricular measure, who would not? But, frankly, against the towering background and crucial need for a campus proudly diverse, inclusive, and tolerant, technicalities are just that. Peruvian writer Ciro Alegría wrote a novel with a wonderful title: *El mundo es ancho y ajeno, Broad and Alien is the World*. And it will save us.

Maite Zubiaurre,
Professor in Spanish & Portuguese and Germanic Languages;
Associate Dean of Diversity and Inclusion, Division of Humanities,
UCLA
Dear Professor Neal Garrett,

I am writing in favor of the Undergraduate Diversity Requirement. Studies have long shown that being well educated in a traditional sense it not a good predictor of bias or prejudice with regard to race, ethnicity, culture, sexual orientation, etc. Exposure, however, is a major indicator and usually has a positive impact on increasing acceptance of and decreasing prejudice against diversity. In this sense, a diversity requirement at UCLA would mainly serve the purpose of exposure. Encouraging public service could also aid this as well.

Furthermore, the college has already voted in favor of this requirement, and the majority of undergraduates favor it. The new vote is because a small group of faculty have cited a never before used bylaw. It is shocking that over the past few decades, the first time a matter would be viewed as important enough to activate this bylaw is the goal of blocking a diversity requirement.

Finally, it has been well studied and investigated how to implement this requirement through existing courses and without increasing the course load or burden on students. Given the extensive examples of prejudice at UCLA that range from undergraduates to faculty over the past few years, I would favor the diversity requirement either way, but I would feel badly if it increased the burden on the students. The fact that it will not increase the burden on the students eliminates the only realistic road block in my mind.

I hope UCLA enacts a diversity requirement and joins the many other UC campuses and colleges across the nation that already do have one. Given UCLA’s recent track record, it would be a further embarrassment to overturn an already approved diversity requirement and would be a victory who want to deny the realities of prejudice. On the positive side, encouraging diversity would harken back to UCLA’s rich history of inclusion and help improve our leadership in research, scholarship, teaching, and as a civic example.

Van Savage
Associate Professor
Dept. of Biomathematics
Dept. of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology UCLA
Dear Professor Garrett,
As a professor in the French and Francophone Studies department and as a member of the Diversity Committee of the Humanities Division, I am voting strongly in favor of the Undergraduate Diversity Requirement in the College of Letters and Science. Since I was hired in 2006, I had the opportunity to consider not only how diversity matters on campus but also how knowledge about diversity in the classroom became necessary. In a world where post-colonial theory and terrorism studies have gained considerable ground, it is our duty, as mentors, to foster discussion about the values of diversity and the danger of racism, sexism, or any kind of discrimination. The Undergraduate Diversity Requirement is a great opportunity not only to participate in a vibrant intellectual debate but to improve the climate on campus, where too many problems remain, as the Moreno report recently showed.
Sincerely,

Laure Murat
Professor
University of California-Los Angeles
Department of French and Francophone Studies
212 Royce Hall, Box 951539
Los Angeles
CA 90095-1539
Tel: (310) 869 3478
Fax: (310) 825 9754
http://www.french.ucla.edu/index.php/people2/faculty?id=15
Dear Professor Garrett,

As a member of the UCLA Faculty Senate, I am writing with the strongest possible support for the proposed undergraduate diversity requirement for the UCLA College of Letters and Science.

In brief, it is clear that UCLA students themselves want to include diversity training in their curriculum, which is a critically important educational objective which UCLA therefore needs, and as such has become the standard both throughout the University of California and across colleges and universities nationwide. UCLA can implement a College undergraduate diversity requirement without increasing the time-to-degree, and must do so immediately to catch up with the rest of the modern academic society.

Furthermore I feel that it is imperative that the College have the autonomy to determine their curricula without interference from other divisions. It is regrettable and embarrassing that this vote has been called and needs my attention at all. It would be a disaster if the College-approved undergraduate diversity requirement were to be reversed. I would urge you to find a path to remove this arcane and damaging Senate bylaw.

Yours sincerely,

Mark Frye

Professor, Department of Integrative Biology and Physiology, UCLA College of Letters and Science

Professor, Department of Neurobiology, David Geffen School of Medicine

--

Mark Frye
Howard Hughes Medical Institute
UCLA
https://www.ibp.ucla.edu/research/frye/index.htm
Dear Professor Garrett:

Please add this statement to the materials submitted in support of the College’s diversity requirement.

College campuses are the primary venue in which young people in the United States first come face to face with the many differences that define Americans as a nation: our multiplicity of racial, cultural, religious, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds; our variety of sexual orientations and gender identities; our socioeconomic distinctions; our political convictions; and the whole host of other identifications that make us individuals. In the era of online courses and online degrees, the experience of actually going to college with very different people—studying together, living together, playing together, organizing together—remains a crucial form of preparation for civic life. Diversity is one of the things that makes the university what it is.

College campuses are also the place where young Americans (and their international classmates) begin to be politically active in ways that can have far-reaching implications. As USAC’s recent misguided discussion of Rachel Beyda’s candidacy for the Judicial Board reminds us, our students are emphatically still learning basic lessons about representation, civil debate, and the responsibilities of acting in the public sphere. As Chancellor Block has pointed out in his February 24 statement, “Even in the heat of debate, we must cultivate the skill and sensitivity to express opinions without belittling others or losing sight of their humanity.” The cultivation of such skills is one of the key functions of a college education, and one of the few redeeming virtues of the USAC episode is that it has occasioned a moment of real reflection on the nature of civil debate. To repeat a cliché, it has become a teachable moment.

If the university experience is defined in part by the way it exposes young people to diversity, and if one of our aims as educators is to cultivate debate that is both vigorous and civil, then we must consider the possibility of building a sustained exposure to diversity into our curriculum. After many years of consideration and repeated efforts at curricular reform, the faculty of the College have now voted in favor of instituting a modest diversity course requirement for the 85% or so of UCLA undergraduates who take their degrees in the College. While it is impossible for a public school like UCLA to require more intensive experiences of the world beyond a student’s hometown—experiences like mandatory period of study abroad, for example—it is well within our abilities to push students beyond the comfort zone of their own background and their own career goals. True, no student required to take a diversity course will automatically become a sensitive negotiator of cultural differences or master of code-switching; but it is likely that many students who would otherwise miss the chance to see the world from different perspectives
will be inspired by their diversity courses and will take from them lessons with lifelong benefits.

In writing this statement I represent only my own point of view. Still, based on my experience as dean of Humanities I can point out that the division offers hundreds of courses on the diverse languages, literatures, art, and music of the world, and that our corporate and philanthropic sponsors emphasize again and again the importance of having college graduates who are employable not simply for narrow vocational skills but for the human skills they acquire in such courses: their ability to recognize others’ needs, their ability to communicate across frontiers, their ability to learn from one another and to adapt. If you believe in improving UCLA as an educational institution and preparing our students better for the global, versatile lives they are to lead, then you must respect the curricular decision the faculty of the College have made.

Please vote in favor of allowing the UCLA College curriculum to reflect the vote of College faculty and—even more important—to reflect the rich diversity of our students and of the world they are about to enter.

Sincerely,
David Schaberg

David Schaberg 史嘉柏
Dean of Humanities
Professor, Asian Languages & Cultures
UCLA
By Jerry Kang, Professor of Law, Professor of Asian American Studies, Associate Provost
Korea Times-Hankook Ilbo Endowed Chair

**The Core Concern: Political Correctness**

Those who oppose the diversity requirement have raised various objections, but the core concern is that a particular ideological or political orthodoxy is being forced upon undergraduates.

**It's not about Political Correctness but Getting Smarter**

If this were true, I too would be concerned. But I think that's a fundamental misunderstanding, which all sides should reject. The requirement isn't that students must think a particular way. Instead, we the faculty are deciding that issues of equity, diversity, and disparity are worth studying widely. In other words, we are setting pedagogical priorities—-that in modern Los Angeles and California, a graduate of an elite public university should have rigorously grappled at least once with such issues.

**Consider How Much We Don't Know**

This pedagogical priority might seem inane if we had absolutely nothing new to learn. But there's so much we don't know. To take just one recent example, FBI Director James Comey identified "unconscious bias" as one cause of the different ways that certain Americans are treated by the police. But do we even know what that means?

What does it mean to be "unconscious"? Is that an allusion to Freud? Is it the same as "implicit"? If bias is unconscious, how do we measure it? What's a "bias" anyway? Is it animus or hate? Is it merely an attitude or a stereotype about social groups? Do we still call it a bias if the stereotype is complimentary? Should it be called a bias if it's probabilistically "accurate"? By the way, how do we pick the proper reference group? And does such "accuracy" guarantee legality or ethicality?

I could go on at similar length about other topics such as the social construction of race, cumulative disadvantage, intersectionality, microaggressions, structural racism, stereotype threat, the factors of balkanization, forward-looking versus backward-looking defenses of affirmative action, etc.

**Worthy Intellectual Work**

My basic point is that there's plenty of hard stuff here worthy of serious critical inquiry by our students. Disparity, inequality, intergroup conflict, and injustice pose some of the toughest challenges of our time. Think Ferguson today. Remember Los Angeles in 1992. Unfortunately, as citizens, we aren't very good at talking about these issues. Shouldn't a great public university "up our game" on
that front? For me, the diversity course requirement does just that, which is good enough reason to
earn my vote.

Jerry Kang  |  UCLA Professor of Law | Professor of Asian American Studies
Korea Times – Hankook Ilbo Endowed Chair | Associate Provost
kang@law.ucla.edu | http://jerrykang.net
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Pro Statement
Vote Yes and Approve the College Undergraduate Diversity Requirement

As we consider the issue of whether to adopt a diversity requirement for students of the College of Letters and Science, our most important concern must be whether and how the change would advance the university’s primary purpose: Education. I draw on the wisdom of several thinkers, from ancient philosophers to a contemporary journalist and on Malcolm Forbes and Margaret Mead, from parts of the ideological spectrum that are not always so much in tune:

“The direction in which education starts a man will determine his future in life.”—Plato

This foundational bit of wisdom implies a standard by which all educational institutions should construct their curricula: What knowledge and skills will our current undergraduates need to pursue professionally effective and personally rewarding lives? Clearly the answer will depend on how we envision that future. One thing is certain, in this instance. We are well into a dual revolution: (1) a demographic change that has brought people of many backgrounds to our society and (2) a communications transformation that has shrunk the distances between nations and cultures and lowers the borders that once kept us tidily in our separate places.

For the most part our students already know this. They live it. Some have called on us to give them the tools they need to operate more successfully in lives where they will be called upon to interact productively and constructively with those of various races, ethnicities, languages, religions, cultural and class backgrounds, gender orientations, and so forth. In this endeavor an anthropologist offers a simple goal:

“Children must be taught how to think, not what to think.”
Margaret Mead

Besides providing students with information, we must help them develop strategies for evaluating what they learn and drawing their own reasoned conclusions about what it means and how it might form the basis for sound and ethical decisions. An economist provides a similar insight:

“The purpose of education is to replace an empty mind with an open one.” Malcolm Forbes

To help students develop an open mind is by definition not the inculcation of values. We simply want them to examine a great variety of alternative perspectives before settling on the values they will live by. The kinds of content that would be part of the diversity requirement would certainly work toward this goal. We sell them—and ourselves—short if we think we can simply lift the lid and pour in the beliefs and values we think they should hold. An ancient philosophers advice is sound:

“It is the mark of the educated mind to be able to entertain a thought without accepting it.” Aristotle

Pro Statement- College of Letters and Science Diversity Requirement
Indeed, our faculty provide an excellent example of how educated minds can draw different conclusions from the same facts. Our students will be no less able to choose for themselves.

I have so far avoided some of the other issues that have arisen in the course of a discussion that was supposed to focus on education. Some have challenged whether UCLA is capable of providing a diversity requirement. But why would we fall short if other campuses of the UC system and major universities elsewhere have accomplished the same task with minimal disruption?

Others put disparaging quotation marks around “diversity” and blatantly refer to it as a code word that stands for some nebulous but malicious conspiracy to brainwash innocent students. I would like to laugh, but this sort of discourse has accompanied virtually every step in UCLA’s path to become an institution of increasing diversity in student, faculty, and staff demographics, in research areas, and in service goals—the very diversity the university asserts pride in having achieved. Every step has faced similar challenges and has been hard fought and won only with great effort and dedication.

And then there’s the intervention of politics, which some opponents argue is a poisonous tool that should be evicted from the premises. In fact, politics is the time-honored way of resolving conflicts without warfare, especially in a democracy. The opponents are employing politics in issuing their challenge, and I respect their right if not their reasons.

But this is all a dust storm that threatens to disguise the crucial question at hand: Will a diversity requirement provide a meaningful enhancement to the undergraduate education UCLA provides? While we can only hope that issues related to our diverse nation appear regularly in our curriculum, setting a requirement ensures that no one leaves town without examining perspectives other than their own. As a journalist has written:

“The whole purpose of education is to turn mirrors into windows.” Sydney J. Harris

Beyond learning more about themselves and their heritage, we want our students to gaze upon the multicultural society we have become and to understand it as a source of enrichment as well as to learn how to deal with its challenges. I support the proposed diversity requirement enthusiastically as a means to ensure that College of Letters and Science undergraduates are provided an education that more fully articulates with the world they live in. I urge you to support this vital curricular innovation in the up-coming Academic Senate Divisional referendum.

Claudia Mitchell-Kernan
Professor of Anthropology and Psychiatry and Biobehavioral Sciences, Emerita
Vice chancellor and Dean of Graduate Studies, Emerita
Professor Neal Garrett  
Secretary of the Division  

I write to you to express my support of the establishment of the Undergraduate Diversity Requirement in the College. For 25 of the past 30 years I have served as Chair of the American Indian Studies program and I have seen the effect of our GE courses on students who take our introductory courses and have their eyes opened in a positive way. Regarding diversity there is no substitute for knowledge and understanding. Respecting and understanding diversity needs to come not merely from an intention to "do no harm" to others but rather from understanding the complex histories of different yet intertwined people throughout US History and continuing in today’s context of super diversity.

UCLA needs a diversity requirement. The knowledge is a skill as palpable and as important as in other course that we currently require. These courses promote a kind of understanding that will work to both improve the campus climate as well as the workplace environments that our graduates will enter as they join the work force. As you know, diversity requirements exist on every other UC campus. It is for me the deepest of embarrassments that the campus with the very finest selection of Ethnic Studies Departments and Programs—does not have such a requirement. We have an outstanding faculty that regularly teaches relevant courses and that can open minds and provide useful resources for understanding racial, social, cultural, economic, and sexual difference.

I hear that the opposition to the diversity requirement talks about the onerous burden of offering diversity courses or the cost in time and money for students to take them. But this objection seems to ignore the fact that we already offer many courses that could satisfy such a requirement and that students could easily take these courses without adding to their time to degree. The plan to implement will thus spread the need across a rather large network of courses that are currently offered thereby making the requirement especially available and practicable.

I look forward to a time when I can be proud of UCLA as an institution that is prepared to do the right thing with diversity education. 50 years ago then Chancellor Young showed both bravery and wisdom when he created the ethnic studies centers that later became the research centers, departments, and programs dedicated to Chicano/a, Asian American, African American, and Native American studies. UCLA made a commitment to diversity research and teaching that has been influential nationwide. But we are long overdue in creating a diversity requirement that better encourages our undergraduates to utilize these amazing resources and to better understand the diverse world they inhabit.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul V. Kroskrity  
Professor of Anthropology  
Chair, American Indian Studies
To: Professor Neal Garrett, Secretary of the Division
From: Professor William I. Newman

March 8, 2015

Re: Pro-statement Favoring the Diversity Amendment

I am writing as an elected member of the current and former Faculty College Executive Committee (Group VII: Chemistry and Biochemistry; Earth, Planetary, and Space Sciences, and Institute of the Environment and Sustainability) that approved the current and former diversity requirement proposals.

Over time, I came to appreciate the underlying problem motivating our students to ask for this diversity requirement: it is one of human rights and a spectrum of antisocial behaviors that present themselves on our campus. Although a diversity requirement may not completely eliminate this problem, it could help present our students with an increased awareness and sensitivity to living in a highly heterogeneous society.

The October 15, 2013 Moreno Report on “Acts of Bias and Discrimination Involving Faculty…” describes only the faculty-related facet of the problem. Our students represent a much broader demographic and we must expect that this class of issues is no less important and in need of remediation than that experienced among our faculty.

I encourage my colleagues to review the statistics widely available on the web from these agencies which make clear the gravity of the situation that we face. Our campus police department provides an annual statement disclosing criminal acts ranging from sexual violence to hate crimes that take place at UCLA. The Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act [20 USC § 1092(f)] is the landmark federal law that requires colleges and universities across the United States to disclose information about crime on and around their campuses.

The assumption held by many that our students are immune from such behaviors is naïve at best and are readily contradicted by prevailing statistics. For example, the Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) Sexual Violence Data Sheet for 2012, in a study of undergraduate women, reports that 19% experienced attempted or completed sexual assaults since entering college. These numbers are widely recognized as being underreported, inasmuch as many students are intimidated by the burden of proof required in seeking criminal conviction, and the added humiliation and shame that they experience. Moreover, Family Education Right to Privacy Act (FERPA) rules also minimize the disclosure of such events. We see indications of this in the UCLA Daily Bruin where accounts are often published of plea bargain deals where individuals accused of multiple sexual assaults (including rape) have their wrists slapped with no permanent record, while the abused women are scarred for life. Hate crimes have occurred and primarily impact individuals with different gender orientations, or reflect religious intolerance, or racial bigotry. Their occurrence on campus is reported routinely by the FBI and the Department of Justice.

A diversity requirement is an affirmation of the civil rights of all of our students, and will ultimately aid in crime prevention. It is time that the our faculty take a stand and make clear to our students through this new requirement that such activity is neither acceptable nor will be tolerated, whether we are talking about micro-aggressions stemming from bullying and intimidation or to various forms of religious, racial, and other slurs, or to acts of violence and extreme manifestations of hate. Please vote “YES” to reaffirm this requirement.
Dear Professor Neal Garrett,

I am writing in strong support of the Undergraduate Diversity Requirement. As has been noted, there are many positive reasons to move forward with this requirement:

--Diversity courses have been demonstrated to reduce prejudice, an intervention that is desperately needed in wake of the Moreno Report and just this week the article in the New York Times that links anti-Semitism to our campus.
--We are already offering courses that can fulfill the Diversity requirement in our departments so this will not pose a challenge to staffing
---The majority of College faculty and students support the Diversity requirement
---UCLA is far behind all the other major research institutions who instituted Diversity requirements in the 1980s and 1990s. Given our location in one of the most diverse and global cities in the country, it is our responsibility as educators to help our students understand the complexity and civic responsibilities that diversity entails.

All the best, Liz

********************************************************
Elizabeth DeLoughrey, Assoc. Prof.
Dept of English/Institute of Environment & Sustainability
149 Humanities Bldg, UCLA
Los Angeles, CA 90095
310 825 3534
RE: Statement PRO diversity Requirement

Dear Senate Chair Aberbach,

I herewith submit my statement in support of the proposed diversity requirement for college undergraduates at UCLA. I’ve already voted for it once—or perhaps twice, I’ve lost count—and I still find it to be a very good idea. I will vote for it again not because I think we need to require more of our undergraduates—we do not, and in this respect I agree with those opposed who see the whole idea of general education requirements as creaky and in need of modernization. Rather I will vote for it again because I think we need to require more of our ourselves, our departments and our administration. As it stands we have few concrete incentives to address the climate of respect, tolerance and difference that faces everyone on our large and impressively diverse campus. Without a requirement of this sort, the same people who always teach about diversity will continue to do so—African American studies, Chicano studies, Asian American studies, Gender studies, and so forth. It is unfortunate to see such intellectual segregation, even if it is exists with the best of intentions. But with a requirement, all departments will have an incentive to take the issue seriously—and to bring their particular specialties to the presentation and critique of the issue. Diversity is a problem, a goal and a challenge for everyone—not only those who are minorities, under-represented, or simply politically aligned with a particular issue; this requirement, if adopted, signifies to me that we the faculty agree to share equal responsibility for the issue, to develop new courses and to integrate the issue into the courses we already teach, and I wholeheartedly support that.

Sincerely,

Christopher M. Kelty,
Associate Professor, Institute for Society and Genetics
Department of Information Studies
Department of Anthropology
March 8, 2015

Professor Neal Garrett
Secretary of the Division and Associate Dean for Education and
Faculty Development
senateoffice@senate.ucla.edu

Dear Professor Garrett,

I am writing to respectfully submit the following statement in favor of the Undergraduate Diversity Requirement. But instead of reiterating the now familiar arguments in support of or in opposition to this requirement, I wish to emphasize its symbolic value for individual perception and institution change.

Sylvia Hurtado (http://gseis.ucla.edu/directory/sylvia-hurtado/), a nationally respected colleague of ours in the Department of Education and the Department of Information Studies, has recently published an article, titled “Diversity Assessment, Accountability, and Action,” in the Association of American Colleges & Universities journal Diversity&Democracy (http://www.aacu.org/diversitydemocracy/2014/fall/hurtado-halualani). With her co-author Rona Halualani, Hurtado observes that institutions tend to quote numbers to document their commitment to diversity, but that “relatively little is known about whether campuses take significant action in light of these annual reports, or how campuses hold individual units accountable for progress on diversity goals.” Given this ambiguity, Hurtado and Halualani explain how important it is to demonstrate explicitly a variety of organizational practices. This concerted effort, they contend, “affects how individuals perceive and experience the work and learning environment.” It promotes diversity as an essentially visible part of the learning process in a mutually supportive campus environment.

Hurtado and Halualani offer rich insights into the challenges that universities face with diversity issues, but for me the most eye-opening aspect of their argument has to do with the positive impact that an explicit requirement, one that is pedagogically sound and institutionally supported, has on every member of community. Last fall, the faculty in the College of Letters and Science approved this requirement through a transparent democratic process and this approval signaled to the UCLA community that racial, sexual or religious discrimination did not reflect its cosmopolitan openness. The news also made headlines nationally (http://chronicle.com/blogs/ticker/jp/ucla-faculty-members-approve-diversity-course-requirement). Based on Hurtado and Halualani’s research, reversing this decision now would not only annul the votes of faculty, students, and the Legislative Assembly, but it would implicitly send the hurtful message that prejudicial acts did not exist or could be tolerated on our campus.

I grew up in Germany, South Korea, the Netherlands, Spain, Mexico, and Venezuela where the color of my skin or my initial language competency regardless of national citizenship excluded me from membership in the political community. On the basis of this experience, I understand how pivotal it is to make diversity, tolerance, and communication key elements of civic engagement in global civil society, and my hope is that UCLA will lead the way in this direction. Thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to share my thoughts with you.

Cordially,
David D. Kim
Assistant Professor of German
To Whom It May Concern:

A glance at UCLA undergraduate admissions “Quick Facts” webpage (https://www.admissions.ucla.edu/campusprofile.htm) situates UCLA amidst one of the most culturally and geographically diverse topographies in the world – Los Angeles. Scrolling down, the information conveys the rich ethnic diversity of the undergraduate student body. The last two headings are “Campus Safety/Crime Statistics” and “Life After UCLA.” Prior to life after UCLA, where alumni thrive in government, businesses, entertainment, medicine, and so forth, students are confronted with the intense social geography within the college and extending beyond its borders into the greater LA region. What they encounter at UCLA will forever shape the way they approach life and the fields in which they will impact others. I find it interesting that those two headings should conclude the Quick Facts webpage, but it serves as a reminder that the celebrated differences intimated above the headings can often lead to disagreements. While disagreements are not wrong per se, such conflict can escalate to violence and crime – hate crimes, discrimination, and biases (as evidenced in the Moreno Report) that also impact life at and after UCLA.

Since there has been overwhelming support of the Undergraduate Diversity Requirement and numerous reports that share with us the benefits of its inclusion in curriculum, I do not feel the impulse to reiterate each individual point. Through a more personal story about discrimination and the importance of “life after UCLA” as encompassing more than one’s employment, I aim to relate the mitigation of crime and promotion of campus safety though community engagement and appreciation of difference.

My father, the son of impoverished Eastern European Jewish immigrants, grew up with the specter of the Holocaust and a commitment to contributing to a world where that never happened again by valuing his culture and all others. UCLA gave my father that opportunity. He was the first person in the family to receive a college degree, and his life after UCLA has been devoted to workers’ compensation (much of his clientele is Chicano). My father would often speak to me about social justice and the necessity of investing in education and supporting public schools, but the community in which I lived as a child was fairly homogenous. Getting into punk music and the subculture, I was exposed to more diversity and the ability to articulate issues in one way, but, like my father, I needed institutional guidance in learning how to articulate what I experienced. At UC Berkeley, I took a number of courses that helped me think critically about alternative practices of everything from class socialization to sexual cultures. With my ability to engage social issues, I co-founded the Marshallese Educational Initiative, a nonprofit that connects research to educational outreach to raise cultural awareness about the Marshallese population and provides them with work and educational opportunities. In addition to my outreach and research, my teaching incorporates multiple perspectives.
I point to my academic and outreach endeavors that helped afford me the position to write this letter aimed at institutional change to evince the generational impact of an undergraduate education at UCLA and the amazing opportunity we have right now to shape generations and advance interpersonal and social relations through critical work and communal engagements. Life after UCLA is not just about post-graduation employment, but how one interfaces with the world and impacts future generations. Behind the flashing screens and glossy images showcasing what UCLA can provide, we need to show our students that we value diversity and difference by establishing this requirement and giving them the time and space to learn and appreciate difference as well as articulate their feelings in a safe space.

The fast pace of life in the 21st century—in LA, CA at least, makes it easier to forget about the Holocaust and the many other devastating crimes against humanity inspired by intolerance and—fundamentally—a close-minded approach to others, to difference. If anger is the manifestation of the emotion “fear,” and we are often afraid of what we do not know, then isn’t it our job as educators to expose our students to other ways of being, looking, sounding, making, doing...living? If fears can be addressed by the critical engagement of students in the classroom, where they are growing intellectually and socially, then perhaps, anger can be mitigated and the last subheading before “Life after UCLA” will be, for more and more students, a reminder of how the atmosphere on campus made them, as unique individuals, feel safe, and less about the crimes that have occurred based on difference or the fear they have felt as potential targets of misdirected anger based on fear of the unknown.

I am therefore in full support of the diversity requirement and joining the other UC campuses that already have such requirements to uphold our collective motto, “Let there be light.”

Respectfully,

Jessica A. Schwartz
Assistant Professor of Musicology, UCLA
PRO STATEMENT FOR DIVERSITY INITIATIVE
Russell Thornton
Distinguished Professor of Anthropology

I write in total support of the diversity initiative at UCLA. It is long overdue!

I come from a rural, isolated area of eastern Oklahoma. It was not known for its diversity. Everyone was Indian, part Indian or married to an Indian. Those who had a western religion were either Methodist or Baptist. My early years were spent in four different Bureau of Indian Affairs’ schools with a brief period toward the very end of WW II at an ordinance depot/prisoner of war camp while my father was fighting in Germany. I graduated from high school in southern Oklahoma and started college at a small, state school in east central Oklahoma in 1960.

As I met various types of people, gained experiences—including those of the Civil Rights Movement—and became educated I grew to greatly appreciate our increasingly diverse society. I have seen diversity within the academy increase significantly during more than forty-five years as a professor at four different universities. Diversity, however, has not by itself produced equality or acceptance or even tolerance or accurate knowledge. (It is amazing how little accurate knowledge about American Indians exists on the UCLA campus, a lacuna that fosters disrespect and insult among other things. This is true for many other groups as well, irrespective of how they are defined.)

I teach about American Indians. I tell my students what they believe about American Indians is their business but what they know about American Indians is my business. My responsibility is to impart accurate knowledge that will assist them to interact competently with the world and form their own opinions. I hope that education lessens prejudgment and prejudice, produces understanding and acceptance, and leads to equality and fairness (and think it does as that has been my experience); but fundamentally it leads to competency.

The Diversity Initiative will assure that graduates from UCLA’s College of Letters and Science are provided with comparative knowledge about at least two different groups. The knowledge will enable them to better understand others, more effectively deal with others, and make heightened informed decisions about others. As such, our graduates will be more competent citizens of our world. And our future world will be a better one.
March 7, 2015

To whom this may concern:

This is a statement in support of the diversity course requirement now being considered for UCLA undergraduates.

I fully support this requirement, and although I wish we didn’t need it, we do. I am impressed by the overwhelming support from the students and the strong support from the faculty. I am glad to see that all the UCs, except Merced, have such a course on their undergraduate curricula. Other comparable universities have such courses and it is clear that some consider diversity issues quite seriously.

I can’t help but feel that diversity and equity issues are important world-wide and world leaders have only begun to assess, understand and address nascent social instabilities.

We still have enormous problems of “difference” in the United States. From the injustices and racism we have seen, and still see, in Missouri and other states to the attacks on science, evolution, climate change, and a national “core curriculum” the distrust of change and difference is increasing. For example, some of these animosities possibly stem from fear that the number of “white Christians” is becoming a smaller part of our population. Some conservatives seriously wonder whether science denies “moral facts” since supposedly the new standards teach children that “facts” are supported by evidence and anything else is opinion. Clearly there is a lack of understanding of science and scholarship. In general the inability of our electorate to understand the concerns of “others” is concerning and alarming.

I believe that all students can benefit from a course that analyzes and explains difference, furthers the cause of tolerance, and helps forge a new synthesis of co-existence and mutual respect.

Respectfully,

Elma L. González, PhD
Professor Emerita
Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology
UCLA

Residence:
115 Armadillo Drive, Newalla, OK 74857
I was a member of the Diversity Requirement Initiative committee, and am currently serving on a committee to review syllabi for this requirement. Proponents of this requirement are hopeful to see the many ways this campus will benefit from its implementation. I am relatively new faculty to UCLA and was recruited in 2013 from a minority-serving institution. I have seen first hand what a tremendous impact a simple diversity requirement can have in building tolerance, understanding different perspectives, and preparing students to engage in leadership roles in increasingly diverse settings. Students are not reluctant to take such courses, even if they are required. This diversity requirement had overwhelming support from UCLA student organizations. Institutionally, UCLA is already a global leader in education- our students and trainees achieve global impact. Imagine however, how much more impactful that same undergraduate degree could be if it comes with the cultural competency to communicate and share ideas broadly. Opponents of this requirement have argued that a single diversity course requirement is just inadequate for such a lofty purpose. But the work has to start, and the sooner the better. National headlines cast the spotlight on what appear to be escalating racial tension and climate issues here at UCLA. Not just among students but among faculty of color. There was a clear understanding by those of us involved in developing the initiative that the implementation of this requirement will likely evolve and continue to undergo review. We have many courses that have already been approved for this requirement, and the review is ongoing, as faculty continue to submit their syllabi. The wheels will turn slowly, and today this change is met with resistance, yet our peer institutions have managed to meet this challenge and implement such a requirement, and so should we. UCLA faculty have already cast their votes. Uphold their vote and approve the requirement.

Sincerely,

Alicia

--
Alicia Izquierdo, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
University of California, Los Angeles
Department of Psychology
Brain Research Institute, SfN Chapter President
Neuroscience Interdepartmental Program

aizquie@psych.ucla.edu
1285 Franz Hall, Box 951563
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1563
(office) 310-825-3459
(lab) 310-825-4407
Hi Neal
I would like to submit this pro statement

The diversity requirement may allow students to take courses that address the measurement of diversity and its interactions with economic performance.

Aaron Tornell
Professor
Economics, UCLA
Dear Colleagues,

I am writing to express my enthusiastic support for the implementation of an undergraduate diversity requirement within the College of Letters and Science at UCLA, as already approved by students, faculty and the Legislative Assembly in an open, democratic process. UCLA remains the only UC campus (Merced notwithstanding) without a curricular diversity requirement and given the recent acts of intolerance and discrimination at UCLA, as outlined by the Moreno Report, and detailed by the Los Angeles Times, the New York Times and the Chronicle of Higher Education, it is time to enact this requirement. This measure has the legitimate support of College students and faculty and these bodies deserve the autonomy to establish their own curriculum and determine its requirements. As College faculty do not vote on the curricular requirements of other schools at UCLA, their choices should not require the approval of non-College faculties at UCLA.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Eric Avila

Eric Avila
Professor of History, Chicano Studies and Urban Planning Associate Dean for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion, Division of Social Sciences UCLA
I am a faculty member in Life Sciences and I am also an individual who conducts clinical research and practices in the community. From this perspective, I would like to emphasize that we are doing a disservice to the public and our community by not requiring our students to take a diversity related course. Imperative to the provision of good clinical care and community interaction is cultural knowledge and competency; simply put, understanding your population and their experiences, and having an open stance to the beliefs and practices of people from diverse groups. A diversity requirement at UCLA is an important and necessary step in this direction. It is a step that students need before they enter the workforce or pursue graduate training. It is a step that students need to improve their interactions on campus as well as with the community with whom we expect them to interact. At UCLA, students serve in various capacities that require interacting with diverse communities. They are volunteers, they are research assistants, they have field-work placements, they have internships. Our students need to be prepared to work in these communities. And more than be prepared, as UCLA students, we want them to shine. Coursework that fulfills the diversity requirement is a critical component of becoming a culturally informed individual who is able to interact effectively and provide quality care to individuals from diverse groups. Understanding diversity should not be an aspirational goal, it is a necessity in our ever-growing multicultural society.

Denise A. Chavira  
Associate Professor  
UCLA, Department of Psychology  
3183 Franz Hall  
310-825-8466

Mailing Address:  
1285 Franz Hall  
PO Box 951563  
Los Angeles, CA 90095
March 9, 2015

Professor Neal Garrett  
Associate Dean of Education and Faculty Development  
University of California, Los Angeles

Pro Statement on Diversity Requirements

I wish to enthusiastically support the current proposal for an undergraduate diversity requirement at UCLA. I teach Conservation Biology (EEB116) with Phil Rundel which is a large upper level class consisting of more than 200 students. Many of the conservation issues discussed in the course would benefit from a better understanding of diversity issues, and how conservation problems differentially affect different cultures and economically disadvantaged groups. I have taught the course for over two decades and the numerous interactions with undergraduates that I have had reinforce the need for enhanced understanding of diversity issues. I would be happy to provide specific examples if needed to better support this view.

Yours sincerely,

Robert K. Wayne  
Professor
With this email, I want to express my strong support for the college undergraduate diversity requirement. I am proud to be a member of the faculty at UCLA, not just because of our academic and research achievements, but because UCLA is comprised of an extremely vibrant, exciting, and diverse community of scholars, scientists, and students. I strongly feel that, as a faculty, we need to embrace, promote and celebrate this diversity, acknowledging that our diversity is a large part of who we are and why we are successful. The proposed diversity requirement is one way that we can accomplish this objective, by doing what we do best, educating our students in key topics that will enhance their success in their future careers.

On a practical side, as long time Vice Chair for undergraduate education and head of the curriculum committee of my department (EEB), I have investigated both the student’s views on this requirement and evaluated any impact on their degree progress. Overall, students are enthusiastic about this requirement, reflecting findings of the recent Campus Climate Survey. Further, our undergraduate advisors, who design personalize schedules for each and every one of our almost 1800 undergraduates, have reassured us that this requirement will have no impact on time to degree for our majors.

Thus, because the cost is minimal and the benefit so large, I strongly advocate we implement the college undergraduate diversity requirement.

Peggy Fong

Peggy Fong, Professor and Vice Chair
Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, UCLA
pfong@biology.ucla.edu
March 9, 2015

Professor Neal Garrett
Secretary of the Academic Senate

Re: Statement in Favor of the Diversity Requirement for the College of Letters and Science

Dear Professor Garrett,

Although I support the merits of requiring a diversity course for undergraduates in the College of Letters and Science, in my role as Dean of Undergraduate Education in the College, I want to use this opportunity to review the processes that have been undertaken to fully deliberate the pros and cons of this change. The proposal was thoroughly researched and vetted—and that is why it earned support at every single stage of the approval process. The College Faculty Executive Committee endorsed the proposal, the College faculty approved the proposal in a College-wide vote, the Undergraduate Council twice voted its endorsement of the diversity requirement, and, most recently the Legislative Assembly—constituted by representatives from all the departments—approved the measure. I believe that our thorough vetting and research provided the foundation for all of those positive votes.

In my 16 years as a vice provost for undergraduate education (first at UC Davis, and now here at UCLA), I’ve never seen a more thoroughly researched proposal. A substantive literature review was conducted and made available. Institutional researchers modeled the impact on time-to-degree and concluded there will be no discernable negative impact. We’ve studied our own course offerings and those submitted by faculty to fulfill the College diversity requirement in order to allow the maximum flexibility for students in meeting the requirement. We’ve analyzed the cost of the diversity requirement and secured funding from the Chancellor and Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost. Given the level of diligence with which this requirement was prepared, I’m not surprised that it has been approved at every approval level thus far. And I want colleagues who are now asked to vote on the matter to vote yes, resting assured that this proposal is well researched, well written, and well documented.

Sincerely,

Patricia A. Turner
Dean and Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education
UCLA
Dear Neal Garrett, Secretary of the Academic Assembly

Please find my statement of support of the college diversity requirement below. I would appreciate it being posted to the Senate website.

Thank you,
Todd Presner

I am writing in support of the diversity requirement at UCLA and to urge my colleagues at UCLA to vote in favor of the requirement. As members of the faculty at one of the leading public universities in the world, we have an obligation to educate students to become responsible, globally-oriented citizens in the 21st century, who are able to think and act in ways that are historically informed, culturally competent, linguistically fluent, and socially aware. Diversity is the absolute core of the educational process precisely because it provides the knowledge of histories, cultures, languages, and societies -- knowledge, which, in turn, enables students to compare, relate, understand, and communicate with one another. If we believe in the possibilities of creating a better, more tolerant, and more democratic world, we must also believe in the value and centrality of diversity in that enterprise. At a time when the climate on college campuses nationwide has taken a disturbing turn toward intolerance and even hatred, we must redouble our investment in the educational process and exercise leadership to influence public discourse on all matters concerning diversity. Voting ‘yes’ on the diversity requirement is not just a matter of principle but also a matter of justice. It is an investment in building a future world that is more democratic, more tolerant, and more just. We must help our students build this world-to-come by educating them in diversity. Please join me in voting yes for the diversity requirement.

Todd Samuel Presner
Sady and Ludwig Kahn Director, Center for Jewish Studies
Chair, Digital Humanities Program
Professor, Germanic Languages and Comparative Literature
As one who has made critical investments over the past year in the preparation and passage of the College of Letters and Science Diversity Requirement, the lessons learned in this process have simply increased my dedication to addressing the concerns that have driven this effort. Trained primarily as a quantitative behavioral scientist, I learned early to rely on empirical evidence to settle scholarly debates—even when the question of “rightness” or “wrongness” was less clear. The “data” I’ve derived from working in the trenches of this campaign provide compelling evidence that this measure is “right” for UCLA and “right” for society in general:

1. Even as we’ve entered a moment in history in which certain forms of flagrant disrespect of others is not tolerated, the intensity of bias on this very campus continues unabated (perhaps more subtle) and many students, faculty, and staff simply have not been embraced as part of the UCLA whole. Our UC-wide climate survey and the Moreno Report make clear this reality. There is robust and consistent empirical evidence that adopting a diversity requirement increases levels of tolerance in the community as a whole. If this were the only goal of this requirement, the need for such is unequivocal—just as every other long-standing university in the UC system has already realized.

2. Success in our increasingly global and interconnected society is now, more than ever, dependent on our abilities to communicate across difference AND to understand and respect the perspectives of others. Having travelled widely this past year, I’ve asked a variety of people outside of academia (often corporate leaders) about what they expect of their employees. All have made it clear that they would not hire anyone without the demonstrated ability to understand and communicate with others unlike themselves. The need for this core competency is just as true of professionals in engineering and the biomedical fields, as it is in the humanities and public policy. The proposal itself cites national employer surveys that make this point empirically. Failure to include this kind of training in the core undergraduate curriculum is a failure to educate our students for the world that is and that will be.

3. There are people of good will from absolutely every sector of this university who have embraced the goals of the diversity requirement and have worked tirelessly to implement this widely supported initiative. I have made new friends across wide disciplinary boundaries and am humbled by their extraordinary efforts to move this initiative and this campus forward. Even within departments with higher numbers of opponents, many of their colleagues have remained staunch supporters of the College’s curriculum proposal.

4. Our students already know that gaps exist in their preparation for work and leadership in the “real world.” Past student votes have made it abundantly clear that they realize the benefits of a diversity requirement for career preparation and campus climate. Your vote is an endorsement of student will and their informed assessments of their educational needs.
5. The entire faculty has already voted on this initiative and supported it in overwhelming fashion. The Legislative Assembly (LgA) is our representative body — much like Congress represents the people of the United States. No one would entertain an attempt to subvert a congressional vote by bringing it before every individual U.S. voter. Every teaching unit in the entire university has seats on the LgA. On November 20, 2014, your representatives voted 84-18 (with 4 abstentions) to strongly support the College of L & S Diversity Requirement. They voted on your behalf. This attempt to undermine the will of the College through a division-wide faculty vote threatens the autonomy of every teaching unit – including yours.

6. Whatever the outcome, the UCLA division-wide faculty vote on whether to uphold the College’s vote to implement a diversity requirement will send a strong message nationwide and beyond. This vote will symbolize UCLA’s commitment to inclusion and training its students to work and lead in our new more diverse and complex world. Will we be counted as leaders or laggards in the movement to deal forthrightly with the challenges and opportunities before us?

In summary, the opposition has striven to obfuscate the real issues — which are clear and direct — by throwing up false arguments in an attempt to divert (i.e., we already know that we’ll have more than enough courses for the new demand; that all education is designed to mold students into productive members of our global society; that this initiative implements a student-desired core competency; that the range of courses submitted clearly demonstrate that no particular political orientation is evident). Please use your vote to demonstrate that UCLA is serious about educating its students for the future — not the past — as well as its commitment to realizing its Principles of Community. Please support curricular autonomy at UCLA.

M. Belinda Tucker
Co-Chair, College of L & S Diversity Initiative Committee
Professor of Psychiatry and Biobehavioral Sciences
TO: To whom it may concern  
FROM: Chris Tilly, Professor of Urban Planning and Director, UCLA Institute for Research on Labor and Employment  
RE: Campus-wide vote on College Diversity Requirement  
DATE: March 9, 2015

I am writing to register my strong support for the College's Diversity Requirement. I have strong ties to two divisions/schools: my teaching appointment is in Urban Planning in the Luskin School of Public Affairs, outside the College; and I direct the Institute for Research on Labor and Employment, which resides in the Social Science Division of the College (where I also hold a nonvoting 0% appointment in Sociology).

Because my teaching appointment lies outside the College, I did not vote in the College-wide ballot on the Diversity Requirement. But I have heard and read the pro and con positions in some detail because I represent the Department of Urban Planning in the Faculty Assembly, and took part in votes there. Ifind the case for a College requirement compelling, and the arguments against one less so. I will briefly run down several reasons for this, and then go into more detail on a couple of points. The brief rundown:

- It is uncontestable that diversity along numerous dimensions is growing, and will continue to grow, in the settings our students are encountering and will encounter over their lives and careers.
- There is a growing body of evidence that being exposed to ideas and discussion about diversity helps people to navigate that diversity. This is subject to the usual caveats about social science—studies are typically further from being controlled experiments, and measures further from precisely capturing concepts, than is often the case in the natural sciences.
- Because there are sure to be numerous opportunities to double-count courses as meeting the Diversity Requirement along with other requirements (notably General Education), this requirement seems unlikely to add to the total number of required courses taken by students, at least in the large majority of cases.
- Since there are a large number of existing courses that appear to satisfy the Diversity Requirement, the requirement would not lead to diversion of faculty effort away from current teaching.
- Critics have suggested that because the criteria for Diversity classification are broad, they will lead to inclusion of courses that won’t actually have value in deepening students’ understanding of diversity and increasing their capacity of dealing with it in life. This is certainly a risk, but I would argue that it would be unwise to try to micro-specify the requirement at the outset; instead we should establish it, monitor and learn from outcomes, and remain open to further refining the requirement when we have information on which to base revisions.
- The faculty of the College voted for the requirement. While one can picture situations in which a School somehow acts in contravention of University policy and has to be brought in line, this seems like a pretty clear-cut case of appropriate self-governance in determining the College curriculum (and when critics appealed to the Senate to override, the Senate chose instead to
affirm the College’s vote). Anyone considering voting to override the College’s decision might want to contemplate whether they would welcome a campus-wide vote on their school’s curricular requirements.

- The majority of UCLA student support a diversity requirement.

Beyond all these points, I would emphasize two things that I know about in more depth. First, though I am not particularly familiar with the literature on learning about diversity in school settings, I am fairly familiar with the literature on diversity in work settings, and to some extent in community settings. There are two striking findings regarding diversity of work teams. The first is that people feel most comfortable working closely with others who are “like” them in various ways. But the second is that diverse work teams are more innovative and creative. The implication is that in order to achieve innovation, it is important to grapple with and overcome barriers of discomfort. The reality is that our society is still quite segregated: though black-white residential segregation and male-female occupational segregation are declining nationwide, progress is glacially slow—and some dimensions of segregation, such as residential segregation between Latinos and Anglos and between people of different income levels, have increased in recent decades. Continuing segregation means that it is a continuing struggle to overcome discomfort with those who are “different,” and also makes it imperative that we step up that struggle.

Another important social science finding bears on bias and discrimination: people of color and women perceive much more bias against their groups than white Anglos and men perceive against those same groups. The gap between white and black respondents is especially wide. This suggests that white and male observers may significantly underestimate the incidence of bias—which helps explain some of the findings of the Moreno Report, as well as why different populations viewed the report rather differently.

Finally, I would like to anecdotally say something about my own experience as a teacher who first stepped into the classroom more than 30 years ago. This is based on teaching courses that were listed as Economics, Management, Public Policy, and Urban Planning. I have worked issues of social diversity into most of those courses, gingerly at first, and with growing confidence over time. Based on what happened in those courses themselves and on selective contact with former students, I am quite convinced that students learned important and useful things about diversity that they had not thought through before. I’ve generally gotten positive evaluations and feedback from students as well. Lastly, my own comfort level with, and understanding of, diversity has been greatly advanced by thinking, lecturing, leading discussions, and grading student work on these subjects. I am certainly not suggesting that every professor should take on this subject matter—but I am suggesting that my own long experience in the classroom ratifies the value of taking up issues and concepts of diversity in the curriculum.
PRO STATEMENT – College Undergraduate Diversity Requirement

Carlos Grijalva

Wouldn’t it be wonderful if we lived in a utopia? As it is, we are very lucky to live in the United States of America; a country built on freedom and the democratic values that everyone should be treated equally and fairly. As marked by the 50th anniversary of the demonstrations in Selma, Alabama, that led to the passage of the Voting Rights Act, our country has come a long way in providing people with equal rights and being able to live in a society free from discrimination and oppression. Nevertheless, we still have a way to go before all segments of our society feel respected and valued, regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, religion, physical or mental ability, or manner of dress. UCLA is not a utopia and has seen its share of racial, religious, and political tensions in its relatively brief history. Just recently, the political tensions of the Israel—Palestinian conflict made its way into our undergraduate student government. The issue involved the eligibility of a Jewish student to be appointed to the campus judicial panel. Janina Montero, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, was quoted in the LA Times as saying that students are learning “difficult and painful” lessons about how to coexist “in a multiethnic, multicultural society and to learn very directly what kind of sensitivities there are and what respect for people means in practice.”

Prejudice comes from a lack of knowledge and ignorance tends to breed fear and anxiety. We live in a golden age of communication where the world is at our finger tips. We live in a global society where we are strongly influenced by the people we interact with and the news media which we prefer to indulge ourselves in. As faculty, we hold ourselves in high esteem for teaching our students about discipline-specific topics. We also require our students to have some proficiency in math and language skills. I don’t think we do a very good job of educating our students about “life skills” and dealing with people from backgrounds different from their own. When our students graduate, their career success will not only depend on how knowledgeable they are within their major subject, but also on how well they can get along with others and see things from a number of different perspectives. I believe that we owe it to our students to teach them about social justice and how to be better, civil human beings. My son will soon be completing the Sheriff Academy. My wife and I are very proud of him but also very concerned, as you can imagine. Being a peace officer these days is riddled with controversy. Given the public focus on police brutality and racial profiling, I would hope that the values he has learned at home, in school, and at the Academy will prepare him to deal with people from all walks of life with dignity and respect.

The opponents assert that there will be costs involved and faculty effort needed to launch the requirement. This is true, but one must also consider the cost-benefit ratio. Will one diversity-related class make a difference? Having been at UCLA for over 30 years, I have seen students take a general education class completely out of their intended major and take on an entirely new perspective in their education from that experience. Is the benefit worth the cost? YOU BET!
I continue to support the proposed College diversity requirement. I voted for it on the merits, prior to the new, broader faculty vote now pending, and I support it additionally because I believe that this vote is an unwarranted intrusion on College autonomy. Regarding the merits of the issue, generally I lean toward fewer requirements in order to foster more variety of educational paths. But the national and international challenges of diversity have been so poorly addressed by existing policies that I believe that more systematic education is needed.

Gregory A. Miller  
Distinguished Professor and Chair, Department of Psychology  
Distinguished Professor, Department of Psychiatry and Biobehavioral Sciences  
Member, Brain Research Institute, UCLA
Dear Neal,

I would like to voice my very strong opinion to the “Pro” that UCLA’s College of L & S should stand by its faculty vote in support of the Undergraduate Diversity Requirement. I also stand firmly by the idea that the faculty in the College, who teach the students of the College, should be the voice that determines whether this is an appropriate requirement for our students.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely, Brad

H. Bradley Shaffer  
brad.shaffer@ucla.edu  
Phone: (310) 825-3836  
Website: http://www.eeb.ucla.edu/Faculty/Shaffer/

H. Bradley Shaffer  
Distinguished Professor  
Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology  
621 Charles E. Young Drive South, Room LS5120  
Box 951606  
University of California, Los Angeles  
Los Angeles, CA  90095-1606 USA

and

Director  
UCLA La Kretz Center for California Conservation Science  
Institute of the Environment and Sustainability  
University of California, Los Angeles  
La Kretz Hall, Suite 300  
Box 951496  
619 Charles E. Young Dr. East  
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1496 USA  
http://www.environment.ucla.edu/lakretz/
Dear Professor Neal Garrett,

I am writing to you in strong support of the proposal for the requirement of the undergraduate diversity course. Every other UC campus has successfully implemented such a requirement, there is documentation from a 2014 survey that 24% of faculty, staff, and students have experienced exclusionary, offensive, or hostile conduct based on race, gender, or sexual orientation. Further, research has shown that diversity content courses can reduce prejudice and increase civic behaviors, which would help UCLA improve campus climate for everyone. Lastly, in a poll, a majority (63%) of UCLA students have indicated in a poll that they want a diversity course requirement. Please post my statement on the Senate Ballot website.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,
Rose C. Maly, MD, MSPH

Rose C. Maly, MD, MSPH
Associate Professor of Family Medicine
George F. Kneller Chair in Family Medicine
David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA
10880 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 1800
Los Angeles, CA 90024
Phone: 310-794-6091
Fax: 310-794-6097
E-Mail: rmaly@mednet.ucla.edu

IMPORTANT WARNING: This email (and any attachments) is only intended for the use of the person or entity to which it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged and confidential. You, the recipient, are obligated to maintain it in a safe, secure and confidential manner. Unauthorized disclosure or failure to maintain confidentiality may subject you to federal and state penalties. If you are not the intended recipient, please immediately notify us by return email, and delete this message from your computer.
To whom it may concern,

I am writing in support of the proposed college of letters and science undergraduate diversity requirement known as “Amendment to Divisional Regulation A-©-458 (C).”

Sincerely,
Gil Hochberg

Gil Z. Hochberg
Associate Professor of Comparative Literature and Gender Studies.
Director of Graduate studies, Comparative Literature.
Hochberg@humnet.ucla.edu
Pro Statement

Christopher L. Erickson
Senior Associate Vice Provost &
Director, UCLA International Institute
Professor, UCLA Anderson School of Management

Vote YES because having faculty from outside the College dictate what College of Arts and Science faculty should teach our students is anathema to the sacrosanct principle of curricular autonomy of UCLA academic units. UCLA academic units should decide the curriculum for their students without outside interference. I vote yes as a faculty member in a professional school to endorse the vote of my colleagues in the College and to affirm their right to self-determination.

Vote YES because overturning the positive votes of the students, Faculty Executive Committee, College Faculty, Legislative Assembly and Undergraduate Council will undermine the foundations of shared governance at UCLA, creating a governance crisis.

Vote YES because UCLA undergraduate students want a diversity requirement. 63% of UCLA undergraduates have voted in favor of a diversity course requirement, showing strong support for this initiative.

Vote YES because overturning the College undergraduate diversity requirement, which was approved through an open, democratic process will cause irreparable damage to UCLA’s reputation, impacting our place of leadership in the Los Angeles community, California, nationally and potentially internationally. UCLA should not be seen as the anti-diversity UC campus.

Vote YES because Extensive peer-reviewed research shows diversity content courses can reduce prejudice and increase civic behaviors. Adding an undergraduate diversity course requirement is a critically important step in helping UCLA improve campus climate, particularly at the undergraduate level.

Vote YES because teaching about diversity in higher education is mainstream. The majority of U.S. 4-year colleges and universities have a diversity course requirements as part of their undergraduate curriculum. National surveys show 71% of U.S. residents believe diversity education on college and university campuses is important.

Vote YES because UCLA desperately needs to improve campus climate. Climate surveys show 24% of faculty, staff, and students have experienced exclusionary, offensive or hostile conduct based on race, gender or sexual orientation. We must act to change this statistic.

Vote YES because Executive Vice Chancellor Scott Waugh as stated that adopting the college undergraduate diversity course requirement will have no impact on the funding or any other resources that support existing general educational requirements across the Arts, Humanities or Sciences.

Vote YES because the College of Letters and Science undergraduate curriculum needs to join the 21st century. All UC campuses except Merced and UCLA, have diversity requirements in their undergraduate curriculum. The School of Arts and Architecture has already adopted a diversity requirement at UCLA.

Vote YES because Corey Hollis, the Director of Academic Advising indicates that the college diversity course requirement will have absolutely no impact on time to degree.

Vote YES because Bob Cox, Director of Enrollment Planning and Academic Performance Analysis indicates that there will be more than sufficient seat capacity to launch the requirement beginning with the 2015 freshman class.
Vote **YES** because Jackie Robinson, Arthur Ashe, Ralph Bunche, Antonio Villaraigosa, Anna Lee-Fisher, Sheila Kuehl, Tom Bradley, Yvonne Brathwaite Burke, have created an enviable legacy of diversity leadership at UCLA. We should embrace, celebrate, and continue their legacy.
Dear Professor Garrett and Other Colleagues--
On this day after a weekend when we celebrated International Women’s Day; the signal events fifty years ago in Selma, Alabama, that led to the Voting Rights Act of 1964; and the Komen LA Race for the Cure and its noble efforts to help women across all social differences understand and take action against breast cancer, how can we NOT understand the value and beauty of human diversity? How can we NOT act as a campus community to pass a Diversity Requirement for all first-year undergraduates at UCLA? Whether one understands passage of this movement to be a symbolic or a real step forward, it IS a step forward, and not two steps back as those who would block the vote would wish. Onward!

Allen F. Roberts

Professor, Department of World Arts & Cultures/Dance

Professor (affiliated), Department of French and Francophone Studies

Former Director, African Studies Center

Co-Editor, African Arts journal

University of California Los Angeles (UCLA)

aroberts@arts.ucla.edu
Neal,

I teach a course, Introduction to American Indian Studies, that has been submitted as a course meeting the diversity requirement. Over the years I have seen students develop life changing awareness of the place of their own cultural history. I have seen students change their major because they better understood cultural diversity in the Americas. A diversity requirement will open our UCLA students to unexpected opportunities.

Nancy

-- Sent from my Palm Pixi
To my fellow UCLA faculty,

My name is Frank Laski, I am a *Drosophila* geneticist in the Molecular, Cell and Developmental Biology Department. I teach Introductory Genetics and have been at UCLA since 1988. As many faculty who have been at UCLA for a couple of decades, I have taken on additional administrative duties. This includes, currently serving as the Chair of the Life Sciences Core Curriculum, and a member of the college’s Faculty Executive Committee (FEC), representing the EEB, MCDB and MIMG Departments.

One thing I am not is an expert on diversity. However, as a member of the FEC I have been educated on the topic. I have attended three symposia/workshops, discussed diversity with a number of students, attended too many meetings and read a lot of reports and papers on the subject. These activities result in my firm belief that there is a diversity problem on campus, as demonstrated this weekend by a “most e-mailed” New York Times article describing how the religion of one of our students almost prevented her from being appointed to a position on the student’s Judicial Board. ([http://www.nytimes.com/2015/03/06/us/debate-on-a-jewish-student-at-ucla.html?src=me](http://www.nytimes.com/2015/03/06/us/debate-on-a-jewish-student-at-ucla.html?src=me)). Listening and talking to a number of experts, I also believe that a diversity course has beneficial effects and can reduce prejudice among our students (as one example, see an article by UCLA Professor Mitchel Chang ([http://pages.gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/chang/Pubs/51.1chang.pdf](http://pages.gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/chang/Pubs/51.1chang.pdf)). A benefit to being on the FEC is that we don’t act in a black box, we can ask specific questions to the faculty/administrators who are in charge.

As a Chair of a teaching department that is planning on providing a diversity requirement course, I was concerned whether or not UCLA would pay for the long-term costs to support the staff and TAs of the course. Executive Vice Chancellor Scott Waugh and Dean of Undergraduate Education Patricia Turner both assured me that this project was very important to them and that funds covering the complete costs would be made available. I believe them. I also know that with the promised resources we will be able to supply enough seats to meet student demand. I am very excited about this proposal and I am looking forward to working on the classes rather than these never-ending votes. I encourage all faculty to vote for the diversity requirement.

Yours,

Frank Laski
Professor, Molecular, Cell and Developmental Biology and MBI
Chair, Department of Life Sciences Core Curriculum
Terasaki Life Sciences Bldg. UCLA
Los Angeles CA. 90095-7239
310-206-3640
laski@mbi.ucla.edu
Dear Professor Garrett,

I wanted to express my enthusiastic support for the diversity requirement. UCLA is behind the times on this.

Sincere regards,

Thomas B. Smith
Professor
Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology
621 Charles E. Young Drive South, Room LS5120
Box 951606
University of California, Los Angeles
Los Angeles, CA  90095-1606 USA

Founding Director
Center for Tropical Research
Institute of the Environment and Sustainability
University of California, Los Angeles
La Kretz Hall, Suite 300
Box 951496
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1496 USA
http://www.environment.ucla.edu/ctr
tbsmith@ucla.edu
(310) 206-4712 phone
(310) 825-5446 fax
Vote Yes on the Diversity Requirement

Dear Colleagues,

Vote YES on the College Diversity Requirement for these reasons:

**Diversity is a Core Competency for our Undergraduates** UCLA undergraduates need to have strong skills in diversity to thrive and lead in a world that is global, complex and interconnected.

**Diversity in the Curriculum Develops Cognitive Skills** A large, peer-reviewed literature demonstrates that diversity in the curriculum improves students' cognitive abilities and reduces prejudice with respect to difference.

**The Diversity Requirement Proposal has been Developed Thoughtfully and Vetted by the Campus Community** Students and faculty have contributed to the development of the proposal since April 2014. The proposal has received unanimous support from the Undergraduate Council, the College FEC, and majority support from the College of Letters and Science Faculty, as well as overwhelming support from the Legislative Assembly in two separate votes.

**The Diversity Requirement is Feasible** UCLA is well-poised to meet the student demand for the diversity requirement. The proposal has been reviewed by the Office of Enrollment and Planning and by the Director of Academic Advising. These offices agree that there is more than sufficient course capacity to meet student demand without increasing time to degree.

**UCLA Students Want a Diversity Requirement** The diversity requirement has been endorsed by USAC, the Daily Bruin, and supported by student body polls.

**The Diversity Requirement Upholds UCLA’s Values** A diversity requirement is well-aligned with UCLA’s Principles of Community and demonstrates institutional commitment to and validation of the values of diversity and inclusiveness.

**The Administration Supports the Diversity Requirement** The Chancellor’s Office has committed funds for new course development and training. Funding of the diversity requirement will not impact GE or any other undergraduate curriculum funding streams.

The College Diversity Requirement is a key element towards fostering educational excellence in our students, improving campus climate and supporting UCLA as a flagship undergraduate educational institution in the 21st century. Please join me in voting YES for the College Diversity Requirement.

Michael Alfaro
Associate Professor
Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Institute for Society and Genetics
Co-Chair, College Diversity Initiative
Statement on Diversity Requirement
Professor Patricia Gándara, Emerita GSEIS – UCLA

For quite a few years Gary Orfield and I co-taught an undergraduate class entitled “Equal Rights, Unequal Education: An American Dilemma.” This course received students from all majors. In the last few years we enrolled up to about 130 students and we always had a wait list. The class dealt with diversity and inequality in education, from kinder through higher education. Once students heard about the class, more wanted to take it than we could reasonably accept. I think this speaks to the desire of students for this kind of course.

Every year, students would line up at the end of the course to receive hugs or handshakes and share a few departing words, and many would have tears streaming down their faces. They wanted to know, “Why was I never taught this before now?” “How did I go all the way through school then college without knowing about these things?” Some students are truly angry, some feel vindicated and validated that they were not alone in their experience of inequality or difference, some just felt so glad that they could now explain things that seemed inexplicable before. Almost all would say they felt better equipped to live and work in a diverse society.

The diversity requirement is so absolutely necessary to help our students understand the world into which they are emerging and to be able to interact successfully with people from different communities, with very different group histories. It is an embarrassment that UCLA—at the center of the most diverse region in the nation—does not have such a requirement! And that some would seek to over-rule the expressed desire for such a course by the faculty and students of the College of Letters and Sciences is simply shameful.
I voted for the petition requesting a vote of the Academic Senate because diversity must include respect for the expression of differing opinion. But I will vote for the diversity requirement, because a liberal education has always included preparation for democratic citizenship. I just wrote a book reporting the origins of contemporary democracy in racism. Because my generation of students were not required to study racialized and gendered interactions, political scientists have generally overlooked this plain connection. Deportations and police killings remind us daily of its persistence. If so, no one can prepare adequately for democratic citizenship without studying diversity. Were I to vote against the diversity requirement, it would mean that I did not believe my own book.
Dear Professor Neal Garrett,

I am strongly in favor of the College undergraduate diversity requirement. As one of the signatories of the open letter supporting the curricular autonomy of the College of Letters and Science and opposing the referendum on the College undergraduate diversity course requirement, I am submitting this brief Pro statement. Excellence through diversity is something that UCLA of all places should be leading other UC campuses and the nation as a top-ranked, research 1 institution. Instead, it appears that we are among the last to adopt such a requirement, which is an embarrassment. Diversity is not something that we can afford to ignore and the diversity requirement for College undergraduates will only enhance our students and our scholarship. The diversity requirement is critical for training and educating our undergraduates to be successful leaders in the global marketplace and in academic arenas. At least from what I have seen, the college requirement will not make us less, but more in terms of our objectives to educate the next generation of scientific leaders and thinkers. The academic culture and values we have at UCLA greatly influence attitudes especially among undergraduate students. We need to have an environment which takes positive approaches to reducing prejudice and increasing civic responsibility. We can do this in such a way as to not impact time-to-degree. Students from all backgrounds and ethnicities need to know that when they come to UCLA, we value diversity and it is what makes us a great institution.

Respectfully submitted,

Dwayne D. Simmons

A tout a l'heure

Dwayne D Simmons, Ph.D.
Director, MARC and Bridges Undergraduate Research Programs
Director, Brain Research Institute, Diversity for Neuroscience Education and Outreach

Professor
UCLA Department of Integrative Biology and Physiology
2028 Terasaki Life Sciences Bldg.
610 Charles E. Young Drive, East
Los Angeles, CA 90095-7239

OFFICE: 310-794-1228
LAB: 310-206-1790
Alternate Email: <dsimmons4@me.com>
MARC webpage: http://www.ugeducation.ucla.edu/urc-care/scholmarc.htm
IBP department webpage: http://www.physci.ucla.edu/physcfacultyindiv.php?FacultyKey=9665
Vocational webpage: http://www.meettheprof.com/ddsimmons

"In the beginning was the Word . . . Soli Deo Gloria!"
Dear Professor Garrett (Neal):

I just want to register my strong support for the Diversity Course being proposed. As a corollary,
I am strongly for each Academic Unit being responsible for its own curriculum, without the input
from other Academic Units.

Thank you very much,

Peter

________________________________________

Peter M. Narins, Ph.D., Distinguished Professor
Departments of Integrative Biology and Physiology, and
  Ecology & Evolutionary Biology
Director, Center for the Advanced Study of Behavior
Center for Tropical Research
621 Charles E. Young Drive South, Room LSB 4835
University of California
Los Angeles CA 90095-1606 USA
pnarins@ucla.edu
+01-310-825-0265 (voice)
+01-310-206-3987 (fax)
To ensure equal opportunity and equal access in our society, and to benefit from our diversity, it makes sense to understand the historical human and social circumstances of our diversity. A requirement of this kind, therefore, will be a boon to our academic programs and to our community in its efforts to be inclusive, prevent conflict and enhance cooperation.

Sincerely,

Efrain Kristal
Professor and Chair
Department of Comparative Literature
One can ask why Louisville, KY (the city of my birth and childhood), never became a world-influencing city, but Los Angeles did. Louisville had considerable early advantages in terms of location, weather and natural resources. It had a 50+ year headstart on Los Angeles as a growing city. But Los Angeles had the most important advantage: diversity. From its very earliest days LA merged Spanish, English and Native American cultures. Throughout its history, wave after wave of immigrants came to Los Angeles. It attracted the misfits, the non-conformists, the dissatisfied, the strivers. I strongly believe that it is the synergisms that arise across diverse cultures and perspectives that was absent in Louisville, but made LA one of the great cities of the world. Yet too often in the public dialog today we advocate closing off America to immigrants: closing it off from people who may not speak like we do, think like we do, or act like we do. Many want to turn the entire US into the homogenous Louisville and cease celebrating the diverse Los Angeles. This is a huge mistake for all of us, both as a culture and as a nation. This is why I support the diversity initiative at UCLA. Diversity is what made the US great, and we should do our utmost to teach this simple lesson.

--
Peter Nonacs
Professor & Vice Chair of Graduate Studies
Ecology & Evolutionary Biology
My name is Steve Smale and I am writing in support of the Diversity proposal as Professor and Vice Chair for Undergraduate Education in the Department of Microbiology, Immunology, and Molecular Genetics (MIMG), which spans the College of Letters and Science and the David Geffen School of Medicine. Because of my role in guiding curricular development for MIMG majors and monitoring their time to degree, I took the time to carefully evaluate the Diversity proposal to determine whether its implementation was or was not feasible. I also evaluated resource requirements for implementation, since funds for MIMG’s own educational programs are in short supply. This careful analysis revealed that the Diversity requirement is not only feasible to implement and will have no impact on time to degree for our students, but it also will require only minimal new resources, which have already been committed. It became clear from my analysis that the feasibility and resource concerns that have been highlighted by those opposed to the requirement have been severely mis-represented.

I would like to emphasize that I have focused the above statement on feasibility and resources because, in my opinion, the ideological issue is straightforward and difficult to oppose. In brief, the ideological question is as follows: Is it appropriate for a university to require its students to gain exposure, in an academic setting, to at least one cultural perspective which differs from that with which the student is most familiar?

I would like to close by emphasizing an additional concern, which is the negative national publicity UCLA will undoubtedly receive if the favorable vote by the College faculty is overturned by the campus-wide vote. The negative publicity will extend beyond the national and international press to organizations dedicated to increasing representation in STEM disciplines by ethnic groups that currently are under-represented in these disciplines, including the National Institutes of Health, the National Science Foundation, and the Howard Hughes Medical Institute. These organizations would be left with the strong and perhaps accurate impression that a large number of UCLA faculty members are insensitive to diversity issues and to the needs and viewpoints of students from under-represented groups. The UCLA case would likely be used for years as evidence of the great need for diversity training, not only for its student body, but also for its faculty. If our faculty do not appreciate the value of a simple Diversity course requirement, can we expect them to appreciate the unique educational needs of students from diverse ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds who come to UCLA with the goal of pursuing a career in a STEM field?
Dear Professor Neal Garrett,

I am writing IN SUPPORT of the Curricular Autonomy and Diversity at UCLA.

**UCLA NEEDS a diversity requirement.**
It is shocking that in 2014 nearly 1/4 of UCLA students, faculty, and staff experienced a hostile, exclusionary, and/or unpleasant environment. Research shows diversity content courses can reduce prejudice and increase civic behaviors, helping UCLA improve campus climate.

Best wishes
- Amy
Dear Professor Garrett,

Below is a statement which I would like to have added as a PRO statement regarding the UCLA diversity requirement:

I am in support of the Diversity Course Requirement for undergraduates in the College of Letter and Science for several reasons. First, the majority of undergraduates are in favor of it. Second, if the diversity courses have even a small impact on helping our students appreciate and value cultures that differ from their own, the courses will have been worthwhile. Research suggests that this will be the case--diversity courses result in a positive effect on students' views. Third, there is little downside to having this requirement as there will not be an increase in time to graduation. I am confident that UCLA will be able to successfully implement this requirement. The fact that nearly all of our fellow UC institutions have such a requirement shows that it can be put into practice effectively.

Best,

~Kirk

******************************************************************************

Kirk E. Lohmueller, PhD
Assistant Professor
Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology University of California, Los Angeles
621 Charles E. Young Drive South
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1606

Office Phone: (310)-825-7636
Fax: (310)-206-0484
******************************************************************************
As a new member of the UCLA faculty and having recently come from an institution that adopted a diversity requirement within the last few years (UCSD), I was surprised by the aggressive opposition to this curricular change at UCLA. As is the case with many faculty, I came to UCLA because of its outstanding research environment and incredible commitment to educating the next generation of thought leaders. The extreme opposition to curricula that supports students' abilities to navigate an increasingly diverse and complex world seemed inconsistent with the values professed by the institution. I could only assume that most of the opposition stemmed not from a rejection of diversity, but from concerns about implementation. So I sought out information to understand the feasibility of a diversity requirement at UCLA. In particular, I wanted to address three key questions: (1) Will this increase student time to degree? (2) Are there enough courses for students to fulfill this requirement? (3) Has there been a transparent and thoughtful process for vetting the concerns of faculty and fine-tuning this curricular change, and is there institutional support for it?

(1) Will this increase time to degree? At UC San Diego, all undergraduates are required to take a course that fulfills the Diversity Equity and Inclusion (DEI) graduation requirement. In order to prevent students from increasing their time to degree, the diversity requirement can be fulfilled by a course that also fulfills another requirement, such as a GE requirement. The SAME approach has been taken at UCLA. In fact, the College of Letters and Science requires 3 courses in "Foundations of Arts and Humanities" and 3 courses in "Foundations of Society and Culture" (http://www.registrar.ucla.edu/ge/GE-LS14-15.pdf). It is easy to see from the 160 or so syllabi that are under consideration by the undergraduate council that by taking one of these courses, students can easily fulfill a GE and the diversity requirement simultaneously.

(2) Are there enough courses to fulfill the requirement? In year one, approximately 4800 students will need to fulfill the requirement at some point during their four years at UCLA. In 2017, the requirement will also apply to transfer students. When the 110 or so courses that are already in the queue for approval are formally approved by the Undergraduate Council to fulfill this curricular requirement, a typical process for all courses at UCLA, then there will be approximately 15,000 seats. This does not account for 50 syllabi that have been submitted since the list was released at the time of the diversity requirement approval in November, and it presumes that there are no additional courses added to the queue, which seems unlikely since the number of courses have more than doubled at UCSD since the requirement was adopted in 2011, and nearly all of the courses approved at UC Berkeley and UC Davis were added in the years since the requirement was adopted. The Undergraduate Council committee charged with evaluating syllabi to fulfill the requirement also identified approximately 9,000 additional seats in lower division courses with relevant content.

With this in mind, I was not surprised to learn that the Robert S. Cox, Director Enrollment Planning and Academic Performance Analysis (and the unbiased professional whose job it is to determine course capacity) reported that there is no problem with the implementation of the requirement at UCLA.

I've read with keen interest the e-mails sent to us all by a particularly vociferous group of opponents. I have worked to square the speculative doomsday scenarios about course enrollments with the experiences at all of the other UC campuses, including my former institution, and the “what if” scenarios bare little resemblance to reality. Nonetheless, watching the skill with which these arguments are crafted has made me more excited to re-read Naomi Oreskes "Merchants of Doubt" and see Robert Kenner’s documentary of the same title.
(3) Has there been a transparent and thoughtful process for vetting the concerns of faculty and fine-tuning this curricular change, and is there institutional support for this change? Looking back through my inbox, I found invitations to town hall meetings about the diversity requirement before the campus vote. I, like many of you, received a number of reminders to vote and was able to see pro and con arguments when I logged onto the CCLE website. I also found notification of the Legislative Assembly (LgA) meeting containing the entire diversity requirement proposal, and at the LgA meeting this curricular change was opened up for public debate for over an hour leading to a vote of 85 in favor and 18 in opposition. This type of vetting and careful consideration feels consistent with the value UCLA places on faculty engagement. It is unlikely that this requirement will be left to languish, since both the Chancellor and the EVC have committed to providing the necessary support to make the diversity requirement transformative for our students, and a group of faculty from across the college, many of whom are in important positions of leadership at the university, have spent the better part of a year working out the feasibility of this proposal.

In my experience, a diversity requirement can make an important impact on a campus. At UCSD, it created an intensive dialog about pedagogy that encourages intergroup dialog, it enhanced TA training for effective discussion of such subject matter, and it fostered interdepartmental collaboration; one need only look at such faculty driven activities as the “Teaching Diversity Conference: Strategies for Creating Inclusive Classrooms and Communities” to see evidence of this. These are a far cry from the now infamous Compton Cookout, an event that helped motivate the adoption of the DEI requirement at UCSD. A recent look at the way UCLA students have been portrayed in the NY Times suggests that our students need these tools as well (http://www.nytimes.com/2015/03/06/us/debate-on-a-jewish-student-at-ucla.html). Perhaps most importantly, adoption of a diversity requirement communicates that we value and support tooling our students with the knowledge they need to succeed in an ever-changing cultural, social, and political landscape. For these reasons, I feel I have an obligation to our students to support the College of Letters and Science Diversity Requirement.

Tracy Johnson, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Molecular, Cell and Developmental Biology
Howard Hughes Medical Institute Professor
I am in favor of the curricular autonomy of the College of Letters and Science. In addition, the diversity requirement will raise consciousness among students, faculty, and staff about the pernicious effects of bias based on race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, and age. Raised consciousness produces more thoughtful behavior.

Patty

Patricia Adair Gowaty, PhD
Distinguished Professor
Ecology and Evolutionary Biology
621 Charles E. Young Drive South
Box 951606
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1606

e-mail: gowaty@eeb.ucla.edu
phone: 310 455-6832

Affiliated Scientist
Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute
Unit 0948, APO AA 34002-0948

Distinguished Research Professor Emerita
Odum School of Ecology
University of Georgia

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/patricia-adair-gowaty/
Aaron Panofsky  
Institute for Society and Genetics

I am writing in support of the Diversity Requirement.

In *The Rhetoric of Reaction* the eminent economist Albert O. Hirschman, outlined three main arguments that opponents of reform have been mobilizing since at least 1789: jeopardy, perversity, and futility. These closely map onto the arguments that opponents of the diversity measure have been making since the start. **Jeopardy:** They argue that the diversity requirement will endanger UCLA by steeping it in politically correct ideology and will further harm students’ academic freedom. **Perversity:** The diversity requirement will have the opposite effect which will be to harden our currently tolerant campus against diversity and spur inter-group resentment. And **Futility:** UCLA’s bureaucracy and faculty are incapable of delivering this curriculum.

In contrast the arguments (on this website and during the earlier votes) of the pro-diversity requirement side are rich and nuanced. They cite the vast empirical and theoretical literature on the benefits of diversity; campus climate survey data, corroborated by recurring episodes of shocking discrimination on campus, showing that our happy campus conceals a series of problems; arguments about the necessity of diversity as a core competence in 21st century citizenry as well as future workforce and corporate leadership; the important analytic and interdisciplinary research necessary to understand dimensions of diversity and effective social relations; personal testimonials of difficult experiences that are often invisible to a majority and elite audience; and the history of responsibility that UCLA must uphold with respect to its peer institutions and its global reputation.

Those who are not so caught up in the reactionary arguments against diversity requirement might worry about one more requirement for undergrads. THIS is a requirement, as the Pro side has clearly shown, that can benefit students, the campus, and the society we’re sending them into. Yes, we need to worry about how many requirements students have overall, but that is not an argument against the quality of this requirement.

Further, this requirement will be most effective as north and south campus faculty work together to offer classes that integrate diversity across the curriculum. Offerings from the Institute for Society and Genetics target these questions in ways that undergraduates can benefit greatly from. It is clear that at least the other departments in Life Sciences, the Institute for the Environment, and likely others can develop a curriculum that will benefit students across the campus.

Please join me in voting YES and then supporting the Diversity Requirement.
Dear Professor Garret;
I am writing to support the adoption of the Diversity Course Requirements at UCLA- that is, I am "pro" the requirement.
First, for me the matter is very personal. I am an African American UCLA faculty member and I have experienced racist behavior at every level at UCLA; from undergraduate students, graduate students and to other faculty. Most of it, I believe, was based on the inexperience of those exhibiting the racist behavior in dealing with African Americans, i.e., the inexperience of students dealing African American faculty and of faculty dealing with an African American colleagues. That being said, and as awful as those experiences have been, those experiences are not the primary reason why I am writing in support of the Diversity Course requirement for our students.
I believe preparing in our students to function effectively in an increasingly diverse culture in the US and on an ever shrinking planet-in terms of a rapidly increasing population and the exploding frequency of international air travel for personal and business reasons, that UCLA is obligated to provide the best education possible to our students. The adoption the Diversity Course requirement would be absolutely necessary in order to fulfill that charge to our students. With the adoption of the Diversity Course requirement UCLA would demonstrate to the students, and the world outside UCLA, that the institution is still committed to its mission of providing a first class education. Anything less than adoption of the requirement, I am afraid, would send exactly the opposite message-that UCLA is no longer aspires to be considered in same class as the Harvard's and "UC San Diego's " of the world in this regard and the message would be very loud and very clear. It would say that we are no longer concerned with the preparation of our students to competitively function in an increasingly “diverse” global economy, which would be a very sad statement indeed!
Best,

Delroy Baugh
Associate Professor
Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry
PRO STATEMENT

Vote YES for the College of Letters and Science Undergraduate Diversity Requirement

The College undergraduate diversity requirement is a response to a deeply felt need that it is hugely beneficial for our students to have exposure to experiences and perspectives of others as part of their curriculum. Climate surveys show 24% of faculty, staff, and students have experienced exclusionary, offensive or hostile conduct based on race, gender or sexual orientation. Recent news reports show that our undergraduates have challenges communicating with peers of different backgrounds. There is a strong empirical research base demonstrating that a curriculum that addresses diversity can reduce prejudice and increase civic behaviors and help to prepare students for a world in which diversity affects so many areas of their lives, especially their working lives. Adding an undergraduate diversity course requirement is a critically important step in helping UCLA improve campus climate, particularly at the undergraduate level. Moreover, undergraduates want a diversity requirement, with 63% of UCLA undergraduates voting in favor of a diversity course requirement in a student government poll. The time has come for UCLA to implement a College undergraduate diversity requirement and join the UCLA School of Arts and Architecture, 7 other UC campuses, and many other universities and colleges.

In a large institution it can oftentimes be challenging to create something new, and the creation of a College diversity requirement has been no stranger to challenges. Yet, because a diversity requirement is of such importance for our students, faculty, students, and administration have faced these challenges with dedication, hard work, and positive attitudes. Adhering to UCLA's valued principle of shared governance, they have worked together over the past year to create and support this College diversity requirement. They consulted with faculty and students and fashioned the requirement in a way to reflect UCLA faculty and student interest in a broad definition of diversity, to provide flexibility in course offerings and timing of courses, and to embed it in an infrastructure with resources to ensure its success. They have done such an excellent job designing this requirement that the Director of Academic Advising indicates that the College diversity requirement will have no impact on time to degree, and the Director of Enrollment Planning and Academic Performance Analysis indicates that even with the initial set of course offerings (which will undoubtedly grow) there will be more than sufficient seat capacity to launch the requirement beginning with the 2015 freshman class. Importantly, EVC Waugh indicates that funds for the diversity requirement will have no impact on the funding or any other resources that support existing general educational requirements across the Arts, Humanities or Sciences. All the critical pieces are in place.

The strength and feasibility of the College diversity requirement is clear, and it has been approved through an open, democratic process at every level of faculty governance for a curriculum change such as this (faculty, undergraduate council, legislative assembly). The support for this diversity requirement is also clear, and has come not only from within the College but also from many areas of our campus, as indicated by the range of diversity course
submissions and the resoundingly positive vote of the Legislative Assembly in November 2014 and subsequent resoundingly positive symbolic vote in February 2015. But instead of spending our valuable time implementing this requirement, the College diversity requirement is instead faced with a new challenge -- an unprecedented divisionwide vote invoked by a petition using a Senate Bylaw never before applied to curricular matters and threatening the sacrosanct principle of curricular autonomy.

This vote will send an important message to our students, colleagues, and the LA community about our values at UCLA. Vote YES to support the College undergraduates. Vote YES to support curricular autonomy. Vote YES to uphold the faculty, undergraduate council, and legislative assembly votes. Vote YES to support shared governance and the dedication of your colleagues to enhance the undergraduate curriculum. Vote YES to send a message that UCLA is a school where diversity matters.

Christina Palmer, PhD
Chair, College Faculty Executive Committee
Professor, Psychiatry & Biobehavioral Sciences; Human Genetics; Institute for Society and Genetics; Statistics
Professor Garrett,
This note is in support of the undergraduate diversity requirement. Curricular autonomy is prized here at UCLA and we should not allow it to be cheapened. UCLA is composed of a diverse community of students and intellectuals. A diversity requirement would only enhance the UCLA experience.

"VOTE YES to support curricular autonomy; VOTE YES to show that UCLA cares about diversity."

Sincerely,
Nalo Hamilton
Assistant Professor School of Nursing
Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Scholar 2011-2014
PRO DIVERSITY REQUIREMENT STATEMENT

A first-class public university has a duty to prepare students to perform both professionally and civically, that is, to prepare students to live productively in the multi-ethnic democracy that is America. There is no doubt that professional performance will be enhanced by knowledge of the likely experiences of colleagues of differing genders, ethnicities, religions, and physical abilities. Civic engagement—such as school meetings, government hearings, and the ballot box, for example—will be enhanced by the same. To be sure, a single course (even were it longer than ten weeks) cannot turn a multitude of disparate experiences and histories into one American history, one American sociology, one American literature, one American .... (you name it). What it can do is teach students to understand that in American history differences have usually resulted in hierarchies and have often resulted in conflict. It can teach that difference, unless critically examined and thoroughly understood from the point of view of the “other” rather than from the point of view of a particular (especially a dominant) group, can warp one’s thinking and can worm sexism, racism, ageism, classism (any of the -isms) into the psyche of even the most benevolent of persons. It can teach critical self and societal examination via rigorous academic disciplines that have been honed over the last fifty years.

I ask you to consider the following list of ten unhappy results from academic or government studies, results that none of us would wish to be party to:

1. College professors, across race/ethnicity and gender, are more likely to respond to queries [for mentorship] from students they believe are white males.
2. White people, including white children, are less moved by the pain of people of color, including children of color, than by the pain of fellow whites.
3. White people are more likely to have done illegal drugs than blacks or Latinos, but are far less likely to go to jail for it.
4. Black men are sentenced to far lengthier prison sentences than white men for the same crimes.
5. White people, including police, see black children as older and less innocent than white children. [A UCLA study]
6. Black children are more likely to be tried as adults and are given harsher sentences than white children.
7. White people are more likely to support the criminal justice system, including the death penalty, when they think it’s disproportionately punitive toward black people.
8. The more “stereotypically black” a defendant looks in a murder case, the higher the likelihood he will be sentenced to death.
9. Conversely, white people falsely recall black men they perceive as being “smart” as being lighter-skinned.
10. A number of studies find white people view lighter-skinned African Americans (and Latinos) as more intelligent, competent, trustworthy and reliable than their darker-skinned peers.

[List compiled by Kali Holloway and published on Alternet March 3, 2015. For a full discussion and links to the published studies, see: http://www.alternet.org/news-amp-politics/hey-smug-white-people-how-you-yes-you-are-racist-too  ]
We can hope that the younger generations will be able to change such statistics (and similar ones involving gender, ethnicity, disabilities) and thus create a more inclusive society. Let us give them one small tool to help them start.

Katherine C. King  
Professor of Comparative Literature and Classics  
Member of the Undergraduate Council  
Past Chair of the Faculty of the College of Letters and Science  
Past Co-Chair of the Chancellor’s Advisory Committee on the Status of Women
I believe the Diversity Requirement for the UCLA College needs to be supported.

1. UCLA is currently home to one of the most diverse college communities in the country. It is one of the largest providers nationwide of Federal Pell Grants to students who are first-generation in their family to attend college. More than one-third of our entering students have a first language other than English. Although there is a range and variety of our student population, the nature of American society is such that most of our undergraduates enter UCLA from sheltered backgrounds with little training and experience for living multi-culturally and for understanding and knowing how to respect difference. The challenge of learning to live together must be acknowledged.

2. Despite its diversity, African Americans are woefully under-represented in the College. This past year, their underrepresentation has gone viral with a video made by our students, and the problem has attracted national attention in print and television media. UCLA has now repeatedly over the course of this past year received bad press across the country. Further, the Moreno Report was issued this year and describes the negative racial climate on this campus to have reached crisis proportions. The attention UCLA has received serves as a self-fulfilling prophecy: prospective African American students are advised not to attend UCLA because of its unwelcoming atmosphere.

3. Students of color report often being the subject of various forms of “micro-aggressions,” unthinking words and actions by students that help marginalize them.

4. A front-page article in The New York Times recently featured UCLA as a site of growing anti-Semitism. Focusing on an incident in student government, it is clear that students often have difficulty differentiating between religious affiliation and the capacity to act impartially in the University community.

The current campus climate serves as ample evidence that we need to accept the responsibility to better educate our students. Situating through various courses the UCLA multi-cultural experience historically and within a larger national and world perspective will help. Further, no one should be exempt from considering the effects of their own perspective on the ways it continues to shape the academic community and the nation. I believe most students would welcome this kind of education; it is essential that the faculty commit themselves to providing it. The UCLA College has already passed this requirement. Should the whole UCLA faculty vote to undo what has already been agreed upon, it will surely garner us more negative attention locally and nationally. In this case, I think it will be well deserved.

Jeffrey Prager
Professor
March 9, 2015

TO: Joel Aberbach, Chair, Academic Senate, Los Angeles Division
    Neal Garrett, Secretary, Academic Senate, Los Angeles Division

FROM: Reynaldo F. Macías, Professor of Chicana/o Studies, Education & Applied Linguistics, and affiliated faculty with African American Studies & with Civic Engagement

re: College Diversity Requirement Re-Vote

Dear Chair Aberbach,

I write to voice concerns regarding the UCLA College undergraduate diversity requirement divisional membership revote. While I consider the called-for divisional revote on this already-college-faculty adopted issue awkward at best and a violation of our academic freedom at worst, I am asking my UCLA divisional colleagues that they cast a YES vote on this question. Let me indicate why.

We have a process of divisional review and approval of Faculty unit curricular and degree requirements that are based on peer and collegial review. This provides for the local faculty units (departments, schools, colleges) independence in initiating or modifying degree programs they are responsible for and the curricular requirements within those programs, followed by a subsequent review and approval process that include faculty executive committees, undergraduate and graduate councils, committees on planning and budget, and, finally legislative assembly—all of the latter bodies reflecting divisional memberships, and serving as working surrogates for the divisional membership. The committee and assembly review and approval process is best viewed as advice and consent respecting the collective academic freedom of the local faculty units to fashion program requirements as they see fit. These committees and the legislative assembly are in a position to raise practical, budgetary, and even substantive issues regarding these academic requirements. As issues are raised, and they are resolved or attended to in the committee and assembly review process, our respect for colleagues’ authority to exercise their academic expertise and visions as it relates to their own units should become more paramount, lest we provide opportunities for abuse of our recognized collective expertise.

In this particular case, the issues raised by the very small number of faculty and students who called for the College of Letters & Science undergraduate diversity requirement to be taken out of the consent agenda and dealt with separately at the LegAssembly meeting had already been raised and satisfactorily answered in the multiple committee review and approval process—to the
satisfaction of quite a number of our colleagues on these committees. The resolution of these questions were so convincing that the turn-out vote of the College faculty was significant, and in substantial majority favor of the change (out of the overwhelmingly large voter turnout of 635 college faculty voting, 332 voted for, and 303 against—52% of those voting in favor. NOTA BENE, this was passed alone by more faculty than ALL of the faculty who voted on this issue the last time it was unsuccessfully raised, which numbered just over 200 faculty votes pro and con). And this process was repeated in the debate that took place at the LegAssembly meeting as these same criticisms (along with some *ad hominem* arguments impuning pro faculty of political motivations and the absence of intellectually respectable content of the requirement) were raised by the nay-sayers and answered yet again, by the large number of faculty who spoke in favor of the regulation.

The resulting and overwhelming positive vote by the divisionally representative Legislative Assembly delegates (85 for, 18 nay, 4 abstentions for a near 80% support) should have settled the matter of this one regulatory change, as it often does on similar changes. Degree requirement changes are brought through this process to the LegAssembly and are often considered non-controversial and placed on the consent agenda. In this exceptional case, a losing faculty member asked for it to be withdrawn from the consent calendar and for it to be made a main motion, precipitating the debate (and subsequently making it possible to call for a divisional membership vote if his side lost again since according to ByLaw 155 (A), only “main motions and amendments thereto ... may be submitted to a mail or electronic ballot”). Seldom are degree requirements subject to main motions reflecting this divisional recognition of respecting the academic freedom of each faculty unit to determine program requirements. One need only look at the relatively non-controversial process of a similar diversity requirement which was approved for another academic unit previously (School of Art & Architecture) and without the frequent, and consistent rancor that our opposing colleagues have generated on this College of L&S regulatory change.

Let me suggest that the rationale for submitting actions of the LegAssembly or Division to ALL of the voting members of the division as a revote of an issue should be intended to validate actions that affect the entire division, which may include positions on socio-political issues, or divisional or system wide application and changes. If the actions do not affect the entire division, as in this case since it adds one requirement to the undergraduate degree only within the College of Letters and Science, then I believe calling for a membership revote should not be available. In the alternative, if a full divisional membership vote is called for, it should imply application of the results to all the divisional programs—meaning that if the nays have it, then the existing diversity requirement in the School of Art & Architecture would be nullified; and if the ayes have it, then there should be a diversity requirement for all the degree programs at UCLA. Otherwise, the collegial respect for the academic freedom of the individual faculty units should be respected, with the advice and consent of the divisionally-representative review committees and the LegAssembly as constituted, representing the faculty of each academic department on campus.

PRESERVE ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND COLLEGIAL MUTUAL RESPECT.
VOTE YES ON THE ISSUE OF THE COLLEGE DIVERSITY REQUIREMENT.
Dear Professor Garrett,

I would like to express my strongest support for the College undergraduate diversity requirement under consideration by the UCLA Academic Senate. Although it would be pleasant to believe that we live in a world where diversity is no longer an issue—at least not on university campuses populated, presumably, by enlightened professors and students—anyone who reads the news will realize that we still have a long way to go before we can ignore diversity education. If anyone needed another reminder of this fact, surely the recent incident at Oklahoma University should suffice. There, undergraduate university students belonging to a fraternity (SAE) were videotaped enthusiastically engaged in racist chanting. One would have to be extremely naive, or simply willfully ignorant, to suppose that this sort of thing does not take place on a daily basis at some university campus somewhere in the US. In the face of such persistent prejudice, indeed hatred, on the part of a significant number of university students, to require our undergraduate students to take a course in diversity appreciation seems extremely reasonable. Such modest measures, one hopes, will hasten the day when underrepresented groups at UCLA are no longer confronted with prejudiced actions such as those exhibited by the SAE fraternity members at Oklahoma University.

Thank you for your consideration of my statement.

Sincerely,

David L. Glanzman, Professor
Departments of Integrative Biology and Physiology, UCLA College and Neurobiology, David Geffen School of Medicine
Dear Professor Garrett,

I am writing to express my strong support for the UCLA College diversity requirement. This requirement will ensure that our students have a minimum level of exposure to diverse perspectives, which is essential in today's ever more diverse society. There is clear evidence in the educational literature that such courses have positive effects on individual students and their collective environment.

I also believe that taking a firm stance on this issue is in UCLA's best interest, to reinforce our reputation as an inclusive and metropolitan institution. On the contrary, it would be a real embarrassment to retract our support for the diversity requirement after we have already approved it.

On that note, I also support the measure as a matter of governance. It is not appropriate that such a small number of dissenters can overturn the will of the College faculty, as expressed in a fair vote. It is also not appropriate that other divisions on campus should vote on an internal curricular matter that only affects students and faculty in the College.

Thank you for your consideration,
Jamie Lloyd-Smith

--
James O. Lloyd-Smith
Associate Professor
Department of Ecology & Evolutionary Biology
University of California, Los Angeles
610 Charles E Young Dr South
Box 723905
Los Angeles, CA 90095-7239

Phone: 310-206-8207
https://www.eeb.ucla.edu/Faculty/lloydsmith/
Office: 4135 Terasaki Life Science Building
Lab: 4000 Terasaki Life Science Building
For the second time this academic year, I write in strongest support of the passage of the Proposed Diversity Requirement in the College of Letters and Sciences. I also voice my disagreement with colleagues who anonymously attempted to overturn the fair and democratic process that vetted and ultimately passed the diversity requirement. While it would be easy to fall victim to anger or frustration at this turn of events, particularly in the wake of the Moreno Report and recent attacks against women, students of color, and religious minorities on UCLA’s campus, we, as educators, must take this opportunity to teach others about why the College Diversity requirement is so important, and why threats to self governance should be of such concern. To that end, I reprise some of the data included in my first pro statement.

As is obvious from news reports from Ferguson, Missouri and elsewhere, we are at a turning point in how we think about the diversity of our nation, our university, and the world. Passage of this new diversity course requirement will help prepare our students to become thoughtful, global citizens able to challenge bias and inequality as they envision a more just and inclusive world.

Our undergraduates themselves are strongly in support of this course requirement, as manifested by the actions of the Student Advisory Board and other groups, and by the viral video produced by UCLA undergraduate Sy Stokes, “Black Bruins [Spoken Word]” [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BE03H5BOIFk](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BE03H5BOIFk) Their support of diversity is in tune with similar student movements across the country, such as “I, too, am Harvard.” (Ahsante Bean, et al. [http://itooamharvard.tumblr.com/](http://itooamharvard.tumblr.com/))

These movements reflect changing demographics:

Non-Hispanic White Population in the US (2013 Census):  62.6%
[http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/00000.html](http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/00000.html)

Non-Hispanic White Population in California (2013):  39%
[http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/06000.html](http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/06000.html)

Non-Hispanic White Faculty at UCLA:  72%

Non-Hispanic White Undergraduates at UCLA:  27.8%
[https://www.admissions.ucla.edu/campusprofile.htm](https://www.admissions.ucla.edu/campusprofile.htm)

I am impressed by the current course proposal, and by the data that shows that diversity courses positively affect student learning, critical thinking abilities, and quality of life. I’m voting “yes” on this again and urge my colleagues to do so, too.
March 9, 2015

Academic Senate Faculty

Re: Proposed Diversity Requirement in the College of Letters and Science

Dear Colleagues:

This letter conveys my full support for the proposed requirement initially approved by the College of Letters and Science as well as the Legislative Assembly. The requirement mandates that undergraduate students within College complete at least one course fulfilling a diversity requirement in order to graduate.

I am a member of the faculty of the Department of Community Health Sciences in the Fielding School of Public Health. Despite having no current or prior teaching responsibilities in the College, I, as with many others, find myself in the position of voting on the curricular decisions of the College. I am very reluctant to second guess the decisions that faculty and others in the College made about the nature of its curricula and the courses needed to prepare its undergraduate students to become effective leaders in the global community they will encounter following graduation. Failure to ensure a unit’s curricular autonomy may set a precedent that makes it difficult for the University to ensure that there are spaces on campus in which the pursuit of various forms of knowledge is possible.

In conclusion, I encourage the ratification of the diversity requirement as proposed.

Sincerely,

Chandra L. Ford, PhD, MPH, MLIS
Associate Professor
March 2, 2015

Academic Senate Faculty

Re: Proposed Diversity Requirement Letter of Support

Dear colleagues,

CODEO categorically supports the proposed College of Letters and Science undergraduate diversity requirement known as “Amendment to Divisional Regulation A-458 (C).” We are extremely troubled by the hostility and vehement obstruction with which the diversity requirement has been met, and we strongly encourage you, our colleagues, to ratify the proposed requirement in the upcoming vote. Your support is critical not only for our students and the broader UCLA community, but also for the future of faculty governance.

Your support of the diversity requirement also offers critical support to the spirit of education that can, as César Chavez put it, “help students and parents cherish and preserve the ethnic and cultural diversity that nourishes and strengthens this community - and this nation.” UCLA's proposed diversity requirement does exactly this, and thus we were proud to be Bruins in October 2014 when the faculty of the UCLA College of Letters and Science passed “Amendment to Divisional Regulation A-458 (C).” After the publication of the Moreno Report, which detailed the deteriorating racial climate and lack of leadership on issues of discrimination and bias at UCLA, it seemed UCLA was on its way to embracing Chavez's message.

Our pride dissipated in December 2014, when 59 faculty successfully petitioned to put the requirement to a campus-wide vote. More egregious is a Daily Bruin submission and public email circulating among faculty that is riddled with inaccuracies about this initiative. The critical, groundbreaking nature of the diversity requirement for UCLA compels us to unpack the letter and article’s fallacious claims:

1. The first issue claims that the diversity requirement: “forces students to take a course on top of their already rigorous academic schedule in order to graduate.”
   a. This initiative is explicitly designed to not disrupt the student's progress towards degree. A directive of the ad hoc Faculty Committee is to ensure that this requirement will not force students to take additional units to graduate.
2. A second claim: “The diversity requirement institutionalizes racial, ethnic, and religious divides within the community.”
   a. Awareness fosters inclusion, not division. These classes will provide students with a safe environment to develop a new understanding of their own culture and an opportunity to explore cultures to which they have not previously been exposed.
3. A third inaccuracy: “University administration has presented no plan to deal with the capacity issues that will be imposed on the classes that would become required”.
   a. The University has outlined a plan for ensuring that the requirement will not produce over-crowding. The ad hoc faculty committee produced an
Implementation Report noting 110 courses currently on the books that fulfill the requirement and have sufficient capacity to handle additional enrollees. Moreover, the chancellor and EVC have already committed funds for course development and instructor training.

4. A fourth unsubstantiated claim: “The diversity requirement forces students to take a class where you could be subject to ridicule for your religious beliefs, ethnic background, or sexual orientation.”
   a. A recent campus climate survey revealed that 24% of respondents had personally experienced exclusionary, intimidating, offensive and/or hostile conduct. The diversity requirement can help change this by creating a culture of awareness and inclusion.

5. One final misguided claim: “The diversity requirement requires more of your tuition dollars to be spent irresponsibly.”
   a. The UCLA College of Letters and Science is a liberal arts institution with an obvious gap in the area of cultural awareness and diversity. The classes that would satisfy the diversity requirement embody exactly what a true liberal arts education is all about: broad, thoughtful, and encompassing knowledge.

Diversity is an issue we all must take seriously. We can never truly walk in another's shoes, but we can learn to imagine another's journey. In doing so, we grow and become ever more effective leaders of our intellectual communities and ever more effective mentors to tomorrow's leaders. No one can lead without understanding and empathizing with the cultural and societal differences that exist in this world, and CODEO believes that “Amendment to Divisional Regulation A-458 (C)” is a crucial step towards this goal.

CODEO implores the faculty of UCLA to vote in favor of passing “Amendment to Divisional Regulation A-458 (C),” the diversity requirement, beginning March 30.

Sincerely,

Marissa Lopez, Chair
Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity

Corinne Bendersky, Anderson School of Management
Tara Browner, Department of Ethnomusicology and American Indian Studies
Esteban Dell’Angelica, Department of Human Genetics
Alicia Gaspar de Alba, Chair, LGBT Studies Program, Departments of Chicana/o Studies, English, and Gender Studies
Darnell Hunt, Department of Sociology and Director of Ralph J. Bunche Center for African American Studies
Rose Maly, Department of Family Medicine
Claudia Mitchell-Kernan, Professor Emeritus, Department of Anthropology
Russell Thornton, Department of Anthropology
MEMO

Date March 9, 2015
From Lily Chen-Hafteck, Acting Chair, Faculty Executive Committee
   School of the Arts and Architecture
To Neal Garrett, Secretary of the Division
RE: College of Letters and Science Diversity Course

On behalf of the Faculty Executive Committee of the School of the Arts and Architecture, I write to express our support of the proposed College of Letters and Science undergraduate diversity course requirement, which amends Divisional Regulation A-458.

As we enter the new millennium, UCLA and our graduates face new challenges. These challenges cannot be met by technology alone. It is important that we understand we are entering into a new and rich global society. This new international arena has far-reaching challenges and great opportunities for the future. Our students and future leaders will be asked to contribute and interact in a new and emerging society in ways yet to be imagined.

Our students should have a clearer and better understanding of how to operate in this new milieu. Having a more informed and clearer understanding of issues that relate to diversity and inclusivity can only heighten our human relationships and facilitate open dialogue between different groups and peoples. Such exchanges foster mutual understanding and stronger collaboration – they are good for everyone and hurt no one. While the UCLA School of the Arts and Architecture has successfully implemented its own diversity requirement, it is indefensible that UCLA and UC Merced are the only UCs not to have a diversity requirement campus-wide. Integrating a diversity requirement in the UCLA College of Letters and Science will be a strong move towards aligning our academic priorities with those of other UCs.

After extensive review and deliberation, the diversity course requirement at the College level has received the approval and the support of students, faculty, and the administration. In 2014, UCLA’s College Faculty Executive Committee, Undergraduate Council, and the Legislative Assembly all voted unanimously in favor of the requirement. It was scheduled for implementation in Fall 2015 for incoming freshmen and in Fall 2017 for transfer students. We are concerned that by submitting the Diversity requirement to an Academic Senate-wide vote, the autonomy of the College of Letters and Science to determine its own curriculum has been undermined.

This unprecedented vote on the diversity requirement is now scheduled to be held from March 30th to April 10th, 2015.

We request that this letter be distributed to the Academic Senate membership and we urge the members to vote in favor of the undergraduate diversity requirement. We strongly believe that this course requirement is foundational to the future quality of our undergraduate curriculum.