


Summer 8-17-2016

Diversifying the Curriculum: An Analysis of Diversity Course Policies at the University of California San Diego

Maria Lourdes Amparo
SIT Graduate Institute, maria.amparo@mail.sit.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcollections.sit.edu/capstones>

 Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#), [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), [Curriculum and Social Inquiry Commons](#), [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [International and Comparative Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Amparo, Maria Lourdes, "Diversifying the Curriculum: An Analysis of Diversity Course Policies at the University of California San Diego" (2016). *Capstone Collection*. 2933.
<http://digitalcollections.sit.edu/capstones/2933>

This Thesis (Open Access) is brought to you for free and open access by the SIT Graduate Institute at SIT Digital Collections. It has been accepted for inclusion in Capstone Collection by an authorized administrator of SIT Digital Collections. For more information, please contact digitalcollections@sit.edu.

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

Diversifying the Curriculum: An Analysis of Diversity Course Policies at
the University of California San Diego

Maria Lourdes Amparo

PIM 74

A Capstone Paper in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Master of International
Education at SIT Graduate Institute in Brattleboro, Vermont, USA.

Capstone Seminar August 15, 2016

Adviser: Lynée Connelly, Professor

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

Consent to Use of Capstone

I hereby grant permission for World Learning to publish my Capstone on its websites and in any of its digital/electronic collections, and to reproduce and transmit my CAPSTONE ELECTRONICALLY. I understand that World Learning's website and digital collections are publicly available via the Internet. I agree that World Learning is NOT responsible for any unauthorized use of my Capstone by any third party who might access it on the Internet or otherwise.

Student name: Maria Lourdes Amparo

Date: July 15, 2016

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

Dedication

This Capstone is dedicated to Paul Yunouye who is a constant source of inspiration and joy for me and so many other lives he has touched.

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge Nanay and Tatay, Lolo and Lola, and Tatay Ambing and Nanay Oleng who have made countless sacrifices and contributions for our family. I would not have been able to pursue my academic and professional goals without your love and support.

Maraming, maraming salamat po sa inyong lahat.

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT 1

INTRODUCTION..... 2

CURRENT STATE OF THE POLICY..... 2

HISTORICAL, CULTURAL, AND ECONOMIC BACKGROUND..... 3

STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS..... 7

ELEMENTS AND COMPONENTS OF THE POLICY 11

 FRAMING THE ISSUE 13

 GOALS AND OBJECTIVES..... 18

 IMPLEMENTATION 19

OVERALL ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 20

 TARGET POPULATIONS 22

 SUCCESSES..... 23

 AREAS IN NEED OF IMPROVEMENT..... 27

 RECOMMENDATIONS 29

CONCLUSIONS..... 31

REFERENCES..... 33

APPENDIX A..... 37

APPENDIX B..... 39

APPENDIX C 40

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

Abstract

As U.S. higher education institutions and the larger society become increasingly global and racially and ethnically diverse, educational institutions are faced with the challenge of adapting their policies and academic curriculum to reflect and meet the demands of a changing environment. As part of a comprehensive plan to address campus climate issues at the University of California, San Diego (UC San Diego), the UC San Diego Academic Senate revised the undergraduate graduation requirement in 2011 to include one course that focuses on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI). In addition to having a diverse student population, UC San Diego is ranked seventh in the nation among universities with the largest percentage of degree-seeking international students. But how is diversity related to international education and what does diversity have to do with international students?

This Capstone Paper will analyze the policies around the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion graduation requirement, including the course approval process and criteria, from an international education lens by synthesizing research on teaching and learning about diversity with studies on international student identity development.

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

Introduction

As U.S. higher education institutions and the larger society become increasingly global and racially and ethnically diverse, educational institutions are faced with the challenge of adapting their policies and academic curriculum to reflect and meet the demands of a changing environment. As part of a comprehensive plan to address campus climate issues at the University of California, San Diego (UC San Diego), the UC San Diego Academic Senate revised the undergraduate graduation requirement in 2011 to include one course that focuses on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI). The purpose of the DEI requirement is to educate students and “to develop innovative pedagogy that enables them to excel and lead in an increasingly complex and diverse society” (Standing Committee for the DEI graduation requirement, 2015, p. 1). All undergraduate students at UC San Diego are required to complete one DEI course from the list of approved courses.

This Capstone Paper will analyze the policies around the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion graduation requirement, including the course approval process and criteria, from an international education lens by synthesizing research on teaching and learning about diversity with studies on international student identity development.

Current State of the Policy

At the time of writing, there were 105 DEI-approved courses, 25 lower division courses and 80 upper division courses, across 22 academic departments and programs (Campuswide Undergraduate Requirement in DEI, 2016). The number of available DEI-courses has increased since the requirement was implemented in Fall 2011 and the DEI Standing Committee continues to accept course proposals to expand current course offerings in order to meet the needs of the undergraduate student population. Current DEI course topics cover race, ethnicity, gender and

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

gender identity, sexual orientation, and language (Campuswide Undergraduate Requirement in DEI, 2016). Race and/or ethnicity is the most represented topic among the range of topics offered with over 25 courses. Several courses also focus on specific racial or ethnic groups. There are nine courses on African American topics, seven courses on Asian American/Pacific Islander topics, seven courses on Hispanic/Latino/Chicano, and eight courses on Native American topics (see Appendix A for a table of DEI course offerings). Language is represented in ten courses, such as the Education Studies course “Language, Culture, and Education.” There are five courses on gender, three courses on sexuality or sexual orientation, and four courses on immigration (Appendix A). There are two courses that cover transnational or non-U.S. subject matter. There are also several broad course titles, such as “Biology and Diversity” and “Urban Education,” that might cover one or more of the DEI-related topics that are not represented in these numbers. Eleven courses are counted twice due to being cross-listed in two different departments.

Historical, Cultural, and Economic Background

The University of California system and its campuses are committed to providing access to higher education for California residents (University of California, n.d.). From 2000 to 2005, the percentage of UC San Diego undergraduate students from California consistently measured at 95%. The percentage of undergraduates that were California residents gradually started to decrease during the period of 2006 to 2010 from 94% down to 92%. From 2011 to 2015, there was a more noticeable decrease in the percentage of undergraduate students from California, which dropped by 3 to 4 percentage points each academic year (see Appendix B for more detailed UC San Diego enrollment information). There was an 18-percentage point decrease in the percentage of undergraduate California residents during the ten-year period from 2005 to

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

2015. In the 2005-2006 academic year, 19,598 California residents made up 95% of the total 20,679 undergraduate student population (Appendix B). In the 2015-2016 academic year, 10,482 California residents made up 77% of the total 26,590 undergraduate student population (Appendix B).

The decrease in the percentage of California residents was not due to a smaller number of California residents enrolled at UC San Diego. The number of California residents increased most years from 2001-2016, but the number of California residents did not increase at the same rate as the total number of undergraduate students. The increase in the total undergraduate student population can be attributed to larger numbers of international and out of state students enrolling at the university. In 2011 the number and percentage of international students enrolled at the university began to increase much faster and more frequently than in previous years. From 2001-2010 international students made up less than 5% of the total undergraduate population (Appendix B). In the 2011-2012 academic year, international students made up 6.6% of the total number of undergraduate students. The percentage of international students has increased from 2.5 to 3 percentage points each year since 2011. This is a significant difference from the period during 2001-2007 that saw little change in the percentage of international students at UC San Diego.

The rapid increase in international students has resulted in a dramatic shift in demographics at UC San Diego. In 2007, international students comprised 3.3% of the total undergraduate population (Appendix B). In 2015, international students comprised 17.5% of the total undergraduate population, which is a 14-percentage point increase in an 8-year period (Appendix B). Various factors have contributed to this shift, such as university recruitment and admissions practices, a decrease in state funding, an increase in tuition fees, and growing

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

international student interest among other reasons. More notably, the economic landscape in the state of California severely impacted the University of California budget and cost of tuition.

California had a budget gap of \$11.1 billion in 2011, which resulted in a \$1.4 billion cut to the University of California and California State University (CSU) systems (Johnson, 2012, p. 5).

Furthermore, California state funding per student fell far below long-term averages from \$20,000 per student in 1998-1999 to \$15,000 per student in 2008-2009 (Johnson, 2012, p. 5-7).

In response to the significant loss of state funding, the University of California campuses increased tuition and modified their enrollment strategies. California resident tuition at UC San Diego increased by 16.6% in 2009, 20.5% in 2010, and 16.8% in 2011, while additional out of state/international student tuition increased by 10.2% in 2009 and by 8% in 2015 (Appendix C). The supplemental tuition for out of state/international students in 2015-2016 was \$24,708 on top of the \$13,557 cost of tuition (Appendix C). The University of California stated that the extra revenue from international and out of state tuition “enables UC to improve educational programs for all students” (University of California, n.d.). The increase in the number of international students since 2011 has brought in an additional source of funding to make up for the loss of funding from the state. For reference, in 2015-2016 there were 4,658 enrolled international students at UC San Diego, which brought in over \$115 million in supplemental tuition (Appendix A, Appendix C).

The sudden and rapid increase in international student enrollment has drawn the attention of various groups of students, staff, faculty, and administrators at the university. Proponents of international student enrollment cite academic and financial benefits to admitting more international students to the university, such as providing more diverse perspectives and bringing

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

in nonresident tuition to subsidize the cost of education for California residents following significant cuts in state funding to the University of California (Jordan & Belkin, 2015).

On the other hand, critics of the increase in the number of international students have argued that a public state university such as UC San Diego should prioritize enrolling California residents over non-resident students (Jordan & Belkin, 2015; Tugend, 2016). The low enrollment of underrepresented California residents is of particular concern among departments and offices that work with historically underrepresented students, some of which view international student enrollment as diverting limited university resources away from underrepresented California resident students (Moreno, 2016). Other criticisms claim that the relatively low English proficiency of international students lowers admissions criteria and has a negative impact on the quality of academic programs (Murphy, 2016).

Furthermore, the sudden increase in the number of international students and the change in undergraduate student demographics happened during a time when the university grappled with campus tensions around racial insensitivity and hostility toward underrepresented minority students. In 2010, there were a series of racially motivated incidents at UC San Diego that targeted African-Americans that included an off-campus party that mocked Black History Month and a noose that was found in a campus library (Archibold, 2010). The DEI course requirement is cited as part of the university response to the racial climate following the racially themed party commonly referred to as the “Compton Cookout” (Campus Climate Study Summary, 2014).

Discussions around the DEI requirement were again brought to the campus’ attention after discriminatory incidents occurred at the university. In the spring of 2016, a series of inflammatory chalk messages targeting Mexican and Latino groups reignited racial tensions and conversations around the campus climate (Warth & Baker, 2016). Student representatives from

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlan (MEChA) and Migrant Rights Awareness (MiRA) presented a list of demands to the university administration that included amendments to the DEI requirement and policies (UC San Diego MEChA & MiRA, 2016).

It is necessary to recognize the history of underrepresentation of African-American and Latino students at UC San Diego and within the University of California system in order to provide historical and cultural context to the creation of the DEI requirement and policies (Shorette, 2016). But the DEI requirement affects and impacts more than the underrepresented student population at the university. The large presence of international students and the underrepresentation of African-American and Latino students, while separate and distinct issues, undeniably shape the perceptions and experiences of undergraduate students at the university. The increase in the number of international students in particular has attracted negative attention during a time of growing scrutiny toward the University of California system and UC San Diego. Negative sentiments and perceptions toward international students have affected and impacted their satisfaction and sense of belonging at the university (Hanassab, 2006, p. 161). There is a risk of marginalizing international, non-U.S. citizen, and non-native English speaking students if the campus environment is not welcoming toward these groups or if the academic curriculum, particularly DEI courses, do not address or meet the needs of marginalized groups.

Stakeholder Analysis

The three main groups of stakeholders at the university are undergraduate students who are required to complete the DEI course, faculty who will teach DEI courses, and university staff and administration involved in implementing and supporting campus diversity initiatives and activities. I will use WaterAid's (2007) stakeholder analysis table to examine the attitudes toward the policies, importance of the policies, and level influence over the policies that these three

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

groups have (p. 98). There are various attitudes toward the DEI requirement among students, faculty, and staff that range from being in support of the policy to being opposed to it. Students are more likely to have low to medium influence on the DEI requirement although they are the most directly affected by it. Faculty have high influence on the policies and place medium to high importance on them. Staff are likely to have medium to high influence on the policies and view the policies of medium to high importance to their work.

UC San Diego is a public, research university with highly ranked programs in engineering, health sciences, social sciences, and humanities (University Communications and Public Affairs, n.d.). The university offers more than 100 undergraduate majors in six disciplinary areas and more than 57% of undergraduate students study engineering, science/math, or biology (UC San Diego Office of Student Research & Information, 2015). At an institution that requires several degree, major, and college course requirements, the DEI course requirement adds to an already demanding load of courses. This is of particular concern for students with majors in engineering, math, or health science that are known to have rigid course schedules and long series of courses to complete. The DEI courses might also be less of a priority and of less interest for students that do not fulfill a major requirement by taking the course. This attitude toward the DEI requirement undermines its effectiveness if students are not committed to learning the material. Students that view the DEI course requirement as an academic burden or hindrance could be anti or very anti toward the requirement. On a positive note, the DEI requirement encourages students to take a course outside of their major to diversify their learning.

When looking at undergraduate students we must consider international students and how they are impacted by the DEI requirement and broader campus diversity policies. UC San Diego

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

defines international students as students enrolled at the university on an F or J visa. The number of enrolled international students in Fall 2015 was 4,658 (17% of undergraduate population) mostly from China, South Korea, and India (UC San Diego International Students & Programs Office, 2015). The top majors for international students are Economics, Management Science, Computer Science, and Applied Math (UC San Diego International Students & Programs Office, 2015). International students might not understand how DEI courses are relevant to their academic experience or field of study. In addition, completing a writing-intensive course on an unfamiliar topic could be more challenging for students that already struggle with writing. According to a study by Bergman and Fass-Holmes (2016), international students majoring in Economics, Engineering, and Math had lower English writing grades than international students in other majors (p. 312). International students that choose majors with fewer English writing requirements might struggle with a writing-intensive course requirement. On top of their challenges with writing, international students might struggle to grasp theoretical concepts and historical contexts that depend on or require a foundation in American culture and history. International students could potentially be anti or very anti toward the DEI course requirement for these reasons.

Students majoring in fields that offer DEI-approved courses, such as History, Education Studies, and Ethnic Studies, might view the DEI courses more favorably because they are able to fulfill the DEI course requirement in conjunction with their major requirements. These courses might be more or less the same level of difficulty as other classes offered in their departmental major. Course readings and assignments might not be too different from students' expectations, compared with students that have not previously taken courses within the department.

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

Undergraduate students in other majors could be neutral toward the DEI requirement compared with students in other majors.

With regard to the content and subject matter, students that identify or connect with the identity frameworks and subject matter represented in the course could be pro or very pro toward the DEI requirement, while students that do not connect with the material could be neutral or possibly anti toward the requirement. There might even be students that do not value or agree with requiring students to complete a DEI course that would be very anti toward the requirement.

Faculty that teach DEI-approved courses could have a variety of opinions on the requirement and course criteria. One challenge in teaching required courses is the number of students taking the class solely to fulfill the DEI requirement and not out of interest, which can be indicated by the number of students taking the class Pass/No Pass instead of a letter grade and the number of students that are not taking the course to fulfill a major requirement. The number of non-majors and Pass/No Pass students could impact faculty decisions on the course content and material, for example, the volume and degree of difficulty of required reading. Some faculty have expressed concerns with student comprehension of material particularly around English language proficiency. On the other hand, faculty have the opportunity to create new courses and receive financial support for their work, which some faculty would view more favorably.

The DEI Standing Committee has a stake in the success of the requirement as they oversee its implementation and growth. It would be beneficial for the committee to garner support from faculty and academic departments beyond the current course offerings. This would allow for a wider selection of courses for students to choose from and also new approaches to teaching about diversity. The committee is also in the position to amend the requirement and

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

course criteria to meet faculty and students' needs and to ensure that they are meeting the objectives of the DEI requirement.

Elements and Components of the Policy

In 2011, an advisory committee developed guidelines for the DEI graduation requirement and compiled a preliminary list of existing courses to satisfy the requirement (DEI Graduation Requirement Submission Date - Spring 2015, 2015, p. 1). The DEI Standing Committee was tasked with implementing the DEI graduation requirement and developing subsequent policies to expand the number and variety of courses offered to accommodate the needs of the undergraduate population (UC San Diego DEI Graduation Requirement Standing Committee, 2015, p. 1). In order to increase the number of approved courses and expand the breadth of DEI course offerings, the DEI Standing Committee developed a course proposal process to encourage faculty to submit courses for consideration.

Although only about 5 years into its implementation, the DEI requirement is already integrated into the institution's process of approving academic courses. Any ladder-rank faculty can submit course proposals to the university Undergraduate Council of the Academic Senate, which reviews all new courses. Course proposal submissions can be submitted until the fourth week of every academic quarter. The procedure for the submission of courses, either new or existing, requires a completed syllabus with course description, lecture titles, and bibliography, as well as a completed form that describes how the course meets the theoretical frameworks, subject matter, and pedagogy criteria (UC San Diego DEI Graduation Requirement Standing Committee, 2015, p. 2). In an effort to incentivize faculty participation, the DEI Standing Committee offered up to ten new or substantially revised courses qualify to receive a \$1,500 grant and established the criteria for the Excellence in Teaching Diversity Award from the

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

Executive Vice Chancellor's office (UC San Diego DEI Graduation Requirement Standing Committee, 2015, p. 2).

DEI Course Criteria

Proposed courses must meet criteria initially determined by the DEI Advisory Committee in 2011. The criteria for DEI courses outline three areas: theoretical frameworks, subject matter, and pedagogy.

Theoretical and analytical frameworks. The first criterion requires courses to use theoretical and analytical frameworks that are relevant to understanding diversity, equity and inclusion the United States (UC San Diego DEI Graduation Requirement Standing Committee, 2015, p. 1). Courses can focus on one or multiple identity frameworks that include “race, ethnicity, gender, religion, sexuality, ability/disability, class, age” (UC San Diego DEI Graduation Requirement Standing Committee, p. 1-2). The course approval committee encourages new and intersectional approaches, such as analyzing how gender, religion, or sexuality intersects with race and ethnicity.

Subject matter. Subject matter must focus on at least one of the following groups: African American, Asian American and Pacific Islander, Hispanic or Chicano/Latino, and/or Native American (UC San Diego DEI Graduation Requirement Standing Committee, 2015, p. 1). Courses must dedicate at least 30% of instruction on one or more of these groups in relation to the nation state and/or other groups (UC San Diego DEI Graduation Requirement Standing Committee, 2015, p. 3). Courses must situate the subject matter within conceptual, thematic, and historical frameworks according to what is appropriate for its academic discipline (UC San Diego DEI Graduation Requirement Standing Committee, 2015, p. 3). Subject matter may include historic, present, and/or diasporic populations originating in Asia, the Pacific Islands,

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

Africa, the Caribbean, Central and South America, and indigenous peoples within the United States (UC San Diego DEI Graduation Requirement Standing Committee, 2015, p. 3). Subject matter based in non-U.S. identity or diversity are not included in the identified subject matter.

Pedagogy. Pedagogical frameworks should facilitate understanding one's individual identity in relation to other identities through a comparative approach (UC San Diego DEI Graduation Requirement Standing Committee, 2015, p. 1) The course approval committee encourages pedagogical approaches that facilitate dialogue, reflection, and analysis of diversity, equity, and inclusion in U.S. society (UC San Diego DEI Graduation Requirement Standing Committee, 2015, p. 4).

Framing the Issue

There are multiple models and approaches to cultivating diversity in higher education. The UC San Diego DEI requirement is an academic approach to promoting student learning around diversity. It is important to analyze the frameworks around diversity, equity, and inclusion that shape and inform the UC San Diego DEI requirement.

Diversity. First, we must analyze diversity and how it functions within the context of higher education. UC San Diego (n.d.) defines diversity as “the variety of personal experiences, values, and worldviews that arise from differences of culture and circumstance... [such as] race, ethnicity, gender, age, religion, language, abilities/disabilities, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, and geographic region.” While the university recognizes multiple aspects of identity in its understanding of diversity, its approach to diversity is more significantly delineated by race and ethnicity than any of the other recognized identities. Social and historical patterns of segregation, (forced) migration, and immigration have contributed to making race and ethnicity more salient and visible markers of diversity in the U.S. These

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

aspects of identity have had societal and institutional implications for the university's diversity policies and the composition of the undergraduate student population.

Two examples that demonstrate the university's focus on racial and ethnic diversity include annual demographics reports of the racial composition of undergraduate students and publication materials that depict students of different backgrounds. While measuring the number and representation of different students is valuable, it exhibits the presence of different groups of people without explaining its significance. Hurtado et al. use the term *structural diversity* to describe the numerical representation of different groups of students at a given institution (as cited in Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, Gurin, 2002, p. 332). Universities often use various measures of structural diversity as evidence of their commitment to diversity. However, the claim that having a diverse student population provides educational benefits assumes that learning will happen simply as a result of bringing different groups of people together. Gurin et al. (2002) argue that structural diversity is an "insufficient condition for maximal educational benefits" (p. 333); therefore, it is important to supplement structural diversity with other forms of diversity in order to further facilitate interaction and learning.

Gurin et al. (2002) present *informal interactional diversity* as a secondary form of diversity that considers the frequency and quality of non-classroom intergroup interaction between students of different racial and ethnic backgrounds (p. 333). These types of interactions inform many of the perceptions and experiences of the university campus climate measured by survey tools such as the University of California Undergraduate Experiences Survey (UCUES), the UC San Diego Campus Climate Survey, and the CIRP Freshman Survey (TFS). The third and most relevant aspect of diversity for the purposes of the DEI requirement is *classroom diversity*, which involves learning about diverse people and learning alongside diverse peers in a

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

classroom environment (Gurin et al., 2001, p. 333). A combination of learning and interacting with diverse groups of people in formal and informal educational settings contribute to student learning and development. The DEI course requirement provides undergraduate students with the opportunity to learn about diversity among a diverse group of peers.

Equity. The second aspect of the DEI requirement is equity, which is defined as the “guarantee of fair treatment, access, opportunity and advancement for all students, faculty, and staff while at the same time striving to identify and eliminate barriers that have prevented the full participation of marginalized groups” (UC San Diego, n.d.). The university’s definition of equity recognizes that marginalized groups face barriers that hinder access, opportunity, and advancement. Although the university does not specify which groups are marginalized, within the context of UC San Diego, underrepresented students and students from low socioeconomic status have experienced marginalization in various forms. The university must identify and eliminate the barriers that prevent marginalized groups from fully participating in the social and academic life of the university in order to create an equitable environment. DEI courses can illuminate the discrepancies in access, opportunity, and advancement between different groups so that students can not only participate equally in the educational process, but also receive what they need in order to be on equal standing with their peers.

Inclusion. The third component of the DEI requirement, inclusion, is described as “the act of creating environments in which any individual or group can feel welcomed, respected, supported, and valued” (UC San Diego, n.d.). With regard to race, focusing the subject matter on people of color in the U.S. creates an inclusive academic environment so that students of color feel represented and a part of the campus. Multiple identity frameworks around ethnicity, gender, religion, sexuality, ability/disability, class, and age can encourage students to explore aspects of

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

their identity and understand the identities of their peers. DEI courses in conjunction with informal interactive diversity are necessary to create an inclusive environment.

Racialized identities of international students. International students are credited with contributing to geographic, racial, and ethnic diversity at U.S. universities. With regard to racial diversity, it is necessary to consider the ways in which U.S. racial frameworks impact international students' academic and social experiences. More than half of all undergraduate international students at UC San Diego come from China, South Korea, India, and Japan (International Student Snapshot, 2015). While students from these countries might not self-identify as "Asian," the university and U.S. society at large ascribe these students with a racialized identity based on U.S. racial categorizations without consideration of the distinction between American and international students of Asian ancestry. This is highly problematic as international students "arrive in the United States with racial and cultural orientations specific to their country of origin" (Fries-Britt, Mwangi, & Peralta, 2014, p. 2), meaning that they might conceptualize race and their racial identities differently from their American peers.

Fries-Britt, Mwangi, and Peralta (2014) provide a framework for analyzing international student learning of race in a U.S. context. Many international students are in the category of unexamined U.S. racial-ethnic identity in that they were not aware of or did not consciously think about their racial identity until they arrived in the United States (Fries-Britt et al., 2014, p. 4). International students in this stage express feeling disconnected from or confused by the salience of race in U.S. society (Fries-Britt et al., 2014, p. 5). The next stage international students can experience involves racial/ethnic encounters in the U.S. context that initiate a self-examination of one's racial identity (Fries-Britt et al., 2014, p. 6).

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

Following racial/ethnic encounters, international students move toward examining their racial and ethnic identity in a U.S. context as they begin to understand that their identity is perceived differently in the U.S. context from how they saw themselves (Fries-Britt et al., 2014, p. 7). International students of color begin to think about their status as racial minorities in the United States and, in some cases, are forced to come to terms with their racial identity because of discriminatory interactions (Fries-Britt et al., 2014, p. 7). The last category of integrative awareness involves a growing awareness of and a more confident sense of one's racial positioning within the U.S. context (Fries-Britt et al., 2014, p. 8).

Furthermore, a study on the perceived discrimination of international students by Hanassab (2006) found that international students experienced discrimination according to U.S. racial frameworks in a way that is similar to how U.S. students experience discrimination (p. 162-167). One finding showed that international students of color experienced more discrimination than white international students. For instance, international students from Africa and the Middle East experienced more discrimination than international students from Central and South America, Asia, and Southeast Asia, while international students from Europe experienced the lowest frequency of discrimination among the seven identified regions (Hanassab, 2006, p. 161). White European students recognized that they were not targeted for their race as other non-white international students from different regions and that in some instances they were even perceived to be American because of their white identity (Hanassab, 2006, p. 161). International students could experience discrimination due to their country of origin and perceived foreignness, as well as discrimination based on their racial and ethnic identity. International students of a non-white racial identity might experience discrimination

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

toward multiple aspects of their identity, such as race, ethnicity, and country of origin depending on how U.S. residents perceive them.

International students and diversity, equity, and inclusion. DEI course pedagogy must facilitate students' understanding of their individual identities in relation to other identities. DEI course faculty should consider the identities of students in the course so that they can provide frameworks that students can connect with and understand. With the growing number of international students, it is important to recognize that these students conceptualize identities such as race, ethnicity, and gender differently from the U.S. context. International students might also be in different stages of learning about race in the U.S. context, from being unaware of or disconnected from their racial identity to having a sense of their racial positioning in the United States. It is also important to consider the asymmetric power structures between students that are familiar with U.S. culture and students that are not so that international students do not feel marginalized because of their foreign status (Otten, 2003, p. 16).

Goals and Objectives

The primary goal of the DEI requirement is to educate students about U.S. diversity within the context of equity and inclusion in higher education. The DEI course criteria outline the ways in which students will be educated about diversity, equity, and inclusion.

The main objective of the DEI requirement is for all undergraduate students at UC San Diego to complete one course that focuses on diversity, equity, and inclusion. This objective is likely to be accomplished because undergraduate students are required to complete one DEI-approved course in order to graduate. An objective that is specific to the DEI Standing Committee is to “increase the number and variety of course offerings throughout the entire spectrum of undergraduate instruction” (Standing Committee for DEI, 2015). The committee

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

means to achieve this objective through the course approval process and by providing funding to faculty that create new or substantially revised courses. A more specific academic objective is to “develop innovative pedagogy” that combines multiple identity frameworks and applies them to a wider range of disciplines (Standing Committee for DEI, 2015). Developing new approaches for teaching diversity can enhance student learning and engage a broader range of students.

Implementation

The lower division “Biology and Diversity” course provides one example of how a science course implements all three criteria. The theoretical frameworks around identity formation used in the course are race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual identity, and the subject matter or groups discussed in the course are African-American, Latino, and women (BILD 60 Syllabus, 2016). The pedagogical approach, or how the course facilitates students’ understanding of their identity in relation to other identities, facilitates dialogue, reflection, and analysis of identity through individual and group presentations, research on current events, and reflective writing (BILD 60 Syllabus, 2016). This introductory science course is sufficiently designed around identity frameworks to meet the three DEI criteria.

Looking at an example from a social science perspective, the History department offers a lower division, faculty-led summer course in Seoul, Korea. The course analyzes race and ethnicity within Asian-American groups through lectures, discussions, media, and site visits (HILD 7B: Race and ethnicity, n.d.). This course adds a transnational element to Asian-American identity by setting the course in Korea where students could become more conscious of their ethnic and national identities.

These two courses provide a model for how DEI courses can be applied to a health sciences approach and a short-term study abroad program.

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

Outcomes

Gurin et al. (2002) identify two types of educational outcomes, *learning outcomes*, such as academic skills and intellectual engagement, and *democracy outcomes*, such as racial and cultural understanding (p. 334). The DEI Standing Committee does not identify specific educational outcomes related to skills or knowledge that students should develop, but it is implied that educating students about U.S. diversity will result in students learning about and understanding diversity in a U.S. context. The committee specifically outlines one democracy outcome, to “enable students to excel and lead in an increasingly complex and diverse society,” which relates to how students will interact with people with different identities (Standing Committee for DEI, 2015). A secondary democracy outcome is to positively influence the campus climate to be more inclusive, particularly of underrepresented minority students and other groups that reported feeling excluded because of their identity. DEI courses on their own might not have a direct or significant impact on the campus climate; however, students becoming more aware and knowledgeable about diversity, equity, and inclusion might interact and perceive their peers more positively than they would have without their DEI course experience.

Overall Analysis and Recommendations

The DEI requirement has the large goal of educating students about diversity, equity, and inclusion. The objective for all undergraduate students to complete one course focused around diversity, equity, and inclusion is highly likely to be achieved because the DEI course is part of the undergraduate degree requirement for all students regardless of their major. The second objective to increase the number and variety of course offerings is an appropriate and necessary objective considering the size of the undergraduate population and the varied academic disciplines represented at the university. The number of DEI-approved courses has increased

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

since the DEI requirement was first implemented; however, the DEI Standing Committee should continue to expand course offerings. The more challenging and complex objective is developing innovative pedagogy to teach and approach diversity in a variety of ways that will be effective and relevant to different groups and academic interests. These goals and objectives are feasible and achievable for an academic course requirement.

The DEI Standing Committee should identify additional goals and objectives to build on the initial objectives as they are reached. Additional goals and objectives could include increasing the number of courses that focus on gender, sexual identity, religion, ability/disability, class, and other identity frameworks; ensuring that DEI courses are equitable and accessible to all students; and cultivating an inclusive classroom environment.

There is not enough available data to analyze the long-term impact or effectiveness of the DEI requirement considering the small sample size of three to four graduating classes having completed the requirement since it was implemented. Assessing the effectiveness of the DEI goal to educate students about diversity, equity, and inclusion will require additional research and data that is beyond the scope of this Capstone Paper. In terms of short-term impact and objectives, it is possible to track the number of students that have completed the DEI requirement, as well as the number and type of DEI-approved courses offered each academic year to measure how much growth has been achieved since the requirement was put into effect. An analysis of course syllabi could show pedagogical approaches to teaching diversity from different academic disciplines. There are also reports and data from annual and periodic surveys of the undergraduate student population that capture aspects of diversity education and perceptions of the campus climate that are connected to the objectives of DEI course requirement.

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

Target Populations

The DEI requirement applies to all undergraduate students regardless of their college or academic departmental affiliation. Various identity groups, while not specifically targeted by the DEI requirement, are represented in DEI course topics on race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation. The needs that different students might have based on their major, identity, country of origin should also be considered so that all students have the opportunity to learn effectively.

While not all majors are likely to offer DEI courses, there are many more opportunities to expand course offerings beyond the social sciences and humanities. For example, out of the 105 approved courses, there are only two science courses that fulfill the DEI requirement while the large majority of classes are social science, humanities, or fine arts courses. This is a limitation for a university where more than half of its undergraduate students study physical science, engineering, math, or health science. The current course offerings do not meet the needs of students that are not able to fulfill major requirements through the DEI course, when other students in social science, humanities, and fine arts are able to complete DEI courses with their departmental major. Adding DEI courses in science and engineering would meet the three DEI requirement objectives to educate undergraduate students, increase the number and variety of course offerings, and develop innovative pedagogy around diversity, equity, and inclusion.

In addition to meeting the needs of students from all majors, DEI courses should also consider marginalized populations that do not feel welcome on the campus. Student perceptions of the campus climate can provide insights of how students feel connected to or included in the university community. In 2013, the University of California conducted a system-wide survey of the climate at each of its campuses. The UC San Diego Campus Climate survey collected responses from 11,915 undergraduate students, graduate students, staff, and faculty (UCSD

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

Campus Climate Survey, 2014, p. 14). While only 19% of the total undergraduate population completed the survey, undergraduate students represented 36% of all survey respondents (p. 21). Although the collected undergraduate student data is not specific/limited to undergraduate international students, the findings are useful in understanding the overall campus climate at UC San Diego.

The Campus Climate Survey showed that there are varying degrees of exclusionary and/or unwelcoming perceptions of groups or identities based on race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, socioeconomic status, English language proficiency, country of origin, learning disability, and other categories. The findings from the 2014 Campus Climate Survey indicate a need to address the perception of disrespectful and exclusionary attitudes toward international, non-U.S. citizen, and non-native English speaking students. However, not all of these characteristics are covered in the DEI course criteria, particularly non-U.S. based categories such as English language proficiency and country of origin. This is a new area where DEI courses can be expanded to meet the needs of marginalized student populations.

Successes

UC San Diego provides opportunities for classroom diversity supported by the campus-wide undergraduate requirement, but the university does not clearly connect classroom diversity to informal interactive diversity. In other words, UC San Diego does not provide any reports or data that show how student learning in DEI courses supplements and is supported by student interactions with different peers. Data from campus survey instruments measured the number of students that have completed a course on diversity, equity, and inclusion; however these numbers are not representative of the entire undergraduate population. The data from campus surveys are used as a reference point for the purposes of this Capstone Paper. The most recent survey data

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

show that most undergraduate students have taken a course that focuses on diversity, equity, and inclusion. Of the students that had taken a DEI course, a high percentage of them achieved learning outcomes and democracy outcomes, such as understanding different cultures and getting along with different groups of people.

The University of California Undergraduates Experience Survey (UCUES) is an online survey of all undergraduate students that is administered at each University of California (UC) campus (UCUES, 2016). The response rate to the UCUES 2014 survey is 35.3% with 8,070 responses out of 22,852 total undergraduate students (UCUES, 2014). Between 34.8%-39.9% of the total number of students that identified with one of the eight ethnic group categories responded to the survey, which is fairly even representation relative to all ethnic groups. With regard to international status, 29.5% of international students completed the survey. Of the 6,452 respondents, 65.4% (4,217 respondents) had completed courses that involve themes related to diversity, while 34.6% (2,235 respondents) had not completed a course that involves themes related to diversity (UCUES 2014 Student Response Summary Reports Experience, p. 2).

In the 2013 Campus Climate Survey, out of 6,076 student respondents, 47% (n=2,650) had taken a class that addresses equity, diversity, and/or inclusion while 53% (n=2,987) had not taken a class on any of those topics (Campus Climate Survey March 2014, p. 247). Of the 2,650 respondents that had taken a course on equity, diversity, and/or inclusion 87.7% (n=2,324) experienced “somewhat”/“high”/“very high” intellectual growth, 82.6% (n=2,189) experienced “somewhat”/“high”/“very high” understanding/knowledge of different cultures, and 81.4% (n=2,157) experienced “somewhat”/“high”/“very high” ability to get along with different kinds of people (Campus Climate Survey March 2014, p. 249). While it is not possible to identify which courses respondents completed or whether they were DEI-approved courses, there is an

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

indication that a large majority of students have experienced some degree of intellectual growth, understanding of different cultures, and ability to get along with different people after completing courses that address equity, diversity, and/or inclusion.

With regard to informal interactive diversity, the UCUES and Campus Climate Survey measured students' perceptions of their understanding and appreciation of interacting with peers from backgrounds that are different from their own. Of the student respondents, 24.3% (n=1,523) "never" or "rarely" gained a deeper understanding of other perspectives through conversations with students who differed in nationality, while 69.7% (n=4,350) "occasionally," "often," or "very often" gained a deeper understanding of other perspectives through conversation with students who differed in nationality (UCUES 2014 Student Response Summary Reports Life, p.1).

Another finding showed that 21.5% (n=1,348) of respondents "never" or "rarely" gained a deeper understanding of other perspectives through conversation with students who differed in race or ethnicity produced while 78.5% (n=4,500) "occasionally," "often," or "very often" gained a deeper understanding of other perspectives through conversation with students who differed in race or ethnicity (UCUES 2014 Student Response Summary Reports Life, p.1). The frequency that respondents gained a deeper understanding of other perspectives through conversations with students who differed in nationality was about the same as the frequency of conversations with students who differed in race or ethnicity. A large majority of undergraduate students at UC San Diego became more understanding of their peers from different nationalities and racial or ethnic backgrounds, but there is a significant number of students that had not gained greater understanding through conversations with their peers.

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

The university surveys compared students' learning when they started at the campus to the time they completed the survey. Of the 7,213 respondents that indicated their ability to appreciate and understand racial and ethnic diversity when they first started at the university, 31.2% (n=2,252) rated their ability as "very poor," "poor," or "fair," while 68.8% (n=4,961) rated their ability as "good," "very good," or "excellent" (UCUES 2014 Student Response Summary Reports 1, p.2).

When rating their current ability to appreciate racial and ethnic diversity, the majority of respondents rated their ability as 35.2% (n=2,515) "very good," 27.9% (n=1,993) "good," and 25.7% (n=1,837) "excellent." There was a shift from the majority of responses as "good," "fair," and "very good" when students first started at the university to "very good," "good," and "excellent" at the time they completed the survey. Similarly, there was a shift from the majority of responses regarding ability to appreciate cultural and global diversity as "good," "fair," and "very good" when students first started at the university to "very good," "good," and "excellent" at the time they completed the survey (UCUES 2014 Student Response Summary Reports 1, p.2). These responses might indicate an improvement in respondents' aggregate appreciation for both racial and ethnic diversity as well as cultural and global diversity.

While not directly in response to their experience with DEI courses, respondents indicated an improvement in aggregate awareness and understanding of their own racial and ethnic identity, racial and ethnic differences/issues, and gender differences/issues from the time they started at the university until the time they completed the survey (UCUES 2014 Student Response Summary Reports Life, p.5). The university provides some opportunities for both classroom diversity and informal interactive diversity through the DEI courses and by having a diverse student population. However, there should be a more deliberate and intentional approach

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

to student learning in the classroom and how it connects to student interactions outside of the classroom.

Areas in Need of Improvement

There are areas of student learning and understanding of diversity, equity, and inclusion that are not being met by the DEI requirement. With regard to student perceptions of courses offered at UC San Diego, out of 5,713 respondents 13.7% selected “disagree” or “strongly disagree” that there are sufficient materials, perspectives, and/or experiences of people based on English language proficiency/accent, 11.9% based on immigrant/citizen status, 11.8% based on international status, and 11.7% based on country of origin (Campus Climate Survey March 2014, p. 150). English language proficiency/accent had the highest percentage of “disagree” and “strongly disagree” responses along with learning disability, which shows that undergraduate courses did not discuss English language proficiency or learning disability identities as often compared with other identities.

The four characteristics that are connected to non-U.S. based identities, English language proficiency/accent, immigrant/citizen status, international status, and country of origin, each had high percentages of “disagree” or “strongly disagree” responses compared to race and ethnicity. While more than half of all respondents selected “agree” or “strongly agree” that courses included sufficient materials, perspectives, and/or experiences of people based on certain characteristics like race and ethnicity, there is a noticeable percentage of respondents that do not think non-U.S. based perspectives or experiences are sufficiently included. DEI courses and faculty should recognize that students think that courses do not sufficiently provide materials or perspectives of all identities.

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

Additional survey findings showed that English language proficiency was a characteristic of particular concern for international and/or non-American students. Respondents perceived the campus climate as least respectful toward non-native English speakers more than any of the other 17 identified groups (Campus Climate Survey March 2014, p. 69). There were 246 respondents that reported “often” or “very often” experiencing exclusionary, intimidating, offensive, or hostile conduct based on English language proficiency or accent (Campus Climate Survey March 2014, p. 72).

Furthermore, of the 129 non-U.S. citizens who experienced exclusionary conduct, 78% (n=101) indicated that their experience of exclusionary conduct was based on country of origin and 75% (n=97) indicated that their experience of exclusionary conduct was based on immigrant/citizen status (Campus Climate Survey March 2014, p. 80). With regard to the classroom or learning environment, almost 1 in 5 faculty and student respondents reported an unwelcoming academic learning environment due to English language proficiency and/or accent (Campus Climate Survey March 2014, p. 137). Among the 23 identified groups, English language proficiency/accent had the highest percentage of respondents that did not perceive the classroom/learning environment to be welcoming toward that characteristic compared to political views, race, and socioeconomic status.

Perhaps the initial creation of DEI courses did not consider the possibility that non-American students would experience exclusionary conduct based on their English proficiency or country of origin. The Campus Climate Survey was conducted after the DEI requirement was designed and implemented. Making adjustments to the DEI requirement course criteria and analyzing the campus survey findings could be beneficial for student learning and for building an inclusionary campus environment.

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

Recommendations

In order to successfully meet DEI requirement outcomes, the DEI Standing Committee, faculty, and related departments must first identify clearer learning and democracy outcomes that are measurable and feasible through one undergraduate course. Learning outcomes could include general outcomes, such as understanding one's own identity in relation to other identities and identifying barriers to equity and inclusion, and outcomes that are specific to particular academic disciplines. The DEI Standing Committee could also expand on its democracy outcomes to include institutionally-focused outcomes, such as demonstrating interpersonal skills in diverse groups and positively contributing to an inclusive campus climate. The DEI course criteria could require faculty to demonstrate how their courses meet some or all of the DEI course learning and democracy outcomes.

The DEI Standing Committee should also clearly identify the working definitions and approaches to diversity, equity, and inclusion. Structural diversity, classroom diversity, and informal interactional diversity are relevant to facilitating students' understanding of diversity in theory and in practice. But the DEI Standing Committee could make a clearer connection between what students learn and how student learning impacts interactions with their peers because structural and classroom diversity do not necessarily facilitate interactive diversity.

In terms of promoting equity through the DEI requirement, courses should recognize and address all students' needs. The needs of international students, non-U.S. citizens, and non-native English speakers are not adequately being met according to campus survey data. Non-American students should be able to learn information in a way that does not assume or require prior knowledge of or experience in the United States in order to understand the concepts. If a course in U.S. racial history is necessary to grasp the course content, then knowledge of U.S.

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

racial history should be identified as a prerequisite or the course could be adapted to address the differences in knowledge that students might have.

Faculty should also recognize that non-American, international students could have difficulty comprehending or connecting with course content due to the different understandings and identity frameworks that they bring. International students might not feel connected to the aspect of race in U.S. society regardless of their knowledge or awareness of it (Fries-Britt et al., 2014, p. 8). Some fail to relate to the struggles of African-American or Latino groups, for example, because they are not from the United States and, therefore, do not think they are affected by racism toward these groups. A lack of understanding of connection to U.S. diversity does not necessarily indicate disinterest, but rather the issue could be caused by different cultural perspectives that international students have. There could also be a course on diversity that is structured around non-American and international perspectives, which also meets the objective to create innovative pedagogy around teaching about diversity.

The DEI Standing Committee could also amend course criteria to require discussions around diversity, equity, and inclusion so that students actively think about how the course connects to equity and inclusion and understand the applications and implications of diversity at the university. International students, in particular, might be able to understand that the negative perceptions of international student enrollment is greatly influenced by the larger historical context of access to public universities, rather than viewing negative perceptions as simply a rejection of foreign students. In turn, U.S. domestic students might be able to better understand international students' experience at the university and the barriers they might encounter. Ultimately, both domestic and international students will benefit from understanding that DEI courses are framed around a U.S. context and approach to diversity.

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

Considering the undergraduate student population, there could be more courses that connect diversity to health, science, and engineering. Courses like Biology and Diversity that approach diversity from the perspective of biology allows students with an interest in health sciences or majoring in a related field to connect with the material and apply diversity concepts to their field of study. This would involve working with academic departments and faculty to encourage the creation of a course that meets both the DEI and major requirements, which also addresses the issue of lengthening the time to graduation and creating more work for students.

In addition to changing the course criteria, students could be more involved and engaged in shaping course offerings. The DEI Standing Committee could facilitate ways for students and faculty members to create courses together, such as special topics courses, for which there is precedent of students and faculty working together to create a course syllabus. There should also be a clearer distinction between courses that present introductory or more advanced concepts around diversity so that students can select the appropriate course level that meets their interests, needs, and knowledge.

Conclusions

The UC San Diego DEI requirement and diversity education policies have been shaped by historical patterns of underrepresentation and influenced by the cultural environment on the campus. As the campus demographics shift and change, the need for DEI courses is even more relevant and crucial to provide students with the frameworks to understand campus diversity and analyze their own identities in relation to other identities. This is particularly challenging for international and non-U.S. identified students that come to the university with little knowledge of U.S. racial, ethnic, historical context and limited lived experience with U.S. diversity. In

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

addition, they bring their own understandings of identity frameworks and categories that might be different from U.S. definitions and categories.

While most DEI requirement objectives are being met, there are several revisions that can be made to the DEI requirement to improve student learning. One important revision is to recognize the challenges that the growing international student population experiences in the academic setting so that they can learn about U.S. identity frameworks more effectively. Also, international students and domestic American students enter the university environment knowing little about one another. The DEI course outcomes could be ineffective if students do not understand diverse identities on an individual level and how diversity functions on a structural, institutional level.

It is crucial for all students to learn about diversity issues and how they impact the climate of U.S. higher education institutions so that they recognize how individual practices and structural dynamics shape campus climate. Students can use this knowledge to strengthen their understanding of their own identities and of a variety of different identities. More importantly, diversity, equity, and inclusion education can help to ensure that students are not targeted because of their identities and to deter students from participating in reproducing or perpetuating systems of inequality. Furthermore, international students can become aware of any prejudices that they brought with them and domestic students can recognize discrimination toward international students caused by of a lack of cross-cultural understanding.

References

- Archibold, R. (2010, February 26). California campus sees uneasy race relations. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2010/02/27/education/27sandiego.html?_r=0
- Chong, R. (2016, May 18). UCSD student organizations send #chalkback demands to administration. *The Guardian UC San Diego*. Retrieved from <http://ucsdguardian.org/2016/05/18/ucsd-student-organizations-send-chalkback-demands-to-administration/>
- Fass-Holmes, B., & Bergman, M. E. (2016). Do Nondomestic Undergraduates Choose a Major Field In Order to Maximize Grade Point Averages? *Journal of International Students*, 6(1), 308-313. Retrieved from <http://icenter.ucsd.edu/about/publications/index.html>
- Fries-Britt, S., Mwangi, A. G., & Peralta, A. M. (2014). Learning Race in a U.S. Context: An emergent framework on the perceptions of race among foreign-born students of color. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 7(1), 1-13. doi:10.1037/a0035636
- Glass, C. R. (2012). Educational Experiences with International Students' Learning, Development, and Positive Perceptions of Campus Climate. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 16(3), 228-251.
- Gurin, P. Y., Dey, E. L., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity and higher education: Theory and impact on educational outcomes. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72(3), 330-366.
- Gurin, P. Y., Dey, E. L., Gurin, G., & Hurtado, S. (2003). How Does Racial/Ethnic Diversity Promote Education?. *Western Journal of Black Studies*, 27(1), 20-29.

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

Hurtado, S., Mayhew, M. J., & Engberg, M. E. (2012). Diversity courses and students' moral reasoning: a model of predispositions and change. *Journal of Moral Education, 41*(2), 201-224. doi:10.1080/03057240.2012.670931

Johnson, H. (2012). Defunding Higher Education. *Public Policy Institute of California*. Retrieved from http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R_512HJR.pdf

Jordan, M., & Belkin, D. (2015, November 16). Foreign students pinch University of California home-state admissions. *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from <http://www.wsj.com/articles/foreign-students-pinch-university-of-california-home-state-admissions-1447650060>

Lee, J. J., & Rice, C. (2007). Welcome to America? International student perceptions of discrimination. *Higher Education, 53*(3), 381-409. doi:10.1007/s10734-005-4508-3

Moreno, C. (2016, April 12). UC audit mobilizes state lawmakers to action. *Vida en el valle*. Retrieved from <http://www.vidaenelvalle.com/news/state/california/sacramento/article71390097.html>

Murphy, K. (2016, March 29). State audit: University of California lowered admission standards for out-of-state students. *The Mercury News*. Retrieved from http://www.mercurynews.com/ci_29699257/state-audit-uc-lowered-admission-standards-out-state

Otten, M. (2003). Intercultural Learning and Diversity in Higher Education. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 7*(1), 12-26. doi:10.1177/1028315302250177

Rankin & Associates, Consulting. (2014). *Campus Climate Project Final Report*. Retrieved from http://campusclimate.ucop.edu/_common/files/pdf-climate/ucsd-full-report.pdf

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

- Redden, E. (2012, September 16). I'm not racist, but. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2012/10/16/tensions-simmer-between-american-and-international-students>
- Ritter, Z. (2012, October 26). Foreign students and tolerance - II. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2012/10/26/essay-deadling-racist-ideas-international-students>
- Shorette, R. (2016, March 1). The ignored history of racism in California: College edition. *The Huffington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/c-rob-shorette-ii-phd/the-ignored-history-of-ra_b_9349900.html
- The campus climate survey. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://diversity.ucsd.edu/reports-and-data/archives/campusclimatesurvey.html>
- Tugend, A. (2016, June 22). How public universities are addressing declines in state funding. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://senate.ucsd.edu/media/217506/dei-list-of-courses.pdf>http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/23/education/how-public-universities-are-addressing-declines-in-state-funding.html?_r=0
- UC San Diego. (2016). *Campuswide Undergraduate Requirement in Diversity, Equity and Inclusion*. Retrieved from
- UC San Diego. (n.d.). Undergraduate Degree Requirements. Retrieved from <http://www.ucsd.edu/catalog/front/UgrdDegReq.html>
- UC San Diego DEI Graduation Requirement Standing Committee. (2015). *Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Graduation Requirement REVISED Submission Date*. Retrieved from http://academicaffairs.ucsd.edu/_files/ug-ed/DEI_Call_for_Courses_2015-16.pdf

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

UC San Diego International Students & Programs Office. (2015). International Student Snapshot Fall 2015. Retrieved from http://ispo.ucsd.edu/_files/publications-reports/quarterly-snapshot/Fall-2015-Quarterly-Snapshot.pdf

UC San Diego MEChA & MiRA. (2016). List of demands.

UC San Diego Office of Student Research & Information. (2015). Student Profile 2015-2016. Retrieved from http://studentresearch.ucsd.edu/_files/stats-data/profile/Profile2015.pdf

University Communications and Public Affairs. (n.d.). UC San Diego Campus Profile. Retrieved from <http://ucpa.ucsd.edu/resources/campus-profile/>

University of California. (n.d.). Accountability Report 2015. Retrieved from <http://accountability.universityofcalifornia.edu/2015/chapters/chapter-1.html#1.4.4>

University of California Undergraduates Experience Survey. (2014). UCUES: 2013 survey response rates. Retrieved from <http://studentresearch.ucsd.edu/surveys/ucues/response-rate2014.html>

University of California Undergraduates Experience Survey. (2016). UCUES 2016. Retrieved from <http://studentresearch.ucsd.edu/surveys/ucues/disclaimer.html>

Warth, G. & Baker, D. (2016, April 14). Pro-Donald Trump graffiti at UC San Diego sparks debate. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.latimes.com/local/education/la-me-ucsd-graffiti-20160414-story.html>

WaterAid. (2007). The advocacy sourcebook. London, UK: WaterAid. Retrieved from www.wateraid.org/~/_media/Publications/advocacy-sourcebook.ashx

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

Appendix A

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Course Offerings, 2016

Department	Lower Div	Upper Div	Race	Ethnicity	Gender	Sexual Orientation	Language	Immigration	African American	Transnational	Asian American/Pacific Islander	Hispanic, Chicano/Latino	Native American
African American Studies Minor	1								1				
Anthropology	2	6	4	1			4						1
Biological Sciences	1		1										
Communication	1	3					1					1	
Critical Gender Studies	1	2			1	2							
Dimensions of Culture	1	1											
Education Studies		10		1			3					1	
Ethnic Studies	7	9	2	16	1	1					2		3
Human Development Program		3											
History	4	12	7	2				1	2		2	3	2
Linguistics	1						1						
Literature	3	7	1	1	1			1	2		2	2	
Music	2	1	3						3				
Philosophy		2	1										
Political Science		6	3	1				1				1	
Rady School of Management	1		1	1									
Religion		2			1								
Scripps Institute of Oceanography		1											
Sociology		7	2	1	1		1	1					
Theatre and Dance		6							2		1		2

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

Urban Studies and Planning	1	1	1	1									
Visual Arts		1								1			
Total	25	80	26	25	5	3	10	4	9	1	7	8	8

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

Appendix B

University of California San Diego Undergraduate Enrollment 2001-2016

	California Resident Students	Percentage of California Resident Students	Percent Increase of California Resident Students	Out of State Students	Percentage of Out of State Students	Percent Increase of Out of State Students	International Students	Percentage of International Students	Percent Increase of International Students	Total Enrolled Undergraduate Students
2001-2002	16,676	95.3%		476	2.7%		353	2.0%		17,505
2002-2003	18,127	95.0%	8.7%	426	2.2%	-17.9%	535	2.8%	51.6%	19,088
2003-2004	18,770	94.5%	3.5%	472	2.4%	6.4%	630	3.2%	17.8%	19,872
2004-2005	19,271	94.7%	2.7%	455	2.2%	-5.8%	613	3.0%	-2.7%	20,339
2005-2006	19,598	94.8%	1.7%	487	2.4%	5.3%	594	2.9%	-3.1%	20,679
2006-2007	20,132	94.2%	2.7%	597	2.8%	18.6%	640	3.0%	7.7%	21,369
2007-2008	20,651	93.7%	2.6%	661	3.0%	7.3%	736	3.3%	15.0%	22,048
2008-2009	20,972	93.1%	1.6%	690	3.1%	2.2%	856	3.8%	16.3%	22,518
2009-2010	21,490	92.9%	2.5%	679	2.9%	-4.3%	974	4.2%	13.8%	23,143
2010-2011	21,837	92.3%	1.6%	639	2.7%	-8.0%	1,187	5.0%	21.9%	23,663
2011-2012	20,838	90.4%	-4.6%	697	3.0%	12.0%	1,511	6.6%	27.3%	23,046
2012-2013	19,665	86.7%	-5.6%	957	4.2%	39.5%	2,054	9.1%	35.9%	22,676
2013-2014	19,756	83.0%	0.5%	1,168	4.9%	16.3%	2,881	12.1%	40.3%	23,805
2014-2015	19,831	79.9%	0.4%	1,272	5.1%	4.5%	3,707	14.9%	28.7%	24,810
2015-2016	20,482	77.0%	3.3%	1,450	5.5%	6.4%	4,658	17.5%	25.7%	26,590

DIVERSIFYING THE CURRICULUM

Appendix C

University of California San Diego Tuition 2001-2016

	California Resident Student Tuition	Percent Increase of California Resident Student Tuition	Additional Out of State/Int'l Student Tuition	Percent Increase of Additional Out of State/Int'l Student Tuition	Total Out of State/International Student Tuition	Percent Increase of Total Out of State/International Student Tuition
2001-2002	\$4,354.50		\$10,704.00		\$15,058.50	
2002-2003	\$4,396.50	1.0%	\$10,704.00	0.0%	\$15,100.50	0.3%
2003-2004	\$5,507.50	25.3%	\$13,730.00	28.3%	\$19,237.50	27.4%
2004-2005	\$6,020.50	9.3%	\$17,004.00	23.8%	\$23,024.50	19.7%
2005-2006	\$6,681.30	11.0%	\$17,820.00	4.8%	\$24,501.30	6.4%
2006-2007	\$7,425.90	11.1%	\$18,684.00	4.8%	\$26,109.90	6.6%
2007-2008	\$7,509.00	1.1%	\$19,620.00	5.0%	\$27,129.00	3.9%
2008-2009	\$8,062.00	7.4%	\$20,608.00	5.0%	\$28,670.00	5.7%
2009-2010	\$9,401.00	16.6%	\$22,717.00	10.2%	\$32,118.00	12.0%
2010-2011	\$11,330.00	20.5%	\$22,879.00	0.7%	\$34,209.00	6.5%
2011-2012	\$13,234.00	16.8%	\$22,878.00	0.0%	\$36,112.00	5.6%
2012-2013	\$13,234.00	0.0%	\$22,878.00	0.0%	\$36,112.00	0.0%
2013-2014	\$13,302.00	0.5%	\$22,878.00	0.0%	\$36,180.00	0.2%
2014-2015	\$13,456.00	1.2%	\$22,878.00	0.0%	\$36,334.00	0.4%
2015-2016	\$13,557.00	0.8%	\$24,708.00	8.0%	\$38,265.00	5.3%