

**A Working Draft from the Committee on Undergraduate Education
(CUE) Summer Task Force for Updating the CGM GUR Requirements
September 15, 2020**

Reviewed by the full committee of CUE 10-1-20

Members of the Summer Task Force

- Donna Qualley, Chair (English)
- Paula Airth, Design
- Reid Dorsey-Palmateer, Economics
- Brooke Love, ACC Chair and CUE Liaison (Environmental Sciences)
- Caitlan Maxwell, Western Libraries
- Gerry Prody, Chemistry
- Richard Simon, Fairhaven & Honors Program
- Jack Herring, incoming VPUE
- Steve Vanderstaay, outgoing VPUE
- Lizzy Ramhorst, Shared Governance Operations Manager

ACC's proposal for "diversity" and its charge to CUE

In their 2016 Report on "Recommended Improvements to the GURs," ACC proposed the following changes to the GUR "Diversity" requirement. ACC believed these changes would introduce systemic equity and justice issues into the GUR curriculum, erase the imposed geographical divisions in the current ACGM-BCGMs, and also avoid the necessity of categorizing a course as either CGM or HUM/SSC. ACC proposed that the university:

1. Increase the current minimum credit requirement for HUM and SSC from 24 credits to 34 credits (from 12 to 17 credits for each of the two areas).
2. Move the GUR courses currently listed under either ACGM or BCGM to either HUM or SSC, as appropriate.
3. Require that students take at least two courses with a "diversity-equity-justice" (DEJ) designation, indicating that the course meets the university guidelines for addressing, in some deliberate form, the study of human diversity and of systemic equity and justice-related issues arising from the experience of diversity.
4. Consider the question posed by the 2016 General Education Task Force: "How could we adopt a developmental approach to understanding diversity, giving our students an initial understanding of foundational diversity concepts, followed by an opportunity for students to explore them in more depth?"

In the fall of 2019, ACC formally charged CUE to complete the following tasks:

1. Evaluate the recommendation for revising Western's diversity requirements.
2. Advise on the feasibility and sufficiency of the proposed approach by "engaging in broad consultation with campus stakeholders."
3. Explore and advise on means and models by which a more developmental approach to diversity curriculum and requirements might be introduced.
4. Deliver one or more plans outlining a proposal for implementation of changes to existing diversity requirements. At least one proposal must utilize existing resources.
5. Include an outline of any new resources without which the (preferred) plan cannot be viably implemented.

Introduction

CUE has examined ACC's recommendations for "addressing in some deliberate and sustained form, the human study of diversity and of systemic equity-and-justice-related issues arising from the experience of diversity" in terms of their feasibility, efficacy, sufficiency, and desirability.

As an extension of the work that CUE was already doing, six faculty members of CUE, the outgoing and incoming VPUE, the Chair of ACC, (with frequent visits from Jeff Young, Senate President) worked over the summer to develop the recommendations and suggestions in this draft. While this committee was unable to come up with an option that met ACC's desired goal of only utilizing existing resources, we offer some options that come close later in the report.

CUE recommends that the entire GUR category be more explicitly re-framed and updated--less as a comparative diversity and multicultural requirement and more as a set of courses that will help students confront and grapple with issues of power, equity, and justice in the U.S. and in the broader world. This knowledge does not automatically emerge from the study of human diversity; rather, it comes from an awareness and understanding of the systemic beliefs, systems, structures, and policies that continue to advantage and empower some individuals and groups at the expense of others. In addition, the "study of human diversity" generally describes work that many, if not most, professors in the humanities and social sciences now do as a matter of practice in their courses. That framework has served its purpose and has effectively rendered itself obsolete.

Refocusing this requirement will not be simple or easy because stakeholders have different investments in these courses and hold different views about what this GUR category should do, how it should be organized, what it should be called, and who should teach these courses. However, reconceptualizing the focus of the requirement could more explicitly advance the goals and values of the university's mission and strategic plan and demonstrate Western's commitment to addressing longstanding concerns of BIPOC students, faculty, and staff, through real curricular change. Re-envisioning this requirement will *more effectively* embody Western's belief that a liberal arts and sciences education "enables people to lead fuller and more interesting lives, to perceive and to understand more of the world around and within themselves, and to participate more intelligently and deliberately in shaping that world" (University Catalog).

In the rest of this report, we:

1. Sketch CUE's efforts and work in assessing the feasibility and sufficiency of ACC's proposal.
2. Explain CUE's recommendation and rationale for changing the name of this requirement to Power, Liberation, Equity, Justice (PLEJ).
3. Define a developmental sequence of courses (PLEJ-1 and PLEJ-2) for fulfilling this requirement.

4. Provide two possibilities for conceptualizing PLEJ-1, the foundational course.
5. Present three alternatives for structuring the requirement.
6. Outline a timetable for phasing in the new requirement.
7. Offer additional thoughts and considerations that emerged in our deliberations.
8. Include additional Information in five appendices.

Section 1. Assessing the Feasibility and Sufficiency of ACC's Proposal

Engagement with campus stakeholders and informal research

1. Until the university shifted to a mostly online environment last March and its efforts were curtailed, CUE had sought input from stakeholders and had conversations with the following individuals and groups:
 - Ethnic Students Coalition
 - Student Ambassadors from the College of Science and Engineering (CSE) and follow meeting at CUE with Kristopher Aguayo & Elias Bashir
 - CHSS Deans and Chairs Committee (DAC)
 - CHSS Faculty Affairs Council (FAC)
 - CFPA DAC
 - Vicki Hseuh, Director of Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies (WGSS)
 - L.K. Langley, LGBTQ+ Director
 - Libraries Teaching & Learning Brown Bag group
 - Fairhaven College Faculty and Staff meeting
 - Shevell Thibou, Social Justice & Equity Committee
2. CUE looked at the language and descriptions of similar courses and requirements at other institutions, including the four major public universities in Washington State (UW, WSU, CWU, EWU).
3. CUE has written to chairs and directors of WWU programs asking for information about current GUR courses and courses in the majors that might focus primarily on foundational theories of systemic and structural oppression, power inequities in all their forms, and intersectional relationships (racism, classism, sexism, homophobia, anti-Semitism, and ableism, to name a few).
4. In addition to conversations with faculty and students, several documents and events have influenced CUE's deliberations. (Also see Appendix One, Appendix Two, and Appendix Three).
 - The list of current ACGM and BCGM courses and their catalog descriptions.
 - The [2016 General Education Taskforce report](#).
 - The language in the university's [Strategic Mission and Plan](#).
 - The [university's support](#) for the decision package for an [Ethnic Studies Academic Initiative](#).
 - The 6/22/20 [letter from Black Student Organizations](#).

- The President's [solidarity message](#), which accompanied his Diversity, Equity, Inclusion Timeline, in which he expressed a desire to "work with the Ethnic Studies Collective (faculty and students), and others as appropriate, to support development of curricula and programming and also "add a General University Requirement focused on African American studies and structural anti-Black racism."
- The situation unfolding in the California State University system regarding a new [proposed Ethnic Studies and Social Justice requirement](#).
- The national response and protests in the aftermath of the murder of George Floyd.

The faculty and students we spoke with have different sets of concerns. Faculty appear more divided in their perspectives, perhaps because we were able to speak to a larger range of faculty than of student groups. The sampling of concerns listed below should not be taken as universal or even representative of faculty or of students as a whole.

- Some humanities faculty are concerned with any changes that could result in loss of Student Contact Hours (SCH). Many students complete Humanities GURs before coming to Western. Having a separate CGM requirement helps ensure that students enroll in their classes. Given declining enrollments due to the Coronavirus that is occasioning department budget cuts, loss of SCH may become an even bigger concern.
- Some faculty are concerned about erasing the geographic distinctions found in the ACGM/BCGM requirement. They believe it is essential that students graduate from Western having taken at least one course with a global/international focus. They believe that any change to this requirement should include both domestic and international courses.
- Some faculty suggest that an approach that adds some type of diversity/equity/justice tag to qualifying humanities and social science courses could send the message that courses without this tag do not address these issues at all.
- Some faculty (and students) were adamant that this requirement not become a "multiculturalism lite" or a "cultural tourism model" that exists only or primarily to serve the needs of white students.

Student stakeholders, AS representatives, and students from the Ethnic Students Coalition (ESC) are more adamant that changes to this requirement must occur at the core.

- The students that we talked with feel that "diversity" has become a buzzword. They feel it has lost its power from overuse and has become a meaningless signifier. It also weakens other terms with which it comes in contact.
- ESC students want a specific, required, foundational course that introduces concepts and theories of systemic oppression.
- ESC students would prefer that this foundational course be an Ethnic Studies course. (They argue that the mission of an Ethnic Studies College will be to teach

these kinds of courses, just like the mission of Huxley is to teach about the environment).

- Alternatively (or as a stop-gap measure), they suggest that Western could identify a small bank of courses already doing this work, such as Sociology 269, WGSS 211, and American Cultural Studies 301. (*Students from the Ethnic Studies Coalition were more reluctant in suggesting ACS courses, because they see these courses as linked to the older focus on diversity and multiculturalism.)
- Students from the Black Student Organizations, responding to anti-Black racism including within the ethnic studies and students of color communities in the Associated Students, want a course to focus on African American Studies and structural anti-Black racism, specifically.
- Some students suggested that every major should require a course that examines systemic inequities in the field so that students in all disciplines may be better empowered to construct their own professional identities.
- Almost all students that we spoke to believe that as many of these courses as possible should be taught by BIPOC faculty (who should be compensated for the work they do in teaching and mentoring students). Meanwhile, some faculty of color were adamant that the university must not continue to overburden its few faculty of color.

Both faculty and students agree that, ideally, concepts and theories of systemic structures, policies, and practices of discrimination and oppression should be infused into courses at Western whenever possible, just as a matter of practice; that courses should include work by writers and scholars that represent diverse identities and cultures; and that faculty must continue to strive to expand the canons from which they teach.

The current situation: Comparative Gender, and Multicultural (CGM) courses

The two most recent descriptions of the CGM category reveal a focus on developing awareness and understanding the “other.”

2016 description of the CGM GUR category: Acquaintance with the values and viewpoints of a variety of cultures and societal roles helps overcome provincialism, aids self-understanding, and is an important element in an educated outlook in the contemporary world.

Current description of the CGM GUR category: Understanding different perspectives is crucial as societies and cultures become increasingly diverse and global. ACGM/BCGM courses help you develop this understanding. Comparative courses deal with the history and culture of societies beyond the Western tradition. Courses on gender explore the social construction of gender and its consequences. Multiculturalism courses deal with the experiences and cultural expressions of minority

groups. ACGM courses focus on areas outside of Europe and North America. BCGM courses focus on Europe and North America.

Both CGM descriptions couch this GUR requirement as one of “diversity,” language that continues to be used in similar requirements at other institutions. Yet, for some, the word “diversity” itself has become an increasingly empty signifier through overuse and confusion with other terms such as “inclusion” and “equity”. (See Appendix 3). Until 2017, when CUE rewrote the GUR category descriptions, the description of the CGM requirement clearly reflected its originary purposes: to acquaint (mostly white, mostly upper-middle and middle class) students with knowledge and understanding of other cultures in the US and the world. The 2017 description attempts to speak to students and to capture the actual multi-dimensional focus: Non-Western cultures and traditions, US minority populations, and the social construction of gender.

The number and kinds of courses under the umbrella of this diversity requirement have continued to expand. According to the 2020-2021 university catalog of courses, students currently have a choice of 83 ACGM courses and 55 BCGM courses. Most of these courses are from departments in CHSS, although other departments contribute courses to this GUR category. Twenty-three different departments or programs contribute one or more courses to the ACGMs. Seven departments contribute more than three courses. The Department of Modern and Classical Languages offers thirteen different ACGM courses, and the Department of Global Humanities and Religions offers twenty-three different ACGM courses. Twenty-one different departments or programs contribute one or more courses to the BCGMs. Four departments contribute more than five courses to the BCGMs.

A cursory survey of course titles and catalog descriptions reveals that maybe 10-15 ACGM/BCGM courses (out of 138) explicitly communicate a focus on concepts and theories of systemic structures and policies of discrimination, oppression and inequity. Certainly, other courses that are not easily identified by reading a title or catalog description may exist, such as courses that are topic-based. Nevertheless, we can see that in most current CGM offerings, the emphasis is on learning about “diverse” cultures, histories, traditions, experiences, practices, and literatures. (See Appendix 5 for examples of course descriptions.)

Currently, students can select any course from the ACGM and BCGM lists (except for the few courses that have major prerequisites or program restrictions) and complete the requirement in any order and at any time. Table 1 depicts some imaginary routes for fulfilling the CGM requirement. Some students (C, D, E, and H) could conceivably focus their choices narrowly by choosing only courses on gender, race, or a specific culture and ethnicity. Other students’ experiences (A, B, F, and G) appear much more disparate and random. This kind of cultural sampling may be sufficient when the purpose of the requirement is an “acquaintance with the values and viewpoints of a variety of cultures.” However, CUE believes that the focus and purpose of this requirement needs to evolve to become more focused.

Table 1: Possible combinations of CGM courses for different students

Student	ACGM	BCGM
Student A	Dance 201 Movement and culture	C2C 203 Youth mentoring Toward Social Justice
Student B	Exceptionalities 101: Elementary ASL/Culture	History 278 Multiculturalism in Canada
Student C	WGSS 213 Introduction to Sexuality & Queer Studies	WGSS 211: Intro to Women, Gender, & Sexuality Studies
Student D	MCL 202 Second Year Chinese	English 236 Asian American Literatures
Student E	Honors 105 Navigating the Human Experience - Postmodernity A	Sociology 365 Gender, Bodies, and Sports
Student F	Art History 201 Zen & the Art of Tea	HU 327: Ireland: A Cultural History
Student G	MUS 205 Survey of World Musical Cultures	COMM 225: Communication, Diversity & Controversy
Student H	Sociology 366 Colonialism, Slavery, & Links to Contemporary Racism	Sociology 269 Race & Ethnic Relations

2. From Diversity-Equity-Justice (DEJ) to Power, Liberation, Equity, Justice (PLEJ)

The original CGM requirement was framed with “diversity” understood as “multiculturalism,” which is, by current educational perspectives, a concept that has run its course. The students who we talked with were quite adamant that “diversity” and “inclusion” not be the focus of this GUR. A [2017 Inside Higher Education article](#) by

Dafina-Lazarus Stewart notes that “diversity and inclusion rhetoric asks fundamentally different questions and is concerned with fundamentally different issues than efforts seeking equity and justice.” (See Appendix 3 for examples). CUE has also come to understand that “diversity” courses and “equity-justice” courses ask different questions, serve different purposes, and produce different outcomes.

The language in ACC’s proposal makes clear that ACC intended that DEJ-tagged courses would focus on both “the study of human diversity and of systemic equity-and-justice-related issues arising from the experience of diversity.” [Emphasis added]. CUE questions the feasibility of linking an understanding of “systemic equity-and-justice-related issues” to the study of diversity as it is currently practiced in the CGM courses. Currently, many CGM courses focus on human diversity, but judging by the catalog descriptions, fewer courses appear to consider systemic equity and justice issues in a sustained and deliberate way.

In their discussion of this requirement, the 2016 GUR Taskforce also linked “diversity” and “global education” together (See Appendix One). This linkage may have formed in part because of the geographic separation between the ACGMs and BCGMs, the focus on diversity as “education about the other,” and their discussions with Marie Eaton (Fairhaven, retired) and Vicki Hamblin (then Director of the Center for International Studies, now retired). These concepts may still be linked in the minds of many faculty who continue to understand the primary purpose of this requirement as awareness and understanding of “other” cultures, identities, and practices, etc.

However, if the study of human diversity remains the key organizing principle for the requirement, the proposal offers less value for meeting the aspirational goals of the university’s strategic mission and plan (see Appendix 2) and does not adequately capture where we are at this particular cultural, political, and historical moment.

Many individuals gave us suggestions for language for the requirement. After considering different terms and combinations, CUE selected “Power, Liberation, Equity, Justice” (PLEJ, pronounced “pledge”) as the language that best evokes the spirit of this requirement and more accurately aligns with the stated values and goals of the university.

Equity and Justice are goals which the university is working to promote, and CUE endorses ACC’s decision to make “equity” and “justice” a part of the name for this new requirement. Including the terms “equity” and “justice” in the name of this requirement indicates that students will learn what equity and justice are and how they have been rendered at various times in history to certain groups while excluding and harming other groups. Ideally, students will also develop strategies for imagining and developing a more equitable and just future.

Instead of “Diversity,” a word whose meaning has flattened through its ubiquity, CUE proposes the words “Power” and “Liberation” as more meaningful and consequential replacements for the term, “Diversity.” The word ‘Power’ suggests that these courses

will focus on what power is and how it is distributed, wielded, and borne, for good and for ill, by all members of a society. Here, we seek both to understand how social, economic, and political power is sustained through individual beliefs and actions and institutional practices and policies, and to empower students with knowledge, understanding, and agency so that they understand what power is, how it works, how to wield it to seek justice, and how to wield it justly. Understanding how power works *empowers* us to effect social change.

Additionally, CUE recommends that the word “Liberation” also be included in the name of the requirement. Collective liberation acknowledges that multiple oppressions exist, and that when we work in solidarity to undo oppression in ourselves, our families, our communities, and our institutions, we are more likely to create a world that is truly just. Thus, liberation suggests a more action-oriented approach, implying that these courses will also focus on ways to address injustices that arise from unequal distributions of power.

3. Defining a Developmental Sequence of courses

In keeping with both the 2016 Task Force Report and the question proposed in ACC’s proposal about a “developmental” approach, CUE strongly recommends that the university institute a two-course PLEJ sequence. The developmental sequencing of two courses also helps address the problem of coherence in this set of GURs.

The first set of courses (PLEJ-1) would be 100 or 200-level GUR courses that introduce core concepts and theories and serve as a foundation for and prerequisite to a second, specialized or applied set of courses (PLEJ-2). PLEJ-2 courses would typically be 200 and 300 level courses. Ideally, a PLEJ-1 course would be taken in the student’s first year at Western. To be considered a PLEJ-2 course, the overall focus of the course must be on power, liberation, equity, and justice issues. For example, a course called “Art as a Form of Racial Protest and Revolution” could likely become a PLEJ-2 course. An art history survey course that only spends a week or two on art as a form of racial protest, would be a welcome part of the culture we hope to build in which these ideas are infused across the curriculum, but such a course would not fulfill the PLEJ requirement. An English course called “Young Adult Literature as a Vehicle for Racial Justice and Equity” could likely become a PLEJ-2 course. A young adult literature course that spends two weeks on this topic would not be classified as a PLEJ-2 course.

Further Distinctions between PLEJ-1 and PLEJ-2 courses

PLEJ-1 courses introduce foundational core concepts and theories for understanding various structural forms of power, discrimination, and oppression that sustain social, economic, and political inequities in the U.S. The goal of PLEJ-1 courses is to equip students with an understanding of systemic theories of oppression, how they work to foster inequity, and to distinguish these structures, policies, and practices from individual acts, beliefs, and prejudices. *In other words, within the PLEJ-1 course, the*

concepts and theories form the primary subject matter and the topic serves to focus and illuminate students' understanding of how these theories work.

PLEJ-2 courses give students an opportunity to **extend, deepen, and apply** the knowledge they have gained in the foundational course. Students can extend their understanding into new areas, explore and examine topics in more depth and specificity, and/or apply their knowledge to specific contexts. These courses could focus on specific identities, cultures, events, organizations, institutions, policies, texts, etc. in the US and/or the larger world. The goal of PLEJ-2 courses, as CUE sees it, would be for students to utilize the knowledge gained in their PLEJ-1 course to examine and analyze specific groups, topics, events, and situations, using the theoretical lenses they are beginning to acquire.

Depending on the model of the PLEJ course (below) and the structure of the sequence (farther below), a few current BCGM courses might be converted into PLEJ-1 courses. More ACGM and BCGM courses would be candidates for PLEJ-2 courses. *The distinction between PLEJ-1 and PLEJ-2 courses rests on the intent: developing a theoretical understanding versus focusing and applying that understanding to a specific subject matter.*

4. Two Models for the PLEJ-1 Foundation Course

CUE offers two models for the PLEJ-1 foundational course. In Model A, PLEJ-1 courses would use race in the U.S to learn and understand concepts and theories of systemic and structural discrimination and oppression including the ways that race and racism intersect with other group identifications. In Model B, additional categories could satisfy this requirement; for example, courses that use gender, sexuality, or disability as a primary lens for examining concepts and systemic theories of power, discrimination, and oppression. While Model B may require fewer new resources because more courses already exist for fulfilling this requirement, this version could mean that some students could graduate from Western without ever having to grapple with race and racism, which are, arguably, among the most critical issues facing the nation today.

Model A: PLEJ-1 courses that focus specifically on theories of systemic and structural racism in the United States

To be truly “culturally literate” today, one must also be racially literate and understand the connections between race and power and how they operate in the US as a result of long-standing and endemic institutional and structural policies and practices. CUE discussed whether Model A should focus specifically on African Americans and anti-Black racism, which many consider to be the [“root of most oppression and racism in the US.”](#) Some CUE members felt strongly that given that CUE’s work has been fueled by the pressing urgency of addressing anti-Black racism that remains the stubborn legacy of slavery, and given that our university is situated on never ceded tribal land in a county populated by the descendants of Northern European settlers and indigenous

people who remain displaced, and given that the most intractable oppressions in the United States seem to be rooted at the intersection of circumstance of emigration and physical appearance as varying from a presumed Northern European "norm," the foundational course should have a strong focus on the institutional systems and structures that continue to cause harm to Black Americans (and/or) to the Indigenous peoples of the Americas in the United States, in particular.

The committee also considered whether the requirement should be slightly expanded to include the groups traditionally encompassed under the umbrella of [ethnic studies](#) (Latinx, Asian-Americans, and Indigenous cultures) or whether decisions on what racial group(s) to focus on should be left to faculty. Ultimately, a majority of the summer task force concluded that as long as these courses provide a strong foundation in concepts and theories of systemic and structural forms of racism in the US, especially as they affect Black (and/or) Indigenous people, the decision should be left to faculty.

This foundational PLEJ-1 course would introduce the concepts and vocabulary associated with racialized discourse. It would demonstrate how systemic and structural racism works. It would examine the intersections of power, equity, justice, and race as they affect racial groups in the US and intersect with other group identifications such as gender, class, ethnicity, age, sexual orientation and/or disability. These courses would provide theoretical frameworks and analytical strategies that would lay the foundation for examining how power, discrimination, and oppression work in other social categories.

CUE favors this first model. By putting issues of race, power, liberation, equity, and justice front and center, this version offers the boldest and potentially most transformational revision to Western's GUR program. However, this model is also likely to be the more resource-intensive option, requiring new hires and more courses and/or sections of existing courses than Model B. Nonetheless, adopting this version of CUE's proposal would show support for concerns forwarded by BIPOC students, faculty, and staff by ensuring that all students who complete the entirety of their education at Western will have taken at least one course in race, racism, and anti-racism. In addition, a required course in race or ethnic studies might have collateral benefits in terms of attracting more faculty and students of color to the campus.

CUE's thinking about this version of the PLEJ-1 was influenced by [events in the California State University System](#). Their Board of Trustees recently passed a controversial new general education requirement whereby all students would take one course in "Ethnic Studies and Social Justice." Students can meet the requirement by taking an ethnic studies course that focuses on one of the traditionally oppressed racial groups in America (African Americans, Latinx, Asian Americans, or Indigenous peoples) OR by taking a course focused on social justice or social movements. The broader take on the requirement means that students could elect to take classes like Jewish or Muslim studies, LGBTQ+ studies, disability studies, and health disparities in urban communities. A number of groups, including the state legislature, voiced their concerns that the requirement would mean that students could graduate without ever having taken an ethnic studies course. CUE's Model A avoids this outcome by requiring a

course on systemic/structural racism, while still offering students a range of options for the PLEJ-2 course.

Model B: PLEJ-1 Courses that focus on understanding systemic structures of power, liberation, equity, and justice in any marginalized, underserved identity group or community in the US

This model would open the foundational course to a wider choice of subjects that could be used to satisfy this requirement. In addition to race, these courses might use LGBTQ+ groups and/or gender, sexuality, disability, etc. as a lens for introducing concepts and systemic theories of power, discrimination, and oppression. The goals for Model B would be the same as for Model A: to introduce foundational core concepts and theories for understanding various structural forms of power, discrimination, and oppression that sustain social, economic, and political inequities in the U.S. However, because CUE is proposing a two-course sequence, and the second course could accommodate all of these subjects, CUE is much less enamored with this option.

Table 2. Comparison of Two PLEJ-1 Models

Courses	PLEJ-1 Course: Race, Racism, Anti-Racism	PLEJ-1 Course: Multiple Identity Categories
Ideally taken in students' first year or before 60 credits,	100 or 200 level GUR courses	
Faculty Resources	Would require some new hires. Opportunities for professional development to educate, facilitate, and motivate this work.	Likely require some new hires, but fewer than "Race, Racism, Anti-Racism" model Opportunities for professional development to educate, facilitate, and motivate this work.
Current seats and number of seats needed	Model A would require more new "seats" than Model B. Difficult to ascertain from catalog descriptions. (See Appendix 5 for further discussion).	
Examples of existing courses that might fit the PLEJ-1 focus	SOC 269 Race & Ethnic Relations (845) AMST 204 African American Experience (35) AMST 301 Comparative Cultural Studies (60)	SOC 269 Race & Ethnic Relations (845) AMST 204 African American Experience (35) AMST 301 Comparative Cultural Studies (60) WGSS 211 Intro Women, Gender, Sexuality Studies (280)

		COMM 260 Communication, Identity, Difference (175)
Examples of existing courses (based on current course descriptions) that might be reconceptualized as PLEJ-1 courses	<p>AMST 202 American Indian Experience (45)</p> <p>AMST 203 Hispaniola-American Experience (25)</p> <p>AMST (205) Asian-American Experience (25)</p> <p>HIST 263 African American since 1865 (75)</p> <p>HIST 275 The Indian in American History (75)</p>	<p>AMST 202 American Indian Experience (45)</p> <p>AMST 203 Hispaniola-American Experience (25)</p> <p>AMST (205) Asian-American Experience (25)</p> <p>AMST 242 Lesbian/Gay Bisexual Experience (60)</p> <p>HIST 263 African American since 1865 (75)</p> <p>HIST 275 The Indian in American History (75)</p> <p>FAIR203A Social Relationships/Responsibility (126)</p>
Other potential complications	Fewer departments would likely contribute to PLEJ-1 courses	Model B could contain a larger list of PLEJ-1 courses which would all have to be listed as prerequisites for PLEJ-2 courses if Banner were to enforce the prerequisite.

5. Three Alternatives for Structuring the Requirement

Below, CUE offers three possible structures for implementing this proposal. All three structures call for:

- A developmental approach with PLEJ-1 being a prerequisite for PLEJ-2.
- A 4-5 credit PLEJ-1 course that focuses on systemic theories and structures of power, discrimination and inequity in the US.
- A 4-5 credit PLEJ-2 course that extends, deepens, and/or applies these ideas in a specific topic or context.
- No geographic restrictions in PLEJ-2 courses.
- A revision to the humanities GUR category description.
- Current CGM courses that meet the criteria can be converted or reconceptualized as PLEJ-1 or PLEJ-2 courses.

- Other CGM courses would be rolled back into Humanities, Social Sciences or another appropriate GUR category.
- A phased-in approach over several years.

All three options will require the addition of new resources with some options requiring more resources than others. However, CUE believes that the benefits outweigh the costs. These changes speak to aspirational values in Western's Strategic Plan and Mission Statement: to "provide a transformational education grounded in the liberal arts and sciences . . ." and to "improve general education requirements and programs of study at the undergraduate and graduate levels to ensure they foster the knowledge, skills, and habits of mind required in a dynamic world" (Goal 1). And most importantly, these proposals "support and strengthen curricula and other programming that engage issues of access, equity, power, and privilege in and across disciplines" (Goal 4).

CUE supports all three structures. Adopting any of these structures would distinguish Western from the state's other major public universities in terms of the focus of the requirement, the two-course developmental sequencing, and for how it re-imagines a broader audience for these courses (not just primarily white students). Western's PLEJ requirement could become a new "Making Waves" story for Western to tell. (See Appendix Four for descriptions of similar requirements in the state's other major public universities).

Structure One: A new PLEJ GUR category

In this version, the CGM GUR would be replaced with a new PLEJ GUR category. Students would take a PLEJ-1 and PLEJ-2 course just as they now take an ACGM and BCGM course. While some CGM courses could become PLEJ courses, this version also opens opportunities for other interested departments inside and outside of CHSS to propose PLEJ courses. Credit requirements for the humanities and social sciences would remain at their current levels (12 credits or 3 courses).

Structure Two: Humanities and social science courses with PLEJ tags

This version labels qualifying GUR courses with a PLEJ-1 or PLEJ-2 tag. Theoretically, any department could propose a PLEJ-tagged course; however, it is likely that most of these courses would come from humanities and social science GURs. Therefore, CUE suggests increasing the humanities and social science credits from 12 credits to 16 credits, or from three courses to four courses each. In keeping with current practice, students could take no more than two of their humanities and social science courses from the same department. This structure also allows students to take as many PLEJ courses as they wish to fulfill their Humanities and Social Science requirements (as long as two of them are from a different department or departments).

Structure Three: PLEJ-1 GUR plus PLEJ-2 tagged course

This version is a combination of the first two options. The first course would be a PLEJ GUR standalone course and the second course would be a **graduation requirement** that students could fulfill by taking either a “tagged” GUR course in the Humanities, Social Sciences (or another GUR category) or a “tagged” course in the major. This option would not increase humanities or social science credits and could conceivably reduce the number of GUR credits that students are required to take (something that perhaps appeals to students more than faculty who might worry about loss of SCH).

Making the second course a graduation requirement would also make this a requirement for transfer students with DTAs who are exempt from WWU GUR requirements. If this option is selected, further discussion would be needed to discuss how to handle the PLEJ prerequisite for these students.

CUE is in the process of slowly collecting information about current GUR and Major courses that provide students with concepts and theories that expand and complicate their knowledge and understanding of systemic structures and policies of discrimination, oppression and inequity. Early returns suggest that while there are fewer GUR courses with this focus, there appear to be many more major courses that could fulfill the criteria for PLEJ-2 courses; for example, PLSC 321 “Queer and Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender Politics” or “ENVS 467 “Power, Privilege & the Environment.” While no department or college would be required to offer PLEJ-tagged courses in the major, allowing for the possibility does open opportunities for departments. Some students have suggested adding courses in the major that would help them develop their academic and professional identities by understanding how systemic inequities play out in their fields (such as history of science courses, for example), and Structure 3 incentivizes the creation of these types of courses.

Table 3. Comparison of the Different PLEJ Structures

Features	Structure 1	Structure 2	Structure 3
Developmental sequence	PLEJ-1 is a prerequisite to PLEJ -2		
PLEJ category or tagged courses	New PLEJ GUR category replaces CGM category	Tagged PLEJ courses appear in other GUR categories	GUR PLEJ category for PLEJ-1; tagged PLEJ-2 courses in GURS or Major
Changes in HUM & SSC credits	No increase to HUM & SSC credits	Increase to HUM & SSC credits from 12 to 16 credits (from 3 to 4 courses)	No increase to HUM & SSC credits

Revision to the Humanities	Require a revision in the Humanities description to include all human experience (no geographic boundaries).		
Benefits	Any department could contribute GUR courses to the PLEJ category.	Students could take more than the required number of PLEJ-2 courses while fulfilling other GUR requirements.	Transfer students with DTAs would need to meet the PLEJ graduation requirement. Any department could contribute PLEJ-2 tagged GUR or Major courses. Students may be able to satisfy a GUR with a Major requirement.
Possible Concerns			DTA transfer students would need some kind of overrides into their PLEJ-2 courses.
New Resources	More new seats needed for PLEJ-1 courses. (More for Model A than Model B). New Hires with the expertise to teach PLEJ-1 courses especially and PLEJ-2 courses more generally		
	Likely some new seats needed for PLEJ-2 GUR courses	Likely some new seats needed for tagged PLEJ-2 courses	Some new seats may be needed for the tagged GUR version of PLEJ-2 course

6. A Phased-In Approach for Implementing the Full Proposal

The CUE Task Force endorses the following options:

1. Renaming the new requirement as Power, Liberation, Equity, Justice (PLEJ).
2. Initiating a two-course developmental sequence.
3. Selecting Model A for the PLEJ-1 course.
4. Adopting any of the three structure designs for the new requirement.

CUE believes that these changes are educationally imperative. They would go far in addressing long-standing student concerns. Ideally, the changes recommended in this report will be accepted and implemented as quickly as possible to meet student

demands, institutional priorities, and state and national needs. And yet, even if quickly accepted, full implementation would take significant time to realize, given budget concerns, resource scarcities, and lingering uncertainties caused by the Coronavirus pandemic, not to mention the time it takes to realize any kind of significant institutional change in an academic environment.

CUE recommends gradually phasing in the new requirement while transitioning from ACGM/BCGM to PLEJ courses. A gradual implementation would mitigate some of the financial impact on the university. It would give departments more time to consider hiring priorities, revise existing courses, develop new courses, and engage in professional development.

As “in the meantime” measures, CUE suggests that departments alert students to current GUR and/or major courses that already focus on this work. Some departments currently offer relevant courses the major, and if the university were to choose “Structure 3,” where the PLEJ-2 tagged course could include either GUR or Major courses, these major courses could easily become tagged PLEJ-2 courses. CUE is also working to create a data base of current PLEJ-like courses by collecting GUR and major course descriptions and syllabi from departments.

In addition, interested departments might develop some new temporary X97 courses as tagged PLEJ “combo” courses. These courses would combine some of the goals of PLEJ-1 and PLEJ-2 courses. They would include relevant theoretical concepts and focus on various structural forms of power, discrimination, and oppression that sustain social, economic, and political inequities in specific contexts. Ideally, these courses would focus on groups and events in the US, but they could be approached from a range of disciplinary perspectives: social, historical, political, literary, rhetorical, environmental, philosophical, and so on. Interested students could satisfy their ACGM and BCGM requirements (whichever are appropriate) with these tagged PLEJ “combo” courses while we are waiting for the full version to be implemented. Offering temporary “combo” courses also might be a way for faculty to “test the waters,” before proposing more permanent renditions. Ideally, some of these temporary courses would later be transitioned into PLEJ-1 or PLEJ-2 courses, refocusing them to meet the more specific requirements if necessary.

Table 4 outlines a strategy for phasing in the PLEJ requirement over four years. CUE proposes beginning with the development of PLEJ-1 courses to ensure that enough courses exist prior to offering PLEJ-2 courses and to give faculty a chance to see what PLEJ-1 courses do before they begin developing PLEJ-2 courses. ACGM/BCGM courses would continue to be offered until the full requirement is implemented in 2024-2025. Developing both courses simultaneously could be overwhelming to departments and could risk conflating the purposes of the two courses.

Table 4. Phasing in the Requirement.

Phase	Structure 1	Structure 2	Structure 3
Preliminary Phase 2020-2021	F 2020: Send working draft to Associated Students Executive Board for feedback before forwarding as a formal proposal to ACC and Senate.		
	W 2021: Public comment & feedback on proposals.		
	S 2021: Approve selected PLEJ change and begin proposing and approving temporary PLEJ Combo courses.		
	Summer 2021: Begin offering professional development workshops for developing & teaching PLEJ courses.		
Phase 1 2021-2022	2021-2022: Continue proposal & approval of temporary PLEJ Combo courses. Allow students to satisfy the CGM requirement with ACGM, BCGM and temporary PLEJ combo courses.		
	F 2021: Departments inventory their current ACGM/BCGM offerings to determine desirability & suitability as PLEJ -1 or PLEJ -2 GUR courses	F 2021: Departments inventory their current ACGM/BCGM offerings to determine desirability & suitability as PLEJ -1 or PLEJ -2 tagged courses	F 2021: Departments inventory their current ACGM/BCGM offerings to determine desirability & suitability as PLEJ -1 or PLEJ -2 GUR and/or Major tagged courses
	F 2021: Rewrite Humanities GUR category description		
	W-S 2022: Begin developing and proposing PLEJ-1 course.		
	Summer 2022: Continue offering professional development workshops for developing & teaching PLEJ-1 and PLEJ-2 courses.		
Phase 2 2022-2023	2022-2023: Continue offering ACGM/BCGM courses but gradually begin moving (non-PLEJ) BCGM courses to HUM, SSC, or other appropriate GUR. Continue offering Temporary PLEJ Combo courses. Begin offering PLEJ-1 courses as alternatives to BCGM GURs specifically.		
	F 2022-W 2023: Begin developing and proposing PLEJ-2 courses (experimental number first).		
Phase 3 2023-2024	2023-2024 Phase out temporary PLEJ combo courses or turn them into PLEJ-1 and PLEJ 2 courses.		
	F 2023: Full implementation of PLEJ-1 courses for all new students. Begin offering PLEJ-2 courses as alternatives to ACGMs.		

	S2024: Complete migration of most remaining BCGMs and ACGMs to HUM/SSC or other appropriate GUR.
Phase 4 2024-2025	PLEJ 1 & 2 requirement in full effect for all new students.

7. Additional Thoughts and Considerations that Emerged from CUE’s Deliberations

Considerations specific to the PLEJ courses and processes

1. When some version of this proposal is accepted and implemented, CUE talked about giving first and second-year students priority registration for PLEJ-1 courses. Courses could be opened to upper-class students in phase II of registration.
2. Having a more limited menu of different course options for fulfilling the PLEJ-1 requirement might be more effective for ensuring that this course does the work it needs to do.
3. ACC might consider instigating an abbreviated Curriculog process for moving ACGM/BCGM courses to other GUR categories and updating titles and descriptions.
4. Instead of migrating current ACGM/BCGM courses to the Humanities or Social Sciences, faculty might consider the feasibility of turning some of these courses into COM C courses by reducing coverage and adding writing instruction and practice.
5. The university might want to consider initiating a PLEJ certificate for students who take multiple PLEJ-tagged courses or engage in action-oriented experiences.

Considerations for pedagogy and professional development

6. CUE supports the suggestion from the Black Students Organizations that all faculty, staff, and students engage in anti-racist training similar to the CASAS mandate for sexual harassment prevention training that we now do.
7. Offer an initial professional development workshop/discussion for faculty who want to understand more about the PLEJ principles and aspirations and ways that PLEJ subject matter and approaches could be woven into other classes.
8. Make available ongoing summer workshops and professional development opportunities for faculty who want to learn how to employ anti-racist pedagogies, language, and assessment policies similar to the opportunities afforded faculty for learning new methods for offering remote instruction.

9. Consider having faculty work together as they develop and teach their PLEJ course for the first time. Maybe some interested teachers could be added to each other's Canvas courses or try out each other's readings and assignments.
10. PLEJ courses benefit from having opportunities for discussion, reflective writing, inquiry work, creative problem-solving, and project-based assignments. While small classes are ideal, they may not be feasible. What alternative methods for delivering instruction might we creatively employ? For example, lectures and presentations by multiple specialists (faculty with specific expertise) coupled with smaller discussion or "lab" sections for discussion, inquiry, and exploration through projects and experiences.

Other matters. . .

11. CUE was unable to accurately determine what resources already exist in terms of courses from the catalog descriptions. With all the digital and linking tools available to us, are there more effective ways to communicate information to students and other interested parties about what these courses are really about?
12. Some faculty members would like to see Western students graduate having taken at least one course with a global or international focus. Although CUE has not recommended this requirement in the current proposal, some ideas emerged in our discussions.
 - a. Consider asking students to take one humanities or social science GUR course that has a global or international focus or experience.
 - b. Consider making this requirement a graduation requirement by tagging appropriate GUR or Major courses with a designated global tag.

Coda

Too often, transformative ideas get sanitized in bureaucratic language during the process of institutionalization. For example, the editors of *Science*, one of the world's leading journals for scientific research and commentary, revised an open letter to STEM from Faculty of Color about combating systemic racism in higher education. All the fierce urgency of the [original version](#) has been stripped away in this much [diminished version](#) that *Science* finally agreed to publish. We hope that will not happen to this draft proposal.

This is the kairotic moment for action. As we write these words, we see moves by the government of the United States to take steps to ["end racial sensitivity training."](#) calling such education "divisive anti-American propaganda." On the contrary, [says U.S. attorney M.E. Hart](#), writing in *The Washington Post*, "We have to see each other as human beings, and we have to do whatever it takes, including taking whatever classes make that possible. . . . These classes have been very powerful in allowing people to do that, and we need them more than ever." CUE strongly urges that the university act now, by passing and getting to work implementing one of the proposed developmental PLEJ GUR sequences in this document.

Appendix 1:

From the 2016 Task Force Report on “Diversity”

The 2016 General Education Task force, from which ACC’s 2016 report emerged, identified several “issues of concern” with the “poorly designed diversity education” requirement. ACC’s report addresses the task’s force’s first concern and the last two bullets in their list of suggested improvement opportunities.

- The current model reinforces Western/non-Western dichotomy.
- The current model lends itself to a “cultural tourism” understanding of others by focusing on education *about* these others.
- (And most importantly) the current approach does not necessarily emphasize a conceptual understanding of structural forms of oppression along lines of race, class, gender, sexuality, ability, etc. or the historical, social, and cultural dynamics that contribute to current inequities.

At the end of their report, the Task Force recommended the following “learning opportunities” for bringing “the diversity education requirement into the 21st century.”

- Articulating diversity learning goals—including skills, knowledge and values related to diversity
- Developing a Diversity Foundations category for courses that address social stratification and related issues.
- Considering how courses plus experiences (service-learning, study abroad, community-based projects) could serve to meet diversity goals.
- Redefining the humanities GUR to be more inclusive of all peoples’ traditions and cultures.
- Adding some of the courses that are now ACGM or BCGM to the HUM list.

In addition, the Appendix of this report posed several key questions for further consideration:

- How could we adopt a developmental approach to understanding diversity, giving our students an initial understanding of foundational diversity concepts, followed by an opportunity for students to explore them in more depth?
- What would be our desired outcomes of the diversity requirement? Would it be a focus on knowledge, skills, dispositions, or attitudes?
- How do we move from a model of education about the ‘other’ to a model of education that encourages students to examine their privileges and positions within domestic and global social structures as well as to challenge stereotypes, assumptions, and ideas?
- Should this requirement attempt to be purely objective and free of normative statements or should it encourage students to work towards equity and justice in society and practice ethical decision making? How do we do this while simultaneously upholding academic freedom?

Appendix 2:

Western's Strategic Mission and Plan

The new requirement offers an opportunity to address many of the values and goals of Western's Strategic Mission and Plan.

- (From Goal 1) Provide a transformational education grounded in the liberal arts and sciences . . .
- (From Goal 1) Review and improve general education requirements and programs of study at the undergraduate and graduate levels to ensure they foster the knowledge, skills, and habits of mind required in a dynamic world.
- (From Goal 4) Western will pursue justice and equity in its policies, practices, and impacts. Western sees equity, justice, inclusion and diversity as fundamental principles calling for authentic engagement
- (From Goal 4) Establish, fund and sustain practices of self-examination and continuous improvement to identify, understand and remediate structural injustices and inequities at Western.
- (From Goal 4) Support and strengthen curricula and other programming that engage issues of access, equity, power, and privilege in and across disciplines.

Appendix 3:

Language is Important

Words matter. A 2017 *Inside Higher Education* article by [Dafina-Lazarus Stewart](#) notes that “diversity and inclusion rhetoric asks fundamentally different questions and is concerned with fundamentally different issues than efforts seeking equity and justice.” Stewart demonstrates the different kinds of questions that emerge from these words.

- Diversity asks, “Who’s in the room?” Equity responds: “Who is trying to get in the room but can’t? Whose presence in the room is under constant threat of erasure?”
- Inclusion asks, “Has everyone’s ideas been heard?” Justice responds, “Whose ideas won’t be taken as seriously because they aren’t in the majority?”
- Diversity asks, “How many more of [pick any minoritized identity] group do we have this year than last?” Equity responds, “What conditions have we created that maintain certain groups as the perpetual majority here?”
- Inclusion asks, “Is this environment safe for everyone to feel like they belong?” Justice challenges, “Whose safety is being sacrificed and minimized to allow others to be comfortable maintaining dehumanizing views?”
- Diversity asks, “Isn’t it separatist to provide funding for safe spaces and separate student centers?” Equity answers, “What are people experiencing on campus that they don’t feel safe when isolated and separated from others like themselves?”
- Inclusion asks, “Wouldn’t it be a great program to have a panel debate Black Lives Matter? We had a Black Lives Matter activist here last semester, so this semester we should invite someone from the alt-right.” Justice answers, “Why would we allow the humanity and dignity of people or our students to be the subject of debate or the target of harassment and hate speech?”
- Diversity celebrates increases in numbers that still reflect minoritized status on campus and incremental growth. Equity celebrates reductions in harm, revisions to abusive systems and increases in supports for people’s life chances as reported by those who have been targeted
- Inclusion celebrates awards for initiatives and credits itself for having a diverse candidate pool. Justice celebrates getting rid of practices and policies that were having disparate impacts on minoritized groups.

Appendix 4:

Examples of General Education “Diversity” Requirements at other Washington State Universities

University of Washington (passed 2013)

The University requires all undergraduates to take a minimum of 3 credits, approved by the appropriate school or college, that focus on the sociocultural, political, and/or economic diversity of the human experience at local, regional, or global levels.

- This requirement is intended to help you develop an understanding of the complexities of living in increasingly diverse and interconnected societies.
- Courses that fulfill the diversity requirement focus on cross-cultural analysis and communication; and historical and contemporary inequities such as those associated with race, ethnicity, class, sex and gender, sexual orientation, nationality, ability, religion, creed, age, and socioeconomic status.
- Course activities should encourage thinking critically about topics such as power, inequality, marginality, and social movements, and support effective cross-cultural communication skills.

These three credits will simultaneously satisfy other Area of Knowledge requirements and do not add to the total number of credits you need to graduate.

Washington State

Diversity courses introduce students to cultural differences and similarities by exploring the multiplicity of individual and group experiences within and across various historical periods, societies, and cultures. This exploration contributes to stronger, more complex cross-cultural understanding and communication, helping students engage various social and cultural contexts and interactions using knowledge, critical thinking, and flexibility in perspective. DIVR courses also encourage students to ask more complicated questions about cultural systems and systems of power, and to pursue answers that reflect multiple cultural and intellectual perspectives.

Choose one [DIVR] course (3 credits) to fulfill part of your UCORE graduation requirements. All DIVR courses are required to:

- Help students move beyond perception-based comparisons, prior knowledge, and individual experiences to understand how social positioning and cultural differences and/or interrelations are constructed.
- Help students recognize how factors including history; politics; economics; systems of discrimination and inequality; structures of power and privilege; and/or cultural values, beliefs, and practices determine social and cultural conditions

- Provide students vocabulary, language, concepts, methodologies, and/or theoretical models with which to engage and analyze how social realities are shaped and how stereotypes are created by cultural and socio-economic differences in the US and/or globally.

Students may demonstrate their understandings by such means as:

- Analyzing and critiquing the cultural and social underpinnings of knowledge claims about individuals and groups and their relations to one another.
- Assessing their own core values, cultural assumptions, and biases in relation to those held by other individuals, cultures, and societies.

Eastern Washington University

Must take a one course in diversity and one in global issues. Each course must address diversity/global issues and one of the following: Analytical thinking, creative thinking, or information literacy

Diversity courses

- Examine movements that shape or challenge systems of power, privilege, oppression, or colonization.
- Evaluate constructions of identities of underrepresented or marginalized groups created through social, cultural, or political practices.
- Communicate the ways in which power differentials operate, are experienced, or are reinforced at individual, group, community, or institutional levels.
- Critically examine their own attitudes about underrepresented or marginalized groups.

Global issues prepare students to:

- Describe one or more contemporary international or global issues from the perspectives of multiple nation-states, peoples or cultures outside the U.S.
- Analyze multiple dimensions of contemporary international or global issues.
- Critically evaluate information about contemporary international or global issues
- Synthesize multiple perspectives concerning contemporary international or global issues for the purpose of forming their own perspective.

Central Washington University

Students must take one course in each of 8 “knowledge” areas including:

Global Dynamics

The Global Dynamics (GD) perspective focuses on how individuals, groups, communities, and nations function in a global society. Students will gain a cultural

awareness and sensitivity that prepares them for citizenship in a diverse, global society by developing an understanding of how culture shapes human experience, an appreciation for diverse worldviews, and an awareness of the complexity of the interactions among local, regional, national, and global systems. Students will:

- Develop ability to identify, analyze and evaluate underlying global, national, and local issues in the present or in a historical context.
- Demonstrate an understanding of how diversity, inequality or privilege interact with social, economic, and political power globally.
- Demonstrate an understanding of concepts and processes required for decision making, participation in civic or international affairs, economic productivity and global stewardship.
- Develop ability to effectively address significant issues and articulate impacts on global issues that may be social, cultural, economic, historic, or political.
- Apply knowledge and skills to address complex global problems using interdisciplinary perspectives and conceptual models.

Community, Culture, & Citizenship (??)

The Community, Culture, and Citizenship (CCC) perspective engages students with historic and contemporary political, ethical, cultural, socioeconomic, and other emerging issues affecting society. By grappling with the intersection of social concerns, students will learn how societies are created and how to contribute to them as effective citizens. Courses are approved for the CCC Knowledge Area based on their capacity to offer students opportunities to attain the learning outcomes below. Students will:

- Articulate the requirements of informed citizenship based on analyses of social, cultural, economic and/or political processes, issues, and/or events.
- Explain how social, psychological, and/or culturally diverse experiences create value in a community.
- Analyze relationships between local, national, regional, and/or global cultures and community, citizenship, politics, and/or government.
- Describe how historical, social, economic, and/or cultural developments have affected communities, citizenship, politics, and/or government.

Appendix 5:

The Difficulty of Estimating New Resources Based on Current Catalog Course Descriptions

CUE is unable to accurately estimate the number of current courses that could automatically roll over into PLEJ-1 or PLEJ-2 courses from reading course descriptions. Some courses appear to touch on systemic theories of power, oppression, and discrimination but it is difficult to determine if these issues are the core focus of the course.

PLEJ-1 courses

Students told CUE that two courses (SOC 269 and WGS S211) do the theoretical work required for a PLEJ-1 foundational course, although the course descriptions are less explicit:

SOC 269 Race and Ethnic Relations (425): Introduces students to the sociology of race and ethnic relations in the United States. Surveys racial and ethnic minority groups and provides a historical context for their relative positions in the United States by considering the dynamics of the political and economic climate, racial/ethnic attitudes, inter-minority relations, and social policy.

WGSS 211 Introduction to Women, Gender and Sexuality Studies (25)
Introduction to the issues, questions, conceptual frameworks, and methods basic to women, gender, and sexuality studies.

PLEJ-2 courses

Example description that indicate a focus on Diversity

HIST 265 LBGTQ+ (75) History in the US; This course explores the multiple and divergent experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people in U.S. history. Our central concern will be to trace the multiple histories necessary for representing the diversity of LGBTQ+ people's cross-cutting identities (including, but not limited to, race, gender, class, nation, and ability) and within the acronym itself.

Example description of some indication of growing PLEJ-2 focus

HIST 263 (75) African American since 1865: Introduces students to the experiences of African American women and men since the Civil War, with special emphasis on the Civil Rights and Black Power movements.

HIST 268 (50) Intro Asian American History: Contributions Asian Americans have made to the development of the United States with emphasis on immigration, adaptation, settlement and their struggle for justice and equality.

Example description of clearer indication of PLEJ-2 focus

SOC 339 (30) Women, Sexuality, and Society: Examines women's sexuality in contemporary U.S. culture. Focuses on the social construction of women's stigmatized sexualities and real-world consequences in various arenas. Topics include intersecting identities, sexual mores, mainstream media portrayals, pornography, sexual harassment, violence, sex work, and sexual health.

SOC 366 (30) Colonial, Slavery, Racism: A seminar course to analyze the precursors of contemporary racism using a sociological perspective of racial inequality in the United States and in western, eastern, and southern Africa. There is a specific examination of the historical record of colonialism, slavery, and interethnic rivalry with a particular emphasis on the lasting effects of slavery for people of color in many parts of Africa and the United States.

DRAFT