

F AIR AND OPEN ENVIRONMENT? **BIGOTRY AND VIOLENCE ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES IN CALIFORNIA**

**California Advisory
Committee to the
United States Commission
on Civil Rights**

This summary report of the California Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on civil rights was prepared for the information and consideration of the Commission. Statements and viewpoints in the report should not be attributed to the Commission or the Advisory Committee, but only to individual participants in the community forum where the information was gathered.

THE UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The United States Commission on Civil Rights, first created by the Civil Rights Act of 1957, and reestablished by the United States Commission on Civil Rights Act of 1983, is an independent, bipartisan agency of the Federal Government. By the terms of the 1983 act, the Commission is charged with the following duties pertaining to discrimination or denials of the equal protection of the laws based on race, color, religion, sex, age, handicap, or national origin, or in the administration of justice; investigation of individual discriminatory denials of the right to vote; study of legal developments with respect to discrimination or denials of the equal protection of the law; appraisal of the laws and policies of the United States with respect to discrimination or denials of equal protection of the law; maintenance of a national clearinghouse for information respecting discrimination or denials of equal protection of the law; and investigation of patterns or practices of fraud or discrimination in the conduct of Federal elections. The Commission is also required to submit reports to the President and the Congress at such times as the Commission, the Congress, or the President shall deem desirable.

THE STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEES

An Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights has been established in each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia pursuant to section 105(c) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 and section 6(c) of the United States Commission on Civil Rights Act of 1983. The Advisory Committees are made up of responsible persons who serve without compensation. Their functions under their mandate from the Commission are to: advise the Commission of all relevant information concerning their respective States on matters within the jurisdiction of the Commission; advise the Commission on matters of mutual concern in the preparation of reports of the Commission to the President and the Congress; receive reports, suggestions, and recommendations from individuals, public and private organizations, and public officials upon matters pertinent to inquiries conducted by the State Advisory Committee; initiate and forward advice and recommendations to the Commission upon matters in which the Commission shall request the assistance of the State Advisory Committee; and attend, as observers, any open hearing or conference that the Commission may hold within the State.

AUG 18 1991

F AIR AND OPEN ENVIRONMENT? **BIGOTRY AND VIOLENCE ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES IN CALIFORNIA**

**California Advisory
Committee to the
United States Commission
on Civil Rights**

This summary report of the California Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on civil rights was prepared for the information and consideration of the Commission. Statements and viewpoints in the report should not be attributed to the Commission or the Advisory Committee, but only to individual participants in the community forum where the information was gathered.

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

California Advisory Committee to the
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

Arthur A. Fletcher, Chairman
Charles Pei Wang, Vice-Chairman
William B. Allen
Carl A. Anderson
Mary Frances Berry
Esther G. Buckley
Blandina Cardenas Ramirez
Russell G. Redenbaugh

Wilfredo J. Gonzalez, Staff Director

Attached is a summary report of a community forum conducted in Berkeley on July 18, 1989, to obtain information on occurrences of bigotry and violence on college campuses in California. The information provided is not the result of an exhaustive review of campus bigotry and violence, but does identify certain specific issues and concerns that the Advisory Committee may decide merit further investigation and analysis.

There was general consensus at the forum that bigotry and violence exist on the campuses of the University of California. Existing programs to assure equal access must be reexamined, and additional efforts to protect the civil rights of all students are needed.

Representatives from the university's administration and from ethnic groups pointed out a lack of minority representation on California's campuses, citing the results of recent studies. They also noted programs and policies that have been designed to prevent and/or eliminate discrimination and discussed their current and potential effectiveness. While some expressed hope that, with improved education and communication methods, problems could be overcome, many expressed dismay that the civil rights of even one person, citizen or noncitizen, had been violated.

The Advisory Committee offers this summary report to fulfill its mandate to advise the Commission of civil rights issues within the State. The Committee voted 11-0 to submit the report.

Respectfully,



MICHAEL CARNEY, Chairperson
California Advisory Committee

California Advisory Committee

Michael Carney, *Chairperson*
Glendale

J. Arnoldo Beltran*
Pasadena

Catherine A. Garcia*
Westwood

C.C. Chang*
Long Beach

Helen Hernandez
Burbank

Ted S. Cooper*
Petaluma

Deborah M. Hesse**
Sacramento

Grace M. Davis
Los Angeles

Andrea W. Patterson*
Sacramento

Edward J. Erler, Ph.D.
Claremont

Herman Sillas
Los Angeles

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The California Advisory Committee wishes to thank staff of the Commission's Western Regional Division for their help in the preparation of this summary report. The project was the principal assignment of Philip Montez with assistance from John F. Dulles. Support was provided by Grace Hernandez and Priscilla Lee Herring. An initial edit of the transcript was done by Lallie P. Dawson with a final edit by Gloria Hong Izumi, both of the Commission's headquarters office in Washington, D.C.

The Advisory Committee would also like to thank former Advisory Committee members Beatrice M. Jett, Maxwell E. Greenberg, and Thomas S. Sayles, all of Los Angeles; and Dr. Julian Lee of Irvine for their participation during this study.

This summary report was written by Thomas V. Pilla of the Western Regional Division. The project was carried out under the overall supervision of Philip Montez, Director, Western Regional Division.

*Was not a member of the Advisory Committee at the time of the study.

**Ms. Hesse was chairperson at the time of this study.

Contents

I. Introduction	1
California Advisory Committee	1
Background	2
II. Campus Climate	5
Incidents	5
Diversity	11
Admissions	11
Programs to Combat Bigotry	13
Faculty Representation	15
III. Summary	18

I. Introduction

Incidents of racism on college campuses in the Nation have been reported throughout the 1980s. Whether these incidents are a backlash to the perceived benefits of affirmative action programs and minority recruitment efforts or a reaction to the diminished financial resources available to all students is a matter of debate. Most academic experts and government officials agree that the incidents are an outgrowth of a combination of factors, including the increased diversity¹ among the student population on college campuses, the inability of secondary schools to prepare students for a multicultural society, and the lack of planning for diversity by universities. Student leaders have alleged that a lack of sensitivity to cultures and individuals "different" from the perpetrators of racial incidents account for the problem. Other students alleged that the universities thought that once admitted, the students would change and not remain different. These students criticized the university for falsely believing its role was to change such students to be like everyone else.

The United States Commission on Civil Rights is concerned² about the "apparent increase in the number of incidents of bigotry and violence on college campuses."³ To ascertain the level of such incidents, the Commission's Campus Bigotry Subcommittee conducted a briefing on May 18, 1989, in Washington, D.C. At this briefing, representatives of colleges and universities, public and private organizations, and Federal agencies presented information on the nature and origin of harassment and violence, the extent and causes of the problem, and offered potential solutions with examples of programs that had been developed and implemented. The Commission encouraged its State Advisory Committees to review the issue of campus bigotry and violence in their States.

California Advisory Committee

To assess the campus climate for incidents of bigotry and violence, the California Advisory Committee to the Commission⁴ proposed a study to determine the underlying causes and to review efforts undertaken by

¹For additional information on this issue, see amongst others, Stephen Goode, "Efforts to Deal with Diversity Can Go Astray," *Insight*, Sept. 10, 1990, pp. 15-19.

²In 1983 the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights published a statement entitled, *Intimidation and Violence-Racial and Religious Bigotry in America*. In 1990 the Commission released an update entitled, *Intimidation and Violence-Racial and Religious Bigotry in America*. A Restatement of the United States Commission on Civil Rights, Clearinghouse Publication 96, September 1990.

³This quote is from the Commission's May 18, 1989, briefing conducted in Washington, D.C., on bigotry and violence on college campuses. U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, "Briefing on Bigotry and Violence on College Campuses Before the Campus Bigotry Subcommittee," May 18, 1989. The transcript is on file in the Commission's headquarters office. Hereafter cited as Commission Briefing. See also, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, "Bigotry and Violence on American College Campuses" (October 1990).

⁴The Commission has established State Advisory Committees in all States and the District of Columbia to advise it of civil rights issues of concern.

university and college officials to combat racism. The Advisory Committee decided that a focus on the University of California system would shed light on the issue.

On July 18, 1989, the Advisory Committee conducted, in Berkeley, a forum on bigotry and violence on college campuses.⁵ Twenty-five representatives of community groups, university officials, Federal agencies, and community organizations appeared before the Advisory Committee to present their perspective on the issue of campus bigotry and violence.⁶ This report summarizes those presentations.

Background

California has been among those "sunbelt" States experiencing population growth. The State's 1970 population of 19,971,069 grew to 23,667,902 in 1980 and to 25,415,000 in 1984.⁷ The Bureau of the Census reported that the 1990 census found a population of 29 million.⁸ The bulk of population growth has been due to migration from other States and immigration from

⁵California Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, "Forum on Bigotry and Violence on College Campuses." Berkeley, California, July 18, 1989. A transcript of these proceedings is on file in the Western Regional Office. All quotes in this summary report, unless otherwise noted, are taken from this transcript (hereafter cited as Forum).

⁶The representatives were: Julian Klugman, Regional Director, Community Relations Service, U.S. Department of Justice; Daniel Boggan, Jr., vice chancellor, Business and Administrative Services, University of California, Berkeley (UCB); C. Judson King, provost, Professional Schools and Colleges, UC Berkeley; Roslyn Elms, academic assistant to the vice chancellor, UCB; Janice Koyama, co-chairperson, Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Asian American Affairs, UCB; William Russell Ellis, Jr., acting provost, undergraduate affairs, UCB; Carol A. Cartwright, vice chancellor, academic affairs, University of California at Davis (UCD); Alice C. Cox, Assistant Vice President for Student Academic Services; Carmen Estrada, executive director, affirmative action, University of California system (UC); Tina Oakland, director, Women's Resource Center, University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA); Ellen Switkes, director, Academic Personnel, Office of the President, UC; Rabbi Douglas Kahn, executive director, Jewish Community Relations Council, San Francisco; Kimberly Papillion, African Students Association, UCB; Lance Johnson, African Students Association, UCB; Harry LeGrande, associate director, Campus Housing, UCB; Susan Brown, director, higher education, Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF); John C. Gamboa, executive director, Latino Issues Forum; Guillermo Rodriguez, student regent, Board of Regents, UC; Melanie Hahn, writing specialist, UCB; Ling Chi-Wang, professor, UCB; Cecillia Wong, senator, Associated Students of California, UCB; John LaVelle, American Indian Student Association; Melinda Micco, American Indian Student Association; Suzanna Castillo Robson, acting director, Student Affairs and Services, Office of the President, UC. Commissioner William B. Allen, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, was present as Chairman of the Commission and as an observer.

⁷The population data for 1970 and 1980 are from the U.S. Bureau of the Census. The 1984 data is from the State Department of Finance, Population Research Unit, Census Data Center and is an estimate based upon projections utilizing the 1980 Federal census.

⁸Preliminary figures from the 1990 census indicated a 26.1 percent increase in California's population between 1980 and 1990. The final figure reported by the census was 29,760,021 or a 25.7 percent increase over 1980. "Census Bureau Delivers California's Census Count," United States Department of Commerce News, February 1991.

foreign nations. For example, one of every six current elementary students was born outside the United States.⁹

In the 1970s, when Congressman Mervyn Dymally was an assemblyman in the California Legislature and later as Lieutenant Governor, he advanced the theory that the State was increasing its ethnic populations at a rate that would make them the majority by the year 2000. He sponsored a series of statewide conferences that enabled academicians, community activists, and officials of public and private agencies to discuss the changing demographics and plan for the State's future. Participants suggested that the greatest initial impact of these changing demographics would be in education.

In fall 1967 there were 4,345,175 students enrolled in kindergarten through 12th grades (K-12) in California.¹⁰ Of this total, 12,809 were American Indian (0.3 percent); 90,412 were Chinese, Japanese, and Korean (2.1 percent); 354,166 were black (8.2 percent); 593,360 were Spanish-surnamed (13.7 percent); 3,264,876 were other white (75.1 percent); and, 29,522 were other non-white (0.7 percent).

In fall 1981 the K-12 enrollment had dropped slightly to 4,046,156 students, and ethnic percentages had changed. American Indians and Alaska Natives had increased to 32,647 (0.8 percent); Asian and Pacific Islanders had increased to 221,899 (5.5 percent); Pilipino students numbered 64,425 (1.6 percent); blacks increased slightly to 399,171 (9.9 percent); Hispanic enrollment grew to 1,045,186 (25.8 percent); and white enrollment dropped to 2,282,828 (56.4 percent).

In fall 1989 enrollment in the State's K-12 classrooms had increased to 4,771,978 students, and ethnic totals and percentages had again changed. There were 36,806 American Indians and Alaskan Natives (0.8 percent); 365,686 Asians (7.7 percent); 25,211 Pacific Islanders (0.5 percent); 104,726 Pilipinos (2.2 percent); 1,574,105 Hispanics (33.0 percent); 416,611 blacks (8.7 percent); and, 2,248,833 whites (47.1 percent).

Although American Indian and black student enrollments have remained basically static, white enrollment has decreased; Asian, Pacific Islander, and Pilipino enrollments have increased; and Hispanic enrollment has shown a dramatic increase. These are the pools of students from which the State's 314 public and private institutions of higher education¹¹ now draw their applicants. These figures will continue to change. According to the Joint Committee for Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education, sometime

⁹*California Faces. . . California's Future Education for Citizenship in a Multicultural Democracy. The Final Report of the Joint Committee for Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education, Sacramento, March 1989, p. 2 (hereafter cited as Report of the Joint Committee).*

¹⁰Data for 1967, 1981, and 1989 was provided by Shirley Kato, staff services analyst, Educational Demographics, State Department of Education, Sacramento, Ca. Telephone interview with Thomas V. Pilla, civil rights analyst, Western Regional Office, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Oct. 18, 1990. The student totals for each year exclude students enrolled in special education classes.

¹¹Edith R. Hornor, editor. *Almanac of the 50 States: Basic Data Profiles with Comparative Tables.* Information Publications, Palo Alto, California, 1990, p. 37. The total reflects those institutions in operation through 1988.

between the years 2000 and 2010, Latinos will constitute over 30 percent of the general population, Asians 13 percent, blacks 8 percent, and whites less than 49 percent. By the end of the following decade one of three Californians will be Latino, and one in seven will be Asian.

Over a third of Latino and black youth drop out of school before the 12th grade. In 1986 only 4.5 percent of black high school graduates and 5.0 percent of Latino graduates were eligible for admission into the University of California (UC).¹² In comparison, in 1986, 15.8 percent of white graduates and 32.8 percent of Asian graduates were eligible for UC admission. Legislative analysts suggest that less than 30 percent of the Latino or black students entering either the UC or the California State University (CSU)¹³ system will graduate in 5 years.¹⁴ The Joint Committee for Review of the Master Plan concluded that each graduating class of the State's public institutions of higher education was considerably less representative of California's diversity than the class of entering first year students.¹⁵

Although numbers of minority students vary from campus to campus, UC systemwide percentages for the 1988 freshman class were: 23.6 percent Asian, 5.4 percent black, 3.7 percent Pilipino, 11.4 percent Latino, 1.1 percent Native American, and, 54.7 percent white.¹⁶ The CSU system's freshman class in 1988 was 16.7 percent Asian, 6.2 percent black, 4.5 percent Pilipino, 13.0 percent Latino, 0.8 percent Native American, and 58.8 percent white.¹⁷

¹²The nine-campus University of California (UC) system includes campuses at Berkeley, Davis, Irvine, Los Angeles, Riverside, San Diego, San Francisco (medical campus), Santa Barbara, and Santa Cruz. The UC system draws its students from the top 12.5 percent of high school graduates.

¹³The California State University (CSU) and State College (SC) system includes campuses at SC Bakersfield, CSU Chico, CSU Dominguez Hills, CSU Fresno, CSU Fullerton, CSU Hayward, CSU Humboldt, CSU Long Beach, CSU Los Angeles, CSU Northridge, CSU Sacramento, SC San Bernardino, CSU San Diego, CSU San Francisco, SC Sonoma, SC Stanislaus, and Polytechnic State Universities at Pomona and San Luis Obispo.

¹⁴Report of the Joint Committee, p. 3.

¹⁵Report of the Joint Committee, p. 19.

¹⁶*Toward an Understanding of Campus Climate. A Report to the Legislature in Response to Assembly Bill 4071 (Chapter 690, Statutes of 1988.* California Postsecondary Education Commission, Sacramento, June 1990, p. 8. (hereafter cited as *Campus Climate Report*).

¹⁷*Campus Climate Report*, p. 8.

II. Campus Climate Incidents

In 1984 John K. Van de Kamp, State attorney general, responding to a perceived need, created the Commission on Racial, Ethnic, Religious and Minority Violence (Commission). In a series of public hearings,¹⁸ this Commission heard testimony which established that crimes, including vandalism, assault, and even murder, were being perpetrated against people in every region of the State because of their race, ethnicity, religion, sex, sexual orientation, age, or disability.¹⁹ Schools were not immune from these activities.

During the 1988-89 school year the Los Angeles County Human Relations Commission noted that 956 primary and secondary schools in the county reported 2,265 hate incidents.²⁰ In July 1988 the California Senate's Special Committee on University of California Admissions requested a special report from UC regarding racial/ethnic incidents at the university.²¹ In response, UC surveyed²² the eight²³ general campuses and reported approximately 178 academic and nonacademic racial/ethnic incidents for the period 1985 through 1988.²⁴

Julian Klugman, Regional Director, Region IX,²⁵ Community Relations Service (CRS), U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), reported that fiscal year 1988²⁶ witnessed a 60 percent increase in the number of hate-violence incidents on college and university campuses brought to the attention of CRS.²⁷ According to Mr. Klugman, in his region there were six alerts²⁸

¹⁸Commission hearings were held in Fresno, Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Francisco.

¹⁹*Final Report*, Attorney General's Commission on Racial, Ethnic, Religious and Minority Violence, Sacramento, California, April 1990, p. 11 (hereafter cited as *Final Report*).

²⁰Los Angeles County Human Relations Commission, *Intergroup Conflict in Los Angeles County Schools, Report on a Survey of Hate Crime*, October 1989.

²¹*Report to the Senate Special Committee on University of California Admissions Regarding Racial/Ethnic Incidents at the University*, Office of the President, University of California, Sept. 26, 1988 (hereafter cited as Special Committee Report).

²²"In preparing their reports, all campuses agreed on standards of data collection, a guiding definition of racial/ethnic incidents, and common sources of data from which incidents would be drawn. An incident is defined as either: 1) an event or activity involving behavior that denigrated individuals on the basis of race, ethnicity, religion, or sexual orientation; or 2) an event that resulted in behavior with racial, ethnic, religious, or homophobic overtones." Special Committee Report, pp. 1-2.

²³The survey excludes the medical and health science campus in San Francisco.

²⁴The total was extrapolated from the individual narratives provided by individual campuses in the Special Committee Report. The totals for academic and nonacademic incidents at individual campuses were: 34 at UC Berkeley; 15 at UC Davis; 7 at UC Irvine; 21 at UC Los Angeles; 22 at UC Riverside; 6 at UC San Diego; 39 at UC Santa Barbara; and 34 at UC Santa Cruz.

²⁵Region IX encompasses the States of Arizona, California, Hawaii, and Nevada.

²⁶Fiscal year 1988 covered the period Oct. 1, 1987, through Sept. 30, 1988.

²⁷Forum.

between October 1, 1987, and September 30, 1988, and nine alerts between October 1, 1988, and July 18, 1989.

To illustrate the problem, Mr. Klugman described an incident at Southwestern Community College in Chula Vista where an escalation of racial tension between Hispanic and white students culminated with an assault on one student. Following meetings with campus officials and local police, CRS was requested to assist in planning a public forum that would discuss the status of the investigation, answer questions, and provide an opportunity to comment on the problem of race relations at that campus.

Mr. Klugman offered some factors that he believed have created the increase of incidents, such as a significant increase in the number of Asian and Hispanic students, a decrease in the percentage of black students, a lack of sensitivity to minority concerns, a lack of response to incidents, ignorance of the civil rights movement by many white students, a low percentage of minority faculty compared to the percentage of minority students, the reluctance of administrators to let students participate in resolving problems, and divisiveness stimulated by global political problems.

William Russell Ellis, Jr., acting provost, Undergraduate Affairs, UC, Berkeley, told the Advisory Committee that "there have been in the last 5 years several documented incidents of racial and inter-ethnic clumsiness, gross insensitivity, or apparent malice." He added that "by far, the vast majority of students at Berkeley live and study without incident and in relative harmony." Provost Ellis pointed out that all campuses of UC employ a code of student conduct and the deans of student life receive all complaints of violations of that code.

Daniel Boggan, Jr., vice chancellor, Business and Administrative Services, UC Berkeley, said that when you consider the number of interactions that take place on a campus with 31,000 students and 10,000 employees, in terms of documented cases, it is probably less intense than most communities. However, he added, "you do not expect the most liberal, intellectual institution of the world to behave in a way that would be backwards and insensitive to people." Vice Chancellor Boggan stated that the campus has established the Commission on a Changing Student Body²⁹ to advise the entire campus on policies and procedures to improve relationships with one another.

Tina Oakland, director, Women's Resource Center, UC Los Angeles, addressed the issue of violence directed toward women. She noted that campuses reflect the kinds of problems that are around them in the

²⁸An "alert" is a formal notification from the field to the [Washington, D.C.] headquarters office [of CRS] that racial tension exists at a particular site. Commission Briefing, p. 9. Nationally, CRS staff filed 77 alerts relating to racial tensions at institutions of higher education in fiscal year 1988 compared to 48 alerts in fiscal year 1987. Forum, p. 9.

²⁹The Commission on a Changing Student Body was created by the chancellor at UC Berkeley in 1989. The appointments to the Commission were made by the chancellor with input from the academic senate and its membership included faculty, students, and staff. In 1990 the Commission released its report with recommendations. Daniel Boggan, Jr., vice chancellor, Business and Administrative Services, UC Berkeley, telephone interview with Thomas V. Pilla, Western Regional Office, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Nov. 8, 1990.

communities in which they are situated. Throughout the UC system, Ms. Oakland said, two to five rapes per year are reported. She said that to counter the problem, an educational component and other services have been provided throughout the UC system which include a mandatory rape prevention and education service during new student orientation; self-defense workshops for students, staff, and faculty; incorporation of the topic of violence toward women in the curriculum; and post-rape protocols such as crisis counselling.

Dr. Alice C. Cox, assistant vice president for student academic services, said that each campus has procedures for tracking incidents and such acts are increasing. She added:

They are increasing in the communities in which our campuses exist and across the country. Our campuses are reflections of the kinds of attitudes, both positive and negative, values and biases which people hold across the country and that when those people come to campuses, sometimes they act out these prejudices. Our policies and educational programs are an effort to [thwart] inappropriate behavior. It is much harder to help people unlearn attitudes than it is to help them learn positive attitudes, but that is also part of what we are about.

Ms. Oakland said that since the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and campus police departments do a fairly good job of keeping track of crime statistics, campuses can look at the differences between on- and off-campus reports. She noted that UCLA has a campus population of 65,000, and comparisons can be made with any community of that size. Ms. Oakland believed that since the campuses are tracking incidents, the number of incidents would be expected to increase rather than decrease. Another factor in the increase is the availability of programs and resources for those who may not have come forward in the past to report incidents. She added, "we have removed that sense of personal stigma." Since there are programs in place, people are willing to come forward and report incidents of rape or racial harassment.

Rabbi Douglas Kahn, executive director, Jewish Community Relations Council of San Francisco, said, "there appears to be from general observation a significant increase in acts of bigotry and violence on college campuses." Within this general increase, Rabbi Kahn said, there has been an increase of anti-semitism, including desecration of religious symbols, harassment of Jewish students, anti-semitic graffiti, distribution of hate literature, and other incidents. In 1988, at California State University, San Francisco (commonly referred to as San Francisco State), a Jewish student, who was presumed to be accepted on the student governing council was told by members of the student community that they would not allow him to take his seat because of his pro-Zionist activities. In June 1989, at UC Davis, a number of Palestinian and pro-Palestinian students physically and verbally intimidated Jewish students.

Rabbi Kahn traced this trend to a number of factors such as negative perceptions and hostile rhetoric toward Israel, alienation and lack of sensitivity to anti-semitism among numerous groups, economic stress,

increased competition, lack of the same degree of strong links between young Jews and non-Jews that existed in previous generations, the breakdown of the public education system, the exploitation of disaffected youth by hardcore hate groups and the breakdown of civility in our society. He believed that the single most important factor in combating prejudice would be to show that such acts have no place on campus or anywhere else and should not be tolerated. According to Rabbi Kahn, "the university administration, faculty senate, student groups, campus media, and law enforcement personnel all have a special role in responding quickly and convincingly to create a climate that is hostile to bigotry."

Lance Johnson, African Students Association, UC Berkeley, told the Advisory Committee that negative attitudes toward black students, which cause many of the problems, are reflected in the curriculum, in the attitudes of professors teaching courses, and in actions taken towards black students in other instances on and off campus. Mr. Johnson discussed a July 15, 1989, campus party that culminated in the arrest and physical beating of black students.³⁰ He said:

At a well-attended on-campus party, a fight broke out and was contained. At around 1:00 a.m., another fight broke out and was moved outdoors. Many people ran out to get away from whatever was going on. Once outside, I saw 21 cop cars and a police line. All these cops were called out in reference to a fight that broke out among four people at a student-held event. Without any warning, without any notice, the cop line charged this [student] group and began to hit males and females with billy clubs. People were running away from the police. I watched one student beaten down to the ground. The cops were kicking him, and beating and hitting him with billy clubs. Another student ran over and threw his body on top of the other person and that student was beaten so badly that he passed out at the police department. The police were chasing students two and three blocks away from the actual incident.

There have been many cases of fights breaking out at other fraternity parties that are held mainly by Caucasian individuals and the response by the police has never been this way. I think this is directly reflective of how people feel about black students because a response like this to such an incident was overt and unnecessary.

Kimberly Papillion, cochair, African Students Association, UC Berkeley, saw three levels of racism: (1) students who, out of ignorance or deliberate insensitivity use different comments, actions, and hold a particular attitude toward blacks; (2) an administration which is sometimes not sympathetic to

³⁰Following Mr. Johnson's description of this event, the Advisory Committee voted to advise the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights to request a U.S. Department of Justice investigation of the July 15, 1989, incident. The Chairman of the Commission so requested in a letter to the U.S. Attorney General on Sept. 20, 1989. The Acting Assistant Attorney General of Justice's Civil Rights Division responded on Nov. 24, 1989, that the FBI had been requested to investigate the incident. An investigation was undertaken and insufficient evidence was found for prosecution.

black views and rights; and (3) law enforcement actions. Ms. Papillion said that there is an attitude that says this racism is tolerable. She continued:

An attitude which says [the university], the people in power will tolerate these types of racist activities from someone scrawling a swastika on the wall of a dorm room, physical and verbal intimidation, lack of diversity in the curriculum, professors [who] insult you, [who] assume that you are unworthy to be present on this campus. And what we will not tolerate is you protesting any of these actions.

Susan Brown, an attorney in the San Francisco office of the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund, found it "truly frightening that racial incidents should permeate the fabric of our universities." She added:

At Hastings School of Law in San Francisco this past year, white supremacists' literature and offensive racial caricatures found their way to the student bulletin boards. At Stanford University, there have been numerous racial incidents this past year. At UC Berkeley, student racial incidents accompanied allegations of institutional racism exemplified by Boalt Hall School of Law's long-standing problem in finding minority or female professors who "think like lawyers."

Cecilia Wong, a senator of the Associated Students, UC Berkeley, member of the Student Coalition for Fair Admissions, and a member of the Racial Grievance Board, said she has been both the observer and victim of a wide range of racially motivated incidents, noting:

One day while walking to class near Eastgate, four young whites rolled down the windows of their car and yelled, "Gook," at me. At first, I was confused as I looked around. When I realized that I was the target of their racial epithet, I stopped dead in the middle of the street, staring after the car as two passengers in the backseat turned to leer through the window.

Ms. Wong added that even university staff, supposedly given training in diversity, are often the perpetrators of racially insensitive acts:

Periodically, in the dining commons at the dormitory in which I lived last year, staff would prepare a special theme night. One night last spring, the dinner theme was Mardi Gras. As I walked by the salad bar, I noticed two paper decorations propped up on the counter. Each depicted a straw-hatted African American man driving a mule cart carrying a well-dressed white couple. I asked the assistant manager of the dining commons to remove the decorations. She indignantly told me to leave the decoration alone. The part-time student manager told me that at least two other students had expressed similar concern about the decorations.

A call to the *Daily Cal* [the campus newspaper] and a formal letter to the housing office resulted in written verbal apologies, but even that positive resolution was tainted by harassment I faced at the hands of resident assistants who tried to discourage me from "mistreating the dining hall staff."

According to Ms. Wong, her resident assistant, who was given training in issues of diversity, was not able to comprehend the viewpoint of a person of color towards stereotypes, but went so far as to verbally accost her in a threatening manner to discourage her viewpoint. The attitude that minorities have no place at the university is pervasive. Ms. Wong said that at a recent orientation for new first year students, an African American student was given a grim welcome to the UC Berkeley:

In his presence, several white participants in the program began a discussion of affirmative action admission policies which degenerated into a racist criticism of a system which the white students believe let in undeserving people, namely, African Americans and Latinos. The black student told his counselor that he did not want to continue with the orientation program.

She concluded that while various student groups and programs like diversity and race education³¹ have made progress in the constant battle against racism, in many minds the doors are closed to equal access and acceptance. She said, "The traditional college images of hallowed academia, the school colors, and team spirit are outmoded when certain groups are denied membership because of their race, ethnicity, sex, physical disability, or sexual preference."

John Lavelle, American Indian Student Association, UC Berkeley, said that a large percentage of Indian students do not graduate from UC Berkeley for a variety of reasons, including feelings of alienation, cultural shock, the size of the campus, negative remarks from professors, and lack of support systems, especially financial and academic. Racism, he added, plays a role:

One very brilliant Indian doctoral student failed an exam prior to leaving the master's program in her particular field. She compared her exam results with other students' and she noted that those who passed had exams with almost the same responses. She confronted the professor on this point and he told her that since she was a minority student he needed to be harder on her now in order to prepare her for the rough time that she could expect in the mainstream society.

If we do not graduate, Lavelle added, our value as role models for younger Indian students is diminished.

³¹The program referred to is Project D.A.R.E. (diversity awareness through resources and education), which is described in a university pamphlet as "a pro active, experiential pilot program designed to increase multi-cultural awareness among new students in the residence halls. Interactive exercises presented by teams of campus staff and students challenge participants to examine their attitudes regarding different 'cultural groups' (e.g., based on ethnicity, race, gender, sexual preferences, etc.) in a non-threatening setting." *Project D.A.R.E. Diversity Awareness through Resources and Education*, Residential Programs, Housing, University of California, Berkeley, Fall 1988.

Diversity

Provost Ellis noted that in his 20 years at UC he has witnessed an extraordinary and positive change in the undergraduate student body composition: "There can be no doubt that UC is making significant progress in realizing the goals of admitting, educating, and graduating the diverse leadership of tomorrow's California and Nation."

Vice Chancellor Boggan added that in September 1988 the undergraduate student body included 1.4 percent Native Americans, 7 percent black, 11.1 percent Hispanic, 26.5 percent Asian, 48.5 percent white, and 5 percent unreported. There was no majority in UC Berkeley's student body, he noted.

Dr. Roslyn Elms, academic assistant to the Vice Chancellor, UC Berkeley, stated that diversity is based upon academic, ethnic, racial, discipline,³² gender, geographic, socioeconomic, height, weight—all the factors that can be considered. Provost Ellis indicated that diversity produces some tension, but believed the programs developed and planned to address these tensions were effective.

Janice Koyama, cochairperson, Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Asian American Affairs, UC Berkeley, suggested that there are situations on campus that have to be examined in order to address where all of the sources of racial tension arise. She said:

There are student interactions between white students who cannot distinguish between Asian Americans and foreign students, and there are relational problems that arise out of dormitory living situations. There are generalizations made on the part of some that are culturally based and the stereotype of the model minority. Students visualize Asian Americans as compelling students that are devoid of social needs. I think there are tensions that arise for Asian Americans due to classroom situations generated by insensitivities from professors or graduate teaching assistants. One source of conflict for Asian American students comes from a home environment with parental pressures [to perform].

Admissions

Impacting upon the issue of student diversity is admissions. According to Dr. Alice C. Cox, assistant vice president for student academic services, UC, under the terms of the California Master Plan for Education, UC is expected to admit students from among the upper 12.5 percent of the high school graduating classes. She added that this policy has changed so that UC offers admission, not necessarily to a campus of choice, to all eligible California residents who apply to UC. Considerations are made based upon socioeconomic, geographic, and cultural factors, and life experiences, Cox said.

³²Discipline is a common academic term used to refer to a particular area of study such as anthropology.

Dr. Elms added that all of UC admissions—whether tier one, academic, tier two, supplemental, or tier three, complementary—are eligible students.³³ He noted:

We are talking about a group of students, who under the mandate of 12.5 percent, if there were room, would be admitted. We then have a category of special admits which has increased from 2 percent to 4 percent and is currently 6 percent, which includes affirmative action students, athletes, and some EOP [Equal Opportunity Program] students who do not meet the eligibility requirement but have some special attribute which we think deserves risk. They do not compete for spaces with the eligible students.

Ling Chi-Wang, professor, Asian American Studies, UC Berkeley, added that UC has recently developed a new student admission program including two new categories: rural applicants and reentry students. He said that since over 98 percent of California's Asian population reside in urban areas, the rural applicant category will assist Asian students the least.

UC campuses offer programs to help retain special admits and others. Provost Ellis mentioned the Summer Bridge Program, which provides an opportunity for incoming students to work on reading, writing, and math skills prior to their first year. According to Provost Ellis, this is a mandated program for special admits. He also noted the existence of student learning centers that provide, throughout the academic year, tutorial and supplemental work for students with particular problems or those seeking to advance their knowledge. A UC regent special action policy mandates a four-night a week study table for athletes. Dr. Elms said that it is important to have a diverse student body rather than to have a homogeneous student body.

According to the Chicano/Latino Consortium, from 1976 to 1987, the total number of Chicano/Latino undergraduates enrolled at the university increased by 88 percent to 10,244 and from 1980 to 1987, the total number of new entering Chicano/Latino students increased by 135 percent to 3,253.³⁴ The consortium noted that "while the University has made significant gains, a gap of over 8 percent remains."³⁵

Mr. Lavelle noted that for Indians, the designation "Native American" on admission applications causes ambiguity: "Applicants are asked to self-identify as Native American, and there is no proper oversight [regarding] Indian [admissions]. There is a lack of review of applications determining the legitimacy of students who claim that they are Indian." A student born in Ohio could check Native American, he said, and as long as this ambiguity remained, an accurate total for Indian student admission cannot be obtained.

³³According to Dr. Elms, "tier one is straight academic scores which [UC] refers to as the academic index. The other two tiers are combinations of things, supplemental criteria of which ethnicity, race, disabled, special talent come into play. [UC] also has a category of special action admits." Forum, p. 49.

³⁴*A Report on the Status of Chicano/Latinos at the University of California*. The University of California Chicano/Latino Consortium, June 1988, p. 14 (hereafter cited as Consortium).

³⁵Consortium, p. 14.

Melanie Hahn, writing specialist, UC Berkeley, pointed out that non-Native English-speaking students, unless they fall into protected categories for admission,³⁶ are not given special consideration. She added, "Presently, there is no formal category for linguistic minorities for admissions. The university makes no formal distinction between a second language Asian American and a native English-speaking third generation Asian American." Ms. Hahn suggested that "Asian American immigrant and refugee students have been identified as the targeted victims of decisions that dramatically affected their opportunity for admission."

Programs to Combat Bigotry

Dr. Carol A. Cartwright, vice chancellor, Academic Affairs, UC Davis, stated, "as the racial and ethnic mix of the population changed [UC Davis] began to implement programs to increase awareness and promote cultural sensitivity for faculty, staff, and students dealing with both racial and gender issues." The development of a comprehensive educational program on diversity is one of UC Davis' highest priorities, she added. UC Davis has established a position of an assistant vice chancellor for faculty development and diversity and a new position of director of educational programs for diversity. She said:

We believe that we must take deliberate action to assist students to adjust to a campus community that is increasingly ethnically and culturally diverse. Over the last 5 years, [UC Davis has] implemented programs for faculty, staff, and students to encourage the development of positive relationships among individuals and to educate them about the value of diversity.

The Associated Students of UC Davis published a brochure entitled, "Open Your Eyes to Diversity," she noted.

Dr. Ellen Switkes, director, Academic Personnel, Office of the President, discussed UC policies and statements that have been adopted over the past several years relating to a fair and open environment. The policies addressed nondiscrimination in employment, sexual harassment, and a statement on a fair and open environment. Dr. Switkes said, "The fact that we have a written policy that says it shall be done really does not impact any students, faculty, or staff unless the campuses are willing to take a lead and they are moving in that direction." In addition to those programs at Davis and the other campuses, she noted, UC Santa Barbara has developed a film series around the topic, "what it is like to be a black or Hispanic student at UC Santa Barbara." According to Dr. Switkes, "the films are very powerful because the students actually speak about their own thoughts and feelings [with] descriptions of problems and concerns in student life."

³⁶Ms. Hahn stated that protected categories for admission included underrepresented minorities such as Hispanics, Chicanos, Latinos, African Americans, or Native Americans. Forum.

Regarding whether there exists a systemwide policy or procedure established to deal with specific incidents of violence and bigotry, Dr. Cox said:

There are several policies in place. One is the Regents' policy on nondiscrimination [and] the universitywide policies on sexual harassment. At the present time [summer 1989], we are developing a universitywide policy in response to racial harassment.

Dr. Cox does not believe that racial violence and bigotry are the inevitable byproduct of diversity, but cautioned that "to be able to close the doors of the campus and keep all sin out has been beyond our ability."

While acknowledging that policies and programs have been developed and are in place, some students questioned whether all sectors of the university system are involved. For students, the level of institutional commitment and implementation is still a question mark. Ms. Papillion said that the UC police department has not been educated on diversity issues.

Harry LeGrande, associate director, Campus Housing, UC Berkeley, noted that the Housing Office devotes about 27 of its 80-hour training program for live-in staff to issues of diversity. "It is an ongoing battle because every year you get a new crop of students," he added, and "all it takes is one 'how does your hair do that?' to erase all the things we try to accomplish."

Cecillia Wong said:

Many Asian American students retreat into an all-Asian clique to get the support that is so hard to find on campus. Asian Americans are taunted for being overly sensitive by other students. Many on campus claim that physical abuse of people of color has ended and say that racism does not exist. Yet the reality is that physical violence is often replaced today by a more covert psychological abuse.

Professor Ling Chi-Wang indicated that some admission policy changes undertaken by UC Berkeley in 1983 or earlier (and unknown to the community) precipitated a significant drop of 21 percent in overall admissions of Asian American freshmen and, in particular, a 30 percent decrease in Chinese American enrollment in the 1984 entering class. Asian Americans protested, he added, "Asian Americans were not treated as Americans. We were basically treated as foreigners. [It was] intentional discrimination. The university admitted it had made mistakes and has taken the steps to correct those mistakes."

C. Judson King, provost, Professional Schools and Colleges, UC Berkeley, said that "the Berkeley campus is the first major university to have made its entire admission criteria public knowledge, and that was done over a year ago (1988)." He added, "The criteria has been looked at by various interest groups, judicial bodies, and special commissions and they have not found it to be a biased policy." The adverse impact of the 1983 policy changes on 1984 Asian American admission, some forum participants alleged, prevents a total belief in the system's commitment to diversity.

Ms. Wong concluded that in order to bring UC up to the present reality of a multicultural student body, a new focus should be developed with a

commitment of resources and energies by students, staff, faculty, and community. The perception is that students and others are not involved, and, as a consequence, implementation of UC programs suffers.

John LaVelle said that there is a lack of accountability on the part of the university with respect to the admission of Indian students. He added that Indians are left out from discussions of affirmative action and their point of view is not solicited:

It is the obligation of the university to be not only tolerant of alternative perspectives and alternative cultural perspectives, but to encourage development of those perspectives and to encourage diversity and that is where the university is lacking.

Ms. Papillon said, "it is a shame that so many students of color have had to leave the campus [UC Berkeley] and go on to other institutions because they felt uncomfortable at one of the finest institutions in the whole world."

An administrator noted that even if committed to diversity, administrations have a tough time getting faculty to institute change.

Faculty Representation

Student participants alleged that greater representation of minorities and women on university staff and faculty would have a beneficial effect on campus climate.

Dr. Cartwright indicated that "there is no direct evidence in the cause and effect sense that the employment relates to the climate, but conceptually, logically, that appears to be the case to many." She added:

We believe that appointment of women and minorities to both faculty, staff, and administrative positions is critically important. We believe that students perform better in their academic programs and stay with us to graduation if they see role models reflected in the faculty.

John Gamboa, executive director, Latino Issues Forum, and co-chairperson of the Hispanic Coalition on Higher Education,³⁷ said that the top governance positions in UC are not awarded to Latinos and blacks. He added that in 1987 Chicano-Latino faculty represented only 3.2 percent of all university faculty and 3 percent of the management and professional program, an upper level management series offered for career development at UC.

Provost King noted that the diversification of the faculty is occurring more slowly than of the undergraduate students because Berkeley is a no-growth campus with slow faculty turnover. According to Provost King, for new appointments during the 1988/89 academic year within the professional schools and colleges, 20 percent of the faculty hired were ethnic minorities and 19 percent were female. To do substantially better, in spring 1989 UC

³⁷The Hispanic Coalition on Higher Education, a coalition of 83 Hispanic organizations across the State was formed in 1987 to work on the problems of diversity within the university and other institutions of higher education in California.

created the Provost's Academic Affirmative Action Council (PAAAC), which is responsible for evaluating, designing, and facilitating the efforts of the campus for diversification of the faculty and the graduate student body.

Mr. Gamboa said:

The tone of racial tolerance and embracing a pluralistic, multicultural State and Nation must come from the highest echelons of the university. The message must be clear and consistent. What we see is a university system that only reluctantly and under pressure acknowledged racial, ethnic realities in California.

Ms. Brown agreed, noting:

I do not contend that any official university spokesperson would condone a racist attitude toward either students or institutionally. I do contend university reluctance and recalcitrance in integrating their top administrative staffs and tenure track faculty slots not only robs students of multicultural, pluralistic experiences, but also sends a very clear message to the student body that racial integration and equality will come only begrudgingly.

Mr. Gamboa added that "nobody ever measures if you have fulfilled your affirmative action goals [and] there is no accountability." He said, "Disparity³⁸ grew for Hispanic faculty by one-third, for [Hispanic] graduate students by 46 percent [and] for Hispanic undergraduate students by 23 percent." Mr. Gamboa suggested these figures represent failure; yet, these administrators are not replaced.

Ms. Hahn alleged that failure year after year to abide by or comply with the university's affirmative action hiring formulas clearly stands as testimony to the perceived insensitivity on the part of this program's administration.

Ms. Micco said that outside of the department of Native American studies at UC Berkeley she could think of only one male professor in traditional departments who could serve as an Indian role model.

Provost King noted that the academic departments create and annually update affirmative action plans, adding:

Each department has an affirmative action committee or affirmative action representative to follow and contribute to the recruitment process. If a recruitment search has not been full and proper, the appointment is not allowed.

Once minority and female faculty are at UC Berkeley there are several support programs, he said.

Dr. Cox pointed out that UC does not have a particular policy that says the university believes that hiring minorities and women will lessen the violence on campus, adding, "What we observe is [that in] the greater society from

³⁸Mr. Gamboa defined disparity as the percentage between the ethnic population and the percentage of the work force or student body.

which we all come, the presence of minorities and women do not lessen the amount of violence.”

A community participant alleged that campuses should not be compared with the outside because colleges should provide a setting for idea exchanges where concepts and stereotypes are challenged without violence.

University participants suggested that individual campuses have programs and specific individuals whose function is to focus on increasing the number of minority and women applicants for faculty positions. The success or failure of these programs remains a point of debate.

III. Summary

Some participants suggested that the lack of planning for diversity of students underlies the campus incidents of the 1980s. Although acknowledging that the State's universities and colleges have developed and implemented programs to ensure a fair and open campus environment, the success of these activities has been questioned.

Some participants alleged that negative attitudes about minority students permeate administrative, staff, and faculty reactions to incidents of bigotry and violence. The insensitivity of fellow students is also cited as a major contributing factor to campus incidents.

Administrators noted that the walls of academia have not been able to shelter students from the general attitudes and discriminatory practices of the world at large. Some students, staff, and other participants suggested that this excuse overlooks a major campus function as a setting for civil exchange of ideas and a period of intellectual challenge for students, including a reassessment of attitudes toward others.

Administrators cite the increase in numbers as evidence of the value of reporting and recording systems that have been put in place to monitor incidents of bigotry and violence and the willingness of students to utilize these systems in the belief that constructive steps will occur.

The enforcement of codes of conduct, policies on racial and sexual harassment, and the creation of campus positions to deal with such issues are offered as mechanisms developed to combat the increase. Sanctions by campus officials against perpetrators of incidents are also mentioned as having an effect. The student participants did not totally agree as to the effectiveness of these sanctions.

Participants agreed that combating incidents of bigotry and violence on campuses takes the concerted effort of all segments of the university community. Some argued that student groups and interested community organizations have not been asked to provide meaningful input for the development, implementation, and enforcement of programs necessary to alleviate campus incidents. Some participants suggested that even with the implementation of training for diversity, incidents continue to occur.

The Advisory Committee is encouraged by university systemwide reactions to the increase and the development by administrations of programs to combat incidents. Some participants noted that the university should have known that the population was changing due to its own student recruitment efforts and changing statewide demographics. Knowing this, the lack of planning for an environment of acceptance is particularly glaring.

The Advisory Committee agrees with participant assessments that all available resources are necessary to counter institutional and individual racism. Only through commitment and diligence can the State's universities and colleges become fair and open environments.