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Abstract

This *Planning* Project mapped the CSU East Bay campus community environment in relation to current beliefs, practices, and attitudes surrounding diversity, multiculturalism, equity, and strategies for supporting the implementation of the Diversity and Social Justice (DSJ) Institutional Learning Objective stating that “Graduates of CSUEB will be able to apply knowledge of diversity and multicultural competences to promote equity and social justice in their communities.” This report details findings from three sources of data: 1) Eleven focus groups with 46 faculty, staff, and students regarding their perspectives on current DSJ practices and suggestions for improvement; 2) The DSJ-specific content in 85 course syllabi drawn from across the campus; and 3) Insights and strategies from visits and face-to-face interviews with our neighboring institutions engaging in exemplary practices. Our work on this project prepared us to submit our PEIL implementation grant for 2013-14, which was selected for funding. The implementation project will support a pilot mentoring and support program for CLASS Faculty, the *DSJ Faculty Fellows Pilot Program*, as well as development of a discipline-specific *DSJ Curriculum Handbook*. 
This Planning Project mapped the CSU East Bay campus community environment in relation to current beliefs, practices, and attitudes surrounding diversity, multiculturalism, equity, and strategies for supporting the implementation of the Diversity and Social Justice (DSJ) Institutional Learning Objective stating that “Graduates of CSUEB will be able to apply knowledge of diversity and multicultural competences to promote equity and social justice in their communities.” This report details findings from three sources of data: 1) Eleven focus groups with 46 faculty, staff, and students regarding their perspectives on current DSJ practices and suggestions for improvement; 2) The DSJ-specific content in 85 course syllabi drawn from across the campus; and 3) Insights and strategies from face-to-face interviews with programs and departments on the CSUEB campus, and visits and telephone interviews with other U.S. universities engaging in exemplary practices. Our work on this project prepared us to submit our PEIL implementation grant for 2013-14, which was selected for funding. The implementation project will primarily support a pilot mentoring and support program for CLASS Faculty, the DSJ Faculty Fellows Pilot Program, as well as development of a discipline-specific DSJ Curriculum Handbook.

**Background**

The existing scholarship on diversity and social justice pedagogies offers a useful framework for our research. A paradigm shift is occurring in higher education, led by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU, 2011) who are calling for the use of high-impact practices that promote student success. The High Impact Practices, or “best practices,” literature largely informs our research and recommendations. The best practices research, as defined by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (Kuh 2008, AACU) offers a set of evidence-based strategies for effective pedagogy at the university. Best practices include “diversity and global learning,” which Kuh defines as courses and programs
that help students explore cultures, life experiences, and world views different from their own. These studies often explore "difficult differences" such as racial ethnic and gender inequality or continuing global struggles for human rights and freedom. Intercultural studies are often augmented by experiential learning in the community (and/or study abroad). Broadly defined, these practices share an emphasis on understanding the intersection between diversity, social justice and civic engagement in the academy. Through civic engagement, scholars seek to bridge theory and practice in student learning (Levine, 2012).

A particular challenge universities face is how to integrate DSJ into the curriculum. Carr (2007) argues that much of the DSJ work done by faculty has been limited to revising and adding content in courses rather than working, simultaneously, with these four key factors: 1) instructors; 2) students; 3) course content; and 4) teaching methods (Marchesani & Adams, 1992). Some of the core challenges of instituting the Diversity and Social Justice ILO at CSU East Bay are, 1) promoting both appreciation of diversity and an understanding of social inequality/social justice issues 2) engaging our students in social justice and social change work, and, 3) simultaneously building the skill base of our students, most of whom come to us from low-income and educationally disadvantaged backgrounds and are overrepresented in the students that need remediation.

Much of the research on DSJ pedagogy can help the University ensure that historically underserved populations are supported by high impact practices including research and scholarship. One area of research on social justice-oriented pedagogies focuses on moving beyond merely representing diversity on college campuses toward transforming pedagogical practices. Sanchez (2012) states that civic engagement (both academic/co-curricular and community engagement) revolves around the relationship between racial/ethnic and social class diversity. He challenges the university to move beyond “false charity” and towards a true focus on diversity and social justice. This diversity and social justice perspective would re-orient high
impact practices and service learning to be inclusive of social justice work with poor and
disenfranchised communities, including immigrant communities. Saltmarsh (2012) deems this
type of involvement a “thick approach” to diversity and social justice. Such an approach makes
connections between student demographics (ethnic, racial, gender, and cultural), the academic
success of historically underserved and disenfranchised populations, high impact practices (with
opportunities for historically underserved populations), faculty diversity, and incentives for the
inclusion of DSJ topics in curriculum, research, publications, and scholarship by faculty. This
could also include incentives for staff to provide rich co-curricular activities to students that
engage them in understanding, accepting and celebrating difference.

In the following pages we discuss our findings from the three components of our study:
focus groups, content analysis of course syllabi, and face-to-face interviews with key informants.

Focus Groups

(Co-PI Sarah Taylor; Collaborator Derek Jackson Kimball; Research Assistant Isobel Marcus)

Focus Group Overview

We conducted 11 focus groups comprised of 46 participants, including 27 students, 8
staff, and 11 faculty. We offered separate groups for staff (1 group), faculty (2 groups), graduate
students, (2 groups), STEM undergraduate students (2 groups), and all other undergraduate
students (4 groups). Undergraduate groups were separated by STEM and non-STEM disciplines
because of specific STEM-related DSJ issues raised by Collaborator Dr. Derek Jackson Kimball,
such as the relatively low representation of female STEM majors. Focus groups covered the
following three main topics:

- Conceptualizations of diversity, social justice, and civic engagement
- How curricular and co-curricular activities currently address diversity, social
justice, and civic engagement, including the explicit and implicit curriculum\(^1\)

- Suggestions for how curricular and co-curricular activities should address diversity, social justice, and civic engagement

In addition to the above focus groups, members of student campus organizations whose work focuses on DSJ issues also participated in brief group interviews. The sample was drawn from the student cultural organizations listed on the Student Life and Leadership Club page: [http://www20.csueastbay.edu/students/campus-life/student-life/slife/organizations/list.html](http://www20.csueastbay.edu/students/campus-life/student-life/slife/organizations/list.html) Our graduate research assistant attempted to contact all of the organizations listed. The five organizations that participated were those that responded to her contact attempts. These brief meetings focused on suggestions for including more DSJ content in the curricular and co-curricular environment. The meetings were not audio-recorded, and no names were documented.

Additional detail about the methodology for the focus groups appears in Appendix A.

**Sample Characteristics**

We asked focus group participants to complete a brief anonymous demographic data form at the end of the meeting. Please see Appendix B for a copy of the form. A little over one-quarter (26%) of participants were male, and the rest identified as female. Approximately 13% of participants identified as LGBTQ. Tables 1 and 2 below provide the self-reported race/ethnicity and age of participants.

**Table 1: Race/ Ethnicity of Focus Group Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/ Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percent of total group participants (n=46)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European American</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino American</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander American</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Ethnicities</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Explicit curriculum is what is formally taught. Implicit curriculum is what we teach indirectly through the structure of our classes, our interactions with students, etc.
Table 2: Age of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Percent of total group participants (n=46)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-22</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-40</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 60</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings

**Group process.** A strength and limitation of this research was that the individuals who made a commitment to RSVP for and attend a focus group on DSJ issues were unique in their high level of interest in this topic. This was a strength because the participants seemed to appreciate and enjoy the focus group conversations; they engaged readily and shared openly. Many groups ended with a dialogue similar to this one:

I: Okay...final question is...do you have any final thoughts or comments? How did you feel about the group today?
R2: I learned a lot about this.
I: You learned a lot about this?
R2: Yeah, a lot about some of the words [related to diversity and social justice].
I: Alright...others?
R4: Hearing the different feedback.
R3: I’m happy that they care about the views of the students about this issue.
R1: I learned a lot about myself and what I need to work on.

The facilitator described the group process in her written subjective impressions, shared with the research team once all the groups had been completed:

*Often when participants—especially students—shared, they generated an immense amount of passion. For example, when one student shared that she felt empowered when she graduated—her energy cannot be captured in the audio recording or transcript. In almost every focus group participants appeared to be comfortable with one another and thoughtful of one another and the conversations flowed smoothly.*

The participants’ passion is also a limitation of this research. The individuals who participated in our focus groups are not representative of the students, faculty, or staff as a whole. It is important

---

² I=Interviewer; R=Respondent.
to note this limitation as the rest of the findings are presented.

**Conceptualizations of diversity and social justice.** Staff, faculty, and graduate student participants described diversity as complex, multi-faceted, and ambiguous. Undergraduate students tended to present a somewhat less complex picture of DSJ. However, all groups conceptualized diversity broadly, to include race/ethnicity and gender, as well as disability, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, family status, immigration status, language, religion, and many other factors. Some faculty participants expressed concern that in this broad definition of diversity, race and racism might be lost, and they wanted race to be a primary consideration. Other participants, particularly in the student groups, felt that some of the other aspects of diversity, particularly socioeconomic status, religion, disability, and sexual orientation, were not being adequately addressed in the explicit or implicit curriculum.

Though participants were asked to comment on both diversity and social justice, interestingly, conversations tended to focus more on diversity. Participants did discuss concepts such as equality, equity, peace, fairness, dignity, power, sustainability, opportunity, access, and advocacy as related to social justice. Similar to the concern about diversity being perhaps too broadly defined, some faculty participants noted that social justice may be becoming “watered down” through overuse.

**Current experiences of DSJ curricular and co-curricular practices.** Faculty, staff, and students provided numerous examples of how DSJ is covered through our explicit curriculum and co-curriculum. Typically, this was in courses and/or in cultural activities with a clear focus on DSJ issues. Interviewees discussed their experiences teaching or participating in specific classes (most frequently in Ethnic Studies, Educational Leadership, Theater, Political Science, Sociology, and Social Work) or campus activities such as Queerfest, Diversity Center lectures, and culturally-specific clubs and organizations. This data will inform our work in next year’s PEIL Implementation project DSJ curriculum handbook, and it reflects what was found in
the content analysis of course syllabi (presented in the next section.)

Most positive comments related to our implicit curriculum and co-curriculum focused on interactions among individuals in which one person “went the extra mile” to support the other. There were numerous examples of this presented, and in these instances, the students, faculty, and staff involved described feelings of empowerment and inclusion. These experiences tended to be informal, mostly occurring during faculty member office hours (rather than in class) or during chance one-on-one interactions. For example, one student described getting help from a high-level administrator with a financial aid issue after meeting the administrator in the elevator. This student had tried to resolve his issue through the usual means without success, and was very appreciative of the assistance he received after this brief elevator encounter.

Another aspect of CSUEB’s implicit curriculum that all participants commented on was the highly diverse nature of our campus community. Participants appreciated this greatly. Students felt they could gain the most from our campus’s diversity by actively engaging in interactive activities, whether in-class, as homework, or in the community. One student described such an activity:

Group activities is number one in my opinion in getting to know other people of different diversity...I was put in this group with...I didn’t choose my teammates. They picked me. One person picked me and I said, “Oh, cool, let’s form a group,” and then I looked around and I noticed the scattered people who don’t have a team, so we formed a team out of all the scattered people and I think it was so awesome. When you get to work with people who you don’t know anything about, and you try to find a way to make it work, that everyone somehow communicates and comes together...We got a B- in the presentation overall. I thought we did an excellent job, by the way. It was not easy pooling all these different people with all these different ideas together and pool together a proposal package and give it to the instructor. But overall, that was such an amazing experience that the grade did not matter, because we overcame diversity. We overcame the perceptions that we have of one another and got this accomplished.

Participants commented on limited resources, the commuter nature of the campus, and lack of coordination amongst various departments and offices within the university as the biggest barriers to creating a more DSJ-supportive campus. Faculty, staff, and students all commented on
budget cuts, larger class sizes, increases in tuition, and limited staffing as limiting their ability to support students (faculty and staff) or participate more fully in campus life (students). Many participants acknowledged that creating a true community that celebrates our campus’s diversity will require a large investment of time, energy, and resources. As one student noted:

... I’m just going to say it straight. Most people that I deal with, including myself, there’s an opportunity cost that we risk by doing anything. If we’re going to do something, in some way it should be beneficial to us. If students are aware that diversity is important and beneficial, because they’ll run into those kind of people in the professional world, then they’ll see some value in committing to more group activities, more social events, maybe join a club or sorority or fraternity or anything like that. That’s my opinion.

The commuter nature of the campus and generally lower socioeconomic status of many of the students further limits the ability of students to build a campus community. Some student participants talked about wanting to be more active in campus life, but being unable to due to family demands, multiple jobs, long commutes, and other issues. Faculty and staff noted this as well, mainly by observing students’ difficulty in coming to office hours or being able to participate in supplemental educational activities that occur outside of class, such as special lectures, films, or community events. As noted above, though students appreciated group activities as a way to collaborate with students who are different from themselves, others commented on how difficult it is to participate in group projects given that many students have numerous other constraints on their time.

Many participants commented on the lack of communication as inhibiting their ability to support students (faculty and staff) or meet their educational goals (students.) Participants described being given different information by different offices, having difficulty finding the right person to speak with regarding a particular problem, and dealing with constantly changing policies, procedures, and fees as barriers to building community. Some participants described the administration as inaccessible, and wished
for better relations between the students, faculty, staff, and administration.

**Suggestions.** As noted above, the focus group participants were a self-selected group of people who are very committed to CSU East Bay’s development as a leader in DSJ education. As such, they made numerous suggestions. Rather than try to capture these suggestions in a few sentences, we present them in Appendix D to give them more space. Many of these suggestions were made by several individuals, and across student, staff, and faculty focus groups.

**Content Analysis of Course Syllabi**

*(Co-PI Colleen Fong; Collaborator Rose Wong; Research Assistant Thanh Le)*

**Sample**

Detailed information about the content analysis appears in Appendix F. We analyzed 85 syllabi drawn from 128 submitted by 68 lecturer and tenure-track/tenured faculty after a solicitation email in Fall 2012 requesting two syllabi and numerous follow-ups. We randomly drew one syllabus from each instructor and a second if that course was substantively different. Our sample is unrepresentative of university curricula since we used convenience sampling. The sample contains syllabi from CLASS (55.3%), CEAS (25.9%), COS (14.1%), CBE (3.5%), and General Studies (1.2%). It includes undergraduate (71.8%) and graduate (28.2%) courses and the face-to-face teaching format (87.1%), online (11.8%) and hybrid (1.2%).

**Findings**

**Two syllabi types.** As expected, we discovered two types of syllabi: DSJ content-dense or “DSJ-specific” (49.4%) and non-DSJ content dense or “Non-DSJ-specific” (50.6%). The DSJ-specific group is comprised of 22.4% Diversity-specific syllabi, 20.0% SJ-specific, and 7.1% Diversity- and SJ-specific syllabi. Among DSJ-specific syllabi, we rated 52.4% as “developed or highly developed” and 47.6% as “initial or emerging” in level and richness of content and teaching methods and approaches.

---

3 As expected, DSJ-content dense syllabi had course titles that contained DSJ terms.
DSJ-specific courses that were “developed or highly developed” include the following examples: (a) Diversity-specific: “Elementary Sign Language I” (MLL 1901, Professor Rowley, CLASS) and “Interpretation of Ethnic and Women’s Literature” (THEA 3310, Professor Fajilan, CLASS); (b) Social Justice-specific: ”The Civil Rights Movement” (ES 3120), “Social Inequality” (SOC 3420) and “American Women in the 20th Century” (HIST 3572 taught by Professor Weiss, CLASS). Diversity- & Social Justice-specific courses include: “Equality and Diversity” (TED 5355, Professor Lubliner, CEAS) and “Dance for All Bodies (THEA 1201 Professor Kupers, CLASS).

**Going beyond the two syllabi types binary.** Non-DSJ-specific syllabi tended to come from COS and CBE. However, some exhibited: 1) DSJ sensitivity on the part of the instructor or 2) potential linkage to DSJ content. In his “General Physics” (PHYS 2004) syllabus, Professor Kimball demonstrates DSJ sensitivity in his thoughtful section “Supportive and Inclusive Environment” which reads in part, “In all our classes, we strive to create a safe, supportive classroom environment where everyone is listened to and respected. We are learning physics together as a team. Be kind and respectful to me and your fellow students”. Other syllabi from the COS contain terms such as “hormones,” “evolution,” and “natural selection” and references to “every day life” that can be linked to DSJ content. Finally, Professor Chung’s syllabus for “Business, Government and Society” (MGMT 4500, CBE) includes the sample statement from CSUEB’s *Policy on Course Syllabus Information* “The University is committed to being a safe and caring community . . . “ which our Research Assistant coded as DSJ-sensitive without knowing this was part of a existing University policy. This indicates CSUEB has provided some important resources but how can we ensure members of the university community utilize the resources that currently exist?4

---

4 We believe CSUEB’s Syllabus Policy which provides guidelines for designing a “quality” syllabus to minimize “student misunderstandings” is of utmost importance given our highly diverse student body.
Non-DSJ-specific syllabi also contained innovative ideas for incorporating DSJ content and transforming syllabi for teaching DSJ. Examples of linkages that COS courses could make include, according to our Research Assistant Thanh Le: (a) “The course description conveys how there are ethical issues within engineering that must be considered and, to a degree, relate to the values of social justice”; and (b) “Statistics can be used [as a social justice tool] to guide evidence-based practice and research of social justice and diversity.” Among the examples of topics and teaching approaches that lend themselves to DSJ learning the Research Assistant noted: (a) “The instructor does have fair policies, which model equality and social justice” (CEAS syllabus); and (b) “The instructor encourages students to be civil in the classroom and has certain social expectations, which model social justice behaviors” (General Studies syllabus).

**Word Search of DSJ Terms**

A word search found twenty-two Diversity and forty-one Social Justice factors. Actual course time devoted to teaching these factors is likely not discernible from syllabi. Only a small minority of syllabi in which factors were found stated explicit coverage of the factor in weekly schedules.

*Table 3: Diversity and Social Justice Factors Found in Syllabi*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Syllabi</th>
<th>Diversity Factors</th>
<th>Social Justice Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30-34%</td>
<td>Culture, Gender</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29%</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24%</td>
<td>Race, Ethnicity, Education</td>
<td>Democracy, Collaboration, Social Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19%</td>
<td>Age Group, Political System</td>
<td>Equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14%</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Multiculturalism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, we believe a “thoughtfully designed” syllabus models fairness and accountability. Syllabi showed partial compliance with this Senate document regarding required statements relevant to DSJ learning. A majority of syllabi stated accommodations for disability (71.8%); a minority stated respect and tolerance in the classroom (21.2%). Syllabi also addressed academic dishonesty (67.1%), emergency evacuation (52.9%), and class conduct (34.1%).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5-9%</th>
<th>LGBTQ, Disability, Immigrant, Religion</th>
<th>Critical Thinking, Advocacy, Equity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Found</td>
<td>Substance Abuser, Veteran</td>
<td>Pluralism; Restorative Justice; Social Progress; Empowerment; Transformative Leadership; LGBTQ Rights; Class Struggle; Social Organizing, Political Organizing; Protests; Anti-Colonialism; LGBTQ Rights; Pachamama</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Linkage with ILOs**

A small proportion of syllabi (15.3%) mentioned ILO-related content, but none specifically referenced the ILOs, as expected given that they were adopted only in Spring of 2012. Content related to the Diversity outcome was mentioned in 7.1% of syllabi, being the second most commonly mentioned outcome area, compared with Specialized Discipline (11.8%), Collaboration (4.7%), Thinking and Reasoning (3.5%), Communication (3.5%), and Sustainability (1.2%). No syllabi stated a linkage between course objectives and the university’s mission, while 9.4% of syllabi stated a linkage between course objectives and departmental missions. These statistics will serve as a baseline for ILO implementation.

**DSJ Teaching Methods**
We studied three areas of teaching methods and approaches employed specifically to support DSJ learning. First, 8.2% of syllabi contained Diversity-related and 4.7% of syllabi contained Social Justice-related learning activities in the community. Second, 35.3% of syllabi showed use of teaching methods such as online clips/videos, films, group activities and discussions. Third, 31% of syllabi contained student activities and assignments specifically supportive of DSJ learning, including field research, self-reflections, activities applying prior knowledge and background, fiction and simulations.

Key-Informant Interviews at CSUEB and Exemplary Programs at Other Universities

(Julie Beck, PI; Philip Chang, Research Assistant)

Overview and Analysis

For this segment of the project, we conducted 15 interviews with key informants from 11 programs. These included face-to-face interviews with 12 representatives from eight programs on the CSU East Bay campus and three telephone interviews with directors of exemplary programs at three other universities. We used a semi-structured interview guide, through which we sought to glean an overall understanding of DSJ-related activities, perceptions, and programing on the campus and how they overlapped with experiential learning about social issues in the classroom and/or community. Questions included asking informants to describe the overall campus climate with regard to awareness of multiculturalism, diversity and social justice (DSJ); how their program has sought to incorporate or infuse DSJ-related education into campus life/the curriculum; the impact of their program on student awareness, dialogue, or action on campus or in the community; particular challenges faced in addressing DSJ on our campus with regard to our student body, faculty, staff; and what kinds of changes or future vision respondents held for their program and for our campus on the whole. To analyze our interview data, we used
grounded theory, a data-driven, “ground-up” approach to qualitative research (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). A list of interviewees appears in Appendix G.

**Findings**

We found core themes, all of which have important implications for bringing about transformative types of pedagogies and practices on the CSUEB campus. These include: a) the need to expand our definitions of “diversity” and “social justice” to include, among other categories, low-income, educationally disadvantaged students and remedial skill-building (for example, through writing-across-the curriculum); b) to more fully and deeply address DSJ campus-wide, for example, through campus conversations and service trainings; and c) to formalize and institutionalize relationships between faculty/academic departments and existing DSJ-related programs on campus and in the community by building ongoing liaisons—among other themes. From this rich database, our report only highlights a sample of these findings in this White Paper in order to illustrate some key areas of interest.

**Core Themes.** Chart A summarizes and illustrates four of seven core themes found in interview transcripts with CSUEB respondents. The fifth theme was “Materialistic values and popular culture as distractions from education and social issues,” and the sixth theme, understandable without illustration, was: “DSJ-related co-curricular and other programs are decentralized and dispersed on the campus. Centralize DSJ related programing into a campus “hub” or core offices, and create a separate physical space for DSJ programs.” The seventh theme, “Transform pedagogy to include hands-on experience with real life issues and social problems,” appears in Chart B, and can be summed up in this respondent’s statement:

---

5 We first identified key concepts from interview transcripts, then, building on these concepts, identified themes from which we derived our recommendations for changes in pedagogy surrounding diversity and social justice at CSUEB. We defined a concept as an idea or insight expressed by a respondent; we defined a theme as a repeated idea or concept, or set of related concepts, found within a single interview and appearing across two or more interviews, which we paraphrased and condensed.
“We participated in this huge march from the Mission to downtown San Francisco. For the students in that class, that was the perfect outcome, because they were able to read about it, they were able to see films about it, they were able to study it, and then they were able to experience it. And those students who went and did all those things that day came down and said that was the most meaningful experience they had ever had in school. I mean it’s those kinds of teachable moments.” (Luz Calvo, Ethnic Studies Department)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Themes &amp; % Respondents Expressing Theme</th>
<th>Quotations from Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme 1</strong></td>
<td>“The cultural exposure tends to be very limited. For example, campus organizations put on events focused on food, dance, or music, and while these things are important, they only scratch the surface in terms of exposure to a culture.” (Diversity Center (DC) Director)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superficial attention paid to diversity and social justice campus-wide.</td>
<td>“We are demographically diverse regarding our students, but have a long way to go to in reflecting them on the campus: the faculty and staff don’t reflect our students, yet we have the right verbiage on paper, in our Mission Statement and ILO… We have a long way to go in diversifying the faculty, addressing discrimination, harassment and bullying, and incorporating diversity into departmental hiring processes…” (FDEC Standing Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33% of Respondents</td>
<td>“The dominant discourse, on our campus at least, is a lot of lip service towards diversity and social justice and very little actual content in that regard…The biggest challenge is willingness to change the way people do things or willingness to look at, for example, departments that have no faculty of color and say what’s going on, and how can we change that?” (Ethnic Studies, Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“From being at other campuses, I am surprised that for being a state school it seems we are little behind in terms of discussion around multiculturalism—and social justice…I was glad to see we actually have a Diversity Officer, and hopefully from that there will be some discussion around even having common definitions around what multiculturalism is, and…you know, I haven’t even seen any real trainings…my friend at Berkeley said we just did this day-long training for the new Dream Act students…I just don’t see or hear about any, like ‘How do you better serve your students’? There has to be some level of training to serve our populations.” (EOP Director)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme 2</strong></td>
<td>“Students are exposed to diversity because we live in the Bay Area… but diversity tends to be limited to just race, that is, there’s a lack of exposure to understanding about other areas of diversity: homosexuality, gender, even being conservative might be considered ‘diverse’ on a college campus.” (DC Director)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand our definitions of DSJ: pay attention to both difference and disadvantage, and better our understanding of how these concepts apply to our particular student</td>
<td>“How I would define multiculturalism? It goes far beyond socioeconomic level, ethnic diversity, into sexuality, religion, political views, etc. and how can we all learn to respect those differences, and work within those differences, and I don’t hear about those discussions on campus—it’s like let’s put it in our Mission Statement, ‘We are a diverse campus’—well, duh, everyone’s diverse!” (EOP Director)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
population.

(For example, include race, ethnicity, inequality, educational disadvantage/remediation, disability, sexual orientation, social class in the definition.)

33% of Respondents

"Social justice is a totally different thing than diversity. So while we may have a student body that is very exposed to various cultures, I think they are apathetic when it comes to social justice, and some of the issues of equality that deal with other societies." (DC Director)

"Low income students are overrepresented in the students that need remediation, there’s a class gap in quality education. So if we really want to graduate students with strong skill bases, we need to infuse writing into all of our courses, not just in remediation classes. We should redefine what we mean by remediation: it’s important to make remediation empowering, not a punishment. Our students are coming from us in large numbers with poor skills due the quality education they received before they got to us. So we’re going to continue the class gap unless we infuse writing throughout the curriculum.... And also I’m concerned about how large, capped, online courses, when used for remediation, such as SJSU Udacity Program, could potentially increase the race and class gap in quality education." (Sociology and Social Services Chair)

"We need an understanding...of who the population is that we serve—it is not the same population as SFSU, as UC Berkeley, our population is unique—I think developing curriculum, co-curricular programs, all of those things that meet OUR students’ needs, you know, the student that we recruit—the Cal state East Bay student. And I think that’s where we kind of miss—" (EOP Director)

"Maybe (we need) just an understanding of, ‘Oh, these students might be going through this, this, and this’, or, ‘This is where this student is coming from,’ or,’ As a first generation college student, these are the things that they kind of come in with, this is what’s in their backpack that may be weighing them down, these are some of their stories: they’ve been through, maybe, the Foster Care system, or maybe a very abusive family situation.” (EOP Director)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Lack of institutionalization of DSJ-related programs and activities, and of formalized relationships between DSJ-related programs and professors.

(This creates a lack of incentive for students and faculty to participate in DSJ education and co-curricular activities.)

50% of Respondents

"I would like La Familia to turn into a class. That would be something... If we somehow could partner up with Ethnic Studies and somehow develop this more, instead of have (a workshop leader) lead these ‘classes.’ It would be great if students could take this as a class the quarter beforehand, to have this knowledge entering our internship. I’ve seen this at other campuses.” (Student Employee, DC)

"At UCB, students entering their Alternative Spring Break program are in classes, which they get course credit for. We had meetings beforehand to prepare the students for the Indian Reservation...but at Berkeley, students have more of an opportunity to be more engaged, because of the incentives that come out of having an institutionalized program.” (DC Director)

"One way to incentivize faculty is to ensure that we’re granting more sabbaticals for faculty who want submit proposals for revising their courses to be more focused on race and diversity. And I suggest making it count in the faculty file for promotion, including in low DSJ programs such as math and sciences. Many scholars do address diversity and social justice issues that do apply to STEM, there’s scholarship on science and race...” (Sociology and Social Services Chair)

"To be honest, things are not systemized, and there’s no staff person to devote time to it, but having [a new Chief Diversity Officer] there is helpful....I don’t have the time for research.” (FDEC Standing Chair)

"I think we have made some headway by partnering with some specific professors...Unless you have the professor providing some type of buy-in, where they’re notifying their student and it’s somehow tied to their..."
curriculum...It comes down to marketing, to what’s relevant...So, we look at them as a resource...With the Diversity Center, I imagine if we could have some type of formal faculty participation, whether that is some type of Board if you will, that helps direct programing in some way...some kind of formalized relationship with departments and faculty to help bridge that gap between what’s going on the classroom and what we can do to supplement that experience for students.” (DC Director)

“I want to see more intentionality being built across the board...so the opportunities we present to the athletes or the student clubs or within resident life for students to serve in the community to really be targeted and help them to see and invest in this concept of social justice, equity, and diversity...it is one thing for students to be involved but it is another thing that they get something out of that involvement. That requires sort of a framing of the experience.” (Service Learning Program, Director)

“I’ve noticed with our clubs on this campus that there’s not a lot of development of leadership... When they try to do an event and they don’t know how because they never had the opportunity for leadership development or had those opportunities. So then we [at the DC] try to act as a resource for some of that, but it would be awesome if they came to us, already as established leaders and established event planners. But that doesn’t really happen.” (Student Employee, DC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 4</th>
<th>Lack of resources and support for DSJ-related pedagogy, programs, and services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33% of Respondents</td>
<td>“UCLA and UCB have amazing programs and have lots of resources. Whereas we have to patch it together, here, on our campus... And there are all kinds of Best Practices out there...Ideally we’d have more resources, whether staff support or other, for example...we are not even working out of an office on our campus...(and) we didn’t resource the McNair (Scholars) Program properly and gave no faculty incentives.” (FDEC Standing Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“There is a lack of support and resources for folks who have a good heart and good intentions, in the community at large, for programs on campus in general. For our program, we are state funded, but certainly it would be great to have more counselors, to have smaller caseloads that would allow us to reach out much more often. We have gotten two more counselors, but I have counselors that have 300, 400 students...” (EOP Director)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“For example, the Sociology and Social Services Department had a diverse graduate program, where many students moved onto Ph.D. programs, but, due to lack of resources, that program was frozen. Another resource issue is that we would like to be able to link students to the Diversity Center in various ways, however, due to the current workload, it becomes difficult to manage those sorts of extra initiatives.” (Sociology and Social Services Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The biggest challenge is not having enough time and resources to fully develop our students regarding their careers—they are less focused this way, and we are not able help them map out their next steps, but we do help with writing and critical thinking.” (Political Science Chair)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transformative Pedagogical Practices. Chart B summarizes types of pedagogy and practices employed by two exemplary programs at other universities and the Diversity Center at CSUEB to impart DSJ concepts and education.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program &amp; Pedagogy/Practice</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Justice Studies Master’s Program, and Undergraduate Degree, SJSU</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights Lecture Series</td>
<td>• U.S. and international guest lecturers and scholars are invited to speak on campus several times per semester on an ongoing basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Intensive Courses</td>
<td>• Elimination of much testing/no more than 20% of tests to be multiple choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic versus Vocational Focus, with an eye towards graduate school preparation</td>
<td>• Undergraduates are split about 50-50 between those entering or advancing in the criminal justice field, and those seeking higher education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Scholarship and Social Change Approach (critical criminology)</td>
<td>• Scholarship that explores social inequality and social justice issues—race, gender, class, and other oppression—and seeks social change and transformative thinking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inside-Out Prison Exchange Program, Temple University, PA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Course About Mass Incarceration Held Inside a Prison.</td>
<td>• Course meets inside a prison, semester long, 1x per week seminar, with 15 “outside students” (Temple University undergraduates) and 15 “inside students” (prisoners).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (The course is taught through a variety of academic disciplines and departments.) | • Course credit offered to students, and to prisoners (where possible)  
• Engaging and transformative pedagogy—circle discussions, interpersonal exchange of ideas and experience between outside and inside students, writing and reading intensive course  
• Goal of social transformation, rethinking mass incarceration, humanizing prisoners, exploring social roots of offending and effects of incarceration. |
| **Diversity Center, CSU East Bay**                             |                                                                                                                                               |
| Diversity & Social Justice-Specific Field Experience and Community Engagement | • Community engagement specifically about DSJ issues—i.e. *La Familia Internship*: NGO-led workshops, rotating topics include:  
Organizing; Youth in the Civil Rights Movement.  
*Alternative Spring Break Program*: 3 days on an Indian Reservation, and in local community orgs:  
Save the Bay, Alameda County Food Bank, Reading Partners/literacy in underprivileged schools. |
Recommendations for Practice

Our overall findings have important implications for the CSUEB campus. They highlighted current practices and ideas for ‘best practices’ that may be useful to promoting DSJ learning at CSUEB. They also clarified directions and needs regarding the development of DSJ pedagogy and application of known ‘best practices’ for an urban, diverse and lower income student population. Specifically, we found a need to: More deeply engage in campus dialogues to define DSJ; To expand the definition of DSJ to address the educational quality gap for low-income students and better meet the basic-skills/remediation needs of our student population; To systematically develop and study the effectiveness of best practices adapted or created for the CSUEB campus; To offer DSJ service trainings; To institutionalize DSJ-specific programs on campus through formalizing relationships and building liaisons between existing programs and faculty/academic departments, and with Bay Area CBO and NGOs with a DSJ focus; To centralize and better communicate about DSJ-related programs and events campus-wide; To allocate adequate resources, including reducing class size in order to reintroduce writing across the curriculum into courses, and support faculty initiatives to develop DSJ best practices and pedagogical approaches, including increasing DSJ content in curriculum, to improve DSJ-related competences.

We offer the following recommendations for changes on the CSUEB campus:
Objective 1: Develop tools and an incentive system which faculty can incorporate and develop to DSJ-related curriculum. Actionable steps, to be implemented in 2013-2014 through our Diversity Faculty Fellows Pilot Program PEIL Implementation Grant:

Actionable steps:
1. Increase level of DSJ content in specific courses
2. Create and distribute a handbook to instructors to assist in transforming and developing new courses
3. Create a critical mass of faculty throughout the university to serve as future DSJ leaders

Objective 2: Transform classroom pedagogy at CSUEB in ways that go beyond incorporating DSJ content into the curriculum. And institutionalize DSJ pedagogy on the CSUEB campus.

4. Institutionalize DSJ-related programs and activities and formalize relationships between DSJ-related programs and professors by building ongoing liaisons between the DSJ-related programs on campus (such as Diversity Center) and academic departments and professors.
5. To do the above, incentivize diversity and social justice-related pedagogy systematically: for example: a) integrate DSJ activities and existing programs on campus into the curriculum by structuring them as classes for credit, and offer credit for community-engagement., b) create a university-wide incentive system for faculty to incorporate DSJ-related activities and materials through, for example, promotion file “credits” (which should apply to STEM faculty and Department Chairs as well as CLASS and the other colleges).
6. Emulate tested pedagogies and programs at other universities, such as writing-intensive courses, discussion-based pedagogy, reduced testing and decreased multiple-choice testing, and others.
7. Redefine “remediation” as part of a comprehensive DSJ agenda and incorporate remedial education into the GE curriculum, such that low-income, educationally disadvantaged students from school districts lacking K-12 college preparation are offered needed background context and skill development.
8. Reintroduce writing-across-the-curriculum in courses to close the gap in “quality education” and skill bases between low-income and middle class students. (CSUEB students are majority low-income and disproportionately represented among those who need remediation.)

Objective 3: Facilitate transformation of faculty, student, and staff understanding and appreciation of diversity and social justice.

Actionable steps:
9. Define and formally adopt definitions of (a) “diversity” and “social justice”, (b) specific competences and learning outcomes related to the DSJ ILO for students, faculty and staff, and (c) objectives for DSJ-related pedagogy at CSUEB, through year-long conversations of various kinds involving students, faculty, staff and administration.
10. Design and implement a DSJ educational campaign through campus-wide discussions and workshops about diversity, multiculturalism, social justice, and civic engagement to increase sensitivity and gain a ‘critical mass.’
11. Conduct research to understand internal change processes toward increased appreciation of DSJ and involvement in civic engagement.
12. Give equal attention to both, appreciation of cultural difference and to gaining an understanding of oppression and empathy for the struggles for justice of economically and socially marginalized groups.

Objective 4: Engage students in social change efforts and campaigns; facilitate students’ taking action on and off campus toward diversity and social justice goals, becoming agents of change in different spheres of personal and community life.

Actionable steps:

13. Build ongoing relationships and liaisons between CSUEB and Bay Area community based organizations and regional and national NGOs focused on social change and social justice. (These should be resources and contexts for student assignments, projects, internships.)
14. Build ongoing relationships and liaisons between CSUEB and Bay Area community based organizations and regional and national NGOs focused on social change and social justice. (These should be resources and contexts for student assignments, projects, internships.)
15. Incentivize students’ participation in community-based internships, service learning, and other projects and workshops through course credit.
16. Conduct research to develop and test best practices that promote transformation toward being change agents.

Objective 5: Allocate adequate resources and support to DSJ-related programs, students, and to faculty to promote participation in, and research on, DSJ-related education.

17. Sponsor DSJ trainings of various kinds (e.g. Dream Act students and others) to help faculty and staff better serve our student population.
18. Hire more staff for programs that offer direct services to students (EOP counselors, Financial Aid Office, Student advisers in Departments, etc.)
19. Create a separate space and centralized office/s for DSJ-related programs (DELO, FDEC, etc.)
20. Offer faculty sabbaticals to create DSJ-specific content and pedagogy for courses, including incorporating remediation into their curriculum.
22. Reduce class size to allow for writing intensive assignments and courses across the curriculum in order to close the education and skills gap between low-income students (who are disproportionately students of color at CSUEB) and other students.
23. Sponsor at the university level DSJ-specific lecture series, student internships, campus-wide workshops, etc.
24. Sponsor research to evaluate and adapt best practices for the CSUEB community, including assessment tools for evaluating student learning and faculty development.

Objective 6: Make CSU East Bay a national model for DSJ education and transformative pedagogy.
25. Create a Center for Diversity and Social Justice Teaching and Research that encapsulates the above recommendations.
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Appendix A: Detailed Information on Focus Group Methods

We conducted 11 focus groups comprised of 46 participants, including 27 students, 8 staff, and 11 faculty. We offered separate groups for staff (1 group), faculty (2 groups), graduate students, (2 groups), STEM undergraduate students (2 groups), and all other undergraduate students (4 groups). Undergraduate groups were separated by STEM and non-STEM disciplines because of specific STEM-related DSJ issues raised by Collaborator Dr. Derek Jackson Kimball, such as the relatively low representation of female STEM majors.

Focus groups covered the following three main topics:

- Conceptualizations of diversity, social justice, and civic engagement
- How curricular and co-curricular activities currently address diversity, social justice, and civic engagement, including the explicit and implicit curriculum\(^1\)
- Suggestions for how curricular and co-curricular activities should address diversity, social justice, and civic engagement

In addition to the above focus groups, members of student campus organizations whose work focuses on DSJ issues also participated in brief group interviews. The sample was drawn from the student cultural organizations listed on the Student Life and Leadership Club page: 
http://www20.csueastbay.edu/students/campus-life/student-life/slfe/organizations/list.html Our graduate research assistant attempted to contact all of the organizations listed. The five organizations that participated were those that responded to her contact attempts. These brief meetings focused on suggestions for including more DSJ content in the curricular and co-curricular environment. The meetings were not audio-recorded, and no names were documented.

The focus group guide was developed through numerous email, phone, and in-person

\(^1\) Explicit curriculum is what is formally taught. Implicit curriculum is what we teach indirectly through the structure of our classes, our interactions with students, etc.
conversations among the PI and Co-PIs. It appears in Appendix A. The questions on civic engagement were added by an MSW student, Isobel Marcus, for her thesis, with approval from the PI and Co-PIs. The leadership team was pleased to be able to support graduate student research through our PEIL project. Ms. Marcus’s thesis is available on request.

Focus groups ranged in length from approximately 75-120 minutes, depending on participants’ arrival and departure times and the facilitator’s judgment regarding when the group had thoroughly discussed each topic. The focus groups were professionally transcribed verbatim by a firm specializing in transcription, At Home Typing Service (http://athometypingservice.com/). Transcriptions ranged in length from 12-32 pages. One group was not audio recorded and transcribed due to participant refusal to be recorded. The facilitator took notes during this group.

Our original plan was to have 10 participants in each of nine focus groups, for a total of approximately 90 participants, but we were not able to achieve this despite a vigorous participant recruitment campaign and incentives for participation (refreshments and a $10 CSUEB bookstore gift card.) The groups were advertised through outreach to our 16-member advisory board, certain campus email lists (LEEP Leadership, All-Graduate Students, Senate Faculty, and CLASS Faculty), as well as through targeted outreach to faculty, staff, and students who were asked to share the information with students and colleagues. We also distributed hard copy fliers in the student union. A barrier to recruiting more participants was the difficulty in obtaining permission to post our email announcement to the All-CSUEB and to the All-Faculty email lists.

The project received IRB approval in November 2012. Due to the sensitive nature of issues surrounding diversity, we hired a professional consultant who is not affiliated with CSUEB to conduct all focus groups. During the groups, no CSUEB-affiliated DSJ PEIL project staff were present. Blanca Tavera, LCSW, facilitated all focus groups. Ms. Tavera leads the Matrix Consulting Institute, a consulting firm dedicated to organizational and personal
development with a particular focus on social justice issues. She has over 25 years of consulting
and social work practice experience. Along with her associates, she leads seminars and training,
and provides consulting in the areas of group facilitation, communication, team building,
collaboration and conflict resolution; leadership development; violence against women; cultural
competency and wellness.

To encourage participants to share openly about their experiences with DSJ, we received
a waiver of written consent from the IRB, so that the only record of participation was a signed
receipt from those who chose to accept the $10 gift card. Audio recordings were immediately
sent to the professional transcription firm, located in another state, and the transcriptions simply
denote speakers as “Speaker 1,” “Speaker 2,” etc. Thus participants were offered a high degree
of confidentiality, and we believe this increases the validity of our findings.

Analysis

Three researchers (Dr. Derek Jackson Kimball, Dr. Sarah Taylor, and MSW Student
Researcher Isobel Marcus) developed the codebook. Each researcher independently read several
focus group transcripts and developed his/her own set of codes. These codes were compiled into
one list, and then all three researchers reviewed and discussed it. Dr. Jackson Kimball and Dr.
Taylor completed an inter-rater reliability test using Dedoose web-based software for qualitative
analysis (www.dedoose.com) and achieved moderate agreement. They discussed areas of
disagreement and then completed all coding in Dedoose. The final codebook appears in
Appendix C.

After the transcripts were coded, we explored the data in each code category by using a
constant comparison process (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) to assess intra- and inter-group similarities
and differences in conceptualizations of DSJ, perceptions of current DSJ practices, and
suggestions for enhancing DSJ efforts on our campus.
Appendix B: Demographic Data Form for Focus Group Participants

Dear focus group participants: Please answer a few brief questions about yourself. Please do NOT put your name on this form, as it is intended to be anonymous.

How do you describe your race/ethnicity?: __________________________

How do you describe your religion?: __________________________

How do you describe your gender identity?: __________________________

How do you describe your sexual orientation?: __________________________

What is your first language?: __________________________

What is your age?
☐ 18-22
☐ 23-30
☐ 31-40
☐ 41-50
☐ 51-60
☐ 61-70
☐ Over 70

Are you the first person in your family to go to college (Please circle one)?

YES  NO  NOT SURE
### Appendix C: Focus Group Codebook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Sample quotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DSJ definitions</td>
<td>Definitions of any aspect of DSJ (could be DSJ as a whole, or a specific DSJ concept, such as race)</td>
<td>I'm sorry you feel that way but these terms are also really very odd, too, in their constructs. Like Caucasian, I explained, if you're North African, Indian, Iranian, all these other, you can be considered white according to this construct but not look like.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSJ content in curriculum</td>
<td>Any mention of explicit course content that covers DSJ</td>
<td>I'm taking this class. It's called Interracial Marriage, Sex, and Cinema. We've been talking about identity and how people who are from different cultures, they're together in a relationship, like any kind of intimate relationship, and what kind of problems they suffered and how the community deals with such a different kind of pair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSJ Personal</td>
<td>Stories, characteristics, and personal experiences related to DSJ</td>
<td>My family is very diverse, too. My stepdad is Mexican American, so I have a huge family on that side. I have step-kids, they're Philippine and my fiance is Hungarian American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect/empowerment</td>
<td>Mentions of feeling or conveying respect and/or empowerment</td>
<td>The professors are really conscious about that and they don't see you for your color or what they might think with ethnicity that might be found. They see people by personality, how I'm doing in class, and I guess that's what it is limited to, because he's here, she is there to guide me through my class, not discriminating or just seeing me what community I'm from or something. So I would say they are really accepting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disrespect/disenfranchisement</td>
<td>Mentions of feeling or conveying disrespect and/or disempowerment</td>
<td>I like that he was thinking that he was sensitive to my English being a second language, but I don't know, I just felt like maybe he had isolated me from the class and just trying to be sensitive to me by using a different grading for me. I mean, I'm not sure how he ranked that, but yeah, I just thought that equality should be if he does that, but he shouldn't use his perception of the people who have second language as English to isolate them or use a different method for those few things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer interactions</td>
<td>Interactions between people of roughly similar levels in terms of university roles (e.g. students interacting with one another; faculty interacting with one another, etc.)</td>
<td>I was put in this group with... I didn't choose my teammates. They picked me. One person picked me and I said, &quot;Oh, cool, let's form a group,&quot; and then I looked around and I noticed the scattered people who don't have a team, so we formed a team out of all the scattered people and I think it was so awesome. When you get to work with people who you don't know anything about, and you try to find a way to make it work, that everyone somehow communicates and comes together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof-student interactions</td>
<td>Interactions between students and faculty</td>
<td>So then when I go up to talk to him on his office hours, I explained to him that sometimes I just need to talk to the professor and you need to tell us a way how to do it. So when I communicated, he understood and then he's like, &quot;You know, you can send me an email. You don't have to worry about my rule.&quot; It was important, so sometimes it can be communication gaps, but I guess when we communicate and we get to know what we both mean, then I guess it goes the right way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSJ-Supportive Implicit Curriculum</td>
<td>Not specific interactions or explicit content, but rather the characteristics of the classroom or co-curricular activity that support DSJ (e.g. mention of diversity of faculty members)</td>
<td>I would say extracurricularly really active, so our extracurricular activities we have, they really reflect the diversity of campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSJ-Unsupported Implicit Curriculum</td>
<td>Not specific interactions or explicit content, but rather the characteristics of the classroom or co-curricular activity that do NOT support DSJ (e.g. mention of lack of diversity in faculty members)</td>
<td>I feel like there's a lot of opportunities and there are people that want to do certain things, but I feel like there's also this sense of disconnect where there are these amazing professors but they are also kind of underpaid. They have their own lives to run outside of school and a lot of them are already taking on a lot of other activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions</td>
<td>Only specific suggestions using words like, &quot;should,&quot; &quot;suggest,&quot; &quot;wish,&quot; &quot;recommend,&quot; etc.</td>
<td>The LGBT community, I would say at my work when we do training, we are really sensitive about it and we welcome everyone. We don't really discriminate, but I think some places on campus, like Pioneer Heights when they do their orientation, maybe they should consider having that part of their thing into their procedures they have. I would say campus should show a bit more support when Queerfest happens.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Meta | Comments about the experience of being in the study or focus group | I: Well, thank you for your comments. We are out of time, but are there any final comments or thoughts and I just want to know how you felt about the group today.  
R2: It was great.  
R1: It was awesome. Have we contributed the data that you need to do the research? |
Appendix D: Focus Group Participant Suggestions

- Train faculty to work with students with disabilities, including general sensitivity training as well as checking that syllabi include information about Accessibility Services
- Build a university-wide web page with information and resources related to DSJ
- Create a university-wide suggestion box or online forum
- Develop a “noon hour” during which there are no classes or office hours, to provide a time for campus organizations to meet and/or offer special programs
- Create a twitter account, website, and/or app that allows all members of the campus community to send brief updates about their social justice and community engagement efforts. This can be a simple way to build community and campus pride.
- Hire a centralized university-wide diversity coordinator
- Encourage more community engagement activities so that students can become active citizens
- Infuse DSJ into General Education
- Provide more workload compensation for faculty to mentor and advise students so they can better support student success
- Provide a mentor for all students; mentoring should include a focus on soft skills necessary for success
- Manage class discussions better to prevent some students from dominating the conversation
- Keep the library, Accessibility Services, Student Center for Academic Achievement, Advising, and Counseling offices open later to accommodate working students
- Offer more support to international students and recent immigrants to help them adjust to American culture and university life
- Acknowledge and support student parents. Bring the child care center back to campus, and make it affordable. Student parents also appreciate it when expectations and deadlines are very clear so students can plan for childcare around important assignments. One students suggested having a "bring your kids to class day."
- Give space to various cultural groups and organizations on campus to create gardens, build restaurants, or engage in other activities that celebrate and reflect our diversity
- Engage alumni. This will help build community connections and opportunities for current students. Alumni could also serve as mentors.
- Do more outreach and mentoring at the high school and community college levels to prepare prospective students better for education at CSUEB
- Offer more workshops for faculty, staff, and students by the Diversity Center. Ideas for specific workshops include sensitivity to people with disabilities, the LGBTQ community, and diversity within broad racial and ethnic groups (e.g. the Asian community contains many cultures and communities, and some participants suggested there was a lack of awareness about this diversity.)
- Find ways to engage and redirect students who have applied unsuccessfully numerous times to impacted programs, such as nursing. These prospective students are committed and may have a lot to offer.
- Develop stronger relationships between student life and academic departments. Some lectures organized by student life have relatively few attendees, even though the content is applicable to a number of courses.
Appendix E: Focus Group Guide: STUDENTS

(The faculty and staff focus group guides matched the student one, with some questions adapted for each groups’ specific role.)

Opening script: Thank you all for coming to today’s focus group! We really appreciate your participation. I’m ____________, a professional facilitator who has been hired to lead the focus groups on your campus. The faculty who organized these focus groups wanted you to feel comfortable sharing your thoughts with me, so they hired someone who has no association with CSU East Bay. This group is completely confidential.

We’re going to take a few moments to discuss informed consent for this group.

- The group today will be about two hours long.
- The focus of this project is on Diversity and Social Justice at CSU East Bay. The research team wants to know how diversity and social justice are already being addressed on our campus, and what your ideas are for infusing diversity and social justice into the classes and extra-curricular activities on campus. We would also like to know what information you would need to obtain during your time here at CSUEB to be able to go back into your communities after graduation and promote equity and social justice.
- This group is completely voluntary. You are welcome to leave the group at any time that you wish. You do not have to answer any questions you don’t want to answer.
- This group is confidential. We have your names on the sign-up sheet and the consent forms, but we will keep your comments today totally separate from these other documents. The research team will not know who said what.
- We ask that each of you keep what’s said in this group confidential. However, in a focus group, there is a risk that one of the group members will reveal information. To minimize this risk, can I get everyone’s agreement now that all information is said here, stays here?
- It would also be helpful if we can agree to speak one at a time, and to be respectful of different perspectives.
- With your consent, the group will be audio-recorded. The recording will be transcribed by professionals who also must keep data confidential and do not work at this university. In the transcript, you will be referred to only by speaker number (eg. Speaker #1 said...) After the transcription is made, we will destroy the audio recording to help protect your confidentiality. Can I get everyone’s agreement to audio-record the group discussion?
- If you have any questions or concerns about this research, you can contact the Principal Investigator, Julie Beck, and julie.beck@csueastbay.edu or the CSU East Bay Institutional Review Board at irb@csueastbay.edu. I have written these email addresses on the board.
- You can read updates about the Diversity and Social Justice Project on our website at: ____________. This website address is also written on the board.
- Does anyone have any questions before we begin?
- If all of this is clear, I’m going to go around the room and ask each person to say “Yes” to indicate that you consent to participate in this focus group.

1. On the index card I’m giving to you, please take a few minutes to jot down the first 5 words that come into your head when I say “diversity and social justice.”

Great, thanks. Can we go around the room and share the words? I’m going to write all the words you said on the white board. You can skip your turn if you don’t feel comfortable.
Looking at our white board, and thinking about your classes and extra-curricular activities at CSU East Bay, please share any thoughts you have about what’s written there (a-f prompt only as needed).
   a. Are there any words that seem especially important to you? Why?
   b. Are there any words that seem to be missing?
   c. Are there any words there that you have a question about?
   d. How are these words reflected in the content of your classes?
   e. How are these words reflected in the way your professors teach (e.g. how they manage the classroom, how they behave in office hours, etc.)
   f. How are these words reflected in your extra-curricular activities?

2. What aspects of your background (see prompts below) do you think need to be considered, recognized, and supported in the university environment?
   a. Prompt as needed using whiteboard and/or:
      i. Race/ethnicity
      ii. Culture
      iii. Sexual orientation
      iv. Disability
      v. Religion
      vi. English language fluency
      vii. Immigration status
      viii. Socioeconomic status
   b. When have you felt most empowered on campus?
   c. When have you felt most disempowered on campus?
   d. What helps you to feel included in class?
   e. What helps you to feel included on campus?

3. What activities have you participated in with people and groups who are different from you that have been most valuable for your learning?
   a. In class or related activities?
   b. In organized extra-curricular activities?
   c. In socializing with other students?

4. What activities have you participated in related to social justice that have been most valuable for your learning?
   a. In class or related activities?
   b. In organized extra-curricular activities?
   c. In socializing with other students?

5. What does civic engagement mean to you?
   a. What would help you to increase your civic engagement?
   b. What makes it difficult to participate in civic engagement activities?

6. What suggestions do you have about______?
   a. Including more diversity and social justice content into your courses?
   b. Including more diversity and social justice content into extra-curricular activities?
   c. Helping your professors become more sensitive to issues of diversity and social justice in the way that they teach?
   d. What you need to learn in class to promote equity and social justice in your community?

7. Please share any final thoughts or comments.
   a. How did you feel about the group today?
Appendix F: Detailed Methods for Content Analysis of Syllabi

We developed a nuanced SPSS coding system to explore the ways and extent to which syllabi covered the ILO in its topics, readings, assignments, learning objectives, activities and teaching methods. We developed the coding system based on a pilot study of twenty-three sample syllabi and DSJ terms and concepts solicited from our Advisory Board and a review of key CSUEB documents as well as Nunez’s Diversity and Equity Glossary of Terminology, California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) (2009), and Adams (2007) on social justice education.

As a result of our pilot study, we decided to go beyond the binary categorization of syllabi as either containing or lacking DJS content as originally proposed and developed two intermediary categories: 1) syllabi that indicated the faculty member was sensitive to DSJ issues and 2) syllabi that indicated the course topic could be linked to DSJ content. These intermediary categories enabled us to devise a coding system that included qualitative sections of innovative DSJ-sensitive teaching methods and approaches and potential DSJ linkages to syllabi topics in courses in disciplines throughout the University. We created a novel coding system to support curriculum development and ongoing curricular assessments not only in courses that readily lend themselves to DSJ content (CLASS and CEAS courses), but also those which at first glance, might not (COS and CBE courses). A master’s level research assistant, Thanh Le, coded syllabi using a SPSS database with our training and careful review.
Appendix G: List of Key Informant and Exemplary Program Interviews and Details Regarding Methodology

*Programs and Departments at CSUEB:*

- The Diversity Center (DC), Director and four undergraduate student employees
- Faculty Equity and Diversity Committee (FDEC), Standing Committee Chair
- Educational Opportunity Program (EOP), Director
- Service Learning Program, Director
- Ethnic Studies Department, Chair
- Sociology and Social Services Department, Chair
- Political Science Department, Chair
- Social Work Department, Interim Field Coordinator.

*At the other universities, exemplary programs and leaders included:*

- Justice Studies Master’s Degree Program, San Jose State University, Director and Chair
- Inside-Out Prison Exchange Program, Temple University, PA, Co-Facilitator of the Instructor Training Program and Professor
- Center for Research and Social Change, UC Berkeley, Academic Staff.

*Methodological Details for Key Informant Interviews*

We used a semi-structured interview guide, through which we sought to glean an overall understanding of DSJ-related activities, perceptions, and programing on the campus and how they overlapped with experiential learning about social issues in the classroom and/or community. Questions included asking informants to describe the overall campus climate with regard to awareness of multiculturalism, diversity and social justice (DSJ); how their program has sought to incorporate or infuse DSJ-related education into campus life/the curriculum; the impact of their program on student awareness, dialogue, or action on campus or in the
community; particular challenges faced in addressing DSJ on our campus with regard to our student body, faculty, staff; and what kinds of changes or future vision respondents held for their program and for our campus on the whole.

To analyze our interview data, we used grounded theory, a data-driven, “ground-up” approach to qualitative research (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). We first identified key concepts from interview transcripts, then, building on these concepts, identified themes from which we derived our recommendations for changes in pedagogy surrounding diversity and social justice at CSUEB. We defined a concept as an idea or insight expressed by a respondent; we defined a theme as a repeated idea or concept, or set of related concepts, found within a single interview and appearing across two or more interviews, which we paraphrased and condensed.