



EDUC 722

***RACE,
RACISM,
and ANTI-
BLACKNESS***

IN HIGHER EDUCATION

WINTER 2022 SYLLABUS

Sy Stokes, Ph.D., Course Instructor

Jarell Skinner-Roy, Graduate Student Instructor (GSI)



EDUC 722 | RACE, RACISM, AND ANTI-BLACKNESS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Units: 3

Term: Winter 2022

Class Meetings: **Tuesdays, 9am-12pm**

Location: SEB 2229

Instructor: Sy Stokes, Ph.D.

Contact Info: systokes@umich.edu

Office Hours: By appointment /Conducted via Zoom

Graduate Student Instructor: Jarell Skinner-Roy, M.A.

Contact Info: jarell@umich.edu

Office Hours: By appointment/ Conducted via Zoom

IT HELP

University of Michigan Information Technology Services provides centralized support for information technologies such as network (voice and data), email lists and our learning management system, Blackboard.

Live Chat: <https://chatsupport.it.umich.edu/>

Phone: 734.764.4357

Contact Info: <https://its.umich.edu/>

Hours: 24 hours a day, every day

ZOOM HELP

If you need help during a live session, please call

Phone: 888.799.9666 ext 2 or 650.397.6096 ext 2

Live Chat: <https://support.zoom.us/hc/en-us/articles/201362003>

Hours: 24 hours a day, every day

COURSE DESCRIPTION

Historically, American colleges and universities have functioned in ways that entrenched and further widened racial inequities in both education and society. Whether the settler-colonial dispossession of Indigenous lands, the blood of enslaved Africans and their descendants, or the legalized exclusion of racially minoritized people and their contributions, higher education is among America's earliest and most persistent institutions of racism. Today, race and racism continue to shape the people, policies, and practices that comprise contemporary higher and postsecondary education in many and various ways. *Race, Racism, and Anti-Blackness in Higher Education*, therefore, offers students an opportunity more deeply understand *how* racism functions in higher education and its social contexts. More specifically, students will learn and employ interpretive and analytical strategies informed by anti-colonial/decolonial and anti-racist frameworks, critical theories of race (e.g., hegemonic whiteness, colorblind and post-racism, and racial capitalism), racialized geographies, and other perspectives to critique the field and function of American colleges and universities. In summative conclusion of the course, students will explore their own conceptualization of radical futures and anti-racist possibilities for a higher education in which we can all *be* – and become – more free.

FOCUS OF THE COURSE

This course concerns itself with not *if* but what, when, where, why and how racism persists and who the arbiters of interpersonal, systemic, structural, and institutional racism are. While this implicitly indicts many, if not most, white people and white institutions, it also alludes to the very ways racism and anti-Blackness are internalized and perpetuated by racially minoritized people and the institutions of which they are a part. Particular attention will be paid to historical, legal, sociological, anthropological, and Black feminist perspectives on race, ethnicity, racial formation, stratification, and socialization in higher and postsecondary contexts. These and other discourses that are critical to furthering our collective understanding of racism will be explored through course texts that include academic articles, essays, books, news media, television, and film. Additionally, the course is concerned with increasing our theoretical and conceptual understanding about *how* racism intersects with other oppressive systems of power and structures of domination toward the end of epistemic and pedagogical injustice at the expense of racially minoritized students, staff, and faculty.

Learning Outcomes

A successful course will be demonstrated by students' abilities to do the following:

- Identify the racial-colonial foundations of American higher education.
- Explain how race and ethnicity are conceptually constructed as similar but different categories of difference.
- Develop analyses that distinguish and relate interpersonal, systemic, structural, and institutional racism in higher education and its social contexts.
- Identify patterns of racial inequity related to college access and choice, student retention and persistence, and socio-academic experiences on-campus.
- Imagine alternative futures and possibilities for an anti-racist higher education of the future.

GENERAL COURSE REQUIREMENTS

Framing Discussions

Diversity, Inclusion, and Equity: Core Principles

To help frame our discussions inclusively, this course builds on the [Association of American Colleges & Universities \(AAC&U\) Making Excellence Inclusive](#) guiding principles for access, student success, and high-quality learning and equity work from the Center of Urban Education at the University of Southern California. Specifically, the following definitions are offered:

- **Diversity:** Individual differences (e.g., personality, learning styles, and life experiences) and group/social differences (e.g., race/ethnicity, class, gender, sexual orientation, country of origin, and ability as well as cultural, political, religious, or other affiliations).
- **Equity:** The achievement of parity across difference with regard to *outcomes* (i.e., success measures). Equity is the result from deliberate and sustainable interventions that explicitly center historically disenfranchised and underserved populations and (re)direct resources necessary to support their success (see also [Equity and Student Success](#)).
- **Inclusion:** The active, intentional, and ongoing engagement with diversity—in the curriculum, in the co-curriculum, and in communities (intellectual, social, cultural, geographical) with which individuals might connect—in ways that increase awareness, content knowledge, cognitive sophistication, and empathic understanding of the complex ways individuals interact within systems and institutions.
- **Equity-mindedness:** The perspective or mode of thinking exhibited by practitioners who call attention to patterns of inequity in student outcomes. These practitioners are willing to take personal and institutional responsibility for the success of their students, and critically reassess their own practices. It also requires that practitioners are race-conscious and aware of the social and historical context of exclusionary practices in American Higher Education. ([Center for Urban Education, University of Southern California](#)).

Key Terms

Race is a social construct and a concept which signifies and symbolizes social conflicts and interests by referring to different types of human bodies (Omi & Winant, 1994, p.54).

Racism, broadly conceived, is the belief that race is the primary determinant of human traits and capacities and that racial differences produce an inherent superiority of a particular race (Omi & Winant, 1994, p.54).

Systemic racism refers to a web of intersecting structures, policies, practices, and norms that frame and determine access to opportunity and assigns value based on perceived belonging to or association with a non-white racial group. Systemic racism, both overtly and covertly, disadvantages non-white individuals and communities in various, but specific ways and to varying degrees across a racial hierarchy in which whiteness, ideologically and embodied, is valued and non-white otherness is oppressed.

Anti-Blackness as being a two-part formation that both strips Blackness of value (dehumanizes), and systematically marginalizes Black people. This form of anti-Blackness is overt racism. Society also associates politically incorrect comments with the overt nature of anti-Black racism. Beneath this anti-Black racism is the covert structural and systemic racism which predetermines the socioeconomic status of Blacks in this country and is held in place by anti-Black policies, institutions, and ideologies. Anti-Blackness is also the disregard for anti-Black institutions and policies. This disregard is the product of class, race, and/or gender privilege certain individuals experience due to anti-Black institutions and policies.

Source: Council for the Democratizing Education

Four Agreements for Courageous Conversation

By participating in this graduate-level seminar class, we collectively agree to abide by the following:

1. **Stay engaged.** Staying engaged means “remaining morally, emotionally, intellectually, and socially involved in the dialogue.”
2. **Experience discomfort.** This norm acknowledges that discomfort is inevitable and asks that discussants make a commitment to bring issues into the open. It is not talking about these issues that create divisiveness. The divisiveness already exists in the society, in our institutions, and in our schools and colleges. It is through dialogue, even when uncomfortable, the healing and change can begin.
3. **Speak your truth.** This means being open about our thoughts and feelings and not just saying what you think others want to hear.
4. **Expect and accept non-closure.** This agreement asks discussants to “hang out in uncertainty” and not rush to quick solutions, especially in relation to shared understanding, which requires a future commitment to an ongoing dialogue.

SOURCE: Singleton, G.E., & Linton, C. (2006). *Courageous conversations about race: A field guide for achieving equity in schools* (pp. 58-65). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Marginalized Voices and Classroom Communication

In addition, as a community of learners, we agree to promote an environment conducive to learning. In doing so, we should equitably respect differences of race, culture, nationality, language, values, opinion, and style. However, respecting differences also requires we account for historical and ongoing relationships of power that typically marginalize the voices of minoritized communities. This means we should be conscientious of the amount of space we occupy during class discussions, especially when we are located in positions of power and privilege that have historically drowned out the perspectives of marginalized and oppressed people. Lastly, in effort to promote clear communication, we should strive to:

1. Be specific rather than broad, general, or vague, with our truth claims;
2. Provide examples and evidence to support our arguments; and
3. Ask “good faith” questions in moments needing clarification.

ATTENDANCE AND PARTICIPATION

Attendance: As a seminar style course, our collective learning depends greatly on everyone attending our scheduled class sessions. However, the pandemic, ongoing uprisings to resist the rising tide of “white supremacist capitalist patriarchy” (hooks, 1997) and a plethora of other stressors have made this a challenging and unpredictable time for all of us. Therefore, absences may be unavoidable or even necessary to manage our mental and emotional well-being. I encourage everyone to make healthy choices in this regard and, when it is possible, to let the instructor or GSI know, whether in advance or soon after the missed class(es). If multiple, consecutive absences occur, the instructor or GSI may reach out to offer additional support and co-create a plan to stay on-track for completing course.

Recognition of Religious and Spiritual Observances: All students are encouraged to participate in the holidays and observances consistent with their religious and/or spiritual practice(s). In those instances where such participation conflicts with scheduled course time, deadlines, etc., please simply notify the instructor of possible absences or needs to adjust assignment due dates to respect and affirm your participation in a religious and/or spiritual observance.

Coursework and Readings: Instructors and students enrolled in this course are expected to read, listen, and watch all content provided in the syllabus. We learn best when we do so in community with others

and therefore we share a responsibility for helping one another learn. This requires we be prepared to critically discuss, interrogate, and raise questions about the texts as well as our interpretations of what the texts offer. Readings are expected to be read *before* each class meeting where they will be discussed. However, this may mean reading *fewer* text some weeks – but having read those few more closely – and more texts read at a high level some others. In either case, prioritize what peaks your interests and dig into those texts that may compel you to offer us the contribution of your thoughts and analysis.

Class Participation: Pair-share and small group discussions will occur during nearly every class session and students are encouraged to actively participate in them whenever possible. Active participation may include, but not be limited to asking critical questions, drawing on and making connections between the assigned readings and higher education policy and practice, and contributing to the overall discussion through critical dialogue with their peers.

Stressful Content (Trigger Warning): We will occasionally discuss trends and problems on college and university campuses that may engender discomfort (and possibly distress) for students who have previously experienced related forms of educational violence and/or trauma. In the event that you may need individual support or modification to participation during a particular unit, please contact the instructor or GSI via email. If you would prefer withdrawing participation from portions or the entirety of a particular unit, feel free to do so without explanation. Simply send an email noting your absence, whether before or after class, to help the instructional team account for your temporary absence. In the event that you may need confidential assistance, the [Counseling and Psychological Services](#) office is available via phone at (734) 764-8312 or email at caps-uofm@umich.edu.

GRADING AND ASSESSMENT OF SCHOLARLY WORK

This course takes a primarily qualitative assessment-based approach to determine areas of success as well as improvement related to our desired learning outcomes. This means, as the course instructor, I am most interested in your own learning objectives and goals for being enrolled and engaging your work with questions and critical feedback than I am in evaluating your assignments and contributions by assigning them a fairly arbitrary numerical value. In addition, a core component of this course is self-reflection, self-evaluation, and peer review of your work to expand the possibilities of what constitutes being a scholar and producing knowledge rather than following predetermined expectations framed by contested categories of merit, excellence, and success. That said, I also recognize this approach may be new – and perhaps even unsettling – to many enrolled, and offer some guidance through a point system associated with each assignment. This system is intended to help students track their own progress in demonstrating various skills typically associated with graduate work, but that are not necessarily taught in this course (e.g., academic/scholarly writing). I am happy to discuss any individual concerns about this approach and developing an alternative pathways for discussing your progress during the semester.

ASSESSMENT POINTS BY ASSIGNMENT

Class Attendance & Participation _____ 25pts
 Personal History Paper _____ 25pts
 Debate Paper _____ 25pts
 Final Paper _____ 25pts

GRADING SCALE

A 94-100	B+ 87-89	C+ 77-79	D+ 67-69
A- 90-93	B 84-86	C 74-76	D 64-66
	B- 80-83	C- 70-73	D- 60-63

ASSIGNMENT SUBMISSION POLICY

All assignments should be submitted via Canvas, not email, no later than the Tuesday (by 11:59pm) they are due (unless otherwise individually or collectively negotiated with the instructor). For example, an assignment due Week 6 should be uploaded by Tuesday, February 8th at 11:59pm.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Operating under the highest standards of academic integrity is implied and assumed. Academic integrity includes issues of content and process. Treating the course and class participants with respect, honoring class expectations and assignments, and seeking to derive maximum learning from the experience reflect some of the *process* aspects of academic integrity. In addition, claiming ownership only of your own unique work and ideas, providing appropriate attribution of others' material and quotes, clearly indicating all paraphrasing, and providing account and attribution to the original source of any idea, concept, theory, etc. are key components to the *content* of academic integrity.

Remember, citation is as much a social and political action as an academic norm and should be respected given the often theft of scholarship and the intellectual contributions of marginalized and minoritized scholars. Therefore, let us aspire to the spirit and highest representation of academic integrity. For additional university specific details, please read the University's General Catalogue, especially the sections that detail your rights as a student and the section that discusses the University's expectations of you as a student (see <http://www.rackham.umich.edu/StudentInfo/Publications>).

SUPPORT AND ACCOMMODATIONS

Students in need of learning support or specific accommodations should contact the course instructor at their earliest convenience. In response, an intentional effort to modify any and all aspects of this course will be made to facilitate the full participation and progress of students with a diverse set of learning needs. Additionally, the instructor will work with the Office of Services for Students with Disabilities (SSD) to help us determine appropriate academic supports to ensure student needs are met. Students may also contact SSD at (734) 763-3000 or via email at ssd.umich.edu at their own discretion to register accommodations using the Verified Individualized Services and Accommodations (VISA) form. Any information you provide is private and confidential and will be treated as such.

ASSIGNMENTS AND ACTIVITIES

Task	Due	Points
Personal History Paper	Week 6	25
Debate/Paper (Master's Students Only)*	Week 11, 12, 14, or 15	25*
Conference Proposal/Presentations (Doctoral Students Only)*	Week 13	25*
Final Paper	Week 16	25

PERSONAL RACIAL HISTORY PAPER

In 3-5 double-spaced pages, write about aspects of your personal racial history using the concepts, theories, and ideas from the course readings. Here are *some* questions for your consideration:

1. How did you grow up?
2. How was race treated and talked about in your family?
3. How diverse were your neighborhood and schools? What did you learn about race in school?
4. As a young person, what assumptions did you make about people who were from racial backgrounds different from yours? From where did these assumptions come?
5. Which identities are most salient to you?
6. What social, environmental, and familial forces shaped the development of your racial identity?
7. When did you first come to recognize yourself as a racialized person?
8. How did you understand, perform, and experience your racial identity in college?
9. How did your perspectives on race evolve during your college years? What facilitated this?

While you are encouraged to think deeply about these nine questions, you are not expected to answer them all. Do not feel compelled to treat this as a checklist. If other dimensions of your racial history are more important to you, please feel free to write about those. However, you must respond to these questions in your paper:

1. How has your prior racial socialization affected who you presently are?
2. What concepts, theories, and ideas from the readings help contextualize your racialized experiences?
3. How have the readings challenged your preconceived notions of race and racism?

While you are more than welcome to use articles/books outside of the course readings, please try to incorporate **at least four articles from the course readings** into your paper.

DEBATE SERIES (MASTER’S STUDENTS ONLY)

Each debate team (4-5 students each team) will either argue on the side of the **affirmative** or **negative** for one of the following debate topics:

1. Has racial inequity in education improved or worsened since the passage of brown v. Board of education (1954)?
2. Should colleges and universities consider race in admissions?
3. Should K-12 schools teach Critical Race Theory?
4. Should colleges and universities remove campus police/cut ties with local police departments?

Teams and topics will be selected **Week 3**. The affirmative and negative positions will be determined by a coin toss. Only one absolute perspective can be argued. Each team must use eight (8) different citations from academic journals or books to support their position – magazines, newspapers, and website citations are not allowed.

DEBATE STRUCTURE

Structure*	TIME
Affirmative Opening Statement	5 minutes
Negative Opening Statement	5 minutes
Affirmative Rebuttal	5 minutes
Negative Rebuttal	5 minutes
Prep Time	3 minutes
Affirmative Closing Statement	5 minutes
Negative Closing Statement	5 minutes
Meeting of the Judges	5 minutes
Judge Decision and Feedback from Judges	10 minutes
TOTAL DEBATE TIME	~48 minutes

DOCTORAL STUDENTS WILL SERVE AS THE PANEL OF JUDGES TO DETERMINE THE WINNERS OF THE DEBATES. Doctoral students will collectively construct a rubric due Week 11 (before the first debate begins).

DEBATE PAPER

In four double-spaced pages, each team will submit **one group paper** that summarizes their position. Please include all citations used during the debate. Papers should take into consideration any possible counterarguments when stating their claims. **Due at 11:59pm on day of debate.**

RESEARCH WORKSHOP AND CONFERENCE PROPOSAL (DOCTORAL STUDENTS ONLY)

Doctoral students are asked to present preliminary theorizations, analyses, or conceptualizations of racism within their own scholarly work and solicit feedback from colleagues through a workshop style presentation. Presentations should be no longer than 15 minutes total with time for questions. Building on the feedback received, students will strengthen their papers in preparation for submission to an academic or practice-based conference (i.e., ASHE, AERA, NASPA, ACPA, NCORE and others). Proposals will go through a peer-review process between writing partners prior to final submission. In some cases, students may decide to undertake creative research endeavors for which the paper is not the primary scholarly product. Such cases will be evaluated on an individual basis and should be discussed with the course instructor. These particular projects will have some writing component to help explain the scholarly framing and significance, but will be significantly shorter than paper proposals.

FINAL PAPER

Further details will be provided in Week 14.

READINGS, TEXTS, AND COURSE SCHEDULE

Readings are available via Canvas under the ‘Files ’tab and in folders designated for each week of the course. Additionally, the texts under the “WATCH” heading are available in the ‘Media Gallery ’tab on Canvas (or can be accessed through your browser by clicking the links below). Texts listed under the “LISTEN” heading should be accessed by clicking the link and opening them in your web browser.

COURSE SCHEDULE

WEEK	UNIT	READINGS	DUE
Week 1 Jan. 4	NO CLASS		
Week 2 Jan. 11	<i>Racial Formation: Introduction to Race, Racism, and Anti-Blackness</i>	<p>Harris, C. (1993). Whiteness as property. <i>Harvard Law Review</i>, 106(8), 1707–1791.</p> <p>Stokes, S. (2020). <i>Into the wildfire: Campus racial climate and the Trump presidency</i> (pp. 19-36) (Publication No. 28150630) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California]. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database https://search.proquest.com/openview/97154c412b847b4fa2fbf8ed208b6c2d/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y</p> <p>King Jr., M. L. (1968). Racism and the white backlash. In M. L. King Jr.’s (Ed.) <i>Where do we go from here: chaos or community?</i> (pp. 71-108). Boston: Beacon Press.</p>	

WEEK	UNIT	READINGS	DUE
<p>Week 3 Jan. 18</p>	<p><i>Colonialism and Anti-Blackness in Higher Education</i></p>	<p>Stein, S. (2016). Universities, slavery, and the unthought of anti-Blackness. <i>Cultural Dynamics</i>, 28(2), 169–187.</p> <p>Dancy, T. E., Edwards, K. T., & Davis, J. E. (2018). Historically White Universities and Plantation Politics: Anti-Blackness and Higher Education in the Black Lives Matter Era. <i>Urban Education</i>, 53(2), 176-195.</p> <p>Wright, B. (1988). “For the Children of Infidels”?: American Indian Education in the Colonial Colleges. <i>Culture and Research Journal</i>, 12(1), 72–79.</p> <p>McClellan, G., Fox, M. J., & Lowe, S. (2005). Where we have been: A history of Native American higher education. <i>New Directions for Student Services</i>, 109, 7–15.</p>	<p>DEBATE TEAMS & TOPICS ASSIGNED</p>
<p>Week 4 Jan. 25</p>	<p><i>Whiteness and White Supremacy – Part I</i></p>	<p>Saito, N. T. (1997). Alien and non-alien alike: Citizenship, “foreignness,” and racial hierarchy in American Law. <i>Oregon Law Review</i>, 76(2), 261-346.</p> <p>Lipsitz, G. (2018). The possessive investment in whiteness. In G. Lipsitz <i>The possessive investment in whiteness</i> (2nd ed) (pp. 1-23). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.</p> <p>Pérez Huber, L. (2016). “Make America great again!”: Donald Trump, racist nativism and the virulent adherence to white supremacy amid U.S. demographic change. <i>Charleston Law Review</i>, 10, 215-248.</p> <p>WATCH Debate: James Baldwin vs. William F. Buckley at The Cambridge Union. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5Tek9h3a5wQ.</p>	

WEEK	UNIT	READINGS	DUE
<p>Week 5 Feb. 1</p>	<p><i>Whiteness and White Supremacy – Part II</i></p> <p>GUEST LECTURE: <i>Jarell Skinner-Roy</i></p>	<p>Leonardo, Z. (2004). The color of supremacy: Beyond the discourse of ‘white privilege.’ <i>Educational Philosophy and Theory</i>, 36(2), 137-152.</p> <p>Cabrera, N. L., Franklin, J. D., & Watson, J. S. (2017). Whiteness in higher education: the invisible missing link in diversity and racial analyses. <i>ASHE Higher Education Report</i>, 42(6), 1-28.</p> <p>Cabrera, N. L. (2014). Exposing whiteness in higher education: white male college students minimizing racism, claiming victimization, and recreating white supremacy. <i>Race Ethnicity and Education</i>, 17(1), 30-55.</p>	
<p>Week 6 Feb. 8</p>	<p><i>Manifestations of Racism and Anti-Blackness in Higher Education</i></p> <p>GUEST LECTURE: <i>Dr. Antar Tichavakunda</i></p>	<p>Mustaffa, J. B. (2017). Mapping violence, naming life: a history of anti-Black oppression in the higher education system. <i>International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education</i>, 30(8), 711-727.</p> <p>Smith, W. A., Allen, W. R., & Danley, L. L. (2007). “Assume the position... you fit the description”: Psychosocial experiences and racial battle fatigue among African American male college students. <i>American Behavioral Scientist</i>, 51(4), 551–578.</p> <p>Tichavakunda, A. (2021). Organizational involvement: Diversity dilution and antiblackness. In A. Tichavakunda’s (Ed.), <i>Black Campus Life</i> (pp. 109-134). SUNY Press: New York.</p>	<p>PERSONAL HISTORY PAPER DUE</p>

WEEK	UNIT	READINGS	DUE
<p>Week 7 Feb. 15</p>	<p><i>Racism and Anti-Blackness in Higher Education Policy</i></p>	<p>Dumas, M. J. (2016). Against the dark: antiblackness in education policy and discourse. <i>Theory Into Practice</i>, 55(1), 11-19.</p> <p>Harper, S. R., Patton, L. D., & Wooden, O. S. (2009). Access and Equity for African American Students in Higher Education: A Critical Race Historical Analysis of Policy Efforts. <i>The Journal of Higher Education</i>, 80(4), 389–414.</p> <p>Gotanda, N. (1991). A critique of “Our constitution is color-blind.” <i>Stanford Law Review</i>, 44(1), 1–68.</p> <p>OPTIONAL:</p> <p>Rodriguez, A., Deane, K C, Davis III, C. H. F. (2021). Towards a framework of racialized policymaking in higher education. In L. W. Perna (ed.), <i>Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research</i> (pp. 1-81). Philadelphia, PA: Springer Nature Switzerland.</p>	
<p>Week 8 Feb. 22</p>	<p><i>Campus Racial Climate</i></p>	<p>Gusa, D. L. (2010). White institutional presence: the impact of whiteness on campus climate. <i>Harvard Educational Review</i>, 80(4), 464-489.</p> <p>Hurtado, S., Milem, J. F., Clayton-Pedersen, A., & Walter R. Allen. (1998). Enhancing Campus Climates for Racial/Ethnic Diversity: Educational Policy and Practice. <i>The Review of Higher Education</i>, 21(3), 279–302.</p> <p>Harper, S. R., & Hurtado, S. (2007). Nine themes in campus racial climates and implications for institutional transformation. <i>New Directions for Student Services</i>, (120), 7–24.</p> <p>OPTIONAL:</p> <p>Harper, S. R. (2010). An anti-deficit achievement framework for research on students of color in STEM.</p>	
<p>Week 9 Mar. 1</p>	<p>NO CLASS</p>	<p>SPRING BREAK</p>	

WEEK	UNIT	READINGS	DUE
<p>Week 10 Mar. 8</p>	<p><i>Critical Race Theory in Education</i></p> <p>GUEST LECTURE: Dr. Oscar Patrón</p>	<p>Ladson-Billings, G. & Tate IV, W. F. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. <i>Teachers College Record</i>, 97(1), 47-68.</p> <p>Patton, L. D. (2016). Disrupting postsecondary prose: toward a critical race theory of higher education. <i>Urban Education</i>, 51(3), 315-342.</p> <p>Yosso, T., Smith, W., Ceja, M., & Solórzano, D. (2009). Critical Race Theory, Racial Microaggressions, and Campus Racial Climate for Latina/o Undergraduates. <i>Harvard Educational Review</i>, 79(4), 659–691.</p>	
<p>Week 11 Mar. 15</p>	<p><i>Interest Convergence and Racial Realism</i></p>	<p>Bell, D. A. (1980). Brown v. Board of education and the interest-convergence dilemma. <i>Harvard Law Review</i>, 93, 518–533.</p> <p>Bell, D. A. (1992). Racial realism. <i>Connecticut Law Review</i>, 24(2), 363-380.</p> <p>Alemán, E. & Alemán, S. M. (2010). ‘Do Latin@ interests always have to “converge” with White interests?’: (Re)claiming racial realism and interest-convergence in critical race theory praxis. <i>Race Ethnicity and Education</i>, 13(1), 1-12.</p> <p>Stokes, S. (2021). A sense of belonging within the imaginative constraints of racial realism: a critical race analysis of Latinx students’ racialized experiences during the Trump presidency. <i>International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education</i>. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2021.1956632.</p> <p>OPTIONAL:</p> <p>Dudziak, M. L. (1988). Desegregation as a Cold War imperative. <i>Stanford Law Review</i>, 41(1), 61-120.</p>	<p>DEBATE RUBRICS DUE (DOCTORAL STUDENTS)</p> <p>DEBATE #1</p>

WEEK	UNIT	READINGS	DUE
Week 12 Mar. 22	<i>Colorblindness</i>	<p>Bonilla-Silva, E. (2015). The structure of racism in color-blind, “post-racial” America. <i>American Behavioral Scientist</i>, 59(11), 1358-1376.</p> <p>Yosso, T. J., Parker, L., Solórzano, D. G., & Lynn, M. (2004). From Jim Crow to affirmative action and back again: a critical race discussion of racialized rationales and access to higher education. <i>Review of Research in Education</i>, 28, 1-25.</p> <p>Nguyen, D., & Ward, L. (2017). A colorblind discourse analysis of higher education race-conscious admissions in a “post-racial” society. <i>North Dakota Law Review</i>, 92, 551–576.</p> <p>Garcia, N.M., López, N. & Vélez, V. N. (2018). QuantCrit: rectifying quantitative methods through critical race theory. <i>Race Ethnicity and Educaiton</i> 21(2), 149-157.</p>	DEBATE # 2
Week 13 Mar. 29	<p><i>Intersectionality</i></p> <p><i>GUEST LECTURE: Dr. Christina Morton</i></p>	<p>Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color. <i>Stanford Law Review</i>, 43, 1241–1299.</p> <p>Harris, J. C. & Patton, L. D. (2019). Un/Doing intersectionality through higher education research. <i>The Journal of Higher Education</i> 90(3), 347-372.</p> <p>Combahee River Collective (1977). Combahee River Collective Statement. Retrieved from https://www.blackpast.org/african-american-history/combahee-river-collective-statement-1977/</p>	<p>DOCTORAL STUDENT PAPERS DUE</p> <p>DOCTORAL STUDENTS PRESENT</p>
Week 14 Apr. 5	<i>Sex, Gender, and Race</i>	<p>Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. <i>The University of Chicago Legal Forum</i>, 1(8), 139-167.</p> <p>Bailey, M. & Trudy (2018). On misogynoir: citation, erasure, and plagiarism. <i>Feminist Media Studies</i>, 18(4), 762-768.</p> <p>Nicollazo, Z. (2016). “Just go in looking good”: the resilience, resistance, and kinship-building of trans* college students. <i>Journal of College Student Development</i>, 57(5), 538-556.</p>	DEBATE # 3

WEEK	UNIT	READINGS	DUE
<p>Week 15 Apr. 12</p>	<p><i>Campus Safety</i></p> <p><i>GUEST LECTURE:</i> <i>Jarell Skinner-Roy</i></p>	<p>Dizon, J. P. M. (2021). Protecting the University, Policing Race: A Case Study of Campus Policing. <i>Journal of Diversity in Higher Education</i>. 1-15.</p> <p>Williams, C. D. (2020). Race and Policing in Higher Education. <i>The Activist History Review</i>. https://activisthistory.com/2019/11/19/race-and-policing-in-higher-education/. 1-9.</p> <p>Dizon, J. P. M., Salazar, M., Yucel, E., Lopez, E. F. (2020). Campus Policing: A Guide for Higher Education Leaders. <i>USC Rossier, Pullias Center for Higher Education</i>. 1-16.</p> <p>Sloan III, J. J. (2020). Race, Violence, Justice, and Campus Police. <i>American Sociological Association</i>. 9-11.</p>	<p>DEBATE # 4</p>
<p>Week 16 Apr. 19</p>	<p><i>“Diversity” in higher education, and other myths</i></p>	<p>Harris, J. C., Barone, R. P., & Davis, L. P. (2015). Who benefits?: A critical race analysis of the (D)evolving language of inclusion in higher education. <i>Thoughts & Action, 1</i>, 21-38.</p> <p>Patton, L. D., Sánchez, B., Mac, J., & Stewart, D-L. (2019). An inconvenient truth about “progress”: an analysis of the promises and perils of research on campus diversity initiatives. <i>The Review of Higher Education, 42</i>, 173-198.</p> <p>OPTIONAL:</p> <p>Tuck, E.& Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. <i>Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society, 1</i>(1), 1-40.</p>	<p>FINAL PAPER DUE</p>