

2019-2020 Faculty and Staff of Color Town Hall Meetings

Executive Summary

Submitted by: ODI Staff and Faculty of Color Council (in alphabetical order): Marysol Acensio, Shardé M. Davis, David G. Embrick, Elsie Gonzalez, Milagros Castillo-Montoya, Jeffrey Ogbar, Daisy Reyes, Jonelle Reynolds, Angela Rola

University of Connecticut | March 25, 2020

Background

Two major issues came together in Fall 2019, which led a small working group of faculty of color to approach the Office for Diversity and Inclusion (ODI) to create a town hall meeting for staff and faculty of color across all University of Connecticut (UConn) campuses. The first issue was what faculty of color at UConn were referring to as the exodus of a critical number of faculty of color from the University. The numbers of faculty of color dwindled and it was impacting the faculty of color who remain. Second, on October 11th there was (another) racial incident on campus where three white students yelled the N-word out from a dorm parking lot. Following this incident, Black students issued a three-page letter to President Katsouleas documenting their disappointment in the university's response to the incident. Subsequently students led protests and communicated that they felt unsafe on campus. On October 21, 2019, Dr. Cazenave wrote an open letter in the *Daily Campus* to President Katsouleas describing some of the racist incidents that have and continue to happen to faculty of color at UConn.

Given the issue of poor retention of faculty of color and the persistent racial incidents on campus (big and small), the small working group of faculty of color, decided to reach out to the ODI to request a town hall and a subsequent meeting with President Katsouleas in order to share, in a safe space, long overdue concerns regarding racism at the University of Connecticut, at the individual and structural/institutional levels. ODI responded promptly to this request and helped us to organize and implement the idea of a town hall. We collaborated in the town hall planning and expanded to include all faculty and staff of color.

Two separate faculty and staff of color town hall meetings were held on December 4, 2019 and February 4, 2020. At the first town hall, attendees raised several overlapping concerns, captured by volunteer scribes who took detailed minutes. The small working group organized the minutes into a first-draft document and shared it with attendees for feedback and confirmation that the issues captured reflected the issues raised. The second town hall was a working meeting in which faculty and staff discussed in more detail the issues initially captured at the first town hall and collaboratively proposed institutional solutions and next steps university leadership can take to address the issues. The working group further distilled the notes into the following five general areas of concern.

It is critical to note that we, the Staff and Faculty of Color Council, took on the leadership and responsibility of working with ODI to organize these town halls out of urgency for change and commitment to making the University of Connecticut a leading institution for faculty and staff of color. Our intent is to work with academic leadership to achieve this outcome. We also want to make it clear that while these first-of-its-kind UConn staff and faculty of color town hall meetings were successful, it was also clear that there was a general climate and context of fear from which staff and faculty spoke up, both with regards to their concerns being taken seriously and the issue of possible retaliation. It is in good faith and with great hope that we submit this executive summary to share outcomes of these meetings and foster a relationship with institutional leadership to create necessary and urgent change. We cannot reiterate enough that for progress to happen at UConn, academic leadership must address the culture of fear. For as long as faculty and staff of color are afraid to even voice their concerns, other efforts will have very little impact on their well-being and ability to carry out the valuable contributions they make to this University. In what follows, we present these concerns with their respective suggested solutions, incremental steps, and a time table for moving forward.

Actively, Urgently, and Strategically Work Toward Building an Anti-Racist Campus

First, all faculty and staff of color who attended the town hall meetings agreed that ongoing racism has been, and continues to be, a consistent issue at UConn. Further, those in attendance noted the draining effects racism has on their ability to function and thrive at UConn; they also expressed, rather strongly, their low morale as a result of their lack of faith in UConn adequately addressing structural/institutional racism on campus.

Solutions for Faculty Concerns

While addressing racism is often a difficult subject, faculty agreed on the following suggestions:

- Yearly racial campus climate data that includes racial diversity data, to be released to the public (aggregate data on racism and representation), accompanied by a strategic plan (updated yearly with achieved and not achieved goals) to address racism on campus and within each department (with accountability built in);
- Institutionalization of town halls (or similar events) for continued deliberation of issues specific to faculty of color and accountability for the university to address those issues in a timely manner;
- formal protocol for reporting and adjudicating racist incidents for faculty of color;
- the institutionalization of general education requirements on racism;
- aptly addressing the racism inherent in teaching evaluations during the PTR process; and
- the need for resources aimed at creating and maintaining faculty of color community(ies) as a constant presence on campus.

Solutions for Staff Concerns

Staff of color noted that the current state-mandated diversity awareness training is required for new employees in their first six months. Beyond this, staff are under no obligation to increase their competencies around diversity, equity, and inclusion issues. The training currently offered is very basic in information and compliance driven. It is essential to provide annual diversity and inclusion training for all staff, as increasing cultural competency and anti-racist practices is a lifelong process.

Incremental Steps Toward Actively, Urgently, and Strategically Work Toward Building an Anti-Racist Campus

Incremental Steps (Staff):	Incremental Steps (Faculty):
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit state-mandated trainings to no more than 30 participants per session to promote genuine conversation for increased learning and understanding (Spring 2021) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training should be in-person rather than on-line. • Provide in-person current and ongoing trainings beyond the mandated initial training for all staff, inclusive of leadership and middle management (Fall 2020)- with no more than 30 participants at a time. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Develop measurable goals to assess for effectiveness of staff competency development as well as the trainings themselves • Normalize trainings as part of professional development for all staff (ongoing) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Destigmatize the state-mandated Diversity Awareness Training from being an end all for D&I work and the message that is not helpful because it is mandated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Office of Institutional Research produces an early report on racial campus climate and racial diversity data related to faculty of color; that report is made accessible to the public. • Every College has an Associate Dean of Diversity and Inclusion who responds to the Dean of the College and has a line of communication to the CDO. • Address concerns regarding the racism inherent in teaching evaluations and how those biases are considered in the promotion process. <p>Time Table:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hire an Associate Dean of Diversity and Inclusion for each College during the 2021-2022 AY. • Create systems of communication between units during the 2020-2021 AY. • Report on racial climate at UConn during the 2020-2021 AY.

Increase Representation of Faculty and Staff of Color

Second, there is an extreme underrepresentation of faculty and staff of color at UConn. As has been noted by faculty, staff, and students of color many times. For instance, “within the UConn faculty, there are three racial and ethnic groups that are represented at less than one percent: American Indian or Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, and Two or more races. In fact, in Fall 2017, the university employed only one faculty member who identified as Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander. Although other racial and ethnic groups are represented at higher than one percent, the rates of representation are meager: Black faculty comprise less than three percent of UConn faculty, Latinx faculty less than five percent, and Asian faculty—despite being relatively overrepresented in comparison to other groups—still only comprise 14 percent. As it is today, the UConn faculty is majority white at a rate of 67 percent” (Robinson et al., 2019, p. 8). It is important to note that these figures only speak to overall representation, but does not address the racial microaggressions or racist experiences that these faculty experience. They also do not point to the underrepresentation of these faculty across several disciplines and fields. While these numbers focus on faculty of color, these issues of representation (and underrepresentation) are similar for staff of color at UConn. See Appendix A for additional related demographic information.

Solutions for Faculty Concerns

In regards to the concerns of faculty of color, UConn should at minimum work to have the demographics of the faculty match that of the student body. Solutions include:

- cluster hires that are open to variable research programs instead of specialized within disciplines; target hires for historically underrepresented faculty of color;
- the creation of a pipeline program (at the predoctoral and postdoctoral level); and
- engage the Institutes and Institute faculty to address the best institutional structure for advancing Africana, Latinx, Asian American and Indigenous Studies, the possibility of becoming departments. The latter is not a new consideration as it has been discussed from time to time but with no real commitment. It is also true that currently we are seeing a national trend of more resources being committed to the development of departments in these fields.

Solutions for Staff Concerns

In regards to the concerns of staff of color, it should be noted that an active recruitment strategy to attract staff of color **does not exist** on this campus.

Incremental Steps Toward Increase Representation of Faculty and Staff of Color

<p>Incremental Steps (Staff):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include diverse recruitment strategies in performance evaluations at all levels (FY 2020-2021) • Select diverse search committee members from across campus (ongoing) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Search committee membership should be published for transparency o Train committee membership on implicit bias o Include an external observer to help committees identify blind spots o Publish recruitment and hiring data to assess patterns and trends 	<p>Incremental Steps (Faculty):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • African American, Latinx, Asian/Asian American, and Indigenous cluster tenure-track hires with open lines for research interests and methodologies to be housed within the institutes. • Provide target hire competition for departments with Dean oversight to ensure that candidates recruited belong to historically underrepresented groups. • Provide the Office for Diversity and Inclusion with dedicated, multi-year resources/funds to offer a pipeline program for predoctoral/postdoctoral students, 2 for each institute in the first year; doing so will encourage institutional diversity. <p>Time Table:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify funds from the Provost Office for hiring during the 2021-22 AY • Departments compete over a five-year period, beginning 2021-22 AY
---	--

Increase Retention Efforts of Current Faculty and Staff of Color (Onboarding, Mentoring, and Engagement)

Third, staff and faculty discussed issues that fall under the broad umbrella of retention of staff and faculty of color. This includes the very real fact that many staff and faculty of color feel compelled to and leave UConn after as little as one semester—a pattern of concern for UConn’s administration.

Many faculty of color expressed concerns about their service overload (often with expectations that they shoulder the responsibility of “diversity” work in their department and college), lack of mentors, inadequate resources to do quality research, salary disparities relative to similarly-ranked white and/or male colleagues, and in some cases extreme disrespect from colleagues—either overt or passive-aggressions.

Solutions for Faculty Concerns

Faculty responded with solutions that include:

- Revise the PTR standards, process, and procedures to make diversity work count in promotion and tenure--not just merit;
- Establish a “real” mentor program that includes, but is not limited to, mentorship toward PTR;
- Conduct exit interviews (with an Ombudsperson) for faculty who leave UConn;
- Provide salary disparity report and offer action items to remedy the problem;
- Offer some standardization of merit processes (necessary to resolve merit pay discrepancy);
- Count “diversity” work as service (and overall departmental balance of service load);
- Recognize racial bias and discrimination by grant-funding agencies and offer faculty support and resources to work through this; and
- Reframe what counts as research to consider community engagement

Solutions for Staff Concerns

Staff of color noted they are committed to creating meaningful communities and a sense of belonging for staff of color on our campuses. However, without a formalized onboarding and mentoring program, it is difficult to engage and retain staff of color at UConn.

Incremental Steps Toward Retention Efforts of Current Faculty and Staff of Color

<p>Incremental Steps (Staff):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Host a welcome reception for new staff (One per semester beginning Fall 2020) • Develop onboarding plan (One per semester beginning Fall 2020) • Compile related and updated listservs/resources that provide information of interest (Fall 2020) • Organize Town Halls (One per semester beginning Fall 2020) • Administer Climate Survey (Bi-annually beginning Spring 2021) • Designate diversity champions throughout the institution to initiate and coordinate programming, dialogue events, and training for all faculty and staff (i.e. celebrations of various religious holidays each month) (Fall 2020) • Develop a formalized mentoring program for staff of color (Spring 2021) • Establish and formalize exit interview at three levels: Supervisor/Manager/Departmental level, ODI level, and OIE level (Fall 2020) 	<p>Incremental Steps (Faculty):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Provost’s and Deans’ Offices should establish a formal mentoring program specific to faculty of color external to departments. • Establish a mentoring program for faculty of color within departments that will support faculty through the tenure process (and promotion to full). • Financially support full participation in the National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity- Faculty Success Program and Pathways Program. • Have the ombudsperson conduct exit interviews with faculty of color before they leave UConn for another job and report general findings to Provost. • Promote flexibility in the PTR process to account for (1) the bias in grant agencies to not fund race-related research proposals and (2) our role as teacher-scholars on campus, including the time and effort we expend to in/formally mentor junior scholars and (under)graduate students of color and the high service load in one’s department, college, university, and professional associations. • Conduct a base-salary equity study by race across UConn campuses, using the mean salary as the standard. <p>Time Table:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Launch mentor programs 2020-2021 AY <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Begin exit interviews 2020-2021 AY • Fund NCFDD Faculty Success Program 2020-2021 • Conduct salary study 2020-2021
--	--

Inclusion of Regional Campuses

Fourth, programming and development opportunities are Storrs-centric. Regional campus staff and faculty of color feel left out, as they are often not included in decision-making or community opportunities. Many faculty of color at regional campuses hold in-residence positions and are in need of further support and infrastructure.

Incremental Steps Toward Inclusion of Regional Campuses

Incremental Steps (Staff):	Incremental Steps (Faculty):
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Campus Director identify a point person on each campus to facilitate collaborative efforts (Spring 2021)• Develop a plan to coordinate transportation between all regional campuses and Storrs when transportation is necessary for work purposes (Spring 2021)• Provide video conferencing and live streaming options for all programming, particularly that happening at Storrs, so regional staff and faculty can join remotely (Fall 2020)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Increase regional faculty in decision making related to issues and policies impacting all faculty (Spring 2021)• Ensure regional faculty are included and adequately represented in university-level committees (Spring 2021)

Accountability and Diversifying University Leadership

Finally, there is a lack of transparency in UConn's decision-making process when it comes to hiring and promoting people of color into leadership positions. Recently, many staff and faculty of color were concerned with the lack of transparency in the hiring of a new Chief Diversity Officer (CDO), and defining what role the person in this position will play on campus. Moreover, there is concern about the underrepresentation of leaders of color in academic leadership at UConn.

Solutions to Faculty Concerns

Faculty identified a pipeline issue in regards to the dearth of faculty of color serving as Department Heads, Deans, and in Provost-level leadership. Some solutions include:

- Increasing the number of faculty of color who serve on university-wide committees, with release from other obligations (e.g., service or teaching) in order to prepare them for university-level leadership positions
- Mentorship (including shadowing) and pipeline program for faculty of color to enter academic leadership at UConn--make this opportunity more transparent and available, as well as targeted for faculty from historically underrepresented groups
- Increase the number of faculty of color who are in senior academic leadership roles
- Provide the new CDO, whomever might assume that position, with ample institutional resources and funds to sufficiently address issues raised in the town hall meetings, diversity committee meetings and other university entities

Incremental Steps Toward Accountability and Diversifying University Leadership

Incremental Steps (faculty and staff):

- Invite faculty of color to meet with CDO candidates during on-campus visits.
- Ensure the CDO considers and implements initiatives that address issues specific to faculty of color across UConn campuses in collaboration with the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL), as well as academic leadership (Provost Office, Deans, and Department Chairs).
- Create a pipeline program to prepare faculty from historically underrepresented groups for academic leadership positions.
- Enhance the responsibility and offer more resources for CETL, ODI, and Deans to address the needs and concerns of faculty and staff of color.
- Ensure each college has an associate dean of diversity and inclusion (a recommendation noted above)
- Increase ODI staff to at least five members in order to adequately address campus needs related to diversity and inclusion.
- Include at least two faculty of color who will receive course release(s) to serve as ODI as in-residence fellows on a two-year rotating basis.
- Clarify and transparently communicate the responsibility of ODI and how the office should engage all members of the UConn community.
- Institutionalize the Faculty and Staff of Color Council within ODI and count this service as a university-wide committee.
 - Triple the current racial diversity of senior academic leadership in the Provost office, the President's Office, as well as senior administrators in the Division of Student Affairs at UConn by 2025.

Time Table:

- Within one year from hiring, the CDO and president (1) attend the next town hall for faculty and staff of color, (2) provide an update on progress made since this report, and (3) listen to the needs of the community.
 - Hire at least one historically underrepresented person for senior-level leadership position by 2022 and another yearly until the triple amount noted above has been reached.

Reference

Robinson, A. N., Ives, J., Burgos-Lopez, L., & Castillo-Montoya, M. (2019). Racially and ethnically diversifying the professoriate. Storrs, CT: University of Connecticut Center for Education Policy Analysis.

Appendix A

The CEPA report further notes that UConn faculty of color representation is low in comparison to the number of students of color at UConn (29.61%) at UConn and the number of international students (an additional 11.97%), who may identify with a variety of racial and ethnic identities. Furthermore, the report notes that faculty of color at UConn are underrepresented when compared to overall State of Connecticut racial and ethnic populations. The report indicates that “American Indian and Alaska Native faculty are underrepresented by about half compared to the state and represented at an even lower rate compared to the national population. Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander faculty are also represented among UConn’s faculty.... Black faculty at UConn are deeply underrepresented compared to the state population and national population.... Black faculty are represented at UConn at a rate less than half that of the national faculty representation (5.5 percent)” (p. 10). Latinx faculty at UConn have “the lowest of all racial and ethnic groups both nationally and at UConn--a 1:4 ratio to the national population” (p. 11). When considering gender also, it is important to note that “women of color faculty constitute only 8.7 percent of the UConn faculty.... underrepresentation is strongest for Black women, who constitute only 37 percent of the Black faculty, resulting in an overall representation in the faculty of less than one percent” p. 12. Furthermore, “women of color faculty represent only 7.3 percent of all tenure-system faculty, and only 6.8 percent of tenured faculty, but they are 11.3 percent of all non-tenure-track faculty. Forty-five percent of all women of color faculty at UConn are non-tenured track faculty” (p. 12). This underrepresentation of faculty of color, and women of color in the tenured faculty has dire consequences for all constituencies. This underrepresentation has been a long-standing issue at UConn and needs to be addressed in good faith (see Appendix B).

Appendix B: University Action Group 1971 Position Paper

A POSITION PAPER
ON
RACISM AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT

	Page
I. Introduction	1
II. Cases of Racism on this Campus	1
III. Racism and Academic Freedom	3
IV. The Roots of Racism	3
V. The Cultural Manifestations of Racism	4
VI. Conclusion and Recommendation	5

November 1971

Reprinted by University Action Group

A POSITION PAPER ON RACISM AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT

I. Introduction

On October 13, all members of the faculty and professional staff at this university were sent a memo by the Faculty Standards Committee of the University Senate, soliciting opinions on a motion which had been referred to that committee last May. The motion, as you know, was presented to the Senate by the Council on Human Rights and Opportunities, and the subject was racism:

Be it moved that . . . the advocacy or support of racism—i.e., the stating or implying that one race is inherently superior or inferior to another—by a faculty member or other professional employee of this University while carrying out his or her professional work shall be considered adequate evidence of lack of fitness in his professional capacity and, therefore, cause for dismissal from the University.

The purpose of this paper is to point to the urgent need to make members of the university answerable for their public exhibitions of race prejudice. The Council's motion attempts to tackle this question head-on. We believe that unless a measure of this sort is subscribed to by the university community, the university cannot be said to be sincere in its professed determination to combat this evil. We further believe that statements "deploring" racism, as proposed by the two substitute motions, are not the answer.

Note that we say "a measure of this sort." This is because we believe the crucial issue to be the spirit and not the wording of the motion. The essential features of any adequate measure on racism are 1) that it define racism, 2) that it declare its public practice unacceptable, and 3) that it attach serious consequences to such practice. The motion attempts to cover these features. Because, however, it does not spell out procedures to be followed in cases where charges of racism have been brought, and because it appears to focus on dismissal as the only action to be taken, we feel that it could profitably be rewritten. To that end, we offer a substitute motion at the conclusion of this paper.

II. Cases of Racism on this Campus

Some people seem to be of the opinion that there is no racism among our faculty and professional staff. This is unfortunately not the case. Let us begin by citing five recent cases in which racism has been charged. We shall not concern ourselves with the daily harassment, the slurs and the slights, the baitings and the obscenities, which are visited on black and Puerto Rican people in our community. What we shall cite are only these recent cases which have been brought to our attention, involving charges of public or "professional" denigration of minority people by members of the faculty, the administration, or the professional staff.

1) A professor, in a course dealing with educational tests and measurements, consistently maintained that the best evidence indicates that black people are mentally inferior to white. By way of substantiating this claim, the professor referred to a book which cited the margin of superiority of whites over blacks in certain tests administered to members of both races. This professor became well known for his position on the mental or intellectual inferiority of black people, and very recently he publicly endorsed, in his capacity as a professor at our university, the "I. Q. argument" by H. J. Eysenck, which espouses the same doctrine.

2) A white U-Conn graduate teaching assistant from South Africa, so identifying himself, said on Station WILI in Willimantic that people in this country "sympathetic" with his position had brought to his attention evidence for the theory that black South Africans are genetically inferior to whites with regard to intelligence, and that he felt the same was "unfortunately" true of black Americans. A group of administrative officers of the Graduate School, having had the broadcast called to their attention by an offended listener, heard a tape recording of it, and concluded that what the graduate assistant had said (accurately paraphrased above) was not a racist statement.

3) A professor, in a course dealing with the Caribbean, said that Puerto Ricans and Cubans are notorious for drinking up their pay; that the United States should pull its doctors out of Haiti because the birth rate there is going up and there are already too many Haitians; and that American Indians of the Southwest have a metabolism that disposes them to drink. This professor was reported by some of the students in his class to be reluctant to engage in debate with those who objected to his statements; and some of those who were offended brought the remarks to the attention of the head of the department. The statements were not corrected or modified, nor was any public apology on the part of the professor forthcoming. The professor, up for reappointment at the time of the disclosure of his statements, was reappointed.

4) An administrator, appearing in a classroom which had been invaded by student demonstrators, singled out two black students as disruptors, and did not immediately identify any other students. There were about eighty students in the room, mostly white, including one white student who had been a secretary in this administrator's office. He was reported to have said later that the two black students were the only students whom he recognized in the room.

5) A black work-study student was employed in the Wilbur Cross Library. With no previous training in library work—and none is expected of work-study students—he was assigned by the head of a department to one of the most difficult jobs. This job usually takes one month to train for, and is not ordinarily given to students. Two days after he was hired, a co-worker remarked to another employee that this student was not "working out." Nothing was said to the student about his performance. Two days later, the department head made the same remark to the same employee, but said nothing to the student. One week after he was hired, the department head told him that he had not worked out and would no longer be employed in that department. During his employment the department head called the student—though not to his face—a "black cripple." (The student was on crutches as a result of a foot injury.)

These five incidents seem to us to be cases of racism. Since we are aware, however, that there might be some disagreement over their interpretation, let us explain why we think as we do.

The first professor and the graduate assistant (cases 1 and 2 above) claimed that objective evidence exists which points to the innate inferiority of black people as compared with white. Ten thousand years of human history have put the lie to this sort of nonsense. They provide us with the richest source of data regarding the relative development of human population groups: a scientific experiment on the grandest scale.¹ Every racial and ethnic group has, at some point in history, produced its own complex civilizations. Rates of development have been uneven because of the complicated nature of this evolution. China and Africa, for example, were quite advanced long before Europe. The centers of most developed technology have thus shifted geographically throughout history; but this has nothing to do with innate superiority or inferiority. Indeed, this geographical shift really demonstrates the exact opposite: people cannot be separated into superior and inferior groups on racial or ethnic grounds. No study can validly contradict this conclusion. Note that we are not talking about secondary differences between races, but rather about the distorted use of such differences to justify the conclusion that people can, on these grounds, be separated into superior or inferior groups. Anyone who professionally subscribes to such conclusions, however objective he or she claims to be, is demonstrating a lack of professional fitness and also helping to perpetuate the oppression of a so-called "inferior" race.

The third case, of the professor who made derogatory pronouncements about Cubans, Puerto Ricans, Haitians, and Indians, is a case of implying the innate inferiority of these peoples to white North Americans. The professor's remarks apparently left no room for doubt as to the origins of the reputed habits of these peoples: they were, by implication, a product of these peoples' nature. Note that this is in the same class with the age-old prejudice about the "natural" tendency of Jews to be usurers—a prejudice which is generally regarded as racial, however difficult it might be to define "race" or "Jew."

The fourth case, of the administrator who singled out two black students as disruptors, may not immediately strike everyone as in the same category with the others. He was not, it might be argued, saying or implying that these students were inferior; and after all, it was easier for him to recognize them because of their color. But does this argument really hold up? He recognized them because of their color—and he singled them out as offenders. He neither recognized nor singled out any white demonstrators, even though he was not known for failing to recognize people he knew, and he was well acquainted with at least one of the white students in the room. The very act of singling out and exposing black students to possible punishment in a crowd of offenders in this manner makes the incident a literal case of racist oppression. It does not matter one whit whom he did or did not recognize, or whether he was conscious of the racist nature of the act.

The fifth case, of the library's treatment of the black work-study student, seems to us a clear case of racism. The department head who assigned the student to a very difficult job, failed to make provision for adequate training, and then fired him without notice after a week, was surely demonstrating a lack of professional integrity—and this would have been true whatever the race of the student. But the fact of the student's color, the original assignment of such an unusual task, the "self-fulfilling prophecy" about the student's not "working out," and the failure to inform him of his shortcomings and of ways to overcome them, all suggest prejudice in a literal sense. However motivated, this action reinforced racist notions of black incapacity. Corroboration of this interpretation is afforded by the department head's reference to the student as a "black cripple." As a matter of fact, a higher official in the library who was told about the case said that he was aware that there was some racism in the library, that he was worried about it and did not know what to do about it, but racism was not the only factor in this case.

The higher official's interpretation of this case (note the parallel to the official interpretation of the behavior of the graduate assistant) only shows the extent to which institutional racism was at work. Perhaps the most common form of institutional racism is an official unwillingness to deal with it in particular cases, however the institution might deplore it in general. This is what is wrong with the two substitute motions made in the Senate: "deploring" racism is too easy, it doesn't commit the institution or its members to either seeing it or doing anything about it. In most of the cases we have cited, racism was "deplored" by some administrator or other, but minimized or overlooked in the particular instances where it actually occurred.

1. Contrast this experiment with the various recent studies which profess to demonstrate innate racial differences in intelligence. With individual intelligence, we are dealing with an exceedingly complex trait, whose objective measurement itself is a subject of considerable debate by experts. Moreover, we are dealing with a trait whose underlying neurology is imperfectly understood at best, and whose genetic basis is of staggering complexity. Yet the Jenses of the world profess to demonstrate differences in the collective intelligence of peoples by such studies.

III. Racism and Academic Freedom

In leaving these cases for a discussion of the broader context in which racism is practiced in our society—and to which all "academic" racism is related—let us deal first with one objection which we know is often made to the sort of motion before us. The objection is that in dismissing, publicly chastising, or even investigating a faculty or professional staff member on charges of racism, indeed in taking any action on such charges, the university would be violating his academic freedom.

The argument from academic freedom goes as follows: that a proscription of what a teacher might say in a class is a limitation of his or her freedom to pursue truth as he or she sees it; and such a limitation is fraught with potentially worse consequences to a "free" society than any damage that might be done by the exercise of such freedom. Less extremely put, the argument would admit that there are some things that are not tolerable in a classroom, but these are forms of perversion of the academic process, demonstrating a clear lack of professional integrity. For example, if a professor systematically gave low grades to women because he sincerely believed and publicly preached that they were (what they have traditionally been called by many men) the inferior sex, not many academic libertarians would defend him.

Thus academic freedom does not mean, even to those who would appeal to it in the cases we have listed, total freedom. We feel that racism should be among those things which academic freedom does not and should not protect. World War II should have taught us that racism and genocide are but different aspects of the same phenomenon. The more recent South African experience certainly serves to reinforce this conclusion. Who would have listened for one moment in 1945 to any argument that academic freedom protects the right of an anti-semitic peddler to peddle his wares on a campus? The concentration camps were too fresh in our minds for us to swallow this sort of distorted logic! We would suggest that all that has changed in the intervening years is the cast of characters: the doctrine of East European and Jewish inferiority has been replaced with that of white supremacy; the concentration camps have given way to crumbling, rat-infested tenements; and the Warsaw ghetto to those of Harlem and Brownsville and Watts and North Hartford. Even Hitler's slave labor force has its near equivalent in the modern condemnation of millions of black Americans to chronic unemployment or, at best, the lowest-paying jobs available.

The principle of academic freedom was never intended, as we see it, to protect racism, any more than it was intended to protect physical assault or libel—with which racism has much more in common than it has with free intellectual inquiry.

We must add that we believe any motion on racism should allow for the correction of acts committed by unintentional error, through the vehicle of public discussion and apology. The main purpose of such a motion would then be to expose the evils of racism: not to pillory, but to educate. (Thus dismissal would be reserved for only the most extreme cases.) If public exposure results in a racist's personal shame, better that than the humiliation visited upon the victims of his racism. If the act in question turns out to have been no more than a pedagogical mistake, then there should be no shame in admitting and correcting it. Of course if the charges are false, the accused should be publicly exonerated and the accuser publicly exposed. The By-Laws of this university make elaborate and adequate provision for due process, by which the rights of the individual are carefully protected.

To sum up on the subject of the relationship between racism and academic freedom: we believe the two to be incompatible. We believe that academic freedom ought not to be sullied by being used as a cloak for a base deed. The exposure and, if necessary, punishment of a base deed does not take away academic freedom, for the deed itself—and racism aims at oppressing, not setting free—has already forfeited the legitimate protection of the freedom.

IV. The Roots of Racism

We have just said that racism aims at oppression. Perhaps it would be historically more accurate to say that racism stems from oppression, and that those who manifest it, often not being themselves oppressors, are unaware of the forces behind their conduct. Why, for example, has racism proven to be so difficult to eliminate from our society in spite of the fact that it is generally acknowledged to be immoral and evil? Are there social forces which nurture it? Are there compelling reasons, in addition to those identified with morality, for us to be concerned with its effects? We believe that some discussion of these questions is important for a wider and deeper understanding of the issues involved in a motion on racism. We feel it to be necessary to touch on the historical roots of racism, even though this may be familiar ground to many.

As the Council's motion implies, racism can be boiled down to the assertion that a group of people—usually identified by racial, national, or religious characteristics—is innately inferior to other segments of the population. In our country it has, in its primary and most virulent form, been directed against black people. It does not center around discussion of the real differences between various peoples. It centers, rather, around the exploitation of such differences and the manufacturing of others, so that one group can put down or keep down another. The manufacturing of non-existent differences, as we have indicated, is one of the devices of racist pseudo-science.

It has often been argued that racism owes its continued existence to ignorance. Education and massive appeals for brotherhood would then be the essential requirements to end it. But such appeals have been made for many years, yet racism persists. Indeed, highly educated men such as Arthur Jensen, William Shockley, Richard Herrnstein, and H. J. Eysenck even today attempt to provide a scientific fig-leaf for it.² It is certainly true

2. Arthur Jensen of the University of California at Berkeley wrote in the Harvard Educational Review (Vol. 39, 1969), that it was not an "unreasonable hypothesis" that "genetic factors are strongly implicated in the average Negro-white intelligence difference." The American Anthropological Association, in condemning such research, "specifically repudiate(d) any suggestion that the failure of an educational program could be attributed to genetic differences between large populations, and declared that such "findings" are "not consistent with the facts of psychology, biology, or anthropology." (Resolution adopted,

that our cultural heritage of racist ideas is deeply embedded, and education can help to alter this. But experience warns us that more than education is required. Modern racism is nurtured by social forces other than inherited ideas.

Racism has always been used to rationalize oppression. The special exploitation of a people set apart from others on physical, national, or religious grounds could not be maintained without the justification which it provides. Even the pre-Civil War plantation system had to develop a rationale for its existence. This rationale was, in effect, the assertion that black people were, after all, not really human beings. They were to be regarded as a species of sub-human savage. It was therefore not a crime to exploit their labor. Much the same sort of thinking was used by the Nazis to explain away their use of slave labor.

Of course the slave trade and its associated mining and cotton and tobacco plantation systems were a veritable wind-fall for the owners. Great fortunes were made from it both in America and in Europe. Liverpool, for example, owed most of its growth during this period to the slave trade. Africans were thus used to produce wealth without which Europe's industrial revolution and development would have been long delayed. And Africa, which had experienced sophisticated civilizations until the beginnings of chattel slaving in the fifteenth century, had its own further development and progress interrupted.³ Profound economic need demanded the proliferation of racist ideas, and this need was answered by slaving advocates in many ways—innate inferiority, religious justification, etc.

What about modern America? After the plantation system and formal slavery was ended, it was rapidly replaced by new methods for the systematic special exploitation of the "freed" black people. The slave plantation itself was replaced by the tenant farming and other semi-feudal forms of oppression. In industry, black workers have been kept at the lowest-paying jobs and paid less than white workers for the same work. Billions of dollars in additional profits have accrued to the industrial elite from the additional funds involved in providing inferior services to black communities: poor schools, poor housing, poor sanitation, poor hospitals, and all the rest—not to speak of the human lives ravaged and destroyed. Economics once again demands virulent racism, and an already available cultural heritage has been pressed into service for this purpose. Today racism in America requires (and supports) the pseudo-scientific "evidence" and ideology of inferiority provided by Jensen and the others.

The roots of racism are thus primarily economic and not cultural. That is one reason it is so difficult to eradicate. It is a tool used to further economic oppression. It is obviously the enemy of black Americans. What is often not realized, however, is that it is also the enemy of all but the few wealthiest white people. Racism and the special exploitation of blacks serves to depress the wages and general living conditions of working-class and middle-class Americans—both black and white.

This pattern has become particularly evident during the current period of recession. For example, the burden of unemployment⁴ has fallen most heavily—by a factor of 4 to 6 in the Hartford area, according to the Hartford Courant—on the backs of black and Puerto Rican workers. Their welfare payments are under attack, and those who attack them use subtle or overt racist arguments. In many places they are being forced to "work for their benefits." This must be translated: it actually means "work for peanuts" and in the process replace someone who would demand a living wage for the same job. Black people in this and other ways are pitted against white people for too few jobs. Both suffer when they see each other as enemies, for as long as they do, they cannot come to grips with the real problem. The racism that divides these working people becomes a cause of worsening conditions in our own university community. The ability of university personnel to obtain decent salaries which keep pace with the rising cost of living is directly affected by the success of industrial workers in obtaining such gains for themselves. Indeed the general living conditions of the entire population can be demonstrated to be depressed by racism.

V. The Cultural Manifestations of Racism

The cultural manifestations of racism are both pervasive and insidious, insidious not just for what they individually are, but because they are so much a part of the culture as to be unrecognized by individuals through whom they are manifested. Let us consider, for example, some of the ramifications of the belief which the majority of Americans hold, whether they acknowledge it or not, that the white race is superior to darker races. Once a people hold such a pernicious view, once it has become a part of the fabric of the culture's self-image, it is difficult at best for even the few enlightened individuals who are able to think beyond the limitations imposed on individuals by culture to be free of racist thought and action. Racism, once ingrained in a culture as deeply as it has been in the American culture, becomes the "natural" mode of thinking and being, and once it becomes natural, it becomes true, reinforcing, unquestioned, and unquestionable.

This assumption of superiority on the part of a white majority has ramifications too frightening to behold. We invite anyone to drive through Harlem or through the north end of Hartford on a Sunday afternoon and to observe there especially the children, children who at quite early ages have in many cases been so damaged by racism as to be maimed

Annual Meeting of the AAA, New Orleans, November 1969.) H. J. Eysenck of London University, according to a recent New York Times Book Review advertisement, "answers a qualified but distinct 'yes' to the significant question: race does affect intelligence" and "the reasons are largely genetic." How far removed is this from Hitler's argument about the scientific superiority of Aryan over Jewish physics?

3. Africa probably lost up to one-third of its population to the slave trade—from 40 to 100 million people, depending on whether those lost in raids, in mid-passage, etc., are counted. (B. Davidson, The African Slave Trade. Boston: Little Brown.) And then racists cite African "backwardness" as a justification for their arguments!

4. Richard Herrnstein, in the September 1971 Atlantic Monthly, advances the thesis that unemployment can be related to genetic characteristics.

for life, psychologically if not physically. Anyone with the least capacity for sympathetic imagination will be able to see himself or his own children in that same situation. To deplore that situation is to do nothing; to put forth effort and energy to correct the general situation wherever he happens to be is far more meaningful. The ghetto example of racism may seem from the perspective of Storrs, Connecticut, an extreme case. Let us then look at matters closer to home, to an area in which we are all directly involved: education.

In education racism means that the racist assumptions of the majority regarding racial superiority will be perpetuated in innumerable ways—for example by textbooks which omit or denigrate minority values, by the attitudes of teachers and administrators which teach racism directly and consciously or indirectly by casual dismissal and the consent of silence. It means that the educational establishment, insofar as it does not deal with this question through conscious action, is by omission as racist as the most vociferous bigot. Any institution of the society will be as racist as the society itself unless it puts consciously directed action and energy into an effort to be otherwise. The untold damage to individual personalities will not only be sustained but sanctioned as well by those institutions which do not work toward the elimination of at least that one element of racism, the assumption of white superiority.

In our own community racism is manifested not only in overt acts of abuse and occasional violence, but in omission of responsibility as well. We have not put forth enough effort to teach the evils of racism on all levels of public instruction. We have not considered it important in our public schools and in many sectors of the university to seek out teachers and other personnel of races other than that of the majority, perhaps because we don't think it necessary to the educational development of our children and students. We have not worked aggressively to root out the racism expressed by members of the community functioning as representatives of our institutions. This may be because we feel there is no racism here, or because we seek to protect "academic freedom," which is so easily used as a cloak for racism. In short our thinking about our own community is almost always in terms of the dominant group, and this tends, whether intentionally or not, to be in effect racist. And of course there are individuals in the community who are quite consciously and intentionally racists, but in the interest of "freedom"—which means allowing what doesn't hurt the dominant group—there is no way of dealing with them. These are only a very few of the gross manifestations of racism. The subtle variety would certainly not be grasped by anyone who cannot grasp them.

VI. Conclusion and Recommendation

We at the university, when we consider a motion on racism, are likely to try to seal it off from some of the ramifications touched on in the foregoing discussion. Let us not allow ourselves to do so this time. Let us remember that the university is a part of the community, and the community is a part of the whole society. Let us act on President Babbidge's remarks of two years ago: "We cannot and will not," he said then, "condone damage to person by racial insult, for whatever reason." Racism is violent to people; by tolerating it, we condone it. Millions of lives have been damaged and lost because of its practice, and untold more are oppressed by its perpetuation. It is time the university declared itself against this oppression in active, determined ways.

We realize that no motion on racism can be proof against criticism on technical or verbal grounds. More significantly, no legalism can by itself eliminate racism. Only an honest and vigilant university community can achieve this. At the same time, because we firmly believe that a meaningful and workable motion is not only possible but urgently needed, and because the Council's motion is, in our opinion, not sufficiently detailed, we feel obliged to suggest an alternative. In this spirit, we submit the following substitute motion.

Be it resolved:

1. That, for the purposes of this motion, racism shall be defined as a) the advocacy or support of beliefs or doctrines which state or imply that one race or ethnic group is innately superior or inferior to another, or b) the justification of oppression of a race or ethnic group, or c) acts or statements which clearly reinforce such prejudices.
2. That racism, so defined, is unacceptable, and shall be considered an offense against the university community.
3. That a committee shall be formed to investigate any charges of racism brought against any member of the faculty or professional staff of this university. This committee shall be representative of the various segments of the university community. Charges of racism shall be quickly investigated through public hearings held by this committee. The purpose of this investigation shall be both to determine the validity of the charges and to educate the university public with regard to the nature of racism. The committee shall recommend appropriate action. The range of possible recommendations shall include exoneration, public apology, and other appropriate measures, and shall not exclude dismissal in the most extreme cases. If the committee recommends university action, the recommendation shall be forwarded to the Administration and the Board of Trustees for implementation under due process as provided in the University By-Laws.

The above statement was signed by 90 UConn faculty members.