

**Report of the Faculty Framework Task Force
on Race Studies at Stanford**

**Submitted to Provost Persis Drell and the School of Humanities and Sciences Dean Debra Satz July 15,
2021.**

Report of the Faculty Framework Task Force¹ for Race Studies at Stanford University to Provost Persis Drell and Humanities and Sciences Dean Debra Satz

July 15, 2021

Introduction

Since the nation’s founding, race has served as a fundamental organizing principle for the structure of American society. There is no facet of life, from the moment of birth to the day of death, that is not affected by how one’s racial identity is perceived and responded to. Racial ascriptions influence where people live, the education they receive, the work they do, the health they experience, and the years they live. Racial and ethnic identities in the U.S. have conditions of life tied to them. And these conditions are part of the context in which they live their lives.

Stanford University has a longstanding history with communities of color and other marginalized people dating to its earliest origins. The wealth that built the University was created from the labor of Chinese and Irish immigrants. The land where the University is located is the ancestral territory of the Muwekma Ohlone people. The University’s sandstone campus was constructed by immigrant Italian artisans. Later, it bore silent witness to the racial segregation that created the communities of Palo Alto and East Palo Alto, White and Black, separate and unequal.

In the shadow of this history, Stanford University has a responsibility to help address racial inequities in our society, bring historically marginalized communities to the foreground, and prepare its students for leadership in a diverse, multi-cultural world. Furthermore, it has the capacity to advance a greater appreciation of the nuances associated with race and ethnicity, and promote an appreciation of cultural differences globally and domestically. Through IDEAL, and the racial justice initiatives announced in the summer of 2020, we hope to address inequities in our own community and increase the racial diversity of our faculty, as well as the number of scholars focused on race and ethnicity in our society—thereby advancing scholarship about race and ethnicity.

These ambitions draw on another long but more recent tradition at Stanford. The Civil Rights movement of over fifty years ago spurred calls for racial justice and equal opportunity in society that forever changed the nation and its institutions, including its colleges and universities. In the 1960s, institutions of higher education, including Stanford, responded, in part, by admitting more ethnically and racially diverse student bodies, and by establishing ethnic studies programs and departments. In 1969, Stanford, in response to calls from its own students, faculty and community members, established the Program in African and African American Studies, the first of its kind among private universities. Some twenty-five years later, again in response to student and faculty concerns, Stanford established the Center for Comparative Studies in Race and Ethnicity (CCSRE). This Center greatly expanded ethnic studies curriculum at Stanford, and its Research Institute provided new and highly generative opportunities for faculty and graduate student research and intellectual exchange. As the first teaching and research center in higher education to emphasize comparative ethnic studies, CCSRE became the model for a “second generation” of ethnic studies programs. Since its inception, it has served as the prototype for similar centers on many campuses across the nation.

¹ A listing of Task Force members along with brief biographical descriptions appear in Appendix 1 of this report.

The Faculty Framework Task Force for Race Studies believes Stanford University is again poised to make a significant expansion of its curricular and research footprint in ethnic and race studies—an expansion that aspires to again lead higher education in seeking solutions to our nation’s most pressing racial and ethnic justice challenges while advancing a greater appreciation of the unique history, art and culture of different racial and ethnic communities. The Task Force also believes that the study of race and ethnicity should take a global perspective on this subject—issues connected with race and ethnicity occur everywhere in the world.

A first step in taking up this challenge is to look critically at how we are institutionally organized to support teaching and research in these areas. As noted, we have a number of strong resources including African and African-American Studies (AAAS), the Center for Comparative Studies in Race and Ethnicity (CCSRE), the Martin Luther King, Jr. Institute, the Program in Human Rights, African Studies, the Institute for Diversity in the Arts, and a new Racial Justice Center in the Law School. But are these resources optimally structured, adequately resourced and effectively organized in relation to each other? And if not, what structures, resources and organization would best foster Stanford’s leadership in these areas? The work of this Task Force is to explore whether there are better ways of supporting our current strengths, while building a bigger research footprint, a stronger teaching program, and more robust programs of community outreach.

Task Force Charge

Provost Drell and Dean Satz asked the Task Force to consider the organization of scholarly activities related to race and ethnicity on campus, and specifically, whether our program in AAAS should be put on a path to departmentalization. They posed the charge in four questions:

1. What structures would best serve to realize our research, teaching and outreach ambitions? How might you articulate with more specificity this set of goals, given that we cannot do everything? And what do these more specifically articulated goals imply for the best form of organization here at Stanford? For example would there be an institute, a new department or set of departments, an enhanced set of IDPs with faculty billets, or something else entirely? In deliberating about this, we urge the committee to think broadly and boldly and not simply reach for easy answers. We are especially interested in your thoughts of how Stanford might be distinctive, drawing on the fact that we have in addition to a top H&S, a set of leading professional schools? How might, for example, the Engineering and Medical school be better integrated with this effort, casting perhaps a uniquely Stanford approach to these issues?

Given the variety of possible arrangements, we ask you to generate a list of several compelling candidate structures with the benefits and costs that attach to each way of organizing ourselves. It would be helpful for the committee to look at what others have done, what has worked well, and what has not. We urge you to be ambitious in thinking how Stanford, as the institution it is, can make a distinctive contribution.

2. In laying out the various organizational options, we would like you to also think through how the multiple units involved in a larger structure would be related to one another, and how these units would be related to departments in H&S as well as to other schools and Institutes across the University.
3. To anchor your thinking, we would like you to consider what structures would be best if only marginally greater resources than we have at present were available; what structures would be

best with a moderate addition of resources (say at the \$25-75M level) and what structures would be best with a very significant influx of resources (\$100M and above).

4. In your consideration of alternatives, please consider the possible departmentalization of AAAS and how that would fit into the overall frameworks that you are proposing. Specifically, we ask you to consider:
 - a. What are the advantages and potential drawbacks of departmentalization?
 - b. How would a departmentalized AAAS relate to the Center for African Studies? To CCSRE?
 - c. What would be the intellectual focus of a new AAAS department and how would its appointments best be structured?

The Task Force carried out its work in three phases that were not entirely distinct. The first was an educational phase when the Task Force sought to learn about the organizational options that might be possible at Stanford. This phase was also an opportunity to hear from key stakeholders in this area. Center and program directors, as well as other faculty leaders were invited to meet with the Task Force and share their views. Time constraints and scheduling problems meant it was impossible to speak with every stakeholder involved in scholarship about race and ethnicity. However, the Task Force met with a very broad swath of the University community and included student groups in these conversations.

The second phase was a series of deliberative discussions that overlapped with some of the later stakeholder meetings. These discussions first dealt with whether AAAS should be made a department. After several conversations, the Task Force concluded that departmentalization of AAAS should be endorsed in principle, and a subcommittee of the Task Force should be appointed to devise a departmentalization plan. A recommendation to this effect was drafted and sent to Provost Drell and Dean Satz February 22, 2021.² They agreed to accept the recommendation and it was announced to the University community on February 22, 2021. Subsequent deliberative discussions considered the remaining questions posed in the charge. These discussions culminated in two lengthy three-hour meetings (April 22 and 23, 2021). These were followed by a shorter meeting to review the findings and recommendations that emerged from the earlier meetings.

The last phase of the Task Force's work involved the preparation and review of this report. The final report has been fully vetted by members of the Task Force. The last working meeting of the Task Force was devoted to suggestions for revisions. A semifinal draft was circulated by email to Task Force members soliciting their approval or further revisions. Although the Task Force was not polled, this report is submitted with a virtual if not complete consensus about its findings, conclusions, and recommendations. There is no dissent to report about any of these subjects.

Organizational Options

The status quo for the organization of race studies at Stanford is a number of different programs or centers located mainly in the School of Humanities (H&S), but others also in the School of Law (SLS) and the Graduate School of Education (GSE). The connections between these programs and centers is vague and diffuse, with few shared resources and little coordination among them. Some of these programs have a low profile in the University and are largely unknown outside of the University. Others are well known in higher education but with less public-facing presence than they might aspire to. An

² This recommendation appears in Appendix 2 at the end of this report.

underlying desire behind this work is an arrangement of these programs and centers that would elevate their presence in the University, make them better known in higher education, and make Stanford's commitment to racial justice yet another endeavor that adds to its distinction. The Task Force considered a variety of organizational structures that might achieve this goal. Keeping with the charge, the Task Force deliberations considered options that could be achieved with limited resources, a middle range of resources, and a substantial investment. From this perspective, the Task Force discussed at length frameworks that involved what might be described as an administrative confederation, an institute, and a school of race studies.

An administrative confederation would simply provide a hub and spokes to those centers and programs already in existence. We anticipate that this model would achieve several desirable outcomes. One is that it would yield some modest administrative efficiencies by centralizing and coordinating a single administrative staff to serve these units. Another is that it might facilitate communication and coordination among these units, limiting scheduling conflicts of events and other activities that might be drawing on the same audiences. It might also facilitate a sense of community among faculty and students on campus with these interests. However, two observations are relevant. One is that it will do little to elevate the visibility of these centers and programs. Will it make the whole greater than the sum of its parts? The Task Force was more than a little skeptical about this. And second, it isn't clear that these centers and programs would join this confederation. Most likely, some would join, others would not. And since the success of this effort depends on participation of the units, the Task Force was relatively unenthusiastic about this approach as the best use of whatever new resources become available for race studies at Stanford.

The Task Force was considerably more enthusiastic about the options that might be possible with abundant resources. In particular, on numerous occasions the Task Force discussed what a school of race studies might look like. Different meanings of the term "school" were considered. When it was formed in 1996, the Center for Comparative Studies in Race and Ethnicity was considered a second generation of ethnic studies. In the years since, many colleges and universities have adopted a similar approach, some even using the same name for their programs. Bringing together the centers and programs devoted to the study of race and ethnicity on campus, and the distinctive work they do, might well produce an intellectual framework that could be characterized as a "Stanford school of ethnic studies", a third generation of ethnic studies, one that takes even fuller advantage of the resources in Medicine, Engineering, and Law than has been the case with CCSRE.

As part of this discussion, the Task Force also discussed the idea of a formal School for Race Studies at Stanford. This school would join the other seven existing schools with its own dean, departments, programs and research centers. The school would enjoy the same autonomy as the other schools at the University. It would oversee faculty hiring, tenure and promotion, offer degrees and graduate training. Many of the Task Force members found the idea of a separate school appealing, and for some it was the preferred approach to be recommended to the Provost and Dean. One justification being that it might enable a more coherent organization of the relevant centers and programs. Nonetheless, there was agreement that this would not be an easy or feasible way forward in even the moderately distant future. The challenge of marshaling needed financial resources and support from various quarters of the University seemed formidable, if not insurmountable at this point in time. Nonetheless, members of the Task Force felt strongly that this option be discussed in the report as a useful record for future generations of Stanford faculty who might be in a better position to consider this idea.

A third usage of the term “school” likened it to a program that might have the organizational characteristics of Stanford’s D-School in the School of Engineering. The D-School has established itself as a premier venue for innovative approaches to design and engineering that can be deployed across a wide range of tasks and problems. However, it is important to note that the D-School is administered as an institute within the university. This raises the third option for organizational structure, an institute, which is the option most strongly endorsed by the Task Force.

Thus the Task Force strongly endorses the objective of developing a Stanford Institute on Race, Ethnicity and Society (as a working title). In terms of the sizing suggested in the Task Force charge, this Institute could be launched at the low end of the budget spectrum, \$25-\$75 million. However, if \$100 million or more could be raised, it would put the new institute on a scale similar to the Woods Institute for the Environment or the Freeman-Spogli Institute for International Studies—making it not only the first Institute of its kind in higher education, but also the most powerful and impactful such enterprise in the nation. The next section outlines the Task Force’s recommendations for the new institute.

Task Force Recommendations for a Stanford Institute on Race, Ethnicity and Society

I. Conceptual and Definitional Issues

- A. **Mission.** A new Stanford Institute for the study of race and ethnicity and their effects in society, will aim to foster practical and policy solutions to racial and ethnic inequality and conflict in the U.S. and societies throughout the world. These solutions will be informed by social science, natural science and humanistic understandings of race and ethnicity that are rooted in historical, cultural, social and ethical analyses. The Institute will take an interdisciplinary approach to developing innovative solutions and leadership in pursuit of racial and ethnic justice and inclusion.
- B. **Guiding Themes.** The focus of the Institute will be on bettering human well-being, achieving social justice, and fostering greater participation in and a sense of membership in society by previously disenfranchised racial and ethnic groups. It will advance an appreciation of racial and ethnic diversity as a global phenomenon.
- C. Examples of **topical foci**:
 - a. Disparities and inequalities in such areas as criminal justice, education, health and health care, housing, property ownership, wealth, and labor.
 - b. Aspects of society in which full membership of racial and ethnic minorities is under threat, such as in voting rights, policing, immigration policy and the reemergence of white supremacist movements.
 - c. Representations of racial and ethnic minorities in all forms of cultural discourse, including narrative and mass media.
 - d. Representation of racial and ethnic minorities in institutional leadership in the U.S. and other nations.
 - e. The role of race and ethnicity in market failures such as in housing, education, and labor, as well as remedial strategies.
 - f. Racial and ethnic fairness in the development of societal infrastructure.
 - g. The role of race and ethnicity in the diffusion of innovation and technology.
 - h. Global indigeneity.

II. Institute Structures

- A. **Existing Centers and Programs for Research and Teaching.** The core of the new Institute will be a constellation of research and scholarly centers focused on topics that implement the mission of the Institute. Some centers already on campus are dedicated to one or another aspect of the new Institute's mission. All or some of these centers may want to find a home within the structure of the new institute.
- a. **Program in African and African-American Studies.** This interdepartmental program was established in 1968 coinciding with the establishment of African American studies at other universities across the nation. It offers a major and minor in AAAS. In recent years, members of the University community have expressed a desire to have the program elevated to the status of a department. A recommendation from the Task Force endorsing this action appears at the end of this report. If the program is converted to a department, it would not have a direct connection to the Institute.
 - b. **Center for African Studies (CAS).** The Center was established in 1965 as an interdisciplinary program intended to promote research and teaching about the nations of the continent. It offers an undergraduate major and minor, and a certificate for graduate study. Perhaps more than other area studies, scholarship in this field resonates well with themes in ethnic studies programs at Stanford and around the nation, especially its focus on decolonization and social justice.
 - c. **Center for Comparative Studies in Race and Ethnicity (CCSRE).** CCSRE was established in 1996 as an inter-departmental undergraduate program with a Research Institute of Comparative Studies in Race and Ethnicity that promoted intellectual exchange and research by faculty and graduate students. It offers majors and minors in Asian-American Studies, Chicano and Latinx Studies, Comparative Studies, Jewish Studies, and Native American Studies. It also houses several research programs and a fellowship program for graduate students. Professor Paula Moya (English) will become the Center's faculty director on September 1, 2021. Professor Moya has expressed an interest in exploring the departmentalization of this program.
 - d. **Faculty Development Initiative (FDI).** The Faculty Development Initiative was launched in 2007 as an effort to increase the numbers of faculty whose scholarship involved the study of race and ethnicity. Faculty appointed through the FDI are closely aligned with CCSRE. Since its inception, it has brought 24 faculty to Stanford. All but three are still with the University. The FDI has worked with departments and schools across the University to recruit these faculty. Their appointment requires them to teach courses that can be cross-listed in the curriculums of the AAAS or CCSRE programs. In the event that these programs become departments, the current structure of the FDI will no longer be workable. However, the FDI program might be repurposed to hire faculty in departments and schools across the University who would have part of their appointment in the Institute as senior fellows.

- e. **Institute for Diversity in the Arts (IDA).** The IDA program was established in 2000 to accomplish several objectives. One was to showcase the work of artists from marginalized communities by bringing to Stanford artists from these communities. Another objective was to expose Stanford undergraduates to this work and give them opportunities to learn and work with these artists. IDA supports the visual and the performing arts in a variety of different programs.
- f. **IDEAL Provostial Fellows (IPF).** The fellows program is a new initiative that was launched in the fall of 2020. It seeks to recruit scholars who have received their Ph.D. within the last three years and whose work focuses on subjects related to race and ethnicity. As currently planned, a cohort of five fellows will be selected each year and once the program is fully staffed, there will be 15 fellows in residence in departments and schools around the University. The institute might usefully serve as a hub for bringing these fellows together on a regular basis.
- g. **The Martin Luther King Jr. Research and Education Institute (MLK).** The MLK Institute was founded in 1985 when Dr. King's widow Coretta invited Stanford historian Clayborn Carson to curate and publish her late husband's papers. Twenty years later, in 2005, the Institute received two gifts that make up its core endowment. The MLK Institute has focused on two projects. One is the curation and publication of Dr. King's papers. The other is a broad research and education mission designed to further the social justice goals that Dr. King articulated and embraced in the later years of his life. The Institute has supported a broad range of projects connected with this mission. Notably, the founding director, Dr. Carson has recently retired. However, the University is actively recruiting a new director who should be able to advance the King Institute's work.
- h. **Race, Inequality, and Language in Education (RILE).** The RILE program is housed within the Graduate School of Education (GSE). It consists of several components. It is primarily a program for training graduate students for a doctoral degree in the GSE. However, it also hosts an annual conference and a speaker series. As a doctoral training program there is no reason to envision it elsewhere. However, the Institute might be a valuable resource for this program. It would provide research opportunities for its graduate students. And it would provide logistical support for its conference and speaker series.
- i. **Stanford Center for Racial Justice (SCRJ).** This center is a recently launched initiative in the Stanford Law School under the leadership of Professor Ralph Richard Banks and Associate Dean Diane Chin. The ambitions of this center are described in the following terms, "The goals of the Center are to promote and achieve legal and policy changes that expand equity and opportunity for Black people and other people of color and deepen understanding of the impact of legal developments on communities historically under represented or locked out of participation in key institutions of our nation." Needless to say, the goals of this center are entirely consonant with the goals of the proposed institute.

- B. **Possible New Centers and Programs for Research and Teaching.** There are also several research and policy focused research programs on campus that while not presently formal centers, might well be interested in becoming centers within the new Institute—thereby promoting the formation of a new intellectual community of researchers and scholars. These include:
- a. **SPARQ**, a center involving mostly social psychologists—although not exclusively so—focused on **problem-solving research in real-world settings and in collaboration with practitioners**. The research of Jennifer Eberhardt with the Oakland Police Department would be a good example of a SPARQ project.
 - b. There are several units in the School of Medicine that could engage issues related to race, ethnicity and health, ranging from health disparities to health care delivery. A center of **epidemiological research** in the Medical School focused, in large part, on the role of race in health outcomes and access to quality health care. The Department of Epidemiology and the Center for Population Health are relatively new units in the School of Medicine. They are potentially important partners for training students and for developing a research program devoted to advancing the science of race and health. Likewise, there are faculty in the Pediatrics department who have a keen interest in race and ethnicity and a new Department of Health Policy (opening September 2021) is certain to attract faculty with interests connected to race and ethnicity.
 - c. A center in the GSE focused on, among other things, tracking **racial and income-level achievement gaps in American schools**. This research program, headed by Sean Reardon, has an unprecedented data set that includes scholastic test scores for nearly every child in American public schools. The possible synergies between this research on race and class achievement gaps and epidemiological research on race differences in health outcomes would open new vistas in understanding and remedying profoundly important racial inequalities in our society.
 - d. A number of faculty research programs in both the Psychology Department and the GSE focus on **developing scalable interventions that reduce racial and class achievement gaps**. These are all centers that would benefit greatly from shared infrastructure and proximity to each other in this Institute.
 - e. In 2011, approval from then Dean of the School of Humanities and Sciences was granted to a group of faculty and staff, along with former trustee Rick West, to raise funds to establish a “Center for Native American Excellence”. The Center would focus on Native American Studies and the plan included two endowed chairs and six endowed fellowships along with support for academic programming. It was originally anticipated that several Native American tribes with successful gaming operations might provide philanthropic support for the Center. While support for this unit has not yet materialized, discussions continue to take place with tribal leaders.
 - f. To ensure a strong and active presence of humanities faculty, some Task Force members have suggested a residential faculty fellows program focused on race akin

to the faculty fellows program of the Stanford Humanities Center. A similar program existed in the early years of CCSRE and it helped create a vibrant community of scholars that augmented Stanford faculty with a small number of visiting faculty from other institutions.

- g. The Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences (CASBS) intends to build capacity for residential fellowships focused on race and diversity. It is also launching a summer institute on diversity. These projects represent an opportunity for the proposed institute to explore collaborative work with a storied institution that has supported social science research for nearly seventy years.

C. Additional Institute Components

- a. **Thematic Programing.** The Institute should also have the capacity to focus research and scholarship on important, emerging issues in race, ethnicity and their impact in society. This could be accomplished through RFP (request for proposal) and seed grant programs that would give the Institute the capacity to nimbly respond to emerging issues in this area.
- b. **Convening Programs.** The Institute should also have the **capacity to convene researchers and scholars around topics of relevance to race, ethnicity and their impact in society.** These topics could be approached from humanistic studies (e.g., historical and cultural analyses), from social science research (e.g., quantitative and qualitative studies of educational and wealth inequalities) as well as from medical and epidemiological research (e.g., studies of health disparities and doctor-patient relationships). **Some of these efforts might congeal into longer lasting assemblages or “schools” of scholars and researchers** that would have national and international strategies for developing approaches (practical and theoretical) in this area.
- c. **Senior Fellows.** The Institute would also have the capacity to award Senior Fellowships to enable at least two kinds of appointments. The first would be full-time appointments of highly qualified researchers and scholars who could make significant contributions to the priorities of the Institute, but who might not be a high priority as departmental hires. These fellows would be consequential for the Institute’s capacity to build critical mass focused on the topics of the Institute’s agenda. The second would be half-time senior fellow appointments—both long-term and episodic—of Stanford faculty connected to one or another of the Institute’s research and scholarly foci. As these half-time senior fellowships will provide faculty with more time to pursue their research and writing projects, they will be a strong incentive to Stanford faculty to invest time in the work of the Institute.
- d. **Student support.** The institute should actively promote the engagement and participation of Stanford undergraduate and graduate students in the Institute’s work. For undergraduates, a fund to support honors thesis research and promote educational programs such as guest speakers and internships would be invaluable for advancing undergraduate interests in scholarship about race and ethnicity. For

this effort, the Institute might collaborate with the office of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education (VPUE). For graduate students, small grants for dissertation research and fellowship support are critical for producing the next generation of scholars and scientists studying race and ethnicity. The Vice Provost for Graduate Education (VPGE) awards several fellowships to students nominated by the Center for Comparative Studies in Race and Ethnicity. The Institute might play a similar role and cooperate with the VPGE in development activities to increase the number of these fellowships.

- e. **Summer Programming.** The institute can provide programming in the summer break months that can be directed at several different audiences. For undergraduates, this programming might be modeled on other summer programs like Honors College or Sophomore College. The institute will have great potential to reach hundreds of undergraduates every summer who are interested in diversity leadership training. Programs open to audiences outside of Stanford would extend the institute's reach and influence, to the benefit of the University. For example, undergraduate programs for rising seniors might help attract and recruit exceptional graduate and professional students. Other programs for professional and lay audiences would burnish the University's reputation for its leading role in the study of race and ethnicity and like executive education programs, serve as a potential revenue stream for the institute.
- f. **Advisory Board.** From both the standpoint of getting advice and guidance, and from the standpoint of developing relationships with potential donors, the Institute should, as quickly as possible, **establish an Advisory Board, some members of which might come from the IDEAL Kitchen Cabinet that the Provost has assembled and who have been such an important resource to the Framework Task Force.**

IV. Versions of the Institute at Different Funding Levels

The Task Force's charge requested that it consider three different models for organizing scholarship about race and ethnicity, at high, medium, and low levels of funding. These scenarios were described earlier in this document. For the sake of completeness, three similar scenarios are presented below for an institute.

- A. **Modest increase in funding (\$10 to 15M range).** A modest increase in the funds currently available for Stanford's programs and centers on race and ethnicity would not only strengthen these programs but also begin to lay a foundation for a future Institute on Race, Ethnicity, and Society. Currently, many of these programs are understaffed and lack the faculty to teach even the core classes. The IDEAL cluster hire initiative in 2020-21 has successfully recruited a handful of faculty to the University but more are urgently needed to support the departmentalization of AAAS and possible departmentalization of CCSRE. Faculty hired into these programs would overlap with the leadership of a future Institute and would be actively involved in bridging an Institute with undergraduate and graduate opportunities and programming.
- B. **Significant increase in funding (\$25 to \$50M range).** This level of funding would enable the start-up of an Institute on Race, Ethnicity and Society of the sort described above.

- C. **Substantial increase in funding (\$100M range). This level of funding would support an Institute as described above, which would include robust and scholarly centers with the capacity to develop and sustain innovative research.** It would be able to hire senior fellows; offer incentives to enable strong faculty involvement; offer support for the programmatic involvement of both graduate and undergraduate students; enable a capacity for outside engagement with communities of practitioners; enable a communications function with the ability to connect to local and national policy issues. Greater funding will greatly increase the rate of growth and impact of these elements, and thus the visibility and influence of the Institute nationally and internationally. It would more definitively signal the emergence of Stanford University as a leader in research and scholarship on race, and establish Stanford's distinctive approach; that of science and scholarship based approaches to addressing real-world challenges of race and ethnicity in society.

V. **Projected Sources of Revenue.**

The categories of revenue for an Institute on Race, Ethnicity and Society would likely be roughly the same as those for other comparably sized institutes on Stanford's campus. These would include: gifts, payout from whatever endowment is raised, revenues from the grants and contracts of its centers, some percentage of overhead from those grants and contracts to be negotiated with the university (perhaps more in early years and tapering off as the Institute's revenues become more stable), possible Foundation support to endowment, direct program support from foundations and donors, and general support from the university, especially early in the Institute's development.

Early institutional investment might take a number of different forms. Cluster hires would be an essential effort to bring dedicated faculty into the institute. One likely approach would involve appointing faculty as half-time senior fellows. With a reduced teaching load, these senior fellows would be expected to conduct research that advances the institute's mission as well as provide leadership for the institute. Some sort of convening space for faculty and students involved with the institute is another essential investment that the University should support. In the current environment, limited available office space, and constraints imposed by Santa Clara County may require a number of interim arrangements before a long-term solution can be found. Nonetheless, it is incumbent on University leadership to set in motion a plan for a long-term location for the institute. Third, seed funds for pilot research projects will be a valuable tool for incentivizing faculty participation in the institute. In some case, these funds might support projects involving one or a few faculty. In other instances, they might be used to support a larger network of faculty involved in overlapping research projects. Fourth, some sort of initial funding will be essential to jump-start the institute. There will be a litany of administrative and related expenses connected to opening the institute and bringing together the various centers, programs, and individuals to be housed within it.

We anticipate philanthropic interest in the Institute, and an ability to attract private gifts through the Office of Development to endow such needs as the Institute directorship and Senior Fellows positions, support of Institute programming, and to the foundational endowment. A more comprehensive feasibility study will need to be done to be more specific about the extent to which philanthropy can play a significant role in our vision.

A Final Task Force Recommendation: The Establishment of a Committee to Explore the Departmentalization of CCSRE

Late in the work of the Task Force, the incoming Director of CCSRE, Paula Moya, brought to the attention of the Task Force the idea of establishing a committee to explore the departmentalization of CCSRE. A subcommittee of the Task Force composed of people with the most extensive involvement in CCSRE and other undergraduate programs was brought together to consider this proposal. From that discussion, several reasons to endorse this recommendation were developed:

1. CCSRE has been and will be in the future a crucial component of race and ethnicity studies at Stanford University. It is what makes Stanford unique in the landscape of race and ethnicity studies in higher education, and what distinguishes us from peer institutions such as Princeton, Yale, Harvard, and Columbia. Faculty, students, and researchers associated with CCSRE have, over the past 25 years, made foundational contributions to the study of race and ethnicity—they have produced important knowledge that is comparative across racial groups and also that focuses on specific ethno-racial groups (especially LatinX, Asian American, and Native American).
2. The intellectual argument for the comparative study of race and ethnicity is compelling. Comparative study across groups and across disciplines allows for the investigation of an ever-shifting social dynamic rather than the examination of one or more fixed categories of people. It illuminates how race and ethnicity are social dynamics involving *all* participants in a society like ours for which race and ethnicity are foundational organizing principles—regardless of which ethno-racial group any one person might be associated with. Comparative study enables us to understand race and ethnicity as historical formations, and to explain the emergence and disappearance of different racial categories across time. Indeed, studying race in globally and temporally expansive ways helps us to see how race as a system of social distinction creates us, separates us, and especially how it influences the distribution of goods and resources (of all kinds) according to how different individuals are perceived racially in any given situation.
3. Conversations about departmentalizing CCSRE have circulated in gatherings of CCSRE-affiliated faculty for at least the past fifteen years. The possibility of departmentalizing CCSRE was also implicit in many Task Force discussions and was discussed at the two meetings in April.
4. A compelling case for the departmentalization of any scholarly unit can only be built on the foundation of strong faculty support for, and investment in, the effort. An important function of the proposed exploratory committee would be to assess the strength of faculty interest in such an effort. The proposed committee would also work in close collaboration with the AAAS departmentalization committee—to enhance synergies between these two branches of race studies. Research and teaching at Stanford as a whole would benefit from the mutual strengthening of these two branches of race studies on campus. The faculty such a department would attract—and enable the appointment of—would also be an essential resource in the development of the proposed Race, Ethnicity and Society Institute.

5. The Task Force, in its educational phase, became aware of the small budgets allocated to the various ethnic studies program within CCSRE, and the partial consequence of finding it difficult to secure sufficient faculty participation. Thus, regardless of any decision about departmentalizing CCSRE, the Task Force encourages the university to reassess this situation and make more adequate resources available to these degree-granting programs. Part of the impetus for considering departmentalization of CCSRE is the need to address this resource problem. The hope is that should departmentalization occur, it would secure CCSRE's curricular obligations, enable the hiring of faculty whose first commitment would be the needs of a CCSRE department (as well as link the department to the proposed Race, Ethnicity and Society Institute), secure a stable administrative structure especially with regard to student needs, and increase the visibility of the unit on campus and beyond.

A department of AAAS and one of CCSRE would make a powerful statement about Stanford's commitment to the full spectrum of teaching and research about race and ethnicity that would set us apart from and even beyond all of our competitors.

6. While there has not yet arisen an equivalent of the Black Lives Matter movement for Indigenous, LatinX and Asian American groups, there is an increasing societal urgency to address the inequities these groups face, as well as a growing student demand for courses and faculty with expertise in these areas.

For all of these reasons, the Task Force for Race Studies at Stanford University recommends the establishment of a committee charged with exploring the possibility of departmentalizing CCSRE. This recommendation helps to meet the Task Force charge from the Provost and Dean to think "broadly and boldly" about what university structures would best facilitate the research, teaching, and outreach ambitions of scholars of race and justice at Stanford.

Next Steps

- A. **Establishing an Implementation Committee.** The first step would be the appointment of an Implementation Committee of campus faculty interested in, and committed to realizing a Stanford Institute on Race, Ethnicity and Society. The charge for that committee would be to develop such things as **a)** a more detailed design of the Institute (for example, its programmatic components such as how it would include students and community outreach, its governance framework, its staffing, incentive systems for encouraging faculty and student involvement, etc.), **b)** a phased plan for standing up the Institute, **c)** a budget for each phase of development, **d)** a strategy for acquiring the funding needed to implement each phase of the Institute's development, and **e)** a plan for fitting the Institute into a physical space on campus. The proposed Implementation Committee should also be charged with exploration of how an institute and departments of AAAS and CSRE, should they come to fruition, might serve as foundations for a possible future School of Race and Ethnic Studies.
- B. An early task of this working committee would be to develop **a procedure by which directors of the already standing Stanford Centers and Institutes focused on race and ethnicity (e.g., IDA, SRJC, MLK papers, the Research Institute of CCSRE) would begin to**

explore their possible involvement with a new, overarching Institute. Our sense is that this may be a complex decision for some or all of these campus units—in light of their having already established roles and functions on campus, distinct constituencies of faculty and students, varied funding models, and varied attachment to functioning as independent centers. In these discussions, perhaps the chief aim of the working committee is to explore how inclusion in the Institute might enable these units to better coordinate with each other—how their whole might exceed their sum of the parts. We are optimistic that the inclusion of at least some of these centers in the overarching Institute would be beneficial to the centers, the new Institute and the community of faculty and students at Stanford focused on these issues. And we would expect these advantages to become even clearer with time.

Appendix 1

Task Force Membership

Alyce Adams is the inaugural Stanford Medicine Innovation Professor and Professor of Epidemiology and Population Health and of Medicine (Primary Care and Outcomes Research), as well as the Associate Director for Health Equity and Community Engagement in the Stanford Cancer Institute. Focusing on racial and socioeconomic disparities in chronic disease treatment outcomes, Dr. Adams' interdisciplinary research seeks to evaluate the impact of changes in drug coverage policy on access to essential medications, understand the drivers of disparities in treatment adherence among insured populations, and test strategies for maximizing the benefits of treatment outcomes while minimizing harms through informed decision-making.

Michael Bernstein is an Associate Professor of Computer Science and STMicroelectronics Faculty Scholar at Stanford University, where he is a member of the Human-Computer Interaction group. His research focuses on the design of social computing and crowdsourcing systems. Michael has received eight best paper awards at premier computing venues, and he has been recognized with an NSF CAREER award and an Alfred P. Sloan Fellowship. His Ph.D. students have gone on both to industry (e.g., Adobe Research, Facebook Data Science, entrepreneurship) and faculty careers (e.g., Carnegie Mellon, UC Berkeley). Michael holds a bachelor's degree in Symbolic Systems from Stanford University, as well as a master's degree and a Ph.D. in Computer Science from MIT.

Albert Camarillo is the Leon Sloss Jr. Memorial Professor/Haas Centennial Professor in Public Service and Professor of American History, Emeritus. He was appointed in the Department of History in 1975. He is widely regarded as one of the founders of the field of Mexican American history and Chicano studies. He has published seven books and dozens of articles on the history of Mexican Americans and other communities of color in the nation's cities. In 2007 he was appointed as Special Assistant to the Provost for Faculty Diversity, directing the Faculty Development Initiative, a faculty recruitment and hiring program in collaboration with the Center for Comparative Studies in Race and Ethnicity (CCSRE). He is the founding director of CCSRE (1996-2002), the founding director of the Stanford Center for Chicano Research (1980-85), and the founding executive director of the Inter-University Program in Latino Research (1985-88). He also served as Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies in the School of Humanities and Sciences from 1990 to 1992. He is past president of the Organization of American Historians and American Historical Association-Pacific Coast Branch.

Jennifer Eberhardt is the Morris M. Doyle Centennial Professor in the Department of Psychology and Professor, by courtesy of Law. She is a social psychologist who investigates the consequences of the psychological association between race and crime. Through interdisciplinary collaborations and a wide ranging array of methods—from laboratory studies to novel field experiments—Eberhardt has revealed the startling, and often dispiriting, extent to which racial imagery and judgments suffuse our culture and society, and in particular shape actions and outcomes within the domain of criminal justice. She is an elected member of the

National Academy of Science and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Among her numerous awards, in 2014 she was the recipient of a MacArthur Fellowship.

Richard Ford is the George E. Osborne Professor of Law. He is an expert on civil rights and antidiscrimination law, Richard Thompson Ford (BA '88) has distinguished himself as an insightful voice and compelling writer on questions of race and multiculturalism. His scholarship combines social criticism and legal analysis and he writes for both popular readers and for academic and legal specialists. His work has focused on the social and legal conflicts surrounding claims of discrimination, on the causes and effects of racial segregation, and on the use of territorial boundaries as instruments of social regulation. Methodologically, his work is at the intersection of critical theory and the law. Before joining the Stanford Law School faculty in 1994, Professor Ford was a Reginald F. Lewis Fellow at Harvard Law School, a litigation associate with Morrison & Foerster, and a housing policy consultant for the City of Cambridge, Massachusetts. He has also been a Commissioner of the San Francisco Housing Authority. He has written for the *Washington Post*, *San Francisco Chronicle*, *Christian Science Monitor* and for *Slate*, where he is a regular contributor. His latest books are *Universal Rights Down to Earth* and *Rights Gone Wrong: How Law Corrupts the Struggle for Equality*.

Kathryn Gin Lum is an Associate Professor in the Department of Religious Studies. She specializes in American religious history. Her research and teaching interests focus on religion and race, religion and violence, and the afterlife, evil, and death in America. She is the author of the *Damned Nation: Hell in America from the Revolution to Reconstruction* (Oxford University Press). She was an Annenberg Faculty Fellow (2012-14), is affiliated with the Center for Comparative Studies in Race and Ethnicity (CCSRE), and organizes the American Religions Workshop at Stanford. Gin Lum received her B.A. from Stanford and her Ph.D. from Yale.

Allyson Hobbs is an Associate Professor of United States History, the Director of African and African American Studies, and the Kleinheinz Family University Fellow in Undergraduate Education. She graduated magna cum laude from Harvard University and she received a Ph.D. with distinction from the University of Chicago. She has received fellowships from the Ford Foundation, the Michelle R. Clayman Institute for Gender Research, and the Center for the Comparative Study of Race and Ethnicity at Stanford. Allyson teaches courses on American identity, African American history, African American women's history, and twentieth century American history. She has won numerous teaching awards including the Phi Beta Kappa Teaching Prize, the Graves Award in the Humanities, and the St. Clair Drake Teaching Award. She gave a TEDx talk at Stanford, she has appeared on C-Span, MSNBC, National Public Radio, and her work has been featured on *cnn.com*, *slate.com*, and in the *Los Angeles Times*, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, the *Christian Science Monitor*, and the *New York Times*.

Tomás Jiménez is Professor of Sociology and the Director of the Undergraduate Program on Urban Studies. His research and writing focus on immigration, assimilation, social mobility, and ethnic and racial identity. His latest book, *The Other Side of Assimilation: How Immigrants are Changing American Life* (University of California Press, 2017), uses interviews from a race and class spectrum of Silicon Valley residents to show how a relational form of assimilation changes

both newcomers (immigrants and their children) and established individuals (people born in the US to US-born parents). His first book, *Replenished Ethnicity: Mexican Americans, Immigration, and Identity* (University of California Press, 2010), draws on interviews and participant observation to understand how uninterrupted Mexican immigration influences the ethnic identity of later-generation Mexican Americans. The American Sociological Association's Sociology of Latinos/as Section selected the book for its Distinguished Book Award. Professor Jiménez has also published his research in *Science*, *American Sociological Review*, *American Journal of Sociology*, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *Social Problems*, *International Migration Review*, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *Social Science Quarterly*, *DuBois Review*, *Social Currents*, and the *Annual Review of Sociology*.

David D. Laitin is the James T. Watkins IV and Elise V. Watkins Professor of Political Science. Over his career, as a student of comparative politics, he has conducted field research in Somalia, Yorubaland (Nigeria), Catalonia (Spain), Estonia, and France, all the time focusing on issues of language and religion, and how these cultural phenomena link nation to state. In collaboration with James Fearon, he has published several papers on ethnicity, ethnic cooperation, the sources of civil war, and on policies that work to settle civil wars. After publishing a book on Muslim integration into France, David co-founded Stanford's Immigration Policy Lab, and has co-authored several papers that estimate the effects of policy on immigrant integration. David played a leading role in a major initiative to internationalize Stanford's faculty and curriculum. He is an elected member of the National Academy of Sciences.

Margaret Levi is the Sara Miller McCune Director of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences (CASBS) and a Professor of Political Science. She is the 2019 recipient of the Johan Skytte Prize. She was president of the American Political Science Association and is a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, the American Philosophical Society, and the National Academy of Sciences. She was a John Simon Guggenheim Fellow. Her books include: *Of Rule and Revenue*; *Consent, Dissent, and Patriotism*; *Analytic Narratives*; *Cooperation without Trust?*; and *In the Interest of Others*. She is general coeditor of the *Annual Review of Political Science* and an editor of *Cambridge Studies in Comparative Politics* and of *PNAS*. Her research is on the conditions that evoke citizen compliance, trust, and the willingness to act in the interest of others.

Brian Lowery is a Professor of Organizational Behavior and a social psychologist by training. At the Graduate School of Business, he is currently driving an initiative to shape enlightened and purposeful leaders for a diverse society, and in so doing, to define the meaning and nature of leadership itself. He oversees the Leadership Fellows Program for second-year MBAs and teaches introductory organizational behavior courses for both master's and doctorate level students. Professor Lowery's research has two major threads. The first thread examines the operation of racial attitudes below the threshold of consciousness. The second thread, which he pursues through the work of the Lowery Lab, focuses on how people perceive inequality. Underlying both lines of work is the assumption that individuals may unintentionally exacerbate existing inequity, despite supporting the ideal of a just and fair society.

Jenny S. Martinez is the Richard E. Lang Professor of Law and Dean of Stanford Law School and the law school's 14th dean. Professor Martinez is a leading expert on international law and constitutional law, including comparative constitutional law. She is the author of *The Slave Trade and the Origins of International Human Rights Law* (Oxford University Press, 2012) and numerous articles in leading academic journals. She teaches courses on constitutional law, civil procedure, international law, and international business transactions. She is a Senior Fellow (by courtesy) of Stanford's Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies and a faculty affiliate of Stanford's Center on International Security and Cooperation and Stanford's Center on Democracy Development and the Rule of Law. An experienced litigator, she has worked on numerous cases involving international law and constitutional law issues.

Paula Moya is the Danily C. and Laura Louise Bell Professor of the Humanities in the Department of English and Professor, by courtesy, of Iberian and Latin American Cultures. She is the author of *The Social Imperative: Race, Close Reading, and Contemporary Literary Criticism* (Stanford UP 2016) and *Learning From Experience: Minority Identities, Multicultural Struggles* (UC Press 2002). She has co-edited three collections of original essays including *Doing Race: 21 Essays for the 21st Century* (W.W. Norton, Inc. 2010), *Identity Politics Reconsidered* (Palgrave 2006) and *Reclaiming Identity: Realist Theory and the Predicament of Postmodernism* (UC Press 2000). Her teaching and research focus on twentieth-century and early twenty-first century literary studies, feminist theory, critical theory, narrative theory, American cultural studies, interdisciplinary approaches to race and ethnicity, and Chicano/a and U.S. Latina/o studies.

Ato Quayson is the Jean G. and Morris M. Professor of Interdisciplinary Studies in the Department of English at Stanford, which he joined in the fall of 2019. He was founding director of the Centre for Diaspora and Transnational Studies at the University of Toronto (2005-2017) and has also taught in the Faculty of English at the University of Cambridge (1995-2005), where he was also director of the Centre for African Studies there, and at NYU (2017-2019). His areas of interest include African Literature, Postcolonial Studies, Disability Studies, Urban Studies, and Fashion Studies, among various others. He is the author of 6 monographs and 8 edited collections. His latest monograph, titled *Tragedy and Postcolonial Literature*, is being published by Cambridge University Press in January, 2021. Quayson is Fellow of the Ghana Academy of Arts and Sciences, the Royal Society of Canada, and of the British Academy.

Vaughn Rasberry is an Associate Professor in the Department of English, the department's Director of Undergraduate Studies, and the Director of Academic Programs in the Center for Comparative Studies in Race and Ethnicity. He studies African American literature, global Cold War culture, the European Enlightenment and its critics, postcolonial theory, and philosophical theories of modernity. As a Fulbright scholar in 2008-09, he taught in the American Studies department at the Humboldt University Berlin and lectured on African American literature throughout Germany. His current book project, *Race and the Totalitarian Century*, questions the notion that desegregation prompted African American writers and activists to acquiesce in the normative claims of postwar liberalism. Challenging accounts that portray black cultural workers in various postures of reaction to larger forces--namely U.S. liberalism or Soviet communism--his project argues instead that many writers were involved in a complex national

and global dialogue with totalitarianism, the defining geopolitical discourse of the twentieth century.

Jonathan Rosa is an Associate Professor in the Graduate School of Education and by courtesy, an Associate Professor in the Department of Anthropology, the Department of Linguistics, and the Department of Comparative Literature. He is a sociocultural and linguistic anthropologist, whose research theorizes the co-naturalization of language and race as a key feature of modern governance. Specifically, he analyzes the interplay between youth socialization, raciolinguistic formations, and structural inequity in urban contexts. Dr. Rosa collaborates with local communities to track these phenomena and develop tools for understanding and eradicating the forms of disparity to which they correspond. This community-based approach to research, teaching, and service reflects a vision of scholarship as a platform for imagining and enacting more just societies. In addition to his formal scholarly research, Dr. Rosa is an ongoing participant in public intellectual projects focused on race, education, language, (im)migration, and U.S. Latinxs.

C. Matthew Snipp (Co-Chair) is the Burnet C. and Mildred Finley Wohlford Professor of Humanities and Sciences in the Department of Sociology at Stanford University. He is also the Director for the Institute for Research in the Social Science's Secure Data Center and formerly directed Stanford's Center for the Comparative Study of Race and Ethnicity (CCSRE). His current research and writing deals with the methodology of racial measurement, changes in the social and economic well-being of American ethnic minorities, and American Indian education. For nearly ten years, he served as an appointed member of the Census Bureau's Racial and Ethnic Advisory Committee. He also has been involved with several advisory working groups evaluating the 2000 census, three National Academy of Science panels focused on the 2010 and 2020 censuses, and a new panel to evaluate the quality of the 2020 census. He is currently a trustee of the Institute of American Indian Art in Santa Fe, NM.

Claude M. Steele (Co-Chair) is the I. James Quillen Endowed Dean, Emeritus at the Stanford Graduate School of Education, and Lucie Stern Professor in the Social Sciences, Emeritus in the Department of Psychology. He is a social psychologist best known for his work on stereotype threat and its application to minority student academic performance. His earlier work dealt with research on the self (e.g., self-image, self-affirmation) as well as the role of self-regulation in addictive behaviors. In 2010, he released his book, *Whistling Vivaldi and Other Clues to How Stereotypes Affect Us*, summarizing years of research on stereotype threat and the underperformance of minority students in higher education. He also has served as the Director of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford, and Provost for Columbia University and the University of California—Berkeley.

Patrice Sweeney joined Stanford's Office of Development in 2019 as the Director of Diversity and Next Generation Giving. As the leader of this program, she is building a foundation to support the next generation of higher education philanthropists. Patrice has worked in higher education development for the past 25 years, serving in leadership roles for more than a decade. At the University of California's flagship campus, she built Berkeley's affinity-based

development program to broaden outreach to diverse alumni communities. She served as lead strategist and fundraiser for the campus' African American Initiative, a \$20-million fundraising campaign to increase the representation of, and improve campus climate for, African American undergraduates. At Stanford, Patrice holds a leadership role in the university's IDEAL (Inclusion, Diversity, Equity and Access in a Learning environment) and racial justice fundraising initiatives.

Sylvia Yanagisako is the Edward Clark Crossett Professor of Humanistic Studies and Professor in the Department of Anthropology. Her research and publications have focused on the cultural processes through which kinship, gender, capitalism, and labor have been forged in Italy and the U.S. She has also written about the orthodox configuration of the discipline of anthropology in the U.S. and considered alternatives to it. Professor Yanagisako has served as Chair of the Department of Anthropology at Stanford, and Chair of the Program in Feminist Studies at Stanford. She received the Dean's Award for Distinguished Teaching in 1992

Appendix 2

February 22, 2021

Framework Task Force on Race Studies Recommendation 1.0

Black Studies, or its cognate African and African-American Studies, has since the late 1960s developed into a field focused on the study of the history, culture, politics of Black people in the United States and also worldwide. Black Studies have become a core vision for many universities, including at Harvard, Columbia, Berkeley, Princeton, Yale and many others. These have in their turn produced many world-renowned scholars that have contributed to a wide variety of research topics well beyond Black Studies itself, such as in urban management, environmental awareness, public health, the philosophy of leadership, and many other areas of interest in American and world society. Having been established in 1968, the AAAS program at Stanford is proud to have also contributed to Black Studies at the university and in the US more generally.

The Provost's and the dean of H&S's charge to the Framework Task Force on Race Studies (FTFRS) outlined four major tasks assigned to this group. The fourth task requested the FTFRS to render an assessment of the following matter: "In your consideration of alternatives, please consider the possible departmentalization of AAAS and how that would fit into the overall frameworks that you are proposing." Pursuant to the Provost's and dean's fourth charge, the FTFRS makes the following recommendation:

As a committee, the FTFRS is in the midst of a substantial re-imagining of how Stanford recognizes and organizes Black studies, along with other efforts devoted to scholarship about race and ethnicity. As part of that re-imagining, we support in principle the departmentalization of AAAS. However, how to structure and organize that department is tightly tied to broader and more sweeping questions about the organization of race studies at Stanford. We recommend in principle the departmentalization of African and African-American Studies, and suggest that a subcommittee should be formed to develop the details.

As a part of this recommendation, we endorse the following measures:

- 1.1 The subcommittee should first determine the intellectual scope of the proposed department. Other universities have often formed AAAS departments focused primarily in the humanities. The subcommittee should consider whether this strategy is likely to lead to a department known for its scholarly excellence at Stanford. Further, the consideration of scope should include the possible role of the social sciences in the new department and the contributions that might be made by scholars of Africa to a department of AAAS. A related detail is the name to be assigned to the new department. A critical decision for the subcommittee is whether the new department will be designated a department of African and African-American Studies or adopt the nascent nomenclature of Black Studies.

- 1.2 Subcommittee composition: The subcommittee should consist of members of the FTFRS and as well as additional at-large faculty members to be appointed by the Provost and the dean of H&S. Student representatives, one graduate and one undergraduate nominated by Task Force faculty should be appointed to the subcommittee. A representative of the subcommittee should report regularly to the Task Force about the subcommittee's deliberations. The subcommittee also should stay abreast of the activities connected with the Race in America cluster hire.
- 1.3 The subcommittee should develop a comprehensive plan for a curriculum in a department of African and African-American Studies. This plan should identify foundational courses that must be included in a departmental curriculum along with elective offerings that would support the foundational courses. The curriculum should be one dedicated to excellence in teaching and research; one that will quickly gain an international reputation for excellence in scholarship.
- 1.4 In the context of the aforementioned curriculum, the subcommittee should conduct a detailed assessment of the faculty that would be required to establish a department of African and African-American Studies noted for its excellence. This should include the number of current Academic Council faculty willing to relocate their appointment to a department of AAAS, the number of current Academic Council faculty willing to have a joint appointment in AAAS, and the number of Academic Council faculty that must be hired. Faculty willing to assume department leadership also should be identified. The subcommittee should address the use of lecturers in the department, the numbers likely necessary to support the curriculum, and the subjects that they might teach. Furthermore, the subcommittee should consult with prospective faculty for the department about the incentives that make an appointment in the new department more appealing.
- 1.5 The subcommittee should consider additional administrative matters such as the physical location of the department, administrative staff support, and other details required for the establishment of a department of African and African-American Studies.
- 1.6 The subcommittee should develop a detailed timeline for the likely implementation of departmentalizing African and African-American Studies.

Appendix 3

Task Force Meeting Dates

1. October 28, 2020
2. November 18, 2020
3. December 2, 2020
4. December 9, 2020
5. January 6, 2021
6. January 14, 2021
7. January 28, 2021
8. February 4, 2021
9. February 11, 2021
10. February 18, 2021
11. March 5, 2021
12. March 12, 2021
13. March 16, 2021
14. March 18, 2021 (fireside chat)*
15. March 22, 2021
16. March 25, 2021 (fireside chat)*
17. March 26, 2021 (fireside chat)*
18. March 30, 2021
19. April 8, 2021
20. April 15, 2021
21. April 22, 2021 (working group, part 1)**
22. April 23, 2021 (working group, part 2)**
23. May 6, 2021
24. June 30, 2021

* “Fireside Chats” were smaller meetings with stakeholders held when it was not possible to schedule a meeting with a full complement of the Task Force present. This was usually done to accommodate the scheduling needs of the stakeholders.

**Three hour working meetings that produced most of the recommendations contained in this report.