

**THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS
STEVE HICKS SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK**

Course Number: UGS DD 303 (64255) **Instructor:** Shetal Vohra-Gupta
(she/her)
sgupta@austin.utexas.edu

Unique Number: 62455 **Office:** 3.116D

Semester: Fall 2018 **Office Phone:** 512-232-2701

Meeting Time/Place: Tuesdays and Thursdays **Office Hours:** Tuesdays 1:00pm-2:30pm
11am – 12:30pm **Other times by appointment**
Room GAR 0.128

THE INVISIBLE 80%*: STUDENTS, POLICY, AND ACTION

I. STANDARDIZED COURSE DESCRIPTION

Signature Course Mission:

The Invisible 80% represents students who typically occupy a marginalized identity. This course aims to give them a voice in policy making. Therefore the mission of this course is to familiarize students with current policy debates at the intersection of race, class, gender, nationality, sexuality, and ability. Students will develop the skill set necessary to analyze, deconstruct, and reform policies from the vantage point of marginalized campus populations. Overarchingly, students will take this skill set and employ it as citizens, potential policy makers, activists, and professionals.

* The Invisible 80% refers to all non-White, non-male, students on the University of Texas campus. Please note that as non cis gendered identity and sexuality are not recorded by the university, these factors could not be taken into account. In addition, class status is an estimate.

Course Description:

This course explores the overt and covert representations of race, class, gender, nationality, sexuality, and ability in public policy. The class acquaints students with the process of policy development and the multiple factors that influence its content, implementation, and consequences for some of the most marginalized communities. Through Critical Race Theory, auto-ethnographic methods, and policy research students will engage in policy research and provide recommendations through a non-majority lens. The beauty of this course lies in examining university policies along with social policies to illustrate how policies are accessible to students and with the right analysis, recommendations and revisions can be adopted.

II. STANDARDIZED COURSE OBJECTIVES

At the completion of the course, each student must be able to demonstrate their ability to:

1. Identify and describe current and historical public policies by race, ethnicity, and gender;
2. Critically evaluate the process through which race, ethnicity, and gender issues become integral parts of policy development at the university, local, state, or federal levels.
3. Utilize Critical Race Theory framework as the basis for analyzing the development, content, and outcomes of public policy;
4. Apply various methods [ethnography, descriptive statistics, and group comparisons] for evaluating the different effects of public policy on student life and other marginalized populations,
5. Critically evaluate select policy issues impacting student mental health services, hate incidents on campus, admissions and retention policies, and sexual violence on campus,
6. Develop and present an action plan for participating in and influencing university policy to make visible student voice in university policy

Signature Course Essentials: (Include how they will be applied in the course)

Info Literacy:

This course will require students to utilize the University of Texas Libraries' resources as a means to integrate their burgeoning policy knowledge with information literacy training. Every two weeks students will be introduced to a policy that impacts marginalized students on campus and the critical debates surrounding that policy's implementation and/or termination. Students, with the aid of a one-time scheduled meeting with a library research guide, will explore primary and secondary sources that will contextualize these policies and make them familiar with navigating scholarly resources and historical databases. Further, as millennial activism and news of current events flow through social media outlets, students will access popular sources, and with a second session with a library research guide, initiate their experience with proper citation and referencing of these sources. The culmination of their developing information literacy will be demonstrated in an annotated bibliography that will support a final policy recommendation project.

University GEM:

This course will build in three hidden GEMs of the University. These GEMs highlight the historical and current racial and political discourse at the University and students will experience that information first hand as tours will be set up for students. The GEMs chosen for this course highlight understanding race and policy through several facets: art, scriptures and statues, and recorded historical events. All of these access different senses for students and it importance to explore policy through a racial lens.

First, students will take the *UT Black History Tour*, conducted by Dr. Edmond Gordon, department head of African and African Diaspora studies. This tour reflects on symbols, traditions, and fixtures that tell the story of race within the UT walls and how policies with in and outside of UT impacted student life. As UT is currently working to create an inclusive environment moving away from divisive symbols of the past, students can be integral in this process. Second, the *Warfield Center's African and African American Art* exhibitions grapple with art and policy and the struggle to highlight Black art from a Black political perspective and demonstrates to students how race and policy impact cultural life and the need for institutions like the Warfield Center. Finally, a visit to the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library and Museum will engage the students through pictures, narratives, and recorded phone conversations about the civil

rights era. In our current state of the nation Black America is being attacked and how key players in the time of LBJ led to the passing of Civil Right Act and student will further examine how the Act has improved or hindered racial justice in the United States.

Writing:

- 1) Reflexive/auto-ethnographic papers
- 2) Historical narrative of chosen policy (integrating information literacy tools)
- 3) Critical policy analysis of a chosen policy integrating historical narrative and auto-ethnographic sources
- 4) Critical policy analysis and recommendations of chosen policy to accompany oral presentation

Oral Communication:

Students will select a policy to critically analyze, deconstruct, and potentially reform based on original recommendations supported by ethnographic, reflexive, and quantitative data collected throughout the course. Students may select a policy that was discussed during the course or a separate policy or policy issue that they would like to engage. Students will be restricted to university policy issues and will present their analyses and recommendations to a select group of university administrators that will be invited to attend the course to view these presentations at the end of the semester. Public speaking and oral presentation skills are vital to developing students into professional and successful members of society and this experience will give them confidence and vital feedback from their peers and university administrators.

III. TEACHING METHODS

The intent of the instructor is to stimulate critical thinking, ideas, alternative perspectives, creativity, and sharing of knowledge and skills about current public policy issues. I want each student to increase the knowledge and skills that they bring to the course and learn more about how to write and revise public policy. Where possible I intend to introduce students to evidence based policies that have a history of changing the direction and outcomes of public policies. To reach these goals, a variety of teaching strategies [didactic, interactive, and collaborative] and tools [readings, discussion, news articles, debate] will be considered. The expectation is that in all assignments, participation, presentations, and lectures faculty and students will perform at their highest level - commensurate with quality graduate study, teaching, and scholarship.

IV. REQUIRED TEXT AND MATERIALS

Bown, K. (2009). The policy paradox. *Rattler (Sydney)*, (91), 26.

Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2012). *Critical race theory: An introduction*. NYU Press.

Suggested Texts:

Crenshaw, K. (1995). *Critical race theory: The key writings that formed the movement*. The New Press.

V. COURSE REQUIREMENTS

End of Course Paper/Presentation:

Each student must select a current university policy or court decision that impacts a university

policy which has differential effects by race, ethnicity, or gender characteristics. The policy must have been proposed by a legislative body – state or federal or a university. Based on an in-depth review of the policy or court decision, the work must result in a critical paper. The final paper must examine how the policy effects one or more marginalized student groups. Topics should be selected within the first three weeks of class and discussed with the instructor. A general outline for the major course paper is included. This paper will be broken down over the semester into historical policy analysis, policy content analysis, and policy analysis. **Course Points: 40%**

Students can work individually on a topic of their selection or with a partner or group. Students will present an overview of their completed work in the latter weeks of the course.

Auto-reflexive papers:

Each student must complete 1-2 **auto-reflexive papers** in the course during the semester. Copies of different approaches to the writing of these papers will be discussed in class. **Course Points: 30%**

Course Discussion: Participation in Discussion: Ongoing

Each week the class will examine a specific policy or current policy issue as a means of increasing familiarity with the structure of policies and ability to quickly identify content. Each student must participate in the overall discussion in class of the subject matter. Input should be based on readings, news items, lecture, experience, and theory. Student input should show a progression in quality over the course of the semester. Within a relatively brief period of time each student should be willing to take increasing levels of intellectual risk to challenge established theory, put life experiences in a theoretical frame of reference, place controversial societal issues in a conceptual framework, and identify gaps and holes in theory. **Course Points: 30%**

VI. GRADES

94.0 and Above	A
90.0 to 93.999	A-
87.0 to 89.999	B+
84.0 to 86.999	B
80.0 to 83.999	B-
77.0 to 79.999	C+
74.0 to 76.999	C
70.0 to 73.999	C-
67.0 to 69.999	D+
64.0 to 66.999	D
60.0 to 63.999	D-
Below 60.0	F

VII. CLASS POLICIES

VIII. UNIVERSITY POLICIES

Religious holy days: A student who misses classes or other required activities, including examinations, for the observance of a religious holy day should inform the instructor as far in advance of the absence as possible, so that arrangements can be made to complete an assignment within a reasonable time after the

absence.

Students with Disabilities: Please notify your instructor of any modification/adaptation you may require to accommodate a disability-related need. You will need to provide documentation to the Dean of Student's Office so the most appropriate accommodations can be determined. Specialized services are available on campus through Services for Students with Disabilities (SSB 4.104, 471-6259).

Policy on Scholastic Dishonesty: Students who violate University rules on scholastic dishonesty are subject to disciplinary penalties, including the possibility of failure in the course and/or dismissal from the University. Since such dishonesty harms the individual, all students and the integrity of the University, policies on scholastic dishonesty will be strictly enforced. For further information, please visit the Student Judicial Services web site at <http://deanofstudents.utexas.edu/sjs/>.

Use of E-mail for Official Correspondence to Students: All students should be familiar with the University's official e-mail student notification policy. It is the student's responsibility to keep the University informed as to changes in his or her e-mail address. Students are expected to check e-mail on a frequent and regular basis in order to stay current with University-related communications, recognizing that certain communications may be time-critical. The complete text of this policy and instructions for updating your e-mail address are available at <http://www.utexas.edu/its/policies/emailnotify.html>.

University of Texas Honor Code: "As a student of the University of Texas at Austin, I shall abide by the core values of the University and uphold academic integrity."

IX. COURSE SCHEDULE

Date	Topic	Assignment Due/Example Policy	Readings
8/30	Intro discussion on Race and Policy		Policy Paradox: Introduction chapter
9/4	Education Policy and Race Forced integration and busing policy	Plessy v. Ferguson to Brown v. Board of Education	Chapman*, T. K. (2005). Peddling backwards: Reflections of Plessy and Brown in the Rockford public schools de jure desegregation efforts. <i>Race Ethnicity and Education</i> , 8(1), 29-44
9/6	Education Policy and Race Identity politics	Affirmative action and Fisher case	Plessy v. Ferguson case file,

	GEM: UT Black History Tour		Brown v. Board of Education case file Derrick Bell: Brown vs Board of Education and interest convergence
9/11	Education Policy and Race Admissions policies Internal segregation Guest lecturer: Admissions office	Auto reflexive papers Due	Brunner, B. (2007). Timeline of affirmative action milestones. Retrieved July, 31, 2009 Fisher v. UT case file Harris, Cheryl. I. (1993). Whiteness as property. Harvard Law Review, 1707-1791.
9/13	Education Policy and Race Fisher vs UT	Fisher vs UT	Newkirk II, Vann R. (2017). The Myth of Reverse Racism. The Atlantic, Aug 5, 2017
9/18	Sexual violence on University campuses Criminal codes surrounding rape and assault Reporting of sexual crime statistics	Sexual assault victim's bill of rights; Student's right to know and Campus security act.	Smith, K. (2016). Title IX and sexual violence on college campuses: The need for uniform on-campus reporting, investigation, and disciplinary procedures. St. Louis University Law Review, vol 35(1).
9/20	Sexual violence on University campuses Gender neutral policies Problems with gender neutral policies for cis and transgendered people	https://titleix.utexas.edu/ https://titleix.utexas.edu/relevant-policies/	Perez, Z. and Hussy, H. (2014). A hidden crisis: Including the LGBT community when addressing sexual violence on college campuses. Center for American Progress. http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED564604.pdf

9/25	Sexual violence on University campuses Guest Lecturer: Title IX	Violence against Women Act (VAWA) SaVE act	People of state of California vs Brock Turner
9/27	Policy Analysis and policy analysis frameworks Content analysis	Historical Policy Analysis Due	Rata, E. (2014). The Three Stages of Critical Policy Methodology: an example from curriculum analysis
10/2	Mental Health policy and students MH policies and race on campus Funding for MH services		Chen, J., Romero, G., Carver, M. (2016). The relationship of perceived campus culture to mental health help seeking intentions. Journal of Community Psychology, 63(6), 677-684.
10/4	Mental Health policy and students MH policies and race on campus Funding for MH services		Equity and Policy Methodology Policy Paradox, Stone, Chapter 2
10/9	Financial Aid policies and students 2011-2012 legislation on budget cuts to Pell Grant funds State Funding vs. Private Funding Universal Free Higher Education	Higher Education Act of 1965; Title IX Higher Ed Amendment (1972); Violent Crime and Law Enforcement Act (1994); American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (2009);	Dynarski, S., & Scott-Clayton, J. (2013). Financial aid policy: Lessons from research (No. w18710). National Bureau of Economic Research.

10/11	<p>Financial Aid policies and students</p> <p>2011-2012 legislation on budget cuts to Pell Grant funds</p> <p>State Funding vs. Private Funding</p> <p>Universal Free Higher Education</p>		Policy Paradox, Debora Stone, Welfare, Chapter 4
10/16	Reproductive Health policies and students	<p>Roe v. Wade,</p> <p>Women's health policies on campus</p> <p>10/17</p>	Incentives chapter- Policy Paradox
10/18	<p>Reproductive Health policies and students</p> <p>Film: Park Avenue</p>		Incentives chapter- Policy Paradox
10/23	Reproductive Health policies and students	Whole women's health vs Hellerstedt	<p>Laws Effecting Reproductive Health and Rights: Guttmacher Inst. Link</p> <p>Article: State of the Union Address Health Disparities and Reproductive Health</p>
10/25	Policy Analysis and policy analysis frameworks	Policy Content analysis due	<p>David L. Weimer (2012): The Universal and the Particular in Policy Analysis and Training, Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice, 14:1, 1-8</p> <p>Moodie-Dyer, A. (</p>
10/30	Free speech and Hate speech polices and campus	UT Bias and Hate Incident Policy	Hate Crime Legislation Article-Krouse

			Liberty Chapter -Policy Paradox Kerska, G. (2017). Balancing First Amendment Rights with an Inclusive Environment on Public University Campuses
11/1	Free Speech and Hate crime policy and campus Gun policy Guest speaker: Office of the President		https://news.utexas.edu/2017/08/31/more-universities-need-anti-hate-policies The Campus Culture Wars: Katy Stienmetz
11/6	Gun policy at universities Film: Tower		
11/8	DACA		Powers chapter: Policy Paradox
11/13	Hazing Policy and vulnerable student populations		Powers chapter: Policy Paradox
11/15	Policy Analysis Frameworks: Critical Race		Critical Race Theory as Theoretical Framework and Analysis Tool for Population Health Research
11/20	Policy Analysis Frameworks: Intersectional	Policy Analysis Paper Due	An Intersectionality-Based Policy Analysis Framework
11/22	Thanksgiving		
11/27	Oral presentations		

11/29	Oral presentations		
12/4	Oral presentations	Final paper and presentations due	
12/6	Oral presentations		

X. BIBLIOGRAPHY

<http://academic.udayton.edu/vernelliarandal/>
<http://thomas.loc.gov/home/thomas.php>
<http://www.law.cornell.edu/search/index.html>
http://statelaws.findlaw.com/texas-law/?DCMP=GOO-LAW_General-StatesPhrase&HBX_PK=Texas+Constitution
<http://www.legis.state.tx.us/billlookup/billnumber.aspx>
 Legislation (previous laws):
<http://thomas.loc.gov/home/bdquery.html>
 Executive Office of the President: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/www.govtrack.us/congress/bills>
<http://www.senate.gov/>
<http://www.house.gov/>
<http://www.loc.gov/law/help/guide/federal.php>
 Legislation(copies of historical laws):
<http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/help/constRedir.html>
http://racism.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=306:aspi0201&catid=64:asian-and-pacific-americans&Itemid=235

I. Examples of Policies

Americans with Disabilities Act
Affordable Care Act
Breast Cancer Treatment Act
Chinese Exclusion Act 1870
Civil Rights Act of 1964
 Death Penalty
Defense of Marriage Act
 Don't Ask Don't Tell
Dream Act
 Equal Rights Act
 Execution of Mentally Disabled
Fair Labor Standards Act 1938
Fairness in Drug Sentencing Act
Fetal Life Act 2013 – Texas
Fugitive Slave Act
 Genetic Information Disclosure Act 2008
Hyde Amendment on Abortion
Immigration Reform Act
Indian Child Welfare Act
Indian Removal Act
Japanese Internment Executive Order
Lilly Ledbetter Act
Matthew Shepherd Act
McKinney Homeless Assistance Act
 McKinney Housing Act
Minimum Sentencing Act
National Labor Relations Act 1935
Native American Health Act
Naturalization Act 1790
New Mexico Abortion in Rape Act
Parity Act
 Public Housing Act
 Racial Integrity Act – Virginia
 Stand Your Ground - Florida
 Stop and Frisk – New York City
TANF
TANF Drug Testing [Texas]
 Title IV E – Sports Equality
Truman's Executive Order on Desegregation
The Trust Act
 Unemployment Insurance
Violence Against Women Act
Voting Rights Act 1965
Women in the Armed Services Act
 Women's' Right to Vote 1922 – Constitutional Amendment

VII. Important Court Cases

Plessy v Ferguson
Brown v Board of Ed
Minor v. Happersett
US v. Wong Kim Ark
US v. Brignoni-Ponce
Loving v Virginia
Buck v. Bell
Shelby v. Holder
National Federation v. Sebelius
Floyd v. City of New York
Citizens United
United States v. Windsor
Ledbetter v. Goodyear

