“By Any Means We Deem Necessary” – An Exposé on Racial Discourse, University Power, and Student Resistance in the 1994 Ethnic Studies Movement at the University of Colorado at Boulder

By: Mateo Manuel Vela

Honors Thesis

Department of Ethnic Studies

Thesis Advisor:

Dr. Enrique Sepúlveda, Ethnic Studies

Defense Committee:

Dr. Jessica Ordaz, Ethnic Studies

Dr. Emmanuel David, Women and Gender Studies

April 4th, 2022

University of Colorado at Boulder

Table of Contents

Abstract

In 2018, a community sculpture was installed at the University of Colorado, Boulder (CU-B) to commemorate the lives of 6 Chicano activists and CU students—Neva Romero, Reyes Martinez, Una Jaakola, Heriberto Teran, Francisco Dougherty, and Francisco Granados—who were killed in 2 separate car bombings in 1974 during the Colorado Chicano movement. After falling into oblivion, in recent years, popular discourse on Chicanx activism at CU-B has mostly centered around this period. Similarly, there has been limited attention to more recent student protests for Ethnic Studies at CU-B which culminated in a 6-day hunger strike at CU-B in April 1994. This movement was organized by a multiracial student coalition named the Alliance, and led to the establishment of an Ethnic Studies Department at CU-B. This honors thesis, written from the position of a Latinx student organizer and CU-B Ethnic Studies major, joins the league of few academic works illuminating this prominent event in BIPoC (Black, Indigenous, and people of color) student history at CU-B. Drawing from interviews with student activists, faculty, and administrators who directly participated in or observed the 1994 protests—as well as from archival research—this honors thesis applies critical social movements theory, critical race theory, and organizational theory to investigate the construction of a student social movement and the unique socio-historical and institutional context in which it occurred to illustrate how student activists and their University allies successfully organized for systemic change. This work concludes with a discussion on the implications of this historical event for contemporary BIPoC student movements at the University of Colorado, Boulder, and at higher education institutions more broadly.

Acknowledgements

First, I thank my thesis advisers and committee members. Thank you to Professor emeritus Joanne Belknap, with whom I began discussing and planning this project in her Theories and Methods class in Spring of Junior year 2021. Your encouragement and mentorship allowed me to take this project to heights I never imagined. Thank you to Dr. Sepúlveda for providing me with ongoing encouragement and feedback throughout this process, and for being a trusted mentor and friend. Thank you to Dr. Ordaz and Dr. David, for agreeing to be a part of my defense committee.

I also sincerely thank and acknowledge the archivists at the Norlin Library, Megan Friedel and Ashlyn Velte, for their assistance in pulling archival documents and newspapers for me even through the COVID-19 pandemic, and through my semester abroad in Mexico. These documents were integral to forming my background knowledge on CU-B's 1994 Ethnic Studies movement, and will be integral to continued study of this social movement at the University by future scholars.

I sincerely thank my study participants, without whom this thesis would not have been possible. Thank you to Marta Loachamin, Tim Russo, Dr. Evelyn Hu-DeHart, Dr. Albert Ramirez, and Dr. Polly McLean. I appreciate each of you for your openness to sharing your perspectives and life experiences with me, and I have gained so much as an organizer, academic, and person from our engagements.

Finally, I thank UMAS y MEChA, the student organization that I have had the pleasure of nurturing and being nourished by for my four years at CU-B. I have seen this organization through the good and bad, through student protests, and through a global pandemic, and we have come out better on the other side. I cannot wait to see what you all will accomplish. I thank my

fellow student organizer and spoken word poet, Ruth Woldemichael, who has provided me with valuable emotional support and friendship in our time at CU-B. This thesis is for you all; for all past, current, and future BIPoC student organizers at CU-B, *y por todxs quienes luchan por la justicia.*

Chapter One: Statement of the Problem and Theoretical Perspectives

Introduction

Much academic discourse regarding Chicanx history and student movements at CU Boulder (CU-B)[1] has been fairly recent, and has primarily focused on the 1974 United Mexican American Students' (UMAS) protests, which were organized in opposition to educational inequity, alleged systemic racism, and administrative repression of the growing UMAS Equal Opportunity Program (EOP). These protests culminated in the death of six CU alumni and Chicanx activists, known collectively as *Los Seis de Boulder* or "the Boulder Six," in two mysterious car bombings. Nobody was ever indicted for the deaths of Los Seis, and redacted law enforcement reports of the incidents were only made available for public record and research by the University in 2021 (University Libraries-University of Colorado Boulder, 2022). To date, Facio (2010) has examined the 1974 UMAS protests from a critical Chicana feminist lens, and Friedel & Baetz (2022) have written a case study about the collaboration between CU-B archivists and Baetz herself as the lead artist and facilitator on the contemporary Los Seis Community Sculpture Project. One of the most prolific works to date recounting the 1974 UMAS EOP protests and the history of Los Seis includes *Symbols of Resistance: A Tribute to the Martyrs of the Chican@ Movement*, which is a historical documentary (Marks, 2017) utilized by community organizers and educators throughout Colorado to teach new generations about Los Seis and the 1974 UMAS EOP. As a result of these histories, distrust between the Chicanx community and the University has resulted in a persistent lack of historical records and scholarship on the Chicanx community at CU-B, as noted by CU Head of Rare and Distinctive Archives Megan Friedel (Pasquale, 2020). These historical tensions have contributed to the

[1] The terms "CU-B" and "University" will be used throughout the thesis to stand for University of Colorado at Boulder.

persisting lack of scholarship on this subject and broader CU-B BIPoC (Black, Indigenous, and people of color) student movements as well.

While academic works on Chicanx histories at CU-B have remained sparse up until recently, several archival sources and community-generated cultural and artistic works have kept the historical memory of Los Seis and the 1974 UMAS protests alive in Colorado, and throughout the Southwest U.S. These works include, but are not limited to, the independent UMAS newspaper *El Diario de la Gente* & the modern Digital El Diario project ("Digital El Diario," 2020), the *Neva Romero: Jamás Olvidados!* biographical documentary (Esquibel, 2017), the CU Aquetza Summer Youth Leadership Program inspired by the 1974 UMAS EOP program (Aquetza Academic Summer Program, 2022), and—as mentioned previously—a participatory public sculpture for Los Seis de Boulder created by CU alumni artist Jasmine Baetz (Friedel & Baetz, 2022). Recent attention by local news media in Boulder has also played an integral role in increasing the general awareness of this erased history as a result of the project (Langford, 2020; Langford 2019). This renewed attention is evident in recent University initiatives to highlight BIPoC histories at CU-B, including the establishment of the Boulder History Project (BHP) by current Chancellor Philip DiStefano. The BHP aims to tell the racialized histories of CU-B from an intersectional lens (University of Colorado Boulder, 2022). In Fall 2021, the CU Norlin Archives held a symposium titled "Los Seis, Race, and Historical Memory," which sought to put the Los Seis bombings in broader academic discourse (University Libraries-University of Colorado Boulder, 2022). These University efforts to preserve histories at CU-B's campus should be commended, while recognizing that there is still more work to be done to mend relationships between CU-B and BIPoC communities, and to combating systemic racism embedded in the policies and academic cultures of the University.

Like the 1974 protests, little academic attention has been paid to another profound movement in BIPoC histories at CU-B: the 1994 Ethnic Studies protests at the CU-B campus, which led to the establishment of the Ethnic Studies Department at the University. This lack of scholarship persists despite consistent local press coverage at the time of their occurrences, by multiple local and national news outlets including *the Colorado Daily, the Boulder Daily Camera, the Stanford Daily,* and more. Furthermore, the 1994 Ethnic Studies movement was co-led by the UMAS y MEChA (Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlán) student organizations along with the newly-formed SCAEP (Student Coalition for the Advancement of Ethnic Plurality) student group under the banner of *La Alianza,* or "the Alliance." Collectively, the Alliance demanded the establishment of an Ethnic Studies department at CU-B, and the protested alleged racial discrimination of a Chicano professor during his tenure review at the University (Roberts, 2013; Reynolds, 1994). Following a series of rallies, marches, sit-ins, and demonstrations, these protests culminated in a 6-day hunger strike, and ended when former CU System President Judith Albino signed the "Declaration of Diversity," acceding to protestor demands (Reynolds, 1994). Despite the fact that both these student movements were decades ago, recent headlines charging racism and a lack of inclusive practices at CU-B abound in local media, citing issues as varied as tenure denial by University administrators to a former Chicana professor in the School of Engineering (Langford, 2020), University unresponsiveness to demands for the recognition of Chicanx history at CU-B (Lysik, 2020), and a racially alienating and hostile environment at CU-B for Black students (*Out Front!* Magazine, 2019). Although the organizational, economic, and political conditions of the University have changed since 1994, some practices remain sorely unchanged. This thesis partially hopes to inspire critical self reflection on the role of the CU-B Ethnic Studies Department as student activists first conceived

of it. This thesis also serves as a call to action for current Ethnic Studies faculty and scholars across the University to critically re-examine and interpret this historical event in BIPoC CU-B history, and within the context of broader Ethnic Studies social movements.

My study will join another CU-B student honors thesis written on this subject (Roberts, 2013), and contributes to growing scholarship that illuminates hidden Chicanx and BIPoC histories at CU-B, as well as the histories and imperatives of Ethnic Studies departments (Yang, 2000; Hu-Dehart, 1993; Gutierrez, 1994). Roberts' thesis provided an analysis grounded in archival and interview methods that demonstrated the impact of identity politics on multiracial Alliance-building and organizing between students during the 1994 protests (2013). Like Roberts' study, my study will include the voices of former CU faculty and students, and my study will also expand the subject pool to include former University administrators as participants, given their unique institutional positions and insights. My study will also feature the perspectives of prominent activists not included in Roberts' study. My archival research will also include original content analysis of a 1994 April press packet assembled by the Alliance, which was generously donated by a study participant.

This honors thesis applies critical social movements theory, critical race theory, and organizational theory to investigate the construction of a student social movement and the unique socio-historical and institutional context in which it occurred to illustrate how student activists and their university allies successfully organized for systemic change. Recent studies on student protests in higher education have called for a deeper focus on the political and ideological factors which shape student movements over simply organizational factors (Museus & Sifuentez, 2021; Rhoads & Liu, 2009), and an examination of the broad cultural, political, and economic effects of neoliberalism on student social movements at colleges

& universities throughout time (Ferguson, 2017; Rhoads & Liu, 2009). Finally, my study supplements these critical theoretical frames with organizational theory (OT) to better understand the relationship between identity and university power during the 1994 protests, both across social identities (race, gender, sexuality, etc.) and university position (students, faculty, staff, and administrators), and to examine how the protests impacted study participants personally, professionally, and more. I conclude with a discussion on the implications of my findings for current and future CU-B BIPoC student activists in particular, and for BIPoC student movements in higher education more broadly.

Theoretical Perspectives

I draw from critical race theory (CRT) in my thesis. CRT is a multidisciplinary school of thought in which activists and scholars assert the role of race and racism in shaping social outcomes within U.S society, and "[engage] in studying and transforming the relationship among race, racism, and power" (2013, p. 3). The study also seeks to understand how race and social identities affected participants of the 1994 social movement, and endeavors to provide insight for BIPoC student organizers and their university allies on how to effectively organize for systemic change. My thesis also applies critical theories of intersectionality in my analysis. Intersectionality describes "the examination of race, sex, class, national origin, and sexual orientation and how their combination plays out in various settings" (Delgado & Stefancic, 2013, p. 58). I utilize an intersectional lens in my study to articulate how participants' social identities, university position, and political power interacted during the protests, and how these factors impacted participant perspectives regarding these events. Finally, I draw from critical theories on counternarratives to accurately explain the cultural significance of the 1994 Ethnic Studies protests at CU-B in my analysis.

This thesis is also grounded in social movement theory with an emphasis on structural and social-constructivist paradigms. Broadly defined, social movement theory (SMT) is a school of thought that examines the causes, forms, and outcomes of social movements, and their political, cultural, and social consequences on a given society (Klandermans & Skelenburg, 2009). Within SMT, social movement organizations (SMOs) refer to both formal and informal groups which participate in collective action for or against social change. Under the umbrella of structural theories in SMT, I make use of political process theory, which contends that aspects external to SMOs and instead within their political and institutional environment create fluctuating political "openings" or opportunities for social change to occur (Klandermans & Skelenburg, 2009). This theory was most applicable to my case study, as I am examining the success of a student movement which occurred during a period of great socio-political flux for CU-B in its institutional history. The political process of advocating for the student demands occurred in a shifting political and economic structure of the university in the mid-1990s, and under the influence of other macrostructural processes with which student activists and faculty, staff, and administrators had to contend in order to get their demands met. In recognition of these external forces, I account for political and economic forces in my analysis of the CU-B Ethnic Studies movement.

Attention must also be paid to the affective elements which shape social movements, especially in the case of BIPoC student movements. To this end, I also utilize social-constructivist theory in SMT, which states that the causes, form, and outcomes of social movements are subject to the perceptions and interpretations of social agents to their socio-political context. Under this theory, factors such identity, meaning (construction), emotion, and motivation become crucial factors in shaping the behavior of actors in social movements

(Klandermans & Skelenburg, 2009). Where structural theory falls short in explaining behavior differences between individuals of a similar organizational position, social constructivism provides a more well-rounded understanding of the many human motivations for participating in collective action within a given socio-political context. Thus, I use social-constructivist theory to illustrate the impacts of cultural identity, political frames, and symbolic protests in student protestor discourse on the successful outcome of the 1994 protests. I will also use this theory to explain differences in perspectives and experiences on the protests between students, faculty, staff, and university administration across varying social identities.

In recent years, scholars have devoted greater energy to examining the relationship between social movements and the organizations in which they occur. Given that I am examining a social movement within the context of a university, I found works on organizational theory (OT) in the context of higher education to be particularly insightful. Acknowledging the modern university as an enterprise, Manning (2018, p. 6) explains that universities in the 21st century are a mature industry that "have a choice to stay dynamic or pass into decline. Mature organizations, with their potentially fossilized structures, must actively work to remain dynamic. This entails astute environmental analysis and an adaptable belief system." Given the long and multidisciplinary histories of organizational theory across time, Manning (2018) advocates for a multi-modal application of organizational theory in order to more completely understand the multi-faceted elements of one's university system. In recognition of CU-B as a multi-faceted research university and business enterprise encompassing varied social, political and economic interests, and the particular convergence of these interests in the political moment of the April 1994 protests, I draw upon concepts in bureaucratic and collegium theories in OT to further

describe the various forces shaping the actions of student and university agents during the protests, and the resulting success of the student movement.

Conclusion

This honors thesis applies critical social movements theory, critical race theory, and organizational theory to investigate the construction of the CU-B Ethnic Studies protest movement and the unique socio-historical and institutional context in which it occurred to illustrate how student activists and their university allies successfully organized for systemic change. The following chapter, Chapter 2, reviews the research literature pertinent to my thesis research. Chapter 3 describes the methods used to conduct this case study and Chapter 4 presents my thesis research findings. Chapter 5 summarizes the thesis perspective and findings, placing them within the existing research and also discusses how these findings are related to the theoretical perspectives outlined in the current chapter (i.e., CRT, SMT, and OT) and the scholarship on Ethnic Studies movements. Chapter 5 also outlines future areas of study.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

Ethnic Studies Activist Roots, & the CU-B Ethnic Studies Department Mission

The discipline of Ethnic Studies originates from a historic struggle with racism and a long tradition of student resistance. Modern-day Ethnic Studies departments and programs have their roots in student movements of the mid-1960s, which were in turn heavily influenced by the Civil Rights Movement (Yang, 2000; Gutierrez 1994; Hu-Dehart, 1993). Originating during a U.S political context in which Eurocentric school curriculums were the norm, when assimilationist theory was considered the primary "solution" to racial tensions between different ethnic groups, and when the vast majority of higher education faculty were white males, students of color and their white allies protested and demanded "better access to college education, changes in curricula to reflect their ethnic cultures and perspectives, recruitment of minority faculty, and establishment of ethnic studies programs" (Yang, 2000, p. 4). In addition to Ethnic Studies movements, there have also been a number of comparable movements led by students of color demanding more culturally relevant, representative, and sustaining curricula since the 1960s, including movements for the creation of Black Studies, Chican@ Studies, Native American Studies, and Asian American Studies departments and programs.

The 1994 Ethnic Studies movement at CU-B aligned with the scholar-activist character and institutional demands posited by the earliest 1960s Ethnic Studies movements. While few people are familiar with the student protests which led to the establishment of CU-B's Ethnic Studies department, even fewer people are aware that the Alliance also had other central demands of University administration. Most notably, their list of demands also addressed the alleged racial discrimination of a Chicano professor during his ongoing tenure review process in the Sociology department, specifically citing procedural errors by the Chair of Sociology during

the departmental voting process. In an April 15th-17th article in *the Colorado Daily* newspaper, Reinholds lists the Alliance's 5 demands:

> "1) An ethnic studies department, offering major and minor degrees in ethnic studies, including master's and Phd. degrees (The Center for Studies on Ethnicity and Race in America offers classes only for undergraduates), 2) tenure for sociology Assistant Professor Estevan Flores, 3) an official inquiry by the Boulder Faculty assembly of [Sociology Department Chair] Gary Marx's actions, 4) 'protection' of Chicano professors in the sociology department, 5) separation of cultural and gender diversity requirements in the arts and sciences core curriculum" (Reinholds, 1994, p.11).

In the same news article, Reinholds (1994) also reported that three Chicano professors in the Sociology department--Professors Facio, Rivera, and Flores--requested to transfer to other departments at the University due to a "racist environment," which can be considered a sixth institutional demand by faculty members of color who supported the student movement. Therefore, it is clear that the broad institutional demands identified by Yang (2000) which characterized previous Ethnic Studies movements were key grievances for the Alliance as well. The Alliance's demands of the University were rooted in not only a desire for a well-resourced, multilateral Ethnic Studies program which represented students of color and their communities, but in a broader desire for greater representation of faculty of color teaching and researching for their communities, a challenge of systemic racism and protection from an exclusive, white supremacist bureaucratic and academic culture for faculty of color, and an expansive institutional conception of diversity and ethnic plurality which respected distinctions between the disciplines of gender and ethnic studies in the general curriculum.

The academic mission and imperatives of the Ethnic Studies department at CU-B today are uniquely tied to the demands and ideals of the 1994 student movement. Though there is no

single consensus on the definition of Ethnic Studies, Yang (2000) described Ethnic Studies as "an interdisciplinary, multi-disciplinary, and comparative study of ethnic groups and their interrelations, with an emphasis on groups that have been historically neglected" (p. 8), and notes that the discipline focuses on studying the cultures and histories of communities of color in U.S society. The CU-B Ethnic Studies department's mission statement echoes this interdisciplinary, comparative, and equitable approach, while going a step further and defining an intersectional (Crenshaw, 1989) and emancipatory (Freire, 1970) mission for the department:

> "The Department of Ethnic Studies at the University of Colorado Boulder is dedicated to centering the epistemologies, histories, and lived experiences of marginalized communities of color and Indigenous nations in order to challenge and critique all forms of oppression and to advance emancipatory, self-determining futures for all people. Ethnic Studies is an interdisciplinary field that is built upon four core disciplinary pillars of scholarship: Africana studies, Native American & Indigenous studies, Asian American studies, and Chicanx/Latinx studies. Our department stresses the unique contributions and perspectives of each pillar, while training our students to think and research across them in transdisciplinary and intersectional ways. We draw upon our strengths in engaged scholarship and culturally-sustaining pedagogy to examine how race and the interrelated categories of culture, ethnicity, indigeneity, gender, class, sexuality, religion, dis/ability, and legal status impact the past and present lives of people locally, regionally, and globally" (University of Colorado Boulder, 2022).

The department's educational mission reflects its student activist roots. I align with the CU-B departmental mission and vision for Ethnic Studies in this honors thesis, and stress the importance of intersectional and critical approaches to the studies of race and ethnicity in the U.S. I also urge the importance of auto-preserving history and knowledge about the CU-B Ethnic Studies Department's historical founding towards its mission of inspiring critical self

reflection and emancipatory futures for BIPoC students on its own campus. As one of only 4 universities across the U.S with a doctoral program in Ethnic Studies, and the only University offering an Ethnic Studies doctoral program outside of California, the CU-B Department of Ethnic Studies has a unique communal and institutional responsibility to honor and preserve these roots, specifically through faculty scholarship, teaching, and course offerings in the Department.[2]

The following section assesses case studies of movements for Ethnic Studies at other colleges/universities, and links them to the 1994 Ethnic Studies protests at CU-B in the historical record, while acknowledging the historical gaps in research of this pivotal event at the University.

Previous Case Studies of University Ethnic Studies Movements and CU-B's 1994 Ethnic Studies Movement

Attention must also be paid to existing case studies of Ethnic Studies movements at other colleges and universities. Ferguson (2017) draws our attention to three of the most formative student movements for Ethnic studies during the 1960s. In 1968, a multiracial student coalition formed by the Black Student Union and Third World Liberation Front organized at San Francisco State University (SFSU) and the University of California, Berkeley and demanded the establishment of a specialized School of Ethnic Studies. In the case of SFSU, an Ethnic Studies department was actually established. In 1969, the University of California, San Diego organized under the Lumumba-Zapata Coalition to demand that a college under construction be dedicated to educating youth of color. Later that year, a group of Black and Puerto Rican students at City

[2] As an Ethnic Studies major at CU-B, I have only taken one class which briefly touched upon the history of CU-B's Ethnic Studies department in my time at the University, and there is currently no class dedicated to studying this pivotal event in the context of Ethnic Studies protest movements across the U.S.

College in New York demanded education relevant to their communities. These protest movements would come to inspire a variety of protests, sit-ins, and demonstrations for Ethnic studies to come at universities around the U.S (2017). The strong presence of multiracial coalitions in early 1960s Ethnic Studies movements is particularly resonant with the case of CU-B's 1994 Ethnic Studies student protests. The CU-B Ethnic Studies protests were organized by a multiracial coalition between the UMAS y MEChA coalition, which were primarily Chican@ organizations, and the contemporaneous SCAEP (Student Coalition for Ethnic Plurality) coalition[3] under the banner of the Alliance, or *La Alianza*. Similar to the 1960s Ethnic Studies movements, the Alliance student organizers also incorporated a broad mix of protest tactics including rallies, informational flyering, guerrilla theater, sit-ins, and a 6-day hunger strike to put pressure on university officials and achieve their goals (Roberts, 2013). Most of these protest tactics were highly visible. While most of the protests were non-disruptive (i.e-mass demonstrations, rallies, and hunger strikes), a few of them (i.e- sit-ins and marches to the administrative offices) can be considered more mild forms of "disruptive" protest tactics which were non-violent. Disruptive protest tactics describe those tactics which disrupt the daily functions of the University. Disruptive tactics can include sit-ins, riots, vandalism, and more (Rojas, 2006).

Unlike other Ethnic Studies movements of its time, little academic work has been generated about the 1994 Ethnic Studies protests at CU-B, despite numerous references to them in local and national media at the time of their occurence (Reinholds, 1994; *Stanford Daily*, 1994; Downing, 1994). In a book by Armbruster-Sandoval (2017), the author conducts detailed case studies of 1990s Chicana-led movements for Chican@ studies at the University of

[3] SCAEP was a student coalition at CU-B representing a variety of student organizations, including but not limited to the Black Student Alliance (BSA), Oyate Native American Club, ACHANGE (Action Coalition Helping Achieve a New Global Equity) and more (Roberts, 2013).

California, Los Angeles, the University of California, Santa Barbara, and Stanford University, and focuses in particular on the use of hunger strikes across these cases. Armbruster-Sandoval also briefly mentions the 1994 Ethnic Studies protest at CU-B in his case studies of the other three universities. An article in the *Stanford Daily* (1994) from the time being studied provides further context on these university movements, demonstrating that the UC Santa Barbara and Stanford hunger strikes for Chicano studies were happening at the same time as the CU-B Ethnic Studies protests, while the UCLA protests had occurred just a year earlier. An April 20th, 1994 article regarding progress made on student demands demonstrates that student activists participating in the 1994 protests at CU-B were in contact with student activists at universities across Colorado, and across the U.S as well (Reinholds, 1994). Although the present study does not thoroughly examine the social or ideological links between CU-B and other students engaged in protests at this time, it is noteworthy that these movements occurred in tandem with each other in history. Additionally, the prominent use of hunger strikes in student movements for Chican@ studies in the early 1990s was a characteristic also shared by the 1994 Ethnic Studies protests at CU-B. Furthermore, the often overlooked essential leadership of Chicana students in activism is a point echoed by Facio (2010) in her research on the 1960s-70s UMAS EOP, which documented the struggles of UMAS Chicanas with machismo in the organization. Roberts (2013) demonstrates that leadership by women of color in the Alliance was a central facet of the organization, although they struggled to be heard during Alliance meetings initially. Within the UMAS y MEChA coalition, the powerful female leadership presence was highlighted by women who were interviewed (Roberts, 2013). When examining the roles and protest tactics exemplified by student protesters in the Alliance, this thesis takes a holistic approach to defining grassroots student leadership framed by Chicana feminist scholar Bernal's (1998) "Dimensions

of Grassroots Leadership" in the 1968 East L.A Blowouts, which includes roles such as Developing Consciousness (Through discussions/print media) , Organizing (Attending/planning meetings or activities related to the protests), Acting as a Spokesperson (In media/before large groups as an official/unoffical representative), Networking (Building a base of support and linking diverse groups), and Holding Office (In community, and/or student organizations related to the protests).

In the absence of scholarship about the 1994 Ethnic Studies protests at CU-B, it appears that the significance of this movement may have been relegated to a footnote in the history of Ethnic Studies movements in the U.S, and in the history of the University itself. One wonders what unique insights scholars of social movements in higher education or Ethnic Studies scholars at CU-B may have missed out on in the decades since, particularly given that most case studies on Ethnic Studies and Chican@ Studies movements have focused on universities on the East and West Coasts. Although falling outside of the scope of this research, it pays to ask: Like the 1974 UMAS EOP protests, how might political and organizational factors have impacted the archiving and studying of the 1994 Ethnic Studies protests at CU-B, despite the establishment of an Ethnic Studies Department as a result of them? What is the legacy of these protests for the Ethnic Studies Department at CU-B today, and what concrete steps can be taken by faculty and scholars to preserve and interpret these records and stories while our academic community has ready access to them?

Apart from scant references in the national media and academia, there has been only one other undergraduate honors thesis written by Roberts (2013) on the 1994 CU-B Ethnic Studies movement. Approaching her research from critical race theory and a queer feminist perspective, Roberts utilized interviews and archival research to explore the factors which led to the success

of the protests, with special attention to how identity and difference were navigated by members of the Alliance. Roberts concluded that "the political moment of the early 1990s, institutionalized support structures on campus for students of color, mentorship of staff and faculty, and an ever-present legacy of radical student activism were key to the movement's success," and reveals social and organizational strengths and challenges embodied in the multiracial coalition (2013, pg. 3). The current honors thesis reorients the analysis of the 1994 CU-B Ethnic Studies Protests with an examination of neoliberal discourse and its impacts on the student movement, as well as an application of organizational theory to examine the roles of faculty and administrators in the outcomes and implications of the 1994 Ethnic Studies protests. Although Roberts touches on the histories presented here in her thesis, the current work also more precisely situates the 1994 Ethnic Studies protests within the particular historical context of Chicanx student activism at the University vis-a-vis UMAS y MEChA's participation, and in the broader history of Ethnic Studies movements to provide a more accurate interpretation of the protests' cultural significance.

The following section reviews the pertinent literature of contemporary theories and studies on social movements in higher education from the three primary theoretical frames of this paper: critical social movements theory, critical race theory, and organizational theory.

Contemporary Theories on Student Movements in Higher Education

Social movement theories originated from the disciplines of political science and sociology, and seek to explain the causes, forms, and outcomes of social movements (Klandermans &Skellenberg, 2009). Social movement theories generally fall into the following categories, which have been developed at distinct points in time: classical theories, resource

mobilization theories, political process theories, and social constructivist theories. These theories are briefly described below.

- Classical theories: Originating from political science, these theories typically viewed collective action as a result of "systemic breakdown." These theories regarded social movement agents as unconventional and irrational. Participants in social movements were seen to be motivated by perceived relative deprivation, shared grievances, and generalized beliefs (Klandermans &Skellenberg, 2009).
- Resource mobilization theories: Developed in the 1970s after waves of social movements--particularly in the U.S--resource mobilization is a structural theory developed in Sociology which regards social movement organizations as more organized and complex than prior theories. Resource mobilization emphasizes social movement organizations (SMOs) and their "resource repertoires' ' (i.e-money, time, social networks, etc) to explain the causes, forms, and outcomes of social movements (Klandermans &Skellenberg, 2009).
- Political process theories: Political process theory emphasizes the political and institutional context in the study of social movements, and contends that SMOs and their tactics themselves are shaped by their political and cultural contexts. Political process theorists pay attention to rare "political opportunities" for social change caused by instability within a given system, and the "action repertoires," or protest tactics, of social movement agents within a given political and institutional context (Klandermans &Skellenberg, 2009).
- Social constructivist theories: Originating from social psychology, social constructivist theories emphasize the ways that individuals and groups perceive

and interpret their environmental conditions. These theories include a focus on framing, identity, and emotions (Klandermans &Skellenberg, 2009).

Recent scholarship has called for a multidisciplinary study of student social movements from a critical lens, and from an organizational perspective. In Museusz and Sifuentes (2021) article, "Towards a Critical Social Movements Studies," the authors analyze the current state of student social movement studies and call for a joining of social movement theory with critical theory, thus forming critical social movement studies (CSM), in order to more effectively analyze social movements at higher education institutions in the 21st Century. Scholars argue that a variety of macrostructural processes set in motion by globalization and neoliberalism, including but not limited to the rapid internationalization and corporatization of American college campuses via academic capitalism (Rhoads & Slaughter, 2004), the expansion of police units at colleges and universities nationwide (Ferguson, 2017), and the proliferation of online activism have fundamentally changed the nature of social movements and power on college campuses. Therefore, traditional social movements theories will not be sufficient alone to explain social movements in higher education today, and past cases of student social movements may benefit from a multidisciplinary social movements analysis.

As Museusz and Sifuentes explain, critical theory offers helpful insights for social movement studies scholars. Critical theory originated as a discipline seeking to examine the dynamics of systems of oppression towards the end of emancipating oppressed peoples (Museusz & Sifuentes, 2021). Additionally, critical race, queer, and feminist studies each seek to contribute to a broader critique of social systems for the purpose of emancipation from their own respective vantage points (Museusz & Sifuentes, 2021). Museusz and Sifuentes define CSM as, "The analysis of how systems of oppression, social structures, and social justice movements all

interact to shape each other, with the goal of empowering and liberating historically oppressed populations" (2021, p. 276). Critical race theories and critical perspectives on neoliberalism are especially relevant to the present case study, given that the protests were mediated by political, economic, and identity issues and discourses that were in flux and in contestation at the University at the time being studied.

Critical perspectives on neoliberalism are a key facet of contemporary social movement analyses. Jones (2012) defines neoliberalism as an economic theory that advances an ideology of market fundamentalism, which posits that markets function best when they are self-regulated. Examples of neoliberalism include, but are not limited to, the privatization of property and industries, deregulation of markets, free trade policies, and globalization. Rhoads & Liu (2008) adopt a critical lens to explain how the process of globalization--which describes the diffusion of products and cultures across national boundaries, especially through free trade--endemic to this system has fundamentally transformed U.S universities, as well as student social movements within them. Rhoads and Liu adopt Kellner's (2000) typology of "globalization from above" and "globalization from below" to describe how globalization manifests at colleges and universities. Namely, globalization can occur both from above through neoliberal policies and practices (at the University level) and from below, at the level of democratic student social movements. As Rhoads and Liu (2008) point out, the concept of globalization can be easily abstracted, and thus it is important to be specific about the effects of globalization on politics, culture, or any other subject of analysis. Therefore, I problematize the issue of globalization for the current case study in order to ponder the political and cultural effects of globalization through neoliberal policies and ideology at the University level, and from below within the Alliance and broader student body. I also argue that covert white supremacy was operating at the University and in

wider U.S society as a concurrent, interrelated racial discourse with neoliberalism which affected the student protest movement, and I consider how white supremacist discourse interacts with neoliberalist discourse in both direct and subtle ways to uniquely impact the political environment of student activists in this case.

Impacts of Neoliberal Globalization on Present Case Study

Participants in the 1994 Ethnic Studies protests at CU-B were impacted culturally, educationally, and materially by neoliberal free trade policies and discourse at the University and in U.S society at the time of their occurence. The protests occurred only four months after the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) went into effect on January 1st, 1994, an agreement which established a trade bloc between Mexico, Canada, and the U.S. A large objective of NAFTA was to stimulate growth in Mexico's developing economy through increased free trade. However, scholars have documented NAFTA's broad catastrophic effects for the agricultural sectors of the Mexican economy. A report by Zepeda, Wise, and Gallagher (2009) dubs NAFTA as a "disappointment" for Mexico's economy, noting weak job and economic growth. This report found that between the early 1990s to the second quarter of 2008, the number of agricultural workers in Mexico dropped from 8.1 million workers to 5.8 million, representing a roughly 2.3 million loss of jobs. Additionally, NAFTA has created an internal migration crisis within Mexico, leading many who cannot find long-term employment as a result of industrialized agriculture in the country (Zepeda, et. al, 2009).

The passage of NAFTA served as a catalyst for radical indigenous social movements in Mexico against neoliberal free trade policies and ideologies. In late 1993, the indigenous Mexican Zapatista National Army for Liberation (EZLN) in the southern Mexican state of Chiapas issued its Declaration of War against the Mexican government, stating the following:

> "We are a product of 500 years of struggle: first against slavery, then during the War of Independence against Spain led by insurgents, then to avoid being absorbed by North American imperialism, then to promulgate our constitution and expel the French empire from our soil, and later the dictatorship of Porfirio Diaz denied us the just application of the Reform laws and the people rebelled and leaders like Villa and Zapata emerged, poor men just like us. We have been denied the most elemental preparation so they can use us as cannon fodder and pillage the wealth of our country. They don't care that we have nothing, absolutely nothing, not even a roof over our heads, no land, no work, no health care, no food nor education. Nor are we able to freely and democratically elect our political representatives, nor is there independence from foreigners, nor is there peace nor justice for ourselves and our children. But today, we say ENOUGH IS ENOUGH" (1993).

The EZLN's declaration reflected the devastating effects of Spanish imperialism and American neocolonialism on the rights, cultures, and welfare of indigenous peoples in Mexico specifically, but also Mexican citizens more broadly, who were also disenfranchised by the policies. It was because of this that the EZLN chose to embark on an armed offensive against the Mexican government on the same day of NAFTA's passage--January 1st, 1994. After a series of armed struggles and failed negotiations with the Mexican government in the decades to come, indigenous Zapatista communities settled into autonomous municipal forms of "de facto" governance in Chiapas that are not recognized by the Mexican state to this day (Stahler-Sholk, 2007).

This struggle and model of indigenous self determination and autonomy heralded in by the Zapatistas became an icon of Chicanx social movements in the U.S that were inspired by their resistance. Prior to the Zapatista revolution, UMAS y MEChA members at CU-B had already been deeply influenced by revolutionary Latin American movements for decades.

Roberts (2013) notes that students in the Alliance were exposed to these revolutionary movements during the time being studied through coursework in the Center for the Study of Race and Ethnicity in America (CSERA), an academic program at the University, and through a course titled "Social Action Leadership Theory and Practice" as part of the University's INVST Social Leadership program. Additionally, the expansion of exploitative U.S free trade policies was a key issue addressed by 1990s protest movements across the U.S (Rhoads, 1998), including at CU-B. The need to resist these exploitative free trade policies inspired the creation of the ACHANGE (Action Coalition Helping Achieve A New Global Equality) at the University, a mostly white student organization which had key members who participated and organized in the Alliance (Roberts, 2013).

Scholars have also expounded on the effects of academic capitalism on higher education institutions in the modern day. Academic capitalism refers to the increasing attention to profit motive by administrators and faculty in research at higher education institutions (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). Academic capitalism, which is a symptom of neoliberalism, has a number of resounding consequences, and manifests in colleges and universities through the processes such as, "Outsourcing, encouraging institutionally-based revenue-generating corporate start-ups, a recruitment of international students for revenue purposes, and an erosion of tenure and academic freedom" (Manning, 2013, p. 50). The latter of these is accomplished through the increasing hiring of adjunct faculty as opposed to tenure-track faculty; adjunct faculty are not only paid significantly less than tenured faculty for the same functions of teaching and research, but do not benefit from the protection from job reprisal and the job security that tenure offers (Manning, 2013). In 1994, CU-B was no exception to the rising tide of academic capitalism. Academic capitalism directly influenced the prerogatives of top University administrators

steering policy at CU-B at the time, and continues to do so in the present day. This is evidenced by student protests at CU-B in recent years which have demanded a decrease in fees for graduate students (Langford, 2019), an end to the purchase of university furniture made from prison labor at CU-B (Hernandez, 2020), and protests against the unanimous, undemocratic recommendation of conservative CU System President Mark Kennedy by the CU Board of Regents (Daniel, 2019). While a comprehensive study on the political and economic evolution of CU-B across time and the influence of academic capitalism in this trajectory fall outside of the current study, needless to say that contemporary BIPoC student activists and our allies must contend with and study this international phenomenon in order to be effective in their organizing efforts today. BIPoC student activists must also consider how they will adapt student social movements to confront growing capitalist prerogatives of universities, incentives which directly undermine the progress of historic BIPoC social movements for equitable and inclusive public education.

Employing Critical Race Theory in CU-B's 1994 Ethnic Studies Movement

The impact of white supremacist racial policy and discourse across the U.S in the mid-1990s must also be taken into consideration for this case study. Policy debates on affirmative action abounded in colleges and universities across the U.S during this time period. Many university administrators were revisiting the question of whether their affirmative action plans developed in previous decades were necessary or not, and some believed that these policies produced "reverse discrimination" against white men in college admissions (Rhoads, Saenz, & Carducci, 2005). Dominant racial discourse by white male higher education scholars was shrouded in confrontational rhetoric about "culture wars" between white people and people of color, and diversity issues on campus were often termed the "race problem," (Yang, 2000). It is likely that students of color in the multiracial Alliance had to address such discourse in

structuring their rhetorical campaign for Ethnic Studies at CU-B, despite the University's limited and ineffective attempts at increasing diversity through affirmative action and other diversity policies. Thus, I chose to focus on discourse in this case study in order to more accurately understand the ways in which students rhetorically constructed their arguments for Ethnic Studies, and how political power functioned in these debates.

The application of critical race theory to the study of social movements theory in higher education is a relatively new phenomenon. Scholars have considered the impacts of institutionalism of Ethnic Studies after the initial 1960s protest movements (Museusz & Sifuentes, 2021; Ferguson, 2017; Hu-Dehart, 1993), and the institutionalization of diversity, inclusion, and equity (DEI) policy pillars across U.S colleges and universities (Ferguson, 2017) as potential sites of blowback for historic student movements for diversity. As a result, scholars have called for more studies on the ways in which universities have responded to and potentially adapted to resist student social movements, but this literature remains scarce. Scholars have examined university discourse and policies on diversity, equity and inclusion (Iverson, 2007), and discourses and responses to racial incidents at colleges and universities (Davis & Harris, 2016). In recognition of the precise role of discourse through media and rhetoric in perpetuating white supremacist and neoliberal values and ideas, and the intertwined relationship between the two, discourse is a focal point of the press packet analysis. The present study also takes seriously the issue of University responses to student activism and faculty & administrator advocacy, including the potential of institutional and political backlash for involvement in social change efforts by students and their institutional allies. Additionally, Reynolds and Mayweather (2022) analyzed the use of counter-storytelling by BIPoC students responding to a public racial discrimination scandal in a predominantly White Midwestern university. The use of

counter-narratives and counter-storytelling as a resistance tactic are explored more deeply in the press packet analysis as well.

Other racialized political events also impacted the Ethnic Studies protests at CU-B. In addition to the passage of NAFTA earlier that year, Roberts (2013) also points out that the 1994 Ethnic Studies protests took place three years after the 1991 L.A Riots, after which 4 police officers were acquitted by a grand jury after beating and murdering Rodney King, an African American male. On September 23rd, 1993, Roberts also mentions a fight that broke out between white members of the Sigma Alpha Epsilon (SAE) fraternity, and a few friends of members of UMAS y MEChA, which led to two Chicano men being arrested by Boulder police. According to participants in Roberts' study, the Boulder Police did not take allegations of a racially motivated attack on Chicano men involved in the altercation seriously (Roberts, 2013). A week later, UMAS y MEChA members held a rally for justice for the two Chicano men on the CU-B campus to demand a probe into racial bias in the Boulder Police department; over 100 people attended the rally (Roberts, 2013). This incident occurred only a semester prior to the CU-B Ethnic Studies protests, and represented the heightened racial tensions the Alliance was exposed to before their decisive social protests in April of 1994. While participants in the present study did not mention the incident on the Hill, it is an important part of the historical record. Future studies might seek to create a more complete historical record for the 1994 Ethnic Studies protests, with special attention to discourse and policy.

The following subsection reviews literature about the roles of faculty and administrators in student social movements, and considers how organizational factors might have impacted the outcomes of the protests as well as participant experiences during the protests.

Organizational Theory in Higher Education: Faculty and Administrators in Student Social Movements

Literature on social movements in higher education has historically focused on students. However, in recent years, a few scholars have investigated the roles of faculty and administration in student social movements, though this type of research remains rare. Kezar (2010), a leading scholar in this budding research area, has examined the effect of faculty and staff grassroots leaders' beliefs about power on their strategies for social change, and the resulting effectiveness of their advocacy. Kezar borrows heavily from Meyerson's (2001) conception of "Tempered radicals," which describes grassroots leaders within an institution who have no formal power (i.e-faculty and staff) and work to create social change from the bottom up, but who temper their approaches to maintain their jobs. The tempered radicalist's change ideals and their commitment to the institution are often in conflict with one another. Analyzing and applying Marxist, postmodern, and tempered radicalist views of power, Kezar (2010, p. 84) identified three respective narratives of power emerging from the study, including: "a) Confrontational narrative (resist and rebel against the oppressor); b) Tempered radical narrative (power conditions exist, but there is room to navigate); and c) Power as context narrative (issues of power are not relevant and tend to blend into the context)." Kezar finds that faculty and staff's views of power were based on their life's experiences. Additionally, Kezar finds that faculty and staff are most effective (and confront less backlash) in advocating for social change within higher education institutions when they apply a tempered radical approach as opposed to engaging in more confrontational forms of protest. These tempered radical approaches vary in terms of their visibility. The concept of tempered radicals is particularly relevant to the current study, which includes interviews with former and/or current faculty and staff at CU-B. Additionally, Kezar

critiques the confrontational and power-as-context narratives, concluding that they are less effective in university contexts. While the power-as-context narratives described those who did not appear to perceive power dynamics, and were therefore ineffective in advocating for institutional change as a result, the confrontational narrative is less effective in Kezar's view because faculty and staff who display this approach lose their legitimacy, and may even be fired for utilizing confrontational approaches.

In another study, Kezar (2010) studies modes of faculty engagement with student activists, and the author once again suggests that faculty mentors partnering with student activists on social change projects most positively impact student activist development when they adopt a tempered radicalism approach because this approach provides more ongoing and stable opportunities for growth compared with partnership focused on confrontational, radical protests. While the 1994 Ethnic Studies protests certainly represented a case of more pronounced, radical student protests, I would argue that faculty in the 1994 Ethnic Studies protests demonstrated a mix of attitudes (and tactics) regarding power, which affected their resulting advocacy in the student movement and the movement's resulting successes. Moreover, it must be stressed that the beliefs and roles of faculty and administrators (who do have formal power, unlike faculty and staff) are not unidimensional, with faculty and administrators capable of playing both supportive and opposing roles in student social movements. This is sometimes lost in discourse about the roles of faculty and administrators in student social movements. As a class of analysis in and of themselves, faculty and administrator roles cannot be readily generalized.

Similar to broader social movements discourse, popular discourse on BIPoC movements at CU-B, and in particular Chicanx student movements, has mostly focused on the roles of students. The discourse on student activism at CU-B fits most neatly into Kezar's traditional

"confrontational model" view of power. Due to well-documented history of tangible political threats against BIPoC student activists in the U.S by University and police authorities (Smith, 2013; Ferguson, 2017), and a tenuous relationship between BIPoC student activists and the University, it is understandable that popular discourse on BIPoC student social movements at CU-B has focused mostly on BIPoC students who have been most marginalized by University policies and practices--while actively de-centering faculty and administrators, as well as views of power which favor institutional channels. Paradoxically, however, supportive faculty members and administrators must logically be involved in processes to enact institutional change for it to occur. In university processes such as tenure review and approval of a new department, students are almost never involved in the backend of decision-making. Scholars such as Kezar (2010) demonstrate that faculty and staff modes of advocacy for social change tend to be less visible, but can be substantial in deciding policy battles behind-the-scenes nonetheless.

In her case study of the 1994 Ethnic Studies protests, Roberts (2013) frames the role of faculty protests in terms of faculty "mentorship" to student activists, but Roberts neglects to regard faculty as social agents in their own right, capable of actively petitioning for change from the university in both direct and indirect ways (or otherwise). Roberts also overlooks the role that some administrators may have also played in advocating for or against student demands, and does not include administrators in her study. As mentioned previously, it is important to acknowledge that faculty and administrators also face unique tensions and constraints as a result of their institutional positions particularly when supporting student movements; these tensions could theoretically be impacted by social identities as well. While this study does not seek to center the experiences of faculty and administrators in this case study, the study does assert that

students, faculty, and administrators must each contend with these institutional forces in some fashion in order to bring about institutional change.

In reviewing the literature, I sought to better understand the role of faculty and administrators at universities, and their relationship to one another from an organizational perspective. In Manning's (2013) book *Organizational Theory in Higher Education*, she clearly explores the roles of faculty and administrators at universities, and the tensions that can originate from the most traditional governing structure of most universities: the collegial model, which splits universities into a bureaucracy and respective collegiums. "Bureaucracies" are managed by administrators and supporting staff, who handle the operational and fiscal affairs of universities; "collegiums" correspond to faculty members at all ranks, who teach and research in their respective departments, may serve on faculty senates, and may potentially participate in other academic units, centers, and programs within their college. Traditionally, faculty have the most impact over impact curriculum through the institution of tenure, which ensures lifelong employment for faculty members who are successful in the tenure review process at a University. Tenure serves to protect academic freedom, ensuring tenured faculty can research and teach without fear of reprisal from administration (Manning, 2013). However, as mentioned previously, the growing influence of academic capitalism has eroded the power of faculty and the ideal of academic freedom over time, as exemplified by the trend of increased hiring of underpaid adjunct, part-time faculty in place of establishing tenure-track positions (Manning, 2013).

An ongoing tenure appeal case in the case of Dr. Estevan Flores, a Chicano Sociology professor, was also central to the Alliance's demands at CU-B in 1994. Manning (2013) provides further insight into the tenure review process, and organizational forces which may

impact a tenure decision. For the purposes of this case analysis, I will be focusing mostly on the factors which impact tenure recommendation at the level of the department, and in particular the department chair recommendation, since these were the points of contention in Flores' case which triggered a response by UMAS y MEChA students, and later the Alliance. First, Manning (2013) explains how traditional characteristics and imperatives endemic to the collegial model may influence faculty conduct in general, and how these factors may influence faculty decisions during departmental votes on tenure cases. The factors of faculty culture (broadly-defined), disciplinary orientation (the tendency of faculty to be loyal to their discipline), faculty loyal to the college (the tendency of faculty to be loyal to the college), and faculty power as expert power are most relevant to this case. Regarded by many candidates as the most important stage of tenure review, the department review is based on an assessment of a tenure candidate's colleagues, who are considered the most qualified to assess the candidate's dossier. Colleagues participating in a tenure vote review their tenure papers and hold a confidential vote on whether to recommend the candidate for tenure or not; the department chair summarizes faculty feedback and outcomes of the vote and provides their own commentary (Manning, 2013). Manning (2013) further problematizes the role of department chairs in the tenure review process, who are charged with not only mentoring tenure-track candidates throughout the tenure and reappointment process, but also assessing the candidate's progress and academic merit, ultimately providing commentary in a candidate's dossier that moves up to higher levels of college and university committees and administrators. The particular organizational processes in Flores' tenure case in the CU-B Sociology Department, as well as the racial discourse surrounding them, are examined more extensively in the archival study.

Conclusion

This chapter placed the UC-B struggle for an Ethnic Studies Department within the existing literature on the establishment of Ethnic Studies Departments in the United States. This section also reviewed previous case studies on student protests for Ethnic Studies in higher education, with a focus on 1960s and 1990s protest movements. Finally, this section reviewed pertinent literature related to student social movements in critical social movement theory, critical race theory, and organizational theory. The next chapter will discuss the interview and archival methods utilized for this thesis.

Chapter 3: Research Methods

Research Questions

This multi-methods study examines the socio-historical construction of the successful 1994 Ethnic Studies movement at CU-B. The multi-methods include qualitative interviews with students, faculty members, and administrators involved with the 1994 Ethnic Studies protests, as well as a content analysis of university and press documents included in an April 20th, 1994 Press Packet released by the Alliance. To this end, the following research questions were used to frame data collection and analysis.

The research questions for the interviews included:

1. What tactics did students, faculty, and administrators use to get the Alliance's demands met?
2. What impacts can be identified as a result of the protests, both on individual participants and on the University?
3. What factors contributed to the successful outcomes of the CU-B Ethnic Studies protests?
4. How did social identity and institutional forms of power interact during the CU-B Ethnic Studies protests?

The research questions for the content analysis of the Press Packet included:

1. What rhetorical arguments can be identified by students advocating for their demands, and what student protest tactics emerged? How did rhetoric and student tactics impact the protests' outcomes?
2. What University (faculty, staff, and/or administrator) rhetorical arguments and tactics emerged?
3. How did social identity and institutional forms of power interact in this case?

Unit of Analysis

Given the multi-methods (current interviews and archival research), this study has two primary units of analyses. The unit of analysis for the interviews were CU-B students who were part of the Alliance, or who participated in/witnessed the student protests, and CU-B faculty and administrator who were involved in the Ethnic Studies protests directly (i.e., who supported Alliance members with mentorship, participated in protests, etc.) or were in a position of knowledge about the protests indirectly (i.e., who participated in/were witness to University policy discussions regarding the protests). For the archival materials that were the unit of analysis, I analyzed primary source documents donated by a study participant, which included a press packet assembled by the Alliance members and distributed to several local press outlets on April 20th, 1994, to coincide with an announcement of the Alliance's 6-day hunger strike for Ethnic Studies.

Interview Sample

The population of interest was college students of the 1994 Ethnic Studies protests at CU-B, as well as former or current faculty or administrators who were either involved directly with the 1994 Ethnic Studies protests or the Alliance (i.e., providing direct guidance or mentorship to student organizers during the 1994 protests), and/or those faculty and administrators who were indirectly involved with the protests by participating in policy matters related to the protests. I interviewed students, administrators, and faculty involved directly or indirectly in the 1994 Protests and who were willing to be interviewed. Although I contacted many people, the final interview sample included 2 students, 3 faculty members, and 1 administrator during the time of the protests. These interviews were conducted in public spaces such as coffee shops, or study participants' homes on request by the participant. The average

interview was about an hour and a half long. I primarily utilized snowball recruiting to find study participants. I drew on my own networks within UMAS y MEChA and the Ethnic Studies Department faculty to identify potential interview participants, and I contacted them by email and phone number when available. These individuals put me in contact with others who may have been interested in being interviewed.

Interview Setting

The 5 interviews with students, faculty, and administrators who participated in/witnessed the 1994 CU-B Ethnic Studies protests took place between June and August of 2021 in the city of Boulder, Colorado. This city was the site of the CU-B Ethnic Studies protests of 1994. CU-B is a large public liberal arts university, with 35,897 students enrolled in Fall 2021 (Office of Data and Analytics, 2021). The current undergraduate tuition rate is projected to be between $33,234-59,468 dollars for students in the College of Arts and Sciences (CA&S), depending on student area of study and residential status (CU Bursar's Office, 2022). The city of Boulder is a mid-sized, wealthy city with an average income of $87,476. Boulder is historically a predominantly white city, with 90% of Boulder County residents identifying as white (U.S Census Bureau, 2021). Similarly, CU-B is historically a predominantly white institution, with 68.2% of undergraduate students identifying as white in the Fall 2020 headcount for CU-B (Office of Institutional Research, 2021). CU-B is also generally considered as a liberal and/or progressive University. The socio-political context of CU-B is important to keep in mind because it had specific impacts on the form and outcomes of the 1994 Ethnic Studies protests generally, as well as on the particular interview participants in this study.

Methodological Processes

For this multi-study, I conducted interviews with students, faculty, and administrators who participated in the 1994 Ethnic Studies protests, and I analyzed university and newspaper

documents included in an April 20th Press Packet related to the 1994 Ethnic Studies protests. I coded the interviews to gain a deeper understanding of the relationships between participant self-reported social identity (race, gender, and/or sexuality, etc.) and university status (student, faculty member, or administrator) in 1994 on the following factors:

1. Types of involvement (noting direct or indirect involvement and types of protest tactics) by participants, and their thoughts on how these tactics impacted the protest and/or policy outcomes
2. Participant attitudes towards and experiences with the 1994 Ethnic Studies protests
3. Participants perspectives on the most important factors of success in this case
4. I also noted broad themes that emerged from the interview data in the coding process that fell outside of these factors.

I observed these themes by writing questions related to the factors above. I then transcribed the 5 participant interviews, and systematically coded them for the factors outlined above. I added more categories to account for new themes that emerged throughout the research analysis process, and repeated the coding process when necessary.

I also analyzed university, newspaper, and archival documents included in an April 20th Press Packet related to the 1994 Ethnic Studies protests for this multi-study. When examining the Alliance's press packet, I arranged the documents by type and systematically coded the documents to observe the purpose of the documents, the student rhetorical strategies employed in them, and student protest tactics within the documents. I also noted the type/source of the documents (i.e- a flier by a specific student organization, a press article by a news outlet, a statement by a specific University administrator, etc), and labeled each document as either "supportive/non-supportive" of student demands. I also systematically coded quotes and

paraphrases by students, faculty, and administration related to the protests. I identified themes in student/University discourse and tactics from these mentions.

For my interview questions, I included open-ended questions that touched on the variables above, as well as secondary variables that I was interested in or emerged throughout the interview process. I drafted one set of questions for student participants, and another set of questions for faculty and administrators. The two groups were asked similar questions for some variables. For example, both students and faculty/administrators were asked what they felt were the most impactful factors for the success of the protests. However, certain questions were specific to the student or faculty/administrator experience, and were necessary to address differences in university position. For example, to understand student protest tactics, I asked students,: *"What tactics and strategies did the students use to get their demands met? Why were these tactics chosen?"* To deduce faculty and administrative responses to the protests, I ask: *"While the student protests were occurring, what discussions were happening among faculty and administrators about how to respond to the protests?"* Both groups were also asked about academic or professional backlash they may have received for their involvement in the protests, as this was a secondary variable that scholars are interested in knowing more about in the study of social movements. The full list of interview questions is attached in the appendix.

Measurement Instruments

I made use of two primary measurement instruments in my study. First, I constructed a codebook for personal interviews I conducted with students, faculty, and administration who were involved in the 1994 Ethnic Studies protests and/or University policy processes related to the protests. Second, I developed a codebook to document themes in discourse, protest tactics, and University responses emerging from the April 20th, 1994 Alliance Press Packet.

Limitations

One potential limitation to this study is that some participants may be hesitant to share explicit details regarding the protests, or policy processes in the University. Given the nature of the 1994 Ethnic Studies protests, it may have been retraumatizing for some former students to discuss, or these participants may have been hesitant to discuss any tensions that may have been present based on identity. Participants in the study who are either former or current CU-B administrators and/or faculty may have faced further bureaucratic, professional challenges in relaying their honest opinions on policy matters (i.e., fear of a backlash for participating or for reporting some actions, behaviors, etc.). There is always the danger in research that a participant may be dishonest about their experiences as well. Other information may be legally confidential. While certain information may remain inaccessible for one reason or another, bureaucratic tensions with information access remain an area of interest for researchers, and conclusions can still be extrapolated from examining these tensions in the study of social movements. Furthermore, subjects who are retired, employed outside of the university, or in a relatively secure occupation at CU-B (i.e., tenured faculty) may be more inclined to share their honest perspectives. Still others may not perceive a threat to their professional life at all, and it may be that participants spoke candidly about their experiences.

Another potential limitation to my study may be that I am interviewing about attitudes and experiences during the 1994 Ethnic Studies protests, which increases the likelihood of participants misremembering or forgetting key information. On the one hand, secondhand accounts of historical events are less preferable in developing historical arguments than firsthand accounts because the latter are more likely to accurately reflect the raw thoughts and opinions of a participant during the event being studied. On the other hand, there exist little public records

on the 1994 Ethnic Studies protests at CU Boulder, and my study nonetheless sheds light on significant events that have been understudied. That the subject has been understudied is in large part a function of University neglect, and perhaps also apprehension by students and faculty to study an event that may have been considered by some to be controversial. While the best time to have interviewed participants in the Ethnic Studies protests may have been back in 1994, it might also be preferable to interview them now because the advantage of retrospect offers study participants the ability to report how the 1994 Ethnic Studies protests impacted them in the long term, and to connect these experiences to modern discourses on social movements at CU and beyond.

A final limitation to the current study includes the interview sample size, and the exclusion of staff from the interview pool. For the current study, I interviewed 2 students, 2 faculty members, and 1 administrator (based on their university position in the April 1994 Ethnic Studies protests). Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and personal time constraints, I was not able to complete the number of interviews I originally set out to do, or identify staff to take part in the interviews. The themes revealed in the data are nonetheless valuable because they contribute to understudied, emerging research areas on the complex roles of faculty and administration in student social movements in higher education, as well as research examining social movements in higher education from a lens of critical race theory. The archival component of the study also provides an understanding about the role of discourse in shaping the outcomes of social movements in higher education. Moreover, my study offers integral insights for the specific case study of the 1994 Ethnic Studies protests at CU-B. For the purposes of documenting an understudied social movement for Ethnic Studies, it was also imperative to me that I was able to interview individuals who participated in these protests while they are still alive to share their

perspectives and experiences. Given the increasing prominence of racial justice issues in national media with the rise of the Black Lives Matter movement, as well as the local resurgence of student protest movements and interest in studying them at CU-B, these perspectives are arguably more relevant now than ever. These accounts offer new layers to consider in contemporary discourses on how best to achieve systemic change, how participation in student social movements impacts those involved, and how social identity, university position, and institutional power interact at CU-B and beyond. The next chapter will report the findings from my thesis study.

Chapter 4: Study Findings

Themes in Alliance Press Packet

The following section reports on the findings of my multistudy, which includes archival research and interviews. This subsection analyzes a series of press releases, events and student activism in the form of a "press packet." The events highlighted in the press packet (multiple archival documents) serve as explanatory and descriptive devices that illuminate the historic battles and context in which student activists fought against an entrenched and hostile campus administration and climate in their quest for the institutionalization of an Ethnic Studies department. The Alliance circulated to the press on April 20th, 1994, to coincide with the announcement of their hunger strike at the Dalton Trumbo UMC Fountain, one of the most popular gathering spots on the CU-B campus and the regular setting for the Alliance's rallies. The contents and organization of the press packet are described in detail in the analysis below.

In order to analyze the press packet, I split it up into different sections depending on their purpose and likeness to other documents (i.e., newspaper articles were paired with other news articles), and manually numbered the press packet myself for reference (the press packet did not come with its own page numbers). Although most of the press packet was naturally arranged with similar materials, some materials were purposefully paired out of their natural sequence to aid in data analysis of similar document types. In total, the press packet numbered 76 pages, and contained 53 different documents. Some documents were primarily print-based, while others were images. The purpose of this content analysis was to find themes in the rhetorical arguments and protest tactics employed by the Alliance in their protests against the University, as well as to analyze the purpose and utility of each section for the Ethnic Studies student movement. Rhetorical statements and tactics by University faculty and administrators themselves, both in

support of the protesters and against them, were also analyzed when they arose in the data to observe the University response. Special attention was also given to the dating of specific documents (i.e., the timing of a press release) for analysis when provided, as timing was also a factor that was important in the students' escalation of protest tactics and because these temporal contexts contributed to the documents' significance. Given the fact that student organization, student demands, and student leadership were identified as integral factors in the success of the student protests by faculty and administrators who were most intimately aware of the institutional policy battles, I wanted to see what strategic and tactical insights could emerge from the Alliance Press Packet for contemporary student organizers, as well as remark on their historical significance in college social movements for Ethnic Studies.

Themes in the April 20th, 1994 Alliance Press Packet:

The Alliance released the "UMAS, MEChA, and SCAEP Alliance" Press Packet on Wednesday, April 20th, 1994. Given the diversity of documents contained in the press packet, I created 8 sections to split up the press packet by pairing documents that were similar in type and purpose so that they could be analyzed together. In total, the press packet numbered 76 pages, and it contained 53 individual documents. While the sections I created are mostly reflective of the natural arrangement of the press packet, two of the documents had to be moved out of sequence for the purpose of being analyzed with similar documents, or when they appeared as standalones with no distinctive purpose of their own (This is indicated where applicable). This did not significantly alter the natural sequence of the press packet as it was created by the Alliance members.

The press packet sections that will be analyzed are listed below, along with their page numbers:

1. Title Page and Alliance Statement of Purpose (Pages: 1-2)
2. Promotional Fliers and Fact Rally Sheets (Pages: 3-12)
3. UMAS y MEChA Histories (Pages: 17-21)
4. SCAEP Demands Statement (Pages: 22-26)
5. Flores' Tenure Case Documents (Pages: 29-40)
6. Support Statements from Other Groups/Individuals (Pages 42-44)
7. Press Releases (Pages: 45-53)
8. Previous Press Articles (Pages: 54-76)

Title Page and Alliance Statement of Purpose (Pages: 1-2)

The first page of the Alliance Press Packet serves as a concise introduction to the purpose and essence of the Alliance, and for the contents contained within it for press reporters. On the cover, the title of the Press Packet ("UMAS, MEChA, and SCAEP ALLIANCE") is emblazoned beneath a raised power fist symbol, which was a popular symbol throughout the packet overall. This logo, which has become a popular symbol for radical social movements throughout the world, originated as a Black Power symbol and is most associated with the Black Panthers. At the bottom of the title page is the Press Packet release date, "Wednesday, April 20th, 1994" (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p.1). This date coincided with the Alliance's rally and march on April 20th, 1994, which was the official date that the Alliance gave CU-B administrators to negotiate seriously about their demands before the Alliance would escalate their protest tactics. On that very same day, the Alliance announced its hunger strike. The timing of the press packet itself can be considered a student tactic, as the students wanted to ensure that press coverage would follow the peak of its own protest movement and apply extra pressure on the administration in the weeks to come.

The second document in the Alliance Press Packet is titled "The UMAS y MEChA and SCAEP Alliance," and acts as a Statement of Purpose for the mutiracial coalition. It presents the main issues with diversity within the University, and the top two reasons why the formation of the Alliance is necessary. The Statement of Purpose is incisive with its critiques of Eurocentrism at CU-B in the past 50 years--invoking the Civil Rights Movement period--claiming that the University is "dominated by Anglo-Saxon and Euro-American social attitudes, [which] have to be modified significantly in order to respond adequately to the legitimate challenges from other Americans reclaiming their ethnic heritage and identity" (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 2). As such, the Alliance takes aim specifically at the white cultural attitudes prevalent at CU-B. A central rhetorical argument for the student demands is presented in this section, which includes the "ethnic imbalances" at CU-B and the "effects" of those ethnic imbalances. The authors point out that these imbalances are illustrated in a survey by the university's own Office of Research and Testing (ORT) in 1990. In Section 2: Fliers and Rally Fact Sheets and Section 4: SCAEP Demands, there is a heavy emphasis by the Alliance on highlighting the abysmal recruitment and retention rates of students of color compared with white students, as well as the hostile racial climate at CU-B, which are prominent rhetorical themes in the press packet. These critiques usually cite the University's own studies on these issues, a prominent student tactic which emerged in the analysis of the press packet. Utilizing specific, verifiable CU-B studies in their critiques likely also lent the student activists greater credibility with press reporters who were documenting the Alliance's protests on an ongoing basis before and after the release of the April 20th Press Packet.

Next, the authors contrast the results of the previously mentioned ORT report with the "viewbooks" that CU-B uses to recruit students from local high schools, viewbooks which

claimed that CU-B "actively promotes diversity" (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 2). The students point out that in reality, CU-B offers students of color institutional racism and structural biases against people of color. By calling attention to the hypocritical nature of CU-B's promotional materials and its actual statistics on diversity, the Alliance draws attention to the racial climate of the University, which is still far below the mark on its diversity goals. Immediately afterwards, the students assert their decision to "hold the administration to its rhetoric" through the creation of the Alliance (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 2). To my knowledge, this is the first time that the Alliance began to go by this name publicly, and so this line also served as an official declaration for their Alliance in the eyes of the public.

Then, the Alliance members of UMAS y MEChA and SCAEP assert their shared experiences with CU-B's "intolerant" racial climate. Importantly, as they invoke the past half a century of "resistance" on the CU-B campus by students of color, the Alliance notes that at the time of writing, the anniversary of Los Seis de Boulder was the following month, and therefore, "the time for change [could] no longer wait" (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 2). Afterwards, the Alliance members connect their student movement for Ethnic Studies at CU-B with national movements for similar goals, "including 10 national schools and all 4 CU campuses." Again, they reiterate the purpose of their movement, to turn the "rhetorical" into the "actual." This particular part of the Statement of Purpose is significant because it demonstrates that student leaders saw themselves as part of a larger historical movement in CU-B history, which included all prior resistance of CU-B students of color, and which pays homage to Los Seis de Boulder. The Alliance members also saw themselves as part of a contemporary, national movement for Ethnic Studies, and as part of a CU community of scholars fighting for diversity in their education as well. The Alliance appeared to blend a mix of rhetorical appeals to specific

audiences in their Press Packet statements, invoking appeals to CU community, previous Black and Brown social movements, and contemporary social movements, which likely reflected the coalition's diverse composition overall.

In explaining the necessity of creating the Alliance, the authors wrote the following 2 points:

> "1) To insure that we, as a united, multi-ethnic, interdisciplinary undergraduate student alliance, act as one. The divide and conquer tactics traditionally employed by the University of Colorado at Boulder will be met with resistance at every level. 2) To promote the concrete implementation of programs that will foster and promote ethnic plurality at UCB" (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 2).

The first purpose listed, which was for the organizations in the Alliance to act as one, can be considered a resistance tactic to University repression through the mutual coordination of the multiracial coalition. The second purpose listed served a rhetorical purpose: to demand "concrete" *programs* to foster ethnic plurality at CU-B. The translation of the rhetorical, symbolic concept of ethnic plurality to members of the Alliance could only be achieved through concrete programs, and they made it clear that, as a collective acting as one, they would not settle for anything less nor be broken down by CU-B administrators. The students' lists of demands repeated continuously, throughout time, and to various audiences as exemplified in Sections 2, 4, 5, 7, and 8 represented those concrete programs that CU-B needed to implement to support diversity. To conclude their Statement of Purpose, the students in the Alliance emphasize their willingness and capabilities to enact long-term social change as a multiracial coalition, ending with a final refrain that is reminiscent of Malcolm X: "The Alliance will see to it that concrete

change is implemented by the end of this academic year, by any means we deem necessary!" (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 2).

Promotional Fliers and Fact Rally Sheets (Pages: 3-12)

In this section, there were three fliers, and six fact sheets. Fliers primarily served as an information and outreach strategy for the student protestors to get the word out about marches and rallies. Fact sheets served as informational engagement strategies at student demonstrations to teach the wider CU-B community about the ideological necessity of their student movement to advance diversity, and to invite rally attendees to participate in concrete actions to support the movement's concrete demands.

The fliers in this section are arranged in descending order, and are dated April 20th, 1994, April 14th, 1994, and April 12th, 1994. All three fliers are authored by the Alliance rather than by any individual group. The April 12th and April 14th flyers both advertise guest speakers and marches; the April 14th and April 20th rallies advertise rallies and marches. The flyers become more visually appealing and organized as the dates go on, with the April 14th and April 20th flyers featuring more of the power fist iconography and varied fonts, as opposed to the April 12th flier which was relatively plain. In the case of the April 14th flier, a list of diverse speakers and their university and organizational affiliations is provided, including: "Haunani Kay-Trask (Univ. of Hawaii), Glen Morris (UCD, AIM), Robert Perkinson (ACHANGE), Raquel Lopez (UMAS/MEChA), Carlos Kareem Windham (SCAEP), [and] Rebecca Dunn-MC" (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 4). The broad list of speakers likely incentivized a greater body and diversity of students to attend the rallies, and can be considered an outreach and engagement tactic. It also demonstrated the wide net of local and national connections that the student organizations pulled together for this protest movement. All three of the flyers focused on

soliciting student support to "demand university action" on diversity, and prompted students to engage with their demands by physically attending a rally, march, and/or by listening to guest speakers (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, Pgs. 3, 4, and 6). Alliance members tied ideological demands with concrete action in their protest fliers and demonstrations to build student empowerment within the movement, which built motivation and momentum around their campaign.

The April 20th flier was also featured in an advertisement Boulder's *Colorado Daily* newspaper on the very same day (Reinholds, 1994). As mentioned previously, this is also the rally at which the Alliance announced its hunger strike. The April 20th newspaper advertisement can be considered an outreach tactic employed by the Alliance, and was likely also accompanied by physical flyering at the CU-B campus, which is another outreach tactic. The Alliance members thus employed a broad range of informational and outreach tactics to garner visibility and support for the April 20th march and rally, which had broader implications for the press coverage and student participation in their demonstrations thereafter. Their rhetorical strategies through text and visuals became more sophisticated throughout the course of the protests as well.

The Rally Fact Sheets[4] in this section were intended to provide information and engagement for students attending the Alliance's protest rallies with the students' goals for diversity, as well as their concrete protest demands. These fact sheets accomplish these goals by employing two rhetorical strategies: drawing attention to the poor recruitment and retention rates of students of color at CU-B through strictly University sources (4/6 of these were solely focused on recruitment and/or retention rates, and all of them mentioned these topics at least

[4] Because only one of the fact sheets is dated (04/14/1994), and most documents in the Press Packet appear to be in a descending order based on date, it is unclear whether these fact sheets were separate documents distributed a various rallies, part of a larger document distributed at an April 14th rally, etc. Due to the varying fonts, textual styles, and information presented, I inferred that they were six separate documents, and analyzed them as such.

once), as well honing in on the "hostile racial climate" at CU-B for students of color especially, and faculty of color as well. In total across the rally fact sheets, 6 different University studies on recruitment and retention of students of color, as well as racial climate at the University, were cited. This demonstrated a widespread, measurable impact of systemic racism on students' of color throughout the University by its own measures of recruitment, retention, and campus climate. Therefore, the Alliance's claim of confronting the University with its own rhetoric (and research) on diversity was consistent throughout their promotional and informational materials even prior to the release of the April 20th press packet.

Language of a "racially hostile climate" was also used extensively in Section 5: Flores' Tenure Case Documents, and in a rally fact sheet which was distributed on April 14th, 1994 that mentioned Flores' tenure denial and presented UMAS, MEChA, and SCAEP's 5 demands from the University. Paired with the "abysmal recruitment and retention" rhetoric, it was clear that the Alliance was drawing a relationship between the inequitable educational outcomes of students of color compared with their white peers and the racially hostile climate at CU-B created by a white supremacist academic culture. Furthermore, students in the Alliance linked their struggles with those of the Chicano faculty in Sociology, who were also suffering from a racially hostile climate and white supremacist academic culture.

UMAS y MEChA Histories (Pages: 17-21)

The UMAS y MEChA Histories section introduces the histories, missions, and prerogatives of the UMAS and MEChA student organizations at CU-B to press reporters. This section contains 6 documents total, including a detailed "UMAS History" document, a page-long promotional brochure introducing MEChA, a full-length article about the Los Seis bombings from the *Campus Press*, a newspaper clipping from *Rocky Mountain News* with a large photo of

the Los Seis Bombing at Chataqua Park (dated 05/29/1987), and two newspaper clippings from the *Boulder Daily Camera* with images of the Los Seis Bombing at the Burger King off of 28th Street (dated 06/03/1974 and 05/30/1974 respectively). In total, the Press Packet mentions Los Seis in 6 separate documents, including in the Section 1: Statement of Purpose and the present UMAS y MEChA History section. It is important to keep in mind that in 1994, UMAS y MEChA were not operating as a single student organization. As described in the "UMAS History" document, UMAS was founded in 1968 as a University "Equal Opportunity Program" (EOP) and later became a student organization after the programs encased in the UMAS EOP were dismantled and spread out into different programs by the University. As described in the MEChA promotional brochure, MEChA (which stands for Movimiento Estudiantil Chicanx de Aztlan) was founded in 1986 at the University. MEChA later came to form a coalition with UMAS (hence, UMAS *y* MEChA) in the early 1990s, given that they were working on similar issues concerning the Chican@ community at CU-B. The UMAS History document offers insight into the group's push-and-pull history of struggle with University racism and its resistance against University repression, while this section symbolically folds MEChA into the CU-B Chicano movement history through pairing their autonomous histories in documents alongside each other. The documents also offer insight into the ways that UMAS y MEChA represented themselves and their work in the media, and the direct action protest tactics they used throughout their history at the University to push for their demands.

The UMAS History document offers insight into the group's push-and-pull history of struggle with University racism and its resistance against University Repression. This document is particularly detailed, and provides a history of UMAS from when it was an EOP program in the early 1960s and 70s to when it became a student organization into the 1990s. During the

1960s and 70s, the primary issues that UMAS was fighting against, according to the document, were listed as equal access to education and access to timely financial aid for UMAS members, who often received financial aid payments late into the semester. These payments were important to supporting the students' education, who did not come from wealthy backgrounds like most of their white peers. UMAS members also appeared to be concerned with opposing Mexican-American administrators and public figures who they perceived to be going against Chicano students' interests, and instead in service of white interests; this theme appeared in both the 1970s and the 1990s events listed. The document also mentioned its continous opposition to Joseph Coors[5], the founder of Coors beer who was also a Regent at the University in the 60s and 70s. UMAS opposition to Coors persisted throughout the decades, even into the 1990s, as described by the document. Also in the early 1990s, UMAS members organized a national student walkout at CU-B to demand, "a tuition freeze, increased percentages of minority students, faculty, and administration, and more financial aid awards instead of loans" (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 17).

UMAS' protest tactics throughout the 1960s-1990s can be characterized as direct action protest tactics, with more disruptive tactics (i.e- building occupations) occurring in the 1960-70s compared with decades afterwards. The most disruptive protest tactics included an occupation by 21 students in the UMAS-EOP of the Regents Administrative Center in 1969 to demand timely financial aid, as well as a 19-day occupation of the 1974 Occupation of Temporary Building-1 to demand the firing of Jose Franco and Paul Acosta, two Chicano administrators hired by the University who some UMAS students felt was misleading the program politically while wasting its money. These two administrators were hired after the firing of UMAS Tutorial

[5]Joseph Coors was a conservative Republican and well known for his anti-Black and Brown politics. At the time, the Chican@ community was actively engaged in a national boycott of Coors Beer.

Coordinator Ricardo Falcon in 1971, a former UMAS student who was fired in connection with his protests of the University. In Spring of 1990, the students also staged a protest against the appearance of Linda Chavez, a politically conservative Hispanic woman who contributed greatly to the campaign for "English Only" legislation in Colorado and who "[claimed] she [represented] the Hispanic community, when in fact, she represents everything which disgraces our people" (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 17).

At times, UMAS members were successful in strong-arming the University into meeting their demands, while they were in an ongoing power struggle with the University over control of the UMAS-EOP. For example, the UMAS-EOP was successfully able to pressure Jose Franco and Paul Acosta to resign, thus granting the students' full control over the UMAS-EOP program. However, the tactics which UMAS employed were often met with what I term as administrative repression, including ignoring protester demands, administrators going back on promises made, and institutional attempts to dismantle the UMAS-EOP program. This pattern characterizes the back-and-forth struggle and resistance by UMAS as presented in this document, particularly in the 1960s-70s period. At times, what I term as "external forces',' or forces outside of the University, appeared in the historical record that acted as political forces which attempted to or succeeded in damaging the UMAS organization, and made UMAS more vulnerable to administrative repression. Under this category, I placed consistent police surveillance of UMAS students while they were occupying TB-1, as well as the two mysterious Los Seis Bombings on May 27th, 1974 at Chataqua Park, and on May 29th, 1974 at the Burger King off of 28th Street. I also included mentions of the unproven narratives pushed by state authorities of Los Seis as "terrorists" in this "external forces" category as well. Although this is not mentioned in the documents explicitly, these events occurred prior to the resignations of Franco and Acosta

(Facio, 2010; Marks, 2017). Thus, while UMAS was able to regain control of the student organization with Franco and Acosta's resignations, the Los Seis bombings themselves--acting as an external, weakening force--were followed by a series of University repression tactics, including:

> "Decreasing [UMAS] funding, taking [UMAS'] building away and spreading the offices which made up UMAS-EOP all over the campus. [In the 1990s], the program [was] branched off into the Ethnic Student Support Program, (ESSP), the University of Colorado Support Program- Admissions, (CUOP), and the University Learning Program (ULC)" (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 17).

In fact, it appears that these external forces supported the acceleration of University repression tactics. The dispersing of the UMAS-EOP into disparate units was a University tactic to structurally disperse the power of Chicano students on the campus, while also allowing the administration to compartmentalize the UMAS EOP's administrative functions into programs that were more non-threatening to the University. However, during this period, UMAS reiterated its student resistance to this University repression, writing, "Now, UMAS has developed into its own student organization which serves as a social support group. However, UMAS continues to carry a strong voice when political issues [arise]" (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 17). Immediately after this sentence, the group discusses its modern forms of activism in the 1990s, as mentioned above.

There are two images in the UMAS History document which follow this struggle-resistance narrative, including a Chicano political image and a Coors boycott flier. The Chicano political image depicts a drawing of an Aztec warrior with a headdress and wrist and ankle bracelets; he is in a bowed stance, holding a sword over his soldier and carrying a bag full

of books. Two titles are visible, including "CHICANO LITERATURE" and "ART." Above the warrior, the phrase "Lost to our land," are emblazoned, and beneath him, the refrain "education is our stand" completes the sentence. This image appears to connect UMAS struggle against education to the broader historical Chican@ movement struggle against colonization; education is presented as a resistance strategy to colonization which empowers Chican@ peoples. Just as much as the UMAS struggle against the University presents a contest between competing institutional demands, the UMAS struggle against the University presents a contest between two disparate value systems when it comes to the purpose of education, especially for Chican@ peoples. That the University cracked down so heavily on the UMAS-EOP when it regained student control over the program is a testament to this struggle, this continuous push-and-pull that continues to today in the UMAS y MEChA student organizations and their organizing initiatives within and outside the University, such as the Aquetza program.

The UMAS Coors Flier also presents an example of the struggle-resistance narrative within the UMAS History document. The flier is a call-to-action to boycott Coors, and features two quotes from the time period that demonstrate his extreme racism and sexism. The two quotes explicitly target Black people. These quotes included the following:

> "One of the best things the slave traders did for you (Africans) was to drag your ancestors over here in chains…It's not that the dedication amongst blacks is less--in fact, it's greater. They lacked the intellectual capacity to succeed" (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 18).

Both quotes by Joseph Coors are dated 1984, which was only about a decade prior to the CU-B Ethnic Studies protests. The flier also mentions the fact that Coors Brewing Company used to sponsor Ku Klux Klan cross burnings on its property in 1920, and that Coors provided

financial support to Phyllis Schlafly, "leader of the crusade against the Equal Rights Amendment" (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 18). While these quotes are disturbing, what is more disturbing was the University's continued support of Coors in 1990. According to this document, the University once again ignored an UMAS demonstration and protests aimed at pressuring the CU-B Regents to cease supporting Coors in Fall of 1990, after Coors had gifted the University money to support the CU-B Athletics Department. The University ignored these protests, and named the events center after Coors in this time period, despite his documented history of extreme racism. From historical accounts such as this, it is clear that academic capitalism and white supremacy have often worked in tandem to create a hostile racial climate at CU-B throughout its history, as has been the case in universities across the U.S. These manifestations of neoliberalism and white supremacy often directly contradict the University's self-purported mission to increase "diversity, equity, and inclusion" by actively disenfranchising students and communities of color in pernicious ways, and contributed to the "hostile racial climate" students experienced in the mid-1990s specifically. The prerogatives of academic capitalism and white supremacy are not compatible with the vision of a liberatory education for Black and Brown students.

The inclusion of MEChA's organizational history alongside UMAS' History in this section symbolically folds MEChA into the CU-B Chicano movement history through pairing the two organizations' autonomous histories in documents alongside each other. It is clear that these two organizations wanted their distinct histories to be respected by the public in submitting this press packet to news outlets, while also wanting to be in symbolic coalition with one another in this historical record. What I term as the "MEChA History Document" is an informational brochure about the national history of MEChA, as well as the organization's mission and work

on campus. Three main themes emerged from analyzing this document, including a connection of the CU-B MEChA chapter to a wider historical Chican@ education movement with a unified purpose, a decolonial and community-based conception of education, and a spirit of solidarity and coalition-building.

For example, the "Our History" section of this document mentions that the MEChA national organization was founded in the late 1960s as a result of the 1969 Conference de Santa Barbara at the University of Santa Barbara, California; the CU-B chapter was created in 1986. Hundreds of students gathered at the 1969 conference to draft "*El Plan de Santa Barbara"*--or the Santa Barbara Plan--in order to create a common philosophy, strategy, and curriculum for Chican@ students. MEChA's top three principles of unity under this university plan included: "1) increased Chicano/a student enrollment; 2) increased Chicano/a faculty; and 3) cultural diversity" (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 19). Given that the educational priorities of MEChA sought to recruit and retain Chican@ students and faculty, and to promote greater cultural diversity in higher education institutions more generally, this mission naturally lent itself to MEChA's participation in coalition with UMAS, as well as in coalition within the larger Alliance for the CU-B Ethnic Studies movement.

The MEChA History Document also reveals a decolonial and community-based conception of education by the organization. One of the images presented in this document includes an image of Emiliano Zapata, the indigenous leader of the Mexican Revolution of 1910-1920, wearing a sombrero and bullet belts across his chest. He is quoted as saying, "DO SOMETHING REVOLUTIONARY…GET AN EDUCATION AND PUT IT TO WORK FOR YOUR PEOPLE" (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 19). Right beneath the image is a quote from *El Plan de Santa Barbara*, which states, "At this moment we do not come to work for the

University, but to demand that the University work for our people" (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 19). Through pairing Zapata's image and this particular quote from *El Plan de Santa Barbara*, the brochure simultaneously calls on the reader--who is presumed to be Chican@--to both put their education to work for their people, while calling on a national movement to compel Universities work for the people as well. This calling to "make the University work for the people" inherently challenges the hyperindividualisic and exploitative nature of universities, which are simultaneously seen as a stepping stone for upwards social mobility for communities of color, while systematically undervaluing the scholarship of students of color and faculty of color research that centers on bettering conditions in their communities.

A final theme identified from the MEChA history section was a spirit of solidarity and coalition-work. The brochure makes multiple references to MEChA being "open to all," and the specific organizational description of the CU-B MEChA chapter emphasizes the organization's goal to "promote knowledge and understanding between people of different backgrounds…because it helps foster a greater understanding of Chicanismo" (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 19). Therefore, there appeared to be an openness in the MEChA organization to work with various racial groups seeking liberation; they saw benefit in creating relationships with other groups for Chican@s as well. While those familiar with the history of UMAS y MEChA know that originally these two organizations did not get along at CU-B originally, they eventually came together in a coalition because they recognized that they were working on a common cause: to increase the recruitment and retention of Chican@s on campus. Therefore, the co-location of MEChA's history alongside UMAS History symbolically connects UMAS History in the Colorado Chican@ educational movement with MEChA's national history, coalescing these two organizational histories into a horizontal coalition.

Finally, the UMAS y MEChA Histories section includes a collection of news articles on the Los Seis bombings, which serve to draw press attention and symbolic recognition of the history of Los Seis in the history of these organizations and in the CU-B Ethnic Studies movement. This section includes 1 newspaper article about the Los Seis Bombings, and 3 newspaper clippings with images of the Los Seis Bombings. The headline of the single full-length article provided--"BOMBING DEATHS STILL UNRESOLVED 15 YEARS LATER" (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 20)--and the headline of a newspaper clipping--"Explosions Probe Continuing" (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 21)--draw attention to the mystery surrounding the bombings, while the images from the ongoing news coverage at the time leave an impression of tragedy for the lives of Los Seis, and what they could have accomplished in life. Given the fact that the Los Seis bombings were for many years unacknowledged by the University up until recent activist initiatives, it is touching that UMAS y MEChA members included this erased history in their dealings with the press in 1994. The significant amount of news articles and newspaper clippings about them demonstrated that they saw Los Seis as an integral part in their movement, one that they wanted more people to know about. The only other reference to Los Seis is included in the Statement of Purpose of the Press Packet, which is one of the most important documents in this collection, the document that symbolically established the Alliance. In this way, students of color in UMAS, MEChA, and SCAEP honored and amplified the legacy of Los Seis, in spite of University repression.

SCAEP Demands Statement (Pages: 22-26)

The SCAEP Demands list in the Alliance's press packet provides as an introduction to SCAEP, a comprehensive statement of need of SCAEP's original three University demands, and a detailed overview for the implementation of these demands. Themes identified in this section

included the exclusion of students from ongoing diversity initiatives, hypocrisy in University rhetoric on diversity and actual practices, a focus on establishing SCAEP's credibility as an independent and coordinated student coalition, an assertion of Ethnic Studies as a rigorous and independent field of study from other disciplines, and a need to establish both Ethnic Studies and Gender Studies as independent fields of study from one another under an University framework of "diversity." SCAEP presented their demands list to CU-B administrators on March 31st, 1994, prior to the creation of the Alliance. Student groups which participated in SCAEP included, but were not limited to the following: BSA (Black Student Alliance), ACHANGE (Action Coalition Helping Achieve A New Global Equality), the Boulder Police Community Board, UMAS y MEChA, INVST, Ethnic Student Coalition, Chancellor's Appointment Committee, Muntu Brotherhood, Project: Interact, Hallett Hall Diversity Council, and the Progressive Student Network (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 23). The student activists who authored the document, along with their diverse list of academic affiliations, are listed at the very top: Jennifer Allen (Anthropology), CarolLynn Boender (Anthropology), Anna Davidson (Journalism/Mass Communication), Rebecca Dunn (Ecologically Sustainable Communities), Michelle Foy (EPOB), Jeffrey Schwartz (Religious Studies), Ryan Smith (American Studies), Scott Smith (Open Option/Pre-Med), Ashild Olsen (International Relations), Carlos Kareem Windham (American Studies), and Leslie Wong (Political Science) (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 22). The list of diverse authors spanning across disciplines and student organizations at CU-B underscore the coalitional nature of the CU-B Ethnic Studies movement, and offer a window into the student organizers and collectives that ultimately contributed to the successes of the Alliance. SCAEP's three demands included the following:

1. Undergraduate Major and Minor degrees in Ethnic Studies;

2. Following the creation of an Ethnic Studies undergraduate major and minor, the creation of Ethnic Studies Masters' and Phd programs;
3. The full separation of gender and cultural diversity requirements in the core curriculum of the College of the Arts and Sciences at CU-B (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 24-25).

First, in the introduction of the document--which serves as the "first impression" of the demand statement--SCAEP establishes its credibility as an independent and coordinated student coalition. The authors highlights in bold that they are "a student coalition…acting of our own volition," before asserting that,

> "Any claims that we are being manipulated by *any* faculty, staff, or administration within the University of Colorado, or without, are fallacious and will be taken as further evidence of the faculty's and administration's unwillingness to hear the voices of the UCB's largest constituency, the students." (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 22).

Establishing itself as an independent student movement was necessary in order to derail narratives that SCAEP's demands and student protests might have been "influenced" by CU-B faculty, staff, and administrators. This was seen as so integral that students employed rhetorical strategies such as bolding these statements, and including them in both the introduction and conclusion sections of the document, to leave a lasting impression on CU-B administrators handling the demand statement that SCAEP organizers would not accept efforts to discredit the student movement by calling into question its student leadership. Student efforts to distance themselves from this narrative were especially necessary given the fact that CSERA faculty had been undergoing the process to establish an Ethnic Studies Department for a year prior to the students presenting their demands, and were actively disengaged from the protests to avoid painting the picture that they were at all influencing SCAEP's student leadership.

SCAEP also needed to establish itself as a coordinated student coalition. Students accomplished this by including the large list of student organizers in their list of authors to the document, by listing the large list of various student organizations that SCAEP members were part of, and by employing a succinct, well-researched, and purposeful organization to the SCAEP Demand Statement overall. This was necessary in order to put credible pressure on upper administration with drastic student action if administrators ignored the students' demands. SCAEP conveyed the message that student organizers were willing and able to draw upon an extensive network of student and community supporters in order to ensure that their demands were met.

The student coalition also had to assert that it had "tried and failed" by way of previous institutional channels before issuing its list of University demands. The students did this by taking aim at the University's recruitment and retention statistics from a 1993 Report by the Office of Research and Information (ORI), and by taking aim at the Chancellor's Committee on Diversity, which was coordinating the development and implementation of the CU-B Diversity Plan of 1994 as mandated by the Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE). As SCAEP pointed out, the Chancellor's Committee on Diversity had instructed departments to create their own unit-level diversity plans, which would limit the plan's overall effectiveness. SCAEP criticized the strategy of the Chancellor's Diversity Committee to advance diversity on the CU-B campus, stating that it committee had "no concrete power" and was "dependent on a system of ill-defined, symbolic 'moral persuasion'...as the primary reward and punishment system" (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 23) to incentivize Departments to take concrete measures to diversify. Put another way, if the Sociology Department struggled with racism in the Department, how could this very same Department be entrusted to carry out an earnest and

robust effort to diversify itself, in lieu of serious administrative direction? The effect was that diversity was left up to the discretion of each individual department, cloaked in a faux progressive rhetoric that each department was "best suited" to craft its own diversity protocol without the serious administrative direction, money, and personnel needed to create a meaningful diversity plan based on concrete initiatives, while the CU-B administration could wring its hands of responsibility to the CDHE mandate. Employing faux progressive rhetoric was a strategy of University repression in developing a meaningful CU-B Diversity Plan in 1994. By calling out the faulty procedure to create the 1994 CU-B Diversity plan, as well as the exclusion of students from the Chancellor's Diversity Committee, students were able to cast doubt on the University's existing "diversity" initiatives while demonstrating that they had "tried and failed" to engage with them, thus necessitating more pointed demands.

After presenting its top 3 demands, SCAEP offered two "Descriptive" subsections designed to qualify their demands. The first one was entitled "Descriptive/Ethnic Studies major, minor, Masters, and Ph.D." The purpose of this subsection was to establish Ethnic Studies as rigorous and independent from other disciplines. This was accomplished by once again employing bolding of words between explanations of Ethnic Studies history and distinct, emerging pedagogical approaches, defining Ethnic studies as a "discipline" and a "field of study" that could not be "substituted" with other disciplines. In this document, SCAEP illustrates that Ethnic Studies came out of the 1960s protest movements, and represented a movement by Black people, Latinos, Asian-Americans, and Native Americans to reclaim and embrace their races and cultures as embodied by popular movement refrains such as "Black power," "Black is beautiful," and "Viva la Raza" (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 26). By the end of this section, SCAEP asserts Ethnic Studies as a "new academic discipline, defined as a specific pedagogy and a new

epistemology. Through implementation of a progressive sequence of degrees…[Ethnic Studies] will advance the educational and career needs of students by preparing us to function intellectually in a multi-ethnic, 'multi-racial,' multi-cultural nation and world" (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 26). Thus, Ethnic Studies as a discipline and Department is linked to the 1960s racial movements that it originated from, as well as the prerogatives of cultural reclamation movements by communities of color.

The second descriptive subsection was titled,"Descriptive/Separation of Gender and Diversity Core Requirements," and it was written to establish Ethnic Studies and Gender Studies as independent disciplines from one another under a University framework that purportedly valued "diversity." This subsection acknowledges that evaluations of the CU-B core curriculum only occurs once every five years, and that one such review had just passed within the last year. Still, SCAEP explains the importance of separating Gender and Diversity Core Requirements in the CA&S core curriculum, explaining that,

> "If UCB is to be successful in diversifying its faculty and student body, they must cease grouping white women and people of color in the same categories, attend to important differences between people of color in the United Statesand immigrants, and between males and females of color. This will not be possible as long as 'Cultural and Gender Diversity,' are one three-hour requirement." (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 26).

SCAEP critiques UCB's diversity goals with its actual practices of lumping together women and people of color in the same category of "diversity," thereby erasing important distinctions between these groups and failing to acknowledge intersectionality between identities and obstructing a meaningful concept of diversity. SCAEP links UCB's failure to meet its diversity goals if it does not adhere to SCAEP's concrete demand to separate cultural and gender

requirements in the core curriculum. Unfortunately, this is one of the few goals that the University was unsuccessful in implementing from the Alliance's demands. Could this have been because the next review for the CA&S core curriculum was not for another four years, and this demand fell through the cracks? Interestingly, this was one of the only demands by the Alliance which did not have specific effects for CSERA students and faculty, but would have had concrete impacts on the educations of all CU-B students in the CA&S for years to come. The ways that Universities define "diversity" is deeply political, and unfortunately, it appears that CU-B's "diversity" seems to become more de-racialized and de-gendered over time.

Following the two "Descriptives" for SCAEP's demands, there are two "Implementation" sections to outline acceptable steps to meet SCAEP's demands. The first section is titled, "Implementation of Undergraduate Ethnic Studies Degree Program." This section calls for a listing of African-American, Asian-American, Latino(a)/Chicano(a), and Native American Studies classes under the same topic heading of Ethnic Studies in the Fall 1994, which would mark an official transition from the Afro-American Studies major to the Ethnic Studies major. This section also highlights SCAEP's independent support for CSERA's proposed Ethnic Studies major, while communicating that SCAEP would take "whatever actions [SCAEP deems] necessary" to support their efforts (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 27). Similarly, the second subsection titled, "Fully Separating 'Cultural and Gender Diversity' Requirements" instructs the Council of Chairs to consult the Women and Gender Studies Department as well as CSERA to systematically separate Cultural and Gender Requirements in the curriculum. This subsection also offers a detailed listing of courses that SCAEP recommends be systematically separated for this core requirement. This section outlines in clear language the acceptable steps that SCAEP would accept from administrators towards reaching its demands, sans further political action.

The "Conclusion" subsection of the SCAEP Demands Statement employed a number of rhetorical strategies to increase the likelihood that administration would respond seriously to the students' demands, and to convey a credible drastic student action in the case that student demands were not met. SCAEP once again reifies itself as a "sovereign" coalition, that is not the "mouthpiece of any faculty, staff, or community" at CU-B. SCAEP gave the CU-B administration 5 days from March 31st, 1994, to respond to their demands before more action would be taken, specifying that there will be no exceptions nor extensions granted. SCAEP also clarified that responses would not be accepted "in any form other than written statement" (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 28). By providing a specific deadline to CU-B administrators and demanding a written response, students created a form of verifiable accountability for their demands while also constructing a credible threat against the CU-B administration if the demands went unheard.

Flores' Tenure Case Documents (Pages: 29-40)

The "Flores' Tenure Case Documents" section includes what I term as a "Flores Tenure Procedure Document" which outlines the voting processes and irregularities in Flores' tenure case, the Department Chair Gary Marx's negative recommendation to Dean Middleton regarding Flores' tenure case, a career statement by Dr. Estevan Flores on his research, teaching, and service in Sociology, and a petition circulated by UMAS y MEChA to demand Flores receive tenure in Sociology. The purpose of these documents is to provide an accurate, comprehensive account of Flores' tenure case that supported UMAS y MEChA's claims that Flores was denied tenure based on unethical and racist voting procedures by Dr. Marx, as well as to provide the press with information to counter Dr. Marx's claims that Dr. Flores' research and teaching were subpar by the Sociology Department's standards. The students also sought to create a more

expansive view of Dr. Flores' excellence as a Chican@ a teacher grounded in community work to petition for Flores' tenure.

The "Flores' Tenure Case Documents" section includes what I term as a "Flores Tenure Procedure Document" which outlines the voting processes and irregularities in Flores' tenure case. The document is organized by level of review in Dr. Flores' tenure case, starting first at the Sociology Department-level, then moving to the CA&S and Personnel Committee recommendation and Dean Middleton's independent recommendation at the College-level, and then moving onto the Vice Chancellor's Academic Committee (VCAC) recommendation and Vice-Chancellor Bruce Ekestrand's recommendation, and then Chancellor Jim Corbridge's review and recommendation, and finally, a review and recommendation by CU President Judith Albino and a final vote by the Board of Regents (Alliance Press Packet, 1994). At the time the document was written, Flores' tenure case had been at the level of Dean Middleton's review, and had yet to be passed onto the third level of review by VCAC Ekestrand's committee.

This document mostly outlines the procedure for Flores' tenure review at the Department-level, particularly in Dr. Marx's conduct of the voting process. During the first vote, unspecified "irregularities" were reported to Flores by Dr. Rivera, who then protested the balloting to Dean Middleton. According to an April 14th press release[6] by Drs. Flores, Facio, and Rivera, which expands on these irregularities, Dr. Marx included three proxy votes that did not meet Departmental deadlines to be counted in Flores' first tenure vote, as well as his own vote as Chair. Chairs are not allowed to vote except in the case of a tie. Dean Middleton sustained Flores' protest and ordered a second ballot. In the second vote, Chair Marx voted as a regular faculty member; Chair Marx also allowed three faculty members to vote "by proxy"

[6] The press releases mentioned in this section are analyzed in Section 7: Press Releases, and are included here for clarity.

(without being present physically) without meeting criteria of exceptional circumstances that account for their absence. An UMAS y MEChA Press Release dated April 9th, 1994 offers clarification on the Department Standing Rules which applied to Dr. Flores' tenure vote. According to these rules, faculty members were not allowed to vote by proxy except in exceptional circumstances that affect their ability to attend a vote, including absence from the campus, unavoidable schedule conflicts, and illness. According to the press release by UMAS y MEChA, Dr. Middleton wrote in a letter to Dr. Flores that "It is clear that some of [the faculty members] missed the meeting for reasons other than the three listed in the rules" (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 51-52). The April 14th press release by the 3 Chicano faculty members corroborated this information. At this point, the procedure document states that Dr. Flores protested the second vote. Dean Middleton sustained this protest and ordered a third vote. Dr. Flores then protested the Dean's decision to hold a third vote on the reasoning that "a third ballot would not be a vote on the merits of the case but rather a political vote on the Chair's leadership" (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 29). Middleton maintained his decision to hold a third ballot, which was unprecedented in a Sociology Department tenure case at the time, and he issued Dr. Marx "12 Rules" to guide him in the next balloting. The final ballot resulted in a 6-9 vote against granting Dr. Flores tenure in Sociology. Dr. Rivera reported "irregularities" in the process to Dr. Flores, who again protested to Dean Middleton. The faculty member's press release clarifies the irregularities of the third vote, stating that faculty members who were not present at the first vote were allowed to vote, which violated the 12 Rules that Dean Middleton provided Dr. Marx in conducting the third ballot.

Middleton decided "not to decide" on the merits of Dr. Flores' protest of the third ballot, and instead rolled over the power to decide on the merits of this protest to his Arts and Sciences

Personnel Committee (PC). The committee held two votes in this case. The first vote was to decide whether or not to accept the Sociology Department's third ballot on Dr. Flores' tenure case. The second vote was to decide on whether to recommend Flores for tenure or not. The document notes that the PC voted to uphold the Sociology Department's third ballot, despite knowledge of Dr. Flores' protests. A second vote was taken to decide on whether to recommend Dr. Flores for tenure, with 1 voting in favor, 10 against, and 1 person abstaining from voting, thus resulting in a negative recommendation from Dean Middleton's PC. The tenure procedure document, along with the students' and faculty members' detailed press releases and other supporting documents in the "Flores' Tenure Procedure Section," provided a detailed and substantiated explanation for the irregularities in Flores' tenure process.

The nature and sequence of the irregularities and complete disregard for departmental procedure, requiring the multiple votes casted serious suspicion on the motives of Dr. Marx, and the racial climate in the Sociology Department. Students sought to rhetorically expose the Sociology Department's procedures as "unethical" and "racist." These claims were tied to central demands for the Alliance, which sought an investigation into Dr. Marx's actions by the Boulder Faculty Assembly as well as "protection" from retaliation for the Chicano faculty members in Sociology. Eventually, student protests against these voting practices came to the attention of upper administration, and resulted in an extensive investigation into the racial climate of the Sociology Department that found that there was indeed racism in the Sociology Department which influenced Dr. Flores' tenure review.

The next document in this section includes a copy of Department Chair Gary Marx's negative recommendation to Dean Middleton regarding Flores' tenure case. The document presents the voting results and Chair's summary of the first two Departmental votes, and an

evaluation of Dr. Flores research, teaching, and community service. The purpose of including this letter in the press packet was to further substantiate the Alliance and 3 Chicano Sociology faculty members' claims that there were procedural errors throughout the voting process, and to substantiate personal claims of racism experienced by Chican@ students and faculty in their personal and professional experiences with Marx that they felt impacted Dr. Flores' tenure review. A central theme in Dr. Marx's recommendation for Flores includes the necessity of applying "general standards" in research, teaching, and service for all faculty members in Sociology, regardless of race. However, from a procedural standpoint, it does not appear that Dr. Marx applied general standards in conducting the three Departmental votes in Sociology. Dr. Marx's writing is personally biased in its characterizations of his failed procedures as Chair in this case, not objective. In the first paragraph of Dr. Marx's recommendation against tenure, Dr. Marx characterizes his decision to allow the proxy votes in the first vote in a way that is personally favorable, and not objective, as a Department chair should be when citing the facts of a case in an official Chair Recommendation. With regards to the results of the first vote, Dr. Marx writes,

> "That tally includes the vote of the Chair. It also includes the vote of three faculty members who, for valid personal reasons, were unable to turn in their vote by noontime on Nov. 23 when ballots were requested. Their votes were turned in about two hours later. A procedural question was raised about that vote. In consultation with the Dean and as a result of his recommendation based on the advice of counsel, a finite revote was held" (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 31).

To be clear, Dr. Marx committed three procedural violations in Flores' first tenure vote, according to the rules of the Sociology Department at the time. First, Dr. Marx casted a vote as a

Chair, although this was not allowed by Departmental rules except in the case of the tie. Furthermore, Marx did not just accept proxy votes without adhering to the Sociology Department's criteria of "exceptional circumstances," which was a second procedural violation, but Dr. Marx also accepted proxy votes that did not meet the Departmental deadline, which was a third procedural violation. While it is unclear based on the information provided whether or not this was intentional or racially motivated, these practices were irregular. The fact that three votes were taken would have compromised the integrity of the vote as Dr. Flores suggested. Thus, Dr. Marx's conduct in Flores' tenure review warranted greater investigation. Furthermore, Dr. Marx's writing is biased and misleading in his characterization of his procedural mistakes. Dr. Marx qualified his decision as Chair to allow the three physically and temporally invalid proxy votes on the basis that the faculty members could not attend "for valid personal reasons." He writes this statement in his official Chair Recommendation, even after it was determined by Dean Middleton that some of the votes did not meet the Departmental definition for "exceptional circumstances" (the criteria is not "personal valid reasons") for a vote of absence, and even after a new ballot was ordered because of this error. This is a subtle way of expressing disagreement with Dean Middleton's revote, and a way for Chair Marx to save face for his errors. Marx also characterized his procedural irregularities as "a procedural question" that resulted in a revote which, while *technically* not incorrect, would obscure these procedural flaws in the upper levels of tenure review. In this way, Marx covertly brushes off his procedural failures. Therefore, Dr. Marx was misleading in his Chair Recommendation regarding the Sociology Department votes, and was also not applying the general standards in the Sociology Department in Flores' tenure process. These procedural discrepancies justified a deeper inquiry into Dr. Marx's actions, and further justified a sentiment by the three Chicano faculty members that the Sociology

Department may have been racially hostile. The Alliance sought to make this record known to press reporters so that accurate reporting could be ensured in this case.

The majority of Dr. Marx's letter discusses his recommendation against Dr. Flores' tenure on the basis of his research, teaching, and service record in the CU-B Sociology department. Specifically, Dr. Marx claims that Dr. Flores' research "is not excellent," as measured by publication in major sociological journals, book publications by reputable sociological presses, and by favorable external reviews. As evidence for his claims, Dr. Marx refers to unfavorable reviews by external reviewers in the fields of sociology of immigration and health, while noting that the external reviewers in the field of Chicano Sociology were very favorable. Dr. Marx also claims that Dr. Flores' teaching record is "good, but not excellent" (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 32). He does not provide specific evidence to substantiate this claim in the front-facing Chair Recommendation, though it is possible he did so elsewhere in his review. Dr. Marx claims that "elements" of Dr. Flores' service is excellent in local, state, and national areas, although he points out that "[Dr. Flores] service to the [Sociology] department has not been strong" (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 32). While a comprehensive analysis of the Flores tenure case is out of the realm of this thesis, future scholars may be interested in analyzing the academic and racial discourse of this particular policy battle.[7] Nonetheless, there appears to be an emerging discourse presented by Marx that values the traditional imperatives of Sociology that have historically privileged a white male subjectivity, and which appears to conflict strongly with the conceptions of Chican@ scholarship that constituted an emerging discipline in Sociology at the time. There also appears to be a discord between Marx's theoretical application of "general

[7] As a result of the 1994 Ethnic Studies protests, an internal investigation was ordered into the racial climate of the Sociology Department in November 1994. This 8-month investigation was then forwarded to 5 external reviewers, which all found that there was some level of racism in the Sociology Department. These external letters were made available to the public by Chancellor Park on July 20th, 1994. A study participant donated me a copy. Dr. Marx's rhetoric on "general standards" must be placed within racial context, and the state of Chican@s in academia in 1994.

standards" as it applied to the Sociology department, and as it applied to his actions in this Departmental review.

This section also includes a career statement by Dr. Estevan Flores on his research, teaching, and service history. This document serves as an explanation of Dr. Flores' research impact for Chican@/Latin@ communities. Dr. Flores documents his work across several research areas, including undocumented Mexican immigration, Mexican migration, the Immigration Control Act, Mexican immigrant women, Race and Ethnic relations, and a career shift to Latin@ cancer research in 1988. Themes in Dr. Flores' Career Statement included a focus on social action research, an international perspective to research, and a focus on improving the lives and outcomes of Chican@/Latin@ communities through research. Highlights from his research included the featuring of his dissertation research on the economic expenditures made by undocumented immigrants in contrast with their use of social services, which was featured in the landmark Supreme Court case Alien School Children V. Texas that ruled that undocumented children had the right to attend Texas schools. His work on Mexican migration and the Immigration Reform and Control Act were also featured in a variety of international publications (Historia y Sociedad, Frontera Nortem), and presented at a number of conferences in Mexican universities (Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico, Universidad de Guadalajara, Universidad de Sonora, etc). In 1988, Dr. Flores changed his research focus to cancer research after losing his own father to the disease. At the time of writing, he had been working on a 5-year cancer study that totaled $2.2 million in funding, and another study that totaled $148,000 in funding. Dr. Flores also had a number of publications pending in the area of "improvements and outcomes" research in Latin@ communities. In addition to his research, Dr. Flores also contributed extensively to CSERA as a Research Coordinator, and wrote many grants

to support the recruitment and retention of graduate students of color at CSERA while drawing many students of color into his research projects. While reading Dr. Flores' career statement, it is clear to see that Dr. Flores' research was motivated by a sincere desire to improve the lives of Chican@s and Latin@s in his community through scholarship, a prerogative which was shared by many of the UMAS y MEChA students who rallied in support of his tenure case and who had Dr. Flores as a professor in their classes. Dr. Flores' made meaningful contributions to the formation of the Ethnic Studies Department, where his research and teaching were valued by faculty and students in the growing Chican@ studies discipline. The students sought to highlight these contributions by including them in their press packet.

Finally, this section concludes with a petition circulated by UMAS y MEChA to demand Flores receive tenure in Sociology, and to demand an inquiry into Dr. Marx's actions. The petition focuses specifically on Dr. Flores research in the Alien School Children v. Texas Supreme Court case, as well as his cancer research project with the National Cancer Institute, and also mentions that this research was funded for $5.5 million dollars. It also mentions that Dr. Flores was on the Governor's "Health Advisors Task Force." The inclusion of these research initiatives demonstrate that the students wanted to draw attention to the wide impact of Dr. Flores' research on Chican@ and Latin@ communities in Colorado. Towards the end of the petition, the students write, "Gary Marx, the chair of the Sociology dept. does not feel that the research Dr. Flores does is worthy of tenureship. In essence, the message Gary Marx is giving is that people of color are not worthy of scholarly research" (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 41). This statement implies that students of color felt personally impacted by Dr. Flores tenure denial, and internalized the message that Chican@ scholarship and the communities that it served was

not valued at CU-B. This was likely amplified by the overall hostile racial climate at CU-B, which often compelled students of color to leave CU-B prior to their second year.

Support Statements from Other Groups/Individuals (Pages: Pages 13-16*, and Pages 42-44)

The "Support Statements from Other Groups/Individuals" section of the press packet contains a letter of support for SCAEP from Chair Joanne Arnold of the Chancellor's Standing Committee on Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual issues, a letter of support from Dr. George Rivera for Dr. Flores and the CU-B Chicano community, and an email from what appears to be a CSERA faculty member to a member of SCAEP, presumably Michelle Foy. In this section, I also included a speech by Dr. Polly McLean called, "WHY ARE WE HERE?" which was delivered on May 7th, 1994 at a CU-B Town Meeting for People of Color. The purpose of this section is to demonstrate a broad base of faculty and administrative support for the Alliance's student demands. Themes identified in this section include appeals to solidarity amongst marginalized groups, as well as critiques of CU-B diversity initiatives and discourse on "diversity."

The first document included in the "Supportive Statements" section is a concise statement of support for SCAEP's Demands from March 31st from Joanne Arnold, who was the Chair of the Chancellor's Standing Committee on Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual (GLB) Issues. The letter serves as a show of support for the SCAEP Coalition and its demands. Arnold mentions that the Chancellor's GLB Committee have "many goals in common," in that both groups "[sought] to make this campus a richly diverse and truly hospitable place for all people." Arnold also stated that she appreciated SCAEP's description of CU-B as a "stronghold of white, male, heterosexual power" (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 42). Another document that I included in this section was a document by the Campus Lambda which appears in the "Previous Press Articles" section,

which expresses support from the student, faculty, and Although not covered extensively in this thesis, a parallel movement at CU-B during the CU-B Ethnic Studies movement included efforts by LGBT students at the University seeking greater recognition and inclusion for LGBT people in University anti-discrimination policies and healthcare (Slee, 1994). According to Roberts (2013), there was not a strong presence of "out" queer and trans voices in the Alliance itself at the time of the protests; groups such as UMAS y MEChA exhibited a level of homophobia as well. It is unclear how much meshing there was between CU-B's Ethnic Studies movement and the LGBT movement beyond statements of solidarity.

The next document in the "Supportive Statements" section includes a statement by Associate Professor George Rivera in the Sociology Department in support of Dr. Estevan Flores receiving tenure, which is addressed to "All Chicano Students at the Boulder Campus." The purpose of this document is not only to express support for Dr. Flores, but to serve as a call to action for Chican@ students to stand in solidarity with one another amidst attacks to the Chican@ community at CU-B. In the letter, Dr. Rivera states his support for Flores' tenure given "his record of Chicano research, teaching, and service," which resulted in "unique contributions to Chicanos at this university and to Chicanos and Mexicanos at the national and international levels" (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 43). With this statement, Rivera reasserts the value of Flores' academic work for the Chican@ community, presenting a challenge to Marx's implication in his Department Chair letter that Flores' academic work was not valuable because it was not universal. Flores' research focus on Chican@ communities challenged a fundamental notion of positivist research, which conceives of research as being inherently "objective" to be valid. To ensure that Flores would get his tenure, Dr. Rivera says, "We are at a time in history where others are trying to erode and minimize Chicano contributions to

society…We, as a family of Chicanos, must stand up to the dictates of our collective conscience" (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 43). In this sentence, Dr. Rivera makes an appeal to *Chicanismo*, or Chicano Nationalism, to motivate CU-B Chican@ students to move into action in Flores' tenure case. Dr. Rivera's statement of support for Flores' tenure is particularly significant to establishing the Alliance's credibility in the media because Dr. Rivera was one of only three Chicanos in the Sociology Department at the time, and also a separate witness to the Sociology Department's hostile racial climate. Dr. Rivera was the professor who alerted Dr. Flores to the irregularities in his voting process, according to the "Flores' Tenure Procedure" document. His statement of support reflects Chican@s' value in community-centered research, teaching, and service.

Another document included in this section includes an email by what appears to be a CSERA faculty member to a member of SCAEP named Michelle. The purpose of this document is to demonstrate CSERA's support for the Alliance, as well as to establish a line of communication between CSERA when SCAEP regarding its demands. While the document is not dated, nor is the sender name visible, it appears to be from a faculty member of CSERA who is trying to set up a meeting with a member of SCAEP named Michelle shortly after the group created a "Demands Document." The letter reveals that CSERA had been working with the Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) for about a year to arrange for an expedited review on establishing an Ethnic Studies major at CU-B, and had received confirmation for this proposal a month prior to the email. The letter states that, "There are many steps in creating a new degree program, but most of them can be dealt with quickly in this case, for reasons that we would like to explain to you all" (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 44). Although it is not exactly clear what these expedited steps are, the sender of the email might have been referring to

CSERA's strategy to convert the Afro-American Studies major to a four-track Ethnic Studies Department, which required significantly less steps than creating an entire new Department. This would have been helpful information for the media to know, so that media outlets were aware that CSERA was also in support of the student movement and that there were steps being taken to create an Ethnic Studies Department that were supported by the student movement.

In the "Supportive Statements" section, I also included a speech by Dr. Polly McLean that she made at a March 7th, 1994 Town Meeting for People of Color at CU-B, which was previously between the "UMAS y MEChA Histories" and "SCAEP Demands" sections. The purpose of including this section in the press packet was to offer historical, political and institutional context of the state of diversity at CU-B amidst the students' demands. The speech was delivered a few weeks prior to SCAEP issuing its demands for an Ethnic Studies Department to the CA&S. Based on the University's first "all-race" conference on February 25th, 1942, the CU-B Town Meeting for People of Color was convened by the Native American, Latino, African American, and Asian Advocacy committees from the Multicultural Center to discuss the 1994 CU-B Diversity Plan commissioned by the Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE). Dr. McLean begins by contextualizing the historic moment the town hall meeting took place in. From CU-B's institution of affirmative action policy for faculty hiring in 1942, to numerous university task forces, and the numerous reports and recommendations that these groups had generated, Dr. McLean wrote, "Whether successful, some of the measures called for have been adopted. Many of us sitting here today and the programs that we represent are the result of these recommendations. So why are we here?" (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. This political context is important because it reflects not only the cyclical nature of institutional reform measures at CU-B that was very present at the town hall, but also the progress (though

limited) that occurred from such measures, despite the fact that CU-B still had a long way to go. This progress was only possible due to the tedious time and labor that students, faculty, and administrators of color put in across various points in University history to make systemic change possible, coming to fruition in specific windows of opportunity. In fact, many of the studies that student protesters cited in their own arguments for an Ethnic Studies Department were the product of years of self-studies and task forces. Despite the fact that the CU-B Diversity Plan of 1994 was limited in its impact, that CU-B was talking about diversity on an institutional, systemwide and statewide level set a helpful backdrop that supported the students' arguments for an Ethnic Studies Department as a way to further institutional diversification goals. This made the students' argument for an Ethnic Studies Department more tenable in 1994.

The speech itself also served as a critique of ongoing University discourse regarding the Diversity Plan, and a call for solidarity amongst people of color at CU-B. A central motif to Dr. McLean's speech is the question, "Why are we here?", with the "we" referring to people of color at CU-B, who often asked themselves that question when facing consistent marginalization at the University. This was perhaps a question attendees of the town hall might have been asking themselves, reflecting a level of exhaustion from communities of color at CU-B discussing yet another institutional initiative for diversity. In describing one of the many purposes for people of color to participate in the process of drafting the Diversity Plan, Dr. McLean writes,

> "We are here to call into question a broad umbrella of diversity, in a postmodern America, that may very well because of its lack of distinctions cause it to include even what it intends to oppose. We are here to guarantee that…no matter how many methods and varying versions of decentering the curriculum exist, what we define as diversity

does not get consumed by debates that obscure our struggles for social justice" (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 44).

This section of Dr. McLean's speech was particularly important because it alludes to a particular historical moment in which campus administrators were trying to "obscure" diversity discourse at CU-B to the point that it would become antithetical to the very social movements that called for a re-examination of University diversity policies and practices to begin with, and would therefore become incompatible with social justice. After all, diversity, equity, and inclusion pillars came out of student of color protest movements. Creating a generalized, abstracted version of institutional diversity would have been beneficial for CU-B administrators who wanted to avoid the costs and labor of creating a more diverse campus at CU-B because it would mean there was no meaningful diversity discourse to hold them accountable to. In this way, CU-B diversity discourse could become effectively deracialized, leveling any and all markers of difference as systematically "equal" while ignoring systemic oppression that created inequitable outcomes for people of color specifically. This sentiment of frustration with diversity discourse at CU-B was also present in the SCAEP demands document, which opted to use the word "ethnic plurality" as the ideological underpinning for its Ethnic Studies movement as opposed to "whitewashed, bastardized phrases [of] 'multiculturalism' and 'diversity'" (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 24).

Press Releases (Pages: 45-53)

In the "Press Releases" section of the press packet, there are 6 press releases that were distributed to media outlets by the Alliance, by the three professors in Sociology, by UMAS y MEChA, and SCAEP. The purpose of these documents was to notify various press outlets about upcoming direct actions that student organizers were going to take, as well as to provide media

outlets with accurate information regarding Flores' tenure case and institutional progress on student organizers' demands. Two of the press releases are authored by the Alliance, one is authored by Drs. Flores, Facio, and Rivera, two are authored by UMAS y MEChA, and one is authored by SCAEP. The last three press releases were presumably authored prior to the creation of the Alliance. Press releases served as an excellent protest tactic for student organizers to solicit ample press attention on their direct actions throughout the course of the protests, and also gave some insight into the protests themselves and the messages that student organizers were trying to convey through their demonstrations.

The two documents authored by the Alliance were titled "PRESS CONFERENCE AND MASS ACTION CALLED BY UMAS y MEChA AND SCAEP ALLIANCE" and "FACELESS ADMINISTRATORS ATTEND ROTARY CLUB MEETING." The first document pertained to the April 20th press conference, march, and rally that student protestors utilized as a final deadline to CU-B administrators to get their demands met before escalating actions, and the second document was used to notify press about an April 15th guerilla theater protest at a CU-B Rotary Club meeting that several upper administrators were attending. At the Rotary Club meeting, student organizers intended to illustrate the lack of response to student organizers' demands by staging a guerilla theater demonstration, with students wearing white masks representing "bureaucracy" and lack of accountability by administrators to CU-B diversity goals. In essence, the April 15th Rotary Club Demonstration served as a surprise demonstration to shock administrators who were unresponsive to the Alliance's demands, and who likely weren't anticipating a demonstration of this type. The motif of "faceless administrators" and the use of the white masks and protest signs also added a visual element to the protests that was particularly striking in the press articles written about it afterwards. By writing press releases, Alliance

members were likely able to garner more accurate and sympathetic media coverage for their protests by progressive news outlets in Boulder throughout the course of the protests. In the April 20th Press Release, the Alliance held a press conference prior to their mass rally and march, and provided news outlets with the press packet that is being analyzed for the current study. Thus, providing the press with a detailed, comprehensive press packet served in and of itself as an organizing tactic by the Alliance, who wanted to solicit a greater amount of news attention in anticipation of its escalated political actions in the weeks to come, including the Tent City and the hunger strike. This media strategy was chosen in order to put greater pressure on CU-B administrators, who would also have to answer to the press to defend their actions (or the lack thereof) on CU-B diversity goals.

The press release written by Drs. George Rivera, Estevan Flores, and Elisa Facio is titled "CHICANO PROFESSORS DENOUNCE RACISM IN C.U. SOCIOLOGY DEPARTMENT." In this press release, the three Chicano professors in Sociology protested inaccurate remarks made by Dr. Gary Marx in the press regarding Flores' tenure case, they described their experiences with racism in the Sociology Department, and they voiced their solidarity for the student movement for Ethnic Studies (Alliance Press Packet, 1994). They accomplished this by detailing the procedural issues with the three votes taken in Flores' tenure review (which were explained earlier in the "Flores' Tenure Procedure Document"), as well as providing a list of racist incidents that they endured while talking to the Chair. These included remarks by Marx that Chicanos didn't belong in the Sociology Department because their research only focuses on Chicanos, implications that Chicanos were "racists" for mentoring and advising students of color, comments that Chicanos were not "well-trained," and Marx comparing Chicano self-determiniation movements to the "Nazi Movement" (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 48).

They then called on Dean Middleton and Vice-Chancellor Bruce Ekestrand to rectify the racially hostile environment in Sociology, and notify the press that they had asked to be transferred from the Sociology Department on April 11th, 1994. Finally, the 3 professors end the letter by reiterating their support for the student CU-B Ethnic Studies movement, writing, "We unequivocally support the student's demands that all people of color be valued as human beings and that Ethnic Studies be accorded the status of a legitimate disciplinae comparable to any other department at C.U" (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 49). The conclusion is important because the students once again symbolically link Flores' tenure case, and the plights of faculty of color in general, with the student movement for Ethnic Studies at CU-B.

The two press releases written by UMAS y MEChA are titled "Chicana(o) Students Meet with Sociology Chair" and "Press Release- April 9, 1994." Both of these press releases were released prior to the creation of the Alliance. The first press release details a meeting between members of UMAS y MEChA and Sociology Department Chair Gary Marx, and it is dated April 12th, 1994. Once again, themes of Dr. Marx's discourse became evident. While he reportedly "evaded questions" related to Flores' tenure case and concerns for retaliation against Chican@ faculty in Sociology , Dr. Marx reportedly said many problematic statements during this conversation. After explaining the need for faculty of color to teach courses on race, the students report that Dr. Marx asked them "why they wanted to separate themselves." They also mentioned that Dr. Marx stated that faculty of color often have research that is "too narrow and unrealistic," and that he "[didn't] see why Hispanics can't do work in their communities and still publish in major sociological journals." Dr. Marx ended the conversation by praising "Hispanics" who could "be realistic…[and] play both sides," stating that he couldn't remember "the Spanish word for oreo, banana, or coconut" (Alliance Press Packet, 1994, p. 50). Based on

this rhetoric, it is clear that Dr. Marx expected a successful Chican@ candidate to conform to white standards of research and ways of being in order to be successful in receiving tenure, and that he generally regarded Chican@ researchers as incompetent compared with white researchers on the basis of race. Dr. Marx had a fundamental misunderstanding about the nature and significance of Dr. Flores' research, which contrasted strongly from those of the Chican@ students and faculty members Dr. Flores had worked with. Further, Dr. Marx saw Chican@ sociology as both divisive and inferior. This press release serves as further documentation of Dr. Marx's bias against Chican@s at CU-B in the media, which was needed to justify an investigation into his actions as Department Chair.

The second press release details their belief that the voting practices in Flores' tenure case were unethical and racist; it describes the voting process in all three votes, as described in the Flores' Tenure Case Documents section. At the time this press release was written, Flores' tenure case was at the second level of review by College of Arts and Sciences Dean Middleton and his committee. The purpose of this document is to refute claims by Marx in his Department Letter, and to present a case for Flores to receive tenure based on his scholarly accomplishments at CU-B and to Chican@-based research in Sociology. UMAS y MEChA members refute claims in Marx's Department recommendation that Flores' work was not published in high quality journals and therefore was not "excellent by these standards" by mentioning that Flores was in fact published in the journals of *Human Organization, In Defense of the Alien, International Migration Review,* and more, and that his syllabus was being included in a volume for Chicano Studies sponsored by the American Sociological Association, which is corroborated by Dr. Flores' Career Statement. The students also refute a central claim by Marx that Flores' teaching was "good, but not excellent" by mentioning that he had received an Excellence in Teaching

Award from the Women and Gender Studies Department at CU-B. In this case, many appeals are made to specific markers of excellence in research, and there is a counternarrative presented by the students to the one being advanced by Chair Marx after the three irregular votes took place. Students continued to protest the narrative about Dr. Flores' scholarship and teaching, and demonstrated the value that he had for Chican@ students, the Chican@ community, and CU-B with his research, despite the fact that the traditional white culture in Sociology did not recognize these contributions.

The final press release included in this section is titled, "STUDENTS DEMAND ACTION ON DIVERSITY," and it was released by SCAEP on April 7th, 1994 prior to the establishment of the Alliance. The purpose of the document is to inform the press about SCAEP's first rally and march in support of its Demand Statement. The press release is very similar in rhetoric and appeals to its demand statement, reiterating that the movement is student-led, that the students are acting as a "united front," and that they are working to advance ethnic plurality. The press release also provides a list of SCAEP's three demands, which were covered earlier in the SCAEP Demands Statement. The press release ends with a commitment to "transform UCB's rhetoric into reality." Given that this was one of SCAEP's first interactions with the press, it makes sense that they would want to communicate their demands statement clearly and concisely to press reporters so that they would understand what SCAEP's student movement was about.

Previous Press Articles (Pages: 54-76)

The "Previous Press Articles" Section has a collection of 20 news articles, newspaper clippings, and images of previous media coverage regarding the CU-B Ethnic Studies protests. The arrangement of the articles as well as the specific articles chosen were organized in order to

present a chronological and comprehensive press narrative of the CU-B Ethnic Studies protests that lent the student protestors credibility and favorable media coverage. The first five articles present institutional and political context for the Alliance's demands, while the next 5 articles focus on the progression of the CU-B Ethnic Studies protests themselves up until April 20th. The proceeding 7 articles represent a shift in media coverage on the CU-B Ethnic Studies protests themselves to the Flores' tenure case. The final news article presented, dated the same day as the Press Packet release date (April 20th, 1994), focuses on progress made on the Alliance's demands as a result of their student protests and recent meetings with CU-B administrators (Reinholds, 1994). The press packet concludes with a series of photos from the CU-B Ethnic Studies protest rallies.

The first five articles present institutional and political context for the Alliance's demands. Two of these articles were opinion editorials in *the Colorado Daily.* One was written by student Tonee Mwamba of the UCSU (University of Colorado Student Union) in critique of the CU-B 1994 Diversity Plan (Mwamba, 1994), and by Carlos Kareem Windham of the Alliance (Windham, 1994). One *Campus Press* article was related to mixed reviews on Chancellor Corbridge's diversity record (Alsever, 1994), and another was about "lackluster" progress on faculty of color hiring from 1992-93 (Slee, 1994). The final article appeared in *the Colorado Daily* and documented UMAS y MEChA's rally on behalf of the 3 Chicano Sociology professors (Reinholds, 1994), in which UyM presented their original demands. These articles were important to establishing a comprehensive critique and context for the Alliance's demands from a variety of perspectives.

The next 5 articles focus on the progression of the CU-B Ethnic Studies protests themselves up until April 20th. Two of the articles, featured in the local *Boulder Daily Camera*

(Cosper, 1994) and *the Colorado Daily* (Reinholds, 1994) respectively, covered the Alliance's first mass rally on Tuesday, April 12th, 1994. Another article in *the Colorado Daily* focused on a Wednesday, April 13th, 1994 rally that featured ex-Panther Lorenzo Kom'Boa Erwin as a speaker (Logan, 1994). The final two articles, featured in *the Colorado Daily* (Reinholds, 1994) and the *Campus Press* (Dahne, 1994), covered a Thursday, April 14th rally where Drs. Flores, Facio, and Rivera were present. The first two articles were significant because they demonstrated a variety of protest tactics that the student organizers utilized to get their demands met. These included staging a rally of over 300 students at the UMC Fountain, followed by a 150-person march down Broadway Street to the Regent administrative center. On their way to the administrative center, students participated in chanting that critiqued the slow pace of progress on their demands, and demanded action over committees (Cosper, 1994). Once at the administrative center, Darin Quintana of UMAS presented Bruce Ekestrand with the Alliance's demands; images of the march and of Quintana presenting the list of demands became popular in news coverage following that event (Cosper, 1994; Reinholds, 1994). Students demanded to meet with Vice-Chancellor Ekstrand and Chancellor Corbridge the very next day, and resisted attempts to have a meeting the following Tuesday instead; they promised to come back on Thursday to either "celebrate" or march (Reinholds, 1994). Tactically, the student organizers employed a variety of escalating protest tactics within this single rally alone, making good on promises to administration that they would rally on behalf of their demands. This was a strong start to the Alliance's joint protests, and set the stage for an extensive and coordinated student movement to come in the following weeks.

The article regarding the Wednesday, April 13th rally focused mainly on a loosely organized student rally that featured ex-Panther Lorenzo Kom'Boa Erwin, who shared about his

time working in the non-violent protest movements against segregation in 1950s Chattanooga, Tennessee, as well as his time as a former Black Panther. In the image included in the article, he is pictured speaking, with student Carlos Windham to his left with arms crossed, and a student named Edelle Corinne to his right; there is a picture of Malcolm X gazing forward in the background (Logan, 1994). The rhetorical effect of this news article is to once again connect the Alliance's struggles for an Ethnic Studies Department to previous liberation struggles and wider community networks, particularly the Black Power movement. The presence of older activists of color gave a certain spiritual quality to the CU-B Ethnic Studies movement that was paying homage to the previous activists that came before it, and a sense that the "baton" for social change was being passed on to the CU-B Ethnic Studies protesters.

The last two articles in this subsection, featured in *the Colorado Daily* and the *Campus Press* respectively, report on the April 14th, 1994 rally, which featured Drs. Flores, Facio, and Rivera as guest speakers (Reinholds, 1994; Dahne, 1994). This rally was significant because it was the first rally that saw the direct participation of faculty in the student protests within this particular sampling of articles. By contrast with the faculty and administrator participants who are interviewed in the following section about their experiences with the CU-B Ethnic Studies protests, Drs. Flores, Facio, and Rivera played a more direct role in the Ethnic Studies protests as evidenced by protest tactics such as speaking at student rallies, contributing supportive materials to the press packet, and writing press articles in support of Dr. Flores and the student protesters. Still, no faculty or administrators participated in more disruptive tactics such as the marches or sit-ins at the Regents office. The 3 Chicano faculty members were in a different university position compared with other faculty and administrators at the University because they were central to the students' demands. With an ongoing tenure case and transfer process from the

Sociology Department, which are typically private and confidential processes, the 3 Chicano faculty were able to expand the policy arena for their concerns to a greater number of people--namely, CU-B students and the press--that would have otherwise had no power to elevate their concerns about racial discrimination in the Sociology Department. While their decision to collaborate with student protesters and go public with the tenure case itself was certainly controversial to some at CU-B, the Chican@ faculty and students were able to interrupt a University process that normally didn't take into consideration the concerns of Chican@ students or their communities, which is nonetheless a subversion of traditional University power dynamics.

The proceeding 6 articles represent a shift in media coverage on the CU-B Ethnic Studies protests themselves to the Flores' tenure case. It is unclear whether there was a shift in the press coverage at this time itself to focus more exclusively on Flores' tenure case, or if student protestors arranged the packet to make a rhetorical shift themselves. Two articles featured in the *Campus Press* (Gewirtz, 1994; Cosper 1994), one articles featured in the *Rocky Mountain News* (Gutierrez, 1994), one article featured in *the Denver Post* (Baca, 1994), and one article featured in *the Colorado Daily* (Reinholds, 1994) expand the record on the Thursday, April 14th, 1994 rally with the 3 Chicano faculty members. One *Colorado Daily* article covers an April 18th, 1994 letter signed by 15 out of the 17 tenured professors in the Sociology Department which countered that Flores' tenure process was "democratic" (Reinholds, 1994).

These articles feature more quotations by the 3 Chicano faculty members and members of the Sociology Department compared with prior media coverage on the CU-B Ethnic Studies protests. This signals a shift in the discourse of the CU-B Ethnic Studies Department to Flores' tenure case in the media after the April 18th rally. While these faculty quotations are rhetorically

similar to previous documents examined for Flores' tenure case, the articles regarding the April 18th rally contribute more details about the faculty and student protest tactics. For example, Cosper's *Boulder Daily Camera* article mentions that CSERA faculty member Salvador Rodriguez del Pino told the 300 students at the rally that should Middleton consent to a transfer, that "[CSERA] would welcome them with open arms" (1994, p. 4). As with the 3 Chicano faculty members' press statement, the Ethnic Studies Department is presented as a joint, related struggle and a "solution" to the transfer case of the 3 Chicano faculty members. From an institutional perspective, it likely would have been easier to establish an Ethnic Studies Department from the old Afro-American studies major than to try to rectify the tense situation in Sociology, especially with issues of racism involved that upper administrators likely did not have adequate experience in handling. This was despite an overarching focus on the University on diversity at the time. CSERA demonstrated a willingness to embrace the 3 Chicano professors in their transfer, and to provide a politically safe solution to the issue.

Certain visual motifs in the media were very similar across these news outlets in the coverage of the overall protests, which was a result of student and faculty protest tactics. These included photos of "faceless administrators" guerilla theater protests, photos of former UMAS co-chair Quintana facing CU-B administrators when presenting the Alliance's demands, and photos of Drs. Flores, Facio, and Rivera speaking at the April 18th rally (Alliance Press Packet, 1994). The faceless administrators protest coverage is particularly significant. Similar to the April 15th Rotary Club demonstration, Reinholds (1994) reported in a frontpage *Colorado Daily* article that there were students who once again put on white masks labeled "FACELESS ADMINISTRATOR" and held up signs with phrases such as "WE'LL FORM A COMMITTEE" (p. 1) to protest the disconnection between CU-B administrators from students of color, and to

critique the common university responses to calls for the implementation of diversity initiatives. In an April 15th article, Reinholds reported that some students playing faceless administrators were walking around saying, "Blah blah blah, we'll set up a committee…blah, blah, blah," and had printed out the Alliance's demands to scribble and doodle all over them (p. 11). One student in Cosper's frontpage *Boulder Daily Camera* article posed straight-on for a photo in a white mask labeled "FACELESS ADMINISTRATOR," holding a sign with the phrase "IT'S NOT MY JOB," and covering his ears, thus "symbolically not listening as students [demanded] a degree-granting Ethnic Studies program" (p. 1). The focus on faceless administrator performances, the standoffs between Quintana and CU-B administrators, and on the visuals of the 3 Chicano faculty members speaking served as a counternarrative to University institutional power. The students were effectively able to craft a rhetorical campaign through staging specific visuals through their protests, thus mocking the traditional bureaucratic channels of power which normally dominated the acceptable discourse and initiatives around increasing diversity, often yielding little concrete change. These protests fascinated the media in the small town of Boulder, Colorado, and these visual and rhetorical protests naturally lent themselves to many frontpage headlines and visuals.

The final news article presented, featured in *the Colorado Daily* and dated the same day as the Press Packet on the final student protester deadline to CU-B administrators (April 20th, 1994), focuses on progress made on the Alliance's demands as a result of their student protests and recent meetings with CU-B administrators (Reinholds, 1994). The effect of this article is to serve as a final, positive note to the future trajectory of the CU-B Ethnic Studies movement. In this article, Raquel Lopez--one of the 4 students who participated in an earlier meeting with upper administrators--conveyed that, "There is progress in the sense that at least there are

promises…but not in the real sense." Later in the article, Lopez states that "All three of the gentlemen we met with seemed willing to work with [the demand for establishing an Ethnic Studies Department]...But they have to deal with larger systems. They're not the ones who can make all of the decisions" (Reinholds, 1994, p. 1). Lopez shows good faith to the administrators that the Alliance members spoke with, who had a productive conversation with the student protesters. However, the student protesters also recognized that while discourse was moving in a positive direction, there was still no commitment to action. The press packet concludes on a powerful note with a series of photos from prior CU-B Ethnic Studies rallies and marches, a premonition of the hunger strike and resistance that would come in the next week.

Conclusion:

This section presented my findings from conducting a content analysis of a press packet released by the UMAS, MEChA, and SCAEP Alliance on April 20th, 1994. This section included a variety of university, press, and archival documents that were meticulously arranged by the Alliance to both represent themselves in the media as a united and organized front, to document their protest demands and autonomous group histories, as well as to signal their continued commitment to the CU-B student movement for Ethnic Studies. The press packet both served as a tactical document in and of itself when it was released on the eve of the student hunger strike announcement, as well as a physical representation of the Alliance's creation and evolution up until April 20th, 1994.

The following section reports on my findings of interviews conducted with 2 former CU-B student protesters, 2 former CU-B faculty members, and 1 former CU-B administrator, based on their university position during the 1994 CU-B Ethnic Studies protests. Each of these participants was involved either directly in student protests for Ethnic Studies, or indirectly in the

policy discussions on the CU-B 1994 Ethnic Studies protests. Their accounts give voice to the relational tensions and possibilities of organizing within the multiracial Alliance in a 1994 context, as well as the tensions and possibilities of protesting and advocating within institutional power channels for an Ethnic Studies Department from their unique institutional positions as students, faculty, and administrators.

Interviews with Students, Faculty, and Administrators

This section reports on the results of interviews conducted with 2 students, 2 faculty members, and 1 administrator[8] who were involved directly in the 1994 student protests, or in a position of knowledge about the 1994 Ethnic Studies Protests at CU-B as they occurred. Given that university status (student, faculty member, or administrator) was a significant factor for participant experiences with the Ethnic Studies protests at CU-B and policy processes related to them, the findings for this section are broken up into two subsections: student interview themes and faculty and administrator interview themes. These findings are reported through narrative portraits and supplemented by quotes to best preserve the voice of research participants, and to demonstrate the relationship between the themes identified and the concrete actions and experiences of study participants.

Subsection A focuses on the results of the student interviews, and reports on the following themes: Level of involvement in Ethnic Studies movement, protest tactics utilized by participants (Direct or Indirect), and leadership roles played in the Ethnic Studies movement; challenges faced in student organizing, tensions and possibilities based on race & gender in the Alliance, experiences with backlash, perspectives on factors for success, impacts on participants, and impacts on the University.

[8] These classifications are based on participant university position (student, faculty member, or administrator) during the 1994 Ethnic Studies protests.

Subsection B focuses on the results of the faculty and administrator interviews, and reports on the following themes: Level of involvement in the Ethnic Studies movement, protest tactics utilized by participants (Direct or Indirect), and advocacy roles played in the Ethnic Studies movement, challenges faced in advocating for student demands, perspectives on factors for success, impacts on participants, and impacts on the University.

Student Participant Backgrounds:

Marta Loachamin was a former student protestor and college freshman during the time of the CU-B Ethnic Studies protests. She identifies as Ecuadorian and as a Latina woman. During the protests, Marta was studying Latin American studies; she eventually switched to the newly-established Ethnic Studies program, and graduated with a Bachelor's degree in Ethnic Studies in 1998. She also took a number of CSERA classes prior to the establishment of the Ethnic Studies department. She was not formerly a part of any particular student organization prior to the creation of the Alliance, but she hung out and made close friends with UMAS y MEChA members, Oyate members, and Black Student Alliance (BSA) members. Marta played a key organizing role in the protests, and served as a secretary for the Alliance's meetings. She also participated in the Alliance's 6-day hunger strike. Today, Loachamin serves as a Boulder County commissioner in District 2, where she works towards social, economic, and housing justice. Loachamin is the first Latina to serve as a Boulder County Commissioner.

Tim Russo was also a student protestor during the 1994 Ethnic Studies protests at CU-B, and he was a senior at the time of their occurrence. He graduated with a degree in Latin American Studies in Spring 1994, and also took a number of classes in CSERA prior to the protests. Russo identifies as a white, cisgender male. He was deeply involved with leftist campus groups prior to the CU-B Ethnic Studies protests, including ACHANGE (A Coalition

Helping Achieve a New Global Equality), SEAC (Student Environmental Action Coalition), and the INVST program. Russo's activism experiences in college included aiding in a support caravan to Black Mesa and Dine reservation to support land rights struggles against coal mines, organizing against NAFTA and neoliberal trade policies, advocating for environmental justice, and more. Russo participated in the hunger strike, and also led many rallies to the College of Arts and Sciences (CA&S) Dean Middleton's office at the time of the protests. Today, Russo works as a Station Manager and Community Coordinator for KGNU Community Radio in Boulder, CO, where he works to elevate voices through community-powered radio.

Level of Involvement, Protest Tactics (Direct or Indirect), and Leadership Roles in the Alliance

Both student participants were heavily involved in the Alliance's protests for the Ethnic Studies movement. Both students engaged in visible, direct action protests held by the Alliance, participated in the 6-day hunger strike, and participated in ongoing, extensive organizing discussions held by the Alliance. Loachamin and Russo's roles varied within the Alliance. As mentioned above, Loachamin played a leadership role in the Alliance documenting the discussions had between members as a secretary for their meetings, and participating in decision-making processes within the Alliance regarding which were the best tactics to use. For Russo, his leadership manifested itself in that he participated in conversations about strategies to use to get student demands met, and he took a role of leading marches to Dean Middleton's office during the protests. Their roles in the Alliance were distinct; however, both forms of leadership contributed to the protests' overall successes.

A variety of protest tactics emerged from the Alliance's protests. Russo and Loachamin mentioned various protest tactics including rallies, flyering campaigns, and, of course, the 6-day

hunger strike. Russo also mentioned that the protestors deliberately chose a variety of spokespeople in the media, so as to showcase broad-based support for the movement. The interviews revealed another layer to the student hunger strikes that I was not aware of previously, which was the deliberate escalation of the protest tactics, and the opportune timing of the hunger strike. Loachamin had mentioned that hunger strikes were a tactic that members of the Alliance had seen take place at other campuses during the protests. Russo mentioned that with the approach of finals and summer in May, the student protestors had begun to feel an urgency to get serious negotiations with the Regents and upper administrators, who were keen on drawing out the protests until the summer for the momentum to die down. Speaking to how the Alliance came to the decision to strike, Russo said,

> "There were a lot of protests that led up to that hunger strike. That was a last resort tactic and strategy, and there was a lot of conversation. I think that there were breakout groups in the different organizations that formed the Alliance…[regarding,] what are the best tactics? And oh, this group wants to do X, and this group wants to do Y. So I came from one of the social groups that ended up being a part of SCAEP and the Alliance that was much more direct-action focused, so we had been pushing for takeovers of some of the buildings…We had conversations about taking over the Engineering building, because that was where the money was made."

Russo's experiences leading up to the hunger strike illuminate several important elements to the Alliance's overall strategy. Firstly, it is important to note the strategic, escalating nature of the Alliance's protest tactics, with the hunger strike employed as a last resort. The Alliance participated in a number of rallies by the UMC, sit-ins in administrator buildings, building occupations, and guerrilla theater performances leading up to the decision to embark on a hunger strike. This decision was not made lightly, and involved deep conversations amongst and between the various student organizations that made up the Alliance. As the press packet

analysis demonstrated, student protesters also had multiple meetings with upper administrators prior to announcing their hunger strike.

The timing of the hunger strike was also noteworthy. Despite the fact that students had meetings with administrators and this was important to establish their credibility from an institutional point of view, the fact was that an escalation of protest tactics was necessary in order to push past administrative unresponsiveness. The students continual engagement with University officials through protests in response to their administrative unresponsiveness maintained their power over the policy discussions, and demonstrated that the Alliance would not be complacent with continued administrative unresponsiveness. As Russo mentioned, with the approach of finals and the summer, administrators would have been able to drag out the protests if the Alliance did not employ a drastic escalation in protest tactics. In other words, the window of opportunity for a successful protest movement was approaching its deadline. The hunger strike not only had a symbolic significance, given that students wore armbands with the word "Huelga" (Strike) in solidarity with Cesar Chavez and the Farmworkers movement, but it also raised the stakes for administrators if they continued to push back the time for serious negotiations with the student protestors. In essence, the longer that the administrators pushed off their meetings, they would continue to be faced with escalating protests, bad publicity in front pages across from the media, calls from parents, and possible long-term legal and fiscal consequences.

Russo also shared that the negotiations with the Regents were an element of the protests that hadn't received as much attention before, but that the hunger strike was used as a medium to bargain during these negotiations. The Alliance members made sure to choose the students who would be most effective in leading these negotiations. While the hunger strike started off with

no food or water, Russo shared that the strike eventually became a water hunger strike, and even moved to a juice strike. This was done to incentivize concrete action on the part of University officials, and to send the message that "We'll move with you a little bit here if you show some good faith on your part." Although neither Loachamin or Russo participated in these negotiations, this element is important to discuss nonetheless.

Challenges of Student Organizing

A key theme which emerged from the student interviews included the challenges of student organizing. Student participants mentioned challenges with organizing in the mid-1990s prior to the explosion of social media, or the proliferation of cell phones and computers. In contrast to the highly digitized processes of organizing via social media today, students in the 1994 CU-B Ethnic Studies Protests had to invest a lot more time, labor, and money into getting the word out about their direct actions. Loachamin described the process of organizing protests throughout the month of April by saying,

> "It's important for people reading whatever you're producing to understand that social media is a completely different way of communicating…And, even just the process of the work that we were doing and organizing, just how different it was. We didn't post [online] and hope people showed up; it was literally that we were finding 200 people in person, and telling them where to be, how to be there and what to bring, so very different [from today]."

Russo expressed a similar sentiment, stating, "The information that was available was because folks went to the [library] stacks and did the research and pulled [documents]. I mean, there was no Google in 1994." This starkly contrasts with the modern day processes of student organizing today, wherein processes such as researching for a demand statement, making a protest flier, printing out copies of said flier, and even advertising a direct action can be done almost entirely online by devices in an organizer's direct possession. In recognizing the

significance of the 1994 Ethnic Studies movement at CU-B, it cannot be understated the sheer level of time, labor, conversation, and coalition-building that went into the successful student movement. The press packet alone is a physical testament to this extensive, ongoing student labor. Student activists had to put in immense time and labor into working in the Alliance on top of the various responsibilities that protestors had to contend with as college students such as attending regular classes, working to support themselves and/or their families, and organizing within their individual organizations.

Just as the stakes grew higher for campus administrators, so too did the stakes grow higher for 37 students in the Alliance and beyond who participated in the hunger strike for Ethnic Studies at CU-B. With the sheer level of involvement from the student organizations that participated in the CU-B Ethnic Studies protests, the student protestors faced varying levels of costs and risks commensurate with their involvement in intense direct action protest tactics. Reflecting on her time participating in the hunger strike, Loachamin relayed,

> "[Students asked themselves,] how important is [the movement] to you? And what are you really willing to risk? For a lot of us, it was our academic path. We were afraid of retaliation. Our professors were worried about losing their jobs. And we were putting our health on the line. And what was that about, and why?"

As Loachamin's case illustrates, student activists were aware of the risks and costs associated with their participation in the protest movement. These risks and costs also took on different dimensions depending on student participant's social identities, and their year in school. For example, Loachamin and Russo discussed a conversation about the best protest tactics to use, and the ways in which risks and costs were associated with different protest tactics. For example, while Russo was a part of one of the progressive white student organizations pushing for more direct actions such as building occupations, Loachamin recalls that her and a group of

women from UMAS y MEChA had discussed these interactions afterwards, saying, “Did you hear what those white kids are saying? Taking over buildings and some stuff like that.” While Russo was about to graduate, he had less to lose compared with Loachamin, who was a freshman at the time of the protests. Additionally, students of color had more to lose (i.e- financial aid, disciplinary action, etc) if law enforcement were to get involved in the use of disruptive protest tactics than white students, especially if they were from a first-generation or working class background.

Tensions and Possibilities within the Alliance based on Gender and Race

There were a number of tensions and possibilities around race and gender that emerged from the student interviews. Loachamin described tensions within UMAS y MEChA at the time of the protests based on proximity to mexicanidad/Chicanidad, and both she and Russo discussed tensions in the Alliance based on gender. Gender inequity played out in both overt and subtle ways in the Alliance. In terms of gender dynamics, Russo pointed out that,“Most of the presentations [at Alliance rallies] were male-dominanted, whether they were men of color [speaking], or white men.” In organizing meetings, Loachamin shared that men in the Alliance would at times talk over the women speaking during organizing meetings without realizing it.

Loachamin expressed that one of her greatest motivations for joining the Alliance was to participate in a multiethnic coalition after having been excluded from UMAS y MEChA by some members, who claimed that UMAS y MEChA was “not her group” because she was not Mexican. She connected these experiences to the internal dynamics within Latinx communities, and the ways in which Latinx communities enact internalized oppression onto one another, and felt that it was important to include this in the historical record. These experiences elucidate deep challenges to unify between Latinx communities in the U.S with their own backgrounds

and migration experiences, despite similar oppressions today.[9] Although Loachamin faced exclusion from UMAS y MEChA, she expressed that she saw her active participation in the Alliance as a way to advocate for greater unity between different racial groups, and to discuss the links between the oppressions that communities of color face. In this way, Loachamin engaged across the internal tensions of race and ethnicity through the intentional process of coalition-building, which served as a possibility to transform these relations in the Alliance.

Backlash

Both students interviewed reported a significant level of social and/or academic backlash as a result of participating in the protests, and this backlash carried different dimensions depending on the students' racial and gender identities, as well as the types of involvement that they had in the protests. Loachamin described experiencing criticism from white students in her classes, and in her workplace, for participating in the protests. Many of the white students asked her questions such as, "What are you doing? Why are you doing that? Are you sure this is a good idea?" These white students were ignorant of the need for students of color to advocate for Ethnic Studies, and these students were critical of the methods employed by the Alliance, as if it were an overreaction. Loachamin also described an instance of racial discrimination at the Dalton Trumbo UMC Fountain during one of the student protestors' rallies, in which a white male student spat in her face and told Loachamin, who is Ecuadorian, to "Go back to Mexico." She has shared this story out in the community and in campaigns today as an elected official. She connected this to a larger sentiment of being critiqued for her involvement in different spaces, and being questioned about her reasons for being there.

[9] In 2020, the MECHA National organization held a vote in Arizona to vote on a name change for the organization. A majority of chapters voted to rename the organization from "Movimiento Estudiantil Xicanx de Aztlán" to simply "MECHA," which means "spark" in slang Spanish. This was done to maintain the moniker, while de-affiliating the organization from Chicanismo and the concept of "Aztlan," which were denounced as inherently exclusive, anti-Indigenous, and anti-Black conceptions of Chicano nationalism.

In Loachamin's case, being a visible Latina student protestor meant that she was subjected to not only critique by white students who did not understand the need to protest for Ethnic Studies on a regular basis, but also that she was subjected to overt racial discrimination for her participation. Given that the dominant discourse on race in the mid-1990s was blanketed in paranoid white supremacist rhetoric about multiculturalism, it was likely that the white students who criticized Loachamin did not recognize the need for Ethnic Studies protests because the mere mention of racial disparities in the U.S at the time was contentious to some white Americans.

By contrast, Russo acknowledges that as a result of his identity as a white, cisgender male from a middle class background, he had much more privilege compared with many of his peers in the Alliance, and thus was not subjected to discrimination while participating in the protests. Russo believes he did, however, experience some academic backlash in connection with his involvement during the protests. After completing his course work at CU-B in May of 1994, Russo explained that he had decided not to attend his graduation for symbolic reasons. He left for Chiapas, Mexico, to do human rights and community work in Southern Mexico and Guatemala immediately after graduating from CU-B. In Summer of 1995, Russo came back to CU-B to visit, having realized that he had never been mailed his diploma from CU-B because, unbeknownst to him, he was being held back at CU-B on 2 math credits that he understood he should have technically qualified for from prior honors math credits in high school. He went to an administrator's office in Old Main at the time with one of his colleagues (a reporter at the Irish Times). As mentioned before, Russo had led many rallies through the Dean of the CA&S's office, so as he described it, he was a "known face and entity there." When Russo met with the administrator, they appeared "caught off guard." Upon recognizing Russo, the administrator

said, “Oh, you were deeply involved in the student movements.” In response to his concerns about being held back on credits he should have already qualified for and never receiving his diploma, the administrator replied by asking, “Based on your work in Southern Mexico working with indigenous groups…What’s the importance of having a diploma?” Russo was deeply frustrated by the administrator's response. He said rhetorically, “How much does it mean to me? After how much I’ve invested personally, financially [in the university]...just being a student, socially and activism wise, working to support efforts to make CU a better place?”

Though we cannot be certain that the University’s actions were an instance of intentional academic backlash in this case, the administrator’s association with Russo and the protests, her racially ignorant characterization of his work with indigenous groups, and the coincidence that Russo would be held back on credits he technically should have qualified for are suspicious at best, and ominous at worst. This is not the first time in history that CU-B administrators have allegedly subjected student activists to academic backlash. Prior to the 1970s UMAS EOP Protests, politically active Chican@ students on campus alleged having their financial aid files withheld by CU-B administrators, and some were potentially expelled from the university for their political involvement. Withholding of financial aid and academic suppression of the UMAS EOP was a key factor leading to the student protests (Marks, 2017; Facio, 2010). That student files are handled confidentially create barriers to researching instances of alleged academic suppression by universities, though accounts like this are important to note nonetheless.

Both Loachamin and Russo experienced a level of personal and academic backlash that took on different dimensions. In Loachamin’s case, she was exposed to greater physical and emotional dangers as a Latina young woman participating visibly in the CU-B Ethnic Studies at

a predominantly white institution compared with Russo, who had a measure of privilege due to his white, cisgender male identity. Russo also faced a high level of academic risk due to his visibility in leading direct actions against specific CU-B administrators, and he may have experienced a form of academic retaliation as a result of this involvement. Taken together, these two accounts demonstrate that student protestors face varying risks to their personal, academic, and professional lives when engaging in protests, especially when student activists are members of a marginalized group, and when they choose to partake in high visibility, direct action protest tactics.

Factors for Success

The most important factor stated by both Loachamin and Russo in the resulting successes of the Alliance's protests for Ethnic Studies at CU-B was the effective coalition-building within the Alliance. As Marta Loachamin put it,

> "We'd literally still be sitting here talking about a potential movement if people didn't come together and talk about what they were willing to give up for it…One group on its own, like UMAS y MECHA, *perdoname mucho*, but you're not gonna be able to do that kind of movement all by yourself. BSA and Oyate *tampoco*. SCAEP, maybe? But not really…There's power in numbers, there's power in movement, there's power in momentum. Your ability to get someone's ear, versus mine, versus [Russo's], is just different."

As Loachamin mentioned, the various groups which formed the Alliance were successful in their efforts because they were willing to come together and have the difficult conversations about compromise, and what they were willing to risk for the movement. Through the process of coalition building, the student organizations in the Alliance were able to combine their power, resources, and networks towards the shared goals of CU-B's Ethnic Studies movement. Indeed, given the abysmal rates of recruitment and retention of students of color by CU-B at the time, it

was highly unlikely that any single student organization on its own could have achieved the sheer level of success that UMAS y MEChA, SCAEP, BSA, Oyate, ACHANGE, and more, had achieved together. The Alliance's marches would not have been able to attract the same level of student investment, nor demonstrate the same level of student power, without the collective efforts of each organization within the Alliance.

Russo echoed Loachamin's sentiment that coalition-building was the most important factor for success in this case. Below, he shares his explanation for why that was:

> "More than the success of the protests, it was the success of the coalition building and the movement. The protests were tactics within a larger movement strategy. The protests are what folks focus on because that's what's visible, and that's what's remembered in a lot of ways, but the successful components that led up to the protests, leading [the students] to push the institution to respond to the movement demands, really was that coalition building…It was folks investing the time and the energy and the pain to collaborate cross-organizationally, and cross-culturally…Without that coalition-building, first and foremost in the students, then with the faculty members, and the national campuses…I don't think there would have been enough 'clout,' so-to-speak, to pressure the CU administration, and the Regents, to meet our demands."

Russo spoke to the importance of coalition building within the Alliance as the driving force of its successful movement strategy. In Russo's characterization of the movement, the Alliance's protest tactics were a result of this effective coalition-building effort, and were not the sum of the Ethnic Studies' movements successes in and of themselves. The protest tactics would not have manifested without the time and labor that students of color and white accomplices in the Ethnic Studies movement took to have meaningful conversations about working together multiculturally. Additionally, it was also integral that the students built powerful connections with not only the other student groups, but the faculty members both directly and indirectly

involved in the Ethnic Studies protest movement, and students building their own movements for Ethnic Studies at universities across the U.S at the time.

Impacts on Participants

Both student participants reported significant long-term impacts on their personal, professional, and academic lives as a result of their involvement with the CU-B Ethnic Studies movement. For example, Loachamin, who was a freshman at the time of the protests, was able to graduate with a degree in Ethnic Studies in 1998. In particular, she notes that Dr. Facio was a prominent influence in her academic journey at CU-B, and she continues to maintain contact with Dr. Flores and other students who were a part of the CU-B Ethnic Studies protests. She has taken Ethnic Studies approaches throughout various careers in her life, including as a real estate agent who worked for many years to empower first-time homebuyers of color, and today as a Boulder County commissioner working towards expanding equity in Boulder. Additionally, she reported that a lot of the concrete skills she learned while being a part of the Alliance--including planning a meeting agenda, learning how to get her message across, learning how to pull together different networks, and more--have become integral to her work as an elected official in Boulder county today. She continues to share her experiences with CU-B Ethnic Studies classes.

Russo also described the CU-B Ethnic Studies protests as "formative" to his experiences as someone working to build community media networks, and to learning how to play a supportive role as a white man participating in cross-border and progressive organizing work. He described how, as a white person engaging in discussions about tactics in the Alliance, it was an opportunity for him to learn more about deep listening skills, however imperfectly this may have been at the time. While he was living in Mexico, he was able to draw on his experiences in the Alliance and from coalition work he had done in Colorado to support work in media

strategies for various Indigenous and Meso-American social movements in Latin America. He would come back about once a year or so after graduating, by Dr. Hu-DeHart's invitation, to speak to Ethnic Studies students about the CU-B Ethnic Studies student movement. He continues to reflect on this protest movement today as a source of personal growth and reflection today, and also continues to share his experiences in the protest movement with CU-B Ethnic Studies classes. In their own unique ways, it is apparent that the CU-B Ethnic Studies movement was significant for Loachamin and Russo.

Impacts on the University

The students noted various impacts as a result of the Ethnic Studies movement at CU-B, and in particular the Alliance itself. Loachamin and Russo identified the creation of a model for multiracial coalition building as a long-lasting legacy of the Alliance protests, and Loachamin agreed. The Alliance was seen as having impacts on the modern-day Ethnic Studies Department, as well as broader implications for contemporary social movements. Speaking to the significance of the CU-B Ethnic Studies movement as a model of coalition-building, Russo said,

> "The end result and the fact that there is an Ethnic studies department that now has PhD programs and is very deeply established, and not only recognizes but champions its roots and the fact that it came out of a series of student protests, is really a testament to what that student coalition was able to achieve…I think it also offered a model of what a multicultural coalition of organizing could look like…You don't necessarily need to live together, but you respect the differences of folks, and you live as harmoniously as possible together, and work together. I don't know that we've really seen any multicultural manifestations [in Boulder] since then."

Loachamin connected Russo's observation that there hasn't been a significant multicultural manifestation in Boulder since the 1994 CU-B Ethnic Studies protests to ongoing issues with immigration organizing in Boulder. They both reflected on the difficulties of cross-organizational coalition building,

and the fears that groups sometimes have in sacrificing their organizational goals while working together to build coalitions for a larger movement. Russo opined that while the contemporary Black Lives Matter movement has inspired a lot of solidarity through mass protests in the wake of George Floyd's murder, he has not seen as much cross-organizational coalition building in the same sense in Colorado. In reflecting on work surrounding immigrant and DACAmented communities in Boulder, Loachamin reflected on the difference between solidarity and coalition building:

> "We have done a great job of hashtag solidarity, but not coalition building. We put our Nepalese community together with our Mexican community and with our Peruvian community, but we are still separated, and we still haven't figured out how to do that…What's that responsibility to do some of that work, and are people willing to make that type of a change?"

The participants reflected that there appears to be apprehension between groups in organizing with individuals who may be different from them today. While there is a solidarity in our knowledge about one another's struggles and our outspokenness about one another's struggles, tangible coalition building and the many benefits that it offers continue to be limited. This is significant because the multiracial coalition itself was identified as the most integral component to the success of the student movement by the student organizers in this study. However, racial discourse, racism, and race relations have evolved greatly in the nearly three decades since the Alliance organized for an Ethnic Studies Department at CU-B. While the Alliance continues to serve as a historical model for coalition building, it is a model that we are still recovering from historical memory and working to interpret for the contemporary moment. Contemporary student organizers must figure out how to put the 1994 Alliance in conversation with our present historical moment to more effectively find new ways to work in coalition with one another, both at CU-B and beyond.

Faculty and Administrator Participant Backgrounds

Dr. Evelyn Hu-DeHart was a professor in the History Department during the CU-B Ethnic Studies protests, and she also served as the Director for the Center of the Study of Race

and America (CSERA). After the Ethnic Studies department was established, Dr. Hu-DeHart also served as the chair of the Department. During the 1994 Ethnic Studies protests, she taught multiple classes in CSERA. She also contributed to the initiative within CSERA to convert the Afro-American Studies major to an Ethnic Studies department. Dr. Hu-DeHart was born in China, and immigrated to the U.S with her parents when she was 12 years old. She identifies as a multicultural person, and knows many languages, including English, Spanish, Chinese, French, and Spanish. Her research has focused on the Asian diaspora in Latin America and the Caribbean, as well as research on Yaqui indigenous peoples in Mexico. Today, Dr. Hu-DeHart is a Professor of History and the Director of CSERA at Brown University.

Dr. Polly McLean was a Professor in the School of Journalism and Mass Communications at CU-B during the 1994 Ethnic Studies protests, as well as the Faculty Associate to Chancellor from 1994-1996. She was regularly in meetings with upper-level administrators in Spring 1994 such as College Deans, Vice Chancellors, and more, particularly representing the faculty on issues of diversity. In college, Dr. McLean and other student organizers at her university in New York successfully protested for more courses focused on Africa. Her dissertation research was also focused on the study of the socialist revolution in Grenada, which she had been personally involved in. During the Spring of 1994, Dr. McLean taught a course through the CU-B INVST Leadership Studies program called, "Social Action Leadership Theory and Practice," which many key members of the Alliance were enrolled in. Dr. McLean is currently a Professor at CU-B in Media Studies, and she is also a chair on Chancellor Philip DiStefano's Boulder History Project.

Dr. Albert Ramirez served as the Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Affairs (AVCFA) during the CU-B Ethnic Studies protests. He identifies as Chicano and Tejano, having grown up

in Houston. In this administrative position, he regularly dealt with faculty affairs regarding tenure review, promotion, hiring, and more. In his capacity as AVCFA, Dr. Ramirez played key roles in advocating for the recruitment and retention of faculty of color at CU-B. He played an advisory role to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Dr. Bruce Ekestrand, who was in charge of the third level of review for Dr. Estevan Flores' tenure case during the CU-B protests. During his time as Associate Vice Chancellor, he also taught a course in Psychology--his home department--titled, "Social Psychology of the Mexican American," which was cross-listed as a CSERA class. Prior to his role as Associate Vice Chancellor, he was also the director of the Mexican American Studies (MAS) program on-and-off for several years, and played a role in hiring many Chicano faculty. Dr. Ramirez later served as the Chair of Ethnic Studies from 2005-2009, and played an integral role in establishing the modern Ethnic Studies Phd program at the University. Dr. Ramirez is now retired as a Professor Emeritus of Psychology at CU-B.

Roles and Tactics by Dr. Hu-DeHart: Strategic (Non)-Involvement by CSERA

The majority of faculty and administrators interviewed about their experiences during the CU-B Ethnic Studies protests employed a mix of direct and indirect protest tactics in advocating for the students demands. These tactics tended to be less visible, and less confrontational. The faculty and administrators interviewed played distinct advocacy roles during the 1994 protests for the 1994 Ethnic Studies protests that were heavily influenced by their unique university positions and, to an extent, by their prior political experiences. Of all of the faculty and administrator interviewees, Dr. Hu-DeHart--who was the director of CSERA, the academic program petitioning for the creation of an Ethnic Studies department in the CU-B College of Arts and Sciences--was ironically the least directly involved in the student movement for Ethnic Studies while they were taking place, as measured by participation in students' direct action

protests, speaking at student rallies, and authoring supportive newspaper editorials. As I interviewed Dr. Hu-DeHart, I came to realize that this was both intentional, and strategic. The official position of CSERA faculty during the Ethnic Studies protests was to, as Dr. Hu-DeHart put it, "Stay out of it." When she explained her academic program's reasoning behind abstaining from direct participation in the student movement, Dr. Hu-DeHart relayed,

> "We stayed out of it…[The CSERA faculty] were very careful, and studiously avoided participation [in the student protests]. We did not go out. I did not once go out to visit the students while they were on strike, so they wouldn't catch me in a photo. I did not speak at any of the rallies. I did not want to allow the administration the opportunity to say, 'Look, it's just a faculty thing, they're the ones driving it, and the students are just following their instructions.'"

Elaborating upon the political reasons for CSERA's abstinence from participation in the Ethnic Studies protests, Dr. Hu-DeHart added,

> "If the administration, if the Deans and the Provost, and anybody else in the administration saw the [CSERA] faculty visibly taking part…in this 'movido,' as we say in Spanish, what would they do? They would then blame the faculty and say, oh, faculty are using the students, or it's faculty generated or whatever. We did not want to give the administration that opening, that option. And, at the same time, I want to give the students all the credit for doing this for themselves, because one of the dynamics of Ethnic Studies, one of the histories of Ethnic Studies, is that it's always been grassroots and student-driven. "

Given the political and racial climate surrounding the Ethnic Studies debate on the CU-B campus, this strategy of decisive noninvolvement with the protests was likely the best course of action that CSERA faculty members could have employed to advocate for the Ethnic Studies department while the protests were taking place. Any public demonstration of support, whether in student protests or in the media, could have sabotaged the academic standing of CSERA, the proposal for Ethnic Studies, and the credibility of the student-led movement. Dr. Hu-DeHart knew that when they were dealing with white administrators who may have been uneducated

about race and ethnicity issues, their position as CSERA faculty and the success of their upcoming proposal for Ethnic Studies was constrained by their perceptions. However, CSERA faculty members were not uninvolved with the process of developing an Ethnic Studies Department behind-the-scenes, nor entirely uninvolved in the CU-B Ethnic Studies *movement*, I would argue. Their roles were simply more discrete.

Indeed, as the CU-B Ethnic Studies Department website notes, CSERA had submitted the "Proposal for the Creation of an Ethnic Studies Major and a Department of Ethnic Studies at the University of Colorado Boulder" in August 1993, over semester and a half prior to when the SCAEP student coalition had first issued their demands to establish an Ethnic Studies Department on March 31st, 1994 (University of Colorado, Boulder-Ethnic Studies, n.d). After President Albino signed the "Declaration of Diversity" on April 20th, 1994--which cemented her support for the 5 student demands, and set tangible institutional processes in place to address them--this signaled a turning point in the policy debate for Ethnic Studies. President Albino's declaration of support for the establishment of Ethnic Studies set a tone for CU-B college administrators such as Chancellor Corbridge, and Dean Middleton beneath her. At this point, Dr. Hu-DeHart explains, the faculty's strategy shifted.

> "After the students did their thing, then the faculty wrote this proposal to make this a whole Department of Ethnic Studies. How we managed this was to take the existing Black Studies major, because we know the politics. We said, we are not asking to create a new major, because that takes a lot of politicking. You know? To create a new major is a big deal. We said, we're not asking to create a new major; we just want to take the existing major and expand it from Black Studies to Ethnic Studies. And guess what? They bought our argument. We succeeded. And once you have a major, then you have a Department."

The choice to convert the Afro-American Studies major and department into an Ethnic Studies major as opposed to advocating for the creation of a whole new Ethnic Studies major was another strategic move employed by CSERA faculty. Dr. Hu-DeHart was right in her assertion that to advocate for the creation of a whole new department would have required more "politicking," and this would have also required significantly more time. This policy battle would have also taken place during the context of a white racial discourse in the U.S that was generally ignorant or defensive towards the issues of race and ethnicity. The deconstruction of the Afro-American Studies major for the purpose of constructing an Ethnic Studies major may seem controversial to some, and may be considered a negative effect of the establishment of an Ethnic Studies department in some views. The implications of this decision are further explored under the "Impacts on CU" subsection.

Roles and Tactics by Dr. McLean: "I wanted to be the Drop, not the Noise"

By contrast with Dr. Hu-DeHart, Dr. McLean implemented a mix of direct and indirect tactics in her involvement with the CU-B Ethnic Studies protests. Similarly, these roles were relatively invisible. Dr. McLean played more direct roles as a politically experienced mentor and professor for key student leaders in the protests, and a more indirect advocacy role at other points in her position as the Faculty Associate to the Chancellor, where she was in a position of knowledge to administrative discussions about the student protests as they took place. Of the interviewees, I believe Dr. McLean had the most direct impact on the student leadership in SCAEP, and on the policy outcomes in Flores' tenure review case.

As opposed to if she were a faculty member in the CSERA program, which would have constrained her involvement with the student leaders, Dr. McLean was in regular contact with key student leaders in the Alliance throughout the protests by way of her INVST class, "Social

Action Leadership Theory and Practice." Dr. McLean described the contents of the class to me, explaining that the class had assigned readings by great social theorists and organizers such as Paulo Freire, Karl Marx, Joseph Lenin, and Saul Alinsky. They read books about social activism, and how to organize. They would ask her questions regarding organizing, and she would share her opinions based on her personal experience. Dr. McLean also said that students were given experiential learning opportunities in her class, such as volunteering opportunities at a Chicano-run school in Denver called Escuela Tlatelolco. The school was run by Nita Gonzalez, the granddaughter of Rodolfo "Corky" Gonzalez, who was the founder of Denver's Crusade for Justice organization and is considered one of the Fathers of the Chicano movement. Dr. McLean also explained some of the organizational skills that key members of the class, and how she got to know Carlos Windham in the class, who was one of the most visible student leaders in the protests:

> "I'm teaching [the students] how to use the media to get their voices heard. They're learning how to write press releases to get the message out. They're learning how to speak; they're learning all these skills plus the theoretical background merging…This was the first time I had a Black Latino in the class. Carlos Windham."

In analyzing the press packet released by the Alliance, it is clear that the student organizers were extremely well-organized and calculated in their protest tactics. That the student protestors selected a broad mix of students from across groups in the Alliance to speak to the media was a sophisticated press technique that likely lent more credibility and demonstrated broad-based support for the movement. While other members in the Alliance likely brought their own knowledge to bear in protest tactics by drawing from their own political experiences in their respective student organizations, social networks, and previous education, it is noteworthy that many of the prominent leaders of SCAEP such as Carlos Windham came out of Dr. McLean's class.

Dr. McLean also implemented more indirect, strategic tactics in advocating for the student demands in her capacity as the Faculty Associate to the Chancellor. Firstly, when the students began their hunger strike, Dr. McLean advocated for the students to be checked on by a nurse. As mentioned in the previous section, Russo also shared that he believed that the negotiations with Regents during the student protests were an element that hadn't received as much attention, but that these negotiations were largely mediated through the hunger strike. In regards to sharing her concern about the student hunger strikers with the Chancellor, Dr. McLean shared,

> "I said to the Chancellor, 'I'm concerned, because they are definitely not eating, drinking. And what I'd like to do is send a nurse to check them out to make sure they're okay,' and he agreed. So one day, a nurse showed up to check--I don't know if they remember this, but I know she came--I don't know what they did. It was their thing, so I didn't want to be the back noise. I wanted to be the drop rather than the noise. I don't even think I told Carlos."

Through this intervention, Dr. McLean was able to advocate for the health and wellness of the student protestors without becoming personally involved and compromising her own position as the Faculty Associate to the Chancellor. However, another effect might have also been that her advocacy lent more emotional concern to the student protestors' movement by Chancellor Corbridge, and other upper administrators he may have been in contact with. This could have positively influenced the negotiations student protestors were having with top university officials, such as the President and the Board of Regents.

After Dr. McLean heard about the instance of alleged racial discrimination in the sociology department, she advocated for an investigation into the racial climate into the sociology department in her capacity as the Faculty Associate to the Chancellor. The Chancellor agreed with her concerns, and appointed her as a principal investigator in the case. An official

investigation was launched by Chancellor Fink into the racial climate of the Sociology Department in November 1994. Dr. McLean, along with the Dean of Music--Robert Fink--led an investigation into the racial climate of the sociology department at CU-B. In describing the results of her investigation of racism in the Sociology department, Dr. McLean shared with me:

> "I came up with a questionnaire. We interviewed almost every faculty member. Some were happy to do it, others were not so happy to do it…When I found out what I found out, which is that there were issues of serious racism within the department…[I told the Chancellor], what we will do is the following, and [the Chancellor] agreed: We will pick the top 5 sociologists in the country. The most learned on racism, who had only studied that all their life, [and] send the results of my interview--which was on tape and printed out--to them, and ask them for their opinion. All five came back and said, 'There is racism in the Department.'"

Dr. McLean's decision to send her investigation to five top external reviewers in the discipline of sociology served two purposes. Firstly, having their professional opinions lent more credibility to the argument that there was racism in the CU-B sociology department, given that these reviewers were more likely to be perceived as objective compared with internal reviewers and the fact that external review by prestigious scholars plays such an integral role in the tenure review processes at a research university such as CU-B. That they were experts in sociology, the subject matter at hand, also gave more credibility to their opinions in an academic setting. Secondly, this decision also "took the heat off" of Dr. McLean, so-to-speak, who would have potentially had to deal with political backlash from the racist department in an already tense political climate, if the final say came from her and Robert Fink.

To conclude, Dr. McLean played an integral role in fulfilling two of the five official demands listed by students within the Alliance, including the granting of Dr. Flores' tenure, and an investigation into Dr. Marx's actions to see if they would merit his resignation. Through this

interview, faculty background--and in particular, political experience--emerged as a strong component that can influence the protest tactics utilized by faculty within universities. Without her prior political experiences as a student organizer herself, Dr. McLean would not have been able to effectively guide and mentor the students in their political campaign to the extent that she did, or advocate effectively for Flores while also protecting her own position.

Roles and Tactics by Dr. Albert Ramirez: A Tempered Radical's Approach

Dr. Albert Ramirez also employed a mix of direct and indirect tactics in advocating for student demands in his position as Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Affairs (AVCFA), which influenced the structure and culture of the University. Direct tactics employed during the 1994 Ethnic Studies protests included utilizing his platform as AVCFA to give an address in support of the student protesters during the Equity and Excellence Awards Banquet and Graduation Ceremony of Spring 1994, which was a campus-wide awards ceremony he had spearheaded in his office to recognize the contributions of faculty, staff, and students of color at CU-B. Indirect tactics included utilizing his power and resources as AVCFA to bring Chicano faculty to CU-B, taking on leadership roles to develop Chicano studies on campus. When I interviewed him, Dr. Ramirez also shared creative and academic works that made reference to his time working at CU-B, and which discussed his specific experiences being a Chicano administrator during the 1994 Ethnic Studies protests. These included a book Dr. Ramirez had written called, *The Profe Files: Social Psychological Perspectives on Power, Pluralism, and Chicano Identity* (2013), as well as a dramatic reading titled, "Remembering the First-Generation Chicano Faculty at CU Boulder: A Dramatic Reading" (2021). These works, along with our conversations, illustrated his specific advocacy roles for the students' demands, and contributed to other insights I gained that will be presented in later sections.

Dr. Ramirez employed one direct tactic in advocating for the student protesters' demands by utilizing his platform as AVCFA to give a public address in support of the student protesters during the Equity and Excellence Awards Banquet and Graduation Ceremony[10] of Spring 1994. This event was a campus-wide awards ceremony Dr. Ramirez had spearheaded in his office to recognize the contributions of faculty, staff, and students of color at CU-B. This address also appeared after the successful student protests in the faculty and staff newspaper at CU-B known as the *Silver and Gold Record* on May 5th, 1994 (Ramirez, p. 2-3). As he chronicles in his book, *the Profe Files: Social Psychological Perspectives on Power, Pluralism,* the Equity and Excellence Awards of 1994 took place while the student protesters were on a hunger strike, and while they were camping inside of a Tent City on the Norlin Quadrangle on the other side of the CU-B campus. None of the speakers at the event had acknowledged this. The Awards also coincided with the campus-wide drafting of the 1994 University of Colorado Boulder Diversity Plan, a mandate by the Colorado Department of Higher Education (CDHE) to increase diversity across Colorado universities (Ramirez, 2015, p. 56). In his closing address titled "Voices of Change," Dr. Ramirez addressed a crowd of over 300 CU-B administrators, faculty, staff, and students, with CU-B administrators and colleagues sitting in the front row. In it, Dr. Ramirez made direct mention to the student protestors and to Flores' ongoing tenure case, saying,

> "We hear the voices of other CU students, and they too are the voices of equity and excellence. In their marches, their rallies and demonstrations, in their fasting, their voices are now and forevermore embedded upon the fabric of this university, and their voices cannot be silenced…We hear the voices of our own staff and faculty of color, and they are the voices of equity and excellence. Voices that refuse to accept artificial limits as to what constitutes the boundaries of their discipline and that dare to go beyond the

[10] The Equity and Excellence Awards continue to be held on an annual basis at CU-B.

existing paradigms of knowledge and understanding. Their voices are now and forevermore embedded upon the fabric of this university, and their voice cannot be silenced" (Ramirez, 2017, p. 56-57).

In describing the reception of his speech by his administrative colleagues, Dr. Ramirez wrote,

> "As I finished, I looked at my administrative colleagues. They were applauding, since everyone else was also applauding. But I could see beneath the smiles on their faces, smiles that covered their real feelings and emotions. And I knew that it was only a matter of time before I would be compelled to leave administration" (Ramirez, 2017, p. 57).

This show of support for the students was significant, and was one of the most visible advocacy tactics by faculty and administrators interviewed. By utilizing his platform as AVCFA, as the founder of the Equity and Excellence awards, and as one of the few Chicano administrators at CU-B, Dr. Ramirez disrupted a culture of silence and hypocrisy amongst University administrators, who were celebrating Equity and Excellence while willfully ignoring the voices and hunger of students who were camped on the other side of campus for diversity. By choosing such a public platform to proclaim his views as a CU-B administrator, Dr. Ramirez also subjected himself to possible criticism or professional backlash from upper administrators and colleagues who did not share his perspectives. At the same time, his address also voiced support for the Chicano faculty members who were facing racism in the Sociology department--whom he had personal relationship with--and whose scholarship was systematically devalued by academic racism at CU-B. This symbolically reified the purpose of the Equity and Excellence Awards to begin with, which was to recognize the contributions of students, faculty, and staff who were truly advancing equity and excellence at the University.

Dr. Ramirez also used a variety of indirect tactics to advocate on behalf of the students' demands, including utilizing his power and resources as AVCFA to bring Chicano faculty to CU-B, and providing emotional and administrative support to Facio, Flores, and Rivera during their transfer from the Sociology Department. As mentioned above, Dr. Ramirez was working as the Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Affairs under Bruce Ekestrand at the time of the CU-B Ethnic Studies protests. Although Dr. Ramirez did not participate in confrontational tactics, Dr. Ramirez shared that he had spearheaded many initiatives to recruit and retain faculty members of color as the AVCFA, in addition to his regular duties to all serve all faculty members. Dr. Ramirez explained that he was instrumental in bringing Facio and Flores to the campus, and he developed meaningful, ongoing relationships with many faculty and staff of color at CU-B in his time working there. His efforts supported the student protestors in their goals to establish the Ethnic Studies department by supporting their critical education, and through supporting the recruitment and retention of faculty members of color that student activists made relationships with at CU-B.

Dr. Ramirez also played an indirect advocacy role in support of the students' demands by taking on leadership roles to develop the Chicano studies program on campus at the University. In the early 1970s and 80s, he served as the Director of what was then called the Mexican-American Studies program (MAS), which later formed the basis of the Chicano Studies program at CU-B. In 2005, a decade after the CU-B Ethnic Studies protests took place, Dr. Ramirez came out of retirement to chair the Ethnic Studies Department, by request of faculty in the Department. At this point in time, Dr. Ramirez explained that "nobody wanted to touch" the Ethnic Studies Department, after it had become embroiled in a political controversy over comments made by CU-B Ethnic Studies faculty member Ward Churchill regarding the

September 9/11 Twin Tower bombings. As a result, the entire discipline came under academic scrutiny at the University, which again pointed to a persistent bias against Ethnic Studies at CU-B. In his time as Chair, Dr. Ramirez played a lead role in the development of the Ethnic Studies Department PhD program, which was a key goal for his time in this position. The proposal for the creation of an Ethnic Studies PhD program was submitted in his time as Chair. Today, CU-B's PhD program is the only Ethnic Studies PhD program that exists in the Western U.S outside of California.

Although both of these leadership roles--as Director of MAS in the 1970s/80s, and later as Chair of the Ethnic Studies Department in the early 2000s--took place outside of the specific historical context of the 1994 Ethnic Studies protests, these roles indirectly supported the studies of students of color in the Alliance who took classes in CSERA, and the doctoral students of color who came later in the Department of Ethnic Studies. In analyzing Dr. Ramirez' impact on the CU-B Ethnic Studies movement, his contributions display elements of the, at times, less visible, tempered radical approaches of faculty and staff of color that can nonetheless have profound and recognizable impacts on the material forms and outcomes of student protest movements, and the concrete implementation of student demands. While the tempered radical approach is most traditionally applied to faculty and staff who do not have formal administrative power (Meyerson, 2010), Dr. Ramirez' case is complex, as he had a number of faculty and administrative roles throughout his academic career at CU-B that at times blurred these power lines. His strength appeared to lie in his extensive University experience, networks, and relationships. His approach to social change also fits some of the grassroots tactics employed by tempered radicalists as identified by Kezar, including "working with and mentoring students; hiring like‐minded social activists; garnering resources and support; using data to tell a story;

joining in – utilizing existing networks; and partnering with key external stakeholders" (Kezar, 2011).

As a faculty member and administrator who navigated under the conditions of a shifting, racist racial discourse in a predominantly white institution between the 1970s, 80s, 90s, and 2000s, it is unlikely that a more confrontational approach would have been effective in his administrative and leadership roles in the life course of the Chicano Studies program, and would have likely put in jeopardy his academic position and livelihood, like Kezar has suggested (Kezar, 2010). Paradoxically, these roles--which demanded a greater level of discretion--also gave Dr. Ramirez greater power and resources to support the recruitment and retention of faculty of color, and to develop academic programs for students of color. Although there continues to be a tenuous relationship between those in social movements who employ radical approaches and those who advocate by utilizing tempered radicalist approaches, these ways of bringing about social change continue to co-exist and impact one another, whether this relationship is recognized or not. In specific historical moments, this relationship can be mutually supportive.

Challenges of Advocating for Student Demands in a University Context

There were two major challenges described by faculty and administrators in this study in advocating for the students' demands, including having to navigate academic racism in advocating for the Ethnic Studies Department, and faculty and administrators of color having to resist attempts by upper administrators to position them against student protestors.

Faculty and administrators of color had to navigate academic racism in advocating for the Ethnic Studies Department at CU-B. This was also a key reason why the Ethnic Studies Department was needed. Because CSERA was an academic *program* rather than a Department, this had a number of consequences for the academic powers and academic standing of Ethnic

studies disciplines at the University as a whole. Dr. Ramirez and Dr. Hu-DeHart both described the problems that existed from that designation, including the fact that CSERA could not hire its own faculty. Faculty members had to be hired jointly with CSERA in other academic departments such as history, sociology, psychology, and so on, and would serve as part-time, adjunct faculty with CSERA. This was the case for Dr. Flores, who was hired in the Sociology department and who also served as the Research Coordinator for CSERA. Speaking to the unequal power relationship between CSERA and the academic departments, Dr Ramirez explained,

> "Because [CSERA] wasn't a department, faculty that came and taught in CSERA--their tenure, promotion, their research, their entire academic/professional life, was not governed by the principles, frameworks, paradigms, [and] scholarship within the discipline, [which was] a very strong *emerging* discipline of Ethnic Studies, it was controlled by the traditional disciplines. In [Flores'] case, sociology, and their paradigms of what was valid scholarship, what were valid fields of scholarship in sociology…and what were the credible sources of disseminating that scholarship/knowledge…It was a system in which faculty may be teaching and spending much time doing service work and teaching at CSERA, but their livelihood and academic existence was in the hands of the Department."

Dr. Hu-DeHart also expressed that CU-B administration would often tack on advising responsibilities to CSERA faculty, which technically fell into the administrative responsibilities of Student Services. Specifically, CSERA faculty members were expected to advise students of color. This reveals another racialized layer of the unequal relationship between CSERA and academic departments at CU-B, and the necessity for establishing an Ethnic Studies Department at the University. Dr. Hu-DeHart relayed,

> "[CSERA] did not want the administration to keep attaching to us Student Services, and advising. We said that's not our job, we are an academic department. Don't tell us to go do student advising. There's a whole division over there that does those things. We had to educate the administration and make sure they understand, we are talking about an academic department just like history, just like sociology, just like economics…Don't confuse us with student services, with advising."

Essentially, instead of diverting money and resources to developing more programs to meaningfully support students of color (by hiring staff and administrators of color to do that), white CU-B administrators tacked on these responsibilities to faculty members of color in CSERA, who were only obligated to teach, research, and participate in service by their job descriptions. This was a practice of racial tokenization, and demonstrated that CSERA faculty had to educate CU-B administrators who were ignorant to the topic of race while they were advocating for the Ethnic Studies Department.

Another challenge faced by faculty and administrators of color was that they had to resist attempts by white CU-B upper administrators to position them against student protestors. Two of the three faculty and administrators of color interviewed reported similar instances of this occurring while the CU-B Ethnic Studies protests occurred. In Dr. Hu-DeHart's case, she recalled the following experience while student protests were happening:

> "A group of students decided to march to the Provost's at this time. And, I got a panicked phone call from the Provost saying, 'Evelyn, the students are marching to see me. You gotta come.' I said, wait a minute? Who are the students demanding to see? If they want to see me, I'm here, they know how to find me. They don't have to march to your office to find me. So if they're going to your office, they want to talk to you, not me, so I'm not coming."

When I asked Dr. Hu-DeHart why she felt that the Provost had called her instead of talking to the students himself, she replied, "Because they don't know how to deal with students of color…They're slightly unnerved, if not outright threatened, by the large number of students of color marching on them." It appears that, in the case of the Provost, Dr. Hu-DeHart believed that his motivation was not necessarily motivated by tact, but may have potentially been motivated by white ignorance and a racialized fear of the large number of students of color who were coming to see him. The plethora of media photos of over 150 student protesters surrounding timid, diminutive administrators throughout the course of the 1994 CU-B Ethnic Studies protests would confer this interpretation (Alliance Press Packet, 1994).

Dr. Ramirez reported a similar instance in my interview with him. He described a time where upper administration tried to get him to "be a buffer" between administration and the student protesters during the CU-B Ethnic Studies protests. Dr. Ramirez said,

> "When the protests came up, I remember the time that some administrators wanted to use me just like I'd been used in the early 70s when students were protesting, and putting me and the other Chicano faculty in the middle. By the 90s I had learned, because they wanted me to kinda go out there and kinda be a buffer. In some ways kind of representing the administration…and I said no, I'm not gonna do that. I'm not gonna do that. I'm going to use my own platform when the time comes."

Although no faculty and administrators reported any instances of professional or academic backlash as a result of their advocacy efforts in connection with the protests, the fact that two of the three faculty and administrators of color interviewed reported attempts by white upper administrators at CU-B to position them against student protestors is alarming. In the case of Dr. Ramirez, this had been a facet of his experience during the 1970s UMAS EOP protests. He was adamantly opposed to repeating this dynamic. In the case of Dr. Hu-DeHart, the Provost

attempting to suppress student protests by positioning her against them as a faculty member of color and the Director of CSERA was also unethical. This University strategy not only puts the professional livelihoods of faculty and administrators of color at risk, but their reputations in the community. More research is needed to understand the racialized forms of University repression against student social movements, and the ways in which these tactics have evolved over time at CU-B and beyond.

Factors for Success

Amongst the faculty and administrators interviewed, a number of overlapping factors for success emerged. These factors articulate the factors of success in different terms when compared with the factors identified by student protestors in this interview sample. A comprehensive list of these factors include the following:

- "Irrefutable" student leadership from an institutional perspective, and the high quality of student leadership;
- Student Demands were described as "clearly articulated," "specific," and "reasonable";
- The Student Coalition: Students came together to ask for the same demands, rather than "different groups asking for different things";
- Student Organization: The student activists had coordinated meetings and demonstrations that were clearly defined and followed through on;
- Student Protest Tactics: i.e- The Hunger Strike showed a seriousness, and commitment to the students' ideals;
- Student organizers were grounded in the historical background of protest movements, and knew that other schools had similar programs;

- No student group tried to “upstage” each other, or act like they were “better” than any other group when discussing strategy in the Coalition.

By contrast with the main factor identified by the two students interviewed (the multiracial coalition), there appeared to be a greater emphasis on the rhetoric and organization employed by the Alliance when faculty and administrators in this study were asked to identify the most important factors for success. From an institutional point of view, it was important that the student leadership was not only of quality, but that the Ethnic Studies movement was “irrefutably” student-led. Additionally, the focus on student demands being simultaneously “clear,” “specific,” and “reasonable” made the Alliance’s overall arguments more palatable and digestible within an institutional logic. There also appeared to be a cross-cutting focus on demonstrated student commitment, as exemplified by the students’ follow-through on meetings and demonstrations, and their participation in the hunger strike. Following through on these commitments built greater credibility behind not only the ideals of the student movement, but the ability that students would follow through on more drastic political actions, if needed.

By contrast, the students identified the student coalition as the most important factor to the protests' successes. In fact, Russo considered the student protest tactics--often the most “visible,” remembered parts of social movements--to have only been possible through the labor of coalition-building that the multiracial student organizations participating in the Alliance had undertaken. This is not to say that rhetoric and tactics were not integral facets of the movement, but this difference in priority speaks to the distinct roles of students, faculty, and administrators within the movement itself. While faculty and administrators were concerned with advocating for student demands within the institution, student protestors had to do the rigorous work of building and sustaining multicultural relationships to organize and agitate effectively for their

demands to be met. As Russo mentioned, there were also specific student organizers who were involved with the aspect of negotiating with upper administrators and Regents during the hunger strike; perhaps their perspectives might have differed.

A final factor that I identified which was an integral factor to the success of the CU-B Ethnic Studies movement includes the complementary roles and powers of student activists, and faculty and administrator advocates. From my interviews with the three faculty and administrators for this study, it was clear that they each had a measurable impact on the policy outcomes of the Ethnic Studies movement. In the case of Dr. Hu-DeHart, she and CSERA faculty played an integral role in the development of CSERA, employing careful political strategy to ensure that the Department would come to fruition. While the tradeoff was that CSERA faculty members had to remain relatively "invisible" in the Ethnic Studies protests themselves, this was ultimately done to secure the future of the Ethnic Studies Department that would support the scholarship of faculty and students of color in the midst of a racist academic culture. In Dr. McLean's case, she drew upon her own political experiences as an activist to sharpen student leaders' organizing skills and theoretical knowledge about social action in her INVST class, while playing an astute advocacy role in the Sociology Department's racism investigation that ultimately had huge impacts on Flores' tenure case. Finally, Dr. Ramirez also played an integral role in aiding the recruitment and retention of faculty members of color at CU-B and developing the MAS and Ethnic Studies PhD programs, both through policy and social support, all while navigating varying racial climates between the 1970s-2000s.

Paradoxically, however, these faculty advocacy efforts were bolstered, if not made entirely possible, by the student movement. If students had not intervened in the tenure denial of Dr. Flores and disrupted what is usually a private and confidential university process, this would

not have caught the attention of President Albino and the Board of Regents, who stepped out of institutional tradition and voted in favor of his tenure review. If student protesters did not strike for Ethnic Studies and show their deep interest and commitment for the Department, Dr. Hu-DeHart wasn't sure that the University would have been incentivized to approve the creation of an Ethnic Studies Department at the time. If students had not demonstrated their deep commitment to Ethnic Studies through their rallies and hunger strikes, Dr. Ramirez' platform would not have had the same impact. Analyses of student protest movements must always center the contributions of students, because it is the essence of authentic student leadership and autonomy that grants them their power. However, there must also be a recognition of the ways in which students of color and their faculty and administrative allies can potentially, under the right circumstances and in authentic respect of student leadership, support each other in movements for social change. This is especially true when studying a movement Ethnic Studies, a discipline that originated from student resistance.

Impacts on participants

Faculty and administrators interviewed reflected different long-term impacts of the CU-B Ethnic Studies movements on their personal, professional, and academic lives. Dr. Hu-DeHart framed the impact of the Ethnic Studies movement at CU-B in terms of her personal pride in the students who had led the movement. In particular, she connected the 1994 CU-B Ethnic Studies movement with other protest movements she had studied, including the first ever college Ethnic Studies movement at San Francisco State University in 1968. She pointed out that in Ethnic Studies movements throughout the decades, students have been at the forefront, and this was no exception in the 1994 Ethnic Studies Protests at CU-B. She stated that the CU-B Ethnic Studies protesters had broad impacts on her as a teacher, administrator, professor, and as an individual.

Dr. Ramirez expressed a high level of impact on his professional, personal, and academic lives as a result of the student protests. Most notably, he felt that his experiences with the protests allowed him to see both the positive aspects of change, and the intransigent aspects of "non-change" within the CU-B administration. He felt that he had brought about as much institutional change as he could have in CU-B administration, and decided to make a career transition to the CU-B Bueno Center for Multicultural Education, where he did community work with students and communities. While reflecting on his time at the Bueno Center, Dr. Ramirez expressed that, "It may [have been] a smaller circle of impact, but it [was] my circle." Dr. Ramirez' identification of his circle of impact speaks to the tradeoff that CU-B administrators at times have to make between positions that grant them more reach for potential impact and the ability to maintain their own identities.

While Dr. McLean was also impacted by the CU-B Ethnic Studies protests, she also mentioned that she had been "accustomed" to protest movements. This was again tied to her previous political experiences as a social participant and dissertation researcher of the socialist revolution in Grenada, and her successful experiences with college student organizing in New York City. In other words, Dr. McLean appeared to be comfortable and familiar with student movements. This perhaps also influenced her ability to be an effective advocate for the student demands and her own viewpoints with administrators. Once again, Dr. McLean's experiences underscore the point that prior political experience is an important factor in determining the form, shape, and outcome of faculty and administrator tactics and roles in advocating for social change, and the way that they make meaning of such experiences.

Impacts on the University

There were a variety of cultural and social impacts as a result of the Ethnic Studies protests, according to faculty and administrators interviewed for this study. In terms of systemic change, the student protesters were successful in securing nearly all of their demands from CU-B administrators. As a reminder, the student demands were the following:

> "1) An ethnic studies department, offering major and minor degrees in ethnic studies, including master's and Ph.d. [sic] degrees (The Center for Studies on Ethnicity and Race in America offers classes only for undergraduates), 2) tenure for sociology Assistant Professor Estevan Flores, 3) an official inquiry by the Boulder Faculty assembly of Gary Marx's actions, 4) "protection" of Chicano professors in the sociology department, 5) separation of cultural and gender diversity requirements in the arts and sciences core curriculum" (Reinholds, 1994).

An Ethnic Studies Department was established at CU-B in January 1996 (University of Colorado, Boulder-Ethnic Studies, n.d), and the Ethnic Studies PhD program was established nearly a decade later. Dr. Flores received tenure in January 1995 from the Board of Regents, and according to interview participants, Gary Marx left CU-B sometime after the external review came out. As Dr. Ramirez mentioned, Drs. Flores and Facio transferred from Sociology to the newly formed Ethnic Studies Department, and Dr. Rivera transferred to the Fine Arts Department. The only student demands that were not met include the establishment of an Ethnic Studies Masters' program, and the separation of Cultural and Gender diversity requirements in the College of the Arts and Sciences Core curriculum. Today, all students in the CA&S are required to take a generalized "Diversity" requirement which subsumes all forms of diversity, including 3 credits for U.S Perspectives which "must substantially address one or more forms of diversity" such as race, gender or sexuality, and 3 credits for Global Perspectives, which "address the need for students to think critically about historical/contemporary global forces and transnational connections" (University Catalog, 2021).

The faculty and administrators interviewed provided me with a deeper understanding of the social and cultural implications of realizing these systemic demands, elements which can often get lost in policy discussions about tenure and departments. Dr. Hu-DeHart described how CU-B, as a result of the Ethnic Studies Department, became one of the few Departments in the West outside of California granting an Ethnic Studies degree at the time, and how the CU-B Ethnic Studies Department became a national model for higher education institutions overall. She explained that, as a result, the campus became more attractive to a greater diversity of students of color. In fact, I only decided to come to CU-B because of UMAS y MECHA, and the Ethnic Studies Department.

Dr. Ramirez described how the establishment of an Ethnic Studies Department meant that faculty members of color such as Drs. Flores, Facio, and Rivera eventually found their "academic home" in disciplines that supported their scholarship and personal growth in ways that the CU-B Sociology Department could not.[11] In these environments, Dr. Facio became an accomplished Chicana studies scholar and became particularly well-known for her work in gerontology; Dr. Rivera became a world-renowned artist, curator, and professor in Fine Arts. Dr. Flores eventually moved on from CU-B, and went onto become the Executive Director of the CU Denver Latino/a Policy Center, and he also became the Chief of Cancer Research at CU Denver as well, doing outstanding research on behalf of his community. These accounts demonstrate that the movement for Ethnic Studies had demonstrable, long-term impacts for the careers and lives of faculty of color at CU-B. They also reveal the real time costs that faculty and administrators of color pay when concrete institutional initiatives to advance ethnic plurality are stalled.

[11] With the transfer of the 3 Chicano professors out of Sociology, the SOCY department lost all three of its only faculty members of color. This was another inadvertent systemic and cultural impact on the CU-B Sociology Department.

There was one negative impact associated with the creation of the Ethnic Studies Department. One controversial aspect about CSERA's political strategy to secure an Ethnic Studies Department was that it required a sacrifice of the Black Studies major and department for the purpose of creating an all-encompassing major and Department for Black Studies, Chicano Studies, Asian American Studies, and American Indian studies. As Dr. McLean shared with me, the Black Studies department came about from an early movement in the 1960s by CU-B's first Black faculty member, Charles Nilon. Roberts (2013) interviewed one Black studies faculty member, Dr. William King, who expressed that he was opposed to the creation of CSERA because he believed that it had been created primarily for "financial and political" reasons. He felt that CSERA was an organization "primarily led by Hispanics…[who] were concerned that given the financial changes that were taking place on the campus, they would not be given the opportunity to become degree-granting, something that Black Studies already had" (Roberts 2013). Dr. King had been told "in no uncertain terms" by Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Dr. Bruce Ekestrand, that if the Black Studies program did not participate in CSERA, then it would receive no further funding from the university (Roberts 2013). It is understandable that Dr. King would have been upset by this course of action, because it meant that Black Studies at CU-B would be systematically "knocked down" a level in systemic power and resources for the purpose of sharing with other programs, which impacted the future trajectory of Black Studies on the campus. It is unclear from the current research whether Dr. King may have felt differently over time, or how other Black studies faculty members felt about this decision. It is also unclear whether or not students were aware of this fact, or how Black students in particular may have felt about the proposal for the creation of Ethnic Studies. The

situation is not clear cut. More research is needed to convey the significance of this policy outcome with historical accuracy and integrity.

The records on the policy discussions and options for developing an Ethnic Studies department were not examined extensively for this case study, due to time limitations and research limitations on records for CSERA in the CU-B Norlin Archives.[12] While the creation of an Ethnic Studies department was financially and programmatically feasible for the CA&S by converting the Black Studies major, it pays to ask whether the administration had other policy options to potentially preserve the Black Studies major, if this was a widely-held position by Black studies faculty. One consideration to keep in mind is that this policy battle was defined by CU-B administrators' political willingness to invest in diversity or not in the future trajectory of the University. The current study suggests that upper administrators in charge of such decisions as departmental approval were ignorant at best about racial issues, if they did not completely disregard them. It is not unheard of in CU-B history that mostly white administrators would pit communities of color against each other by utilizing political maneuvers, as Professor emeritus Albert Ramirez demonstrates in his recent dramatic reading on the history of the Chican@ faculty in the Mexican American Studies program in the 1970s and 80s (Ramirez, 2021). Future studies should examine this internal policy discussion and its implications from an intersectional lens, and analyze how different faculty and administrators felt about it across social identities and university positions.

Conclusion:

The interviews with students, faculty, and administrators who participated directly or indirectly in the CU-B Ethnic Studies protests revealed a number of trends. Students explained

[12] As of now, many records directly related to CSERA and the Ethnic Studies Department in the 1990s in the CU-B Norlin Archives are not accessible, due to the fact that they may contain personally-identifiable information.

the power in coming together as a multiracial alliance, and the respect for consensus decision-making and the autonomy of each student organization. They also explained some of the challenges and benefits of coming together in a multiracial coalition, acknowledging the fact that they got to be a part of a rather rare collective across time. The students each sacrificed a lot for the CU-B Ethnic Studies movement in time and energy, and played important leadership roles in their own rights. Each student faced some form of backlash for their participation, a risk that they were willing to take for their critical education. For students, the CU-B Ethnic Studies protests served as a pivotal event that set them on a course for greater activism in their own respects for decades to come.

For faculty and administrators, the CU-B Ethnic Studies protests were experienced differently depending on the person and their lived experiences, with some feeling more impacted than others. Regardless, all faculty and administrators expressed positive emotions around the 1994 Ethnic Studies protests at CU-B. They each played unique roles that were informed by their jobs, departmental affiliations, previous political and life experiences, and social identities. While their tactics tended to be more discrete, they each played a supportive and strategic role in the realization of the students' demands.

The following section presents the concluding remarks of the thesis, focusing on the key points from the interview and archival study, relevance of study findings to prior studies, relevancy of the current case to the study of Ethnic Studies movements, and areas for future study.

Chapter 5: Conclusions

This section presents the concluding remarks of the thesis, focusing on the key points from the interview and archival study, relevancy of the study findings to prior studies, relevancy of the current case to the study of Ethnic Studies movements, and areas for future study. This thesis investigated the socio-historical construction of the successful student movement for Ethnic Studies at CU-B in 1994. Through an analysis of an April 20th Press Packet authored by the Alliance, as well as interviews with 2 former students, 2 former faculty members, and 1 administrator who participated directly or indirectly in the Ethnic Studies movement at CU-B, a number of insights have emerged. The Press Packet, which both represents a tactical repertoire (Klandermans & Skelenburg, 2009) of student resistance as well as an archival record, demonstrated that there were notable continuities in student protester discourse and rhetorical frames throughout the Alliance protests. Rhetorical continuities included critiques by student activists of the dismal recruitment and retention rates at CU-B, which were connected to a hostile racial climate for students and faculty of color. The Alliance fused SCAEP's Demands for Ethnic Studies with UMAS y MEChA's demands for tenure of Dr. Flores and protection for Chicano professors facing racism in the Sociology Department, illustrating the links between the struggles of students and faculty of color in a white supremacist academic culture. There was also an unwavering sense of respect for the distinct histories of each group within the Alliance, and a recognition of their power in coming together, which was essential to their effective coalition-building and co-organizing. The Alliance also utilized a variety of consistent and escalating protest tactics which supported their political campaign to turn University rhetoric into reality by both proving the value of their demands, while demonstrating their ability to join together and mobilize their communities. The media was utilized as a tool to uplift their

rhetorical arguments, with textual media, protest chants, and protest visuals serving as powerful messages that stayed in the consciousness of the media, as well as the history of the CU-B Ethnic Studies Movement.

The interviews with students, faculty, and administrators helped elucidate the lively legacy of the 1994 Ethnic Studies movement at CU-B, as well as the tensions and possibilities that exist in multiracial coalition building amongst student organizations, and in faculty advocacy for student initiatives within an institutional context. Student organizers and faculty members played different roles and employed different techniques within the Ethnic Studies movement, which had coalescing impacts on the successful outcomes of the Ethnic Studies movement. While students interviewed participated in direct and highly visible protest movements, the faculty and administrators interviewed demonstrated a mix of direct and indirect tactics, with a general tendency to be more discrete with their advocacy. Some maintained discretion for fear of reprisal, and others to maintain a political edge. However, ultimately, students and faculty appeared to work well together in this case scenario. These were dynamics that could not be examined so clearly by looking at the media record. Students were particularly impacted by the CU-B Ethnic Studies protests, in ways both positive and negative. Students became further politicized through this event, and went onto work on various projects and careers for social justice in their own rights. They also got valuable experience in working through racial and cultural differences in a rare multiracial coalition, even by today's standards. Students also faced social and institutional consequences as a result of their sacrifices and visibility in the Ethnic Studies movement. As revealed by the interviews, there were disturbing, yet unsurprising University repression tactics utilized in the 1994 CU-B Ethnic Studies protests. These included a tendency by CU-B administrators, mostly white, who have historically ignored the demands of

students of color, co-opted and whitewashed "diversity" rhetoric, and found political and bureaucratic tactics to pit faculty and students of color against each other, fighting over a lack of resources (read: a lack of administrative investment).

The Alliance Press Packet and the interviews showed some consistencies across the data sources, and these similarities complemented each other. For example, the student interviews elaborated upon the various and escalating student tactics observed in the Press Packet by providing a more nuanced view of how the Alliance organized across racial lines. The faculty and administrator accounts also gave insight into how student rhetoric illustrated in the Press Packetwere interpreted by upper administrators in policy battles. The student interviews also expanded upon the multiple social links between the members of the Alliance prior to the start of the Ethnic Studies protests, as well as the community ties that Black and Brown student organizations within the Alliance brought to bear in the fight for Ethnic Studies. Furthermore, the Press Packet and the interviews reinforced the importance of multiracial coalition-building as a source of power for the Alliance, which ultimately led to its success.

The Alliance Press Packet and the interviews also displayed some different themes compared to one another. For example, the Alliance Press Packet offered more precise political and historical context on the timeline of the student movement and the substantive issues discussed in the interviews, such as Flores' tenure case and the demands for an Ethnic Studies Department. The Press Packet demonstrated the ideological underpinnings of the protest movement, and their expressions through protests and in the media. However, the interviews themselves also expanded beyond the archival record offered by the April 20th Press Packet, and we learned from student interview participants about the challenges of student organizing in a mid-1990s context, as well as the tensions and possibilities of organizing across a multiracial

coalition. The interviews also humanized the demands of the student protestors, and demonstrated student, faculty, and administrator perspectives on how these policy issues had long-term, sustaining impacts on the lives and professional trajectories of those who participated in CU-B's movement for Ethnic Studies, as well as the University, for years afterwards. By contrast with the interviews, the Press Packet also demonstrated more"confrontational" (Kezar, 2010) roles and protest tactics by the three Chicano faculty in the Sociology Department compared with the three faculty and administrators interviewed for this study, and demonstrated that one at least one CSERA faculty member--Salvador Rodriguez del Pino--did show up to a student rally to proclaim support for the Chicano faculty's transfer to CSERA, which differed from Dr. Hu-DeHart's account that CSERA was entirely uninvolved in the Ethnic Studies movement in front of the public eye. Finally, the faculty and administrator interviews offered a more nuanced view of the roles and tactics of faculty and administrative supporters of the CU-B Ethnic Studies movement. Through these accounts, faculty and administrative advocacy emerged as a tenable factor of success for the student protests that likely could not have been observed so clearly from the Press Packet alone. The accounts of the 3 faculty and administrative participants and their unique roles and tactics demonstrated the observable impact of University position, social identity, and political experience in shaping roles and tactics amongst faculty and administrators in student social movements.

The current study is consistent with Kezar's findings in examining the roles and tactics of faculty and staff on initiatives for social change, which found that faculty and staff advocacy tactics tended to be less visible overall (2010), while this study also calls to question key tenets underlying the tempered radical framework. The present study challenges Meyerson's (2003) assertion that "tempered radical," incremental grassroots strategies and tempered radical views of

power (Kezar, 2010) are more effective compared with confrontational tactics by faculty or staff, particularly in cases where progress on diversity initiatives are stalled due to administrative gridlock. Further, this study demonstrates that faculty and administrators can have complex views of power that may belie their less visible, and/or indirect political strategies and roles. For example, Dr. McLean in this study was clearly a proponent of this student movement, having participated in them herself in college and given the fact that she directly contributed to the success of the CU-B Ethnic Studies movement through her mentorship and guidance on social movement organizing in her classes. However, these "tactics" were not readily visible, neither in the media nor to administration. Her dealings with administrators as Faculty Associate to the Chancellor were purely advocacy-based, and not based in "confrontational" protest tactics. Similarly, while Dr. Hu-DeHart and Dr. Ramirez both supported the spirit of the "confrontational" student movement, their own protest tactics and roles in exercising their institutional power fit more neatly within institutional power channels. This may be because faculty and administrators have to conceal their beliefs on power to be effective, or perhaps because their beliefs on power may be dependent on who is wielding it. This multistudy challenges the notion of a single view of power or effective strategy for faculty and administrators within a "tempered radical" framework, which Meyerson and Kezar argue is the best way for faculty and staff to achieve social change in a contemporary moment.

This is not to say that tempered radical approaches are not necessary to create social change. Rather, this study supports the view of political opportunity theory (Klandermans & Skelenburg, 2009) that posits that institutions are stagnant and slow-changing, and that there are rare political openings contingent on institutional vulnerability (in this case, the shifting financial state and priorities of the university and CSERA's Ethnic Studies proposal, President Albino's

contentious presidency, and the Sociology racism case) that motivate specific grievances (i.e. an Ethnic Studies Department, tenure for Flores, and protection of Chicano professors) as well as strong organizational leadership (via the Alliance) to mobilize for social change. It took strong mobilization by the Alliance, which represented a vast network of local and national collectives, in order to effect change in demanding the Ethnic Studies Department, and to reverse the course of Dr. Flores tenure case by catching the attention of President Albino, who intervened decisively to support the student demands. Tempered radical activism forms part of the political environment and culture of universities, and contributed to this current case study in very significant ways. For example, the student protestors' critiques of the University utilized a variety of institutional self-studies on the recruitment and retention of students of color as well as the racial climate of the University; these self-studies were a result of long-term, tempered radical advocacy approaches through task forces and committees that students of color also ironically critiqued. However, the student protest underlined and highlighted the reality of these studies, thereby playing a mutually supportive role. Additionally, the fact that CSERA faculty maintained relative invisibility and handled the process of establishing the Ethnic Studies Department in the "backchannels" had a positive impact on the student movement by both protecting the students' credibility, and by tangibly contributing to the establishment of an Ethnic Studies Department. This study also demonstrates that those who advocate using tempered radical approaches and those who utilize so-called confrontational approaches can, at times, support each other in specific political moments, whether this effect is intended or not. Social change does not happen in an institutional power vacuum; students, faculty, and administrators draw from vast networks to effect change, and their ability to mobilize during political opportunities can create dramatic change.

This current study also builds upon the knowledge of student movements for the establishment of Ethnic Studies departments, and the previous honors thesis written on this topic by Roberts (2013). This is only the second academic work produced about the CU-B 1994 Ethnic Studies protests, which was forgotten in the canon of 1990s movements for Ethnic Studies that happened at the same time (Armbruster-Sandoval, 2017) and in the general canon of Ethnic Studies movements. Through this multistudy, there was a more tactical and historically-rooted understanding of the Alliance's broad and escalating protest tactics as well as the student rhetoric that the Alliance implemented in order to get their demands met. This thesis builds upon Roberts' (2013) thesis, which investigated the Alliance's inner workings and the ways that student organizers mobilized together across social differences, to examine the ways in which social identity interacted with bureaucratic power as well. New perspectives from students and administrators who hadn't been interviewed before were also heard. Furthermore, this thesis also turned the lens of analysis towards the roles and tactics displayed by faculty and administrators to advocate for the establishment of an Ethnic Studies Department at CU-B, which was identified as an additional factor of success for the movement.

Future studies should consider analyzing other facets of CU-B's student movement for Ethnic Studies in greater detail. These studies may consider utilizing similar theoretical frames (critical race theory, critical social movements theory, and organizational theory) and an interview format similar to the current study's, which takes into account social identity and university position as variables for analysis. It is evident from the current study that students, faculty, staff, and administrators each offer different insights to the study of student social movements. Future topics of study on the CU-B Ethnic Studies movement include, but are not limited to: analyzing racial discourse in the Flores tenure case, analyzing student

protester/University discourse in newspaper media, and analyzing the transition of CSERA and the Afro-American Studies major into the Ethnic Studies Department from an intersectional lens. Future scholars should also consider analyzing the connections between prior CU-B BIPoC protest movements and the 1994 Ethnic Studies protests (i.e. the UMAS EOP protests), and the continuities and changes of student protest movements at CU-B and Universty tactics of repression over time to the current day.

The world has changed a lot since the 1994 Ethnic Studies Protests at CU-B took place. Student activists at CU-B and beyond will need new, varied strategies to meet the political and economic moment today. With deeply entrenched and complex forces as formidable as academic capitalism and white supremacist academic discourse, this will not be easy. However, studying past social movements allows student organizers and institutional allies to figure out new ways that we may adapt to shifting racial and neoliberal discourses and policies.

Appendix

Student Interview Questions:

1. How involved were you in the 1994 protests, and what was your role as they were taking place?
2. What factors motivated you to get involved in the protests?
3. How do you feel that your race, gender, and/or any other salient identity that you hold impacted your experience during the protests?
4. What tactics and strategies did the students use to get their demands met? Why were these tactics chosen?
5. How did the students maintain their motivation while the protests were taking place?
6. How did coalition members interact with faculty and administration during the protests? Did you have any allies within or outside of the institution?
7. Did you experience any academic or professional backlash for your involvement in the protests? If so, what did this entail?
8. How were the relations within the coalition? Did any tensions ever come up around identity when working together?
9. In what ways was the coalition effective in organizing for the student demands? In what ways do you feel that the coalition could have been improved?
10. Were you ever approached by the news media during the 1994 protests, or did you publish any media yourself? How do you feel that the news media impacted the student movement for Ethnic Studies at CU?
11. As you likely know, there was a 6-day hunger strike for the protestors' demands which ultimately resulted in the signing of the Declaration of Diversity by the CU System

President Judith Albino. This declaration officially ended the protests, and led to the establishment of the Department of Ethnic Studies at CU Boulder. Did you participate in the hunger strike? What was this experience like?

12. From your perspective, what were the most important factors that led to the success of the protests?
13. How did the 1994 student protests impact you in the long-run? I.E, academically, professionally, or personally.
14. What advice would you give to students, faculty, staff, and administration pushing for equity on the CU-Boulder campus today?

Faculty and Administrator Interview Questions:

1. What was your level of involvement in the movement for Ethnic Studies, and what role did you play in advocating for the students' demands?
2. How do you feel that your race, gender, and/or any other salient identity you hold impacted your experience advocating for the student protestors?
3. How did you balance your desire to assist the student protestors with your own position within the university? What challenges did you face in advocating on behalf of the student protestors and their demands?
4. Did you experience any academic or professional backlash for your involvement in the protests? If so, what did this entail?
5. To your knowledge, what discussions were happening amongst the faculty, staff and/or administrators about how to manage the protests while they were occurring?
6. To your knowledge, what conversations were there amongst other faculty, staff, and/or administrators about how to address the students' list of demands?
7. Were you ever approached by the news media during the 1994 protests, or did you publish any media yourself during this time? How do you feel that media attention impacted the movement for Ethnic Studies at CU-Boulder?
8. Though the 1994 protests are most remembered today for having led to the creation of the Ethnic Studies department at CU Boulder, another central grievance by student protestors and faculty supporters included the alleged racial discrimination of Chicano sociology professor Estevan Flores during his tenure review. In your opinion, did the CU administration handle Dr. Flores' tenure case fairly and competently? Why or why not?

9. As you may know, there was a 6-day hunger strike for the protestors' demands which ultimately resulted in the signing of the Declaration of Diversity by the former CU System President Judith Albino. This declaration officially ended the protests, and led to the establishment of the Ethnic Studies department at CU Boulder. How did university faculty, staff and administrators react to this announcement?
10. How did the 1994 student protests impact you in the long-run? I.E, academically, professionally, or personally.
11. Do you feel as though the 1994 protests had any lasting impacts on CU-Boulder policy or culture? If so, what were these impacts?
12. From your perspective, what were the most important factors that led to the success of the protests?
13. What advice would you give to students, faculty, staff, and administration pushing for equity on the CU-Boulder campus today?

References

(2019, October 14th). Black Students Protest in Boulder: BSA "Demands Change." *OUT FRONT Magazine*. Retrieved January 29, 2022, from https://www.outfrontmagazine.com/black-students-protest-in-boulder-bsa-demands-change/

Aldama, A. J., Facio, E., Maeda, D., & Rabaka, R. (2010). *Enduring Legacies: Ethnic Histories and Cultures of Colorado*. University Press of Colorado. http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/ucb/detail.action?docID=3039741

Alsever, J. (1994, September 16). Corbridge's diversity gets mixed reviews from minority groups. *Campus Press.*

Aquetza Academic Summer Program. (n.d). *About Aquetza.* https://www.colorado.edu/aquetza/about-aquetza

Armbruster-Sandoval, R. (2017). *Starving for Justice: Hunger Strikes, Spectacular Speech, and the Struggle for Dignity.* University of Arizona Press.

Baca, S. (1994, April 15). 3 Chicano profs: CU sociology department racist. *The Denver Post.*

Bernal, D.D. (1998). *Grassroots Leadership Reconceptualized: Chicana Oral Histories and the 1968 East Los Angeles School Blowouts. University of Nebraska Press,* 19(2), 114-142. https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/3347162.pdf

Cosper, D. (1994, April 13). CU students rally for progress. *Boulder Daily Camera.*

Cosper, D. (1994, April 15). 3 professors ask to transfer. *Campus Press.*

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum, 1989,* 139-168.

Dahne, J. (1994, April 14). 150 gather to demand diversity. *Campus Press.*

Daniel, S. (2019, April 15). "CU Boulder Students Protest Against Presidential Finalist." *KUNC.*

Davis, Shametrice and Harris, Jessica C. (2016) "But We Didn't Mean it Like That: A Critical Race Analysis of Campus Responses to Racial Incidents," *Journal of Critical Scholarship on Higher Education and Student Affairs*: Vol. 2 : Iss. 1, Article 6. Available at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/jcshesa/vol2/iss1/6.

Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2017). Critical race theory. In *Critical Race Theory (Third Edition)*. New York University Press.

Digital El Diario. (n.d). *About the Project.* http://digitaleldiario.com/

Downing, S. (1994, April 28). "Albino, students reach agreement on demands for diversity at UCB." *Silver and Gold Record.*

Esquibel, N. P. (Director). (2017). *Neva Romero: ¡Jamás Olvidados!* [Film]. *Flying Dragon Films.* http://libraries.colorado.edu/record=b9970110~S3

Ferguson, R. A. (2017). *We Demand: The University and Student Protests*. Univ of California Press.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. The Continuum International Publishing Group.

Friedel, M. K., & Baetz, J. The Los Seis de Boulder Sculpture Project: A Case Study of Socially Engaged Archivist/Artist Collaboration at the University of Colorado Boulder. *Journal of Western Archives*, *13*(1), 1.

Gewirtz, J. (1994, April 14). Chicano faculty joins protests. *Campus Press.*

Gutierrez, H. (1994, April 15). Hispanics call CU racist in tenure case. *Rocky Mountain News.*

Gutierrez, R. (1994). Ethnic Studies: Its Evolution in American Colleges and Universities. *Multiculturalism: A Critical Reader,* edited by David T Goldberg, 157-167.

Hernandez, E. (2020, June 17). CU to re-examine buying furniture made with prison labor after petition from students, faculty. *The Denver Post.*

Hu-Dehart, E. (1993). The History, Development, and Future of Ethnic Studies. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, *75*(1), 50–54.

Jones, D. S. (2012). *Masters of the Universe: Hayek, Friedman, and the Birth of Neoliberal Politics.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Logan, C. (1994, April 14). Ex-Panther urges a 'fight' for diversity. *The Colorado Daily.*

Langford, K. (2020, February 14th). CU Boulder students protest Latina former professor's denied tenure. *Boulder Daily Camera.* Retrieved January 29, 2022, from https://www.dailycamera.com/2020/02/14/cu-boulder-students-protest-latina-former-professors-tenure/

Langford, K. (2019, October 17). "CU Boulder grad students plan protests." *Boulder Daily Camera.*

Langford, K. (2020, March 11th). Students demand "Los Seis" statue be made permanent. Retrieved January 29, 2022, from https://www.dailycamera.com/2020/03/11/students-demand-los-seis-statue-be-made-permanent/

Langford, K. (2020, June 19th). CU Boulder pledges policy changes to address racism. *The Denver Post*. Retrieved January 29, 2022, from https://www.denverpost.com/2020/06/19/cu-boulder-pledges-policy-changes-to-address-racism/

Lysik, T. (2020, March 11). Push to make sculpture permanent at CU comes to a head with protest. *The CU Independent.* https://www.cuindependent.com/2020/03/11/los-seis-sculpture-protest/

Meyerson, D. E. (2001). *Tempered radicals: How everyday leaders inspire change at work.* Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Pasquale, C. (2020, May 14th). Five questions for Megan Friedel: From UFOs to COVID-19, CU Archivist Overseas Treasure Trove. *CU Connections.* https://connections.cu.edu/spotlights/five-questions-megan-friedel

Kellner, D. (2000). Globalization and new social movements: Lessons for critical theory and pedagogy. In N. C. Burbules & C. A. Torres (Eds.), Globalization and education: Critical perspectives. New York: Routledge, P. 299–321.

Kezar, A. (2010). Faculty and staff grassroots leaders' beliefs about power: Do their beliefs affect their strategies and effectiveness. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, *6*(1), 84-112.

Kezar, A. (2010). Faculty and staff partnering with student activists: Unexplored terrains of interaction and development. *Journal of College Student Development*, *51*(5), 451-480.

Klandermans, P., & Stekelenburg, J. (2009). Social movement theory: Past, present and prospect. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/254828894_Social_movement_theory_Past_present_and_prospect

Iverson, S. V. (2007). Camouflaging Power and Privilege: A Critical Race Analysis of University Diversity Policies. Educational Administration Quarterly, 43(5), 586–611. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X07307794

Manning, K. (2018). *Organizational theory in higher education* (Second). Routledge. https://go.exlibris.link/njynvWQp

Marks, C. (Director). (2017). *Symbols of Resistance: A Tribute to the Martyrs of the Chican@ Movement* [Film]. Freedom Archives. https://freedomarchives.org/projects/symbols-of-resistance-outreach/

Museus, S. D., & Sifuentez, B. J. (2021). Toward a Critical Social Movements Studies: Implications for Research on Student Activism in Higher Education. In L. W. Perna (Ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research* (Vol. 36, pp. 275–321). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-44007-7_4

Mwamba, Tonee. (1994, March 18). Time for the university to work for pluralism. *The Colorado Daily.*

Office of Data Analytics. *Overall Enrollment Profile-Fall 2021.* https://www.colorado.edu/oda/sites/default/files/attached-files/overallprofilefall21.pdf

Office of Institutional Research. (2021). *Diversity Report*. University of Colorado System. https://www.cu.edu/system/files/pages/81280-reports-policy-briefs/docs/oaareportdiversity-2020-2021.pdf

Ramirez, A. (1994, May 5). We hear the voices of change at CU. *Silver and Gold Record.*

Ramirez, A. (2013). *The Profe Files: Social Psychological Perspectives On Power, Pluralism, And Chicano Identity.* Rakuten Kobo. Retrieved December 17, 2020, from

https://www.kobo.com/us/en/ebook/the-profe-files-social-psychological-perspectives-on-power-pluralism-and-chicano-identity

Reinholds, A. (1994, April 12). CU students decry tenure denial. *The Colorado Daily.*

Reinholds, A. (1994, April 13). Protestors take over hall, demand action. *The Colorado Daily.*

Reinholds, A. (1994, April 14). Students to rally for diversity again today. *The Colorado Daily.*

Reinholds, A. (1994, April 15-17). Chicano profs allege racism at CU. *The Colorado Daily.*

Reinholds, A. (1994, April 20). "Progress is made on demands, students seeking diversity say." The Colorado Daily.

Reynolds, R. Mayweather, R. (2017). Recounting Racism, Resistance, and Repression: Examining the Experiences and #Hashtag Activism of College Students with Critical Race Theory and Counternarratives. *The Journal of Negro Education*, *86*(3), 283–304. https://doi.org/10.7709/jnegroeducation.86.3.0283

Rhoads, R. A. (1998). Student Protest and Multicultural Reform: Making Sense of Campus Unrest in the 1990s. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *69*(6), 621–646. https://doi.org/10.2307/2649211

Rhoads, R. A., & Liu, A. (2009). Globalization, Social Movements, and the American University: Implications for Research and Practice. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research* (pp. 273–315). Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-9628-0_7

Roberts, R. (2013). We Are Here Because We Belong Here—The Grassroots Student Movement for an Ethnic Studies Department at the University of Colorado at Boulder. University of Colorado, Boulder. CU Scholar Database. https://scholar.colorado.edu/concern/undergraduate_honors_theses/8p58pd405

Rojas, F. (2006). Social movement tactics, organizational change and the spread of African-American studies. *Social Forces*, *84*(4), 2147–2166. https://doi.org/10.1353/sof.2006.0107

Slee, K. (1994, March 16). CU minority hiring record called 'lackluster.' *The Colorado Daily.*

Slee, K. (1994, April 14). CU homosexuals to get spouse coverage. *The Colorado Daily.*

Stahler-Sholk, R. (2007). Resisting Neoliberal Homogenization: The Zapatista Autonomy Movement. Latin American Perspectives, 34(2), 48–63. https://doi.org/10.1177/0094582X06298747

UMAS, MEChA, and SCAEP Alliance Press Packet. (1994, April 20).

University of Colorado, Boulder. (n.d). *CU Boulder History Project: Project Mission & Goals*. https://www.colorado.edu/about/history

University of Colorado, Boulder. (n.d). *Department History*. Ethnic Studies. https://www.colorado.edu/ethnicstudies/department-history

University of Colorado, Boulder. (2021). *General Education Requirements.* College of Arts and Sciences. https://catalog.colorado.edu/undergraduate/colleges-schools/arts-sciences/policies-requirements/#newitemtext

U.S. Census Bureau. *Quick Facts- Boulder County, Colorado.* (2021, July 1). https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/bouldercountycolorado

Windham, K. C. (1994, March 3). Don't give us any white lies about our racial awareness. *The Colorado Daily.*

Winkle, S. V. (2014, May 23). Flashback Friday: Hunger strikes at other schools. *The Stanford Daily*. https://www.stanforddaily.com/2014/05/23/flashback-friday-hunger-strikes-at-other-schools/

Yang, Q. P. (2000). *Ethnic Studies: Issues and Approaches.* State University of New York Press.

Zepeda, E. Wise, A. T. Gallagher, P. K. (2009). Rethinking Trade Policy for Development Lessons from Mexico under NAFTA. *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.*