

**LAS Program Council Response to the H&SS Dean's Summary and Evaluation for the LAS PPR**  
**LAS Program PPR**  
**Spring 2017**

While we tried to understand the concerns raised in the Dean's Summary and Evaluation to the LAS Program PPR, we the LAS Council members, would like to begin this response by indicating that there are much more positive characteristics of our program that should be noted. Moreover, our program fulfills many of the missions and goals established by the University as well as the newly approved University Strategic Plan. As the initial Program Response mentioned, the "free-floating" nature of our program is quite important. We are engaged in collaboration and dialogue with different departments and colleges on campus, which makes it a unique program. This collaboration creates an important synergy that has led to cross-disciplinary dialogue through our conferences, study abroad opportunities for all students, exposure of the Fullerton Community to Latin America, research opportunities for faculty and students, as well as a cultural center for the Hispanic and Latino community outside of Latinx/Chicanx Studies. Hence, the limited resources allocated do not help our program achieve its full potential, nor does focusing solely on number of majors and minors. We feel that establishing "benchmarks" and stating the "possible dissolution of the program" if numbers are not met, is quite a shortsighted vision of the strategic importance of our program. We would like to see a more holistic appreciation and review at all levels of the University. Judging a program's viability based on numbers does not coincide with our vision of what a university education entails. At this rate, the diversity of academic interests as well as the efforts to offer more options for underrepresented groups to fulfill their intellectual ambitions will be curtailed, and our students will be limited to study in disciplines with the most majors and minors.

CSUF is a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) with a clear Strategic Plan, Learning Goals, and a Mission. Among the multiple points that comprise our Strategic Plan, we believe that the LAS Program best reflects the following:

**Goal 1:** "Develop and maintain a curricular and co-curricular environment that prepares students for participation in a global society and is responsive to workforce needs."

The LAS Program does this both in curricular and co-curricular ways. It does so more than many programs. Indeed, the global focus is built into its name, and by completing the requirements for a major or minor, students are preparing to participate in a global society by knowing more about Latin America through different disciplines. Furthermore, under this goal the University outlines the following: "Increase by 25% the number of CSUF students participating in international, service learning, internship, community engagement or other innovative instructional experiences that prepare students for professional endeavors in a global society." Our program is a leader in this area as all our students are engaged in innovative instructional experiences that will prepare them for working and functioning in a global society.

As a strategy for meeting that objective of Goal 1 of the Strategic Plan, the university offers strategies "d) Identify, expand and provide resources to curricular and co-curricular programs that advance students' recognition of roles they play in an interdependent global community" and "e) Provide resources for programs that increase student participation in activities that link degree, career, and community." By limiting the resources available, and contemplating the possibility of program suspension and dissolution, the Dean's office would be going against strategy (d).

**Goal 2:** "Improve student persistence, increase graduation rates University-wide, and narrow the achievement gap for underrepresented students."

LAS is a program that serves underrepresented students. Failing to fund it or give it continuity, contradicts Goal 2. The language of Goal 2 also notes that High-Impact Practices, "those pedagogical and programmatic approaches that promote student engagement, retention and graduation, are integral to these efforts."

According to the CSUF website on HIPs, “**High Impact Practices** are transformational learning opportunities inside and outside of the classroom that provide:

- Performance expectations at appropriately high levels
- Significant student engagement by investment of time and effort
- Meaningful and substantive learning interactions with faculty, staff, students, or external entities
- Experiences with diversity, complexity, and change
- Frequent and meaningful feedback
- Reflective and integrated learning
- Experiential learning”

The LAS Annual Conference meets the second, third, and fourth criteria. Study Abroad programs to Latin America, affiliated with LAS, meet the last criterion as well as the penultimate one. Since all of our classes linked to the program, LAS meets the first criterion. Finally, the small size of the program makes it more likely to receive “frequent and meaningful feedback” and “meaningful and substantive learning interactions with faculty, staff, students, or external entities.”

The LAS Annual Conference serves to offer students experience in presenting at conferences in a supportive environment, and with meaningful feedback from professors of varied disciplinary backgrounds. Furthermore, as evident in this year’s conference that took place on April 21, students are able to present research that bridges interests from home and academia. Various presenters did so. This is important for student retention. Currently, H&SS is working on communication with families of Latinx students (see the recent brochure titled, “Navegando tu universidad”) to bridge the realms of home and school. The conference extends this connection. Limiting resources to LAS and steering it towards suspension (by failing to support the LAS Program that sponsors it) would send a contradictory message. Having a formal, academic space that welcomes students to study, academically, concerns that relate to their home life, is likely to promote retention. In particular, the paper by a student comes to mind. In it, the student author noted that she feels her home department is not especially welcoming of her academic research. The Latin American Studies program, and its corresponding conference, provided a place that welcomed and affirmed such research. Furthermore, the conference allows students from varied disciplinary backgrounds to network not only with faculty members from different departments, but also with one another. This, too, provides a springboard for supportive connections and promotes retention.

With regard to study abroad as a High-Impact Practice, LAS students have a significant rate of participation in study abroad. In addition, several LAS-affiliated faculty have led Study Abroad (Pérez, Voeks, Stocker, Ishikawa, etc.), which is likely a higher percentage than other departments. If H&SS is sincere in its commitment to raise the numbers of students who study abroad, stunting a program that may be a leader in doing so seems counter-productive.

The objectives of Goal 2 are as follows:

- “Increase the overall 6-year graduation rate, such that the Fall 2012 cohort of first-time full-time freshman is at least 10 percentage points higher than that of the Fall 2006 cohort.
- Increase the 4-year transfer graduation rate, such that the Fall 2014 cohort is at least 10 percentage points higher than that of the Fall 2008 cohort.
- Reduce by at least half the current 12% achievement gap between underrepresented and non-underrepresented students.
- Increase participation in High-Impact Practices (HIPs) and ensure that 75% of CSUF students participate in at least two HIPs by graduation.”

LAS has been actively engaged in reaching these goals. Students have presented their research in several conferences both in and outside CSUF; students have published in journals; LAS students have advanced to graduate schools; and most of our students have been underrepresented and non-represented.

The strategies outlined for meeting those objectives for Goal 2 are as follows:

“Strategies:

- a. Identify and expand programs that have a documented impact on increasing student achievement in bottleneck, gateway and low success rate academic courses.
- b. Identify and increase participation in new and ongoing efforts that support underrepresented student persistence and achievement.
- c. Identify, track and integrate curricular and co-curricular High-Impact Practices and ensure participation in one HIP in the first year and one subsequent HIP in student’s major field.
- d. Establish accountability metrics at the division, college, department, and program levels to ensure progress on retention and graduation rate strategies.”

The LAS Program constitutes one such program/department to be identified, given that it serves underrepresented students and supports their persistence and achievement, promotes HIPs.

**Goal 3:** “Recruit and retain a high-quality and diverse faculty and staff.”

Failing to support a program that perhaps has a more diverse faculty and staff than many other majors contradicts this goal. The wording of this goal includes the following: “To this end we will develop a Diversity Action Plan to cultivate an environment that honors differences in various forms – race, ethnicity, gender, age, (dis)ability, sexual orientation, religious or political beliefs and status within the University.” Failing to support or threatening to suspend/terminate a program that honors such difference in its curriculum, its staffing, and its student body sends a strong message, and one that is contrary to the stated mission of the University.

The “**Conclusion**” of the Strategic Plan is as follows:

“We are committed to student success. The goals here speak not only to the responsibility, but also the necessary steps, we have to undertake in order to promote learning, create knowledge, and support our region. Going forward, our challenges will be to build out the infrastructure in terms of facilities, sufficient faculty, and necessary staff support campus wide to support our activities. Yet, it is by taking on these challenges now and pursuing our goals that we can attain our long-term vision.” It seems that the plan to phase out or continue limiting resources to the LAS program contradicts this stated commitment, and thereby obstructs the long-term vision of this campus.

Now, if we focus on the **CSUF Learning Goals**, these state:

- I. Demonstrate intellectual literacy through the acquisition of knowledge and development of competence in disciplinary perspectives and interdisciplinary points of view.
- II. Think critically, using analytical, qualitative and quantitative reasoning, to apply previously- learned concepts to new situations, complex challenges and everyday problems.
- III. Communicate clearly, effectively, and persuasively, both orally and in writing.
- IV. Work effectively as a team member or leader to achieve a broad variety of goals.
- V. Evaluate the significance of how differing perspectives and trends affect their communities.
- VI. Recognize their roles in an interdependent global community.

Most, if not all, courses in LTAM support Learning Goals I, II, III, V, and VI, and, depending on the course, some may support Learning Goal IV as well.

With regards to the different paths that the External Reviewers had proposed in their Report, these should be further explored and discussed within the Program Council as well as with the students. Since the

unique and interesting path of the creation of an M.A. program has been deemed as not viable from the Dean’s response although it still seems like a great idea, we are limited to consider the remaining three paths: 1) replacing the program with a Think Tank but with a larger focus such as Global Studies; 2) putting the program under the umbrella of a larger department such as MLL; or 3) maintaining the program as is. The first two, as mentioned, will be topics of discussion within the Program and also with other departments. An interesting and viable option would be to focus on Diaspora Studies, which would bring programs such as ASAM, AFAM, and Chicana/o Studies together. This, however, would need to be carefully orchestrated and the Dean’s Office should serve as facilitator to discuss the possibility and also, in an event of agreement, taking care of the logistics. Whichever path is taken, however, we would need more resources from the Dean’s Office as well as from other sources (we are actually exploring, for example, the possibility of agreements for collaboration with the “Cátedra Mario Vargas Llosa” and joint publication of monographies with the University of Alicante). Our Program is set to engage in more proactive solutions for a successful path, keeping in mind that the objective is for the LAS Program to reach its full potential. This, however, is not possible without support. For example, regular departments have been able to access reassigned time to create assessment plans or create innovative curriculum. The LAS Program with its faculty having mandatory obligations to other departments lacks the time resource to attend to its various needs. Assigned time needs to be supported by the H&SS Dean’s Office to accomplish specific tasks and not include them with the overall administration of the program. Furthermore, we insist on the reestablishment of a physical space as was pointed out by the External Reviewers as well as in our initial response. Considering the effort to support our program, is the current resource allocation by the Dean’s Office enough? Clearly not. We believe that more resources—at least at the level of the pre-2009 years with a .2 unit per semester and a physical space for the program—are required to rebuild the program and eventually have it advance a route towards expansion. As it can be seen in the following data, there is an evident correlation between the decrease in numbers of majors and the decrease in resources as the numbers on the Dean’s response show:

#### **Enrollment of Latin American Studies majors and minors**

<b>AY</b>	<b>Primary Major</b>	<b>Secondary Major</b>	<b>Total Major</b>	<b>Minor</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
1998-99	8	0	8	0	8
1999-00	8	0	8	0	8
2000-01	6	0	6	1	7
2001-02	8	0	8	5	13
2002-03	7	0	7	5	12
2003-04	6	0	6	4	10
2004-05	14	4	18	8	26
2005-06	12	3	15	22	37
2006-07	11	5	16	21	37
2007-08	18	11	29	20	49
2008-09	8	4	12	8	20
2009-10	8	3	11	11	22
2010-11	7	3	10	7	17
2011-12	6	2	8	5	13
2012-13	5	2	7	11	18
2013-14	5	1	6	9	15
2014-15	5	0	5	10	15
2015-16	1	0	1	3	4

The Dean's Response mentions: "Given that the Program had difficulty maintaining enrollments when resources were higher, it is not possible to justify providing more support at the present time." It should be noted that the reduction of reassigned time occurred after 2010. Looking at the numbers above, the decrease in majors and minors coincides with this period. Is it a mere coincidence? This also raises the question of what the Dean's office understood with the phrase "when enrollments were higher." We should not forget that we are talking about a Program that has not had a full time faculty as coordinator.

Even though we recognize that the number of majors and minors is not as high as in previous years, numbers are quite relative as can be seen in the statistics below. This by no means should be a defining factor to "threaten" a program with suspension or probationary measures. The numbers below of H&SS majors and minors, were provided by the Office of Institutional Research:

Major	fall 1995	fall 1996	fall 1997	fall 1998	fall 1999	fall 2000	fall 2001	fall 2002	fall 2003	fall 2004	fall 2005	fall 2006	fall 2007	fall 2008	fall 2009	fall 2010	fall 2011	fall 2012	fall 2013	fall 2014	fall 2015	fall 2016	Total
African American Studies	5	6	7	4	3	4	6	6	10	9	10	9	22	20	17	15	18	13	10	4	8	7	213
American Studies	98	97	95	94	99	109	125	146	136	137	150	156	163	134	132	126	103	99	92	76	78	99	2544
Anthropology	134	159	171	184	183	186	224	218	204	190	201	227	230	186	209	214	163	116	110	134	126	130	3899
Asian American Studies	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	11	10	8	14	11	12	10	13	11	10	9	6	8	9	150
Chicana/o Studies	24	22	25	36	28	29	31	28	26	23	31	31	35	30	27	31	20	20	18	20	19	24	578
Comparative Literature	19	19	19	13	20	17	19	14	13	11	13	16	10	11	8	7	5	8	5	3	5	3	258
Criminal Justice	599	620	638	676	698	712	706	751	788	818	962	997	962	918	933	985	1113	1230	1194	1149	1175	1237	19861
Education - TESOL	43	40	43	57	56	55	52	56	64	64	73	80	79	86	68	63	72	86	76	59	61	65	1398
English	588	579	611	593	570	588	574	664	654	653	712	722	756	738	673	686	666	614	577	544	514	547	13823
Environmental Studies	88	90	101	104	90	78	73	68	66	69	74	74	71	64	73	66	74	62	69	55	47	51	1607
European Studies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	6	6	7	6	2	3	2	2	5	4	3	54
French	32	31	38	38	41	38	42	38	32	23	29	30	26	28	15	15	16	7	10	13	11	14	567
Geography	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	86	88	77	92	102	107	96	93	110	105	103	98	86	84	81	1489
German	12	7	15	9	11	10	10	14	11	12	18	11	6	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153
Gerontology	130	119	109	101	96	91	16	21	35	38	42	38	44	42	27	35	40	28	28	29	18	12	1139
History	386	408	417	419	476	505	546	588	630	633	716	749	730	684	700	615	640	662	563	512	497	495	12571
Japanese	20	17	17	14	14	14	17	21	16	24	34	48	41	38	49	50	38	45	37	33	27	30	644
Latin American Studies	13	9	15	7	7	6	6	4	7	7	7	5	9	6	7	7	6	4	4	6	1	3	146
Liberal Studies	767	894	961	1139	1275	1350	1503	1687	1651	1539	1463	1311	1243	1085	999	814	701	623	538	493	456	482	22974
Linguistics	51	54	56	55	48	40	48	56	54	69	61	54	52	55	69	66	66	98	113	117	132	120	1534
Philosophy	46	45	55	47	46	37	50	49	47	57	77	90	99	88	102	99	95	92	77	66	68	64	1496
Political Science	403	373	344	309	309	358	399	428	418	450	514	503	518	454	463	449	453	430	424	375	385	375	9134
Psychology	1085	1139	1088	1052	1096	1119	1190	1232	1278	1296	1450	1521	1608	1602	1732	1795	1974	2062	2172	2202	2198	2306	34197
Psychology - Clinical	18	28	28	32	26	25	27	27	24	31	31	28	34	44	37	37	46	45	46	55	49	52	770
Public Administration	104	94	97	94	93	105	110	129	147	145	159	187	231	244	220	190	181	199	224	203	210	233	3599
Religious Studies	32	20	17	23	29	35	41	36	32	32	30	31	42	47	45	25	23	28	20	19	12	16	635
Russian and East Area Studies	3	7	4	2	2	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Social Science	4	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Sociology	369	416	444	429	424	398	477	500	556	542	566	584	679	670	745	701	708	759	819	775	819	925	13305
Spanish	124	117	151	151	133	142	146	149	150	137	191	191	178	182	170	147	147	147	154	133	125	102	3267
Women and Gender Studies	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	12	9	11	12	17	18	18	24	23	20	26	23	27	30	19	302
<b>Total</b>	<b>5197</b>	<b>5414</b>	<b>5567</b>	<b>5682</b>	<b>5873</b>	<b>6056</b>	<b>6532</b>	<b>7035</b>	<b>7158</b>	<b>7110</b>	<b>7731</b>	<b>7832</b>	<b>8010</b>	<b>7594</b>	<b>7655</b>	<b>7386</b>	<b>7507</b>	<b>7618</b>	<b>7512</b>	<b>7199</b>	<b>7167</b>	<b>7504</b>	<b>152339</b>

Minor	fall 1995	fall 1996	fall 1997	fall 1998	fall 1999	fall 2000	fall 2001	fall 2002	fall 2003	fall 2004	fall 2005	fall 2006	fall 2007	fall 2008	fall 2009	fall 2010	fall 2011	fall 2012	fall 2013	fall 2014	fall 2015	fall 2016	Total
Undeclared	4875	5095	5222	5324	5515	5774	6251	6738	6861	6790	7379	7472	7664	7165	7214	6937	7059	7107	7013	6652	6644	6953	143704
American Studies	10	13	7	8	11	4	3	2	6	5	5	6	8	9	7	10	15	11	10	13	10	2	175
Anthropology	4	9	10	8	6	5	3	5	9	14	15	14	19	17	22	19	9	15	11	18	11	16	259
Comparative Literature	0	1	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
English	23	28	29	29	19	15	16	25	10	7	12	14	7	6	17	13	5	10	10	11	6	10	322
Ethnic Studies (African American Studies)	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	3	0	3	3	3	5	3	3	1	1	3	3	4	3	2	49
Ethnic Studies (Chicano Studies)	6	6	7	6	6	5	5	8	10	5	4	6	9	2	4	2	5	4	6	5	13	13	137
European Studies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	1	0	2	2	3	0	1	14
French	2	5	6	3	4	5	6	5	1	2	4	7	4	3	5	7	6	6	6	2	4	3	96
Geography	11	6	4	6	4	4	2	6	5	3	6	7	6	3	4	7	9	1	5	7	8	6	120
German	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	3	3	4	5	3	0	30
History	19	21	24	20	18	9	8	10	15	16	16	17	13	17	15	14	10	17	12	13	13	8	325
Japanese	1	0	1	1	0	3	1	2	1	1	3	2	1	1	2	6	8	9	4	3	4	10	64
Latin American Studies	1	0	2	1	1	1	4	1	2	3	9	7	8	7	6	6	2	4	4	6	1	1	77
Liberal Studies	34	32	23	33	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	4	1	1	3	3	3	184
Linguistics	3	4	5	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	0	1	3	2	5	2	0	4	4	43
Philosophy	5	3	5	4	10	7	14	9	11	11	9	14	16	9	5	8	8	10	10	17	18	17	220
Political Science	20	24	22	16	21	32	26	29	23	25	20	20	18	21	22	20	23	20	21	9	12	12	456
Political Science (Public Administration)	1	4	4	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Psychology	92	77	93	101	81	12	18	12	17	24	31	24	30	33	32	28	20	33	29	33	27	33	880
Religious Studies	4	3	3	4	4	4	2	3	1	10	5	6	4	4	4	4	5	10	8	10	6	3	107
Sociology	31	30	43	47	50	15	15	26	20	18	18	23	41	51	41	36	51	42	37	42	34	37	748
Spanish	8	7	12	13	6	30	29	31	26	18	21	20	16	20	10	11	22	28	24	32	29	26	439
Women's Studies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	26	24	17	14	13	11	15	22	153
Total	5197	5414	5567	5682	5873	6056	6532	7035	7158	7110	7731	7832	8010	7594	7655	7386	7507	7618	7512	7199	7167	7504	152339

Since we are talking about numbers, we can see that other programs, African American Studies, for instance, has three full time professors (with RTP processes attached) when the number of majors oscillated between 4~18 since 2010; the trend though is downward. Other large departments such as English, History, Anthropology, Modern Languages and Literatures, Political Science, etc. have seen decreases of 50+ and sometimes 100+ majors in the same period after 2010. A more stark case is Liberal Studies, which has gone down about 1000+ students when compared to its heyday. Small departments such as Comparative Literature, Religious Studies, and others have seen also a downward trend, having 10+ less majors when compared to 2010. How come then, the LAS Program is being targeted for possible suspension and dissolution? In comparative terms, it seems that the decreases in numbers of majors and minors in the above mentioned departments since 2010 has a much larger impact than the average of 6 student decrease in LAS (remember with only .2 reassigned time per year for the coordinator). Furthermore, these departments and programs have full-time faculty attached when LAS does not. Why isn't our Program assigned a full-time professor with an RTP process attached, to dedicate his/her time solely to rebuild the program? In the College of H&SS, the shift for Women and Gender Studies to grow came precisely with the opening of a faculty position dedicated to that program. The current program coordinator was the first faculty member in that program and can attest to the impact that position had in the growth of the program. Now, if we focus on the number of majors, we can see that the number of majors has gone up from 1 to 3 in the previous semester. This is a 200% increase. What is the justification then, for the intention to suspend a program like LAS with such little budgetary impact that shows that the amount of majors has gone up? All this is to indicate that the focus solely on numbers is quite unhealthy since it leads to unnecessary competition between departments and programs, as well as unwanted comparisons. Furthermore,

numbers are relative and they can be interpreted according to what one wants them to reflect. What is more important is to understand that each program and department is unique and has to be seen in terms of the academic options it offers to the students as well as the preparation of successful students who engage in high impact practices, study abroad, and global competency through our contributions to a diverse curriculum that is necessary in order to meet our institutional mission and goals.

It is quite unfortunate to force our Program to agree with the terms set forth by the Dean's office in engaging in further promotion of the program to increase the number of majors and minors, simply because the program depends on the College's budget allocation; if comparisons are to be used, the cost of the LAS Program is minimal when compared to the cost of the "low performing (in terms of majors and minors)" departments discussed above. However, we insist that programs should not be run with numbers of majors and minors as the only measure of success given that this does not hold true across the college, nor are the resources granted sufficient to address the program's needs. If this indeed is the priority then a tenure-track line needs to be opened with this particular task imbedded in the job description for the new hire. The purpose of a university goes far beyond the amount of students that can be pushed through the academic production machine. It is a place where students engage in critical thinking, where they explore their academic curiosity, and deepen their knowledge about many aspects that affect human and social life. It is a place where students have the option of pursuing their desired academic paths and to think, analyze, and become active members of an ever-globalizing world. The LAS program's major and minor do just that, beyond meeting other aspects of the Missions and Goals of CSUF as was discussed above. We want our students and faculty to have options to forge an ideal academic career and to be able to understand and communicate with other cultures and societies in order to build bridges and not walls. We are confident that these elements align with the University's true Mission and Goals, and not with how many majors and minors a program produces. Furthermore, without an adequate investment with a long-term vision, without understanding the positive academic impact of a program, without responding to student demands, it is quite impossible to see a program thrive. A shortsighted vision and disinvestment in a program will inevitably lead to a downward spiral.

In concrete terms we aim to engage in recruitment and promotion activities in collaboration with the College Marketing Specialist, the H&SS Student Success Team, and CSUF Strategic Enrollment Management, so that we can maintain at least 4 majors every year. If we see this stabilization by 2020, we want to raise the number to a minimum of 8 majors by 2025. There will be direct reporting to the Dean by the Coordinator. However, we insist again that adequate resources have to be allotted so that we can create a successful recruitment and promotion plan, while carrying forth advising, organization of events, assessment, curricular planning, and the multiple bureaucratic loopholes. Meanwhile we will be meeting during the fall semester in order to come up with a strategic plan that we can share with the Dean's Office. Among other things, we are planning to:

- 1) refine quantitative and qualitative benchmarks which would be measurable for success
- 2) develop roadmaps to provide ideal course sequencing to attract minors, majors and double majors
- 3) come up with a marketing plan of outreach to local community colleges and other colleges at CSUF to see about synergies across degree programs, including the feasibility of an online degree completion program.

However, as it has been insisted throughout this document, the .2 per AY reassigned time is clearly not sufficient to realistically dedicate the sufficient time and energy to steer the Program to a growth trend. As for the course offerings, we will begin to offer LTAM 100 for freshman once the GE status is approved. Hopefully, through enrollment in the course there will be more interest in majoring or minoring in LAS from the beginning. We will continue to explore study abroad opportunities for our students and also restructure our LTAM 350 course so that it will be taken as a GE course for faculty-led study abroad program in Latin America. Finally, we will continue on with the organization of the LAS Annual Student Conference, as well as many other events to have students engage in research, share their findings, and prepare for intellectual collaboration.

We would like to conclude this response by manifesting discomfort to have our program threatened with suspension and eventual dissolution. As was indicated in the Reviewers' Report, we are very engaged faculty who truly are interested in student success and in having our University community appreciate and understand

the richness, diversity, and complexity of Latin America, through our courses, our research, and our HIPs (current members are likely participating in 1-2 already). We would not be sacrificing our time and energy if there was no genuine interest and if our efforts were reduced to numbers of majors and minors. What the University Mission, Learning Goals, and Strategic Plan indicate is that CSUF should first think about the students and that this is a higher learning institution. We are not a for-profit academic institution nor are we a company.