

From: Rachel Lindley
Sent: Friday, August 2, 2019 8:55 PM
To: Ethnic Studies
Subject: Draft 2020 Ethnic Studies Model Curriculum

I have reviewed the glossary, by definition intended to explain basic terms of the curriculum. Our society is evolving in many ways, but it is my opinion that defining those concepts listed in the glossary with the explanations attached to them provides very little information of substantive value to the potential students, rather the explanations themselves are highly divisive. Many of these explanations are very clearly coming from a specific and EXCLUSIVE slant.

Consider the explanation of "boycott, divestiture, sanctions" for example. Those terms and concepts, separately or collectively, are used, can be used, should be used, in a variety of contexts, but in this curriculum they are tied specifically to Palestinian/Zionist conflict. This is just one example of what seems to me as the glossary's very doctrinaire proclamation of right and wrong.

Wasn't the goal of an ethnic studies curriculum to capture the interest of students that feel disenfranchised in their current educational situation? Cultivating belligerence seems to me to be a very poor way of trying to engage them. Within the public high schools in my community, I doubt it would be effective at reaching the population it is intend toward. (BTW 48% of kids our qualify for some kind of lunch aid program, last time I checked.) This stuff is just not where most kids, kids of color, are at.

From my review of the basic terms used, the curriculum is seriously flawed.

Signed,
A parent of teens who pays property tax