
Presidential Taskforce on Naming of Craven Hall

Final Report Fall 2022

DECEMBER 9, 2022
CRAVEN TASKFORCE
Cal State University San Marcos

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
Taskforce Charge	5
Taskforce Membership	6
Taskforce Process Overview	7
A Process Informed by Listening and Public Engagement.....	7
A Process Informed by Documentation	8
Findings	10
I. Discover, document, and analyze the historical record of William A. Craven's statements and actions as they relate to his past leadership roles and affiliations with CSUSM, our region and our state.....	10
Summary and Background on the life of Senator William A. Craven.....	10
Senator Craven's Relationship to CSUSM	11
The Naming Controversy of 1993-94	13
Senator Craven's Request to Identify Undocumented School Children	13
Senator Craven's Sponsored Reports on Undocumented Immigrants	14
Senator Craven's Statements at the Senate Special Hearing on Border Issues	15
CSUSM Institutional Response to Senator Craven's Report and Statements.....	16
Senator Craven's Response to Academic Senate and the Latino Association of Faculty and Staff	16
Senator Craven's Initiative to Issue ID Cards and a Renewed Effort to Rename the Building	18
Reactions by External Campus Community	21
II. Analyze and build a common understanding among the Taskforce membership of the contemporary issues surrounding his association with CSUSM.....	23
III. Building on the results of an educational and information-gathering process, articulate the potential impacts of retaining, replacing or contextualizing the name and representation of Senator Craven at CSUSM with supporting evidence.....	26
IV. Develop opportunities for open and informed discussion with the internal and external campus community regarding the issue under consideration as it relates to our institutional mission and values.....	29
Conclusion and Recommendation	32
Timeline of Key Events 1989-2021.....	34
Appendices	38

Presidential Taskforce on Naming of Craven Hall

Final Report

Fall 2022

As a Taskforce, convened by California State University, San Marcos (CSUSM), we acknowledge that the land on which we gather and the virtual space in which we collaborate is the traditional territory of the Luiseño/Payómkawichum people. Today, CSUSM and its surrounding areas is still home to the six federally recognized bands of the La Jolla, Pala, Pauma, Pechanga, Rincon, Soboba Luiseño/Payómkawichum people. It is also important to acknowledge that this land remains the shared space among the Kuupangaxwicheh/Cupeño and Kumeyaay and Ipai peoples. We acknowledge and honor the original inhabitants of the various regions.

Introduction

Place names are powerful. They carry meaning by reminding us that history has relevance in our own time. The use of any name at CSUSM is no exception.

State Senator William A. Craven has been called the “father of CSUSM.” The late Senator Craven was profoundly influential in founding the University. Through his legislative office, he worked for many years to secure the support and funding to establish a California State University (CSU) campus in North County San Diego. When CSUSM was “officially” founded in 1989, it became the 20th campus of the CSU and the first to be established in decades. Indeed, the first administrative building on the campus was dedicated in Senator Craven’s name. The naming of what would become known as Craven Hall became controversial when, in 1993, the senator was quoted with nativist (and some would call “racist”) language regarding undocumented Latinx members of the community.

The naming of Craven Hall thus has a complicated history that dates to the very founding of CSUSM. This naming controversy was brought to new light once again at CSUSM in the Spring of 2021. Just as many other institutions of higher education—including other campuses in the California State University system—have sought to understand the historical context and impact of various campus namings, so too was CSUSM called upon to examine the use of one individual’s name on the first administration building on the campus.

In spring 2021, the CSUSM Academic Senate passed Academic Senate Resolution (AS 769-20) in Support of Renaming of Craven Hall, Craven Circle, and Craven Road and Removal of the Bust of William A. Craven from the CSUSM Campus.¹ The Academic

Senate, which is the official voice of faculty at CSUSM, serves several major functions at the university. Broadly, the Senate works with the Administration through shared governance to create a quality institution of higher education. In pursuit of this goal, the Senate reviews, initiates, develops, and recommends policy for issues concerning academics and faculty. The Senate is also a consultative body to the administration regarding academic matters. If the faculty believe an issue impacts student learning or success, the Senate may take up the issue and provide a recommendation to the Administration. The Senate also reviews and recommends new academic programs as faculty have purview over the curriculum. Article 2 of the Constitution and Bylaws of the University Faculty and Academic Senate states, “The Academic Senate shall formulate, evaluate, and recommend to the President of the University policies and procedures pertaining to the development, maintenance, and improvement of the University program, and shall serve as a forum for expressing the opinions of Faculty members on matters affecting the operations of the University.”²

Shared governance is a critical aspect of academic institutions. It provides for the harnessing of the collective knowledge, wisdom, and experience of a variety of groups and people. Consultation between faculty and administrators informs and facilitates decision-making based on the principles of partnership, equity, and accountability. Topics for discussion and recommendations may originate from faculty, campus administration, the Chancellor’s Office, or the Board of Trustees. In some cases, topics may even be initiated or raised by actions of the California Legislature. Academic Senate Resolutions may be proposed by any Senator (and often proposed by standing committees of the Academic Senate) and sent to the Academic Senate Chair and Executive Committee to be placed on the Senate agenda. Resolutions are then brought to a Senate for a first reading, during which debate, deliberations, and recommendations for alterations occur. At a subsequent meeting, the Resolution comes up for a second reading, during which comments are to be limited to statements of support or opposition. The Resolution is then put to a vote unless it is tabled or removed from consideration by the proposer. If the Resolution passes, it is presented to the President for information and possible administrative action.

In response to the Senate Resolution (AS 769-20), President Ellen Neufeldt took administrative action and announced the creation of the Taskforce on Naming of Craven Hall (Appendix A). The purpose of the Taskforce was to explore the complexity of Senator William A. Craven’s relationship to CSUSM. The Taskforce was not charged to interrogate or explore the Academic Senate resolution.

In the context of the campus culture, mission, and values of CSUSM, and within the frame of President Neufeldt’s leadership, the Taskforce launched an intentional process to undertake this task. The Taskforce was charged in September 2021 with four specific elements (see below) and continued to work together through the fall of 2022.

Membership on the Taskforce included students, alumni, faculty, staff, and community members, some of whom were elected by their peers, and others who were appointed

by various means (Appendix B). Members came together in the fall semester of 2021 to begin the work. Initially anticipated to conclude in February of 2022, it soon became clear that the scope and weight of the work demanded and deserved extra time, thus the work continued through the fall of 2022.

Through the process, the Taskforce met with numerous individuals including many who witnessed the founding of the campus and “lived” through the experience of the events that created the controversy surrounding the naming of Craven Hall. The Taskforce reviewed a range of historical documents including, but not limited to, the original naming nomination submitted to the CSU Board of Trustees, related correspondence, newspaper articles, audio recordings of a Legislative committee hearing on Border issues, and correspondence and comments from those who wished to communicate with the Taskforce. The Taskforce also convened and participated in numerous listening sessions with various groups of the campus and regional community.

It became and remains clear that strong opinions are attached to the whole of this issue and that positions are polarized. Indeed, the Taskforce members represented a broad range of viewpoints and perspectives and did not reflect a unified view on understanding of the historical record or characterization of the Senator’s words and actions. The Taskforce does not represent a unanimous assessment or opinion of appropriate next steps and acknowledges the complexity of the issue. The Taskforce charge directed the membership to conduct different levels of review and analysis, including identifying potential impacts of retaining, replacing, or contextualizing the name of Craven Hall.

This report provides a summary of the work with respect to the scope of the Taskforce charge, as well as recommended action or next steps. The report is organized in sections that reflect the process used to seat members of the Taskforce, the process used to gather and analyze evidence, as well as to meet a direct expectation of gathering community input and participation. The report describes the findings as related to the charge. The report reorders the elements of the Taskforce charge in order to facilitate flow of the narrative. Finally, this report also serves as part of the historical campus record and narrative regarding Craven Hall.

Taskforce Charge

President Neufeldt charged the Taskforce to undertake four (4) areas of investigation:

- ***Discover, document and analyze the historical record of William A. Craven's statements and actions as they relate to his past leadership roles and affiliations with CSUSM, our region and our state.***
- ***Analyze and build a common understanding among the Taskforce membership of the contemporary issues surrounding his association with CSUSM.***
- ***Develop opportunities for open and informed discussion with the internal and external campus community regarding the issue under consideration as it relates to our institutional mission and values.***
- ***Building on the results of an educational and information-gathering process, articulate the potential impacts of retaining, replacing or contextualizing the name and representation of Senator Craven at CSUSM with supporting evidence.***

Taskforce Membership

Membership on the Taskforce included students, alumni, faculty, staff, and community members, some of whom were elected by their peers, and others who were appointed by various means which are described below.

Taskforce membership drew from different constituencies affiliated with CSUSM. Members were identified and invited to participate through processes appropriate to their constituency group.

- President Neufeldt invited Drs. Patricia Prado-Olmos and Elizabeth Matthews to serve as co-chairs.
- Students were identified through an ASI call for volunteers and outreach to campus offices.
- An alumni representative was identified through a call by the CSUSM Alumni Association.
- Provost Carl Kemnitz invited faculty to submit their interest in serving. All faculty who expressed interest were invited to participate and include representation from tenure-track and lecturer ranks as well as multiple Colleges and content areas.
- Staff representatives were identified through an election process organized by a staff committee.
- Community members representing two long-standing campus-affiliated groups (Foundation Board & University Council) were invited to participate, in addition to general community members.

The Taskforce membership changed over the course of the fall 2021 semester. At the first meeting, members suggested adding tribal representatives. Subsequently, two tribal partners were invited to participate and joined the Taskforce.

There were challenges with consistent student participation on the Taskforce. Participation on the Taskforce demanded a significant commitment of time that often interfered with students' primary obligations to their academic success. The student voice was included through other means such as direct invitations to meet with the Taskforce and a student listening session.

A complete list of members is included at the end of this report.

Taskforce Process Overview

A Process Informed by Listening and Public Engagement

The Taskforce held meetings during the fall and spring semesters in academic year 2021-2022. These meetings were primarily held on Zoom to facilitate participation and support the health and safety of members considering the changing circumstances related to the Covid-19 pandemic. For the initial meetings, the Taskforce partnered with the National Conflict Resolution Center (NCRC) to provide education on inclusive communication and advise on aspects of the process moving forward, including in the administration of listening sessions with constituent groups in the spring.³

Importantly, NCRC supported the work as it launched by assisting the Taskforce to establish community practices of engagement. The first meetings of the Taskforce included establishing a set of guidelines and personal behavioral commitments. The practices supported members of the Taskforce to both share their own perspectives openly and listen to the perspectives of others with curiosity and respect.

Given that the context and content under consideration are very much of the *recent* past, the Taskforce envisioned and implemented a process informed by public engagement. In brief, the process included:

- Regular meetings: the members of the Taskforce were convened weekly to review core concepts related to the history of Senator Craven's role in founding CSUSM, history of the naming controversy in the 1990s, the record of materials in the digital collection, and engage in discussion related to the review of the materials.
- Invited speakers/ presentations: The Taskforce benefited from first-hand accounts from persons involved in the controversy in 1993/1994; the Taskforce also benefited from visits and presentations from parties who may have not been involved in the controversy of 1993/1994, but who are—in one form or another—directly affected by the naming of the building (Appendix C).
- As the process unfolded, closely interested parties were invited to share perspectives. Many of these parties spoke on behalf of Senator Craven, and included his family, very close friends, and direct colleagues. These witnesses to Senator Craven were extremely valuable and the Taskforce are grateful for their time and personal accounts, as it was evident that this deeply affected all involved.
- Parties who were not directly involved in the naming controversy of 1993/1994 were similarly invited to present their views. Students and offices

on campus that represent students shared their perspectives, interests, and impact of the name of the building.

- Public comment and listening sessions: to account for the role of the campus community in the conversation, and to reveal the extent to which these matters have energy and life on the campus of CSUSM, the Taskforce invited the campus community—including faculty, staff, current students, and past students—as well as the local community to share their perspectives, personal accounts, and other insights and observations with the Taskforce (Appendix D).
- After completion of a preliminary draft report, Taskforce members gathered to share their thoughts and analyses with President Neufeldt. As a result of that discussion, the President requested the Taskforce continue its work to summarize the analysis and formulate a recommendation. To assist with gathering information for the recommendation, a survey was distributed to all Taskforce members.

Throughout the process, the Taskforce made every effort to locate and invite all relevant parties to inform the dialogue. Some parties we pursued did not wish to participate, though many parties were willing to assist us in building a greater understanding of the issues pertaining to this issue and thus expanding the Taskforce’s capacity to learn more about how and why this matter has remained relevant to the life of the campus at CSUSM.

A Process Informed by Documentation

In addition to listening and engaging the campus and larger community, an equally important aspect of the process for the work of the Taskforce was to gather as much documented evidence as possible.

The CSUSM library houses an existing archive of materials from Senator Craven’s participation in the establishment of the campus, as well as the occurrences surrounding the naming and the associated controversy. With the assistance of the Special Collections Librarians, support staff organized a secure digital site accessible to only the members of the Taskforce. The site included an extensive body of resources related to Senator Craven’s role in founding CSUSM, as well as documents detailing the controversy surrounding Senator Craven’s activities and statements relating to undocumented immigrants, and campus and wider community reaction to those events from 1991 to 1995. The digital site also included documents and communications received from the campus and external communities. Temporary digital recordings of confidential presentations delivered to the Taskforce were made available to members who could not attend every meeting. As the work of the Taskforce continued, new documents were added to the digital site and members were routinely notified of new materials.

Additionally, the Taskforce continuously accepted feedback in a variety of formats for the purpose of informing the work and analysis being undertaken. Comments and communication from the community were accepted throughout the term of the Taskforce's work. Feedback was received in the following formats: 1. Via email /electronic messaging, 2. Via presentation to the Taskforce (by invitation), 3. Via listening sessions which took place on six different dates, in both in-person and virtual formats (additional information is provided below), 4. Via Special Community Convenings. All communication that was shared with the Taskforce was added to the secure digital site. The materials that were publicly available in the CSUSM library continue to be available.

Findings

The Taskforce findings relate to the recent history of the campus, the contributions of Senator Craven and his association with CSUSM, as well as the ensuing controversy of the naming of the building when Craven Hall was dedicated. In addition, per the charge, the report summarizes findings related to Senator Craven's association with the University in the context of the contemporary political, social, and cultural climate in which CSUSM exists today.

The views and opinions of Taskforce members varied concerning the legacy of William A. Craven. Some members of the Taskforce believed that the outcome should strongly consider how the perception of the work and life of Senator Craven will be impacted. Some believed that Senator Craven could/should still be honored for the work to establish CSUSM and the demonstrated commitment to the campus, but in ways other than the naming of a building. Still other members maintained that the name and likeness of Senator Craven have no place on the campus and represent values and perspectives that are misaligned with CSUSM's values, mission, and vision.

The findings are guided by the four (4) areas of investigation identified in the charge of the Taskforce.

I. Discover, document, and analyze the historical record of William A. Craven's statements and actions as they relate to his past leadership roles and affiliations with CSUSM, our region and our state.

Summary and Background on the life of Senator William A. Craven

Senator William Anderson Craven (1921-1999) has a storied life and career. He was born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and after many years of military service moved his family to the west coast where he was a public servant in the region for over forty years. Senator Craven was a dedicated public servant with a strong reputation for seeking compromise and reaching across the aisle.

Senator Craven had a distinguished military career as a United States Marine. During World War II he was part of the battalion that raised the flag on Mt. Suribachi on Iwo Jima. He served again during the Korean War, ultimately retiring from military service as a major. While deployed in Korea, he wrote a Marine Corps radio program that aired weekly over more than 130 stations; and, by 1951, he produced a weekly television program that ran for more than three years.

After leaving military service, he moved his family to the west coast, settling in Oceanside, California. He was a practicing Catholic and a parishioner at a local Oceanside parish. It was here that he began his career in public administration. He spent twelve years on the Oceanside Planning Commission and later worked as an

executive assistant to the Board of Supervisors from 1962 to 1969. He served as the county's first public information officer. He spent four months as the San Marcos city manager before winning election to the San Diego County Board of Supervisors in 1970, when he was named North County Man of the Year by the Northern San Diego County Associated Chambers of Commerce.

In 1973, in a contest among eight other Republicans—and 14 rivals overall—he won a seat in the California State Assembly. He was one of only two Republican assemblymembers to head a legislative committee in the Democrat-controlled lower house—the Local Government Committee. In 1978, Senator Craven jumped to the state Senate, a seat he held for 20 years. During his career, he defied GOP leaders on such issues as the Equal Rights Amendment, term limits, Proposition 13, and abortion funding. He counted himself as a moderate Republican and, apparently, was discouraged by the increasing influence of religion in politics—and especially in the Republican party. During his final term, he complained that upon meeting new members of the Republican legislature, they frequently would ask him if he was a Christian. His response was, “Yes, I am,” and immediately their response, according to Senator Craven, was, “Born-again?” And Senator Craven would respond, “No. Once has been enough for me.”⁴

In a 1993 speech he declared, “I have never been a fellow who followed the Pied Piper of Hamelin down the cobblestones just because he was Republican.” Indeed, Senator Craven crossed party lines without apology, and many times delivered the final vote needed to send Democratic bills to the governor. He prided himself on his bipartisanship and his friendships with many Democratic leaders.

Senator Craven was proud of winning extra funding for Torrey Pines State Reserve, as well as habitat preservation in Poway; supporting anti-pollution legislation that targeted aerosol cans and vapor-recovery systems on gas pumps; increasing the size of Butterfield Park in San Pasqual; and raising from five to seven the number of judges at the Vista courthouse. He also advocated for rent control—a taboo topic among Republicans at the time—in mobile home parks, given that the residents were primarily elderly. Senator Craven sponsored bills that created the state's network of freeway callboxes and laid the groundwork for Coaster light-rail service.

The Senator also had interest in improving educational opportunities for the youth of North County. He pursued this by trying to bring a campus of higher education to the North County region. It appears the work the Senator undertook to establish the university may have also been one of the longest running initiatives in his career, as this work is believed to have begun in the late 1960's, early 1970's.

Senator Craven's Relationship to CSUSM

There is no doubt that the history of Senator William A. Craven is closely tied to the history and establishment of CSUSM. Among all his accomplishments, the creation of

CSUSM is described as the "crowning legislative achievement of his career." After leaving office in 1998, and shortly before his death in 1999, Senator Craven donated \$250K of leftover campaign funds to CSUSM for the establishment of an academic scholarship with condition that the recipients be "average" students with special qualities.⁵

As early as 1968-1970, Senator Craven, then sitting on the Board of Supervisors, served on a Joint North County Chamber of Commerce Committee to provide a feasibility study of a possible four-year university in North County San Diego. The study was rejected.

A few years later, however, the idea was raised again by a community resident, Carol Cox.⁶ A mother of five who decided to return to college, she transferred from Palomar Community College to San Diego State University. A resident of North County San Diego, she began to lobby for a four-year educational institution closer to her home region. She began to lobby local area officials—including Senator Craven—to persuade them that a satellite campus in North County would benefit the region. She approached Assemblyman Senator Craven with a "novel idea" for an SDSU satellite campus in North County and Senator Craven "would carry the budget item if she could get the community support" which she did. Senator Craven provided the legitimacy and political power.

In 1979, Senator Craven successfully secured \$215,000 from the Chancellor's Office to establish a North County Center of San Diego State University (SDSU-NC). The initial location was Lincoln Middle School in Vista. Classes began in the Fall of 1979, and Carol Cox claimed she was the first student to register. Within five years, SDSU-NC had its first director, Richard Rush, and served about 450 students.

Carol Cox approached the Senator again in 1980, as she received her B.A. in Public Administration and requested an internship. Cox was hired into Senator Craven's office as a field representative and, along with others among Senator Craven's staff, worked with community organizations to encourage them to lobby for a full four-year campus. Between 1979 and 1985, Senator Craven's office was working tirelessly to lobby for a more permanent campus.

At the Chancellor's request, in January 1985, Senator Craven introduced a bill, SB 1060, to fund a \$250,000 feasibility study of a permanent campus in North County. The bill was signed by then-Governor Jerry Brown in September; by December, the study was launched. The study recommended the purchase of 300-400 acres for the establishment of a university.

In 1986, Senator Craven introduced SB 1732 as a bill to be used for site purchase funding, should the CSU Board of Trustees accept the feasibility study's recommendations. In 1987, Senator Craven successfully carried the Chancellor's budget request through the legislative process allocating \$10.4 million for the purchase of 304 acres in San Marcos for the new campus. In 1988, Senator Craven was

instrumental in getting approval for the new campus from the Governor's Office, along with a budget request of \$48.9 million for construction of Phase 1—the first three buildings on the new campus.

In early 1989, Senator Craven introduced SB 365 proposing to name the new campus California State University – San Marcos. On Sept 1, of that year, California Governor George Deukmejian (R) and 38th District Senator Craven took part in the signing of SB 365 into law. The signing took place at San Diego State University's North County campus, the two-year home of the new university. On that day in 1989, CSUSM became the twentieth campus in the California State University system.

In 1989, the CSU Board of Trustees voted to name the first signature building on the campus William A. Craven Administration Hall (later Craven Hall) in honor of the senator. On February 23, 1990, Senator Craven gave the keynote address during groundbreaking ceremonies held at the future site of CSUSM. Students were to begin attending CSUSM in fall 1992, and Craven Hall had an occupancy date for spring 1993. The naming of Craven Hall met controversy in February 1993, when Senator Craven was quoted in the *San Diego Union Tribune* as having made disparaging remarks regarding undocumented immigrant members of the community at a hearing of the Senate Special Committee on Border Issues.⁷ The ensuing communication between Senator Craven and the faculty at CSUSM is detailed below.

The Naming Controversy of 1993-94

The Taskforce closely reviewed the events of 1993 and 1994. The Taskforce benefited from visits from faculty members who were actively in opposition to the naming of Craven Hall at the time of the naming controversy. The Taskforce learned more from those who knew Senator Craven well, including his living family members, as well as other community members who closely worked with him.

The Taskforce also benefited from the extensive resource materials that exist—including public statements, newspaper articles, and photographs—to document the early history of CSUSM's founding and Senator Craven's relationship to the University and to the wider community it serves.

Senator Craven's Request to Identify Undocumented School Children

In January 1991, Senator Craven, in his capacity as chairman of the Legislature's Special Committee on Border Issues, commissioned a report titled "A Review of Selected Issues Relating to Undocumented Persons in San Diego," which assessed the financial impact of undocumented residents in San Diego County.⁸ In April, guided by the findings of the report, Senator Craven suggested that San Diego County officials, every school district, and city in the county do a head count of suspected undocumented persons who used public services.⁹ The survey was justified by

Senator Craven's office as data necessary to demand additional federal funding for the county. Both the intentions of the survey and the tool itself were harshly criticized as racist and utilizing flawed methodology by immigrant groups and educators.¹⁰ The criteria for determining school children who might have been undocumented included:

- "If a child has no previous school records, he may be considered to be an illegal resident of this country.
- If an incorrect or non-existent address is given by the child's parents, or if he does not have a U.S. birth certificate, he may be an illegal alien.
- Teachers should also be on the lookout for children with limited or no English skills."¹¹

Senator Craven was later tasked to initiate further research on the cost of providing services for undocumented persons for the specific purpose of securing reimbursement from the federal government.

Senator Craven's Sponsored Reports on Undocumented Immigrants

In 1992, the California Legislature's Special Committee on Border Issues, chaired by Senator Craven, launched a study conducted by two professors in the School of Public Administration and Urban Studies at San Diego State to discover the economic burden of "illegal immigrants" in San Diego County. The first findings were published in August 1992 in a report titled *A Fiscal Impact Analysis of Undocumented Immigrants Residing in San Diego County*.¹² The authors of the 128-page report concluded that undocumented immigrants cost San Diego County and the state a net \$146 million in services annually in the County.

A second version of the report, published in September 1993, was titled *Illegal Immigration in San Diego County: An Analysis of Costs and Revenues*.¹³ This report analyzed various economic sectors to which immigrant communities have access—namely, the criminal justice system, health services, public education, as well as "social and other public services," such as foster care, Aid to Families with Dependent Children, and other social welfare services. The report was 172 pages and concluded that costs amounted to \$210 million annually.

The final chapter of the September 1993 report includes recommendations for identifying undocumented immigrants, asserting that "those seeking public assistance should be required, as a condition of eligibility, to be photographed and fingerprinted." Moreover, the authors endorsed then-Governor Pete Wilson's proposal for national identification cards to distinguish "legal residents of the United States from those individuals who are present unlawfully."¹⁴

When the initial version of the study was released in February 1993, many local political leaders supported the study stating their budgets were constrained by the cost of providing for undocumented people resulting in lost services in their community. They supported the study which they felt could lead to a much-needed federal cost reimbursement, according to local politicians.¹⁵

Indeed, it is important to note that Senator Craven was not acting alone in this vein; the Governor of California, Pete Wilson, as well as other senators across California, were similarly conducting studies to assess the costs and benefits of the influx of immigrants—both documented and undocumented—to the state...

But the study also came under attack from various academic and institutional organizations who decried the study as flawed and racist. For example, Raymond Uzeta, executive director of the Chicano Federation, was quoted as saying that the study was "driven by personal political agendas and biases against the Latino community." Similarly, Community activist Roberto Martinez, a member of the Latino Advisory Committee for the County Board of Education called the survey "biased and incredibly flawed."¹⁶

Senator Craven's Statements at the Senate Special Hearing on Border Issues

On February 5, 1993, a hearing of the Senate Special Committee on Border Issues was convened. This hearing focused on discussion of the very themes that would later trouble the CSUSM Faculty Senate and wider community. The hearing was organized with three objectives: 1) to receive public comment on the first study commissioned by the committee; 2) to receive information from representatives of other state agencies that serve the undocumented in San Diego County, but were not consulted for the study; and 3) to discuss "reporting and verification systems that can be utilized to determine the number of undocumented who receive public services, the services provided, and the ultimate costs of such services."¹⁷

During this committee hearing it was suggested that all school districts, hospitals, and trauma centers count persons who were suspected of being undocumented to get a more accurate count of the impact made. According to Jeffrey Rose who reported on the hearing for the *San Diego Union Tribune*, "Craven complained that hospitals that treat undocumented immigrants and schools that admit them do not make serious attempts to find out whether they are legal residents. He further said that undocumented immigrant children should not have the same right to an education as American citizens."¹⁸

At this hearing, Senator Craven spoke the words that would later be at the heart of the 1993 naming controversy at CSUSM and in the wider community. Information was provided by the legal counsel for the California Department of Education regarding the information gathered for the survey conducted in the spring 1991—information gathered to determine the "legal status" of children in San Diego County school districts (see

above). In response, Senator Craven offered the following comment which we quote in full from the committee meeting's transcription:

There will be a lot of people who will disagree with what I am going to say and it is just a thought that I had. It is not a philosophy. It seems rather strange that we go out of our way to take care of the rights of these individuals who are perhaps on the lower scale of our humanity for one reason or another, and we really spend a lot of time and, obviously a lot of money to discommodate the people who pick up the tab to take care of the people that the law seems to favor. Is that correct? Well, maybe I should not ask that...¹⁹

CSUSM Institutional Response to Senator Craven's Report and Statements

In response to the conclusions of the report and Senator Craven's statements made at the February 5, 1993 hearing, the CSUSM Academic Senate unanimously authorized the Chair of the Senate, Edward Thompson, to write to Senator Craven to ask for a meeting to discuss the meaning of his words.²⁰ Citing Senator Craven's description of undocumented immigrants on the "lower scale of our humanity," the letter offered Senator Craven an opportunity to explain himself: "Perhaps you were misquoted or quoted out of context. Perhaps the words you spoke did not accurately reflect your true feelings on these subjects. We understand that such confusion can occur when the media covers events and would appreciate any light that you can shed on the situation... In fairness, we want to give you an opportunity to clarify or correct the statements attributed to you." On behalf of the Senate, Thompson urged Senator Craven to meet with the Senate to clarify his meaning. Senator Craven responded with a letter to the Academic Senate on February 25, 1993 (see below).

Gerardo M. Gonzalez, President of the Latino Association of Faculty and Staff (LAFS) at CSUSM, sent a public letter on behalf of LAFS to Senator Craven in response to the comments made at the hearing, as well as regarding the "reliance on an apparently flawed study that distorts data about undocumented immigrants as a basis for a public hearing that has polarized communities."²¹ The LAFS letter endorsed the Academic Senate's request for a clarification of the statement made at the hearing. The letter concludes, "LAFS strongly feels that unless these issues are addressed satisfactorily, we have no option but to consider action to oppose the dedication of the new administration building in your name."

Senator Craven's Response to Academic Senate and the Latino Association of Faculty and Staff

As mentioned above, in response to the letter from the Academic Senate, Senator Craven responded with a letter of his own on February 25, 1993. He clarified that this comment was taken out of context, and that he was referring solely to the "economic status" of undocumented immigrants. Moreover, Senator Craven further defended the

comment as being without reference to race, “As I have said on numerous occasions and in fairness as the reporter noted in the article, there was no racial characterization in my remark.”²²

The CSUSM Academic Senate held a special meeting on March 31, 1993. A result of this meeting was a Senate Resolution titled “Reaffirming the Academic Senate, CSU San Marcos Commitment to the University Mission statement, To confidence in Chair Edward Thompson III, and to respectful and cooperative dialogue with Senator Craven.”²³ The resolution called for specific steps to be taken to “adopt a cooperative posture towards Senator Craven’s Office in an effort to reestablish cooperative relationships with the Senator, Legislature, San Marcos city officials and all other interested and concerned parties to this episode,” as well as a letter to “Senator Craven expressing our regret that this matter has escalated to its current level and stating our desire to defuse the situation.” While the Taskforce was unable to locate a letter, former staff members and community members shared that the CSUSM Academic Senate sent a letter to the Senator that served as an apology. Indeed, one former staff member to Senator Craven recalled seeing the letter and described it as an acknowledgement that comments can be taken out of context and expressing appreciation for the Senator’s efforts related to campus.

On April 2, Senator Craven followed with a second letter addressed to the Chair of the Academic Senate.²⁴ In this letter he began by clarifying the purpose of the Special Committee.

On February 5, 1993, the Senate Special Committee on Border Issues convened a hearing in San Diego. During the last three years this Committee has taken a leadership role in looking into the fiscal impact of the undocumented in San Diego County. As Chairman of that Committee and in cooperation with the State’s Auditor General we have been instrumental in laying the groundwork for Federal reimbursement for local programs which provide services to the undocumented in the areas of education, health and welfare, as well as the criminal justice system.

Then, he further clarified the remarks that he felt were taken out of context at the Committee hearing. “It is true,” he began, “that at one point of the discussion I referred to some of the undocumented as being ‘perhaps on the lower scale of our humanity,’” He went on to explain,

but, as you know, this remark was taken out of context of a larger discussion. At no time was this comment meant as a denigration of an economic class; at no time was it used as a racial insult; it was only an illustration depicting a very real segment of people who desire to come to the United States. Those of you who know me, or those of you who will look at my record over the past 35 years, know that I have great compassion for all mankind and that this comment was never racially motivated.

In the CSUSM “Special Dedication Edition” of the *North County Report / Times Advocate* newspaper dated April 17, 1993, Senator Craven was interviewed prior to the dedication of the administration building, which would bear his name.²⁵ Toward the end of the interview, the senator was asked the following: “It’s no secret that you personally are the object of criticism by the Cal State San Marcos Academic Senate over published remarks regarding illegal immigrants. How are you are [sic] going to handle that tension at the dedication? How are you going to get beyond that?”

The senator begins by saying “I don’t know. That’s a very legitimate question. But I don’t know. I thought of telling the whole story, which I think would be of interest to a lot of people. Then I think, what the hell is to be gained by that? I’ve given it thought, many times, many times.” He then acknowledges “I don’t mind at all if people choose to criticize me; if they want to do that, fine, that’s entirely up to them. And I don’t say they are wrong because they do. But this was a situation that I thought was really weird.”

The Senator then summarized his perception of the exchange with the Academic Senate and LAFS by saying “It just indicates to me they took me unaware of what the hell has been going on.” Senator Craven was open to meeting with some members of the academic senate to “have a dialogue.” But, according to Senator Craven, he was asked to meet with “the whole student body or something.” A meeting of this scope was characterized by Senator Craven as a “theatrical spectacle,” something he was not prepared to do. “I am not up there to display my histrionic prowess,” he explained. “If pushed, I can do [that]. Certainly. That’s not in my judgement a way to solve it.”

Craven Hall was dedicated on April 19, 1993. Faculty and students protested the naming of the building at the event.

Senator Craven’s Initiative to Issue ID Cards and a Renewed Effort to Rename the Building

The historical context of heated public debates surrounding Proposition 187 in 1993/1994—the California state ballot measure restricting undocumented immigrants from using public healthcare, schools, and social services—is important to understanding the discussion of ID cards to verify citizenship.

Once again, a quote by Senator Craven was at the heart of the reemergent renaming controversy. On October 18, 1994, the *San Diego Union Tribune* quoted Senator Craven as saying, “I think basically, when people talk about it, they’re thinking of what I would have to say in a sort of an encompassing sense (is about) Hispanics.”²⁶ This comment indicated to some observers that Senator Craven was racially profiling the Latinx community. The policy seemed to indicate that only people of Latinx descent would have to carry ID cards, not everyone.

On the same day as the newspaper story, Senator Craven sent letters to the Academic Senate and to LAFS, acknowledging that he was “very much disturbed” by the article, as it represented a “misstatement” of his views “regarding identity cards as a remedy to illegal immigration.” To avoid any misunderstanding (in his words), Senator Craven also forwarded to the Academic Senate and to LAFS an official statement from his Legislative office in response to the article, which read, in part, “I was referring to the need to create a legal-resident eligibility card that would be required for proof of eligibility for *all* legal residents who seek government benefits and which would be effective in preventing people from using falsified documentation to get work.”²⁷ Senator Craven sent copies of both letters and of the official statement from his office to President Bill Stacy.

A former Administrative Aide to the Senator reported to the Taskforce that this was only an idea that was never acted upon. He further contextualized, “During this period, California’s economy was at the worst in its history with unemployment as high as 8%. At that time, there was a large influx of illegal immigrants, which was vexing to those who were here legally. Those here legally had gone through an extensive process and whether employed or seeking employment felt they were being harassed on several fronts. Gaining employment during a high unemployment period was tough, and then exacerbated with the need to also prove legality so the employer did not violate U.S. Federal law making it a fineable offense to hire an unauthorized immigrant. The cards being used were at that time easy to forge, so having one was still scrutinized.”²⁸

The faculty and student governing bodies at CSUSM were split on how to respond to Senator Craven’s proposal of requiring ID cards to prove citizenship. Nevertheless, the event prompted exchanges of letters between various campus constituencies and the university president, Bill Stacy.

On October 19, the Council of Program Directors for the College of Arts and Sciences (COAS) sent a letter to Stacy urging the president to “publicly repudiate” Senator Craven’s statements and to “pursue a way” to remove Senator Craven’s name from the administration building, as well as remove the bust from the lobby of the building.

On October 21, President Stacy responded to the Program Directors of COAS and to LAFS to indicate that he had indeed objected to the “ID card suggestion” in the *San Diego Union Tribune* and in other North County newspapers. He also explained that “the matter of building naming” was not the prerogative of the campus, but rather of the CSU Board of Trustees.

October 24, Victor Rocha, the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, sent a memorandum to the entire COAS community expressing his “disappointment” in the comments made by Senator Craven and inviting the Senator to “extend an apology to the Hispanic community, and to the larger North County Community.”

On October 25, 1994, Senator Craven sent a letter to the Academic Senate, now chaired by George Diehr. Once again acknowledging that his comment was taken out of context, Senator Craven went on to clarify his position:

Never during the entire debate over illegal immigration have I heard anyone suggest that there be an identity card issued for one segment of our population. Rather, the debate has centered on a universal card which every resident would carry in lieu of existing identification in order to circumvent the usage of false documents by persons who have entered this country illegally.²⁹

Senator Craven closed his letter by reiterating his commitment to CSUSM and adding, “I want to assure you just one more time that I would never denigrate any one segment of our society. I abhor political divisiveness, and I abhor intolerance. The only reason I chose a life of public service was to help others. Therefore, you can imagine that I am saddened that my motives and reputation would be called into question.”

Largely in response to the historical context surrounding Proposition 187 and to Senator Craven’s remarks regarding the proposed policy to issue ID cards, a special meeting of the Academic Senate of CSUSM was convened on October 26, 1994, to vote on a Senate “Resolution Asking That the Name of Senator William A. Craven Be Removed from Campus Buildings and Streets.”³⁰ The Academic Senate meeting was “open to the public and statements and comments were made by Senators, other faculty, staff, students, and members of the community.”³¹ The resolution was passed unanimously.

President Stacy was not able to attend the Academic Senate meeting on October 26 because of university-related travel to Japan. In his absence, President Stacy provided a statement to the University community that was shared at the Senate meeting. He began by explaining, “Upon my first learning of this ID card report, I expressed strong disagreement with Senator Craven’s remarks.” He went on to say, “I have given a great deal of thought to this challenging situation and appropriate campus responses. After careful consideration of many points of view, I have decided against proposing or advocating renaming of Craven Hall, removal of Senator Craven’s bust from the lobby, or renaming of campus area streets.”³² He closed his letter with an acknowledgment that he fully understood the “disappointment, hurt, and anger felt by the University community as a result of Senator Craven’s remarks,” and he applauded the “forthright and constructive manner in which the issue has been engaged on campus.”³³

The Associated Students council (the student government representing student interests on behalf of the student body) voted against the Academic Senate’s recommendation. The ASI decision on this matter reflected President Stacy’s position that Senator Craven contributed so much towards the establishment of the campus and that having his name on the administration building does not indicate a position on the Senator’s statements on immigration. The Academic Senate resolution was sent to Chancellor Barry Munitz because, according to the Academic Senate, President Stacy

indicated the building name was not a prerogative of the campus, but a decision held by the Board of Trustees. It was accompanied by a synopsis of the events surrounding the issue.

Chancellor Munitz responded on November 30, 1994 and indicated he would not recommend action to the Board of Trustees regarding the removal of Senator Craven's name from all buildings and streets on campus.³⁴ He wrote, "The naming of Craven Hall recognized all the many positive past actions Senator Craven performed in assisting San Marcos. Those actions, on behalf of the University, cannot be 'undone' as the CSU "recognition" of it cannot be 'undone.'" The Chancellor's letter further indicated that President Stacy should meet with the Senate to "try and come to a mutually agreed upon conclusion to this matter."

A draft and undated letter to Chancellor Munitz from the Academic Senate indicates faculty representatives met with President Stacy to "discuss this issue and our differences." The letter indicates the two parties resolve to "respectfully 'agree to disagree'..." and that there is better understanding of each other's positions and views.³⁵

Reactions by External Campus Community

What is clear from the collection of materials available is that between 1993 and 1994 numerous letters from various constituency groups or persons were directed across the landscape of stakeholders creating a web of demand and criticism. Of note, in March 1993 the Academic Senate Chair received a letter from City of San Marcos mayor Lee B. Thibadeau chiding the faculty for holding their position regarding Senator Craven's statements, which the mayor asserted was "taken out of context" and focused on the "high public cost of illegal immigration."³⁶

An onslaught of criticism was directed at CSUSM faculty from other government officials, as well as the print media, issuing harsh criticism of both the faculty and concepts such as "multiculturalism" and "political correctness." These events were experienced by CSUSM faculty, particularly Latinx faculty, as intimidation. It is also clear that this experienced intimidation was structural in that it was generated by several regional and political institutions.³⁷

These persistent attacks succeeded in silencing CSUSM faculty in the interim, at least from continuing to make direct requests for clarification from the Senator. However, the objection to Senator Craven's name on the building, his bust and name of the street did not dissipate.

On January 19, 1995, the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) drafted a resolution in support of removing Senator Craven's name from all CSUSM buildings and streets. The draft resolution supported the CSUSM Academic Senate's October 26, 1994 resolution to remove Senator Craven's name from CSUSM and the

November 30, 1994 call on the Chancellor to reconsider the decision not to bring the issue to the Board of Trustees. The ASCSU withdrew this resolution in March 1995; it is not known why it was withdrawn.

This section of the report summarizes the events of the early nineties. However, since that time the controversy over the use of Senator Craven's name did not dissipate. The use of the Senator's name at CSUSM and the on-going discontent is part of CSUSM's oral history. The campus community has long believed that there was not an opportunity to fully address the issues raised in the early 1990s, and that no inclusive process was undertaken to ensure that all voices were heard.

The timeline the Taskforce was able to construct is the result of existing documents and resources as well as memories from those involved or observers at the time. As a result, there are some details that remain unclear. In particular, one detail emerged as important to share, as the collective memories in the external community and in the campus community vary significantly.

The detail in question concerns the extent to which President Bill W. Stacy conducted a review process to explore the concerns about Senator Craven voiced by members of the campus community. The campus community has long held that President Stacy did not engage in a review process around events in 1993 or 1994. In contrast, community members report that President Stacy spent three months looking into the issues in 1993. The events in 1993 occurred between February 6 when the Senator's comments from the hearing of the Senate Special Committee on Border Issues were reported in the *San Diego Union Tribune* and April 19 when Craven Hall was dedicated. The Taskforce could not locate any reports or memos from President Stacy that documented a review process.

II. Analyze and build a common understanding among the Taskforce membership of the contemporary issues surrounding his association with CSUSM.

As the Taskforce acknowledges, the discussion and controversy surrounding the naming of Craven Hall—both in 1993-94 and again in 2021-22—is in no way unique to CSUSM. The contemporary context that is impacting institutions and governments across the country is central to the Taskforce conversations with regard to Senator Craven’s legacy at CSUSM. At the same time that universities have histories, they are also living, breathing institutions, the mission of which is to serve current student populations and the surrounding communities. This requires a willingness to engage in self-reflection and acknowledge that certain ways of memorializing individuals in society that were accepted in the past were, and continue to be, harmful to members of our communities. As a university designated as a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI), it is incumbent upon the campus community to create an environment conducive to success for all students. Students expressed to the Taskforce that Senator Craven’s rhetoric causes them harm and impedes their ability to experience a sense of belonging at CSUSM.

Given the contemporary context, in recent years, institutions of higher education across the nation have increasingly sought to reevaluate their relationships with the people whose names label campus buildings, especially when those people “played a hand in creating institutions but who also held discriminatory or other harmful views in word or deed,” as stated in a 2022 article in Higher Ed Dive.³⁸ The Taskforce listened closely to voices who want to preserve Senator Craven’s historical legacy, as well as to those who are convinced that his words and actions are antithetical to the University mission.

For some on the Taskforce, as well as for members of the campus community and the wider community that CSUSM serves, renamings at local, regional, and national levels are part of a larger reckoning with racism with the goal to address the historical legacy of racist practices in the United States. The review of the use of the name of Senator Craven at CSUSM represents an explicit effort by the University to address systemic racism. Practicing anti-racism requires making a conscious decision to dismantle and fight against racism at the structural, institutional, and personal levels. For this reason, some on the Taskforce and in the campus and wider community expressed deep concern that Senator Craven’s rhetoric in the 1990s resonates with language being used in the contemporary landscape of the United States. This is part of a long history of white prejudice and nativism toward immigrants in the United States. That history is still unfolding today.

For community members who identify Senator Craven’s attitudes toward immigrants as nativist, Senator Craven’s perspective was centered on white American hegemony which manifests itself as non-whites having to suppress their culture and adopt the dominant culture. From this point of view, Senator Craven’s actions and comments are interpreted by many as a continuation of settler colonial and imperialist mentality, where those who were here before settlers came are seen as less than and were either victims

of genocide and/or relegated to servitude and second- or third-class citizenship. Those with this perspective see these events as a form of covert racism, based in unconscious bias, however still bearing painful impact on the community to whom it is directed. For those who follow this line of thinking, it is insufficient that the Senator may not have meant it, or that he may have misspoken. These persons have placed tremendous value on restoring the harm experienced by those impacted and placing accountability on the Senator.

Moreover, words matter. Language is a powerful form of oppression, which has been historically and is contemporaneously used both carelessly and as a weapon. For those who share this perspective, CSUSM should not be an apologist for Senator Craven's words: his language was insulting then and is equally insulting today. The indignities that the Senator leveled at the Latinx immigrant communities demonstrate a lack of awareness around matters of social class, and those factors comprising social class, such as colorism and indigeneity, socio-economic status, and access to resources, factors which deeply affect the lives and possibilities of immigrant and minoritized communities. Many on the Taskforce expressed deep concern over Senator Craven's unwillingness to apologize for the hurt caused by his comments. Additionally, many expressed concern over the sentiment that the Senator was somehow immune to being held accountable by the public he aimed to represent. To them, this represents the role power and privilege has played in society: those with power do not need to be concerned with those without it. This issue is larger than Senator Craven and his remarks; this is an issue of social and economic equity at CSUSM and the need to pursue efforts to create a just and inclusive campus for all.

Others on the Taskforce and on the campus, as well as in local communities, adamantly reject the notion that Senator Craven was in any way racist, or that his remarks toward undocumented immigrants—however imprudent—constitute sufficient cause for denigrating his name. Those who reject the argument that Senator Craven was racist are persuaded that the current climate of “cancel culture” contributes to an unfair bias against Senator Craven, his legacy in North County San Diego, and his relationship to CSUSM. From their point of view, the “woke” culture of the moment and the movement to cancel anyone who may have acted in a way that does not align with the contemporary moral compass explains the call to remove Senator Craven's name from a prominent position on campus.

Indeed, for some of the community members who visited the Taskforce to share more about their respective relationships to Senator Craven and about the man himself, the report he commissioned and the comments he made in 1993 were unfairly misconstrued as being racist. Instead, as they reminded the Taskforce, Senator Craven's comments were directly related to the senator's obligation to assess the economic impact of undocumented families in San Diego County in an effort to garner additional federal funding. From this perspective, the historical political context is all-important to understanding Senator Craven's motivations for launching the study with regard to undocumented immigrants, and seeking to assess the cost to the region: the California “tax revolution” that was launched in the late 1970s, the fiscally conservative

presidency of former California governor Ronald Reagan in the 1980s; and Governor Pete Wilson's advocacy of Proposition 187 and corresponding immigration policies of the early 1990s, put pressure on state and local authorities—including on Senator Craven—to justify spending for public services that benefited non-citizens.

According to some of the people with whom the Taskforce consulted, as an economist by training and as a civil servant representing a region with a high immigrant population, the Senator was merely doing his job. His observation about undocumented immigrants being on the “lower scale of our humanity” was not made in reference to their racial or ethnic identity or status, but rather in strict reference to their generally low socio-economic status and thus the potential economic burden they placed on taxpayers. In other words, the contemporary issues serve to create an unfair bias against Senator Craven that not only tarnishes his legacy and significance to the history of CSUSM but skews the facts. The contemporary context in which the Taskforce is operating, from this point of view, prejudices the view against Senator Craven, rather than helping to clarify the circumstances surrounding the actions and words of the Senator. For these persons, the Academic Resolution language that uses terms including nativist and racist in relation to Senator Craven, is wildly determinative, and any decision to remove the name would be confirming this implication. These parties place incredible value on the intent, pointing to the fact that the Senator repeatedly stated that he did not mean to ascribe racial meaning.

Opinions are also divided regarding how the current CSUSM campus community engages with the life, work, and legacy of Senator Craven. The naming of any location or artifact on campus in honor of any person has notable symbolic value. The Taskforce acknowledges that there will be significant impacts for multiple constituencies in the decision concerning the continuation of the prominent featuring of Senator Craven's name (see below).

III. Building on the results of an educational and information-gathering process, articulate the potential impacts of retaining, replacing or contextualizing the name and representation of Senator Craven at CSUSM with supporting evidence.

The Taskforce members engaged in a robust conversation concerning the impacts of retaining, replacing, or contextualizing the name of Senator Craven at CSUSM. Regardless of the decision made, there will be profound impacts on the campus and local community, particularly CSUSM students, staff, and faculty, as well as friends and family of Senator Craven. This is both an emotional and intellectual issue with different interpretations and understandings across communities and individuals. The Taskforce members acknowledge the toll this has taken and will continue to take in the wake of this report and subsequent decision concerning this issue.

Retaining the Name: The Taskforce members identified numerous impacts in the discussion stemming from all the evidence presented to the Taskforce as discussed above. If the campus *retains the name* of Senator William A. Craven, it is evident from the testimonies of students, faculty, and staff that the climate of fear on campus will be exacerbated for certain populations. This is especially true for CSUSM's Latinx population with particular concern for undocumented members of the campus community. In the Taskforce sessions as well as through the forums and feedback website/email, perspectives were shared from many campus members who experience this fear and concern daily. Failing to acknowledge the pain caused by Senator Craven's remarks will heighten their feeling that they do not belong at CSUSM and increase the fear they experience on campus. In addition, Latinx students in particular have expressed the hurt caused by walking into Craven Hall to acquire services intended for their advancement. It was expressed to the Taskforce that this is contrary to the campus mission and reminds them on a daily basis that they are not truly welcome at CSUSM. A failure to remove Senator Craven's name will further demoralize the students, faculty, and staff who are harmed by his words. Further, the University claims to be focused on anti-racism initiatives and many in the community would see the retention of Senator Craven's name as antithetical to those goals. This may have a detrimental impact on the reputation of CSUSM. The university may find it difficult to recruit and retain students of color, greatly diminishing the educational experience on campus.

On the other hand, Taskforce members also heard and acknowledge that retaining the name would preserve the legacy of Senator Craven as a founder of CSUSM. This is a history that should not be erased. Retaining the name could also serve to mend the relationships with long-term friends and sponsors of CSUSM who knew, worked with, and supported Senator Craven. Retaining the name may also be seen as an opportunity for President Neufeldt to demonstrate her leadership and provide a safe place for donors to feel comfortable providing funds that could result in a naming on campus. It is

likely that faculty and students will continue to object to the centering of Senator Craven's name and the administration is likely to face significant pressure if the name is retained. This may make the situation difficult for the President and other campus leadership and may lead to some instability. It was noted that retaining the name would send a message to the Academic Senate that the President is focused on Academic Excellence.

Removing the Name: If the campus *removes the name* of Senator Craven, it will impact the perception others have of him. Regardless of the context provided, some will conclude this was done because of a character flaw and not as a consequence of the pain caused by his words. It was argued that because the Academic Senate resolution made racism an issue, removing Senator Craven's name will declare that he was indeed a racist. Furthermore, because the process did not focus on the resolution, the process was lacking in scope. Many people believe this will destroy the legacy of Senator Craven. The question that has been raised through the correspondence and presentations is whether the Senator was a racist or if he was inarticulate in speaking off the cuff at the February 5, 1993 hearing in which hurtful language was used. From this perspective, removing Senator Craven's name will propagate a false narrative, that of him being a racist. This is seen by some as sacrificing Senator Craven's legacy to prevent campus unrest and to accommodate the Academic Senate's displeasure at the original naming.

Removing his name may also produce negative impacts from the community of CSUSM supporters; some may stop their advocacy for the University while others may withdraw their financial support. It was suggested that future funding for buildings or other spaces on campus might be impacted as some donors could be hesitant to pursue naming opportunities. The personal impacts cannot be ignored as some individuals will be hurt by this decision. Some long-term supporters, the Craven family, original University Council members, and Foundation Board members who expressed concern since they knew or worked with the Senator will be aggrieved. The Taskforce cannot assume how widespread this might be, but certainly some community members will react negatively and an unfavorable opinion of CSUSM may occur. As with a decision to retain the name, this decision could result in difficulties for CSUSM leadership and potential instability. Empowered by this decision, threats may arise across campus, particularly from white supremacy groups in the region.

Conversely, CSUSM may gain new supporters who favor the decision to remove Senator Craven's name. New donors may be gained and CSUSM's image and narrative may be more positive in certain parts of the community. Removing the Craven name will be seen by many as a gesture to build trust and as opportunity for inclusivity, particularly but not only, with Latinx and Indigenous populations in the region. This will be seen by many as being aligned with CSUSM's status as a Hispanic-Serving Institution. Many of those who spoke to the Taskforce highlighted the incongruity with

the honoring of Senator Craven and the institution's status as an HSI. Removing Senator Craven's name will also allow the University to be more in line with the mission and strategic plan focus on inclusion and equity. Many faculty, staff, and students will be in favor of such a decision, and it will allow the University community to rename, reclaim, and design the space as one that is welcoming to all students. Removing Senator Craven's name will alter the future of this institution by responding to current and future students at CSUSM looking for a sense of belonging.

Contextualizing the Name: The Taskforce also considered alternate ways to *contextualize the name and representation* of Senator Craven. Some Taskforce members believe there are positive ways to create a clear, impartial representation of the founding of CSUSM. The University could provide a place and a space for ongoing learning. It would need to be factually driven and data informed. It could provide the opportunity to honor the role Senator Craven played in the founding of CSUSM while also resolving the conflict over the memorializing of his name on the building. Other members of the Taskforce see this as an unacceptable outcome. It presents a lose-lose scenario in which neither side will be satisfied. One Taskforce member believes this would be seen as an element of "cancel culture."

If a form of contextualization is chosen, it would need to be done thoughtfully and with intentional discussion. Some suggestions that were made include a plaque, website or permanent exhibit dedicated to the founding of the campus in the library. This could also take the form of a thoroughly researched and vetted paper that lives in the library with the other founding documents. Whatever form this takes, it would need to explain both the Senator's contributions as well as a discussion of the language he used and policies he supported that were hurtful to members of the campus and wider community. If such contextualization is pursued by CSUSM, care needs to be taken as any images or discussion of oppression can be damaging to those who see them even if they are properly labeled. It was also suggested in the Taskforce discussion that a true understanding of the complexities and impacts would need to be interactive. For example, it would require panel discussions, workshops, and/or teaching materials to be fully effective. It was stated many times that for these events to achieve a state of true reconciliation there would need to be an engaged relationship among the invested parties and affected communities.

Regardless of the decision, a clear rationale must be provided, and it must be situated in the context of the region and its history and population. The campus reputation and fundraising goals will be impacted, one way or another. Some campus partners will be lost and gained. All possible scenarios would lead to a difficult situation for campus leadership, potentially including calls for the President to resign and campus protests. Conversely, the President may be regarded as the leader who led this difficult issue and helped align the mission and strategic plan while preserving in some way the Senator's legacy and contributions toward the establishment of the University.

IV. Develop opportunities for open and informed discussion with the internal and external campus community regarding the issue under consideration as it relates to our institutional mission and values.

The Taskforce developed multiple ways to engage the internal and external campus communities in open and informed discussion. These included direct presentations to the Taskforce, organized listening sessions, as well as an email address and a feedback form made available on the Taskforce website linked to the Office of the President website.

Presentations to the Taskforce

The Taskforce welcomed numerous guests to meetings to share their information and perspectives about the issue under consideration. A complete list of presentations is in the appendices. Individual names are redacted to maintain confidentiality.

The presentations included information and reflections offered by individuals who were part of the campus community during the original events related to the naming of Craven Hall in 1991. These presentations offered perspectives that reflected opinions across the spectrum; the Taskforce heard from individuals who knew Senator Craven personally, including a Craven family member, observed his political career and contributions to North County as well as supported his work to establish a four-year institution of higher education in San Marcos. These individuals described a deeply committed “servant leader” who held service above self as a core personal value. These presentations noted that Senator Craven worked for years to establish a CSU campus in North County and would be extremely proud of today’s diverse and inclusive student body who attends the University.

We also heard from other presenters who expressed deep concerns about Senator Craven’s association with CSUSM and the mission of the University. Among these presenters was one who was part of the original protest of the naming in the early 1990’s. Other presenters documented the profound significance of cultural identity, space, and place. Still others shared students’ personal words and their thoughts and feelings of alienation, lack of belonging, and disillusionment about attending a campus where a building would be named after an individual who did not, in their estimation, espouse values of inclusion.

Listening Sessions

The Taskforce organized six listening sessions during March 2022. The listening sessions were organized around different audiences that included internal campus constituencies as well as external community. The purpose of the listening sessions was to provide an open space where members of the campus and external communities could be welcomed to share their perspectives on the issues pertaining to the charge of the Taskforce.

Listening sessions were in-person as well as virtual formats. A complete list of the sessions is included below.

- March 3, 2022 – CSUSM Student Community
- March 8, 2022 – CSUSM Faculty Community
- March 10, 2022 – CSUSM Staff Community
- March 15, 2022 – CSUSM Open Event (virtual)
- March 17, 2022 – CSUSM Open Event
- March 22, 2022 – San Marcos External Community (virtual)

An additional community convening was organized by members of the Latinx community. The Taskforce co-chairs as well as the Chief Diversity Officer were invited to attend. The limited invitation was due to concerns for personal and professional safety.

- April 28, 2022 – Latinx Community members

The listening sessions followed the same organizational framework. Taskforce co-chairs, Dr. Elizabeth Matthews and Dr. Patricia Prado-Olmos attended each session. In addition, facilitators from the National Conflict Resolution Center attended sessions in a support role. Each session opened with a brief presentation that provided information about the Taskforce charge, ways to provide feedback beyond the listening session, a schedule of all Sessions and a list of conduct and language agreements by which the Session dialogue would proceed.

Overwhelmingly, listening session participants indicated support for renaming Craven Hall. This trend was seen across all audiences. Among the reasons voiced included the belief that Senator Craven's remarks and actions related to immigrants were antithetical to the values of CSUSM, were not aligned with CSUSM's new strategic plan nor were they reflective of the University's stated position regarding a growing "culture of care." Participants reported feelings of alienation, lack of belonging, distrust, fear, and no sense of welcoming of their identities, language, families, or their very existence.

Some participants voiced support for retaining the name of Craven Hall. These individuals shared perspectives that ranged from their personal knowledge of Senator Craven to concern about "cancel culture," the actions of the CSUSM Academic Senate "in driving decisions," as well as deep offense at the presumed maligning and damage

“to the reputation of the person most responsible for establishing the campus.” Indeed, it was often repeated that “the campus would not exist if it weren’t for Senator Craven.”

Email/Electronic Feedback

The University established an inbox to collect inbound messages from the external community related to the matter of the Academic Senate Resolution regarding the naming of Craven Hall and the subsequent work of the Taskforce. These modalities were entirely open to any type of feedback, and there were no parameters laid out for what the Taskforce was aiming to receive in terms of feedback. A description of the data collected is included in the appendices.

The email address was posted on the public website for the Taskforce. To date over 70 messages have been received. In general, perspectives range across the spectrum: those in favor of removing the Craven name from the building, and those in favor of retaining the Craven name on the building. In addition, a Change.org³⁹ petition was submitted to the Taskforce. The petition, which advocates for removal of the Craven name from the building, has garnered over 500 signatures by late 2022.

Conclusion and Recommendation

After the completion of document review, presentations from guests, and discussion, the Taskforce members were asked to make a recommendation on two related issues. The first is whether to retain or remove the name of Senator Craven from the campus building. The second is to address contextualizing the name of Senator Craven and his relationship to the CSUSM campus.

While the Taskforce members did not come to a unanimous recommendation, the overwhelming majority of Taskforce members endorsed the removal of the Senator's name from the building. While recognizing the vital role Senator Craven played in the establishment of CSUSM, Taskforce members focused on several key factors in justifying their recommendation. Taskforce members highlighted comments Senator Craven made at the Senate Committee on Border Issues hearing in 1993 during which he referred to undocumented immigrants as the "lower scale of our humanity." Several Taskforce members focused on the Senator's lack of apology for this comment as a critical factor in their decision-making. The Senator explained that the comment was taken out of context, and the Taskforce reviewed the video of the hearing and heard the comment in context. The majority of Taskforce members were not satisfied with the Senator's explanation and believe his failure to meet with the faculty and staff and acknowledge the pain his comments cause the Latinx community demonstrates behavior counter to the values of CSUSM. In addition, members were influenced by the Senator's support of identification cards and Proposition 187.

Several members expressed deep concern for the current and future CSUSM students. The Taskforce heard from students about the impact of Senator Craven's name on the building and how it makes them feel unwelcome and unsafe. Members mentioned the CSUSM mission and vision as a place of inclusive excellence and the belief that continuing to honor the Senator with the building name runs counter to those values. As a Hispanic Serving Institution that values diversity and inclusion, retaining the name would continue to harm students of color. If the University is going to continue to espouse ideas of inclusive excellence and uphold the meaning of a Hispanic Serving Institution, the name must be changed.

As stated, the Taskforce members were not unanimous in their recommendation. The single dissenting perspective as voiced by one member of the taskforce recommends retaining Senator Craven's name on the building. This perspective argues that the naming issue was resolved in the early 1990's and no new evidence was introduced in this process to support reconsideration of that decision. It also asserts that in the 1990's the Senator responded to inquiries from the CSUSM Academic Senate, explained his remarks as being taken out of context, or as misstatements. Furthermore, it is believed the historical narrative is clear that the Senator never intended harm and that he supported CSUSM and all students.

The second issue the Taskforce was asked to address was whether or not to contextualize the name of Senator Craven on campus. On a scale of 0-10 (with 0 being Not in Favor and 10 being Very in Favor), Taskforce members rated contextualizing the Senator's name at 7.83. Thus, there is strong support for memorializing the Senator's role in creating CSUSM as well as addressing the controversy around his words. Several suggestions were made, including a Library display of CSUSM's history (it was also suggested this could be in the lobby of the administration building), the bust of Senator Craven being moved to the Library or the Veteran's Center, or a plaque placed on campus. A workgroup could be created to explore how to address the history properly and fully on campus. It was also suggested that a history of this land and the campus should be included in all campus orientations.

In summary, a majority of Taskforce members recommend that Craven Hall be renamed through a clear process consistent with the values of CSUSM and Senator Craven's relationship with CSUSM be contextualized in a new way on campus.

Timeline of Key Events 1989-2021

1989

- June 1989: Chancellor W. Ann Reynolds' directs Vice Chancellor John W. Smart "to place the naming of the administration/library for Senator Craven on the September Board of Trustees agenda," with President Stacy's approval.
- Sept 1, 1989: SB 365 is signed into law establishing the campus of CSUSM.
- September 1989: Recommendation to name the building in honor of Senator Craven is listed on the Board of Trustees agenda, Committee on Gifts and Public Affairs; recommendation considered in closed session.
- November 1989: Board of Trustees minutes note approval of resolution to name the first campus building in honor of Senator Craven.

1990 - 1991

- February 23, 1990: Senator Craven gives the keynote address during groundbreaking ceremonies held at the future site of CSUSM.
- January 1991: Senate Office of Research authors report for Senate Special Committee on Border Issues, titled *A Review of Selected Issues Relating to Undocumented Persons in San Diego County*.
- April 2, 1991: *Los Angeles Times* reports Senator Craven's proposed practices for counting and tracking undocumented community members who benefit from public services, including public schools.

1992

- August 1992: Professors Rea and Parker author report for Senate Special Committee on Border Issues, titled *A Fiscal Impact Analysis of Undocumented Immigrants Residing in San Diego County*.
- Fall 1992: Students begin attending CSUSM; Craven Hall had an occupancy date for spring 1993.

1993

- February 5, 1993: Senate Special Committee on Border Issues hearing takes place. Senator Craven is quoted in the *San Diego Union Tribune* as referring to undocumented immigrants as being "perhaps on the lower scale of our humanity."
- February 15, 1993: Edward Thompson, Chair of the Academic Senate, writes a letter on behalf of Senate to Senator Craven, inviting the senator to clarify the statement he made either by visiting the Senate in person or explaining in writing.

- February 25, 1993: Senator Craven responds to Thompson's letter, explaining that his words were taken out of context and that he was only referring to the economic status of undocumented immigrants. He thanks Thompson for the opportunity to explain.
- March 10, 1993: Discussion of the Craven Hall controversy at Academic Senate. They unanimously pass the following motion:
- "That the Academic Senate make known to President Stacy that the Senate is opposed to the dedication of Craven Hall until these concerns (e.g. McCarthyism and ethnicity and class) are addressed to the satisfaction of the Academic Senate; that a letter be written to Senator Craven requesting clarification of his remarks and inviting his presence on campus for an exchange of views."
- March 17, 1993: Thompson writes another letter expressing the Senate's disappointment with Senator Craven's explanation of events, and in order to "resolve these issues," invites Senator Craven to meet with the Senate "for a dialogue."
- March 17, 1993: The Academic Senate passes a Resolution reaffirming the body's commitment to the University Mission and to Thompson's two letters of February 15 and March 17.
- March 17, 1993: Thompson writes a letter to President Stacy (per Senate request/ approval) expressing Senate frustration with Senator Craven's written response, referencing his March 17 letter to Senator Craven.
- March 1993: Latino Association of Faculty and Staff (LAFS) sends a public letter to Senator Craven criticizing flaws in the study design, and reinforcing the need to hear a clarification of the Senator's remarks made at the hearing.
- March 31, 1993: Special meeting of the Academic Senate that results in Resolution titled "Reaffirming the Academic Senate, CSU San Marcos Commitment to the University Mission statement, To confidence in Chair Edward Thompson III, and to respectful and cooperative dialogue with Senator Craven." Resolution includes call to send a letter to Senator Craven expressing regret at the escalation and to reestablish cooperative relations.
- April 19, 1993: Craven Hall dedication (The Latino Association of Faculty and Staff did not attend; about 15 protesters held signs critical of Senator Craven).
- September 1993: Rea and Parker author another report for the Senate Special Committee on Border Issues, titled *Illegal Immigration in San Diego County: An Analysis of Costs and Revenues*.

1994

- November 8, 1994: Prop 187, a law designed to prohibit undocumented immigrants in California from using public healthcare services (except in cases of emergency), social services, and public schools, appears on the ballot. California voters pass the measure 59% to 41%. The constitutionality of Proposition 187 would later be challenged by several lawsuits. It was ultimately overturned in 1997 and appeals

to the judgment were dropped by incoming Governor Gray Davis's office in 1999.

- October 18, 1994: *San Diego Union Tribune* reports Senator Craven's comments that the state should explore requiring Latinos to carry legal-resident identification cards.
- October 18, 1994: Senator Craven releases official statement clarifying his remarks. He said he was referring to a universal ID card for all state residents, not just Latinos.
- October 19, 1994: The CSUSM Council of Program Directors of the College of Arts and Sciences (COAS) sends a letter to President Stacy expressing concern over the statements attributed to Senator Craven in the *San Diego Union Tribune*.
- October 19, 1994: Senator Craven sends a series of letters to various stakeholders at CSUSM—including to the Academic Senate and LAFS in defense of his remarks.
- October 21, 1994: President Stacy sends response letters to COAS Program Directors and to LAFS indicating that he awaits the outcome from an October 26 meeting of the Academic Senate and that removing Senator Craven's name from the administration building is a "decision held by the Board of Trustees with the Chancellor's recommendation following campus and other consultation."
- October 24, 1994: Victor Rocha, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences sends a memorandum to the COAS community inviting Senator Craven to "extend an apology to the Hispanic community, and to the larger North County Community."
- October 24, 1994: President Stacy writes a letter to the campus community. In the letter he writes: "After careful consideration of many points of view, I have decided against proposing or advocating renaming of Craven Hall, removal of Senator Craven's bust from the lobby, or renaming of campus and area streets."
- President Stacy further writes: "To react to the statement (or misstatement) of a controversial point of view by removing his name from a campus building would, in my opinion, be an inappropriate reaction to an unfortunate set of circumstances."
- October 26, 1994: The CSUSM Academic Senate holds a special meeting open to the public and passes Resolution asking that Senator Craven's name be removed from "all University buildings and streets." The Resolution is addressed to Chancellor Barry Munitz.
- November 30, 1994: Chancellor Munitz decides against bringing the issue to the Board of Trustees. CSUSM Associated Students council did not support the Academic Senate resolution. The Chancellor directs the President and Senate to meet and arrive at a "mutually agreed upon conclusion" to the issue.
- Undated: The CSUSM Academic Senate addresses a letter to Chancellor Munitz that notes faculty representatives met with President Stacy on several occasions and resolved to respectfully "agree to disagree."

1995

January 19-20, 1995: The Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) drafts a resolution in support of removing Senator Craven's name from all CSUSM buildings and streets; the resolution is withdrawn in March 1995.

2021

April 2021: Academic Senate issues resolution proposing the removal of Senator Craven's name from the building, road, and removal of the bust bearing the Senator's likeness.

Appendices

Appendix A: Charge of the Taskforce



California State University
SAN MARCOS

Office of
the President

Office of the President California State University San Marcos 333 S. Twin Oaks Valley Road San Marcos, CA 92096-0001
Tel: 760.750.4040 Fax: 760.750.4033 pres@csusm.edu www.csusm.edu/president

MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 24, 2021

TO: Members of the Taskforce on Naming of Craven Hall

FROM: Ellen J. Neufeldt, Ed.D. *Ellen J. Neufeldt*
President

SUBJECT: Charge and Membership

Recently, many institutions of higher education across the nation have sought to understand the history, context and impact of various campus namings. Following a spring 2021 Academic Senate resolution, I am charging this group to examine our university's connection to the late Senator Craven as it relates specifically to the naming of Craven Hall as well as the location of the Craven bust.

In alignment with our commitment to our [mission and values](#), and an intent for this to be an inclusive and deliberative process that draws on the voices and perspectives of our internal and external campus community, the taskforce charge is to:

- Discover, document and analyze the historical record of William A. Craven's statements and actions as they relate to his past leadership roles and affiliations with CSUSM, our region and our state.
- Analyze and build a common understanding among the Taskforce membership of the contemporary issues surrounding his association with CSUSM.
- Develop opportunities for open and informed discussion with the internal and external campus community regarding the issue under consideration as it relates to our institutional mission and values.
- Building on the results of an educational and information-gathering process, articulate the potential impacts of retaining, replacing or contextualizing the name and representation of Senator Craven at CSUSM with supporting evidence.

It is critical that all members be open to hearing and understanding a diversity of opinions, experiences, ideas and evidence.

In addition to the membership below, other CSUSM experts and/or external community experts will be invited to attend meetings based on the need for additional expertise and perspectives. The expected time commitment for the taskforce is 20 hours per month, meeting frequently and as needed.

Please accept my appreciation for being a part of this important and timely taskforce. I value your participation and voice, and look forward to receiving your report.

The California State University

Bakersfield | Channel Islands | Chico | Dominguez Hills | East Bay | Fresno | Fullerton | Humboldt | Long Beach | Los Angeles | Maritime Academy
Monterey Bay | Northridge | Pomona | Sacramento | San Bernardino | San Diego | San Francisco | San Jose | San Luis Obispo | San Marcos | Sonoma | Stanislaus

Membership

- Elizabeth Matthews, Interim Dean, CHABSS (Co-Chair)
- Patricia Prado Olmos, Chief Community Engagement Officer (Co-Chair)
- Aswad Allen, Chief Diversity Officer
- Raye Clendening, Past President North County African American Women's Association (University Council Representative)
- Frank Foster, Executive Director at A Step Beyond, retired (Community Representative)
- Michael Geck, Work and Asset Management Systems Specialist, CSUSM (Staff Representative)
- Major General Anthony Jackson, USMC Retired (Foundation Board Representative)
- Richard Jaenisch (Alumni Representative)
- Carleen Kreider, Retired Community Leader (Foundation Board Representative)
- Renzo Lara, Director, Director Latin@/x Center, CSUSM (Student Affairs Representative)
- Scotty Lombardi, Senior Manager of Global Talent (University Council Representative)
- Brenda Miller, lecturer, School of Nursing (Faculty Representative)
- Joely Proudfit, Professor, American Indian Studies (Faculty Representative)
- Xuan Santos, Associate Professor of Sociology (Faculty Representative)
- Ricardo Scheller (Student Representative)
- Lourdes Shahamiri, Catalog and Curriculum Coordinator (Staff Representative)
- Ruby Reyes (Student Representative)
- Kimber Quinney, Assistant Professor, History (Faculty Representative)
- Sean Visintainer, Head of Special Collections

Appendix B: Membership of the Taskforce

Craven Taskforce Membership

Co-Chairs

Patricia Prado-Olmos
Elizabeth Matthews

Foundation Board representatives (2)

Tony Jackson
Carleen Kreider

Faculty representatives (3)

Xuan Santos
Brenda Miller
Joely Proudfit
Kim Quinney

Community representative (2)

*Frank Foster (Resigned Fall 2022)
Lourdes Shahamiri

Staff representatives (2)

Mike Geck
*Lourdes Shahamiri (retired, and moved to
community rep Spring 2022)
*Mandie Thompson (Began Spring 2022)

Student Affairs rep (1)

*Renzo Lara (Resigned Fall 2022)

Student representatives (2)

Ricardo Scheller
*Ruby Reyes (Resigned Fall 2021)
*Albany Silva-Sanchez (Began Spring 2022)

Chief Diversity Officer

Aswad Allen

Alumni representative (1)

Richard Jaenisch

Head of Special Collections and History Librarian

Sean Visintainer

University Council representatives (2)

Raye Clendening
Scotty Lombardi

Tribal Member representatives (2)

Wendy Schlater
Chris Devers

**Members with different participation timelines*

NCRC Support and Facilitation:

Laura Kass-Moreno, National Conflict Resolution Center
Cuezpallin (Cuez) Tlacuilo, National Conflict Resolution Center
Karla Broady, National Conflict Resolution Center
Holly Sullivan, National Conflict Resolution Center

Appendix C: Catalog of Presentations to the Taskforce

Presentations

Friday, October 29, 2021

CSUSM Professor, Political Science and Global Studies
Shared Governance in Higher Education – ppt presentation

CSUSM Professor, Psychology
What's in a Name? The CSUSM-Craven Legacy – ppt presentation
Published Article

CSUSM, Associate Professor, Modern Language Studies
Exploring the Linguistic Landscape – ppt presentation

Friday, December 10, 2021

Student Representatives from the Quality Education group

Shared student perspectives and made inquiries of the Taskforce about the charge and process.

Friday, January 28, 2022

Professional and Social Colleagues of Senator William Craven
-Chairman & CEO, The Jack Raymond Companies
-Attorney, Lounsbery, Ferguson, Altona, & Peak
-Retired community member, Engineer – Hughes-JVC Technology Corporation
-Retired community member, District Rep, Congressman Ron Packard 1983-1987; President/CEO, LEAD San Diego, 1988-2001

Presented on their recollections of the events of the founding of CSUSM, the life and character of Senator Craven, and the controversy surrounding the commissioned reports.

Friday, February 4, 2022

Family Member of Senator William Craven

Provided a personal and historical narrative of the Senator's efforts to establish the CSUSM campus, the controversy surrounding the border hearing, and the naming of the administrative building on the campus.

Friday, February 18, 2022

Administrative Aide (Retired) to Senator William Craven

Provided detailed context and history regarding the Senator's efforts to establish the CSUSM campus.

Friday, February 25, 2022

Former State Senator, Professional Associate to Senator William Craven

Provided a collegial character reference, describing the nature of the William Craven's work life and reputation as a State Senator.

Former Administrative Aide to Senator William Craven

Provided additional context and history regarding the work of the Senator's office.

Friday, April 1, 2022

Office Coordinator, DREAMer Resource Office, CSUSM

Provided feedback from current CSUSM students regarding their experience on the campus and relationship to the name of the administration building.

- Former Tribal Chairman, Pauma Tribe of Luiseno Indians
- Member and Vice Chairwoman, La Jolla Band of Luiseno Indians
- Department Chair of American Indian Studies; Professor of American Indian Studies; Director of California Indian Culture & Sovereignty Center

Provided a history and context of the land in the region and the relationship to namings.

Listening Sessions

Six Listening Sessions – attended by members of the CSUSM community, members of the regional and local community, and other interested parties.

Appendix D: Descriptive Analysis of Public Response Received

Public Response and Letters Received Descriptive Data

The Taskforce invited the campus community—including faculty, staff, current students, and past students—as well as the local community to share their perspectives, personal accounts, and other insights and observations with the Taskforce. All information collected was reviewed by the Taskforce and informed the process and final assessment of the issues. What follows is a simple quantitative description of what was received.

- o 74 messages were received
- o 42 messages were sent to the email address created to collect feedback
- o 32 messages were sent via the webform created to collect feedback
- o 20 of the emailers included a document, such as a letter or similar
- o 1 included a link to a change.org petition regarding removing the name with 538 signatures

35 messages appeared to be from local community members

Of these:

- o 4 indicated a preference to “remove” the name
- o 28 indicated a preference to “retain the name
- o 3 were not clear in their preference (2 proposed a possible new name)

29 messages appeared to be from parties associated with university

Of these:

- o 20 indicated a preference to “remove” the name
- o 4 indicated a preference to “retain” the name
- o 4 were not clear in their preference (two provided a possible new name or focus for the new name; one negatively critiqued the process in general)

35 messages are attributed to – “retain” the name

29 messages are attributed to – “remove” the name

10 messages did not clearly state a desire to remove or retain the name

- o 6 of those who were “unstated” – provided an alternate name proposal
- o Among the other 4 “unstated” messages – the senders provided additional information that would have required an inference of some kind to assign their preferred position regarding the name

Endnotes

¹ Academic Senate, California State University San Marcos, *Resolution in Support of the Renaming of Craven Hall, Craven Circle, and Craven Road and Removal of the Bust of William Craven from the CSUSM Campus*, AS 769-20. Approved April 7, 2021. The naming of Craven Road was not under the purview of the Taskforce.

² California State University San Marcos, *Constitution and By-Laws of the University Faculty and Academic Senate* (AS 027-91). Originally implemented August 21, 1990. Last updated May 7, 2021.

³ <https://www.ncrconline.com/>

⁴ Gerry Braun and Jeff McDonald, "WILLIAM A. CRAVEN - 1921-1999 - Cal State San Marcos Among Lawmaker's Lasting Legacies." *San Diego Union-Tribute*, July 13, 1999: A-1

⁵ Gerry Braun and Jeff McDonald, "William A. Craven (1921-1999)— Cal State San Marcos Among Lawmaker's Lasting Legacies," *San Diego Union Tribune*, July 13, 1999, A:1.

⁶ Many of the details noted here have been provided by Carol Cox, both in writing and in her presentation to the Taskforce.

⁷ Jeffrey J. Rose, "Migrants a Burden to Local Budgets? Hearing Gets Heated," *The San Diego Union-Tribune*, February 6, 1993, B:1.

⁸ Senate Office of Research, "A Review of Selected Issues Relating to Undocumented Persons in San Diego. Prepared for Senator William A. Craven, Chairman, Senate Special Committee on Border Issues," January 1991.

⁹ H.G. Reza, "Craven Alien-Count Request Raises Fuss: Immigration: State senator wants to know financial impact undocumented aliens have on public agencies. Rights group call survey flawed and racist," *Los Angeles Times*, April 2, 1991.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Richard A. Parker and Louis M. Rea, Rea and Parker, Inc., "A Fiscal Impact Analysis of Undocumented Immigrants Residing in San Diego County: Costs and Revenues of Significant State and Local Government Programs," Report by the Auditor General of California, August 1992.

¹³ Richard A. Parker and Louis M. Rea, Rea and Parker, Inc. “Illegal Immigration in San Diego County: An Analysis of Costs and Revenues,” Report to the California State Senate Special Committee on Border Issues, September 1993.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Rose, “Migrants a Burden.”

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ California State Senate Special Committee on Border Issues, Office of Senator William A. Craven, Transcript of Proceedings, February 5, 1993.

¹⁸ Rose, “Migrants a Burden.”

¹⁹ California State Senate Special Committee on Border Issues, Office of Senator William A. Craven, Transcript of Proceedings, February 5, 1993; and California State Senate Special Committee on Border Issues, Video Recording of Hearing Proceedings, February 5, 1993. At the hearing, Senator Craven intimated that the reaction to the investigations conducted by the Senate Committee on Border Issues was comparable to the McCarthy-era hearings of the 1950s; although the Academic Senate would later take issue with this comparison, the focus would remain on comments the Senator had made about undocumented immigrants.

²⁰ Edward Thompson, III, Chair, Academic Senate, California State University San Marcos, Letter to Senator Craven in response to statements made by the Senator and quoted in the *San Diego Union-Tribune*, Feb 6, 1993. February 15, 1993.

²¹ Gerardo Gonzalez, on behalf of the Latino Association of Faculty & Staff, California State University San Marcos, Letter to Senator Craven regarding the statements made by the Senator and quoted in the *San Diego Union-Tribune*, February 6, 1993. March 26, 1993.

²² Senator William A. Craven, Letter to Edward Thompson III & Academic Senate, February 25, 1993.

²³ Academic Senate, California State University San Marcos, *Resolution Reaffirming the Academic Senate, CSU San Marcos Commitment to the University Mission Statement, To Confidence in Chair Edward Thompson III, and to Respectful and Cooperative Dialogue with Senator Craven*, March 31, 1993.

²⁴ Senator William A. Craven, Letter to Edward Thompson III & Academic Senate, April 2, 1993.

²⁵ Cal State San Marcos Special Dedication Edition, “Craven Hall: Senator kept his eyes fixed on the prize—a university,” *Special Edition of North County Report-Times Advocate*, April 17, 1993.

²⁶ Maria C. Hunt, “Craven says all Hispanics should carry I.D. cards,” *San Diego Union-Tribune*. October 18, 1994, A-1.

²⁷ Senator William A. Craven, Senate, California Legislature, Letter to clarify comments in the *San Diego Union Tribune*, October 18, 1994.

²⁸ Dennis Koolhaas, interview and documentation provided to Taskforce, February, 25, 2022

²⁹ Senator William A. Craven, Senate, California Legislature, Letter to George Diehr, Chairman, Academic Senate, California State University San Marcos, October 25, 1994.

³⁰ Academic Senate, California State University San Marcos. *Resolution Asking That the Name of Senator William A. Craven Be Removed from CSUSM Campus Buildings and Streets*. AS 073-94. Approved October 26, 1994.

³¹ Special Academic Senate Meeting, *Discussion of Senator Craven’s Remarks re: ID Cards*, All Members of the University Community Invited, Academic Hall 102, October 26, 1994.

³² Bill W. Stacy, President of California State University, San Marcos, Open Letter to the University Community, October 24, 1994.

³⁴ Barry Munitz, Chancellor, California State University, Letter to George Diehr, Chairman, Academic Senate, California State University, San Marcos, November 30, 1994.

³⁵ [Author unknown, but assumed to be Chair of the Academic Senate, California State University, San Marcos], Draft memo addressed to Chancellor Barry Munitz and the California State University Board of Trustees, n.d.

³⁶ Lee B. Thibadeau, Mayor, City of San Marcos, Letter to Edward Thompson, Chairman, Academic Senate of California State University, San Marcos, March 25, 1993.

³⁷ Some of these incidents are noted in an undated draft memo addressed to Chancellor Barry Munitz and the California State University Board of Trustees, op cit. See also Gerardo M. Gonzalez, et al. “What’s in a Name? Conflict as a University for the Twenty-First Century,” in R.V. Padilla and R. Chévez Chévez, eds., *The Leaning Ivory Tower: Latino Professors in American Universities* (New York: SUNY Press, 1995).

³⁸ Laura Spitalniak, “Colleges Seek Better Ways to Rename Buildings,” *Higher Ed Dive*, March 22, 2022.

³⁹ “Rename Buildings, Roadways, Remove Symbols Memorializing White Supremacy at CSUSM” Petition at Change.Org. <https://www.change.org/p/rename-buildings-roadways-remove-symbols-memorializing-white-supremacy-at-csusm>.