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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In the spring of 2020, Cañada College made a campus-wide commitment to stand against racism and support Black Lives Matter. Cañada College continues to recognize the critical need for anti-racist practices, services, and teaching in the College community. As part of the College’s efforts to update its 5-year Educational Master Plan (EMP), Cañada College contracted with racial and equity consulting firm Áse Power Consult, LLC (APC) to critically examine the impact of racial and cultural bias on campus culture and internal institutional systems. As part of this examination, Áse Power Consult would provide recommendations based on stakeholder data represented in this report to further the College’s goal of becoming an anti-racist institution.

Currently, Cañada College does not have a formal process for examining and disrupting racial and cultural inequities embedded within internal systems and practices. This report aims to provide Cañada College administrators, faculty, and staff with suggestions, supported by internal stakeholder data, for implementing adequate diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) practices, protocols, and policies across all of the College’s institutional systems.

It is important to note that the College previously engaged in efforts to address disrupting racial and cultural bias by forming an anti-racism task force in 2020, conducting focus groups in the spring of 2021, and the ongoing commitment of the Academic Committee on Equity and Success (ACES) to meet the needs of an ethnically and culturally diverse college community. This report attempts to reveal additional opportunities the College can explore to formally integrate DEI practices within institutional structures that support positive outcomes for students, faculty, and classified staff. Specifically, identifying opportunities to disrupt anti-black inequities within internal systems and exploring options for the College to operationalize equitable programming and professional development for underrepresented minority (URM) groups.

To conduct this assessment, APC captured data from employees and students using three methods of data capture. Method one utilized a design-thinking process to provide students, faculty, and classified staff with an opportunity to empathize with one another and articulate how they perceive they are seen, heard, and represented as members of their racial and/or cultural group. Method two utilized a quantitative data capture where 32 DEI-centered questions were submitted to Cañada College stakeholders via a secured anonymous platform. Students participated in the National Assessment of Collegiate Campus Climates (NACCC) in the spring of 2021, administered by the USC Race and Equity Center surveyed in 2021, and did not participate in the APC cultural audit. The final evaluation method involved an internal equity scan of institutional systems identified by college leaders (administrators, faculty, and staff).
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The recommendations outlined on pages 15-19 are opportunities to support the Cañada College community by integrating internal stakeholder suggestions into a transparent strategy for addressing the DEI issues outlined in this report. ÁPC recommends an investment of the following courses of action to ensure the College remains on track towards becoming an anti-racist institution:

- A committed re-evaluation of employee bandwidth, employee and student safety, and inclusive access for students, faculty, and classified staff.
- Strategic integration of equity-centered anti-racist and anti-black racism interventions based on internal stakeholder input that includes policies, procedures, and practices uplifting URM groups.
- A sustained commitment to an authentic redressing of institutional power imbalances.
- A culturally competent and sustained investment in connection and community building.
- A commitment to developing formal, transparent protocols for improving communication systems across systems and departments.

LIMITATIONS

Two primary limitations should be considered for future research. They are as follows:

1. The student sample utilized for the listening sessions and the internal equity scan were predominantly affiliated with leadership roles at the College. Therefore, the results may not adequately represent the sentiments of the general student population not serving in student leadership positions.
2. The scheduling of listening sessions could not always accommodate the work schedules of employees serving in part-time or adjunct roles. Therefore, listening session results for classified staff and adjunct faculty may not be fully represented.
INTRODUCTION

The racial and cultural reckoning the world witnessed in 2020 motivated colleges, universities, and organizations to re-examine their commitment to authentically disrupt structural racism and cultural biases embedded within their institutional practices. The murders and violent attacks against Black, Indigenous People of Color (BIPOC), the Asian American Native American Pacific Islander (AANAPI) community, the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, Intersex, Asexual (LGBTQIA+) community and members from historically marginalized groups, reminded American institutions that our society is not free of structural and institutional racism and bias.

In 2020, the FBI reported a 64% hike in hate crimes against URM groups. Additionally, according to the Campus Safety and Security database, the Federal Office of Post-Secondary Education reported that hate crimes increased by 57% on college campuses within the last decade.

Educational institutions like Cañada College have an opportunity to explore how they can commit to acknowledging the impact that racism and cultural biases have on their campus and actively work towards a sustained disruption of discriminatory practices across college systems. The research conducted by Áse Power Consult attempted to scan the College’s existing efforts towards creating a culture of equity and anti-racism. To identify racially and culturally biased systems that require disruption, consultants conducted listening sessions with classified staff, faculty, and students (also referenced throughout this report as internal stakeholders) to provide them with an opportunity to identify how they experience empathy on campus. ÁPC administered a cultural auditing survey to assess how internal stakeholders racially and culturally identify and experience racism and additional cultural biases on campus. As the final data collection method, ÁPC utilized an internal equity scan to engage multiple stakeholders during one-on-one interview sessions. Those interviewed provided critical individual insights from varied stakeholder viewpoints on the efficacy of DEI within the College’s internal systems.

This report offers the following:

- An opportunity to examine the impact of racial and cultural bias on the College’s internal systems.
- An opportunity to investigate identified barriers and invest in identified bridges.
- An opportunity to invest in short and long-term equitable, restorative practices to foster a community invested in equity, diversity, access, and inclusive practice integrations.

This report’s contents attempt to offer Cañada College’s internal stakeholders an opportunity to invest in fostering a more authentic and sustainable path towards equitable change.
To conduct the assessment of Cañada College's internal systems, ÁPC captured data from students, faculty, classified staff, and administrators using three evaluation methods. The three evaluation methods consisted of listening sessions, a cultural audit survey assessing overall campus culture, and an internal equity scan, which included individual and group interviews with employees and students across institutional systems.

The methodology and key findings are ordered as follows:
Method One-Listening Sessions: Pages 7-8
Method Two-Cultural Audit: Pages 9-10
Method Three-Internal Equity Scan: Pages 11-14
METHOD ONE: LISTENING SESSIONS

ÁPC conducted two listening sessions for students, two for faculty, and two for classified staff. These sessions allowed participants to practice empathic connection and reflect upon how they perceived they are seen, heard, and represented on campus as members of their racial and/or cultural group. A listening session is an empathy-centered conversation tool that allows stakeholders to provide greater insight into how Cañada College can generate DEI resources across multiple systems. Listening sessions were not video recorded to practice a higher level of safety. ÁPC reflects the approximate number of attendees at each session. Participants entered sessions and left sessions at will; therefore, the number of attendees is reflected as approximations.

LISTENING SESSION KEY FINDINGS

Students

Approximately 11 students attended the first listening session. The initial listening session for students revealed a desire for more connection on the physical and virtual campus. Additionally, students indicated a need for more investment in cultural sensitivity and competency when students of color (specifically Black students with intersecting racial and ethnic identities) speak to their individual and collective experiences as people of color. Students expressed a desire to model and experience psychological and physical safety in a society impacted by violence against BIPOC and URM groups. A significant number of students voiced gratitude over framing the listening session with community expectations or equitable agreements and the use of empathy mapping to center their experience.

Approximately 11 students attended the second listening session. The second listening session revealed perceived inequities within early access programs. Several students viewed early access programs as inequitable and biased, explicitly referencing the inefficiencies in how early access programs are marketed to URM groups in under-resourced high schools.

Key Takeaways:
- Students and employees identified limited access opportunities within early access programs as an equity barrier. Additionally, there was an expressed desire for the College to invest in developing accountability protocols for faculty and staff exhibiting explicit or implicit bias on campus.
- Several students identified the need for more opportunities to reflect on racial and culturally biased experiences with each other as a top priority.
- Several students identified the need for more opportunities to connect with other students to build community connections and share best practices for navigating the College’s internal systems.
- Students identified a need for more student ambassadors to help incoming students navigate the College’s internal systems, specifically, financial aid and scheduling classes.

Classified Staff

Approximately 18 classified staff members attended the first listening session. Participants in the first listening session expressed a need for more transparency and accountability with the administration. Additionally, classified staff expressed a desire for more opportunities to connect for professional and social community building.

Approximately 5 classified staff members attended the second listening session. The second listening session investigated how the College’s mission, vision, and values resonated with classified staff experiences. Classified staff members expressed concerns regarding the impact of increased work, and the lack of safe spaces for URM groups impacted their capacity to remain motivated in the workplace. Black identified staff members shared deeply about the impact that the killings of unarmed Black people had on their sense of psychological and physical safety.
Key Takeaways:
- Due to a perception of high administrator turnover, there is an implication of general distrust of the administration's ability to deliver on projected goals and build meaningful connections with classified staff.
- Respondent listening session and internal equity scan data revealed a sincere commitment from classified staff to cultivate lasting connections with each other and an expressed commitment to providing services for students despite budget and staffing shortages.
- Several classified staff members identifying as BIPOC, specifically as Black in America, expressed deep concerns over the sincerity of the College's commitment to providing a sustained budget and staffing support for incoming programs like UMOJA. Classified staff expressed concerns about the College's commitment to investing in authentic strategies that increase realistic access points between Black communities and Cañada College.
- Respondent listening session data revealed a general fear of repercussion amongst classified staff members concerned about job safety or promotion if they challenge inequities they perceive within the College's internal systems.
- Respondent listening session data revealed multiple indications of equity disparities in work expectations and pay, specifically relating to committee and meeting time for part-time employees.
- Respondent listening session data revealed high-level investment in social capital amongst classified staff and a sincere commitment to providing students educational and social service resources.
- Respondent listening session data revealed a lack of faith in the current system of disciplinary actions for classified staff, faculty, or administrators espousing racist and or culturally biased viewpoints on campus.

Faculty

Approximately 20 faculty members attended the first listening session. Administrators were present in breakout rooms for the first faculty listening session. Administrator presence potentially impacted responses. Faculty members communicated needs and concerns echoed by classified staff, such as needing more staff, cross-departmental and administrative representation from URM groups, and psychologically safe(r) spaces to express concerns and build community connections with colleagues. Dominant concerns expressed throughout the session were (1) a need for more accountability amongst administration. (2) a more transparent communication process, specifically regarding program funding, and (3) classroom resource concerns and concerns over Covid-19 protocols and strategies. There was a general frustration with unmet institution-wide goals and, therefore, a lack of faith in the College's ability to accomplish projected anti-racism goals.

Approximately 4 faculty members attended the second listening session. Dominant concerns during the second session echoed session concerns from the first faculty listening session. Participants in the second session expressed an interest in learning how to adopt frameworks that could solve inequities across departments and institutional systems.

Key Takeaways:
- Faculty maintain general respect for colleagues and appreciate the capacity of faculty members to problem solve amid multiple outside barriers such as Covid-19, virtual learning barriers, and a lack of supportive resources for students that require more accommodations and financial support.
- Respondents have a sincere commitment to student safety. Maintaining student safety was a sentiment expressed across listening sessions. Faculty members expressed concerns over providing students from URM groups with the support needed to succeed on their terms within the collegiate system. Faculty defined specific support efforts such as language accommodations, accommodations for students with disabilities, flexibility in classroom assignment deadlines, increased access to faculty and counseling service office hours, and supportive social systems such as housing, child care, mental health, immigration services, and financial aid.
- Respondent listening session data revealed a sincere desire for connecting with colleagues to foster community and provide professional and personal support if needed.
- Respondent listening session data revealed frustration with the participatory governance model and a general perception that favoritism is a factor in some programs receiving support over others. There was an expressed desire for a more equitable transparent method for approving additional staff and budget support.
- Respondent listening session data revealed concerns over the efficacy of accessibility options for incoming students who may not know how to navigate the College's systems, such as registration, counseling services, and general accommodations.
- Respondent listening session data revealed that racial and cultural competency training requirements were a dominant concern—an additional dominant concern revealed a need for an intermediary disciplinary action for racial and cultural microaggressions occurring in the classroom and within employee meetings.
METHOD TWO: CULTURAL AUDIT

ÁPC worked with representatives from administration, faculty, and staff to develop an anonymous survey to assess how racial and/or cultural bias impacts diverse stakeholders within the College. The audit was guided, in part, by the Bloomsburg University Campus Climate Survey, and an additional assessment created by the Minority Inclusion Project. Consisting of 32 items, the instrument incorporated primarily multiple-choice and Likert scale questions. Survey respondents received the opportunity to expand on personal experiences with two open-ended response inquires. Additionally, the assessment collected demographic information on six key identifiers and an evaluation of responding employee perspectives on community climate. Students were not surveyed as part of the cultural audit since they participated in the National Assessment of Collegiate Campus Climates (NACCC) administered by the USC Race and Equity Center surveyed in the spring of 2021.

While the analysis of response data examines different demographic groups, ÁPC recognizes the importance of intersectionality. Oxford dictionary defines intersectionality as "the interconnected nature of social categorizations such as race, class, and gender as they apply to a given individual or group, regarded as creating overlapping and interdependent systems of discrimination or disadvantage." The cultural audit does not account for how multiple biases impact respondents with intersecting identities on campus.

The Cultural Audit was distributed to 799 Cañada College stakeholders on October 27 and November 3, 2021, utilizing an anonymous survey platform. Of the 799 survey recipients, 114 contributed data, yielding a 14.3% response rate. The survey was distributed to former employees and Cañada College stakeholders across the San Mateo Community College System; this wide distribution pool could have contributed to a lowered response rate. Under an industry-standard 95% confidence level for similar assessments, the associated results are expected to have a ±8.5% margin of error. 113 of the 114 respondents indicated they were employees of Cañada College.

ÁPC recognizes that while all employees had the opportunity to provide information, there may be an element of selection bias present for responding individuals. Employees who prioritize DEI advancement may have been more likely to respond to the survey than employees who are not currently engaged in DEI conversations. While the intent is to provide the institution with the data to initiate change, all observed measures should be interpreted based on the context provided.
CULTURAL AUDIT KEY FINDINGS

Bias interactions, both implicit and explicit, significantly impact the working environment of Cañada College respondents.
- 56.6% of all survey respondents experienced biased interactions during their tenure.
- Nearly half of all responding stakeholders believe that system barriers exist within the College or department.

Perception of diversity, equity, and inclusion varies among work classifications.
- Classified staff respondents are nearly 24% more likely to confirm biased experiences than faculty and over 30% more likely than administrators who responded.
- Faculty and administrator respondents were more likely than classified staff respondents to positively view the College’s provisions to individuals with physical, mental, and medical disabilities.
- Classified staff respondents unanimously agree that the College requires an improved process for resolving race, culture, ethnicity, gender/gender identity, access, and inclusion-related issues. In contrast, only 19.6% of all other responding employment classifications concur.

Race and ethnicity dramatically alter the climate of employment at Cañada College.
- 35% of all responding stakeholders reported experiences with racial/ethnic bias. Half of the respondents who experienced an occurrence of prejudicial treatment attribute the incident to race/ethnicity.
- White/European Ancestry/Non-Hispanic respondents are least likely to perceive biases of any kind. Conversely, 75% of Hispanic/Latino/a/x and 65% of Multi-racial or Biracial respondents have been subject to prejudicial treatment.
- 28.3% of non-white respondents believe that the College offers protection or interventions for racial and cultural biases.
- White/European Ancestry/Non-Hispanic respondents are over 30% less likely than all other races/ethnicities to feel pressured to perform beyond their scope of employment.
- Less than half of all non-white respondents feel as if Cañada College is taking the necessary steps to become anti-racist.

Gender and sexual orientation differences create varying experiences at Cañada College.
- Stakeholder respondents identify gender identity as the second leading cause of discrimination.
- As much as 100% of all non-binary and 75.4% of all female respondents have been exposed to discrimination, while only 61.1% of males fall within the same category.
- Responding homosexual and pansexual identifiers are 26.2% more likely to be subject to partialities than other sexual orientations.
- Responding females are nearly 25% less likely than male and non-binary employees to positively view verbal and written language inclusivity.

Communication of diversity, inclusion, and equity-related issues needs improvement.
- Evident within open-ended survey responses, responding employees are commonly unaware of interventions to prevent or address discriminatory acts on campus. Multiple stakeholders indicated a lack of awareness amongst themselves and/or colleagues in reference to campus actions to prevent or respond to discrimination. While the number of respondents who referred to themselves can be identified, the number of colleagues cannot be accurately measured.
- Just over 30% of all responding administrators, faculty, and staff respondents feel there is transparency in recruiting and retaining a diverse employment base.
- Less than one-quarter of survey respondents believe that DEI-related onboarding efforts for new faculty and staff are sufficient.
- The vast majority of respondents are unaware of any attempt to gather feedback from existing faculty, staff, or students.
METHOD THREE: INTERNAL EQUITY SCAN

The final evaluation method, an internal equity scan, involved reviewing Cañada College's existing efforts to create a culture of equity and anti-racism that achieves equitable educational outcomes for internal stakeholders. To complete this scan, ÁPC worked with administrators, faculty, staff, and students to identify students, classified staff, faculty, and administrators from diverse backgrounds to participate in 20-40 minute interviews. 27 individuals participated in the internal equity scan, and we conducted a single group interview with the Student Services Planning Council. Interviews were not video recorded, and subjects who participated in the scan had the option to claim anonymity for this report. ÁPC provided participants with a transcription of their interview conversation delivered to an email of their choosing. ÁPC provided participants with an opportunity to confirm which portions of the conversation they wanted to be on or off the record.

ÁPC defined on and off the record as follows:

- On the record—ÁPC included comments previously approved by participants in the report, and the participant's name and title would be affiliated with the statement.
- Off the record—ÁPC would include comments previously approved by participants in the report, and the participant's name and title would not be affiliated with the statement. The comment would be listed as anonymous.
- Completely off the record—ÁPC would not include any comments in the report the participant explicitly indicated as completely off the record. The comment would not be listed in the report at all.

Of the 27 individuals interviewed, 13 agreed to be on the record, 10 participants agreed to have their comments included in the report if they could maintain anonymity, and 4 did not indicate a preference, therefore, ÁPC recorded their comments as anonymous.

The feedback allowed members of the ÁPC team to identify what internal equity efforts need expanding or re-imagining to ensure the success of equitable and inclusive integrations within all of the College's significant systems.

This report defines a normative practice or system as “an organized set of ideas or theories or a particular way of doing something,” as defined by the Oxford Dictionary. This report attempts to identify the various named and unnamed systems that impact the efficacy of diversity, equity, access, and inclusive practice integrations within the College’s institutional systems. We define an institutional system as the customs, practices, protocols, and frameworks the College utilizes to provide educational services and resources to students, faculty, and classified staff.

Institutional systems previously identified by college administrators, faculty, and staff to explore during the internal equity scan were as follows:

- Teaching and Learning, including supplemental instruction (Tutoring, Library)
- Student Services (Registration, Counseling, Education Planning, and Financial Aid)
- Administration (Scheduling, Facilities, Hiring and Retention of Faculty, Classified Staff, and Administrators)
- Communication
- Participatory Governance and Decision-Making
- Professional Development
Individuals interviewed were asked to identify normative systems that impacted the efficacy of DEI integration within the College. Additionally, we asked participants to consider what barriers consistently prevent equitable, inclusive, and anti-racist policies and practices from taking root within the College. Respondents also described how the College fostered opportunities for equitable connection through programming and services that bridge diverse cultural groups to each other and provides economic, academic, and professional growth.

Reference definitions utilized during the internal equity scan:

- **Bridge**: "To make something possible by getting rid of disagreements, differences, or difficulties" - Macmillan Dictionary
- **Barrier**: "Anything that restraints or obstructs progress, access." - Dictionary.com
- **Normative Practice**: "A particular way of doing something." - Oxford Dictionary

**Internal Equity Scan Questions**

- Considering the definition for barrier, what if any obstructions would you say exist that prevent DEI integrations from taking root within your department or the College?
- Considering the definition for bridge, can you think of opportunities your department or the College can take advantage of to begin bridging across equity, access, and diversity barriers? If there are no issues with equity, access, or diversity, you do not have to reflect on this question.
- Considering the definition for system, what is the normalized practice within your department or the systems you manage? Is this process helpful or harmful? What do you think is needed to disrupt this system?
INTERNAL EQUITY SCAN KEY FINDINGS

Teaching and Learning

Several respondents identified normalized systems of practice that fostered inequitable practices within the teaching and learning system. Several employees identified the inequitable distribution of release time or paid work time for part-time employees as a significant inequity they would like resolved. Employees identified excessive meetings as another normalized system of practice that should be disrupted and noted the challenges of effectively accomplishing program or department goals due to low bandwidth issues. The respondents identified a perceived expectation for programs to continue providing for students with less funding and still accomplish program goals. Although significant barriers were identified, respondents noted the positive impact investing in social capital had on internal systems. Many respondents identified their social capital investments as a primary reason for staying employed with the College.

In addition to internal normalization practices that hinder progress, respondents named effective practices that emerged due to navigating impediments. As a consequence of feeling otherized as individuals from URM groups, several faculty and classified staff members started affinity groups to create safer spaces for minority classified staff and faculty on campus. Employees who self-identified as Black spoke to the importance of providing safer spaces for Black members of the College community to practice safety and vulnerability. Several respondents noted a general appreciation of the College’s attempts at setting intentions to identify and disrupt anti-black racism, racism, and culturally biased systems. However, nearly all respondents expressed concerns over the College’s ability to translate anti-bias and anti-racist intentions into actions that generate more equitable outcomes for employees and students.

Key Takeaways

- Respondents expressed a general commitment to providing supportive and equitable resources to students from historically marginalized groups.
- A significant number of faculty and classified staff respondents expressed concerns over the College’s ability to maintain a sustained commitment to accessible education and supportive resources to students who identify as Black, students who identify as Latino/a/x, students in need of social services, and additional accommodations, veteran students, students navigating housing and financial insecurity, part-time adult education students, and students navigating immigration status.
- Several staff members spoke to the missed opportunity for developing meaningful community connections with current and prospective students from First Nation/Native American communities.
- Respondents noted a practice of normalizing understaffing, inadequate planning time provisions, inadequate professional development time, and the normalization of microaggressions within teaching and learning systems. Students, faculty, and classified staff expressed difficulties navigating professional relationships and sustaining trust when explicit/implicit bias incidents occur on campus without clear consequences.

Student Services

Several respondents in supervisory/management roles expressed concerns over the College’s ability to increase equitable access systems for students and classified staff. Specific concerns expressed centered on the need for a re-branding of financial aid that includes community outreach and more straightforward access points on the College’s website. Several respondents reported difficulty exploring and integrating new work methods because of a resistance to change.

Key Takeaways

- Responding employees expressed heightened concerns regarding unchecked implicit and sometimes explicit bias occurring on campus. Responding student leaders expressed frustrations with confusing website access points for financial aid, mental health counselors, and people tasked with helping students navigate these systems.
- There were three main connecting points or bridges that respondents identified as having a positive impact on internal systems (1) a commitment to fostering workplace collaborations, (2) the positive effects of the College’s speaker series on employees, and (3) a desire for more opportunities to cultivate thought partnerships with Skyline College and The College of San Mateo.
Professional Development

Several classified staff respondents identified uncompensated labor and inequitable scheduling of professional development opportunities as a significant barrier. Responding staff expressed frustration with professional development opportunities that don’t align with responding classified staff schedules. Several respondents across classifications desired mandatory cultural competency and anti-racism training for all Cañada College employees.

Key Takeaways

- Responding employees expressed general satisfaction with Cañada College’s anti-racism training and learning anti-racism goals.
- Responding employees desired increased access to cultural competency workshops and anti-racist workshops. Several respondents wanted the workshops maintained through the year or semesters.
- Responding employees expressed concerns that professional development training would be less impactful if anti-racism and cultural competency training were not operationalized across the College’s systems.
- Responding employees expressed the need for dedicated staff responsible for developing the College’s Flex Day and professional development planning and coordination.

Participatory Governance, Communication, and Administration

We combined participatory governance and communication administration under the same institutional system due to the high occurrence of employee responses that referenced or combined the three systems.

Key Takeaways

- Several responding student leaders described participatory governance as a productive system. However, student leaders did indicate that participatory governance could be improved by developing more access points for the general student population to participate in the participatory governance process.
- A majority of responding classified staff and faculty interviewed expressed a desire for participatory governance to operate with less bureaucratic procedures.
- Several responding employees indicated participatory governance could benefit from integrating anti-racist and anti-bias standards in the decision-making process.
- Regarding communication and administration, most respondents expressed a need for centralized information hubs to update Covid-19 protocols and DEI integrations.
- Regarding communication and administration, respondents expressed a need for a more equitable approach to recruitment, retention, and overall facility management.
- There was a recognition by faculty, staff, and students of the current administration efforts to rectify issues with communication and transparency.

Comprehensive Finding

Comprehensive results from the internal equity scan revealed a need for immediate addressing of employee concerns regarding low worker bandwidth due to understaffed programs and the need for clear transparent communication from administration.

Respondents expressed a need for more community-building activities and opportunities for employees and students to practice safety in psychologically safer spaces, particularly for Black, Indigenous, People of Color, and Latino/a/x communities with intersecting racial/cultural identities, members of the LGBTTQIA+ community, People with Disabilities, and Veterans. These racial and cultural groups were mentioned repeatedly across internal systems as groups in need of affinity spaces.

Results also revealed a general appreciation for attempts made by the College to promote a more diverse, equitable, and inclusive campus culture. However, the lack of sustained commitment to funding programs, anti-racist and anti/bias training, and employee needs has significantly impacted employee and student morale. The College has an opportunity to collaborate with employees and students to determine the best strategies for authentically recovering with equity across all internal systems. Although most respondents cited administration turnover as a reason for lacking institutional memory and established trust between staff and administration, several respondents expressed satisfaction with the administration’s recent efforts to develop more precise methods for retaining effective systems, data, and transparent communications.
RECOMMENDATIONS SHORT-TERM

The recommendations offered in this report are based on data captured from the listening sessions, cultural audit, and internal equity scan assessments administered by Áse Power Consult. Short-term recommendations are opportunities to reflect on moving forward with equity-centered diversity, access, and inclusion integrations within 6 to 12 months.

• **Recommendation 1-Restorative Practice:** Prioritize repairing trust with classified staff, students, and faculty. Train an employee to facilitate conversations centered on restorative practices and restorative justice on campus to rebuild trust between employees and administrators. Dedicate time to investing in rebuilding or sustaining trust and transparency with faculty, classified staff, and students through frequent listening sessions, surveys, check-ins with groups that support marginalized students and employees on campus.

• **Recommendation 2-Affinity Spaces:** Prioritize affinity spaces for historically marginalized groups on campus. Provide opportunities for individuals currently leading affinity spaces on campus to receive additional training facilitating anti-racist and anti-bias conversations. Prioritize creating affinity spaces for Black/African Americans, the Latino/a/x community, the LGBTQIA+ community, Veterans, People with Disabilities, New Migrants, and Dreamers. These groups were mentioned repeatedly throughout assessments as needing spaces to practice physical and psychological safety while learning how to navigate the College’s systems.

• **Recommendation 3-Virtual and Covid-19 safe in-person community building:** Fostering communal spaces for employee and student connection is vital to growing a positive campus culture. Invest in regular zoom community-building events centered on keeping Cañada College stakeholders connected during the pandemic. Solicit feedback from the Associated Students of Cañada College (ASCC), Classified Senate, and the Academic Senate on ways the College can support campus-community connection in person.

• **Recommendation 4-White Accountability:** Prioritize investment in sustained training for disrupting dominant group cultural practices on campus. Invest in the development of White Accountability Cohorts. Develop dedicated spaces that help white-identified employees learn how to practice individual and collective accountability in dismantling white supremacy systems and practices.

• **Recommendation 5-Racial/Cultural Bias Incident Accountability:** Coordinate with the Policy, Training, and Compliance Director to develop or clarify the protocol for addressing implicit or explicit bias occurring on campus that does not warrant district-level investigation. Create a page outlining the protocol for reporting bias and the discrimination reporting process for individuals not seeking a district-level investigation.

• **Recommendation 6-Equitable Scheduling:** Collaborate with the Classified Senate, Academic Senate, and the ASCC to develop a more equitable approach to scheduling meetings, training, and events on campus.
SHORT TERM RECOMMENDATIONS (CONT’D)

- **Recommendation 7-Champion Equitable Work Commitments:** Commit to disrupting the normalization of unpaid work and overtime specifically for part-time employees. Explore how the administration and employees can align on a strategy for developing a more equitable workload, specifically for classified staff. Consider offering flexible work schedules and encourage flexible deadlines for departments impacted by staff shortages.

- **Recommendation 8-Communication:** Dedicate resources and time to simplifying and streamlining information to effectively relay Covid-19 updates, DEI integrations, and other campus-related opportunities and resources. Incorporate employee and staff suggestions for achieving better communication and develop a communication plan that outlines the specific methods the College will utilize to improve communication. Invest in peer-to-peer communication technologies as an additional tool to communicate shifting college updates.

- **Recommendation 9-Financial Aid and Student Services:** Identify opportunities for collaboration with Financial Aid and Student Services. Schedule frequent strategizing sessions with employees and student leadership connected to student services. Determine the best strategy for correcting ineffective methods for helping students and employees access resources on campus. Consider the following actions: (1) examine the efficacy of access points on the College's website; troubleshoot office hours availability as it relates to registration. (2) invest in a marketing campaign that communicates a clear path to services for individuals in need of social service support such as housing security resources and immigration support. (3) invest in building relationships with community programs and organizations committed to providing resources to historically marginalized groups, leverage resources of these groups to compensate for services the College does not currently have the infrastructure to support. (4) provide employees with introductory trainings on integrating [asset-based language](#) that prioritizes the strengths of historically marginalized groups.

- **Recommendation 10-Centralize Anti-Racism and Cultural Equity Task Forces:** Collaborate with various anti-racism task forces, affinity groups, and programs that provide services for historically marginalized groups across the San Mateo County Community College system. Explore opportunities for cross-collaboration on achieving anti-racism task force and ACE5 committee goals.

- **Recommendation 11-Early Access Opportunities:** Develop a plan to investigate potential inequities within early access programs. Create a student and employee advisory committee dedicated to addressing identified issues and creating policies and protocols that redress power imbalances.
RECOMMENDATIONS: LONG-TERM

The recommendations offered in this report are based on data captured from the listening sessions, cultural audit, and internal equity scan assessments administered by A3e Power Consult. Long-term recommendations are opportunities to reflect on moving forward with equity-centered diversity, access, and inclusion integrations within 12 + months.

- **Recommendation 1-Hire a Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Director:** Hire a DEI Director dedicated to training employees and students in anti-racist and culturally competent practices. The role's title can be classified according to the needs present within the College's internal systems. For instance, the role can also be titled Director of Equity, Diversity, and Belonging. Utilize stakeholder feedback to inform the what type of title and position is needed. Invest in providing infrastructure the director would need to accomplish DEI goals. Some resources required include but are not limited to (1) a dedicated DEI budget, (2) adequate support staff, (3) dedicated spaces, and (4) clearly outlined support from administrative leadership.

- **Recommendation 2-Re-imagine Participatory Governance:** Develop a steering committee dedicated to examining the efficacy of the participatory governance system. Continue to gather research on significant issues impacting employees with the participatory governance process. Develop think tanks composed of employees from different classifications to begin brainstorming ideas on making the process more streamlined and accessible. Identify suggestions most supported by employees as tactics to streamline the participatory process and experiment with implementing recommendations through consistent prototyping, testing, and evaluation.

- **Recommendation 3-Cultural Competency-Anti-Racism Training:** Develop a DEI and cultural competency training calendar informed by URM groups represented on campus. Ensure that most offered training is accessible to all employees regardless of classification. Develop a plan for incorporating DEI and cultural competency training materials into learning modules or toolkits for professional development or student enrichment in the future.

- **Recommendation 4-Champion DEI Funding Campaigns:** Collaborate with the Grants Development and Management Office to design a capital campaign to expand grant-funded programs that support URM programs. Collaborate with programs and committees in need of funding to develop a viable strategy for securing funding from diverse funding streams. Increase funding for departments, centers, and faculty that offer social justice, critical race theory, genderqueer, ethnic, and gender studies classes and workshops. Once funding is secured, work with programs and committees to determine an equitable budget allocation.

- **Recommendation 5-Power Redressing:** Dedicate time and resources to identifying and redressing power imbalances across college systems. Publicly claim accountability for any implicit or explicit biased system impacting underrepresented minority groups and communicate the plan to redress that harm. Publicly report goals and progress.

- **Recommendation 6-Bias Reporting:** Implement a campus-wide bias incident reporting system with safeguards for victims and transparent methods for addressing all reports effectively. Ensure that data on incidents are disseminated for analysis, policy improvements, and prevention.

- **Recommendation 7-Employee Equity:** Develop a plan to draft a policy that pays employees for their intellectual and emotional labor, time, and effort spent on equity, access, diversity, and inclusion work in addition to their positions at the College.

- **Recommendation 8-Review, Revisit and Re-implement:** Racial and cultural institutional change takes time. Commit to constantly assessing the efficacy of new initiatives, programs, and policies through qualitative and quantitative metrics. If projected goals are not achieved, celebrate the efforts of those who worked towards achieving the goal and include them in assessing what elements need re-imaging. Don't be afraid to re-implement a plan that isn't working; it is more important to revise a DEI integration or strategy instead of completely abandoning it.
Respondent recommendations are vital to fostering an inclusive and equitable campus environment. Continue to invest in opportunities for employees and students to provide insights on how the College can recover with equity in 2022 and beyond. Cañada College employees and students provided recommendations for how the College could become a more equitable and anti-racist institution. The comments below reflect suggestions made by employees and students to move Cañada College towards equitable outcomes. Ase Power Consult received permission from respondents to list their names and titles with their statements. Respondents who did not want their names or titles referenced are listed as anonymous.

- Develop a “shadow program to connect administrators to students to deepen their understanding of students’ school and personal lives. I know the higher up you go, the less contact you have with students. I need it to be not our student leaders. I don’t want you to shadow them because those are ideal students.” (Anonymous)

- “Full-time faculty [should] partner with a couple of adjunct faculty to keep them informed and support them... it would be great if full-time faculty could build a bridge with adjuncts. Even if [it’s] just check-ins or something at Flex Day.”-Gonzalo Arrizon, Retention Specialist & Adjunct English Instructor

- “There’s not really an area [on Flex Day request for proposal link] where it’s kind of like, ‘I have ideas for Flex Day but feel you don’t have resources, let us know here’ kind of thing. I think that would be cool.” (Anonymous)

- “What I do appreciate though, is that a couple of Student Services Planning Council meetings ago, we were put into breakout rooms and were given a sheet where we were asked, ‘how do you practice anti-racism and equity as an individual in your role, as your program or service together, and how does that connect to the institution.’ So I thought that was really great. And it also gave us an opportunity to offer suggestions to what Student Services programs can and should be doing to further operate as an equity-minded entity.” (Anonymous)

- “We’ve got our new compliance officer... she does an incredible Unconscious Bias workshop... she makes you go inside yourself – and she makes you take inventory so that you can make a connection to how you hold biases and how you need to be conscious of them... I don’t know if that’s a requirement for onboarding. I know it’s a requirement if you wanna do a hiring committee. But I would need it to be a requirement of working at this college, [and] in this district.” (Anonymous)

- “There was also talk recently of possibly having a faculty professional development coordinator and a staff professional development coordinator, so the staff needs could be more appropriately met by that person.” (Anonymous)

- “I’m using the impact grids that Jeremiah Sims developed over at College of San Mateo that’s part of the Ideal Program..... the impact grid has been helpful to me as kind of a rubric grid to break out into pieces of this program and really analyze the equity aspect and look at where things are kind of not working.” -David Reed, Dean of Academic Support and Learning Technology

- “I’ve recently started the Black staff and faculty monthly lunch, and then there’s a colleague at Skyline who had been wanting to do something like that, so she and I discussed doing something that could be district-wide and also include administrators... maybe doing something twice a year for Black faculty and administrators to get together.”-Lezlee Ware, Professor of Political Science and UMOJA Program Coordinator
“CSM is hiring an Ombudsperson specifically to deal with the gap in reporting between overt issues and issues that should/could be reported but are not. That position reports directly to the president and is charged with making sure issues get addressed. Since we won’t be getting that or anything similar in the near future, it is a matter of the next best option.” (Anonymous)

“If we had an equity slash PD person since they are very integrated anyway…I don’t know if anybody’s written up a position description and entered it into our system.”
-David Meckler, Professor of Music, Cañada College, former CIETL Coordinator

“We need to hold on to our current retention specialist…we need him [to be full-time]…Looks like he’ll be 50% UMOJA….but that needs to be just solidified, which shouldn’t be a guessing game whether he’s staying here, you know, it should be like he’s hired…permanently.”-Lezlee Ware, Professor of Political Science and UMOJA Program Coordinator

“Give the [Classified] President 5,000.00, give the [Classified] Vice President 2,000.00 give the [Classified] Secretary 1,000.00, and the other officers 500.00.”-Jeanne Stalker, Program Services Coordinator

“If you are a decision-maker you need to be trained in anti-racism, period. I don’t understand how we expect…to move forward without it. You have tenured faculty, what is the deadline for them to get on board? … What is the deadline for people to get on board? When do you start removing people for not being willing to do the work?” (Anonymous)
LISTENING SESSIONS: STUDENTS, FACULTY & STAFF

LISTENING SESSION PROTOCOL

A listening session is an empathy-centered conversation tool that provides stakeholders an opportunity to share insights into the efficacy of the College’s institutional systems. APC utilized a non-violent communication framework and empathy mapping when conducting listening sessions to explore and assess internal stakeholder perception of racial and cultural equity representation practices on campus. Session prompts for outcomes one and two applied to the listening sessions for classified staff, students, and faculty. Due to session time constraints, participants did not reply to all session prompts. Probing questions and outcomes for listening sessions one and two are listed below.

Outcome One: Examine how classified staff, students, and faculty experience empathy individually and interpersonally through the utilization of non-violent communication empathy mapping.

Prompts
- Whom are we empathizing with? What cultural and/or racial group do you want to understand more?
- How do you see URM groups represented on campus? How do you feel seen on campus?
- What do you/they hear? How do you feel heard on campus?
- How do you think URM groups feel about Cañada’s College’s DEI efforts and other supportive efforts?
- How do you feel?
- What does Cañada College need to do to provide authentic support?

Outcome Two: Examine the classified staff, students, and faculty’s perception of the efficacy and impact of the College’s mission/value statement. Examine which goals internal stakeholders believe should be prioritized.

Prompts
- What will it take to achieve an increased sense of belonging amongst faculty/students/classified staff within the next 3-6 months?
- What priorities are still relevant? What are the current priorities for diversity, equity, access, and inclusion, as the College sees it, within your department?
- What is an emerging priority that needs to be prioritized?
- What priorities, specifically DEI priorities, can be paused and revisited?
- What don’t you know? What additional data do you need to move forward?
The first listening session feedback primarily came from student leaders affiliated with the Associated Students of Cañada College (ASCC). The primary student feedback centered on safety, both psychological and physical. Students' psychological and safety needs relayed a desire for more opportunities to talk about the impact of racial and cultural behaviors (both explicit and implicit) and the normalization of anti-black microaggressive language on campus.

Students expressed concerns with the College's limited access points and sensitivity towards individual experiences with racial bias, microaggressions, and representation of URM group on campus. Several students desired an opportunity to have more conversations where the nuances of race, culture and representation could be discussed in a cultivated safe (r) space.

Regarding discussing racism and representation, students spoke to perceived inequities on campus.

"I remember around this time last year people were talking about the criminal justice system and stuff, sometimes in a productive way, sometimes not, and I remember a lot of ideas were getting thrown around that seemed kind of disrespectful like, 'oh well you know black people are policed more because they commit more crime' and I remember... that really made me feel negative and really impassioned me emotionally that they were just seen as just having a discussion and there wasn't really any sort of reflection."(Anonymous)

"We as ASCC [representatives] have a lot of power to represent the student body, so again taking their [students] lead on what they think they need to feel safe. For example, a student has already brought up a lack of gender-neutral bathrooms on campus for the genderqueer community...now we're trying to look into that more to make sure the campus is safe for the most basic needs, like going to the bathroom."(Anonymous)

"Back when I was in high school and in an honors English class, I was the only person that looked like myself, and it was really hard, I remember staring at the clock just wanting the class to be over. And thinking that my English skills weren't worth it. Now that I'm here in college my professor sharing with me that what I had written was very powerful. And all this time I thought that could be reinforced at other campuses." (Anonymous)

The second listening session feedback primarily came from student leaders affiliated with the ASCC. The students identified a need for a closer evaluation of the efficacy of equity, inclusion, cultural competency, and access points within early access programs. Students wanted the College to dedicate more resources to advertising early access programs to URM groups and addressing racial and cultural bias. Additionally, students expressed concerns regarding the visibility of students with disabilities in campus literature and on the College's website.

Responses regarding web access and representation.

"I want to see Cañada take more time to think about its faculty members and students with disabilities. I think that they are often left out of equity discussions...take a look at your website itself. Accessibility concerns for the website are all the way down at the bottom of the site. So we're talking about positioning, just positioning right I think that was actually pretty valid." (Anonymous)

"We attend the community college and take a mixture of high school and college classes, and it's a great opportunity and I personally really like it there. And it's really just changed my entire educational perspective but like something that I noticed, even when I was like applying was that it's really not well advertised. It's basically up to the students themselves, and like word of mouth to figure... this out, ...there's not too much like racial or ethnic diversity" (Anonymous)
FIRST LISTENING SESSION: OUTCOME ONE

Primary concerns and needs identified during the first listening session centered on the following: a lack of bandwidth to support colleagues and students effectively, frustration with retention impact on DEI, and a general fear of practicing vulnerability on campus. Several classified staff members expressed the importance of building community connections with students and colleagues but felt ill-equipped to do so with limited resources and opportunities to experiment with connecting communities while social distancing. Despite expressed frustrations, classified staff members appeared to care deeply about their jobs and students.

FEEDBACK

Regarding expressing and experiencing empathy some employees mentioned trying to understand each other on a personal level while others were fearful of practicing vulnerability at the College.

“I typically manage a very diverse staff and it’s changed over the years. I will individually go ... and ask them questions about their life, their culture, their experiences, their background[s], because not only does it help me learn who they are, I also find out the different things [about their] culture.” (Anonymous)

Regarding what URM groups need to experience safety and what the College can do to achieve DEI goals.

“I honestly can’t think of anything that would be superficially necessary. It can’t be like a flag, so I want something that would be more intentional and not like a Band-Aid, so, for example, it’s easy to put up safe zone signs. It’s challenging when you know that the other people are not safe, so how do we intentionally make it safe?” (Anonymous)

“I am going to be very honest. People are afraid to speak up. People have been hurt. There is a lot of trust that has been broken... I love this place and I love the people that we work with and yet we have been through a lot of tough times, but you know what, we’re still here.” (Anonymous)

I also do believe that the other person plays a part in their own comfortability, as far as they are open to accept it [safe spaces]. Does it have to look a certain way in order for it to be received as authentic to the person who wants that authenticity?” (Anonymous)

Regarding feelings towards DEI impact, classified staff expressed that constant turnover impacted the cultivation of an equitable workload.

“I fear continued turnover. The churn is already fast and it hugely affects those of us that are already wearing so many hats.” (Anonymous)

“I am not sure how many have an active voice/seat at the table in the decision-making process about where funding goes and how budgets will be developed.” (Anonymous)

“If the pains [referencing workload] persist, Cañada will continue to perpetuate the status quo. meaning folks can fall into ‘this is just my job’ category; checked out.” (Anonymous)

SECOND LISTENING SESSION: OUTCOME TWO

Primary identified concerns focused on a lack of bandwidth to support program goals and students fully. Classified staff members also reflected on the severe impact the killings of George Floyd and other members of the black community had on their sense of psychological and physical safety. The conversation that emerged from these comments revealed a deep need for staff to have supportive places to be seen, heard, and valued, particularly when centering BIPOC and LGBTQIA+ identities. Classified staff also expressed a desire for more effective town halls.

FEEDBACK

Regarding what priorities are still relevant regarding diversity, equity, access, and inclusion, employees mentioned the need for interactive town halls and more equity for staff and students.

Referencing Inclusive Town Halls: "I could be getting confused with the district one [town hall]. The district ones [town halls] for sure are not [inclusive]. They call them town halls, but they're just basically powerpoints, people, talking to us... I don't recall our town hall being interactive.” (Anonymous)

"I attended [the town hall] the interactive portion is very short. It's like the tail end of it; it's like 15 minutes. They shuffle you to a breakout room to discuss extremely heavy complex subject matter with, you know, sometimes people you don't know.” (Anonymous)

"Providing employees have sufficient resources to be able to do their work at a capacity that is equitable, anti-racist, and centers on creating the best educational spaces for students.”(Anonymous)

"As these racial injustices heavily reflect on my life; I'm a Black woman in America...and so, like, last summer wrecked me... and so having the space to get to know people [and] to open up about that.” (Anonymous)

"We have one-person departments and employees covering multiple jobs. We've integrated the mandated Guided Pathways initiative, but after 5 years we're just now looking at hiring to make it work. People were told their jobs 'wouldn't change' with this new initiative, but of course, they did.” (Anonymous)
FIRST LISTENING SESSION: OUTCOME ONE

Primary concerns and needs identified were a need for more opportunities to explore best practices to combat zoom fatigue for faculty and students. Several respondents indicated a need for more linguistic accommodations in addition to Spanish and English. Regarding the College's impact on DEI, several respondents expressed frustration with minimal lasting DEI institutional changes despite the College's commitment to equity and inclusion goals yearly.

FEEDBACK

Regarding what URM groups need to experience safety and what the College can do to achieve DEI goals.

“[Provide] Zoom fatigue solutions.” (Anonymous)

“[Increased] Representation within faculty, staff & administration.” (Anonymous)

“Linguistic accommodations, more materials that are in different languages other than English and Spanish.” (Anonymous)

“The onboarding process [being] more responsive in differences in communication styles and internal communications.” (Anonymous)

“More on-campus jobs and more student cultural activities and events.” (Anonymous)

Regarding feelings towards DEI impact and goals.

“I am not personally frustrated about [the College’s anti-racism] goals, but I can see how [some goals] may bring about some anxiety around just feeling scrutinized or a different way of being scrutinized regarding your performance at work.” (Anonymous)

“Another frustration lies in that we have had similar goals for years, and there has been little done.” (Anonymous)

“[I] don’t see any representation by or communication to Native American groups from Cañada College.” (Anonymous)

“They are making progress in building an accessible website and resources for students with sight or hearing impairments.” (Anonymous)

“The College needs to do more to make night students and adult returning students feel welcome and part of the community, like providing access to tutoring, clubs, and other opportunities usually only available in the day.” (Anonymous)

“More services and support for part-time students to be more on par with services and support provided to full-time students. Examples: financial support, book vouchers, built-in counseling scaffolding to get their educational plans done to get the support they need to make good progress to their goals.” (Anonymous)

“[There are] many programs and complex systems are posing a challenge for students – it takes knowledge and persistence to navigate the system to access all the available programs. This difficulty/barrier undermines the goal of equity.” (Anonymous)

SECOND LISTENING SESSION: OUTCOME TWO

Several faculty members expressed a need for more support for classified staff, faculty, and URM serving programs. There were additional concerns regarding the barriers that students face navigating the College systems due to inaccessible counseling hours or a lack of available staff to assist with navigation of the College's systems. There was a general concern for the overall psychological safety of employees from URM groups when microaggressions or explicit bias occurs in meetings and on campus.

FEEDBACK

Regarding what priorities are still relevant? What are the current priorities for diversity, equity, access, and inclusion as the College sees it within your department?

“Support the Puente program, [provide more] counseling support for the program. These programs have always been fighting for; support the marginalized, give them what they need so they have the opportunity to learn.” (Anonymous)

“We sometimes feel as if we are attending meetings and listening sessions, feeling that some of the individuals that may need that coaching are not attending professional development opportunities...really thinking about how to bring those folks in...the only way I can think about is [to make] this a mandatory meeting.” (Anonymous)

“Counseling hours in terms of incoming students, what impression do students have, because they can’t get a counseling appointment as they are trying to register for classes. That’s the first impression on some of these people; we don’t know how many people just don’t register.” (Anonymous)

Regarding support for programs, specifically programs that support URM groups and addressing racist and cultural bias at work.

“We need counselors in the summer to help us recruit because we are not there in the summer. Be honest about whether you have money or not... now UMOJA is coming hopefully UMOJA won’t experience what we [Puente program] experienced.” (Anonymous)

“People using the chat logs to write [triggering] comments about the presentation, our dean brought us back from the break sessions and said we need to talk about this right now, everybody was distracted, and some people were really hurt.” (Anonymous)
The Cultural Audit is an additional assessment tool ÁPC utilized to capture employee experiences regarding equity, diversity, access, and inclusive practices on campus. The College can use the data from this cultural audit as a foundation for developing metrics that measure progress across institutional systems and tracks DEI impact on campus culture in the future.
ÁPC invited stakeholders to provide insights into the culture and climate of the Cañada College community by completing a Cultural Audit Assessment designed to collect information on diversity, equity, and inclusion. Of the 799 stakeholders, 114 contributed to the survey, yielding a 14.3% response rate. The diagram below displays a comparison of survey respondents indicating employment classification, to the comprehensive employment list for the fall of 2021.

The distribution of respondents identifying as classified staff and administration were very similar to the representation of all employees within these categories. In contrast, there were significant variances in response collection from both full and part-time faculty. Although these distribution differences do not discredit the merit of the cultural audit, part-time faculty members may be slightly underrepresented by the results.

Individuals responding to the questionnaire were asked to provide demographic information to develop a better understanding of the cultural impact on specific groups. The following pages analyze distributions of survey respondents by age, gender identity, sexual orientation, and race/ethnicity categories. Some individuals elected to omit information regarding demographic segments. In such instances, responses were considered in reference to the response population, but omitted while analyzing measures by specified groups.
Over 100 Cañada College stakeholders provided information on age, with the most considerable distribution occurring from 41 to 56 years. A small collection of respondents declined to indicate their age group, primarily amongst faculty members. Of those reporting, 70.3% were 56 or younger. Responding administrators were recognized as the youngest employment classification, as every survey response is within the two youngest age brackets. 77.1% of responses from classified staff were also from these groups. Conversely, responding faculty members account for the vast majority of the older population, as 81.8% of respondents over 65 indicated a teaching role.

Female-identifying individuals accounted for over half of all survey submissions. Significant response distribution was attributed to males and few respondents identified as non-binary. Responding administrators, full-time faculty, classified staff, and part-time faculty have relatively similar gender identity distributions, while females dominated the part-time classified staff representation. 66.7% identified as female, while the remaining respondents chose not to provide gender-related information. Notably, many respondents chose to exclude gender identity from those who omitted age information. These results imply an increased reluctance to provide increasingly personal information, especially in faculty and staff.
The respondents included a broad spectrum of racial and ethnic groups. However, representation for the different classifications varies significantly. The majority of respondents to the cultural audit identified as White/European Ancestry or Hispanic/Latino/a/x. While 16.7% of survey respondents elected not to provide race or ethnicity identification, response volume did allow for further analysis by major demographic groups. Additionally, identified employment classifications displayed distinct differences in diversity. Non-Hispanic, White/European individuals submitted 62.3% of responses in administration and faculty, while only accounting for 23.5% of the classified staff. In contrast, all other racial/ethnic groups displayed increased representation among responding classified staff.
Confirmations of biases were most common amongst classified staff, as 73.0% of surveyed positions indicated discriminatory experiences during their employment at Cañada College. Responding administrators were more likely to be uncertain of their subjectivity to partiality while responding faculty members primarily reported certainty in their exposures. Notably, full-time staff respondents across all employment classifications were nearly 25% more likely to acknowledge personal encounters with prejudice than part-time staff.
Survey respondents identified types of biases that best represented their experiences. The graph below displays the distribution of bias types amongst responding individuals. Though race and ethnicity are two separate identifiers, of the 56 respondents indicating an occurrence of racial bias, 55 also indicated ethnic discrimination. Thus, the intersectionality leads to analyzing race and ethnicity as the primary driver of partiality towards responding Cañada College stakeholders. Further explanations of these incidents ranged from microaggressions or implicit preferences to blatant prejudicial acts. While some responding stakeholders (specifically responding faculty) mentioned encounters with students, interactions with colleagues or supervisors dominated explicit references of racial/ethnic biases within open-ended response collection.

Respondents elaborating on their experiences expressed discouragement in the action taken when reporting bias incidents to individuals in authoritative positions. Lack of accountability emerged as a theme, as stakeholders were often unaware of preventive or corrective actions to address bias. Other recollections mentioned supervisors or senior members of faculty and staff that appear to be above reproach. As a recurring issue, Cañada College respondents were often reluctant to confront blatant acts of bigotry due to a fear that individuals in leadership positions “[would] retaliate against anyone who stands up.” (Anonymous)

"...When a report is filed with a supervisor, not much is done. Or, if something is done there is no transparency as to next steps, so it appears that the issue is ignored by not being addressed further with a post report debrief.”

-Anonymous

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Bias Experienced</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homophobic</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical or Mental Ability</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/Ethnic</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transphobia</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight/Body</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of Respondents Identifying a Bias
Though mainly referring to hindrances, instances of racial and ethnic bias were occasionally identified to benefit some individuals. One respondent indicated that their identified race provides a "general advantage" while also stating that race discredited their viewpoint. Response trends suggest that racial and ethnic groups with superior representation in the employment/student population are more likely to have their equity and inclusivity needs met. Conversely, groups with minority representation on campus are often overlooked.

"We had to fight, hard, to institute a program specifically serving Black students..."  
- Anonymous

Racial or ethnic distinctions also seem to affect the likelihood that a Cañada College stakeholder respondent experienced discriminatory treatment. While White/European Ancestry/Non-Hispanic respondents reported the lowest probability of collective bias (43.5%), Asian/Asian American/Southeast Asian/South Asian Native, Black/African American, and Middle Eastern North African respondents also reported slightly below the collective norm of 56.6%. Conversely, though the sample size is small, every Hawaiian or Pacific Islander respondent identified experiences with partiality. Additionally, 76% of Hispanic/Latino/a/x and 66.7% of Multi-Racial or Biracial individuals surveyed indicated occurrences of biases. While racial/ethnic bias remained the primary driver, other types of inequalities were also more likely to have occurred within these groups.

The second most common occurrence of biases in the respondent base of Cañada College relates to gender identity. Over one in every four survey respondents experiencing partiality can attribute these instances to gender identity. Notably, non-binary and female-identifying respondents report significantly higher rates of bias confirmation than males.

While specific experiences with gender bias were more common for responding females (32.4%) than responding males (12.5%), non-binary respondents did not indicate any prejudicial treatment based solely on their gender identity. Multiple respondents further indicated a discrepancy between the expectations placed on male and female employees, including extra work assignments and conduct in meetings.
Recurring responses indicated that responding females are often either held to a higher work standard or expected to take on additional roles. Furthermore, responding females reported common occurrences of their ideas or opinions discredited by male colleagues. Although gender disparities were identified, concerns were placed by both responding females and males about the chauvinistic actions of supervisors towards employees of a different gender.

Age was reported just below gender in the frequency of bias occurrence amongst Cañada College stakeholders. 22% of survey respondents who indicated discriminatory experience(s) identified age differences as the cause. Most significantly, part-time employees reported age as the primary contributor to bias occurrences, at 42.9%. Comparatively, full-time staff and administration attributed only 15.6% of partiality to age.

Respondent age also served as a significant indicator of collective bias experiences. Due to the frequent reports of incidents based on race or ethnicity, age was not the principal contributor to prejudicial interactions for any age group. However, as age brackets increased, bias experiences decreased. 25.0% of 25 to 40-year-old respondents indicated partiality contributed to age, compared to 16.0% of 41 to 56-year-olds and 27.3% of 57 to 66-year-olds. Notably, responding stakeholders 66 years and older did not identify any partiality based on their age. However, there were instances in which inclinations were in favor of younger respondents. One such respondent recounted an experience in which they were discouraged from seeking positional advancement due to their current role being “less demanding” and a “better fit for someone my [their] age.”

"As a female faculty member, it is an unwritten expectation of administration that I will take on more, extra, unpaid work." -Anonymous
Many other varieties of bias were reported at lower frequencies by Cañada College stakeholders. Notably, though homophobic bias was only identified by 8.5% of those reporting partialities, discrimination based on sexual orientation occurs more significantly within specific groups. One-third of responding homosexual and pansexual-identifying individuals reported partiality based on their orientation. Furthermore, homosexual and pansexual respondents were over 25% more likely to confirm any type of bias, in comparison to other sexual orientations.

Additional biases that prompted reports from respondents included position, weight/body, physical or mental ability, socioeconomic status, transphobia, xenophobia, education status, religious affiliation, and previous work experience. Though only 10.2% of respondents experiencing bias attributed occurrences to position, personal accounts provided further insight into the impact of employment classifications on the impartiality of Cañada College. Multiple responding part-time employees felt ostracized by full-time colleagues or institutional systems. This is especially pronounced amongst adjunct faculty. Additional concerns were raised from classified staff respondents regarding the policies surrounding professional needs. These individuals identified a bias in professional development offerings that often omitted non-faculty members.

While not all respondents provided a response, the sample population provides significant insight into perceived biases within the Cañada College workplace community. Establishing awareness around existing biases serves as an initial step in creating a more equitable and inclusive environment for all people.

"As a classified staff member, professional development has always been a problem, in that informational sessions offered are geared more towards faculty, which leaves most staff out of the loop in terms of training..." -Anonymous
The Cañada College cultural audit provided a selection of Likert scale questions in which respondents were instructed to provide a level of agreement with a given statement. While the presented diagrams will provide a further distribution of responses, demographic comparisons will focus on three categories: agree, neutral, and disagree.

Stakeholders were asked about institutional procedures/policies that address racial and or cultural bias. While racial/ethnic biases are undeniably present within the College, 37.4% of respondents agree that the institution has offerings to protect faculty and staff, while 34.6% opposed that notion. Older employees and males were more inclined to agree. 54.5% of respondents over 65 and 57.1% of males believe that there are institutional systems in place to address these issues.

In contrast, only 35.1% of females and 0% of non-binary respondents believe in the current procedure/policies. White/European Ancestry/Non-Hispanic respondents displayed significantly higher levels of support, with 52.2% agreeing and only 21.7% disagreeing. Contrastly, all other racial/ethnic groups were only in agreement 28.3% of the time, while disagreeing at a rate of 45.7%. These results highlight the significant disparity in the needs of racial/ethnic minorities.
The majority of survey respondents admit to hesitancy in bringing up concerns due to a fear of retribution. Throughout the survey, multiple respondents chose to omit information citing this concern. Respondents with a part-time employee classification were 64.5% in agreement and more likely to suppress institutional concerns such as perceived bias in the normalization of excessive workload, unpaid meeting time, and broad inequities experienced across institutional systems than respondents who self-identified as full-time (50% agreement). Responding females were nearly twice as likely to feel this reluctance than responding males, while 100% of non-binary respondents agreed with the proposed statement. Notably, Black/African Americans were the most likely (66.7% disagreement) to feel comfortable expressing concerns.

Respondents were also prompted to respond to inequalities in expectations. 40.2% of respondents feel they are required to work harder than other colleagues to obtain approval. 25 to 40-year-olds agree 54.2% of the time, in comparison to 33.3% for all other age categories. Additionally, administration and classified staff respondents are nearly twice as likely as responding faculty to infer an increased work requirement. Black/African American respondents were the least likely racial/ethnic group to agree, at 11.1%. White/European Ancestry/Non-Hispanic respondents are also less likely to feel pressured to outwork their peers (24.4% agreement) than all other races/ethnicities (57.8% agreement). Additionally, heterosexual respondents were less likely to agree (29.7%) than other sexual orientations (54.3%).
63.5% of survey respondents believe that the institution is taking the necessary actions to foster an anti-racist community on campus. However, respondents who self-identified as part-time were less likely to agree (42.9%) than full-time respondents (72.1%). Also, significant disparities exist amongst racial and ethnic groups. 86.4% of White/European Ancestry/Non-Hispanic respondents believe in the current development of an anti-racist culture. In contrast, only 44.2% of all other racial and ethnic groups agree. The disparity in these categories again highlights the perception of the effect of racism on the campus community.

Cañada College administrators and employees are taking the necessary actions to foster a campus community that is antiracist.

- Strongly agree: 18.8%
- Somewhat agree: 44.8%
- Neither agree nor disagree: 16.7%
- Somewhat disagree: 9.4%
- Strongly disagree: 10.4%

Do you perceive systemic barriers within the college or within your department?

- Yes: 48.4%
- Maybe: 33.7%
- No: 17.9%

Perceptions of systemic obstacles within Cañada College also varied significantly. While less than half of all respondents were aware of systemic issues, 61.0% of 25 to 40-year-olds report their existence. As age groups increased, perceived barriers decreased. Additionally, respondents who self-identified as administrators were more aware of these obstacles (71.4%) than classified staff respondents (63.0%) and faculty respondents (39.3%). The most significant disparities again exist between racial and ethnic groups on campus. While perceived barriers are highest among Asian/Asian American/Southeast Asian/South Asian Native (71.4%), Multi-racial and Biracial (66.7%), and Hispanic/Latino/a/x respondents (61.1%). Black/African Americans report the lowest perception of system obstacles with only 37.5% responding "yes."
Within the Cañada College cultural audit, a collection of questions requested that respondents rate items on a scale from terrible to excellent. While the presented diagrams will provide a further distribution of responses, demographic comparisons will focus on three categories: above average, average, and below average.

Nearly half of Cañada College respondents believe that the institution provides above-average instructional accommodations for those with physical disabilities. Perception plays a significant role, as respondents identified as faculty and administrators were twice as likely as classified staff respondents to provide a positive ranking for the College. Additionally, 76.2% of responding males suggest that the campus provides above-average accessibility, while only 32.7% of female and non-binary respondents agree.

While only 41.4% of survey respondents believe that the College provides above-average accessibility options for individuals with psychological disabilities, a significant portion ranked services as average. Respondents identified as full-time faculty provided higher rankings, as 54.3% ranked the school as above average, in comparison to only 33.3% of all other employees. Another significant perception difference existed by age categories. Only 22.2% of respondents between 25 and 40 provided a positive ranking for the College, while 47.8% of all other age groups indicated a similar rating.
85.9% of survey respondents believe that Cañada College provides either average or above-average instructional accommodations to those with medical disabilities. While very few respondents ranked accessibility as "excellent," very few also see medical disabilities as a severe hindrance to instructional opportunities. Faculty respondents provide higher rankings (55% above-average) in comparison to other respondents (30.3% above average). Contrary to physical and mental disability access, perception varied in ethnic groups, as 56.8% of White/EuropeanAncestry/Non-Hispanic respondents reported an above-average ranking, compared to 37.5% of all other races/ethnicities.

The majority of responding college stakeholders believe that the inclusivity of written and verbal language on campus is either "good" or "average." Though few respondents indicated "excellent," only 13.5% believe that the campus has a below-average use of inclusive language. However, there were some disparities amongst demographic categories. Only 38.9% of female respondents ranked the college above average. Comparatively, male and non-binary responses were 53.1% above average. Additionally, only 28.6% of Hispanic/Latino/a/x and Multi-Racial and Biracial respondents indicated above-average encompassing language on campus, nearly half the rate of all other racial and ethnic groups.
Few survey respondents were aware of any institutional systems at Cañada College that adequately handle DEI-related issues. Just over 40% of respondents reported a lack of awareness of the subject, further indicating a need for transparency in the college’s response to emerging incidents. While slight variances occurred amongst different demographics, part-time classified staff respondents felt particularly strong about this topic, as 100% of respondents indicated that appropriate procedures are not currently in place. Comparatively, only 17.9% of all other employment classifications responded with "no."

Transparency within the process for recruiting and retaining diverse employees garnered mixed responses. While 30.9% of survey respondents feel there is clarity in preserving diversity amongst colleagues, 41.2% disagree. Employment position seems to impact these perceptions, as nearly twice as many administrators and full-time faculty respondents confirmed agreement than classified staff and part-time faculty respondents. Additionally, White/European Ancestry/Non-Hispanic respondents provided more positive responses, with 37.8% believing in a transparent recruitment and retaining process of diversity, while 37.8% disagreed. Comparatively, only one out of four respondents in all other racial/ethnic groups agreed, while 44.2% contended the statement.
In an effort to create more awareness and increase the transparency of faculty and staff changes, survey respondents were asked to select their preferred method of communication in instances where Cañada College leadership executes updates and/or changes to faculty and staff. The majority of responding individuals (53.7%) indicated email as their preferred method of communication. Staff meetings and either a newsletter or inter-office communication garnered nearly identical responses, at just over 20%. Few respondents listed the website as a primary resource of communication. Additionally, respondents were allowed to provide unique suggestions. Many respondents requested the use of multiple methods, particularly in the 25 to 40 age bracket, as 43.8% of these respondents preferred staff meetings but also acknowledged the effectiveness of multiple avenues of communication.

Further investigation into the perception of the employee recruitment process reveals that the majority of survey respondents are aware of how the college attracts talent. Confirmations were elevated by the responding administration and full-time faculty and staff, as 85.7% and 60.7%, respectively, indicated an understanding of such institutional systems.

While the majority of stakeholders understand recruitment, only just under 30% believe that Cañada College is effectively leveraging non-traditional methods of recruitment for minority groups. Among others, these methods include going to community events, supporting local BIPOC or LGBTQIA+ services or events on campus, or implementing fairs or free school events. While responding administrators presented at a higher level of agreement (57.1%), all other employment categories were below the norm.
Cañada College respondents indicated that addressing diversity, equity, and inclusion-related needs during the onboarding process may be an area in which the institution can immediately improve. Only 21.9% reported a positive view of the integration of goals, expectations, and commitments to DEI initiatives during the introductory employment process. Specifically, part-time employee respondents indicated a lack of DEI-related information during onboarding, as only 13.8% agreed with the current institutional system.

Notably, Black/African American respondents had the highest distribution of agreement at 33.3%, followed by White/European Ancestry/Non-Hispanic respondents at 26.7%. Only 14.3% of the remaining racial/ethnic groups provided a positive view of the current onboarding procedures involving DEI initiatives.

Survey respondents indicated a potential lack of opportunity to provide feedback on college governance practices and general fairness. 38.5% of all respondents indicated that the College does not regularly measure faculty and staff approval. Amongst part-time employee respondents, an even greater percentage (51.7%) disagreed with the frequency at which they are able to provide perception on these institutional systems. Additionally, Black/African Americans were the racial/ethnic group most likely to feel underrepresented, as 44.4% reported disagreement with current standards.
Exit surveys or interviews exist as an opportunity to assess the experience within Cañada College from a variety of different perspectives. Potential information gathered in these assessments would provide direction in identifying areas of opportunity in the retention and engagement of employees and students.

While some form of exit surveys for faculty, staff, and students exits, survey results indicate that occurrences may be infrequent. Only 11.3% of respondents believe that departing faculty and staff are given the opportunity to provide feedback on their employment experience. These numbers were very consistent across all employment classifications and demographic groups.

Even lower numbers of survey respondents are familiar with exit surveys and/or interviews being administered to students. However, an increased number of administrator respondents (28.6%) indicated knowledge of these practices involving departing students. In contrast, only 7.9% of classified staff respondents and faculty respondents agreed that the College consistently solicits feedback from students as they graduate, transfer, or leave college. These discrepancies may be due to the particular nature of administering such assessments. However, the results of exit surveys and/or interviews are not being communicated across all employment levels.
The insight provided by the stakeholders of Cañada College indicates a significant opportunity for the community to improve on the current culture and climate. However, 67% of respondents believe that the institution is capable of establishing appropriate and adequate systems to become an anti-racist college. While some respondents are unsure, only 15.5% disagree with the capability for change within the institution. Full-time faculty and classified staff respondents retain the most optimistic outlook.

However, only 58.6% of part-time employee respondents and 57.1% of administrator respondents are confident in the opportunity to implement adjustments. Additionally, variances also exist among racial and ethnic groups. 84.4% of White/European Ancestry/Non-Hispanic respondents believe Cañada College is capable of implementing institutional changes, while only 57.9% of all other responding racial and ethnic groups agree.

As respondents anticipate a future of improved circumstances for all groups of people, realistic expectations are evident. Nearly half of survey respondents expect two or more years of work for Cañada College to become viewed as an anti-racist institution. The respondent base is deeply interwoven into the current culture of the College. They provide an existing and long-lasting perspective into the current culture and climate. Responses indicate a desire to build better relations supporting diversity, equity, access, and inclusion across institutional systems.
An internal equity scan is a process that deeply examines the structural systems that may create unequal access to opportunities for groups that are not part of dominant group internal cultural power systems. The systems explored during the internal equity scan were Teaching and Learning, Students Services, Administration & Communication, Participatory Governance, and Professional Development. There was a slight variance of interview questions to understand better the perspectives of faculty, classified staff, and students regarding the following outcomes:

**OUTCOME ONE**

Seek to understand the normalized systems or practices that impact the efficacy of diversity, equity, access, and inclusive practice integrations within the College’s institutional systems explored. For the purpose of this report, we defined a normalized system or practice as “an organized set of ideas or theories or a particular way of doing something” as defined by the Oxford Dictionary.

**Prompt**

What normalized practice or system does Cañada College utilize to address DEI-related issues within departments or within the systems you manage? Is this process helpful or harmful? What do you think is needed to disrupt this normalized practice or system?

**OUTCOME TWO**

Seek to identify perceived barriers preventing diverse, underrepresented minority groups from accessing opportunities or an equitable, inclusive practice from taking root within the identified institutional system. For this scan, “barrier” was defined as “anything that restrains or obstructs progress, access.” - Dictionary.com

**Prompt**

Considering the definition for barrier, what if any obstructions would you say exist that prevent DEI integrations from taking root within the College or your programs?

**OUTCOME THREE**

Seek to identify perceived bridges connecting diverse, underrepresented minority groups to the College’s opportunities and resources.

**Prompt**

Considering the definition for bridge, can you think of opportunities the College can take advantage of to begin bridging across equity, access, and diversity difficulties? If there are no issues with equity, access, or diversity, you do not have to reflect on this question.
OUTCOME ONE-NORMALIZED PRACTICE

**Internal System Assessed:** Teaching & Learning - Tutoring Services

Approximately 6 classified staff, faculty members, and students from diverse racial and cultural identity backgrounds were interviewed for this section of the internal scan. They were asked to identify the barriers, bridges, and normalized practices that prevent or promote racial and cultural equity changes from being operationalized within the system of teaching and learning. Common normalized practices expressed included the expectation to operate programs and departments despite the challenges of providing services for students with limited staff and budget. There was also a general concern that microaggressions and acts of explicit bias would become a normalized practice if left unchecked. Lastly, a practice expressed consistently in interviews and across systems was the normalization of excessive work and meetings.

OUTCOME TWO- IDENTIFIED BARRIERS

1. **Funding/Financial Aid:** An inability to fully commit to student needs and instruction due to a lack of internal and external funding sources. Internally, programs must compete for funding under the participatory governance model and navigate delivering program outcomes with limited staff and supportive resources. Additionally, faculty and staff relayed how external factors such as a lack of housing and strained economic resources impact students’ abilities to commit to full-time education.

   "I think sometimes it becomes a battle of, do we need this counselor more than this faculty member... it just becomes very difficult ... to assess... where is the money needed. I see that [the] administration often is trying their hardest to fix things. What I don’t know is what happens when it reaches the president’s desk, and how they prioritize.” (Anonymous)

   "I’ve had a number of students who stated that they are, despite their young age, the head of their household, or the only one working, and so, I feel that ... really hampers on the time that they’re able to just be able to spend and focus on their learning.” (Anonymous)

2. **Access Points:** Faculty and classified staff expressed a need for a more accessible recruitment process and access points that connect students to the College.

   "Students, specifically first-generation students are unaware of how to navigate the college website to find services [there is] a hidden curriculum that we talked about a lot in academia where students [are] not necessarily aware of what they can potentially ask for, or what they may potentially need to be able to succeed." (Anonymous)

   "I really feel like we’re gonna need the superintendent to probably get involved because the curriculum issues the way the students are recruited, I mean everything, the essays they write.. a simple way to say it is everything needs to be overhauled. The whole thing." (Anonymous)

   Additionally, faculty and staff commented on the challenge of transportation.

   "[Cañada College] is very removed from Redwood City to even a certain extent it’s up on top of this big hill... and it’s a Hispanic serving institution that is settled in an area that is not specifically Hispanic. There are transportation issues just to get to Cañada. If you don’t have a car, it’s hard to get there." (Anonymous)

3. **Faculty Bias:** There was also an expressed need for faculty members initiating multiple racist or culturally biased actions on campus to participate in sustained training to increase their levels of cultural humility. Culturally humble teaching allows educators to understand that their cultural values are not more meaningful than those of their students or colleagues.

   "We have students in [_____] programs that feel marginalized, who are experiencing really just racist kinds of conversation and then the teachers because of their gaps, you know to put it nicely... they’re basically just cosigning on, you know, racist comments.” (Anonymous)

   "I had two bad experiences with two of the [_____] teachers? ...they were just so aggressive, when trying to explain something, it was like they were impatient, right? And when it came to someone else asking that question, they were super nice, you know, and everybody noticed that, everybody noticed that I got treated differently.” (Anonymous student)

“Workload issues...I know that’s a recurring theme at our college. It’s like, I know I’m going to end up working every weekend. And part of it is because you know how do you set that down? How do you just say, ‘Oh-equity antiracism, I did 2 hours, so I gotta put it down... it’s also just you know our jobs are huge, and then when you take on additional commitments oftentimes they’re under-resourced.” (Anonymous)

“We don’t have an Equity Director, we don’t have an equity department. We just have some already overworked people. Some of whom are being paid release time because faculty can get that, and the others of whom are classified and cannot get that. So there’s also that inequity thing there. But as far as committee work, we basically... we find time our own time to do committee work. So there’s the overtime part, but you can’t be paid for it...And so if I do work outside, it’s basically volunteer.” (Anonymous)

OUTCOME THREE-IDENTIFIED BRIDGES

1. Workplace Allyship: Several classified staff and faculty members spoke to seeking out individuals with more tenure or seniority within the College to help advocate on their behalf.

“I’ve had co-workers who are staff, and stuff happens to them. I’m always, you know trying to support them..., tell me what I need to do because as a tenured person, I have more protection. (Anonymous)

“Those of us that do have institutional memory, sometimes they [senior leaders/administrors] don’t want to hear it, and that kind of goes into the feeling of retaliation ... I’m so proud. how hard it was at times, to be the voice to bring things forward, just because that’s what we’re here for.” - Jeanne Stalker, Program Services Coordinator, Welcome Center

2. Student Inclusion and Equity: Several faculty and classified staff mentioned the importance of including all students regardless of their participation in leadership committees in DEI integration and programming efforts. Across interviews, employees identified counseling services as a bridging system that should be re-imagined to provide students with easier access to college programs and services.

“I work with one of our student leaders who is a Middle College student, and she’s great... I reached out and invited her to join me in some of the conversations, and she was really appreciative ... that would be something we could at least be doing to show that we’re actually paying attention and that we’re hearing what they’re saying.”
- David Reed, Dean of Academic Support and Learning Technology

“We were reaching out to our peer mentoring groups to our student ambassadors, and to our front desk folks in the Learning Center, and we created a collaborative training so that we could say hey, we’re all student employees we are all ambassadors for this college in our own separate ways but recognize this is how they actually connect.”
- Justin Taylor, Tutor Coordinator/Basic Skills Specialist

“I’ve been a part of some efforts to cohort students in learning communities. We had one that was very successful called ‘Crossing Borders’ that put an English class with my History of Race, Ethnicity, and Immigration in the U.S. class.” (Anonymous)

“Things are mandated by the state, so we have requirements for counseling, which I think are very well intended, and I am a big proponent of counseling, as a successful intervention for students as a helpful intervention for our students to be successful, but it’s a requirement for new students as part of matriculation so you can’t get in your classes until you’ve met with a counselor and have an educational plan, so it’s both this benefit and a barrier at the same time.” - Max Hartman, Dean of Counseling
STUDENT SERVICES

**Internal System Assessed:** Student Services (Registration, Counseling, Education Planning, and Financial Aid)

**OUTCOME ONE—NORMALIZED PRACTICE**

Staff, classified staff, faculty, administrators, and students from diverse racial and cultural identity backgrounds were interviewed and asked to identify the barriers, bridges, and systems that prevent or promote racial and culturally equitable changes from being operationalized within student services.

During interviews, several normalized practices were identified as standard practices that characterized the overall operating culture within student services. Common practices included the expectation of microaggressions or explicit bias occurring without clear consequence, deficit language use, particularly when referring to Black and Latino/a/x students, access barriers, resistance to change, work silos, and inequitable work expectations and compensation.

**OUTCOME TWO: IDENTIFIED BARRIERS**

1. **Anti-Racist/Bias Accountability:** The perceived failure of institutional systems to address and hold individuals accountable to biased incidents is seen as maintaining a hostile environment, sustaining a ‘culture of denial,’ and damaging to those impacted.

   “Frankly, I have zero faith in this institution becoming an anti-racist institution. Because we don’t do stuff like call [expletive] out when it needs to be called out...I’m exhausted feeling like ‘m...one of very few people who’s really considering what it could be like for this institution to be an anti-racist [institution], and I don’t feel like our board is thinking about that. We have one person of color on the six-person board; I think there’s two women.” (Anonymous)

   “Culture of denial...[In one meeting, a colleague] ‘spoke on the Zoom to say, “Why are we saying we’re moving towards an anti-racist institution, it makes us sound that we’re not already that.” What I wanted to do was be like, ‘So talk to me about how you practice equity?’” This pattern that I see with the anti-racism work. We are spending too much time ‘othering’ racism as if it’s not something that happens here.’(Anonymous)

2. **Deficit Thinking/Language:** A significant number of respondents discussed witnessing colleagues use ‘deficit language’ when talking about students, which they see as erecting a barrier to student success.

   I would say over time, prior to us having UMOJA, we would constantly talk...they would constantly talk about the low success and retention rates of Black students but without a solution...so that was very problematic.”

   -Professor Lezlee Ware, Political Science Department Chair, UMOJA Coordinator

   “I heard a faculty member say...you know, at Flex Day, they never ask students if they’re receiving financial aid because they don’t want to make them feel bad...that was just shocking to me because I was a financial aid recipient and I’ve worked my whole career removing that stigma.” (Anonymous)

   Sometimes, unfortunately, I’ll hear deficit language from some of my colleagues. ‘Students can’t’...or ‘Students won’t’...or ‘They don’t care.’ I guess it would fall under micro-aggressions.” (Anonymous)

   “I might hear some counselor say, ‘Well, this student is not cut out for...’ something, and so rather than say, ‘Oh, it’s because of their skill set,’ they might suggest it’s because of their ability. which is really damaging, and so then the student internalizes that, “Well, I’m not cut out for it.”” (Anonymous)

3. **Faculty Access:** Inability of students to access faculty office hours.

   “I’ve also seen faculty members get away...not being accessible, not holding office hours for students. Not having that support. And so then it becomes a very hostile environment...And again, this is something I talk to my colleagues about...students end up going to Skyline [College] or CSM [College of San Mateo] rather than take courses with some of our faculty here.”(Anonymous)

   “I definitely see barriers for students. You know, like being able to access office hours. I would say that’s number one. You know, like where do you get sort of the insider information?”-Gonzalo Arrizon-Retention Specialist\English Adjunct Instructor
4. Resistance to Change: Adherence to the status quo and resistance to change were named barriers to equity steeped in a lack of awareness of how individuals may unconsciously reproduce inequities in their roles.

“So the first thing that came to my mind [when asked to name barriers to equity] is people’s personal beliefs and an unawareness of how they manifest in their work. So, holding on to tradition and rules, we have a lot of people who are what we call ‘lifers’ at Cañada, they’ve been here for a long time... and, [they say] ‘Well we didn’t do it like that before’ and ‘that’s not how we do it.” (Anonymous)

“There’s a lot of historical knowledge that continues to be brought up at every single meeting, of like, “Oh well we did it this way” back when which is nice to a point. There’s a resistance to change because ‘we’ve always done it this way’ and it’s worked, but it doesn’t mean it has worked well...it doesn’t mean we can’t improve on what we’re doing.” Andrea Garcia-Rittgers-Interim Director of Financial Aid

5. Work Silos: A significant number of faculty and staff indicated that work silos impact communicating effectively and delivering services to students. Due to less access to opportunities to share information across departments and insufficient time to prepare and unpack new information, employees often duplicate work.

“We don’t do a lot of streamlining; there’s a lot of silos, and duplication of effort and things like that.” (Anonymous)

“Silos tend to happen, and it especially happens to the grant-funded programs that kind of fall outside the margins of Student Services.”-Nimsi Garcia-Program Services Coordinator

“We do operate in silos, you know. I think that’s the promise of Guided Pathways, is that we’re going to be forced to do a lot more collaboration.”-Gonzalo Arrizon- Retention Specialist\English Adjunct Instructor

6. Inefficient Staffing Impact Program Health: Classified staff, administrators, and faculty spoke of the challenge of running a program without a consistent senior leader who is not serving in an interim role. Operationalizing effective department and programmatic systems and practices prove difficult because of a lack of awareness or access to tools and resources from previous leaders and insufficient staffing.

“But we’re sitting here, with the entry point of Cañada College is outreach, the exit point of Cañada College is the Transfer Center, and both only have one employee. So the outreach program has one employee, one full-time employee, and the rest of her team are students. So she has to retrain them; it’s a retraining every single year, and then she’s like going out to different events and things like that. And it’s like she has been in a position where she has to send students to be alone at an event.” (Anonymous)

“Without a dean- it’s all most like running without a head. To talk about system... for example, one of the questions I had myself was... how come Cañada College does not have a Dean of Enrollment Services? For the past twenty years or so - they just never had one.” (Anonymous)
Internal System Assessed: Student Services (Registration, Counseling, Education Planning, and Financial Aid)

OUTCOME THREE: IDENTIFIED BRIDGES

1. Social Capital: Faculty, classified staff, and students identified the positive impact that a supportive supervisor and colleagues had on the quality of their work and on department culture. Several employees spoke to the significance of the strong presence of social capital as a primary reason for goals being met and employee retention. Several student ambassadors expressed a desire to help other students as a result of positive experiences with classified staff or administrators.

“The Retention Specialist group – I feel like that group is really tight. We share lots of information. So that really is the bridge, you know, for equity for students. To be able to say, ‘Hey, I’m holding this workshop’ or ‘I’m having you know this group of students kind of experiencing this difficulty or this barrier, what are some solutions?’”
-Gonzalo Arrizon, Retention Specialist\English Adjunct Instructor

“You know what’s worked, and here’s a good example of a bridge, it’s having a supervisor who recognizes the value of what I do, you know, and supports me.”-Gonzalo Arrizon, Retention Specialist\English Adjunct Instructor

“Cañada has in general... classified professionals... who really, strive for equity, social justice, [and] anti-racism across the departments and I think that is a huge bridge. I mean you don’t have to convince anyone.”
-Dr. Wissem Benanni, Dean of Enrollment Services

“I had an interview with (name omitted) like, you know, she helped me like realize a lot of things, just by allowing me to talk and asking me open-ended questions, and then you know because I’ve received all this support, I saw the position as a TRIO Ambassador come up and I was like, you know, I really want to give back and I think community is really important and it helps support students through school.”- Lesly Ta, TRIO Student Ambassador

“I think the biggest thing for me is as someone who needed the support because of like my anxiety and depression, having the accommodations is great, but having the person who like gives it [accommodations] to the professor and like shows them like, this is the accommodations that I need. I would really appreciate it.”
-(Anonymous student)

2. Speaker Series, Initiatives, and Programs: Although, the comments below reflect feedback from one employee the responses are reflective of the opinions of several classified staff and faculty members who desired a more rigorous speaker series schedule.

“I’ve seen wonderful initiatives, like a few years ago there was a Women in STEM group that was totally initiated by a group of young women who were experiencing microaggressions in the classroom from faculty. Where they felt invisible. You know, it’s like, they were calling on the men, and the women responded with, ‘We’re going to form a group, and we’re going to hold a panel of professional women, and we’re gonna try to build a bridge and build community.”-Gonzalo Arrizon- Retention Specialist\English Adjunct Instructor

“We also have a Peer Mentor Program which helps a lot, because students bring in other students [to the tutoring, STEM center]. It’s one thing for me to go out there and say, ‘Hey, you know, come,’ but if they hear it from their peers they’re more likely to come”.
-Gonzalo Arrizon- Retention Specialist\English Adjunct Instructor

“And especially with career exploration, you know we have a wonderful speaker series that we’re hoping to expand to the college... students get so much from hearing from an actual person, ‘Hey I also struggled [and I’m] an engineer, I’m a biologist, I’m a doctor, you know. That has been really, really great to have that as a resource.”
-Gonzalo Arrizon- Retention Specialist\English Adjunct Instructor

3. Program Models/Thought Partnerships: Classified Staff and Faculty identified thought partnerships as an important tool to identify best practices in program implementation and cultivate thought partnerships.

“I think with Promise, we were lucky in having like a model because we follow the CUNY [The City University of New York] model.”
-(Anonymous)

“So there’s a full-on team from New York who kind of has these technical assistant meetings. There’s directors at the different sister colleges who have weekly meetings to talk about [the] Promise [program] and best practices. So you never feel alone in the work because there’s different pockets of support for Promise.”
-(Anonymous)
**Internal System Assessed: Professional Development**

**OUTCOME ONE-NORMALIZED PRACTICE**

Approximately 3 classified staff, faculty, and administrators from diverse racial and cultural identity backgrounds and students were interviewed for this section of the internal scan. They were asked to identify the barriers, bridges, and systems that prevent or promote racial and cultural equity changes from being operationalized within the institutional systems of professional development.

**OUTCOME TWO: IDENTIFIED BARRIERS**

1. **Workload:** Inadequate staffing and funding. Employees expressed concerns over the impact that workload has on their capacity to efficiently complete work.

   "It has been difficult for some of our staff when they’ve been given additional job responsibilities on top of their already existing job."(Anonymous)

   "People get so busy that they don’t prioritize these meetings as much as they should. And then a lot of this stuff just gets pushed back. Which is true for any of the committees I’ve been on. If the people aren’t consistent you spend a lot of time catching people up, and then (there is) a lot... less forward movement."(Anonymous)

2. **Inadequate Staffing and Funding:** Employees expressed repeated concerns regarding the challenge of developing a robust professional development program without dedicated employee (s) to manage the system.

   "There was also talk recently of possibly having a faculty professional development coordinator and a staff professional development coordinator so the staff needs could be more appropriately met by that person. But then there’s the whole question where does the funding come from? Would it be an additional duty from one person’s already packed schedule which a lot of people don’t have time for or a completely new position?"(Anonymous)

3. **Administration Turnover:** Turnover of administrators was named as potentially acting as a barrier to maintaining a strong institutional vision, institutional memory, and an effective DEI strategy.

   "I think also maybe just another potential barrier that could exist campus-wide is when you have certain people who have so much knowledge and are in charge of so many things and then if that person leaves or something like that, a lot of historical knowledge, institutional knowledge, leaves with them. So that could potentially be a barrier."(Anonymous)

   "Who has got the big picture? There’s a lot of turnover at the top levels, and so there’s a lot of kind of new people coming in, and that erodes my confidence that somebody has the big picture."(Anonymous)

4. **Work Silos:** Silos were repeatedly named as delaying work or duplicating efforts across institutional systems.

   "So we have these silos, and we have not yet figured out how anti-racism and equity are merging exactly into a group, but meanwhile who’s working on it? Our actual equity committee, how are we working together? It’s kind of like the classic barrier that I think we see over and over again in multiple ways, and that’s just like these silos, under-resourced silos."(Anonymous)

5. **Mandatory Equity Training:** Multiple interviewees spoke to a need for more, consistent, and mandatory equity and anti-racism training, as well as improving equity-minded standards for teaching & learning.

   "There seems to be an emerging consensus that we need some kind of... package, like what makes you qualified when it comes to equity-minded practices in teaching and learning? What qualifies you to teach from that perspective? And outlining some kind of package, whether it’s required or not I don’t know, but some kind of package where you can say things will change and new things will come in, but essentially here are these four key areas, and if you have some basic training in all four areas, you’ve got a good foundation, you’re ready to start."(Anonymous)
6. Equitable Profession Development: Learning and professional development opportunities need to adapt to meet the time and schedule requirements of employees and students.

“I do think students can be sometimes better informed about some of the events...how do you help make resources ongoing or perpetually available to students who may not have the access to be able to [attend workshops] when things are happening? Because there’s a lot of great knowledge and sessions shared, but if you had to pick up your kid because otherwise daycare charges $100 bucks an hour, you’re going to pick up your kid and you’re not going to have the chance to attend the session on ‘Equity in America’. I think sometimes that gets lost.” (Anonymous)

OUTCOME THREE: IDENTIFIED BRIDGES

1. Approachable Leadership: Several internal stakeholders appreciated how approachable and accessible the current president is. Employees expressed a general appreciation for the accessibility of employees, specifically administrators across systems.

“I do think the majority of the employees are very approachable...for example, we have a new college President and I didn’t know her even though she worked at one of our sister colleges and I find her to be very approachable, I can ask her things if I have any concerns. I know the administrators, which would be the President and various VPs...all setup office hours...like a drop-in opportunity to present any of their questions or have any of their needs clarified or met.” (Anonymous)

2. Anti-Racist Efforts: Several internal stakeholders appreciated efforts made to develop a collective understanding of anti-racist terms. Additionally, employees desired to quickly operationalize collective anti-racist terms and anti-racist/bias comprehension.

“I think we have an increased awareness of racism and the importance of being proactively anti-racist, both as an institution and as individuals. And especially addressing anti-black racism, I feel like we have an increased awareness and I’m concerned, I don’t want it to become a missed opportunity or one that is not fully embraced and resourced.” (Anonymous)

“I do think that our district anti-racism council is a really wonderful potential bridge as well. Because, even just defining terms at the district levels, we can now take their definitions, in our groups or our work areas, we operationalize it, we can say, what does this mean for our group? And so I think that’s excellent.” (Anonymous)
PARTICIPATORY GOVERNANCE

OUTCOME ONE: NORMALIZED PRACTICE

APC interviewed 4 employees and student leaders regarding participatory governance. Several of the students interviewed expressed a general appreciation for inclusion in the College's decision-making process. In contrast, most employees interviewed did not share this viewpoint. Most employees identified slow decision-making and a lack of transparency as the normalized processes impacting the efficacy of participatory governance as a system.

OUTCOME TWO: IDENTIFIED BARRIERS

"We are so bogged down by all these other procedures that we have to adhere to because of the shared governance model that we don't get to really spend time to really focus on the why, but we rather focusing too much on the how." (Anonymous)

I think in terms of the discontent with the participatory governance... we've just been emergency planning, there are certainly very understandable griefs with like how we've been trying to plan, coming back for the spring right and that's the bulk of what the feedback I'm getting from [employees] .... It's frustrating that it's a little hard because it's not just the College with this planning... it's the district as a whole." (Anonymous)

"I think the whole process to even request personnel, is very cumbersome and it requires a lot of politics... it just takes too long to get things going and to build your team, because you have to go through these... through our different committees and groups." (Anonymous)

OUTCOME THREE: IDENTIFIED BRIDGES

Student Leaders

"I feel like the College represents the students well. I know that the current administration does. I do feel appreciated, I do feel like I am heard. And anything I say or anything student reps say but especially what the rest of the student body says, I know everything is heard ...they want to hear our final opinions and thoughts." -Xitlali Curincita, President of the Associated Students of Cañada College

"I have seen, like for example, the Board of Trustees were planning to take out the religious exempt right, of the Covid vaccination? There's this law right, and students actually came in the town hall meeting and they expressed how it shouldn't be taken out, and the administration heard that, and responded to it great... they were fighting for what the students wanted.

-Xitlali Curincita, President of the Associated Students of Cañada College

COMMUNICATION AND ADMINISTRATION

APC interviewed 3 employees and student leaders regarding participatory governance, communication, and the efficacy of administrative systems. Respondents provided limited feedback on the effectiveness of normative systems, barriers, and bridges associated with these systems directly. Therefore, we could not collect enough data to outline three outcomes. The comments listed below reflect general frustrations with identified barriers and satisfaction with identified bridges.

"Zoom helped because it's allowed some people to zoom in to meetings, but never would have been able to attend in the past. However, it is also a barrier because we're not interacting. I don't normally use the wrong word, but it doesn't have the free exchange that meeting in person does in large groups" - Roz Young, Chemistry Lab Technician & Classified Senate President

'[There's] poor [direction] from the district level, at some point, if we're going to have people back [the administration] has to say, 'you have to be back.' Yeah, it sounds awful. But at some point you've got to put that hard data out there and be like, this is the date." - Roz Young, Chemistry Lab Technician & Classified Senate President

"The general system across the board for making appointments, it's a bit hard sometimes to navigate it. That's a question that a lot of students come to me for as a student ambassador. When I'm doing hours, they get confused on how to make appointments with a certain counselor." (Anonymous student)
APPENDIX A

This glossary provides definitions for terms appearing throughout the Internal Equity Report. Descriptions were pulled directly from sources hyperlinked next to the relating term. The explanations provided are not meant to be absolute. Culturally competent definitions are not fixed terms and should continually evolve to ensure that people and practices are identified with respect and compassion.

GLOSSARY

Affinity Groups: A group of people who choose to meet to explore a shared identity such as race, gender, age, religion, and sexual orientation. These groups can be further broken down into smaller groups within the two major affinities (e.g., African American men/women, bi/multi-racial, etc.) [Utah Division of Multicultural Affairs]

Bias Interactions: Implicit or explicit bias incidents occurring between individuals or groups. "Social psychology scholars have conceptualized bias as either implicit or explicit. Explicit bias refers to the prejudice beliefs or attitudes one has towards a person or group on a conscious level. Implicit attitudes are feeling and thoughts that one deliberately believes and can consciously document. Implicit biases are prejudices, beliefs, or attitudes towards a person or group that are not within the margins of awareness, and are thus, unconscious. Implicit bias can be difficult to acknowledge and control because it exists beyond one's conscious thoughts or feelings. Implicit bias can undermine our explicit intentions or openly-held beliefs. (Advance Geo Partnership)

Black in America: The term 'African-American' is typically used to describe ethnicity while 'Black' often describes race. For example, Black people who live in America but are from other parts of the world other than Africa may not identify as African-American. However, those factions of people may still consider 'Black' to be their identity. Several Canada College stakeholders spoke to the experience of being Black in America and self-identified as either African-American, Black American, Afro-Latino(a)l(x), or multi-cultural. The phrase Black in America is an attempt at honoring the self-expressed identities of the aforementioned groups. (Black vs. African-American)

Cultural Competency: The ability to understand, appreciate and interact with people from cultures or belief systems different from one's own. (American Psychological Association)

Cultural Group: A cultural group is defined simply as a collection of individuals who share a core set of beliefs, patterns of behavior, and values. These groups may be large or small, but they are identified by their ways of thinking and behaving. All cultural groups are marked by intragroup variation. Many factors of diversity impact culture, including but not limited to: ethnicity, country of origin, language, gender, race, physical appearance, age, religion, sexual identity, disability, education, and social class or status. (Georgetown University Center of Child and human development)

Deficit Language: Language that communicates an implicit or explicit bias against historically marginalized groups. Deficit language creates negative narratives about students from underrepresented minority groups in the education sector. Student assets, like background knowledge, experiences, and culture, that can inform school culture are not a priority. (National Center for Institutional Diversity)

Dominant Group: The classic sociological definition of a dominant group is a group with power, privileges, and social status. Another related definition is a social group that controls the value system and rewards in a particular society. (The Inclusion Solution)

Dreamers: In the last few years the term “DREAMer” has been used to describe young undocumented immigrants who were brought to the United States as children, who have lived and gone to school here, and who in many cases identify as American. The term DREAMer originally took its name from the bill in Congress, but it has a double meaning about the undocumented youth who have big hopes and dreams for a better future. (Anti-Defamation League)

Empathic Connections: In its simplest form, empathy is the ability to recognize emotions in others, and to understand other people's perspectives on a situation. At its most developed, empathy enables you to use that insight to improve someone else's mood and to support them through challenging situations. (Mind Tools: Empathy at Work)

Historically Marginalized Groups: Individuals, groups, and communities that have historically and systematically been denied access to services, resources, and power relationships across economic, political, and cultural dimensions as a result of systemic, durable, and persistent racism, discrimination, and other forms of oppression. Historically marginalized populations are often identified based on their race, ethnicity, social-economic status, geography, religion, language, sexual identity, and disability status. (North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services)
Latinx refers to a person with origins in Latin America. The recent term was intended to be gender-inclusive, replacing the Spanish words Latino or Latina. Latinx is used only in English and mostly by non-Latinx people. According to the Pew Research Center, only 23% of those identifying as Latina, Latino, or Hispanic have heard of the term and only 3% actually use it to describe themselves. (Diverse Issues in Higher Education)

LGBTQIA+: Acronym encompassing the diverse groups of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, transsexual, queer, intersex, and asexual populations and allies/alliances/associations. (Utah Division of Multicultural Affairs)

Microaggressions: Microaggressions are defined as verbal, behavioral, and environmental indignities that communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative racial slights and insults to the target person or group. (Harvard Business Review)

Pansexual: Pansexual describes someone who has the potential for emotional, romantic, or sexual attraction to people of any gender though not necessarily simultaneously, in the same way, or to the same degree. Sometimes used interchangeably with bisexual. (Human Rights Campaign)

Restorative Justice: An emerging global social movement with many traditions and approaches embraces community empowerment, participation, and accountability to address harm and strengthen relationships. (School of Leadership and Educational Sciences)

Restorative Practice: Restorative practices is an emerging social science that studies how to strengthen relationships between individuals as well as social connections within communities. Though new to the social sciences, restorative practices have deep roots within indigenous communities throughout the world. (iiRP Graduate School)

Social Capital: Individuals who network together to share norms, values, and understandings that facilitate cooperation within or among groups. (Investopedia)
Cañada College Cultural Audit Assessment

"Diversity asks, "Who’s in the room?'' Equity responds: "Who is trying to get in the room but can’t? Whose presence in the room is under constant threat of erasure?'' Inclusion asks, "Has everyone’s ideas been heard?'' Justice responds, "Whose ideas won’t be taken as seriously because they aren’t in the majority?'' - Dafina Lazarus-Steward, Professor of Higher Education and Student Affairs at Bowling Green State University.

This assessment is modified from survey questions pulled from the Bloomsburg University Campus Climate Survey and a survey created by the Minority Inclusion Project with modifications made by Åse Power Consult. Select the answers below that best describe your college climate to date.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey which should take about 8 minutes to complete. It is administered on an SMCCCD server and is completely anonymous. Your responses will help to identify how Cañada College can continue working towards achieving equity and justice for students, faculty, and staff. To obtain this document in an alternative format that accommodates your specific needs please contact skeegan@asepowerconsult.com.

Definitions
Race: "Sociology uses and critiques the concepts of race and ethnicity, connecting them to the idea of majority and minority groups and social structures of inequality, power, and stratification. "Race'' refers to physical differences that groups and cultures consider socially significant, while "ethnicity'' refers to shared cultures, such as language, ancestry, practices, and beliefs. '' - American Sociological Association

Systemic Barriers: "Organizational or systemic barriers are policies, procedures, or practices that unfairly discriminate and can prevent individuals from participating fully in a situation. Organizational or systemic barriers are often put into place unintentionally.``. - Council of Ontario Universities

Q1 What is your age range?
☐ 18-24 (1)
☐ 25-40 (2)
☐ 41-56 (3)
☐ 57-66 (4)
☐ 66-75 (5)
☐ 76-93 (6)
☐ Prefer Not to Say (7)

Q2 What is your classification at Cañada College? (Check all that apply.)
☐ Administrator (1)
☐ Faculty (Full-Time) (2)
☐ Faculty (Part-Time) (3)
☐ Classified Staff (Full-Time) (4)
☐ Classified Staff (Part-Time) (5)

Q3 Gender. How do you identify?
________________________________________________________________

Q4 What is your sexual orientation?
________________________________________________________________

Q5 How would you describe yourself? (See definitions for race and ethnicity)
☐ American Indian/First Nation American Alaskan Native
☐ Asian/Asian American/Southeast Asian/ South Asian Native
☐ Black/African American
☐ Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
☐ Hispanic /Latino/a/x
☐ Middle Eastern North African
☐ Multi-Racial and Biracial Identities
☐ White/European Ancestry/Non-Hispanic
☐ Prefer not to say

Q6 If your race and/or ethnicity was not listed above please list here. You may also list your tribal affiliation here if it applies.
________________________________________________________________

APPENDIX B
Q7 I am aware of the Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC) and the College’s Antiracism Task Force’s approved goals.
☐ Yes (1)
☐ Not sure where to access (2)
☐ No (3)
☐ Prefer not to say (4)

Q8 Have you ever experienced bias at Cañada College?
☐ No (1)
☐ Maybe (2)
☐ Yes (3)

Skip To: Q2 If you have ever experienced bias at Cañada College? = No

Q9 Please indicate the type of bias you experienced (check all that apply)
☐ Racial Bias Ethnic Bias (1)
☐ Homophobic Bias (2)
☐ Transphobia Bias (3)
☐ Age Bias (4)
☐ Gender Bias (5)
☐ Weight/Body Bias (6)
☐ Socioeconomic Bias (7)
☐ Physical or Mental Ability Bias Position Bias (Full-time/Part-Time) (8)
☐ List bias not on the list you may have experienced here: _________________________________
☐ Prefer not to say (10)

Q10 If you have experienced bias at Cañada, please explain.
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________

Q11 Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement: Cañada College has procedures/policies that offer protection and/or mediations for staff/faculty experiencing racial and/or cultural bias at the College.
☐ Strongly disagree (1)
☐ Somewhat disagree (2)
☐ Neither agree nor disagree (3)
☐ Somewhat agree (4)
☐ Strongly agree (5)

Q12 Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement: As a Cañada College employee, I am reluctant to bring up concerns for fear that it will affect my performance evaluation or produce a separate negative repercussion.
☐ Strongly disagree (1)
☐ Somewhat disagree (2)
☐ Neither agree nor disagree (3)
☐ Somewhat agree (4)
☐ Strongly agree (5)

Q13 Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement: As a Cañada College employee, I have to work harder (i.e., longer hours or my work is more closely evaluated) in order to be perceived as legitimate.
☐ Strongly disagree (1)
☐ Somewhat disagree (2)
☐ Neither agree nor disagree (3)
☐ Somewhat agree (4)
☐ Strongly agree (5)

Q14 Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement: Cañada College administrators and employees are taking the necessary actions to foster a campus community that is antiracist.
☐ Strongly disagree (1)
☐ Somewhat disagree (2)
☐ Neither agree nor disagree (3)
☐ Somewhat agree (4)
☐ Strongly agree (5)

Q15 Do you perceive systemic barriers within the college or within your department? (see definition of systemic barriers)
☐ Yes (1)
☐ Maybe (2)
☐ No (3)

Q16 If you answered yes or maybe to the above question, please provide an example of an exclusionary policy, practice, or procedure that directly impacted you, a colleague, or a student.
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
Q17 How would you rate the accessibility on campus of course instruction and materials for people with physical disabilities?
- Excellent (1)
- Good (2)
- Average (3)
- Poor (4)
- Terrible (5)
- I do not have enough information/not sure (6)

Q18 How would you rate the accessibility on campus of course instruction and materials for people with psychological disabilities?
- Excellent (1)
- Good (2)
- Average (3)
- Poor (4)
- Terrible (5)

Q19 How would you rate the accessibility on campus of course instruction and materials for people with medical disabilities?
- Excellent (1)
- Good (2)
- Average (3)
- Poor (4)
- Terrible (5)

Q20 How would you rate the use of inclusive written and verbal language on campus?
- Excellent (1)
- Good (2)
- Average (3)
- Poor (4)
- Terrible (5)

Q21 Does Cañada College utilize a culturally competent process for resolving conflicts that emerge around race, culture, ethnicity, gender/gender identity, access, and inclusion-related issues?
- Yes (1)
- No (2)
- Not sure (3)
- I understand this is in-progress (4)

Q22 Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement: There is a transparent system for explaining to staff and faculty the process for recruiting & retaining new employees who represent the diverse identities represented on campus.
- Strongly disagree (1)
- Somewhat disagree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Strongly agree (5)

Q23 What is your preferred method of communication for Cañada College Leadership to use when communicating updates and/or changes to faculty and staff?
- Email Blast (1)
- Newsletter or Inter-office memo (frequency to be determined) (2)
- Website (3)
- Staff Meeting (4)

Q24 If your desired communication option was not listed above, please provide an example here.
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

Q25 Do you understand how the employee recruitment process functions at Cañada College?
- Yes (1)
- No (2)
- Not sure (3)
Q26 Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement: Cañada College leverages non-traditional methods of recruitment of minority groups (going to community events, supporting local BIPOC or LGBTQIA+ services or events on campus, Fairs or Free School Events, etc) including the utilization of employees and community partners to identify and recruit potential candidates.

☐ Strongly disagree (1)
☐ Somewhat disagree (2)
☐ Neither agree nor disagree (3)
☐ Somewhat agree (4)
☐ Strongly agree (5)

Q27 Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement: New faculty and staff receive onboarding materials that provide an overview of data related to equity, diversity, and inclusion, as well as goals, expectations, and commitments to antiracism within the College.

☐ Strongly disagree (1)
☐ Somewhat disagree (2)
☐ Neither agree nor disagree (3)
☐ Somewhat agree (4)
☐ Strongly agree (5)

Q28 Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement: Cañada College regularly measures classified staff and academic faculty satisfaction of college governance practices and general fairness.

☐ Strongly disagree (1)
☐ Somewhat disagree (2)
☐ Neither agree nor disagree (3)
☐ Somewhat agree (4)
☐ Strongly agree (5)

Q29 Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement: Cañada College schedules exit surveys and/or interviews with exiting staff and faculty.

☐ Strongly disagree (1)
☐ Somewhat disagree (2)
☐ Neither agree nor disagree (3)
☐ Somewhat agree (4)
☐ Strongly agree (5)

Q30 Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement: Cañada College schedules exit surveys and/or interviews with exiting students.

☐ Strongly disagree (1)
☐ Somewhat disagree (2)
☐ Neither agree nor disagree (3)
☐ Somewhat agree (4)
☐ Strongly agree (5)

Q31 Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement: Cañada College is capable of integrating institutional change/improvements in order to produce a college climate that is strong in its commitment and actions towards becoming an anti-racist college.

☐ Strongly disagree (1)
☐ Somewhat disagree (2)
☐ Neither agree nor disagree (3)
☐ Somewhat agree (4)
☐ Strongly agree (5)

Q32 If you agree with the above statement, how long do you think it will take?

☐ 1-2 years (1)
☐ 2-4 years (2)
☐ 4+ years (3)
☐ I’m not sure (4)
☐ Prefer not to say (5)
APPENDIX C

RESOURCES

Promise 54 DEI Case Studies
https://casestudies.promise54.org/

SPECTRA UNIVERSITY FACULTY AND STAFF: CASE STUDY

STUDENT NEED CASE STUDY
https://www.learningforjustice.org/magazine/fall-2014/excerpt-case-studies-on-diversity-social-justice-education

LGBTQIA+ CASE STUDY
https://diversity.oregonstate.edu/cases/lgbtn-resource-center-team-%E2%80%93-attending-world-perspectives-gender-identity

MONTANA UNIVERSITY STRATEGIC PLAN
Model of University DEI Strategic Plan
https://www.montana.edu/diversity/data/index.html

MCDANIEL COLLEGE STRATEGIC PLAN
https://www.mcdaniel.edu/about-us/diversity-equity-inclusion

UC SAN DIEGO WHITE ALLIES
https://diversity.ucsd.edu/initiatives/white-accountability-group/index.html#Additional-Tools-and-Resources:

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY MARYLAND BIAS REPORTING
https://www.loyola.edu/department/report-bias/process

RACIAL AFFINITY GROUP GUIDE FOR FACILITATORS
https://www.greatschoolspartnership.org/resources/educational-equity/racial-affinity-groups-guide-for-facilitators/