November 2020
Executive Board Comments, Concerns and Recommendations: EODAC Racial Equity at BC v.9

<u>General Comments</u>
- Comment: We have so many programs to help students. We need to make programs available to all students who need help to be successful. As an educator, our goal should be to encourage, instruct, and provide the necessary information for all students regardless of race to be successful in our classes.
- Comment: BC and California Community Colleges are among the most tolerant, welcoming environments in California and throughout the world for all individuals regardless of gender, race, ethnicity, age, language, religion, abilities/disabilities, sexual orientation, gender identity and socioeconomic status. Every classroom, lab, library and facility is open to all students on an equal basis. Far from discriminating against underrepresented minorities in admissions, BC has sought tirelessly to devise and implement programs to overcome all equity gaps created by external causes. Any document based on the premise BC is rife with systemic issues of bias, racism and discrimination with regard to student access, momentum, and completion, as well as in the recruitment/hiring process of the faculty is truly unjust. It does BC, our students and our community absolute no goodwill to teach them to see bias, discrimination and racism where there is none. Follow your mission statement: Bakersfield College **provides opportunities for students from diverse economic, cultural, and educational backgrounds** to attain Associate and Baccalaureate degrees and certificates, workplace skills, and preparation for transfer. **Our rigorous and supportive learning environment promotes equity** and fosters students' abilities to think critically, communicate effectively, and demonstrate competencies and skills in order to engage productively in their communities and the world.

<u>Purpose, Goal, Audience and Document Title</u>
- Concern: Where does this document go, who reads it and what impact is it hoping to accomplish.
- Concern: Who is the audience? Why is EODAC focusing on Racial Equity? The Chancellor's Office asked colleges to review Equity and uses 'race and ethnicity' instead.
- Concern: If this is a document meant for general public consumption, the phrasing should be easily understood without the need for follow up questions. It should be concise, inclusive, and use positive language
- Concern: The intent and the audience of the document needs further clarification. Bakersfield College is a public funded and facing institution, the work we do is public facing. However, in a document being written as a response to certain people groups in our community out of a response to recent national events, is the audience intended to be to our community at large or to academia, business partners, and other educational stakeholders? Bulleted comments below are based upon the premise that the document and commitment is more of a personal nature to certain people groups within the community rather than an institutional framework to guide our work.
  - Is not written in at-large community friendly language

- o Uses and emphasizes divisive and combative language
- o Is exclusive instead of inclusive in terms of diversity
- o Terminology used is not clear or defined or agreed upon
- o Exclusive of other ethnicities and races besides Black & Latino/a/x (Middle Easter, Native American, etc.)
- o Commitment #1 refers to an Equity Plan that isn't identifiable. May be references the compliance-based **Student** Equity Plan
- Concern: The content of the document exceed the document's title of "Equitable Access & Completion". How do Commitments #2, #3,and #4 create "equitable access"?   Also, do Commitments #2, #3 and #4 create "equitable completion"? If such commitments do create "equitable completion" data for support needs to be provided.
- Concern: The opening paragraph states, "this document serves as a renewal of that commitment". This document does not describe a recommitment. It describes an expansion of scope and a new focus.
- Concern: The 2nd paragraph states, "to create spaces for shared listening, learning and engagement". How? This wasn't discussed in any of the commitments.

No Definition of Equity
- Concern: What is 'equity' for purposes of this document?
- Concern: There is no definition of equity, which opens the door to a wide variety of justifiable interpretations that could be rationalized with this vague document. Is equity any difference in student success outcomes? Such definitions based on relative positions create an unsolvable crisis that cannot be remedied until we have arrived at an impossible perfect parity. And is there need for equity when any group performs lower than any other group, or just when lower than the average, or lower than the highest performing group? Or is the goal not perfect parity but parity within a certain margin? If so, what is that margin? And haven't Latino/Hispanic students already achieved that (Hispanic success rates are nearly the same as the campus average)? And is equity inherently racial? Does equity entail treating students and potential applicants differently based on their race? Or is equity simply proving all students equal access to succeed? The tone of this document is to provide unequal treatment but most of the examples articulated are not race-specific so it's a little confusing. Ultimately this leaves the question; "what is the goal?" How do we know when equity is completed, or is it never complete?
- Recommendation: Define equity and include specific measurable goals we hope to achieve by equity initiatives.

Use of vague language with the potential for implied definitional other meanings
- Concern: Racial equity is undefined but BC has is drawing from USC (on opening Day a BC administrator explained that BC's notion of equity is inspired by USC's Estela Mara Bensimon; the proposed Racial Equity Commitment document also pledges to send 60 employees to USC's equity training workshops). The notion of racial equity as presented by USC and Bensimon in particular is quite radical and to use their language and affix BC to their institution is to imply we share those same values. For example:
  - o Bensimon defines equity in terms that reject self-responsibility (she disparages research that emphasizes how cultural differences produce different results) and

instead she emphasizes factors that are external to students as the primary variables that determine outcome. Considerable scholarship from economists like Walter Williams (George Mason), Glenn Loury (Brown), Thomas Sowell (Stanford), and many others have refuted this misguided analysis. Is BC adopting the USC conception of racial equity that assumes individual actions are less significant in determining outcomes than structural processes? Such an approach seems dedicated to treating symptoms instead of causes. Symptom management certainly has a place in medicine but the central focus should be on fixing the core problem—working with students to enable them (more so than accusing the system of error). BC historically follows the student-centered model but invoking USC language seems to suggest a change in that direction.

- o Bensimon also defines equity as an opposite to equality and insists on abandoning race-neutral policies. Is that the intent of BC's notion of racial equity? Again that would be a change from BC policies that generally serve needy students regardless of race.
- o Finally, Bensimon defines equity as two part: (a) "racial parity," and (b) "the omnipresence of whiteness" and a "distribution of power" that favors whiteness. Is that what BC means by racial equity? Bensimon says the system must not be merely reformed but torn down and points to 1960s activists (eg. Black Panthers) as her model. It is the ideological framework for the USC model and this document invokes USC language and mentorship.

- Recommendation: Either stop using the term "racial equity" or remove all references to USC that would imply BC shares their definition of the concept. Spell out a definition that clearly distances BC from the radical ideology taught at USC. State that equity is not about criticizing "the system" for "omnipresence of whiteness" nor exempting students of color from longstanding standards. State that we embrace longstanding metrics of success from Western civilization and strive to help all our students achieve those standards.
- Recommendation: Outwardly state that BC shares those misguided notions taught at USC (ie., the system is white dominated and racist and must be destroyed).

<u>Narrow focus on "racial" equity (Title and entire document)</u>
- Concern: In the title it says Racial equity, but under diversity it mentions, religion, gender, disability and sexuality.   Yet, these are not mentioned anywhere else in the document. Where is the commitment to those areas?
- Recommendation: These should be addressed or left out of the document because these areas are not covered under any of the commitments.
- Concern: Document is focused on "racial" equity and not equity in general. The emphasis on a particular type of equity ("racial") without any broad equity statement already in place creates confusion that this narrow focus is the only type of equity with which BC is concerned—and perhaps that is even the intent for some of the contributors. Certainly, it can be read that way and for that reason requires clarification. There seems to be a disconnect between the stated mission value of diversity which is quoted in this document and defines diversity as "multiple perspectives" and the Racial Equity

Commitment document's emphasis on race (which is not always a reliable indicator of multiple perspectives. Furthermore, the state chancellor call to action is never mentioned "racial equity" and the vision for success consistently used the language "diversity, equity and inclusion"—not racial equity. The BC brand of equity seems overly fixated on race by contrast to the state initiative. This is deeply troublesome become there appears to have been no effort at a multivariable analysis to distill just what factors drive inequality at BC. In assuming inequity is racially driven this document overlooks other likely causes of inequality, such as economics (household income), first generation students, low high school performance/preparation, enrollment in DSPS, etc. Indeed, geographic data such as zip codes or zoning might prove a more useful predictor of success, inequality and need. Did EODAC run any multivariable analysis of other likely causes to identify the variable with the highest correlation to low success? If so, can they provide that data to show race is indeed the single most important predictor? If not, why is it taking priority over a broader inclusive equity?

- Recommendation: Strike narrow focus on race throughout document and broaden this document to be an umbrella document for "diversity, equity and inclusion."
- Recommendation: Include a paragraph that articulates a broad commitment to all forms of equity and makes clear that "racial" equity is just one of the many aspects of equity to which the college is committed. Perhaps something like what appeared in the compromise document rejected by EODAC: "Bakersfield College provides opportunities for students from diverse economic, cultural, and educational backgrounds to attain Associate and Baccalaureate degrees and certificates, workplace skills, and preparation for transfer. Our rigorous and supportive learning environment promotes equity and fosters all students' abilities to think critically, communicate effectively, and demonstrate competencies and skills in order to engage productively in their communities and the world."

Problematic Charts:
- Concern: Data charts do not truly represent mission of college, 'to attain Associate and Baccalaureate degrees and certificates, workplace skills, and preparation for transfer." Since numerous individuals has expressed "equity" is about "outcome" the data used should align with the institutions mission, not two subjects of the institutions.
- Recommendation: Replace data on success rates of English and Math for only Hispanic/Black students with data on Degree & Completion for all ethnic/racial groups over a 3 to 5 year period with establish goals clearly identified.
- Concern: It is hard to make a comparison if we have nothing to compare it to. Where are the completion levels for white, Asian and other groups. How do we know those are higher and not significantly lower that those of Hispanic or African-American/Black students
- Concern: The Transfer-Level charts show improvement across time for both Latin and African American students but lacks context to help readers visualize any reasonable goal. Have these groups achieved the goal? What is the goal? Statistically speaking, when do we know that our equity program worked (or did not work)? That said, it may be a mistake to produce a goal based on outcomes of other groups. Considerable research has found that different groups produce different outcomes for a variety of reasons that

cannot be fully controlled and that such efforts produce diminishing returns even as they increasingly strip away freedom of choice; such attempts at top-down management become counterproductive. So how are we defining equity? What is the purpose of these charts? As they currently read, they seem to show significant improvement and that perhaps we do not need to make additional commitments, and I'm sure that is not the intent.

- Concern: There is a focus on two specific race/ethnicities. Why? The data displayed should explain this. Why are these the only two metrics (transfer level math and English completion) shared?
- Recommendation: Include data on all racial groups over time (i.e. last 3 to 5 years) with target goal clearly indicated on chart.

Undefined Accountability (Accountability section on second page)
- Concern: in what ways will EODAC be monitoring the elements in this document? In "addressing racism in all aspects of college and student life" are we granting EODAC oversight of other committees from student conduct to curriculum? Will EODAC become the authority on approved speech, defining what is a microaggression and what is approved speech? The nebulous nature of this passage is open to wide interpretation.
- Concern: The commitments in the document involve groups and areas outside of EODAC. Does this now create a new hierarchy or reporting system for the groups/areas mentioned in the document? How will monitoring be done?
- Recommendation: state narrow clear focus and clear goal(s)

Board Policy and Education Code Issues
- Concern: Does this commitment establish a form of reverse racism/discrimination by not recognizing and emphasizing services to all students of need where completion rates need to be increased? Policy states: "The District is committed to providing an **academic** and work **environment that respects the dignity of individuals and groups.** The District shall be free of sexual harassment and all forms of sexual intimidation and exploitation. **It shall also be free of other unlawful discrimination, including that which is based on any of the following statuses: national origin, religion, age, sex (gender), race, color, medical condition, ancestry, sexual orientation, marital status, physical or mental disability, or because he or she is perceived to have one or more of the foregoing characteristics."**

Commitment #1 – Unclear on "BC 2019-22 Equity Plan" (opening words)
- Concern: What is this referring to? The Student Equity Plan of do we also have an Equity Plan now? Which voices were involved in the creation of this document?
- Concern: Opening paragraph states: "BC administrators, faculty and staff will intensify our resolve to achieve racial equity in outcomes…" When did this agreement occur? What team(s)? Who decides those outcomes? What are the outcome, clearly state in document?

Commitment #1 - Unclear justification for selective inclusion of groups
- Concern: Title should read, "Racial-Ethnic Equity" not just "Equity"

- Concern: Commitment 1 examines just at two races, but does not cover differing socio-economic backgrounds. If we are trying to "dismantle barriers" why was differing socio economic data not included?
- Recommendation: incorporate data that covers both race/socio-economics regarding success as well as expanding data to be more inclusive of racial groups.

- Concern: Advance completion rates among African America and Latino/a/x/o should be rephrased to 'Historically marginalized groups' or use the Chancellor's verbiage. Why focus on these two race/ethnicities?

- Concern: success rates among African American students (55% in Fall 2019) are well below the campus average (68%) and so if equity is to be defined in racial categories the need to focus on African Americans seems obvious. But what is the justification for including Hispanic/Latino students (67%) who are statistically comparable the campus average. And Native Americans score only slightly better (68%) but are omitted from this charge. Pacific Islanders are the lowest achieving (47%) but are also omitted. The omission of Pacific Islanders and Native Americans is presumably due to the low number of enrolled students. Is that a justifiable reason? Would that not make them an easier group to support and improve? What is the justification for selectively including one group who is effectively equal to the campus average while excluding another who is well below it?
- Recommendation: Include some explanation about why some groups are omitted and others are included in this commitment. Outline what metrics for comparison we are using to determine who is included and who is not.
- Recommendation: eliminate inclusion of groups achieving at rates close to the campus norm (0.8% or higher?)
- Recommendation: include Native American and Pacific Islanders.
- Recommendation: Stop using the flawed metric of race and instead look at other factors such as income, first generation student, or other factors that better predict need.

Commitment #1 - Use of "Latinx" term
- Concern: Latino/a/x is the typical order
- Concern: Latinx is not a term embraced by the Latin/Hispanic community but rather an imposed term by outsiders that is widely rejected by Latin/Hispanic people. A recent Pew Survey found that 97% of Latin/Hispanic individuals prefer terms other than Latinx. Columbia linguist John McWhorter has also anticipated the term's likely failure because it is so disconnected from the people themselves and imposed from outside. The ethnic insensitivity in imposing of a foreign term upon a historically marginalized group by those who think they know better is the quintessential act of colonialism that we should be eschewing, not embracing. Adoption of this term against the preference of those it attempts to describe constitutes the very systemic racism this document claims to oppose. Additionally, Latinx invokes gender issues that are beyond the scope of an distract from the function of this document.
- Recommendation: Replace all references to Latinx with Latino/a or Latin or Hispanic or Latin/Hispanic—see Pew Survey for preferred terms.

<u>Assumptions without evidence (end of page 1 and in Commitment #1)</u>

- Concern: Evidence based reasoning should be our goal and this document does not represent that standard. What evidence is there that BC is has a problem with "racism"? Indeed, the most recent District Climate (polled last year) survey shows that employee respondents feel the working environment is comparably in welcoming differences in race (75%.5), age (79.9%), citizenship (76.1%), education level (73.4%), sexual orientation (76.7%). Interestingly, it does show that two other types of difference are far less tolerated at BC: "Political Beliefs" (55.6%) and "Religious/Spiritual Beliefs" (64.0%). That survey would suggest that if we have an intolerance problem it is not along racial lines but along political and religious divides, and this document seems to contribute to exactly that sort of intolerant climate with unfounded accusations of racism that can be found verbatim in the national political platform of one of the two major political parties. Elsewhere the climate survey found that since 2016 the employee perception of "Welcoming/supportive of differences of expression of different ideas, opinions, & beliefs" has dropped from 74% to 57.2%. This document seems less data driven and more partisan driven, and that practice will intensify problems rather than resolve them.
- Concern: What evidence is there of "institutional barriers"? If race-specific institutional barriers exist they should be clearly identified so that we may jointly work to remove them, but no such barriers are identified. Using vague undefined language seems like it simply opens the door to others to define the terms and use this document as a justification for (potentially inappropriate) personal interpretations.
- Concern: What evidence is there of "financial barriers"? The campus already devotes considerable funds and supports for low income students, former foster care students, first generation students, undocumented students, students of color, etc. What financial (or institutional) barriers continue to exist for students of color that do not exist for low income white, Asian, or Native American students?
- Concern: What evidence is there of "digital divides" specific to race? Economic class is probably far more indicative of digital access, and that would be a more appropriate focus than race. Should BC not support all students who have access issues? What evidence is there that digital divides are racial issues and not economic issues?

<u>Commitment #1 Lack of Specific Examples</u>

- Recommendation: Include race-specific examples like Umojoa if this is to remain a race-specific document; or provide equity examples that are not race-specific (like Chromebook/Electronic Equipment Advance Applications) if this is to be a broader equity document.

<u>Commitment #1 Support of vague notion of "dismantling"</u>

- Concern: What are these policies and practices to be dismantled? What mechanism of dismantling is to be employed? Such incendiary language opens the door to a broad interpretation that could be inclusive of all forms of behavior we do not condone.
- Recommendation: identify specific policy/practice issues and employ less incendiary language.

Commitment #1 Other Concerns
- Is there a more unifying way to phrase "dismantling institutional barriers"?
- Define "students of color"
- Barriers should be identified and defined first so they may be addressed and removed
- Define the term "digital divide"

Commitment #2 Lack support of vague notions of "systemic issues" and "disrupt policies and practices"
- Concern: "addressing systemic issues" assumes systemic issues exist without giving data or explaining what they are and how to resolve them
- Concerns: What are these policies and practices to be disrupted? What mechanism of disruption is to be employed? Is this invoking the USC model that prizes 1960s disruption? Such incendiary language opens the door to a broad interpretation that could be inclusive of all forms of behavior we may not condone. The word disrupt makes it sound as if we would be tolerant of violent protests. Remove the words "disrupt and".   I believe, even after asking and hearing responses during E-Board, that the term disrupt is not defined.
- Recommendation: identify specific policy/practice issues and employ less incendiary language
- Recommendation: Use less noncombative word such as "disrupt"?
- Recommendation: A clear definition is needed to understand the intent of Commitment #2 and thereby, the entire document

Commitment #2 Concern of encroachment on freedom of thought
- The concepts of "microaggressions" and "implicit bias" are vague and when paired with "collective consciousness raising" constitute real threat to independent thought. If diversity is or mission why would we promote collective attitudes that deny a viable alternative perspective? Furthermore, studies have repeatedly found that implicit bias training simply doesn't work so the potential gains are unlikely to offset risks. Finally, the district climate survey suggests that faculty perceive less tolerance toward political views than racial, gender, or other forms of difference and the language in this passage seems to risk exacerbating the larger problem with a disproven strategy to solve the lesser frequent problem. Diversity training and implicit bias training have routinely been championed by one side of the political spectrum while universally panned by the other. The college should not adopt one partisan viewpoint over another and certainly not hold meetings to browbeat those who do not share those views. This is not a commitment to be taken lightly without open discussion. What guarantee is there that these consciousness raising meetings will include diverse thoughts and open discussion? Thus far they seem to serve to reinforce a particular (partisan) viewpoint. Is this something we really want to institutionalize?
- Recommendation: strike language committing to combatting assumed microaggressions and implicit bias and assumed racism.

Commitment #2 Endorsement of USC Racial Equity Institute

- Concern: This is voluntary program (probably should be noted) and participate does not mean institutional endorsement. Further, since this is voluntary, what is there for EODAC to monitor?
- Concern: The USC Racial Equity Institute is clearly focused more narrowly than the state chancellor's call for "diversity, equity and inclusion." I have been told the USC workshops omit pretty much fixate on African Americans and marginalize Hispanics, women, disabled, veterans, and any other groups we might aspire to serve. I am concerned that this narrow conception of equity is becoming BC's notion of equity when instead we should be following a broader model laid out by the state. I am also concerned that the literature produced by this institute (a) employs faulty logic that misrepresents outcomes as evidence of discrimination and (b) advocates treating students and potential applicants differently based on their race.
- Concern: I had difficulty in locating the USC Racial Equity Institute goals. If they disband, or the program becomes cost prohibitive to BC or BC chooses not to be a participate at a later date
- Recommendation: State equity training rather than list a specific one.
- Recommendation: If utilizing USC Institute in document a footnote included the goals of the USC Institute should be included.
- Recommendation: do not explicitly support the USC Racial Equity Institute.

Commitment #2 Lack of support of vague "new structures"
- Concern: what are the "new structures" proposed in Commitment 2? This is vague language that can give expansive permission/support for as yet unimagined entities.
- Recommendation: strike the words "and new structures"
- Recommendation: Are there examples?

Commitment #2 Other Concerns:
- What does "through collective consciousness raising" mean? Is there a better way of phrasing this?
- In the definition provided of "collective consciousness raising" always the case or just in this instance?
- What does "strengthening our campus culture" mean? What is 'campus culture'?
- Will the USC Racial Equity Institutes provide professional development opportunities and partners?
- It is unclear what is the connection with the District Office EEO. Who will be participating? EEO should be written out. (last bullet of commitment #2)

Commitment #3 Racial discrimination in employment
- Concern: Commitment 3 will remove Senate and faculty authority over search and hiring practices violating Board Policy. Policy places the authority of applicant pool criteria through forwarding candidates in faculty search committee's purview. Human Resources may make recommendations only regarding applicant pool.

- Concern: Commitment 3 seems like a veiled attempt to get affirmative action instituted at the institution level. Affirmative action has been voted down twice by the population of California. This commitment is asking for hiring faculty based on the color of students and not on anything listed under diversity.
- Concern: Language in Commitment #3 entertains open racial discrimination. It reads: "It is important our students of color see in our faculty ranks people who look like them and share their lived experiences" There are many problems with this.
  - First, this presumes that phenotype predicts experiences and biases, which is nearly the textbook definition of racism.
  - Second, we cannot endorse a policy to treat potential applicants different based on their appeared racial affiliation. Beyond being racist, it simply bad policy because it assumes race is the primary sense of identity when in fact for many it is tertiary and those students are well matched with a mentor of any race who shares their primary sense of identity, such as career pathway, religion, gender, or other. To assume race is the guiding identity is simply bad policy, as well as racist. The passage or failure of Prop 16 may also affect the legality of such policies.
  - Third, this hinges on the argument that students are better served by faculty of their race when in fact they may be better served by faculty who look like their surrounding community, employers, or other environments. I understand an alternative version of this document included references to studies that support this nonsense that students of color are better served by faculty of color. As a society we reject that sort of segregationist rhetoric and it has no place at BC. Furthermore, across time the most successful ethnic students in American history are nearly always those with cross cultural experiences. Similarly, legal scholar Carol Swain's study of Congressional representation (thrice cited by SCOTUS) that found racial commonality irrelevant and actually less helpful than racial difference in representation and advocating for black constituents. There is sufficient evidence to question this racist notion that students are better served by their own.
  - Fourth, as BC already has a proportionate representation of African Americans students to faculty (about 5% for each) the intent of this goal is unclear. Kern county is 6.3% African American; the BC student population is 4.43%, and the BC faculty population is 5.44% African American. Is the purpose of this goal to create a disproportionately high rate of African American faculty? And if race matters then what is the impact on students who are not African American, and is that justified?
  - Fifth, such discussions often omit that applicant pools are largely influenced by the larger nation-wide applicant pool which is reflective of rates of education across the country. Because whites nationwide have a higher frequency of graduate level education and constitute a majority of the nationwide population BC will consistently receive more white applicants than black or Latin/Hispanic applicants. Thoughtful advertising of positions may allow some minor shifts in

the local applicant pool but it won't be a significant change unless BC employs very illegal practices.

   o Sixth, this sends a message that BC search committees should hire people based on race. Intentional or not, this messaging promotes discriminatory practices that are illegal.

- Commitment #3 states: "It is important our students of color see in our faculty ranks people who look like them and share their lived experiences" Is this mean to be literal or figurative? This is not research based. Socioeconomic status matters more according to research, not race/ethnicity.

   o BC data illustrates the Hispanic/Asian groups do not have an equity gap for Degree & Certificate Completion without a proportion of faculty in those ethnicity on staff. In fact, the Asian ethnic has one of the highest success in Degree & Certificate Completion with the lowest proportional rate of faculty in that ethnicity.

Commitment #3 Mischaracterization of ASPIRE as racial equity motivated
- Concern: This document characterized the ASPIRE Faculty Diversification Internship Program as racial when in truth the program is centered on attracting qualified applicants from abroad regardless of race in an attempt to fill STEM field positions that have undersized search pools; an English applicant would be equally appealing to an African or Latin American applicant. It misrepresents this program to characterize it as advocating racial equity.
- Concern: Were faculty involved consulted beforehand? Will the faculty, grant, and program now report to EODAC?.
- Recommendation: articulate that the ASPIRE program is open to foreign applicants of all races.
- Recommendation: spell out the acronym ASPIRE

Commitment #3 Redefining search committee structures
- Concern: The notion of redesigning search committee structures upon on notions of racial equity overlooks the many other elements that contribute to experience, and that ultimately it is that broader diversity that we ought to seek; racial diversity is one means to that end and ought not be the end itself. To emphasize one element over all others is to lose track of the bigger goal. If search committee structures were to be revised in the interest of diversity more inclusive construction would account for categories like religious views, nationality, ideological preferences, age, rural/urban origins, and other factors that are equally important to shaping experience and creating diverse individuals. It would be a huge mistake to obviate those concepts in favor of prioritizing race. Such a policy would likely narrow diversity, not expand it.
- Recommendation: strike second bullet or revise it to include more complete concepts of diversity.

<u>Commitment #3</u> Concern: What does "cultural competency" look like in hiring practices? How will this be measurable?

<u>Commitment #3</u> Concern: Commitment #3 states "help prospective applicants". This can read as though BC is giving preferential treatment to 'people of color' that *may* apply for positions. This violates Board Policy and California law.

<u>Commitment #4</u> Concern: First bullet, training hours have increased beyond 24. This should be corrected.

<u>Commitment #4</u> Should bullet #2 "Partnership" be more inclusive to allow for future partnerships – Law Enforcement Agencies? First responders include EMT/Fire as well. What phrasing can be including to incorporate them?

<u>Other Recommendation: Staff Diversity</u>
- If ethnic/racial diversity is the genuine goal, why not propose partnerships with the universities that service Bakersfield six Sister Cities? Why not commit to hiring faculty from those cities? They include Wakayama, Japan; Partisan District of Minsk, Belarus; Cixi, China; Santiago de Queretaro, Mexico; Bucheon, Republic of Korea; Amristar, India. A visiting professorship for such applicants or funding for recruitment and even applicant travel might add substantially more diversity than recruiting one more person who shares views similar to those already here. If diversity is the goal, why not fully commit to it?

<u>Other Recommendation: Looking at the Example of Successful Students</u>
- The focus of this document is in exploring what can be given to African American and Latino/Hispanic students to help elevate success metrics. Is there any effort to look to the examples of success we already have and promote those attributes? What can be learned from successful students – black, Hispanic, white, foreign nationals – that our struggling students can adopt? What Habits of Mind can we promote? What about student mentors? In what ways can we help struggling students learn from successful students and take ownership of their life? Some of our existing programs may do this but it is not evident in this document that seems to attribute student success to external factors.

<u>Other Content Concerns and Recommendations</u>:
- Concern: Bottom of 1st page states, "Together, BC commits to the following framework:" Who formed the framework? Was the framework developed by this commitment? Was it developed elsewhere? Is this framework the Institution Equity Framework?
- Concern: 1st sentence of page 2 stating, "In the last 6 years", seems out of place and separates the summary of the framework from the descriptions. This could be a link.
- Concern: Bottom of page 2 Accountability sentences read like a committee commitment – not a college wide one.
- Concern/Recommendation: Much of the resistance to this document centers on concerns that it may prioritize race over merit and treat people differently based on their color of skin. To resolve those concerns why not include an overt statement insisting equality of students and staff regardless of race.

- Concern: Not a response to the CCC Chancellor's June 5 [Call to Action] or DEI task force report – follows one of the six action items:
  - A System wide review of law enforcement officers and first responder training and curriculum. – PARTIALLY Completed, addressed in Commitment 4
  - Campus leaders must host open dialogue and address campus climate.
    - Our campuses already use surveys, focus groups and town halls to address campus climate (Results of Ours? Do we?), but building community virtually requires new strategies and tools. This work must be led by our campus CEO's/Presidents in partnership with district trustees, campus police, chief student service officers, campus student leaders and their community.

    Campuses must audit classroom climate and create an action plan to create inclusive classrooms and anti-racism curriculum.
    - Faculty and administrative leaders must work together to develop action plans that provide proactive support for faculty and staff in evaluating their classroom and learning cultures, curriculum, lesson plans and syllabi, and course evaluation protocols.
    - EEO work happening and other faculty programs at work (PARTIALLY addressed)
  - **District Boards** review and update your Equity plans with urgency.
    - Colleges will need to pull together a **cross-campus team**, including research, human resources, technology, faculty, support services, classified staff and others to **focus on naming the barriers**, **identifying solutions**, and then rallying the full campus to engage in meeting the needs. Equity plans must take into consideration the non-credit and adult education students, who consist of close to a million students in our system, and make up some of the most vulnerable and socially disadvantaged groups. We have all seen campuses do what was previously considered impossible as they responded to COVID-19; it is time to channel that same can-do attitude and community resolve towards **addressing equity** and **structural racism**. This work must be led system wide in **partnership** with district trustees, CEO's/Presidents and **all campus leaders at all levels**.
  - Shorten the time frame for the full implementation of the Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Integration Plan.
    - DEI Integration Plan with a call to fully implement **68 recommendations** over the next five years. The Chancellor calls for the Chancellor's Office DEI Implementation Workgroup, the statewide representatives in the Consultation Council and campus leaders to mobilize to implement all tier 1 recommendations in the next 6 to 12 months and to act with urgency to implement tier 2 recommendations (PDF excerpt attached).
  - Join and engage in the Vision Resource Center "Community Colleges for Change."

- Recommendation: Review and recommend small changes to a campus-wide affirmation of the June 16th EODAC commitment
  - Commit to crafting a comprehensive institutional equity plan that is reviewed each year   and updated as necessary.
    - Make sure this involves true community involvement from all stakeholders and the community at large.
    - Have a sense of urgency, but do not rush through this important work.
- Recommendation: 1st page Diversity, Integrity and Community definitions should be a link instead of taking up screen space. Think digital instead of paper.

- Concern: In Accountability (bottom page 2) it states EODAC will renew the committee "biannually". For clarity, renewing twice a year? Also, reviewing a 'racial equity' commitment and an 'equity plan' seems inefficient.

Process and Transparency
- Concern: Lacks transparency and process. Created when faculty where off contract. Originally authored by Admin. V2 of document is posted on College Council, authored 6-16-20 by Student Success Director. Minutes from summer meetings of EODAC are not posted. In Admin workplan, Admin 2020-21 Workplan, a reference is made to EODAC's oversight. A bullet point from the Equity section states: Support EODAC's oversight of the **institutional racial equity framework** (this phrase is a link which is not assessable by most) to guide a renewed 2020-21 commitment.

- Concern: This document has been produced in secrecy, advanced without input, and shielded from any scrutiny in a brazen attempt to force it as policy without open discussion. It now arrives in Senate as a deeply flawed document.

- Concern: This Racial Equity Commitment document was created in secrecy in unannounced backroom meetings over the summer by individuals without authority to represent the faculty. The document was then given to the administration and passively reference in the June 15 College Council and then rolled out in Opening Day meetings (Aug 18) as if settled policy without consulting faculty (other than who illicitly created it). It also circulated in FCDC at this time, again as settled policy with no opportunity to discuss the content. The chair of Biology did send several emails to FCDC questioning the content of the document, but the administration refused to address those concerns.

On Sept. 16, an Academic Senate executive board member questioned the provenance of the new racial equity initiative and the justification for excluding faculty in that decision process. The senate president said he would investigate. One week later at the Sept 23 Academic Senate meeting, the Physical Sciences department senator asked for clarity about the emerging policies and the senate president suggested that department collect concerns and bring them back to the senate. Also, on Sept 23, the Senate approved a new membership of EODAC that included the author(s) of the illicitly created Racial Equity document. Sometime thereafter the newly organized EODAC voted to approve the racial

equity commitment document, finally granting it the authority of a shared governance committee, but still without any genuine input from faculty outside the individual, or few, hand selected to produce it.

On Sept 30, the Academic Senate executive board met and learned that the Senate president and vice president were working on a collaborative document, and so the document recently approved by EODAC was tabled as we awaited the new document. Discussion was also tabled a week later in the Oct 7 full senate meeting for that same reason. On Oct 14, the Senate executive board met, but could not address the document because EODAC had not considered the new collaborative language. EODAC met on Oct 19 to discuss the collaborative document. Several faculty attended for the first opportunity to provide feedback from outside the original authors. However, EODAC restricted guest comments to the beginning of the meeting – before unveiling the new collaborative document for discussion – and then only read through the first quarter of that document before tabling the document until their next meeting in two weeks. And though EOADAC rejected a suggestion to hold an unscheduled meeting to complete the task, once the meeting concluded EODAC called an unscheduled meeting without outside observers and produced a vote to approve the original document, effectively rejecting the compromise document and refusing to engage any of the concerns issued by Physical Science or Biology. Once again, the authors of the document managed to shield it from outside commentary.

EODAC then failed to provide the quietly approved document to executive board in time for the executive board to review the document on Oct 28 (most of executive board had not yet read the document). The EODAC chair then came to the full senate on November 4 and alleged a conspiracy to delay the document and urged an emergency meeting that would effectively skip the normal process of an executive board review. This attempt to fast-track the document without allowing the executive board an opportunity to review is frustrating.