Working, Subcommittee DRAFT

Equity Lens Framework Master Doc

Equity Lens Framework: Advancing a Culture of Inclusive Excellence

Purpose Statement

The President's Advisory Council on Inclusive Excellence was charged with designing a tool to allow for the review and development of administrative and curricular policies, programs, and practices through an equity lens to promote racial and social justice and to advance inclusivity for CSU Channel Islands (CSUCI) students and employees.

The Center for Urban Education calls for using an equity-minded framework in policy by teaching practitioners to be deliberately race-conscious, to recognize the need to eliminate disparities in educational outcomes of students from underserved and underrepresented populations, and to prioritize institutional accountability for student success (Center for Urban Education, 2017). An implication of adopting an equity-minded framework in higher education is that institutions and the individuals working within them become accountable for the success of their students and see the closing of equity gaps as a personal and institutional responsibility.

CSUCI is profoundly grateful to the Center for Urban Education for providing the foundation for this work through its Protocol for Assessing Equity Mindedness in State Policy. While this protocol focuses on promoting racial equity for students in state policy, it is also relevant for examining inequities in policies, programs, and practices within higher education institutions. The protocol was adapted for this purpose in the following ways:

1. Expanding the equity lens focus to examine structural barriers that impact the success of employees from minoritized groups *and* students from racial, ethnic, and indigenous communities historically underserved and excluded by higher education.
2. Expanding the focus on racial equity also to incorporate intersectional identities (e.g., ability, age, citizenship status, ethnicity, gender, national origin, neuro-atypicality, race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status).
3. Embedding an Equity Lens Definitions Glossary throughout the Equity Lens Framework to identify keywords and concepts (temporarily highlighted in yellow) commonly used in the fields of diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging; intersectionality; and critical race theory.

Equity Lens Theoretical Framework

Three theoretical lenses informed the development of the Equity Lens Framework: the equity imperative, equity and intersectionality, and Critical Race theory. A brief description of each follows.

The Equity Imperative in Higher Education

The equity imperative in higher education calls for policies and practices to be critically examined through a lens that questions why inequities exist and to direct institutional resources where they are needed so that educational injustices can be corrected (Witham et. al, 2015). Understanding the equity imperative requires educators to acknowledge that personal and institutional biases and privileges are present when developing and implementing policies, programs, and practices; when using language to describe students; when presenting data; and when designing interventions to eliminate inequities (McNair, et. al, 2020).

What can create significant discomfort among some educators is the process of digging deep to understand ongoing structural barriers that impede educational equity, specifically exclusionary practices of racial discrimination in the social-historical context of American higher education. Doing so requires examination of implicit biases and acknowledgment of unearned privileges, both of which can give rise to feelings of anger, vulnerability, and embarrassment. Anticipating emotional responses within ourselves and in each other can help us to be ready for the work ahead, particularly if we can also give ourselves and each other (1) permission to lean into discomfort as the place where learning, growth, and healing are most likely to happen, and (2) grace and space for doing this learning, growing, and healing work, both individually and collectively.

It is essential to note that a select few cannot do equity work; it requires collaborations and engagement across the entire institution to achieve lasting and meaningful change. Collectively, these understandings, acknowledgments, and actions advance educational equity to help shape an institutional culture of inclusivity and justice, quite literally, for all.

The Equity Lens Framework is a tool to promote this kind of cultural transformation. Examining issues through an equity lens prompts educators to use their personal and institutional responsibilities to prioritize student success, preparing our institution and programs to be "student ready" rather than blaming students for not being "college-ready." The Center for Urban Education defines equity-mindedness as "the perspective or mode of thinking exhibited by practitioners who call attention to patterns of inequity in student outcomes" (Center for Urban Education, n.d., para. 1). Equity-minded practitioners question their own assumptions and practices, are deliberately race-conscious and systematically aware of patterns of inclusion and exclusion relative to other forms of marginalized identity, and use disaggregated data and other evidence to design and guide decisions about policies, programs, and practices (Bensimon & Malcom, 2012). They are equity-advancing, taking action to identify, understand, make visible, and ameliorate barriers that reproduce educational

inequities. In this way, equity-minded practitioners are institutionally focused and hold the institution and institutional decision-makers accountable for equity-minded actions that advance the equity imperative in higher education.

Equity and Intersectionality

Framing equity work through an intersectional lens recognizes that a minoritized individual's identity has many dimensions. These dimensions (e.g., race, ethnicity, gender, age, class, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, ability, and citizenship status) do not exist in isolation. Instead, they work collectively to affect an individual's experience and behavior in response to inequality, injustice, exploitation, and oppression. The term was first coined by Kimberlé Crenshaw in 1989 to address how racism for Black women cannot be separated from their gendered oppression (Crenshaw, 1989). Since then, intersectionality has grown into a field of study, an analytical strategy and critical praxis for social justice projects and public policy (Hankivsky & Jordan-Zachery 2019). Intersectionality is a powerful tool for analyzing systemic oppression in a broad context as points of overlap or coming together at a point of intersection. The goal of intersectional awareness and analysis is not to show that one group is more oppressed than the other; rather, it is to recognize similarities and differences in experiences of discrimination and to work to build within- and across-group solidarity to find solutions. Solutions must reflect the intersectional realities of people and recognize the political, social, and historical forces that impact a group and subsets within that group, while acknowledging the reality that individuals can be both privileged and oppressed. Such complexities require a holistic approach to solutions generated through intersectional analyses, in the work to change policies, practices, and beliefs that contribute to discrimination and all forms of oppression, transforming institutions so that racial and social justice are structurally achieved and sustained.

Equity and Critical Race Theory

This Equity Lens Framework is grounded in Critical Race Theory (CRT), which, since its conception, has held that racism "is normal, not aberrant in American society" (Delgado, 1995, p. xiv). Historically, CRT and its variants (e.g., AsianCrit, LatCrit, BlackCrit, TribalCrit, WhiteCrit) have helped its users to denaturalize the harmful normality of white supremacy and to support the apprehension, critique, and changing of institutional policies, procedures, and practices that can be overtly racist or so routine as to escape notice, but which in either case serve to systematize the perpetuation of white privilege.

White privilege--a concept originally defined by McIntosh (1989) and later articulated by Yosso (2006) as "a system of advantage resulting from a legacy of racism and benefiting individuals and groups based on the notions of whiteness" (Yosso, 2006 p. 5)--has corollaries in other forms of privilege. In addition to CRT, other variants of Critical Theory such as DisCrit, FemCrit, and QueerCrit, support the related, essential work of apprehending, critiquing, and changing policies, procedures, and practices that perpetuate forms of privilege and injustice such as those rooted in the ideologies of ableist supremacy, male supremacy, and straight supremacy. Just as CRT "foregrounds

race as the central construct for analyzing inequality" (Zamudio, et. al, 2011, p. 2), so do these and other variants of Critical Theory foreground other historically marginalized, minoritized, often intersectional identities for analyzing and ameliorating injustice. Equity minded practices builds upon a strengths-based perspective that recognizes the talents, strengths, experiences and community cultural wealth that students bring to our campus (Yosso, 2006).

Through this theoretical framework, the Equity Lens Framework promotes the goals of racial and social justice, which we define as a way of seeing and acting aimed at resisting unfairness and inequity while enhancing freedom and possibility for all. Through this mindset for equity and justice, we at CSUCI seek to pay primary attention to how people, policies, practices, curricula, and institutions may be used to liberate rather than oppress those who have historically been least served by decision-makers in higher education.

How to Use the Equity Lens Framework

Uses of the Equity Lens Framework

There are two primary ways to use the Equity Lens Framework:

1. To conduct an equity audit of *existing* administrative and/or curricular decision-making processes (i.e., policies, programs, practices) that impact minoritized groups and students from racial, ethnic, and indigenous communities historically underserved and excluded by higher education.
2. To inform the design of *new* administrative and/or curricular decision-making processes (i.e., policies, programs, practices) that impact minoritized groups and students from racial, ethnic, and indigenous communities historically underserved and excluded by higher education.

Nine Equity Lenses

The Equity Lens Framework includes nine *equity lenses* developed to achieve equity mindedness in designing and implementing policies, programs, and practices. Those nine equity lenses are:

1. Equity-mindedness as the guiding paradigm;
2. Equity in language;
3. Institutional data collection and reporting strategy;
4. Disproportionate impact on students;
5. Impact of cultural taxation on minoritized faculty, staff, and administrators;
6. Consistency and ubiquity in policy, program, and/or practice;
7. Framing the rationale for equity; (move out and into the introduction)
8. Equity considerations for creating places and opportunities for belonging; and,
9. Guiding principles for equity in budgetary decisions.

Application Examples (under development)

For example, if your intention is to….Add two examples here….existing and new. … …….

1. xxxx audit of *existing* administrative and/or curricular decision-making processes
2. xxxxx design of *new* administrative and/or curricular decision-making processes

Navigating the Equity Lens Framework

Our goal is to habituate our campus's collective use of critical questions and prompts to make equity intentional by design. Toward this end, the nine equity lenses include critical questions and prompts to support users in arriving at better original designs or in making equity-oriented changes to existing policies, programs, and practices. Each of the nine equity lenses are presented in the tables below and their meanings are defined and illustrated through the first two columns in each table:

1. **Column 1: Equity Lens *Critical Questions*.** Critical Questions are designed to help users shift their thinking toward equity-mindedness by calling attention to patterns of inequity in policies, programs, and practices that impact students and employees.
2. **Column 2: Implications and Considerations.** Implications and Considerations offer additional context, examples, and questions designed to guide thinking about the specific case being studied.
3. **Column 3: Notes: Applying Equity Lenses**. This column is provided as a blank space for users to:
   - Mark which of the nine equity lenses are relevant for use in the particular case being analyzed (i.e., the new or existing policy, program, or practice under study). Note: users should feel free to be selective, disregarding lenses that are not helpful to a particular case;
   - Record responses to Critical Questions;
   - Draft additional Implications and/or Considerations that may be relevant to the particularities of the case being analyzed; and
   - Keep track of specific ideas and language for improving an existing case or ensuring an equity focus for new designs.

Habituating ourselves to using the Equity Lens Framework will help us to incorporate equity-mindedness in our daily work, ensuring that our policies, programs, and practices are designed to include, support, and serve all of the employees and students of CSU Channel Islands, rectifying the patterns of exclusion and harm that have been endemic in higher education

Steps for Applying the Equity Lens Framework

1. Determine your purpose for using the tool. Are you conducting an audit of an existing policy, process, or practice, or working to ensure that a new effort is created with an equity-oriented focus?
2. Review the nine Equity Lenses and decide which of them are most applicable to your purpose for using the tool.
3. Review Column 1 and Column 2 for each of the Equity Lenses selected, examining your specific case through the "Critical Questions" and "Implications and Considerations" of each relevant Equity Lens.
4. Use the "Notes" column to take notes on questions posed; note additional implications and/or considerations relevant to the case under study; keep track of specific ideas/language for building an equity focus into the case.

1 EQUITY FRAMING FOR RACIAL AND SOCIAL JUSTICE

Equity Lens Critical Questions	Implications & Considerations	Notes: Applying Equity Lenses
a. **Racial Justice Framing:** Do administrative and/or curricular decision-making processes (i.e., policies, programs, practices) explicitly frame the participation and success of employees from minoritized groups and students from racial, ethnic, and indigenous communities historically underserved and excluded by higher education as an institutional responsibility?	• When equity is not framed as an institutional responsibility how might it create or worsen inequities among racial and ethnic minoritized groups in the context of the case (i.e., policy, procedure, or practice) being studied?	
b. **Intersectionality and Inclusivity of Marginalized Identities:** Do administrative and/or curricular decision-making processes (i.e., policies, programs, practices) explicitly frame the participation and success of employees and students from minoritized groups and/or people with intersectional identities (e.g., ability, age, citizenship status, ethnicity, gender, national origin, neuro-atypicality, race, religion, sex,	• How can calling attention to intersectionality help to build within- and across-group solidarity for finding solutions? • When intersectionality and inclusion of marginalized identities are not framed as an institutional responsibility, inequalities for some groups may be worsened.	

sexual orientation, socioeconomic status)as an institutional responsibility?		

2 RATIONALES FOR WHY EQUITY MATTERS

Equity Lens Critical Questions	Implications & Considerations	Notes: Applying Equity Lenses
a. Given that the case for equity can be framed in one of three ways (i.e., economic well-being, demographic shifts, moral imperative), which rationale(s) is/are relevant to this case in order to speak to a broad base of stakeholders across sectors?	• How does the history of one or more rationales for equity (i.e., economic, demographic shifts, moral imperative) impact the current case under study?	
b. Economic Rationale If the case for equity utilizes an economic rationale, how should impact, audience, and data needs be anticipated? How does the history of economic inequities impact the current reality?	• California's future economic prosperity depends on the supply of a diverse, college-educated workforce from groups that have been historically underserved and excluded by higher education. ▪ **Impact:** What is the return on investment (ROI) argument for the proposed change? ▪ **Audience:** Why and for whom is an economic rationale for equity in this specific context necessary? ▪ **Data:** What data are needed to make this ROI case?	

c. Demographic Change Rationale If the case for equity utilizes a demographic-change rationale, how should impact, audience, and data needs be anticipated? How does the history of US and/or CI demographic patterns impact current realities?	• How are we collecting, analyzing, and using data to inform policies, programs, and practices that bridge the degree gap deficit and future economic trends and state's increasing demand for a diverse and college-educated workforce? ▪ **Impact:** How does the proposed change address changing demographics at CSUCI and in the region? ▪ **Audience:** Why and for whom is a demographic change rationale for equity in this specific context necessary? ▪ **Data:** What data are needed to demonstrate awareness of changing demographics and needs at CSUCI?	
d. Moral Imperative Rationale If the case for equity utilizes an equal opportunity/moral imperative rationale, how should impact, audience, and data needs be anticipated? How does the history of differential access to educational opportunity impact today's struggle for equitable opportunities?	• In applying the moral imperative rationale it is important to form and maintain teams across campus to scale and sustain equity work and progress, so it does not fall on a select few. ▪ **Impact:** How has access/opportunity in the context of the proposed change been constrained, historically, and how will the proposed change help to broaden access/opportunity?	

	▪ **Audience:** Why and for whom is an equal opportunity/moral imperative rationale for equity in this specific context necessary? ▪ **Data:** What data are needed?	

3 EQUITY IN LANGUAGE

Equity Lens Critical Questions	Implications & Considerations	Notes: Applying Equity Lenses
a. Are biased or stereotypical assumptions made about students and/or employees who are impacted by administrative and/or curricular decision-making processes (i.e., policies, programs, practices)?	• How might the language of biased or stereotypical assumptions be reframed away from an emphasis on student deficits to a focus on institutional responsibility?	
b. What types of words are used to describe the beneficiaries of administrative and/or curricular policies, programs, or practices? Are they framed from a deficit-based to asset-based perspective?	• We know from our own student data and from the literature that students whose identities upon arrival are tied almost exclusively to their deficiencies start at an extreme disadvantage. How might an assets-based approach be used to eliminate deficit-based language to describe our students?	
c. Who has been left out?	• How can the message, language, &/or image be changed to be more inclusive and equity-minded?	
d. How might persons from different ethnic and racial groups perceive the message/language/image?	• How can the message, language, &/or image be changed to be more culturally aware, sensitive, appropriate, and accurate?	

e. How might persons from minoritized groups and/or with intersectional identities (e.g., ability, age, citizenship status, ethnicity, gender, national origin, neuro-atypicality, race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status)perceive the message/language/image?	● How can the message, language, &/or image be changed to be more culturally aware, sensitive, appropriate, and accurate?	

4 DISPROPORTIONATE IMPACT ON STUDENTS

Equity Lens Critical Questions	Implications & Considerations	Notes: Applying Equity Lenses
a. Could the policy, program, and/or practice cause disproportionate impact to specific groups based on other factors related to educational disadvantages, such as attendance patterns, residential vs. non-residential, participation in advanced college-prep curricula, other?	● What kinds of data are needed to help us learn about students who are and are not being successful? ● What patterns can be discovered regarding course, program, and degree completion? Do such patterns correlate with barriers to success patterns?	
b. Does the *policy, program, and/or practice* design build in safeguards to protect against potential negative effects on equity in access or success?	● Are disaggregated data used to evaluate impacts of the policy, program, and/or practice? ● What questions could be asked and/or what actions could be taken to help access and success metrics shift from students being "college ready" to the policy, program, and/or practice being "student ready"?	
c. Who will benefit from the *policy, program, and/or practice*?	● Have policymakers, program leaders, and/or practitioners habituated themselves to the routine of asking: "Who stands to gain/lose from this decision?"	

	● Are responses to that repeated question tracked, analyzed, and used to inform future decisions?	
d. Who will be excluded? How can we include them?	● What steps are taken to find out who is not present, which voices and perspectives are not included? ● Are data collected to track and analyze patterns of inclusion and exclusion, and used to inform future efforts to be inclusive?	
e. Who is not eligible?	● How do eligibility criteria invite and/or disinvite participation? ● Are common barriers to success recognized and addressed?	

5 INSTITUTIONAL DATA COLLECTION AND REPORTING STRATEGY

Equity Lens Critical Questions	Implications & Considerations	Notes: Applying Equity Lenses
a. Are student data collected and reported by racial group (e.g., African American/Black, Hispanic/Latinx, Native American, Alaskan Native, Asian American/Pacific Islander, White), sex, gender, socioeconomic status, and first-generation status?	● Given that we cannot fix what we cannot see, how are institutional leaders making visible the identities of each group in order to understand their unique and different circumstances in order to address inequities?	
b. Is disaggregation of student and employee data practiced across different reporting mechanisms and incorporated consistently in administrative and/or curricular policy and program evaluation, accountability, institutional reporting?	● By disaggregating data one can determine whether inequities exist and understand how inequities vary within and across students and employees.	
c. Once the data is disaggregated how are practitioners contextualizing and making meaning of the data?	● What patterns do you notice in the data? ● Which groups are experiencing inequities? ● Which groups would you prioritize for goal setting and why? ▪ What are your equity gaps? ▪ What are your hunches about what might be contributing to the equity gaps?	

	● What additional data do you want to collect to better understand the gap? ● What equity-minded questions might you pursue further? ● Are faculty practitioners using data to address the equity gap in their programs or classes?	
d. When data are collected from vulnerable populations, what safeguards and best practices have been implemented to protect the identities of students and employees?	● How are you protecting the confidentiality and anonymity of small marginalized groups from risk of harm? ● How are you protecting marginalized groups from stereotypes and further stigmatization?	

6 GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR EQUITY IN BUDGETARY DECISIONS

Equity Lens Critical Questions	Implications & Considerations	Notes: Applying Equity Lenses
a. As institutional leaders begin the process of budget allocation, trimming budgets and eliminating positions, how will they use an equity lens to ensure that they do not worsen historical inequities and recent inequities caused by the Covid-19 pandemic?	● In what ways do CSUCI students, faculty, staff, and administrators experience impacts of resource allocations disproportionately?	
b. How do our budget decisions and priorities commit resources to support the success of our students, especially those who have been historically underserved and excluded by higher education?	● Are we directing institutional resources where they are needed to remove barriers to achievement, prioritize and provide the necessary support for student success among groups (i.e., POC, low-income) who have been disproportionately impacted by current (i.e., COVID-19 pandemic) and historical educational injustices? ● If we were to actually confront and learn from the past in our region, what would higher education decision-making and budget-making implications have to entail?	
c. Which kinds of work at CSUCI require the paying of “culture taxes”?	● What are the budgetary implications, if this work were monetized? ● How might we deploy flexible use of resources and supports, recognizing the current limitations on revenues but	

	while creating opportunity to understand and distribute resources creatively (e.g., informal time off, compensatory time, short-term use of staff support to advance strategic projects/initiatives, support added administrative workload)?	
d. Do our budget decisions prioritize a commitment to inclusive excellence?	● Budgetary decisions have intended and unintended consequences on people, programs, and practices.. ● Some key questions to ask when making decisions are: ▪ Who is better off as a result of this decision? ▪ Who is harmed by this decision? ▪ Who has been left out of the process? ▪ How do we know?	

7 IMPACT OF CULTURAL TAXATION ON MINORITIZED FACULTY, STAFF, AND ADMINISTRATORS

Equity Lens Critical Questions	Implications & Considerations	Notes: Applying Equity Lenses
a. How is representation impacting the design and implementation of policies, programs, and/or practices?	• Is there one demographic that is over- or under-represented in a particular program, team and/or work activity?	
b. How are you identifying, interrogating, and mitigating cultural taxation in the design and implementation of policies, programs, and/or practices?	• How are you raising awareness about cultural taxation within your division, school, program or workplace? • How is this work allocated, valued, and evaluated for impact on those providing it? • How are rewards and compensations distributed for work within your division, school or program?	
c. How are you identifying, interrogating, and mitigating gender-based taxation in the design and implementation of policies, programs, and/or practices?	• How are you raising awareness about gender-based taxation within your division, school, program or workplace? • How is this work allocated, valued, and evaluated for impact on those providing it? • How are rewards and compensations distributed for work within your division, school or program?	

8 CONSISTENCY IN POLICY, PROGRAM, AND/OR PRACTICE

Equity Lens Critical Questions	Implications & Considerations	Notes: Applying Equity Lenses
a. Are the needs of students and employees from racial, ethnic, and indigenous communities consistently included in the policy, program, and/or practice?	• Do you have a clear understanding of the needs/issues that need to be addressed by the policy, program, and/or practice? • What kinds of data are needed can be (or are being) collected to help us learn about the needs of students and employees to inform the development or changes to policy, program, and/or practice?	
b. Are the needs of persons from minoritized groups and/or with intersectional identities (e.g., ability, age, citizenship status, ethnicity, gender, national origin, neuro-atypicality, race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status)consistently included in the policy, program and/or practice?	• Is there a clear understanding of the needs and inequities to be addressed by the policy, program, and/or practice? • What kinds of data are needed can be (or are being) collected to help us learn about the needs of students and employees to inform the development or changes to policy, program, and/or practice?	
c. Are disaggregated student data (i.e., race, ethnicity, sex, socioeconomic status, and first-generation status) used in planning, evaluation, accountability,	• What can we do more of as an institution to assume the responsibility for being "student ready," and to move away from the language and	

and institutional reporting requirements?	expectation of students being “college ready”? ● Stating that students are not “college ready” is a function of deficit-based thinking that blames the student for unequal outcomes and is not a solution that advances equity. ● Are there patterns that correlate with barriers to student success for some groups? ● What is in our control to change in order to remove such barriers?	
d. How is consistency ensured in the design of policy, program, and/or practices to understand how intersectionality (i.e., students with multiple minoritized identities) impacts serving, retaining, and graduating students?	● What other factors might impact student success?	

9 EQUITY CONSIDERATIONS FOR CREATING PLACES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR BELONGING

Equity Lens Critical Questions	Implications & Considerations	Notes: Applying Equity Lenses
a. Where and in what ways do historically under-represented, marginalized identities (e.g., ability, age, citizenship status, ethnicity, gender, national origin, neuro-atypicality, race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status) have the opportunity to see themselves represented on campus?	• Are historically under-represented and marginalized identities represented in high contact and administrative locations on campus? Which identities are/are not celebrated and made visible? ▪ If not, what strategies are in place to improve diversity in this area? In what ways does CSUCI intentionally honor people and groups from diverse communities? • Where are the spaces and places where BIPOC, LGBTQ, and persons with disabilities feel welcomed? • Do physical spaces in departments and campus spaces celebrate diversity versus focus on images of "diversity"? • Does artwork in physical and digital spaces intentionally honor people and groups from diverse communities?	How do executive leadership offices, spaces and suites ensure a safe and welcoming environment that advances IE Values and sense of belonging for students and employees. Are syllabi, courses, and classrooms reflective of an inclusive environment? Is there forethought to evaluate inclusivity and an action plan to correct deficiencies?
b. Do structures, images, documents, or other campus elements feature	• Who and what is highlighted through the naming of buildings, the hanging of artwork?	

proponents or actions borne of white supremacy?		
c. In order to learn from the past, is the history of CSUCI transparent, available, and accessible? If so, does this history include the complex story of underrepresented groups (i.e. Chumash, Black artists, LGBTQ+, people with disabilities, women in STEM, etc.)?	• How is the past, present, and future story of CSUCI told? When? To whom? For what purposes? • When, why, and how is this land and its history acknowledged?	
d. Does CSUCI celebrate major events or anniversaries that provide opportunities for students, faculty, and staff to learn from the past?	• How have persons from diverse communities impacted or contributed to specific majors? How is this information shared with students, faculty, and staff in the department?	

Works Cited

- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2018). *Racism without racists. Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the United States.* Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Center for Urban Education. (n.d.). Equity mindedness. Retrieved from https://cue.usc.edu/about/equity/equity-mindedness/
- Crenshaw, K. (1989) Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of anti-discrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics, University of Chicago Legal Forum, v. 1989, Issue 1: 139-167.
- Delgado, R. (Ed.). (1995). *Critical race theory: The cutting edge.* Temple University Press.
- Hankivsky, O. and Jordan-Zachery, J. (Eds.) (2019). *The Palgrave handbook on intersectionality in public policy*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Harper, S. R. (2012). Race without racism: How higher education researchers minimize racist institutional norms. *The Review of Higher Education*, 36(1), 9–29.
- Hirschfield, L.E. & Joseph, T. D. (2012). We need a woman, we need a black woman: Gender, race, and identity taxation in the academy. *Gender and Education.* 24(2): 213-227.
- McIntosh, P. (1989). White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack. Wellesley Centers for Women National SEED Project. Retrieved from https://nationalseedproject.org/images/documents/Knapsack_plus_Notes-Peggy_McIntosh.pdf
- McNair, T. B., Bensimon, E. M., and Malcom-Piqueux, L. (2020). *From equity talk to equity walk: Expanding practitioner knowledge for racial justice in higher educatio*n. Wiley.
- Sue, D.W., Capodilupo, C.M., Torino, G.C. and Bucceri, J.M. (2007). Racial microaggressions in everyday life: Implications for clinical service. *American Psychology* 62(4): 271-286.
- Witham, K., Malcom-Piqueux, L.E., Dowd, A.C, Bensimon, E.M. (2015) *America's unmet promise: The imperative for equity in higher education*. Association of American Colleges & Universities, Washington D.C.
- Yosso, T. (2006). *critical race counterstories along the chicana/chicano educational pipeline*. Routledge.

- Zamudio, M. M., Russell, C., Rios, F. A., and Bridgeman, J. L. (2011). *Critical Race Theory matters: Education and ideology*. Routledge.
- Equity Lens Definitions Glossary

Additional Resources:

Concepts and Activities for Racial Equity Work

Racial Equity Tools: Core Concepts

Anti-Racism Education in California Community Colleges

Why Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Matter