Anti-Racism Education in California Community Colleges

ADOPTED FALL 2020

Anti-Racism Education in the California Community Colleges

Acknowledging Historical Context and Assessing and Advancing Effective Anti-Racism Practices for Faculty Professional Development

ADOPTED FALL 2020

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE 2020-2021

"Take a long, hard look down the road you will have to travel once you have made a commitment to work for change. Know that this transformation will not happen right away. Change often takes time. It rarely happens all at once. In the movement, we didn't know how history would play itself out. When we were getting arrested and waiting in jail or standing in unmovable lines on the courthouse steps, we didn't know what would happen, but we knew it had to happen." –John Lewis

This paper is dedicated to the lives of those we have lost to racial violence.

Breonna Taylor, George Floyd, Nina Pop, D'Andre Campbell, Tony McDade, Regis Korchinski-Paquet, Ahmaud Arbery, Jordan Baker, Victor White III, Keith Lamont Scott, Dontre Hamilton, Larry Jackson Jr., Jonathan Ferrell, Sean Reed, Steven Demarco Taylor, Ariane McCree, Terrance Franklin, Miles Hall, William Green, Alton Sterling, Eric Garner, Philando Castile, Sandra Bland, Trayvon Martin, Samuel David Mallard, Tamir Rice, Botham Shem Jean, E.J. Bradford, Antwon Rose Jr., Stephon Clark, Natosha "Tony" McDade, Freddie Gray, Brendon Glenn, John Crawford III, Yassin Mohamed, Wendell Allen, Finan H. Berhe, Darius Tarver, Kwame "KK" Jones, De'Von Bailey, Christopher Whitfield, Anthony Hill, Ezell Ford, Dante Parker, Eric Logan, Kendrec McDade, Jamarion Robinson, Gregory Hill Jr., JaQuavion Slaton, Ryan Twyman, Brandon Webber, Kajieme Powell, Michael Brown Jr., Laquan McDonald, Mario Woods, Jimmy Atchison, Willie McCoy, Trettrick Griffin, Jemel Roberson, DeAndre Ballard, Botham Shem Jean, Robert Lawrence White, Akai Gurley, Rumain Brisbon, Charly Keunang, Anthony Lamar Smith, and, sadly, many more before and after.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Racism exists. Racism exists within communities and within colleges. Overt racism is repeatedly on display with news of the latest attack on or deaths of Black people like George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, and Ahmaud Arbery, but it is also ever-present in the structures that professionals in the California Community Colleges system work within and that students of color must navigate. Striving to achieve equity is not enough and is not possible within the current community college system. Policies, processes, and other systemic structures built on a history of racism must first be dismantled and then rebuilt with a focus on equity and inclusion.

Dismantling racist structures requires a review of the history that created those structures. It requires understanding the history of the construct of race as a culture, the white supremacy ideology, the centuries of laws intended to maintain positions of power for whites, and the ways in which the equity and diversity efforts within California's community colleges have fallen short. Constructing anti-racist structures and developing anti-racist campus cultures require an understanding of the tenets of anti-racism education and principles for professional development.

This paper provides foundational information for California community college practitioners to better understand the origins of today's racial conflict and reasons why gaps in achieving equitable educational outcomes for students, particularly for students of color, cannot be closed within current systems. The paper is intended to engage college practitioners in self-reflection and critical consciousness as they develop and deliver the strategic anti-racism education and professional development needed to reconstruct campus cultures and learning environments built on principles of equity and inclusion.

This paper does not purport to provide solutions to classroom challenges, nor does it provide strategies specific to instruction and support of students. Instead, to work on re-constructing a community college system based on tenets of anti-racism, one must consider how to progress along one's own anti-racism journey while also working to educate and move others along their own journeys. This paper provides historical and foundational information to aid in those journeys.

The paper concludes with recommendations for individual growth, for local academic senates, for colleges and districts, and for the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges.

INTRODUCTION

Almost sixty thousand faculty serve nearly 2.1 million students in the 116 California community colleges. The community college system in California strives to provide all students with an excellent educational opportunity. To this end, an intentional, systematic approach is needed to understand and address the contemporary and historical context of institutions and current students. In the fall of 2019, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges approved and published the paper *Equity Driven Systems: Student Equity and Achievement in California Community College*s to provide community college system leaders a framework to improve student outcomes and close gaps in order to achieve equitable

educational outcomes for disproportionately impacted students. The purpose of this current paper is to further advance equity work through anti-racism education. This process starts with listening to the voices of students, especially disproportionately impacted students, to learn about their lived experiences, including their journeys within and outside their institutions.

> *I am here to give you my own experience as a child of a Jamaican immigrant, as a student that has been in the system eight years now and about to transfer to UC Berkeley. This journey has not been easy for me and I recognize it has not been as difficult for me as it has been for so many of my Black and brown brothers and sisters. (Bryan Daley, student, City College of San Francisco)*

Students' lived experiences are shaped by their racial identities and the legacy of racism, both individually purported and systemically pervasive. Critical Race Theory (CRT) is a lens that is useful for examining educational processes, systems, and agents within the context of race and racism. This paper uses CRT to examine educational practices and provide action-oriented solutions through anti-racism education.

In 2020, the United States and the world were faced with a pandemic that will forever change the course of history. In the midst of this pandemic, the Black or African-descent community and other communities of color exponentially experienced the legacy of white supremacy ideology and racism. As the COVID-19 pandemic intensified, inequities exacerbated disparities and revealed the true depths of racial and ethnic injustices that have plagued the United States for centuries. However, while COVID-19 established the current situation, history created the conditions for today's disparities and conflict. The path forward is through anti-racist action and education.

> *Our country is suffering from two diseases. One that's novel, COVID-19, and one that is historical, the scourge of racism. And both need a cure. (Dr. Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza, Vice-President of Instruction, Skyline Community College)*

In the wake of increased murders of unarmed individuals of Black/African or indigenous descent and other people of color, escalated hate crimes, and racist rhetoric, faculty and other system stakeholders must come to understand structural racism. Community college faculty and staff must learn how to apply race-consciousness and how to infuse anti-racism in daily practice to become anti-racist practitioners. As a collective community, community college faculty are invested in cultivating and maintaining a climate where humanity, equity, and mutual respect are both intrinsic and explicit by valuing individuals and groups from all backgrounds, demographics, and experiences.

> *Social and political constructions of oppression and discrimination against women and people of color —in particular, people of African descent – remain embedded in American political, economic, religious and educational institutions. (hooks, 1995, as quoted by Dr. Regina Stanback Stroud, former President of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges and former President of Skyline College)*

Becoming anti-racist practitioners is necessary, yet it is not easy. It is an ongoing journey, and progress may not be linear. As is noted in the work of Dr. Ibram X. Kendi (2019), everyone is in a different place in regard to anti-racist efforts and attitudes, a reality that inspired Dr. Andrew M. Ibrahim (n.d.) to create the image below that captures well the stages through which anti-racist practitioners may progress.

The Becoming Anti-Racist Learning Zone includes educating oneself about race and structural racism, acknowledging vulnerability about biases and knowledge gaps, understanding privilege, and seeking out uncomfortable questions. This paper is intended to be a resource for educators moving personally through the Learning Zone toward the Growth Zone and who may regularly engage with others in the Fear Zone.

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges acknowledges that the structure of higher education and the California Community Colleges house the biases and prejudices of its founding time and history.

Addressing racism and its history can be overwhelming. The intent of this paper is to provide context to empower faculty throughout the state to engage in identifying, describing, and dismantling existing racist structures and making the structural changes required to become anti-racist institutions. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges is committed to leading structural change work along with community college faculty leaders and stakeholders.

Figure 1 Becoming Anti-Racist
(Ibrahim, n.d.)

In the fall of 2019, ASCCC delegates adopted Resolution 3.02, Support Infusing Anti-Racism/No Hate Education in Community Colleges:

> *Whereas, The* California Community Colleges Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Statement *defines the system as, "As a collective community of individual colleges, we are invested in cultivating and maintaining a climate where equity and mutual respect are both intrinsic and explicit by valuing individuals and groups from all backgrounds, demographics, and experiences. Individual and group differences can include, but are not limited to the following dimensions: race, ethnicity, national origin or ancestry, citizenship, immigration status, sex, gender, sexual orientation, physical or mental disability, medical condition, genetic information, marital status, registered domestic partner status, age, political beliefs, religion, creed, military or veteran status, socioeconomic status, and any other basis protected by federal, state or local law or ordinance or regulation."*
>
> *Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Inclusivity statement "recognizes the benefits to students, faculty, and the community college system gained from the variety of personal experiences, values, and views of a diverse group of individuals with different backgrounds. This diversity includes but is not limited to race, ethnicity, sex, gender identity, sexual orientation, disability status, age, cultural background, veteran status, discipline or field, and experience. We also understand that the California Community College System itself is diverse in terms of the size, location, and student population of its colleges and districts, and we seek participation from faculty across the system. The Academic Senate respects and is committed to promoting equal opportunity and inclusion of diverse voices and opinions. We endeavor to have a diversity of talented faculty*

participate in Academic Senate activities and support local senates in recruiting and encouraging faculty with different backgrounds to serve on Academic Senate standing committees and task forces. In particular, the Academic Senate acknowledges the need to remove barriers to the recruitment and participation of talented faculty from historically excluded populations in society."

Whereas, To eliminate institutional discrimination the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges strives to integrate an accurate portrayal of the roles and contributions of all groups throughout history across curricula, particularly groups that have been underrepresented historically; identify how bias, stereotyping, and discrimination have limited the roles and contributions of individuals and groups, and how these limitations have challenged and continue to challenge our society; encourage all members of the educational community to examine assumptions and prejudices, including, but not limited to, racism, sexism, and homophobia, that might limit the opportunities and growth of students and employees; offer positive and diverse role models in our society, including the recruitment, hiring, and promotion of diverse employees in community colleges; coordinate with organizations and concerned agencies that promote the contributions, heritage, culture, history, and health and care needs of diverse population groups; and promote a safe and inclusive environment for all.

Whereas, Racism and racial discrimination threaten human development because of the obstacles which they pose to the fulfillment to basic human rights to survival, security, development, and social participation; Racism has been shown to have negative cognitive, behavioral, affective, and relational effects on both child and adult victims nationally and globally, historically and contemporarily; Racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance have been shown to be attitudes and behaviors that are learned;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate of California Community Colleges denounces racism for its negative psychological, social, educational and economic effects on human development throughout the lifespan.

Resolved, That to eliminate institutional discrimination the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges will take steps to not only strive for a greater knowledge about and the celebration of diversity, but will support deeper training that reveals the inherent racism embedded in societal institutions, including the educational system; and asks individuals to examine their personal role in the support of racist structures and the commitment to work to dismantle structural racism.

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges infuses Anti-Racism/No Hate Education in all its activities and professional development opportunities."

Readers are invited to explore with an open heart and mind this paper's topics, questions, and opportunities to advance anti-racism education and action. The intent of this paper is to contextualize history and introduce an anti-racist framework to empower individuals as they facilitate the transformative change the community college system needs to truly embody the values of diversity, equity, and inclusion. Its focus is on the foundational knowledge necessary to understand racism, including its origins, and its negative implications in statutory actions in many aspects of society, including education.

The paper will first define critical terms to help the reader develop a shared vocabulary in order to have a better understanding of the historical and contemporary context of racism in the United States. A review of the foundations of racism, a history of discriminatory laws in the United States that have impacted education, and an overview of racism in academia will then lead to an exploration of the California context to reflect on the impact of institutional discrimination and racialized structures on racially minoritized students, faculty, and other employees. The reader will then learn about the role of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges and other system stakeholders over time. In a call to dismantle structural racism, anti-racism tenets are described and supported by explicit anti-racism education and professional development tools and resources. Lastly, a summary is presented along with specific recommendations for individual faculty, local academic senates, colleges and districts, and the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges.

DEFINITIONS

For the purposes of this paper, the terms "race," "white supremacy," "racism," "anti-racism," "equity gap," and "critical race theory" are defined to further the readers' understanding and development of a shared vocabulary. Other terms will be defined in various sections of this paper.

Race

One central theme in Critical Race Theory is that "'race' and 'racism' are products of social thought and relations." This position, referred to as social constructionism, argues that races as we define them today "correspond to no biological or genetic reality; rather, races are categories that society invents, manipulates, or retires when convenient" (Delgado & Stefancic, 2017, p.9). The construct of race is "not based on any real or accurate biological or scientific truth. The concept of race was created as a classification of human beings with the purpose of giving power to white people and to legitimize the dominance of white people over non-white people." In other words, race is a power construct based on subjective social differences.

White Supremacy

While race is a social construct, it has a social reality, one that has real effects on those classified by race. This social structure, or white supremacy, is a racial structure "that [awards] systemic privileges to Europeans (the people who became 'white') over non-Europeans (the peoples who became 'non-white'). White supremacy...became global and affected all societies where Europeans extended their reach" (Bonilla-Silva, 2018, pp. 8-9). Bonilla-Silva further defines white supremacy as "the totality of the social relations and practices that reinforce white privilege...[including] social, economic, political, social control, and ideological mechanisms responsible for the reproduction of racial privilege in a society" (p. 9).

Racism

As defined by the California Community Colleges Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Workgroup and adopted system-wide on September 21, 2020, "Racism is the intentional or unintentional use of power to isolate, separate and exploit others on the basis of race. Racism refers to a variety of practices, beliefs, social relations, and phenomena that work to reproduce a racial hierarchy and social structure that yield superiority, power, and privilege for some, and discrimination and oppression for others. It can take several forms, including representational, ideological, discursive, interactional, institutional, structural, and systemic. Racism exists when ideas and assumptions about racial categories are used to justify and reproduce a racial hierarchy and racially structured society that unjustly limits access to resources, rights, and privileges on the basis of race" (Cole, 2019; Pacific University, 2019).

Consistent with this proposed definition, Oluo (2019) defines racism as "any prejudice against someone because of their race, when those views are reinforced by systems of power" (p. 26). This definition is essential to productive conversations about race because, without including power in the analysis, racism is reduced to individual acts of prejudice versus an understanding that racist acts are part of a larger system of oppression. This definition also explains why there is no such thing as reverse racism. People from the dominant race, who benefit from the privilege of power, cannot experience racism (Oluo, 2019).

Anti-Racism

An anti-racist analysis views racism as structural and embedded into all societal structures. This position means that all people are affected by racism and hold implicit bias, which allows for the sustenance of racist structures (Oluo, 2019). Kendi (2019) states that anti-racist ideas argue that "racist policies are the cause of racial inequities" (p. 20). To be anti-racist is to see racial groups as equals in "all their apparent differences--that there is nothing right or wrong with any racial group" (Kendi, 2019, p. 20) and to advocate for changing the policies that produce inequities among racial groups.

Educational Equity Gap

At its core, the term educational equity gap refers to "the condition where there is a significant and persistent disparity in educational attainment between different groups of students" (Higher Learning Advocates, 2019). In 2014, the United States Department of Education (USDE) expanded the definition of equity gap further to make specific reference to low-income and color as elements influencing disparities in educational achievement. The 2014 USDE definition of equity gap is "the difference between the rate at which students from low-income families and student of color are educated by excellent educators and the rate at which other students are educated by excellent educators" (United States Department of Education, 2015, p. 8). Related to the access to excellent teachers as a contributor to the equity gap, the USDE also uses the term "equitable access" to refer to "the difference between the rate at which students from low income families or students of color are taught by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers and the rate at which other students are taught by these teachers" (p. 8).

At the community college level, the term refers to any disparity in a metric like graduation rate or term-to-term persistence along racial, socioeconomic, gender, or other major demographic groupings. These gaps lead colleges to ask what processes, policies, strategies, etc. are in place that create or exacerbate these disparities rather than what the students are doing wrong.

Critical Race Theory (CRT)

Critical Race Theory is a theoretical lens that acknowledges the existence of race and racism as ordinary and ubiquitous in daily life and within institutions and organizations (Delgado & Stefancic, 2017). Several tenets undergird CRT, including the following: a) the dominant ideology must be challenged, b) experiential knowledge is valued, and c) a transdisciplinary analysis of racism is needed within a historical and contemporary context (Yosso, Parker, Solórzano, & Lynn, 2004).

THE FOUNDATIONS OF RACISM

An exploration of the foundations of racism should consider historical philosophies regarding the construction of white supremacy ideology and race classification as well as their development, applications, and outcomes. Research produces a wealth of information that is too vast and too deep to examine in depth in this forum. However, it is helpful to review a few of the pioneers who contributed to the false narrative of white supremacy and racism.

The concept of race has been considered by various scholars for centuries, and certain individuals and institutions significantly impacted worldwide acceptability of the societal norms of white supremacy and racism. White supremacy is a false construction process that was created as a "culture" (Rothenberg, 1998). This culture was developed through a race classification that placed white people as superior to all others. The process and delivery vehicle of white supremacy and the minimizing of non-whites birthed the term, concept, and application of race, and therefore racism; it was taught to and easily adopted by whites. The desire for acquiring wealth and power is a driving force that has challenged humanity throughout the ages; in America, racism was fueled by early vestiges of capitalism. The Catholic Church sanctioned white supremacy and racism and promoted racist practices during the exploitative activities of Spain and Portugal, as evidenced by both countries barbarically conquering peoples of color around the world in the name of the crown and church. Thus, prior to this false construct, the foundation of classism is also at the core of racism.

During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, two influences were running on parallel tracks of creating and developing white supremacy and racism: science and Christianity (Western States Center, n.d.). The scientific approach was most referred to and influenced by George-Louis Leclerc, Carolus Linnaeus, and Johann Friedrich Blumenbach (Marcel Salas, 2017). In the twentieth century, American Carleton Coon contributed further to constructs around race, white supremacy, and racism. The deep influence and investment that Christianity leveled against all non-whites around the world, particularly in the United States of America with the enslavement of Blacks, must not be overlooked. The church is one of the most segregated institutions in America, much like educational institutions. The three early

and central race classification categories included Caucasian, Mongolian, and African, although various other names are also used with these three created classifications (Models of Classification, n.d.).

George-Louis Leclerc (1707-1788, France), also known as Comte de Buffon, had a varied career portfolio, but he is known most for his work *Histoire Naturelle* or *Natural History*, a series of volumes published between 1749 and 1804 in which he systematically examined the natural world of plants and animals and the differences between them as a result of their environments and isolation. His finding that environmentally similar but isolated regions have distinct collections of mammals and birds and that climates and species are changeable became known as "Buffon's Law." He suggested that development of species may both improve and degenerate due to environmental factors after dispersing from the center of creation. In *The Varieties of the Human Species* (1749), he claimed there were six primary races, all with the same origin but differing based on variations of physical and cultural features: Caucasian, Mongolian, American, Malay, African, and Australian. Of these races, Buffon held that the Caucasian was the original and most beautiful race while other races were more primitive due to variations caused by environment, although he also believed that variations in races could revert to Caucasian with proper environmental controls. Buffon's theories, beliefs and influences played various roles in creating the culture of white supremacy and racism (Claude-Olivier 2012). Unfortunately, his work was accepted and helped to solidify the culture of white supremacy.

Carolus Linnaeus (1707-1778, Sweden), a contemporary of Buffon, was a botanist, zoologist, taxonomist, and physician. Linnaeus was known as the "father of modern taxonomy" based on his 1758 work *The Systema Naturae*, a text concerned with the classification of plants and animals. Essays on sexual reproduction influenced him to believe that plants had male and female reproductive organs and, as he put it, could be seen as husbands and wives. He also applied his theories to humans. His work offered the early classification of four races: European, American, Asiatic, and African/Ethiopian. He believed that cross-breeding created infertility. His classification system for naming, ranking, and classifying organisms is still in use today, albeit with many changes.

Johann Friedrich Blumenbach (1752-1840, Germany) was a physician, naturalist, physiologist, and anthropologist known for his studies of the human being as an aspect of natural history. In the third edition of his work *De Generis Humani Varietate Nativa* (*On the Natural Variety of Mankind, 1795*), he coined the term Caucasian to define light-skinned people from Europe, North Africa, and western Asia. Blumenbach's early work used the four-race classification of his predecessor and teacher Linneaus, but by 1795 he divided humans into five races based on geography and appearance by renaming the European classification—now Caucasian—and adding a new classification, Malay. His final five classifications were Caucasian, Mongolian, Malayan, Ethiopian, and American, the last referring to indigenous people of the New World. He argued that physical characteristics like skin color and cranial profile depended on geography, diet, and mannerism. Like Buffon, Blumenbach believed in the degenerative hypothesis, the theory that Adam and Eve as Caucasians were at the center of creation and all others were a result of degeneration caused by environmental factors (Raj Bhopal and Usher, 2007). Despite this view, he had an admiration for Blacks and considered Africa among the most civilized nations of the earth. Of the early influences on the construct of race, Blumenbach was the least racist in that he considered Black Africans and white Europeans to be of equal status; however, his changes to Linneaus's classification system did the most to establish a superiority for the classification of Europeans upon which all others would be judged (Gould, 1994).

Carleton Coon (1904-1981, United States) was a professor of physical anthropology at Harvard University. He used the terms "Caucasoid" and "white race" synonymously as had become common in the United States, although not elsewhere. He believed white people superior to other races, claiming they are more evolved with larger brains. However, Coon believed that Europeans were a sub-race of the Caucasoid race. He believed in Darwin's theory of evolution and held the same beliefs as Buffon. He also classified humans into five races: Caucasoid-White, Mongoloid-Oriental/Amerindian, Capoid-Bushmen/Hottentots, Australoid-Australian Aborigine and Papuan, and Negroid-Black. He believed that the darker the skin, the less intelligent the people. Coon's work is often used by segregationists. His *The Origins of Race* was a highly controversial writing that spurred much consternation that fueled racism in America, especially after World War II (Jackson, 2001).

A contrasting view of race classification is offered by sociologist Neely Fuller, Jr. Fuller indicates in *The United Independent Compensatory Code/System/Concept: A Compensatory Counter-Racist Code*, a textbook and workbook for thought, speech and action for victims of racism and white supremacy, that there are three basic types of people in the known universe:

1. "White" people who classify themselves as white and have been classified as white and are accepted as white by other people and who generally function as white in all nine major areas of people activity, including economics, education, entertainment, labor, law, politics, religion, sex, and war.

2. "Non-White" people who have been classified as non-white and who generally function as non-white in their relationships with each other and with people classified as white in all of the nine major areas of activity, including economics, education, entertainment, labor, law, politics, religion, sex, and war.

3. "White Supremacists," or racists, who classify themselves as white, who generally function as white, and who practice racial subjugation based on white/non-white classifications against people classified as non-white at any time, in any place, in any one or more of the nine major areas of activity, including economics, education, entertainment, labor, law, politics, religion, sex, and war. (Fuller 2016, p.8)

Fuller further states that "If you do not understand White Supremacy (Racism)—what it is, and how it works—everything else that you understand will only confuse you."

This cursory overview serves as a backdrop to the development of white supremacy as an arbitrary cultural occurrence that led to the application of the racist mindset, which spawned multiple concepts of structural and institutional racism prior to reaching the New World. By the time whites came to the Americas, the die was cast for whites to actually believe that they were justified in being masters and superior over all non-white people of the world at all levels or functions of life.

Ironically, these white supremacy pioneers did not think of themselves as or believe themselves to be racists; indeed, the concept had not been invented yet, and these classifications were considered to be the natural order of life. The research in this area reveals not only hundreds of scholars that laid the foundation; it also reveals the depth of racism presently and seeds of racism in the future. After hundreds of years of white supremacy and racism, people today are witnessing a worldwide challenge to these

concepts. However, a push back from those that wish not to change the policies, laws, and practices of the status quo is also being seen. From Brown v. Board of Education to online distance learning of 2020, America's education system has struggled and failed to provide anti-racism, equal opportunity, and access to students of color, especially Black males, at all levels of education. This failing includes disproportionate applications of discipline. The challenge of changing policy, procedures, and minds is significant.

HISTORY OF DISCRIMINATORY LAWS IN THE UNITED STATES

The United States has a history of systemic racism, including discriminatory laws and practices. Since colonists first came to what is now the United States, various groups of people have been excluded from basic human rights, property rights, citizenship, labor rights, education, and the ability to take part in the political process. These groups were excluded from developing and voting on laws that brought the country to where it is today. This history of exclusion through legislation has established the system of power and oppression within which everyone lives and operates today (Rothstein, 2018). From this history of exclusion, America's educational systems and community colleges, along with their policies and practices, were built.

Jamestown, Virginia, the first English settlement in the New World, was established as a colony in 1607. This area was home to the Powhatans, indigenous people who maintained an agricultural society (Takaki, 1993). The Powhatans provided sustenance for the starving colonists, but, in 1609, Governor Thomas Gates arrived with word that the indigenous peoples should be forced into labor for the colonists. The bloody battle for land and unpaid labor for the colonists forever changed the lives of indigenous peoples.

In 1619, "20 and odd" kidnapped Angolans arrived in Virginia via the White Lion, a Dutch ship flying a British flag. The White Lion's crew had stolen the Angolans from a Portuguese ship. The kidnapped Africans were sold to the colonists, who forced them into servitude. This historical event marks the beginning of a history of dehumanization, exclusion, devaluation, murder, anti-Blackness, and racism against people of African descent in the New World that continues to present day in the United States.

The slavery of people of African descent continued in what is now the United States throughout the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries. This time was rife with laws, practices, and beliefs engineered to maintain the American institution of slavery, which led the way for colonialism and a stratified society in the New World. During this time period, both the north and the south developed their law enforcement units, with the Night Watch created in Boston in 1636 and Slave Patrols created in the Carolina colonies in 1704. In both the northern and southern states, law enforcement focused attention on returning runaway slaves, policing "dangerous classes" including the poor, foreign immigrants, and free Blacks, enforcing the Black Codes, enforcing Jim Crow laws, and brutalizing, controlling, devaluing, and incarcerating Black people.

Laws and practices related to land and home ownership played a major role in creating systemic barriers for minoritized populations. Land increases in value and adds to the wealth of its owner. Land can also be passed down from generation to generation, thus providing increased wealth for the heirs of landed citizens. Restricting land ownership restricts people's wealth and that of their descendants. Native

Americans, Mexican Americans, Blacks, and other non-European immigrants experienced restrictions in land and home ownership as well as having land taken from them. The unfulfilled promises to people of Mexican descent in the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848 separated Mexican people from their land, denied many of the citizenship that was promised, and made them a disenfranchised, minoritized group living in poverty on what was once their own land. Other discriminatory practices were codified into law, with the Homestead Act (1862) and Dawes Act (1887) continuing to deny Native Americans land rights. Restrictive covenants and the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) denied home ownership to people of color.

While many white Americans enjoyed the privileges of land and home ownership, starting in the early 1900s, restrictive covenants became a popular way of protecting white neighborhoods from having people of color living among them. Housing sales could specify restrictions such that properties could not be sold to non-Whites and non-Christians. These covenants remained legal until they were declared unconstitutional in 1966. The FHA took advantage of restrictive covenants and codified a racist practice into law as redlining. From 1934 to 1968, FHA mortgage insurance utilized redlining, the practice of denying or limiting financial services to certain neighborhoods based on racial or ethnic composition without regard to the residents' qualifications or creditworthiness. The term "redlining" refers to the practice of using a red line on a map to delineate the communities of color as areas where financial institutions would not invest, denying loans to residents in those areas regardless of their creditworthiness or qualifications. The FHA gave White Christians an unprecedented opportunity to purchase homes with the new mortgage system while denying that opportunity to non-Christians and people of color. This process kept loans out of older communities of color and funneled them into new white suburbs. These laws and practices further segregated residential neighborhoods. This segregation increased with the urban renewal efforts of the 1950s and 1960s. "From 1960 to 1977, four million whites moved out of central cities, while the number of whites living in suburbs increased by twenty-two million. During the same years, the inner-city Black population grew by six million, but the number of Blacks living in the suburbs increased by only 500,000 people. By 1993, 86 percent of suburban whites still lived in places with a Black population below 1 percent" (Lipsitz, 1995, p. 374).

These discriminatory laws and practices had, and continue to have, negative consequences in terms of reproducing inequity in public schools, particularly for those in communities of color. Public schools have been viewed as local institutions that are to serve their local communities and were traditionally supported by contributions from community members. By the end of the nineteenth century, the tradition of funding schools through local property taxes was widespread. Funding schools through property taxes creates a disparity, as schools in higher-income areas receive more funding than those located in low-income areas because low-income areas have comparatively lower property and income taxes. People of color disproportionately reside in low-income areas. This situation robs students of color of resources and opportunities that are prevalent in higher income, predominantly white communities. The California Supreme Court ruled this funding practice unconstitutional in 1971 and ordered the state to provide supplemental funding, but the damage was already done and property taxes are still part of the funding equation for public schools. In Robinson v. Cahill (1973), the New Jersey Supreme Court found that relying on property taxes for school funding violated the state constitutional guarantee of access to a "thorough and efficient" public education system. However, the rulings regarding the use of property taxes for school funding were different in other states. For example, in the 1973 case San

Antonio Independent School District v. Rodriguez, the parents of students in a school district in Texas challenged the use of property taxes to fund schools. The United States Supreme Court found that the system did not violate the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment because the system did not intentionally discriminate against a certain group of people. These practices show the current-day impact of past land ownership inequities, restrictive covenants, and redlining in public schools.

Appendix A of this paper outlines additional discriminatory laws and legislation in its "Timeline of Discriminatory Laws in the United States"; however, the timeline is not exhaustive in nature. This timeline covers laws and legislation relating to human rights, citizenship, voting, property rights, education, rights to earn a living, and more. However, these examples only represent de jure discrimination as opposed to de facto practices. Practices and ideals including Manifest Destiny, the Black Codes, and voter suppression such as poll taxes, grandfather clauses, and automatic voter purges have contributed to building the systemic barriers students face today.

AN OVERVIEW OF RACISM IN ACADEMIA

> *Our system has embraced difficult conversations about systemic racism, so no matter where you are as a community we've got you. Our system has not shied away from connecting the dots and calling structures, practices, language and behaviors for what they are, vehicles to preserve, protect, or reproduce systemic racism. (Dr. Daisy Gonzales, CCCCO Deputy Chancellor)*

The history of the United States reveals that schools were initially created to educate white male children, resulting in the exclusion of women and people of color. When access was expanded to include women and people of color, it was for the purpose of cultural assimilation, the process by which a cultural group assumes the values, behavior, and norms of a dominant group. Prior to the Civil War, no higher education structure existed for Blacks. During the Reconstruction Period from 1865 to 1877, Blacks were allowed to attend schools. Various settings provided opportunities for literacy development including Black schools sponsored by private missionary societies. According to Watkins, during the time of Reconstruction, "missionary education drew on the tradition of humanism. Notions of altruism, free expression, salvation and the unfiltered development of the individual undergirded missionary views" (2019, p.14). Civic-minded groups and the reform and charity movement also contributed to the education of Blacks. From the 1860s to 1915, the missionary societies established more than thirty colleges that now enroll over 60% of Black students attending college (Watkins, 2019, p.19).

Beginning in 1881, education was seen as the means to achieve equality. Jim Crow laws, a set of discriminatory laws in the southern states after Blacks had earned their freedom from slavery, turned de jure access into de facto inclusion. Following the Civil War and the emancipation of enslaved Black people, the United States government established land-grant institutions for Black students through the Second Morrill Act of 1890. "As a result, some new public Black institutions were founded, and a number of formerly private Black schools came under public control; eventually 16 Black institutions were designated as land-grant colleges" (U.S. Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights, 1991). These racially-segregated institutions eventually grew in number and became known as Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

U.S. Supreme Court decisions played a pivotal role in addressing racism in education. Plessy v. Ferguson (1896) and Brown v. Board of Education (1954) were two landmark court decisions impacting the educational rights of Black people. Plessy v. Ferguson established a "separate but equal" doctrine that impacted all aspects of Black lives, including public education. The Supreme Court ruled that the protections of the Fourteenth Amendment applied only to political and civil rights, including voting and jury service, not social rights like riding in rail cars or participating in public education. However, in its 1954 Brown v. Board of Education decision, the Supreme Court declared the "separate but equal" doctrine unconstitutional "and held that racially segregated public schools deprive Black children of equal protection guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution" (U.S. Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights, 1991). The court decision was a consolidation of five cases that ended racial segregation in public schools.

The 1960s is a period historically remembered as the decade of social justice and civil rights. The civil rights movement was organized by Blacks to end racial discrimination and gain equal rights under the law. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 was landmark legislation providing equal opportunity protections from discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin.

Throughout history, anti-racist progress made within the education system has been matched by pushback that served to further cement racist structures. For example, the use of redlining in the late 1960s to displace, exclude, and segregate transitioned to progress with the implementation of court-ordered busing to desegregate schools. The pushback against desegregation, however, led to privatization of education when white parents moved their children from public to private schools to prevent their children from being bused to schools in minoritized communities. Privatization was about reverting back to segregation and was rooted in racism. While forced integration may have been an honorable attempt to eliminate desegregation, it unfortunately resulted in the creation of disparities, racialized tracking, and remediation.

This overview underscores how past developments led to current movements that have activated communities to disrupt the pre-school to prison pipeline, anti-Blackness in the United States, and racial inequity. Anti-racist practitioners are encouraged to learn more as they continue to address racial equity and racial justice in academia.

WORKING TOWARD RACIAL EQUITY IN THE CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Though the California Community Colleges (CCC) system, like all American systems of education, was born out of a culture of systemic racism that covertly privileges white Americans while saddling students of color with significant barriers along the path to success, the CCC system has made several attempts over the past decades to promote equity and close achievement gaps between white students and students of color. The authors of the 1960 California Master Plan for Higher Education envisioned an educational system that offered universal accessibility in order to facilitate upward class mobility. Indeed, "the Master Plan was nothing more than a blanket commitment from the state to educate all the California students

who wanted an education and, in doing so, to facilitate the kind of class mobility that has placed public education at the center of American civic life" (Bady and Konczal, 2012). Unfortunately, the promise of the Master Plan was never fully realized, as the structural barriers contributing to inequitable opportunities and transfer and graduation rates were not addressed through an anti-racist lens. Significant inequities and disparate opportunities remained hallmarks of the CCC system.

These inequities would not be addressed in any meaningful, organized way for an additional three decades. The 1988 Community College Reform Act called for an increased focus on hiring of faculty members with a sensitivity to diversity, and student equity plans were mandated for the first time in 1992. These plans required each California community college to report campus data on access, retention, degree and certificate completion, transfer rates, and basic skills course completion, and to analyze performance gaps between majority and minoritized groups. Furthermore, the plans required that campuses set goals, design action plans, and commit funds to address success gaps and adverse impacts of local policies on underrepresented groups and to review progress every three years and make necessary revisions. In 1996, the state further emphasized the importance of equity plans by making them a requirement for colleges to receive Proposition 98 funding. In 2002, amid questions about the impact of equity plans and under pressure from the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, a Chancellor's Office task force was convened to evaluate the plans' status and effectiveness. The task force report emphasized the connection between diverse faculty and the success of traditionally underrepresented student populations, recommended increasing efforts to recruit and retain diverse faculty, and resulted in a strengthening of the Title 5 language around equity plan requirements. Despite these revision efforts, by 2010 equity gaps between white students and students of color were still a significant problem for the California community colleges, and educational professionals and lawmakers alike understood that greater, more effective efforts were needed to promote equity within the system. Thus, in 2010, the legislature mandated that the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges implement a comprehensive plan to improve student success; in response, the 2011 California Community Colleges Student Success Task Force was formed. This task force produced twenty-two recommendations that were adopted by the Board of Governors, and these recommendations were the foundation of the Student Success Act of 2012.

Student Success Act of 2012

The Student Success Act of 2012 mandated changes in four broad areas: it required assessment, orientation, and education plans for incoming CCC students, permitted time or unit accumulation limits for students to declare a major, allowed for establishment of minimum academic standards for fee waiver eligibility, and created Student Success and Support Program (SSSP). It also led to the creation of the Student Success Report Card, a performance measurement system designed to increase transparency within the community colleges. Data in the scorecard, which could be disaggregated by gender, age, and ethnicity, examined campus performance in remedial instruction, job training programs, retention of students, and graduation and completion rates. While these reforms and improved transparency did lead to modest improvements in areas such as pass rates in remedial coursework, overall they failed to significantly increase completion rates, the main target of the legislation. By 2015-2016 six-year completion rates remained below 50%, and educational experts in California and across the country were expressing concerns about poor success rates among community college students.

Guided Pathways and AB 705 (Irwin, 2017)

Following the publication of *Redesigning America's Community Colleges – A Clearer Path to Student Success* in 2015 and to expand upon the efforts of four colleges that were involved in a national Association of American Colleges and Universities pathways project, the Foundation for California Community Colleges launched the California Guided Pathways Project at twenty pilot campuses in late 2016. Then, in 2017-2018, the California Legislature approved $150 million in one-time grants to provide funding for system-wide adoption of the guided pathways framework. Colleges were allocated guided pathways funding for five years if they adopted a guided pathways plan and submitted regular reports to the Chancellor's Office for approval. Thus, guided pathways became the framework for achieving the California Community Colleges *Vision for Success* initiative in 2017, and all 114 campuses began developing programs based on this framework.

Guided pathways provides a highly structured framework for institutional redesign intended to improve the student experience, outcomes, and, ultimately, student success. The four main components of the guided pathways framework are "Clarify the Path," "Enter the Path," "Stay on the Path," and" Ensure Learning." Thus, this program challenges community colleges to ensure that students start college with a clear understanding of what they need to accomplish to reach their goals and of the resources available to help them succeed, that they choose an area of study—often referred to as a meta major—early on, and that the success team—a group of teaching faculty, counselors, and student support staff—within that meta major track students' progress and provide the necessary, discipline-specific resources to promote each student's success in reaching his or her goals. Colleges across the state are in various stages of implementing local strategies within the guided pathways framework, so determining the degree to which guided pathways has meaningful impact on closing the gaps to achieve equitable educational outcomes within the community colleges is difficult, but many people throughout the system are hopeful, and early evidence suggests that guided pathways will improve success for all students, especially racially minoritized students.

In addition to the funding for guided pathways, the 2017 California legislative cycle also brought about the adoption of Assembly Bill 705 (Irwin, 2017), a law that overhauled the assessment and placement system in the community colleges. Designed to dramatically increase the likelihood that students would enter and pass transfer level math and English coursework within their first year of enrollment, AB 705 mandated multiple measures such as high-school coursework, high-school grades, and high-school GPA be used along with, or in place of, high stakes exams for initial student placement into math and English courses. California lawmakers intended that the implementation of AB 705 would promote equity by removing the barrier of remedial coursework from students' paths. Historically, students of color are significantly more likely to be placed into remedial coursework than their white and Asian peers and students placed into remedial coursework face many more obstacles in their educational journeys than those placed directly into transfer level coursework, and therefore the use of multiple measures for placement along with proper support to help students succeed in transfer level coursework was expected to help to close equity gaps for students of color. Like guided pathways, AB 705 is still being implemented across the system, and thus long-term success data is not yet available. However, early data based on Fall 2019 course taking indicates that while more students are entering and completing transfer-level math and English during their first year, success rates have decreased and the rates of students receiving

substandard grades in a transfer-level course have increased, especially for students of color in B-STEM pathways.

Student Equity and Achievement Program (SEA)

The Chancellor's Office overhauled student equity programs in 2018 to integrate student success and support, basic skills, and student equity into one program named Student Equity and Achievement (SEA). Intended to erase equity gaps between disproportionately impacted groups and their peers, this program was designed simultaneously with the adoption of guided pathways and integrates well into the framework by offering students a clear path to their stated goals, developing an educational plan to meet those goals, and replacing outdated, inaccurate placement tools that were creating unnecessary barriers to success. Disproportionately impacted groups are defined locally by each campus using equity data, so they can vary from college to college but typically include groups such as Black students, Latinx students, former and current foster youth, and differently abled students. The SEA program requires each college to incorporate the principles of guided pathways and AB 705 into a campus-wide equity plan where key success indicators are monitored over time to determine whether the campus is making meaningful progress toward reaching equity goals. This data-driven approach is expected to allow colleges to determine early which equity areas are most problematic and adjust to address these concerns in a timely manner. The years 2017-2018 marked a monumental shift in how the California community colleges approach student success and equity, and only in time will the success or failure of these reforms be made clear.

California Community Colleges *Vision for Success*

To further promote equity and ensure that all students are able to reach their goals and help their families and communities, the Board of Governors for the California Community Colleges adopted a five-year *Vision for Success* in 2017. This program is rooted in the guided pathways framework and has six measurable, aspirational goals: increase degrees and certificates by 20%, increase transfer to California State University and University of California by 35%, decrease unit accumulation, increase the number of existing career technical education students employed in their fields of study, reduce equity gaps across all of the above measures through faster improvements among disproportionately impacted student groups, and reduce regional achievement gaps across all of the above measures through faster improvements among colleges located in regions with the lowest educational attainment of adults. To achieve these very ambitious goals, the *Vision for Success* includes seven core commitments on which colleges must focus: "focus relentlessly on student goals; always design with the student in mind; pair high expectations paired with high support; foster the use of data, inquiry, and evidence; take ownership of goals and performance; enable action and thoughtful innovation; and lead the work of partnering across systems" (Foundation for California Community Colleges, 2017, p. 19). While none of these ideas are new, each of the commitments addresses a historical challenge for the CCCs in promoting equity for traditionally underrepresented student populations. While the goals of promoting equity for all and closing achievement gaps between white students and students of color once and for all are immensely challenging and have been elusive to this point in time, they must be realized not just because allowing

all students an equal chance to succeed is the right thing to do, but also because in order to meet the workforce needs of the next generation, the educational system must find a way to educate and prepare all Californians to be contributing members of society. Only by providing opportunities for all students to succeed, regardless of their races or ethnic backgrounds, will the CCC system realize its mission of providing access to higher education for all.

Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Actions

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) has long been active in promoting and supporting efforts related to equity and closing success gaps among students of color and to increasing the diversity of faculty through attention to hiring practices. A review of ASCCC resolutions, which establish the positions and actions of the organization once adopted by delegates at bi-annual plenary sessions, provides a historical trail of equity-related positions and actions that include, among other items, working with the Chancellor's Office to implement, support, or influence policy and practices and providing support to local senates engaged in equity work. Further, ASCCC papers provide more in-depth information about topics impacting student access and success, including for students and faculty of color. Each paper includes historical and background information on the target topic; most also establish positions and provide recommendations for local academic senates, colleges, and districts, as well as the Board of Governors. Articles in the quarterly ASCCC *Senate Rostrum* also address equity gaps and challenges with access and success, particularly for underserved and disproportionately impacted populations.

Despite many years of ASCCC and system efforts related to closing gaps in order to achieve equitable outcomes, increasing access and success, and increasing the diversity of faculty serving within the California Community College system, not enough significant change has occurred. According to the Chancellor's Office DataMart, between 2000 and 2019, the number of people employed by colleges increased by ten percent from 80,377 to 88,533. Employment of faculty, including tenured or tenure track and academic temporary, increased at nearly the same pace, from 53,024 to 58,187. Some change in the racial make-up of faculty has occurred, primarily through increases in the ratio of Asian and Hispanic faculty groups to all faculty (6.7% to 10.5% and 8.9% to 15.9% respectively) and decreases in the ratio of white Non-Hispanic faculty to all faculty (74.2% in 2000 to 58.4% in 2019). Employment of African-American faculty has remained relatively static, only slightly increasing from 5.3% of all faculty in 2000 to 5.8% of all faculty in 2019. While these gains may be promising, the changes have taken nearly twenty years, and the racial diversity and makeup of faculty is still inconsistent with the student population of the California Community College system.

Much of the effort to improve diversity, equity, and inclusion across the California Community Colleges has been directed at processes, practices, and curriculum. Most efforts, at least at the statewide level, have also been more focused on equity across all groups than on actions to elevate representation and performance of specific racial groups. The approach has largely been color-evasive and has not been focused on systems and policies that were built as a result of the history of structural racism. Fortunately, that situation is changing. In Fall 2019, ASCCC delegates approved Resolution 3.02 Support Infusing Anti-Racism/No Hate Education in Community Colleges as a first step toward addressing racism, including developing an increased awareness of racism, its impacts, and anti-racist practices. That action has

been followed by development of this paper to assist in providing faculty an overview of the impacts of historical racism as well as steps that can be taken individually, by colleges and districts, and by the system to more directly address racism.

To increase awareness of the experiences of Black faculty within the California Community Colleges, in summer 2020 the ASCCC called for contributions for a special edition *Senate Rostrum* publication. The resulting Summer 2020 ASCCC *Senate Rostrum* is a powerful and moving collection of Black voices, experiences, and perspectives with topics ranging from personal experiences to recommended changes in hiring practices, institutional constructs, and individual disciplines.

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Implementation Plan

In recent years, the ASCCC has also been a partner with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office on diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts. In January 2019, the Chancellor's Office engaged stakeholders with the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Taskforce and included ASCCC President John Stanskas as co-chair. The taskforce led the foundational effort whose groundwork was adopted by the Board of Governors in September of 2019 as the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Integration Plan, which included strategies to integrate diversity, equity, and inclusion into the *Vision for Success*, adopt the California Community Colleges Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Statement, and approve the budget proposal necessary to augment statewide resources to advance the implementation of the faculty and staff Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Integration Plan.[1]

Beginning in February of 2020, on behalf of the Board of Governors, the taskforce evolved to become the Statewide Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Implementation Workgroup. The workgroup is focused on measuring progress and accountability in the implementation of the plan. This work will occur through progress reports to the Board of Governors in September 2020, March 2021, September 2021, and March 2022. The workgroup is also focused on coordinating structural changes and deployment of system-wide professional development and technical assistance for local colleges and districts.

On June 3rd of 2020, as a result of COVID-19 and the brutal killings of George Floyd and other people of Black or African descent, the Chancellor's Office called for action and established a set of system-wide priorities (California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, 2020). These priorities are aligned to the DEI Implementation Plan and are as follows:

1. A system-wide review of law enforcement officers and first responder training and curriculum.

2. Campus leaders must host open dialogue and address campus climate.

3. Campuses must audit classroom climate and create an action plan to create inclusive classrooms and anti-racism curriculum.

4. District governing boards must review and update their equity plans with urgency.

---

1   The Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Integration Plan can be found at https://www.cccco.edu/-/media/CCCCO-Website/ Reports/CCCCO_DEI_Report.pdf?la=en&hash=69E11E4DAB1DEBA3181E053BEE89E7BC3A709BEE

5. Shorten the time frame for the full implementation of the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Integration Plan.

6. Engage in the Vision Resource Center "Community Colleges for Change."

These priorities require that the California Community Colleges system, colleges and districts, and local academic senates, as well as the ASCCC, identify, describe, analyze, and change racist structures that have led to inequitable outcomes. The focus on anti-racism is an added emphasis to original diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts and reinforces the need for all those vested in the success of community college students to become more educated in the history of racism, its effects in education, principles of anti-racism, and anti-racist actions that should be taken.

ANTI-RACISM TENETS FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES

For much of recent history, education systems have valued policies that claim not to see race and to treat all students equally rather than working from a place of being race-conscious, which requires noticing and embracing difference as the first step to ensuring that these differences do not become weaponized or used to disadvantage some students. This trend stems from what critical race theorists recognize as a "color-blind" approach to addressing racism and assumes that neutrality is an effective method for achieving equality. However, because such methods tend to erase race from any dialogue on racism, and because they tend to emphasize approaches that insist on treatments that are across-the-board equal for all groups, they are able to address only the most blatant forms of discrimination. As Ibram Kendi (2019) explains, "there is no neutrality in the racism struggle . . . One either allows racial inequities to persevere, as a racist, or confronts racial inequities, as an antiracist. There is no in between safe space of 'not racist.' The claim of 'not racist' neutrality is a mask for racism" (p. 9). The systems of the California Community Colleges and California higher education have come into being over time and have long histories. In some cases, those histories are explicitly racist, shaped by explicitly racist ideas and ideologies. Even in cases that may not be explicitly racist, misguided attempts to treat all students the same and efforts that support color-blind neutrality can create racial disparities or, at best, uphold them.

Engaging in anti-racist work requires one to be a race-conscious leader. It requires going beyond conversations and moving towards raising questions and being reflective about how one's own actions or inactions reproduce racial inequity. In a presentation titled "Responding to Racism on College and University Campuses," Shaun Harper (2015) introduced four steps to becoming a race-conscious leader:

▪ Understanding the current moment.

▪ Authentic conversations and collaborations that entail feeling and hearing, which leads to action.

▪ Accurate understanding of the realities of race on campus

▪ Boldly confronting long-standing racial problems embedded into the structure of the institution.

Race-conscious leaders know the difference between individual and systemic racism and understand that while white people may not consider themselves racist, they still benefit from a system that favors them. Race-conscious leaders create change by constant questioning and critical self-reflection. They question meritocracy when they see racial inequity and segregation. They recognize that overwhelmingly white leadership teams are a sign of a malfunctioning organization and seek out other perspectives. They own their imperfections by being vulnerable (Selzer, Evans-Phillips, & Johnson, 2017).

The primary tenets of doing anti-racist work, as leaders strive to be race-conscious, are to identify racial inequities, to take deliberate, targeted action to counteract inequities, and to engage in constant inquiry and improvement. Anti-racism requires action as opposed to neutrality or niceness. Practitioners within the California Community Colleges must familiarize themselves with these tenets in order to make progress as anti-racist educators and administrators and to dismantle the racist structures that adversely impact Blacks and other people of color.

Identify Racial Inequities

Being anti-racist means looking at every aspect of systems within which one lives and works through a race-conscious lens that looks not just for explicit racism but that considers the racial implications of policies and practices. While the voices of people of color should be centered in these conversations, white allies must collaborate with and support the efforts of faculty of color to identify and address white supremacy. In order to identify these inequities, professional development and education can help establish race-consciousness as a lens to seek out implicit racism in its many forms. As racial inequities are uncovered, resistance and denial are likely to occur, because, as Kendi (2019,) explains, "denial is the heartbeat of racism, beating across ideologies, races, and nations" (p. 9). To be anti-racist is to confront this denial and expose the inequity in order to understand how to fix it.

Take Deliberate, Targeted Action to Counteract Racial Inequities

Once the policies, practices, or systems that create racial inequity are identified, they must be corrected. As Kendi (2019) states, "The defining question is whether the discrimination is creating equity or inequity. If discrimination is creating equity, then it is anti-racist. If discrimination is creating inequity, then it is racist." He continues, "The only remedy to racist discrimination is anti-racist discrimination. The only remedy to past discrimination is present discrimination. The only remedy to present discrimination is future discrimination" (p. 19). These points may be confusing at first and may seem counter to what most people normally believe, but this perspective is a foundational tenet of anti-racism: practitioners must be discriminating, in that they must take deliberate action and actively work not toward equality but to combat inequities in systems to bring equity and to best ensure current systems do not perpetuate or create future inequities.

Engage in Constant Inquiry and Improvement

Anti-racism is an iterative and accretive process, and education is a foundation to personal and professional growth. To be anti-racist is to understand the need for cultural humility and constant growth, which necessitates continuous professional development, conversation, reflection, and work. To be anti-racist is to understand that racism is not a fixed identity, and neither is anti-racism. Mistakes will happen, but one must acknowledge them and work to make matters right. Most of all, to be anti-racist is to resist comfort by challenging one's own beliefs and assumptions and listening openly when challenged by others.

As community college professionals engage in anti-racist work, much needed change to systems and structures brings encouragement to those who understand their positions and roles in anti-racist efforts. As inequities are addressed, environments can be re-created in culturally responsive ways. As Zaretta Hammond (2015) reflects, classrooms must be spaces of positive relationships that do not just acknowledge struggles or histories but actively affirm students' identities and build agency. While the challenges and potential for a focus just on diversity can cause problems if they are stopping points or the only efforts to be acknowledged, positive social interaction and affirmation that comes from celebrating diversity can be an integral part to culturally responsive spaces. To further understand key areas to engage in operationalizing equity, Hammond's research and praxis present a continuum and show the differences between multicultural education, social justice, and culturally responsive teaching. Multicultural education focuses on diversity, while social justice education centers on developing consciousness about the inequities that exist. Anti-racism work is an intricate part of social justice learning and teaching. Culturally responsive teaching is a process of using cultural information to build cognitive capacity and an academic mindset that pushes back on dominant narratives about people of color. While many efforts to advance equity have centered around multicultural education and, to some degree, culturally responsive teaching, efforts have fallen short. Social justice learning and teaching, inclusive of anti-racism education, is a critical area to include in self-growth as well as curriculum, instruction, and professional development. To achieve equity, practitioners must use anti-racist lenses to develop institutions in multiple areas, and a major key is the necessity to equitize systems and structures to enable more equitable systems and culturally responsive teaching.

Bianca C. Williams (2016) states, "The forms of racism and sexism that permeate the academy frequently push women and scholars of color to question their sense of worth and belonging, which can lead to feelings of shame about perceived incapabilities" (p. 75). By creating spaces of "truth-telling" where narratives and experiences are valued and affirmed, more culturally responsive learning environments can be developed where students can be their whole selves. Williams argues that "truth-telling and brave vulnerability…open up space for educational moments and chip away at cultures of silence and shame" (p. 79).

Thus, an imperative tenet of anti-racism is that practitioners not only dismantle racist systems, but also develop cultural response systems in their place. This work can be difficult. Williams shares, "As we gain entrance to this privileged world and earn the right to access its substantial social and economic resources, we are required to be radically honest as we acknowledge the ways we are sometimes implicated in the oppressions we seek to destroy" (p. 81). Anti-racist work requires that people take action with integrity, and often doing so can be uncomfortable.

ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT THEORY AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

> *Many practitioners have become routine in their applications; they have succumbed to management pressure for the quick fix, the emphasis on the bottom line, and the cure-all mentality….They seem to have lost sight of the core values of the field. (Margulies and Raia, 1990, as cited in Anderson, 2012)*

According to Anderson (2012), the values of an organization are a significant part of its identity. He emphasizes that an organization's values help leaders with identifying choices about how to proceed in an intervention and provide a method for evaluating work. Moreover, he identifies the following as organizational values: participation, involvement, empowerment, groups and teams, growth development, learning, thinking of organizational members as whole people, dialogue, collaboration, authenticity, openness, and trust. Organizational development leaders provide intervention strategies for conscious organizational change, and the principles of organizational development may be useful in transforming colleges as anti-racism agents. In restructuring or advancing equity work in California community colleges, a primary responsibility of organizations is the management of systems and structures to bring about necessary change.

The process may include three primary change areas: team, organization processes, or responsibilities. The strategies encompass effective approaches and techniques to facilitate change within organizations. Implemented strategies require organizational development leaders to understand how to navigate challenges to holding organizational development values. Burke and Bradford (2005, as cited in Anderson, 2012) define the practical application of these strategies as a "system-wide process of planned change aimed toward improving overall organization effectiveness by way of enhanced congruence of such key organizational dimensions as external environment, mission, strategy, leadership, culture, structure, information and reward systems, and work policies and procedures" (p. 3). Additionally, organizational development leaders provide broad behavioral science techniques applicable to organizational change. The practical application strategies that change agents use are viable for achieving organizational goals, marketing, information technology, operations, human resources, and communications. Although originally used for business organizations, organizational development practices can be applied to the desired accountable systemic change for California community colleges. The practical application of organizational development theory can serve to achieve organizational anti-racism goals.

The organizational development political strategies can provide a moral operating system for effective professional development approaches and techniques to facilitate universal change within the California Community Colleges system. Additionally, the organizational development leadership approach can provide broad behavioral techniques applicable to "transform work," defined by Howard and Corver (2008) as skillful decision making in the workplace. The practical ethical application strategies of the organizational development leadership approach provide values of quality, productivity, and efficiency intervention techniques and direct leadership behavior. Ethics derive from values that undergird behaviors based on those values (White & Wooten, 1985). Therefore, anti-racism must become an explicit value in California community colleges and for their institutional agents.

While organizational development leadership provides a framework for integration of anti-racism values and examination of existing structures, policies, and processes in California community colleges, the effects of transformational leadership must also be considered. Several studies introduce leadership constructs associated with organizational change and innovation adoption (Aarons, 2006; Anderson & Ackerman-Anderson, 2010; Ashbaugh, 2013; Basham, 2012; Bass, 1990; & Ozarialli, 2003; Sanchez, 2014). Aarons (2006) identifies links between leadership, organizational process, consumer satisfaction, and outcome. Ozaralli (2003) discovers significant correlation between transformational leadership and empowerment and team effectiveness. Basham (2012) identifies transformational leadership as the extent to which one is able to serve and learn across disciplines. He states, "Transformational leadership is essential within higher education so that adaptation can be completed to meet the constantly changing economic and academic environment" (p. 344). Transformational leaders challenge the organizational culture and possess the ability to share their vision; they influence others and generate awareness by inspiration, intellectual stimulation, and meeting others' emotional needs (Bass, 1990). Recognizing and meeting others' emotional needs is vital to anti-racism work, and, more specifically, to anti-racism education. Those engaged in anti-racism work beyond self-growth and activism can utilize organizational development leadership and transformative leadership when engaging and educating others through professional development.

ANTI-RACISM EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Education must be viewed as liberation work, be it financial freedom or emancipating one's mind. Being race-conscious should be at the rudimentary level of any professional development for educators. The ambivalence of colorblind education, well-intentioned or not, has been detrimental to minoritized students. The term colorblind itself has a negative ableist connotation and has more recently and progressively been replaced with color-evasiveness. Due to their widespread usage and notoriety, both colorblindness and color evasiveness can be utilized interchangeably during transition towards more equity-based language.

While race itself is a social construct, the social construction of it must be addressed in the socialization process of educational institutions (Monroe, 2013). In constructing curriculum and teaching in classrooms, teachers often insert their bias or regurgitate the standard colonized systematic discriminatory practices that exist. Furthermore, research is clear that instructors are often hesitant to discuss race and have open discourse about it, much less incorporate it in their syllabus and lesson plans (Lewis, 2001). In actively reflecting on their positionality, humans must reflect on their racial identities and their impact on the emancipation and liberation of their experiences with others (West, 1993). Likewise, the faculty who view education in this light must lift the veils of racist stereotypes and emancipate themselves in order to emancipate the minds of their students. Thus, actively reflecting on the experiences of race and on its benefits and consequences such as privilege often causes the uncomfortable experiences needed to move from a racist base of understanding to an anti-racist platform. The examination and interrogation of oneself and of the perspectives through which one views the world must be modeled in the active decolonization of self and teaching andragogy. For faculty and institutions ready to engage in this work, a four part framework includes researching the self, researching the self in relation to others, shifting from self to system, and understanding curriculum and instruction.

Researching the Self

Faculty must respect the racial identities of their students just as they must reflect on their own. Faculty must consider the experiences and implicit biases that shape who they are inside and outside the classroom. They must interrogate their thought processes and views on race and actively reflect on how those thoughts and behaviors impact them in the classroom. Some helpful guiding questions to ask oneself are as follows:

- What is my race and how did I come to that conclusion?

- How do I negotiate race outside and inside my classroom?

- In what ways has my racial background impacted my decision making?

- In what ways has my racial background informed what I emphasize in the classroom or not? How do I know?

- How do my beliefs about learning and pedagogy impact the race of my students in the classroom?

- In what ways have my beliefs about certain students' racial upbringing changed as a result of my teachings?

- How has teaching students of color impacted my pedagogy and curriculum?

Researching the Self in Relation to Others

Given the understanding that race is the most salient factor in the work that is needed, an opportunity is present to dissect the many layers of experiences that exist. CRT once again gives an effective framework for this dissection. In understanding how the self is impacted by the interplay between power and authority in society, CRT scholars point to intersectionality, a term coined by Kimberlé Crenshaw, as an important element. According to Delgado and Stefancic (2017), intersectionality "means the examination of race, sex, class, national origin, and sexual orientation and how their combination plays out in various settings. These categories—and still others—can be separate disadvantaging factors" (p.58). Understanding the intersectionalities of experiences and identities and how they are impacted by societal power dynamics may lend itself to a more nuanced approach connecting the complex experiences of humans based on race, class, and gender (Crenshaw, 1993). The lived experiences of poverty or class may sprout an opportunity of empathy in relation to students. Some things to reflect upon are the potential lack of experience of faculty in relation to their students. Ladson-Billings (2009) mentions that perhaps growing up in privilege or wealth or a different race provides an essential learning opportunity, as both differences and similarities must be analyzed. Some active questions to reflect upon are the following:

- How do I negotiate my racial experiences with those of my students?

- What are some political, social, or historical events that have shaped my life and how do I view them differently from or similarly with my students?

- How consistent or inconsistent is my reality from those of my students?

Thinking of events like the 2016 presidential election, the laws and bans such as Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals or the Muslim travel ban, the Black Lives Matter protests, or the Dakota Pipeline protest provides additional opportunities to be reflective:

- How have these events shaped my thoughts and actions?

- How have these events shaped the lives of my students?

- How have I emphasized or neglected these experiences in my classrooms?

- How have I negotiated my understanding of these events in my curriculum and pedagogy?

Shifting from Self to System

Systems are made up of people who then enact racist policy, thus making racism systemic and institutional. Racism does not simply occur at the individual level. In fact, much of the deleterious miseducation teachers receive has come from racist colonial versions of education that most educators are now trying to contest via culturally relevant teaching and professional development (Lopez, 2003). Some guiding questions can be as follows:

- What are some systematic and organizational barriers that shape the experiences of students of color?

- What is the pre-school to prison pipeline?

- In what ways do policies and practices intentionally or unintentionally produce inequitable outcomes for students of color?

- How have educators and policymakers contributed to unproven popular discourse regarding students of color?

Understanding Curriculum and Instruction

The process of researching the self, researching the self in relation to others, and shifting from self to system must then be enacted in shaping the classroom and curriculum. Teachers need to transition from theory to action and to design learning environments reflective of their students' experiences. Curriculum in its broader sense can be defined as what students have the opportunity to learn in schools (Eisner,1994). Eisner classifies it in three different sections: explicit, implicit, and null. The implicit refers to what is emphasized and stated in policies, procedures, and publications and is actively and visibly prominent. It is featured in the syllabus and salient across the course content. The implicit is drizzled throughout and sprinkled on, unlike the explicit which is baked in. It is perhaps brought into the conversation by accident or supplemental material. The null is completely negated and erased from the curriculum. Eisner eloquently argues that by not learning the null elements of curriculum, faculty are by default learning its importance and relevance. The erasure of historical figures and contributions or inventions by non-whites to the world has lasting implications. Educators are obligated to insert null curriculum into the explicit domains, such as economics courses covering Black Wall Street, urban planning courses

covering gerrymandering, biology courses covering medical apartheid and the Tuskegee Experiment, and STEM courses covering environmental racism and understanding why COVID-19 has a statistically higher probability for communities of color than white Americans. Some questions to ask include the following:

- How can I ensure my students see themselves in the curriculum?

- How can I ensure my students are represented in the curriculum?

- How can I draw upon the experiences of my students and reflect that in my curriculum?

Advancing Anti-Racism Professional Development

The shifting of an organization from passively racist to active anti-racism leadership requires systematic approaches and appropriate resolution strategies. Institutions must provide faculty with professional development centered on understanding racism and progressing as anti-racist practitioners.

As the rise of diversity, equity, and inclusion awareness and professional development programming across the California Community Colleges system is acknowledged, questions about why past diversity, equity, and inclusion work has done little to bridge the equity achievement gap must be asked. Diversity-focused professional development clearly has not addressed the root causes of the inequity embedded in today's educational system (McNair, Bensimon, and Malcom-Piquex, 2020). A true commitment to anti-racism requires an understanding that it is not the same thing as diversity. Diversity asks everyone to celebrate differences while at the same time honoring shared humanity. Learning to be comfortable with people who are different is a very good thing, but no one can afford to continue to bask in commonalities while people of color continue to live under the oppression of racism. Anti-racism is focused on removing systemic barriers that restrict access to resources and opportunities for people of color. It requires practitioners to critically consider the needs of people of color at the foundation of the development of new educational services, policies, and curriculum, and it requires the reform of old systems. Most importantly, anti-racism work compels people to action and demands persistence and stamina because racist structures are insidious, formidable, and enduring (Alexander, 2012).

If community college practitioners are to authentically commit to serving the students being left behind, they must be willing to look more deeply within themselves and their campus institutional structures and honestly address the documented fact that race is at the heart of educational inequity. Many white California community college faculty members were socialized to believe equality and color evasiveness were fundamental values, yet the roots of racial inequity could not be and were not discussed (Subini, Jackson, and Morrison, 2017). At the heart of this color evasion were often suppressed and unacknowledged white supremacist beliefs. Despite espousals of equality in American society, white Americans knew the races did not in fact hold equal status, and, rather than confront the shame and benefit of structural inequity, they lived under the illusion that the inequality was in fact the fault of people of color, conclusions they justified by citing unsubstantiated evidence of poor family structures and a lack of value for education (Gotanda, 1991). The logic of this evasion expounded that if America provided equal opportunity and people of color were not capable of embracing what was free for the taking, white America could do little but continue to treat everyone the same and hope that one day

people of color would be ready to share in the privileges white Americans had earned. Color evasion excused well-intended white Americans from confronting their implicit racism and exclusive structures. The inability to acknowledge white privilege and the existence of structural racism kept the culture of white America silent on issues of race (Sue, 2015).

The limitations of color evasiveness work against an outcome of racial justice. Colorblindness keeps many campuses in the comfortable limbo of diversity work at the expense of transformational anti-racist change. Students and colleagues of color have not experienced colorblindness, and the belief that all should be colorblind impairs everyone's ability to identify and actively work to dismantle the structures that perpetuate racism on community college campuses. In order to take the deep look necessary to penetrate the heart of institutional racism, campus personnel must first begin with the difficult conversation on race and racism. A key cause of tension around this conversation is a lack of shared vocabulary and common understanding regarding what is meant by race, racism, and institutional racism. In order to begin to do anti-racism work, a shared definition of the term "racism" is important. Racism is prejudice based on race and reinforced by systems of power (Oluo, 2019). Discussion of racism without a power analysis reduces racism to merely excusable individual acts of prejudice without truly understanding that racist acts are part of a larger system of oppression. A corollary of this definition is that the concept of reverse racism cannot exist, because people from the dominant race, who benefit from the privilege of power, cannot experience racism (Oluo, 2019).

One of the greatest obstacles to effective campus anti-racism work, next to color-evasion, is ideas surrounding racism that are embedded in a good-bad binary where society is divided into the bad people who are racist and the good people who are color-blind and see all people as equal. Alternatively, an anti-racist analysis views racism as structural and embedded into all societal structures. This means that all people are affected by racism and hold implicit bias, which allows for the sustenance of racist structures. This good-bad binary prevents well-intentioned people from confronting their own racism or from taking action against racism because their beliefs that connect racism to their own immorality do not allow them to see or acknowledge the racism around them, nor their accountability and complacency. The moral investment in not being a racist makes people actively resistant to anti-racist change or even the starting point of anti-racism education (DiAngelo, 2018). When anti-racists declare their institution is racist, those who do not have a common understanding see this statement as a deep moral affront and resist moving forward in conversation or action. For this reason, campuses need to begin by establishing common language and understanding. An explanation of the anti-racist perspective, with a structural perspective on racism, allows for the elimination of the diversion of the good-bad binary and clears the way for the structural analysis necessary to set a foundation for effective and meaningful change.

Anti-racists also understand that belief in colorblindness and meritocracy, which are directly connected to the good-bad binary, also serve as an obstacle to productive anti-racism discussion. When a person claims to see and treat all people equally, regardless of race, that person disregards the negative impact racism has had on the lives of people of color and the privilege and opportunity that comes with being white. This is why institutions have moved beyond an inadequate focus on equality to a more informed aspiration of equity. Efforts must no longer be directed to providing all students with the same resources but instead providing students with what each one needs through an individualized assessment that takes into consideration the legacy of racism (Crenshaw, Harris, HoSang and Lipsitz, 2019). Yet, like

campuses that remain stuck in diversity, a danger exists of remaining comfortable at the higher stage of equity work that does not force a structural analysis. If practitioners are to truly provide students of color with the resources and opportunities each needs, they must first dismantle the racist structures which have perpetuated their struggles in education.

If anti-racism professional development is going to affect real campus change, it must also include a discussion of the traditional governance structures that work in community college institutions to oppress and marginalize faculty in addition to diverse student populations. College governance structures have adapted to support and sustain inequity, and those who work in the system have learned to adapt and, for many, even thrive. For this reason, Audre Lorde's (1984) words, "The master's tools will never dismantle the master's house," must be taken into consideration. A new form of campus organizing is needed to support anti-racism work. Traditional shared governance structures support racist structures and have historically silenced people of color and their allies as gadflies and troublemakers. In order to allow space for authentic anti-racism work, anti-racist activists must be supported to organize outside of the structures that have traditionally silenced and villainized them. Activists must be supported to organize in affinity groups that separate white colleagues from colleagues of color. There must be an understanding that self-reflective and action-oriented anti-racist work is not the same for white people as it is for people of color. Also, as white people awaken to the realities of racism, care must be taken to ensure the feelings and experiences they have during their learning process are not at the expense or taxation of people of color. Activist leaders must also be accountable to people of color and be provided with resources and empowered to enact change, even as the structures and the status-quo that have thrived for so long resist.

An example of active leadership is found in Santa Barbara City College's Leaders for Equity, Anti-racism, and Reparations Now (LEARN) Committee, recipient of the 2019 Dr. John W. Rice Diversity and Equity Award honoring California community college programs making the greatest contributions towards student equity. LEARN is a grassroots committee composed of a variety of stakeholders from across Santa Barbara City College who came together after independently expressing frustration about the lack of impactful diversity and inclusion training on campus and the myriad problems that students, faculty, and staff of color experience due to this lack. Before the establishment of LEARN, the focus of SBCC's campus equity training had been in celebration of diversity and did not get to the heart of the structural basis of racism at SBCC. LEARN's envisioned training model, which includes face to face and online professional development, empowers SBCC faculty, administrators, and staff to be versed in the many forms of systemic oppression so they can act as effective and well-informed advocates, allies, and partners to students as they actively work together to dismantle oppressive systems.

As a result of the efforts of LEARN, by spring semester 2020, more than 250 members of SBCC's faculty, staff, and administration experienced intensive anti-racism training and were invited into SBCC's Anti-racism Community, an ongoing forum committed to anti-racism work. As SBCC faced the Coronavirus pandemic, the most telling aspect of the transformative nature of the anti-racism training was that the college held fast to its commitment to anti-racist structural change. With acute knowledge that students of color and disproportionately impacted students were being the most harmed by the virus and the transition to online learning, the campus required every faculty member to go through foundational anti-racism training and required an anti-racism guided equity plan to be embedded into its Emergency

Distance Education Addendum approval process for every course taught at SBCC. This process ensured that students of color and other disproportionately impacted students were foundational to the consideration of the formation of the new systems in response to the Coronavirus, and the college made the commitment to continue requiring an equity plan in the regular curriculum approval process to ensure equity would remain at the forefront of college planning beyond the pandemic.

For campuses ready to go beyond diversity and basic equity training and advance to anti-racism professional development, certain key elements of effective anti-racism training should be included. These elements are based on LEARN's anti-racism work at SBCC as well as similar work at other colleges and are infused with ideas from many of the authors cited throughout this paper.

1. The analysis of racism as an individual, cultural, systemic, and institutional problem of power that goes beyond personal prejudice. Racism should be contextualized with the historical development of systemic racism in American institutions generally and the educational system specifically, with consideration of the link between racism and other forms of oppression.

2. Masterfully guided self-reflection about personal investment in racist structures and the actions individuals take to uphold these structures followed with skills to interrupt old patterns and inequitable practices that limit access and exclude some people of color.

3. Effective methodology for facilitating productive conversations about race, including methods to build trust and clear communication and to make decisions based on multiple perspectives, especially those of people of color.

4. An examination of the ongoing realities of racism, including the identity-shaping power racism has on people of color and white people.

5. The provision of participants with tools to take personal action to disrupt racism and a strategic methodology to dismantle racism in campus institutions.

6. The practice of affinity group separation during training with the understanding that the nature of anti-racism work is not the same for white people as it is for people of color and a commitment to prevent anti-racism education for white people from taxing colleagues of color.

7. A campus commitment to view anti-racism professional development as an ongoing cycle of collegial development that takes time. Trainings should be multiple days and should be spread out over weeks or months to allow time for self-reflection and growth, affinity group support, campus organizing, and anti-racist practice.

Educational institutions must provide belonging for students of color at all levels of the academic experience and through all experiences, direct and indirect, students have with the institutions. For this reason, professional development efforts must not only pierce services and procedures, but also the classroom experience. Many academic disciplines have as foundations within the colonial systems a means of understanding, categorizing, and subjecting other cultures. The lack of systems for recognizing and understanding other cultural and belief systems has historically caused antagonism and racism and embedded bias into many traditional American academic disciplinary methodologies (Battiste, 2017).

New research in the field of neuroscience and memory adds important scientific understanding to why this form of subjugation through knowledge is so effective in maintaining racist and biased structures in the educational system. These ways of knowing are perpetuated through the use of Euro-centric examples and images that reinforce racist and colonialist structures and delegitimize and exclude non-Eurocentric knowledge. They privilege students who are able to identify with Eurocentric reference points and examples and who have an easier time correlating new information with previously held knowledge that is the foundation for long-term memory storage and deep learning (Hammond, 2015).

If structural bias in classrooms is to be addressed, it must be through training instructors who create space and time for students to understand new knowledge in non-Eurocentric and culturally relevant contexts in order to facilitate the learning of students from diverse cultural experiences. Culturally responsive teaching, also known as culturally reflective pedagogy, recognizes the importance of including students' multiple cultural references in all aspects of learning (Ladson-Billings,1994). The goal is for all students to see themselves in course content. Key to the success of culturally reflective pedagogy is the collaboration between faculty and students to co-produce knowledge to ensure courses are culturally responsive and emphasize cultural wealth, are relevant to students' experiences and goals, are academically rigorous, and cultivate belonging and community among students and faculty. The practice of culturally responsive pedagogy is an effective tool for the promotion of healing and reconciliation that will be directly and immediately experienced by students of color and other disproportionately impacted students.

Intentional Online Faculty Professional Development

In the journey toward a progressive anti-racism educational climate, California community college stakeholders must not overlook the value of conducting intentional faculty-focused professional development in the online environment. This practice is even more important in the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic that has prevented on-campus professional development opportunities and may lead to many aspects of faculty and staff responsibilities, including professional development, remaining online.

One culturally responsive implementation strategy anti-racist practitioners and organizational developers must integrate in an organization is intentional professional development focused on rethinking the way faculty engage as students in learning spaces online. Faculty development programs focused on the knowledge, skills, and attitudes critical to faculty roles have increased (Cook & Steinert, 2013; Lane, 2013; Paul & Cochran, 2013; Reilly, Vandenhouten & Gallagher-Lepak, 2012; Roehrs, Wang & Kendrick, 2013). While online faculty development has been explored due to increased student enrollment (Cook & Steinert, 2013), this growth area provides leaders the ability to promote race literacy pedagogy in online faculty development. "Critical race literacy pedagogy – a subset of the approaches known as multicultural education, culturally responsive teaching, and anti-racist teaching – is a set of tools to practice racial literacy in school settings with children, peers, colleagues, and so forth" (Mosley, 2010).

According to Eberwein (2011), professional development that incorporates technology should serve as the foundation of blended online and face-to-face pedagogy in higher education. One approach to online faculty development is the engaged self-training approach (Roehrs et al., 2013). Cook and Steinert (2013) examined faculty development programs common in online learning programs and concluded that

online faculty development appears to be at least comparable to traditional training. Johnson, Wisniewski, Kuhlemeyer, Isaacs and Krzykowski (2012) acknowledge that "faculty development programs grounded in andragogy and transfer of learning theory can greatly enhance and strengthen an educator's teaching/ learning repertoire" (p. 64). As faculty engage in professional development with an anti-racism focus, whether via traditional face-to-face modes or via online delivery, the goal should be developing a cadre of anti-racism practitioners while modeling effective engagement with anti-racist principles, both with the ultimate goal of increasing understanding to bring about transformational change for faculty and students.

RACIAL RECONCILIATION

Racial reconciliation is a healing process that positively transforms the ripple effects of an enslaved people through a responsive curriculum. Racial reconciliation manifests itself in the following ways:

1. Recognizes that racism in the United States is both systemic and institutionalized.

2. Points out that racial reconciliation is engendered by empowering local colleges and academic leaders through relationship building and truth telling.

3. Stresses that justice is the essential component of the process, often known as restorative justice.

In recognizing America's construction of race and re-organizing European immigrants who had a sense of identity, such as Jewish, Irish, and Polish, into whiteness, structural barriers were created to promote white supremacy. Hence, the racist structural and systemic barriers resulted in a plethora of Jim Crow laws targeting racial minorities, specifically African Americans, from receiving certain inalienable rights. Educators must grapple with the fact that the educational system was among those institutions that were weaponized by white supremacy to subjugate Blacks. It was illegal for Blacks to read, and subsequent policies and laws prohibited Blacks from accessing education. The educational system must reconcile with the fact that it was constructed to produce inequitable access and unjust outcomes for all. The United States Supreme Court ruled in favor of segregation in *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896), which asserted, "the underlying fallacy of the plaintiff's argument to consist in the assumption that the enforced separation of the two races stamps a badge of inferiority. If this be so, it is not by reason of anything found in the act, but solely because the colored race chooses to put that construction upon it" (p. 551).

This is the ugly truth: the first step in any reconciliation effort, be it atonement or forgiveness in spiritual practices or recovery in substance abuse treatments, is grappling with the truth and being honest enough to admit or confess that a problem exists. The educational system is marred with inequities and injustices. White allies must be at the forefront in providing space for reconciliation efforts as beneficiaries of white supremacy. Minoritized people in predominantly white institutions consistently grapple to justify their existence. This situation often leads to psychological and physiological impacts that can be detrimental to their health and career. In seminal research on stereotype threat, Steele (1997) stated that one must surely turn first to social structure: limits on educational access that have been imposed on these groups by socioeconomic disadvantage, segregating social practices, and restrictive cultural orientations are limiting with both historical and ongoing effects. By diminishing one's educational prospects, these limitations—e.g., inadequate resources, few role models, preparational disadvantages—should make identifying with academic domains more difficult (p. 613).

Local academic senate leaders must provide space and mentorship as well as leadership opportunities for people of color who may not otherwise have access to such opportunities. That action requires an understanding of privilege, exercising that privilege to promote justice, and supporting endeavors that may not necessarily be personally advantageous but are beneficial to the collective betterment of the institution. This practice can be operationalized by ensuring people of color have a seat at the table in various committees of influence both at the statewide and local levels. It requires one to introspectively interrogate oneself and one's positionality to conclude whether it is more appropriate to take a back seat to allow people of color and voices who have been marginalized to be heard or amplify their voices by elevating and centering their challenges. Each institution has its own unique set of challenges; therefore, justice is the aim and, unlike the conflation of equity and equality, a one size fits all approach is not appropriate. Part of seeking justice requires, after seeking the truth, an opportunity to repeal the harm by listening to the victims' recommendations to repair the institutional damage that has transpired. This paradigm shift requires flexibility and extreme collegiality. Institutional vision needs to center on race and adapt to the campus community's demands. Those historically in power or who have been in power must reconcile that they must now either relinquish that power or share it.

Restorative justice emphasizes repairing the harm caused or revealed by criminal behavior. "The purpose of restorative justice dialogue is to provide a safe place for the people most affected by a specific hate crime, hate incident, or criminal act (victim, offender, family members of both, and other support persons or community members) to have the opportunity to enter into a direct dialogue with each other in order to talk about the full impact of the crime upon their lives, to address any lingering questions, and to develop a plan for responding to the harm caused to the greatest extent possible" (Andrus, Downes, and Umbreit, 2001, p.1).

In the development of opportunities to address racial reconciliation, academic leaders must address the following:

1. Becoming aware of the historical context of enslaved people of African descent;

2. Being uncomfortable with institutional change;

3. Honoring and embracing diversity and representation;

4. Gaining intentional and deliberate knowledge by working to achieve cross-cultural or multicultural literacy, embracing ethnic diversity, taking risks, and developing authentic multi-ethnic relationships;

5. Developing the institutional structures needed to create a "culture of care";[2]

6. Taking risks and developing relationships; and

7. Educating and working with faculty and other stakeholders across differences.

These efforts may seem cumbersome to some and overwhelming to others. They are essential in the healing process, which is what is historically sought after. The duality of relinquishing power and resources to create space at the table presents a winner versus loser paradigm, which is truly inaccurate.

---

2   "Building a culture of caring means providing a supportive environment that is focused on the employees; it means truly wanting to take care of them" (Bruce, 2016),

As active agents and participants of a system that excluded Blacks from the human right of literacy and enacted laws that prohibited them from accessing education as a fundamental right, part of repairing the harm and the conversation of race must explicitly include their offspring receiving those rights. Thus, an anti-racist approach is inclusive and liberating, restorative, and just.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The roots of systemic racism in the United States higher education system are deep-seated in its history. White supremacy and white privilege systematically affect communities of color: the way they are treated, the way in which policy is enacted, and the ways in which discrimination is perpetuated in academia. The United States is experiencing a moment of awakening and an opportunity to dismantle, deconstruct, and reconstruct the systems that have created inequities in education for minoritized groups. California community colleges, given their diverse and dynamic student populations and broad reach into communities throughout the state, are critical vehicles for anti-racism education and equity.

Local academic senates play a pivotal role in transforming institutional policies and practices. This work requires that faculty leaders, in partnership with other stakeholders, understand and act on the four levels of researching self, researching self in relation to others, shifting from self to systems, and understanding curriculum and instruction. It also calls for faculty to examine anti-racism concepts such as good-bad binary, meritocracy, color-evasion, and colorblindness. Furthermore, professional development efforts must focus on transformative organizational development leadership in creating the professional learning opportunities needed to respond to the times, including online culturally responsive andragogy and creating a path toward racial reconciliation and healing.

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges is committed to deliberately engaging faculty and faculty leaders across the system in a call for action and education on anti-racism. The ASCCC recognizes that racist conditions impact the educational experiences and outcomes of students of color. Consequently, the achievement of racial equity is prioritized as an intricate part of the transformation of the community college system.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Anti-racism education is necessary to respond to the current moment in time and to ensure the transformation of the community college system, districts, and colleges. The following recommendations are intended to guide faculty and system leaders to facilitate the development of anti-racism education as an integral part of the equity-driven systems movement. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges offers these recommendations for individual self-growth, for local academic senates, colleges, and districts, and for the Board of Governors.

Recommendations for Individual Self-Growth

1. Use the work and scholarship of Black scholars to recognize and address challenges of Black students and Black colleagues.

2. Participate in implicit bias training in the context of oppression and racism.

3. Learn the history of discriminatory laws and practices that contribute to the stratification of U.S. society by race.

4. Actively explore various methods of assessments to adapt to technological disparities exacerbated by COVID-19.

Recommendations for Local Academic Senates

1. Convene Black, Latinx/Chicanx, indigenous, and other people of color to understand lived experiences and to inform cultural climate and structural updates to academic senate constitutions, bylaws, rules, policies, and processes.

2. Intentionally increase representation on the local academic senate by identifying, including, and empowering missing voices.

3. Create a local academic senate goal focused on anti-racism and no-hate education.

4. Hold a series of discussions of structural racism and colorblind culture and address the topics of race consciousness, lifting the veil of white supremacy, danger of the good-bad racist binary, dilemma of dismantling the "master's house with the master's tools" and what this means for shared governance, and the need for calling-in culture.

5. Enact culturally responsive curricular redesign within disciplines, courses, and programs and with curriculum committees.

6. Acknowledge, without assigning blame, that the structure of the college houses the institutional biases and prejudices of its founding time. Those biases have privileged some and disadvantaged others, particularly African-American and Latinx/Chicanx communities.

7. Partner with administration and faculty collective bargaining leadership to transform faculty hiring, onboarding, evaluation, and tenure processes with an anti-racism focus.

8. Work with the administration and students to offer constructive ways for students to express themselves about their lived experiences and the structural and historical biases that exist for Blacks, Latinx/Chicanx, indigenous, and other minoritized groups and to center student voices more predominantly in governance and decision-making.

9. Provide organizational and transformational leadership faculty training and support and ongoing online faculty development, including racial literacy education.

Recommendations for Colleges and Districts

1. Explicitly make a commitment to anti-racism and incorporate it into guiding institutional documents such as diversity, equity, and inclusion statements, values statements, and mission statements.

2. Conduct a racial climate survey to better understand racial attitudes and issues.

3. Implement restorative justice practices into district and college culture.

4. Fund and create a professional development program in culturally relevant and responsive pedagogy and andragogy.

5. Scale up and appropriately fund programs and services dedicated to advancing racial equity through a holistic approach.

6. Provide professional development in equity-mindedness and anti-racism.

7. Provide resources and professional development opportunities to critically interrogate and reflect on the impact of key discriminatory laws and practices in the U.S. in higher education.

8. Examine and update current policies and procedures using both an equity and anti-racist lens.

9. Incorporate explicit anti-racism training in new faculty onboarding processes and programming as well as existing professional development.

10. Center student voice more predominantly in governance and decision-making.

11. In partnership with unions, conduct an audit of collective bargaining agreements through a lens of equity and racial and social justice.

Recommendations for the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges

1. Make anti-racism a focus of the board's goals underlined in the California Community Colleges *Vision for Success.*

2. Explicitly state a commitment to anti-racism within the board's Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Statement.

3. Incorporate anti-racism and equity minded language in the system's regulations, policies, plans, and areas such as finance, institutional effectiveness, educational services and support, digital innovation, and other areas identified.

4. Establish an anti-racism policy to drive the assessment and evaluation of racial equity.

5. Support anti-racism, equity, diversity, and inclusion policy making and funding allocation to provide professional development and learning at the system and local levels. Allocate resources at the state level to partner with expert organizations in the provision of professional development and learning.

6. Provide intentional incentives to institutions that move beyond complicity towards anti-racist reform.

REFERENCES

Aarons, G. A. (2006). Transformational and Transactional Leadership: Association with Attitudes Toward Evidence-Based Practice. *Psychiatric Services*, 57(8), 1162- 1169. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/213075046?accountid=10051.

Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. (2019a). *Equity Driven Systems: Student Equity and Achievement in California Community Colleges.* Retrieved from https://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/Equity_Driven_Systems.pdf.

Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. (2019b). *Resolution 3.02 Support Infusing Anti-Racism/No Hate Education in Community Colleges.* Retrieved from https://asccc.org/resolutions/support-infusing-anti-racismno-hate-education-community-colleges.

Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. (2020, Summer). *Senate Rostrum.* Retrieved from https://www.asccc.org/rostrum-download.

Alexander, M. (2012). *The New Jim Crow*. New York: The New Press.

Annamma, S.A., Jackson, D. D., & Morrison. D. (2017). Conceptualizing color-evasiveness: using dis/ability critical race theory to expand a color-blind racial ideology in education and society. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 20:2, 147-162, DOI: 10.1080/13613324.2016.1248837.

Anderson, D. (2012). *Organizational development: The process of leading organizational change* (2nd ed.). California SAGE Publications.

Anderson, D., & Ackerman-Anderson, L. S. (2010). *Beyond change management: how to achieve breakthrough results through conscious change leadership.* (2nd Ed.) San Francisco: Pfeiffer.

Andrus, J., Downes, K., & Umbreit, M. (2001) Community Reconciliation through Facilitated Dialogue and Restorative Justice. Retrieved from https://www.racialequitytools.org/resourcefiles/andrus.pdf.

Ashbaugh, M. (2013). Expert instructional designer voices: Leadership competencies critical to global practice and quality online learning designs. *Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, 14(2), 97-118. Retrieved from https://www.infoagepub.com/qrde-issue.html?i=p54c3c39c59eed.

Bady, A & Konczal, M. (2012) From Master Plan to No Plan: The Slow Death of Public Higher Education. *Dissent, 59(4).* Retrieved from https://www.dissentmagazine.org/article/from-master-plan-to-no-plan-the-slow-death-of-public-higher-education.

Bass, B. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. Organizational Dynamics, 18(3), 19-31. Retrieved from http://strandtheory.org/images/From_transactional_to_transformational_-_Bass.pdf Bass.

Basham, L. (2012). Transformational leadership characteristics necessary for today's leaders in higher education. *Journal of International Education Research*, 8(4), 343-348. Retrieved from http://www.bkconnection.com/static/Leadership_From_the_Inside_Out_EXCERP T.pdf.

Battiste, M. (2017). Decolonizing Education. British Columbia: Purich Publishing.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2018). Racism Without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence Of Racial Inequality In The United States. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Bruce, David. (2016) Team Culture: If You Don't Build It, Someone Else Will. *EDUCAUSE Review,* September 19. Retrieved from https://er.educause.edu/blogs/2016/9/team-culture-if-you-dont-b uild-it-someone-else-will.

California Community Colleges. (2020), *Vision for Success Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Taskforce Update.* Retrieved from https://www.cccco.edu/-/media/CCCCO-Website/Reports/CCCCO_DEI_Report.pdf?la=en&hash=69E11E4DAB1DEBA3181E053BEE89E7BC3A709BEE.

California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (2020). California Community Colleges Family Letter. June 5. Retrieved from https://www.cccco.edu/-/media/CCCCO-Website/Files/Communications/dear-california-community-colleges-family.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2019). Get the Facts About Coronavirus. Retrieved from https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/index.html.

Claude-Olivier, D. (2012). Race and Genealogy. Buffon and the Formation of the Concept of " Race." *Humana.Mente: Journal of Philosophical Studies* 22, pp.75 - 109. Retrieved from https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-01508913/document.

Cole, N.L. (2019, July 14). Defining racism beyond its dictionary meaning. *ThoughtCo*. https://www.thoughtco.com/racismdefinition-3026511.

Crenshaw, K., Harris, L. C., HoSang, D., and Lipsitz. G. (2019). *Seeing Race Again: Countering Colorblindness Across the Disciplines.* Berkeley: U California Press.

DiAngelo, R. J. (2018). *White Fragility: Why It›s so Hard for White People to Talk About Racism.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Delgado, R., and Stefancic, J. (2017). *Critical race theory: An introduction.* New York University Press.

Eberwein, D. H. (2011).The role of technology in transforming higher education. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 4*(4), 61-64. doi:10.1002/jls.20196. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.mvc.edu:2636/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=8427c868-f8b9-4b06- aa59-4005bd5f49b1%40sessionmgr4003&vid=3&hid=4103.

Education Law Center. (n.d.). Retrieved July6 , 2020, from https://edlawcenter.org/.

Foundation for California Community Colleges (2017). *Vision for Success: Strengthening the California Community Colleges to Meet California's Needs.* Retrieved from https://foundationccc.org/Portals/0/Documents/Vision/VisionForSuccess_web_2019.pdf.

Fuller, N. Jr. (2016) *The United Independent Compensatory Code/System/Concept: A Compensatory Counter-Racist Code.* Revised/Expanded Edition. NF Productions.

Gotanda, N. (1991, November). A Critique of «Our Constitution is Color-Blind.» *Stanford Law Review, 44,* 1. Retrieved from https://advance-lexis-com.sbcc.idm.oclc.org/api/document?collection=analytical-materias&id=urn:contentItem:3S3V-3WP0-00CW-832X-00000-00&context=1516831.

Gould, S. J. (1994). "The Geometer of Race." Discover 15(11): 64-69. Retrieved from www.discovermagazine.com.

Hammond, Z. (2015). *Culturally responsive teaching and the brain: Promoting authentic engagement and rigor among culturally and linguistically diverse students.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Harper, S. (2015, December). *Responding to Racism on College and University Campuses.* Conference Presentation. Center for the Study of Race and Equity in Education and the University of Pennsylvania.

Heifetz, R. A. (2002). *Leadership on the line: Staying alive through the dangers of leading.* Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Heizer, R. F., & Almquist, A. J. (2000). *The other Californians: Prejudice and discrimination under Spain, Mexico, and the United States to 1920.* Berkeley: U. California Press.

Higher Learning Advocates (2019). *101: Equity Gaps in Higher Education.* Retrieved from https://higherlearningadvocates.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Final-Equity-101.pdf.

Howard, R. and Corver, C. (2008). *Ethics (for the real world): Creating a personal code to guide decisions in work and life.* Boston: Harvard Business Press.

Ibrahim, Andrew M. (n.d.) *A Surgeon's Journey through Research and Design.* Retrieved from http://www.SurgeryRedesign.com.

Jackson, J. P., Jr. (2001). "In Ways Unacademical": The Reception of Carleton S. Coon's The Origin of Races. *Journal of the History of Biology.* 34: 247–285.

Johnson, T., Wisniewski, M. A., Kuhlemeyer, G., Isaacs, G., & Krzykowski, J. (2012). Technology adoption in higher education: Overcoming anxiety through faculty bootcamp. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 16(2), 63-72. http://ezproxy.mvc.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=t rue&db=ehh&AN=82576242&site=eds-live.

Kendi, I. X. (2019). *How to be an Antiracist.* New York: One World.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The Dreamkeepers.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishing Co.

Lane, L. M. (2013). An Open, Online Class to Prepare Faculty to Teach Online. *Journal of Educators Online.* 10(1), 1-32. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.mvc.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=t rue&db=ehh&AN=86008625&site=eds-live.

Lipsitz, G. (1995). The Possessive Investment in Whiteness: Racialized Social Democracy and the "White" Problem in American Studies. *American Quarterly*, 47(3), 369. doi:10.2307/2713291.

Lorde, A. (1984). "The Master's Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master's House." *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches.* Berkeley, CA: Crossing Press. 110-114.

Marcel Salas, M. (2017, April 18). Scientific Racism. *The San Antonio Observer.* Retrieved from https://www.saobserver.com/single-post/2017/04/18/Scientific-Racism.

McNair, T. B., Bensimon, E., and Malcolm-Piqeux, L. (2020). *From Equity Talk to Equity Walk: Expanding Practitioner Knowledge for Racial Justice in Higher Education.* Hoboken: Jossey-Bass.

Models of Classification. (n. d.) Retrieved from https://www2.palomar.edu/anthro/vary/vary_2.htm.

Mosley, M. (2010). 'That really hit me hard': moving beyond passive anti-racism to engage with critical race literacy pedagogy. *Race Ethnicity and Education.* 13:4, 449-471, DOI: 10.1080/13613324.2010.488902.

Oluo, I. (2019). *So You Want to Talk About Race.* New York: Hachette Book Group.

Ozaralli, N. (2003). Effects of transformational leadership on empowerment and team effectiveness. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal.* 24(6), 335-344. Retrieved from doi:10.1108/01437730310494301.

Pacific University Oregon. (2019, October 19). Equity, Diversity & Inclusion Glossary of Terms. Retrieved from https://www.pacificu.edu/life-pacific/support-safety/office-equity-diversity-inclusion/glossary-terms.

Paul, J., & Cochran, J. (2013). Key interactions for online programs between faculty, students, technologies, and educational institutions a holistic framework. *Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, *14*(1), 49-62.

Pfeffer, J. (2010). *Power: Why some people have it-and others don't*. New York: Harper Collins.

Plessy v. Ferguson, 163 U.S. 537 (1896). Retrieved from http://cdn.loc.gov/service/ll/usrep/usrep163/usrep163537/usrep163537.pdf.

Raj Bhopal, B., and Usher, J. (2007). The beautiful skull and Blumenbach's errors: the birth of the scientific concept of race. *BMJ*. Dec 22; 335(7633): 1308–1309. Retrieved from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2151154/.

Reilly, J. R., Vandenhouten, C., Gallagher-Lepak, S., & Ralston-Berg, P. (2012). Faculty development for e-learning: A multi-campus community of practice (COP) approach. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*. 16(2), 99-110. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.mvc.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=t rue&db=ehh&AN=82846503&site=eds-live.

Roehrs, C., Li, W., & Kendrick, D. (2013). Preparing Faculty to Use the Quality Matters Model for Course Improvement. *Journal of Online Learning & Teaching*. 9(1), 52-67. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.mvc.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=t rue&db=ehh&AN=90223493&site=eds-live.

Rothenberg, P. S. (1998). *Race, class, and gender in the United States: An integrated study*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.

Rothstein, R. (2018). *The color of law: A forgotten history of how our government segregated America*. New York, NY: Liveright Publishing Corporation.

Sanchez, R. U. (2014). Education in action an engine of change, creativity, innovation, leadership and social commitment. *Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, 15(1), 33-38. Retrieved from http://libproxy.chapman.edu/login?url=https://search-ebscohostcom.libproxy.chapman.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,u id,cookie,url& db=eft&AN=97849240&site=ehost-live.

Selzer, R, Evans-Phillips, J, &, Johnson, M. (2017, October). Stepping Up to Talk About Race: Race-Conscious Leadership in Higher Ed. *Women in Higher Education*, 26.10, p.1-3. Retrieved from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/whe.20487.

Steele, C. M. (1997). A threat in the air: How stereotypes shape intellectual identity and performance. *The American Psychologist, 52*(6), 613–629. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.52.6.613.

Stein, S. (2018). Confronting the Racial-Colonial Foundations of US Higher Education. *Journal for the Study of Postsecondary and Tertiary Education*, 3, 077-096. doi:10.28945/4105.

Sue, D. W. (2015). *Race Talk and the Conspiracy of Silence*. New Jersey: Wiley.

Takaki, R. (1993). *A Different Mirror*. Boston, MA.: Little, Brown and Company.

United States Department of Education (2015). *State Plans to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators: Frequently Asked Questions*. OMB Number 1810-0725. https://www2.ed.gov/programs/titleiparta/equitable/eafaq2015.pdf.

U.S. Department of Education Office of Civil Rights. (1991, March). Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Higher Education Desegregation. Retrieved from https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/hq9511.html.

Watkins, W.H. (2019). *The White Architects of Black Education: Ideology and Power in America, 1865–1954.* The Teaching for Social Justice Series. 2nd Edition. New York: Teacher's College Press.

Western States Center. (n.d.) Racial Equity Tools. A History: The Construction of Race and Racism. Retrieved from https://www.racialequitytools.org/resourcefiles/Western%20States%20-%20Construction%20of%20Race.pdf.

White, L. P., & Wooten, K. C. (1985). *Professional ethics and practice in organizational development*. New York: Praeger.

Williams, Bianca C. (2016). Radical honesty. *Race, equity, and the learning environment.* Eds. F. Tuitt, C. Haynes & S. Stewart Stylus.71-82.

Yosso, T. J., Parker, L., Solórzano, D. G., & Lynn, M. (2004). From Jim Crow to affirmative action and back again: A critical race discussion of racialized rationales and access to higher education. *Review of Research in Education, 28*(2014), 1-25. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/3568134.

WORKS CONSULTED

Allen, E., & Seaman, J. (2013). *Changing course: Ten years of tracking online education in the United States.* Babson Survey Research Group Report. Retrieved from: http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&e src=s&frm=1&source=web&cd=1 &ved=0CB4QFjAA &url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.onlinelearningsurvey. com%2F reports%2Fchangingcourse.pdf&ei=5QLIVN v3HY3ZoATmu4KACQ&usg=AFQ jCNFd75Lu6h4hsx-KsvBUi4tOYKA94Q.

Bamberger, M., Rugh, R., & Mabry, L. (2012). *Realworld evaluation: Working under budget, time, data, and political constraints*. 2nd Ed. Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage Publications.

Baran, E., Correia, A., & Thompson, A. (2011). Transforming online teaching practice: critical analysis of the literature on the roles and competencies of online teachers. *Distance Education*. (32)3, 421-439. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.10 80/01587919.2011.610293.

Bradberry, T. & Greavis, J. (2009). *Emotional Intelligence 2.0.* San Diego, CA: Talent Smart.

Cook, D. A., & Steinert, Y. (2013). Online learning for faculty development: A review of the literature. *Medical Teacher*, 35(11), 930-937. doi:10.3109/014215 9X.2013.827328. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.mvc. edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login. aspx?direct=t rue&db=ehh&AN=90815812&site=eds-liveBN 978-0-9743206-2-5.

Cornner, R. M. (2010). Organizational leadership and institutional factors related to the implementation of online educational programming in California community colleges. *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/do cview/750445094?accountid=10051. (750445094).

Jaggars, S. S. (2013). Choosing between online and face-to-face courses: Community college student voices. *American Journal of Distance Education*, *28*(1), 27-38. Retrieved from doi: 10.1080/08923647.2014.867697.

Lofgren, K., Niemi, E., Makitalo-Siegl, K., Mekota, A.,Ojala, M., Fischer, F., & Heikkinen, P. (2013). Meeting the challenges of generational change in the teaching profession: Towards a european model for intergenerational teacher collaboration. *Educational Research*, 2, 107-119. doi: 10.5838/erej.2013.22.03.

Malik, S. K. (2015). Strategies for maintaining quality in distance higher education. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*. 16(1), 238-248. Retrieved from 163 http://ezproxy.mvc.edu/login?url=http:// search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=t rue&db=ehh&AN=101080562&site=eds-live.

Neben, J. (2014). Attributes and Barriers Impacting Diffusion of Online Education at the Institutional Level. *Distance Learning*. 11(1), 41 -50. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.mvc.edu/login?url=http:// search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=t rue&db=ehh&AN=97589866&site=eds-live.

Radford, A. W. (2011). *Learning at a distance: Undergraduate enrollment in distance education courses and degree programs*. NCES Report No. 2012-154. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Educational Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from http://nces. ed.gov/pubs2012/2012154.pdf.

Schulte, M. (2010). Faculty perceptions of technology distance education transactions: Qualitative outcomes to inform teaching practices. *The Journal of Educators Online. 7*(2), 1-34. Retrieved from http:// www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&frm =1&source=web&cd=2 &ved=0CCwQFjAB&url=htt p%3A%2F%2Ffiles.eric.ed.gov%2Ffulltext%2FEJ9 04077.pdf&ei=B17aVOmXCYTwoATM-4Io&usg=AFQjCNHizJKqVAZ_bdotlu1WLp26B43-Q.

Schwarz, R., (2002). *The Skilled Facilitator.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

White, P., Harvey, T., Kemper, L. (2007). *The politically intelligent leader: Dealing with the dilemmas of a high stakes educational environment.* Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Xu, D., & Jaggars, S. S. (2011). *Online and hybrid course enrollment and performance in Washing State community and technical colleges*. CCRC Working Paper No. 31. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, Community College Research Center. Retrieved from http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/ publications/online-hybrid-courses-washington.html.

APPENDIX A: TIMELINE OF DISCRIMINATORY LAWS IN THE UNITED STATES

Past discriminatory laws and practices have impact today.

1607 Colonists founded first American colony in Jamestown, Virginia.

1669 Virginia legislature passed "an act about the casuall [sic] killing of slaves."

1699 First African captives arrived in Virginia to be sold as slaves via the White Lion, a Dutch ship flying a British flag.

1704 First slave patrol created in the Carolina colonies.

1740 The Negro Law of 1740 prohibited Blacks from leaving America, congregating in groups, earning money, and learning to write.

1776 Declaration of Independence. "All men are created equal" except for those who had no legal rights, including Native Americans, indentured servants, poor white men who did not own property, Black slaves, and women.

1789 US Constitution "three-fifths compromise." Black slaves to be counted as 3/5 of a person for calculating representation in Congress for states.

1790 Naturalization Act of 1790. Citizenship restricted to free whites.

1819 Civilization Act of 1819. Assimilation of Native Americans. Provided U.S. government funds to subsidize protestant missionary educators in order to convert Native Americans to Christianity.

1830 Indian Removal Act. Legalized removal of all Native Americans east of the Mississippi.

1831 Act Prohibiting the Teaching of Slaves to Read. Stated teaching slaves to read or write was illegal.

1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. Ceded Mexican territory in the southwest to the United States—over one million square miles, including what is now California, New Mexico, Nevada, parts of Colorado, Arizona, and Utah. The treaty promised to protect the land, language, and culture of Mexicans living in the ceded territory. Mexicans were given the right to become U.S. citizens if they decided to stay in the territory. Many were not granted citizenship despite adhering to the treaty. The U.S. Congress did not pass Article X, which stipulated the protection of the ancestral lands of Mexican people. The U.S. Congress required inhabitants to prove—in U.S. courts, speaking English, and with U.S. lawyers—that they had legitimate titles to their lands. Many became landless and disenfranchised.

1848 Gold found at Sutter's Mill in California. California Gold Rush 1848-1855. White miners learned mining techniques from miners of Mexican ancestry because techniques for extracting gold were developed in Mexico. Mexican mining laws in California were repealed so miners could not claim mine ownership based on the Mexican laws.

1848   The Great Mahele in Hawaii (1848-1855). Allowed private ownership of land for the first time in Hawaii. Lands were formally divided and commoners were given an opportunity to claim their traditional family—kuleana—lands. Many claims were never established and foreigners were able to acquire large tracts of land.

1849   California Constitutional Convention. Called by Governor Riley to draft the first California Constitution. Decided not to allow slavery in California because the state did not want southerners to bring their slaves to work the gold mines due to competition for gold.

1850   Alien Land Ownership Act in Hawaii. Written by an American lawyer, it allowed foreigners—non-Hawaiians—to hold title to Hawaiian land.

1850   Foreign Miners Tax. California levied taxes on all foreigners engaged in mining. This act was aimed at Mexicans. After a revolt, it was repealed in 1851 and then reestablished in 1852, aimed at Chinese. It remained in effect until the 1870 Civil Rights Act.

1850   California entered Union as a free state due to concerns over having Blacks in California and allowing southerners to bring their slaves to California to work the gold mines.

1851   Governor of California John McDougall declared a "war of extermination" against Native Americans.

1854   People v. George W. Hall. Established that people of color could not testify against white men. "No Black, or Mulatto person, or Indian, shall be allowed to give evidence in favor of, or against a White man."

1855   California required all instruction to be conducted in English.

1860   The Bureau of Indian Affairs established the first Indian boarding school on the Yakima Indian Reservation in the state of Washington. Boarding schools were made to assimilate Native Americans into U.S. society.

1862   Homestead Act. Allotted 160 acres of western land—Native American land—to anyone who could pay $1.25 and cultivate it for five years. European immigrants and land speculators bought 50 million acres. Congress gave another 100 million acres of Native American land to the railroads for free. Since the Homestead Act applied only to U.S. citizens, Native Americans, Blacks, and non-European immigrants were excluded.

1862   Morrill Act, also known as Land-Grant College Act of 1862. Provided grants of land to states to establish federal public colleges. The land used was taken from indigenous people.

1865   Juneteenth. Union soldiers land at Galveston, TX with news that all slaves were free, two and a half years after the 1863 Emancipation Proclamation and a year after the 13th Amendment to the Constitution abolishing slavery.

1868   Treaty of Fort Laramie. Whites could not enter Black Hills without Native American permission. When gold was found there, the terms of the treaty were changed by U.S. Congress without Native American consent.

1870   Naturalization Act of 1870. Revised Naturalization Act of 1790 and fourteenth Amendment. Naturalization limited to white persons and persons of African descent. Excluded Chinese and other Asian immigrants from naturalization.

1878   The United States Supreme Court ruled Chinese individuals ineligible for naturalized citizenship.

1882   Chinese Exclusion Act. Prohibited Chinese immigration for 10 years, bowing to pressure from nativists on the West Coast. Renewed 1892, made permanent 1902, repealed 1943.

1887   Dawes Act. Dissolved tribal lands, granting land allotments to individual families. Explicitly prohibited communal land ownership. The U. S. Supreme Court decided in favor of the Maxwell Company and allocated millions of acres of Mexican and Native American land in New Mexico to the white-owned corporation.

1887   Bayonet Constitution in Hawaii. King David Kalakaua, the last reigning monarch of Hawaii, was forced at gunpoint to sign a constitution drafted by white businessmen that stripped the monarchy of much of its power. Changed voting rights in the kingdom; only men of Hawaiian, American, and European ancestry who met certain financial requirements could vote. Disenfranchised thousands of Asian voters and opened voting to thousands of non-citizens.

1890   Wounded Knee massacre of Native Americans by U.S. Army.

1893   Queen Liliuokalani deposed in an overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy by a group of American businessmen led by Sanford B. Dole.

1896   Plessy V. Ferguson. Upheld "separate but equal" doctrine among Blacks and whites in public facilities.

1901   U.S. citizenship granted to the "Five Civilized Tribes"—Cherokee, Choctaw, Seminole, Creek, and Chickasaw.

1910   Restrictive covenants used as a way of protecting white neighborhoods. The states were barred from setting racial boundaries in housing, but private citizens could. An example of restrictive covenant language is "Racial Restrictions: No property in said Addition shall at any time be sold, conveyed, rented or leased in whole or in part to any person or persons not of the White or Caucasian race."

1921   Corrigan v. Buckley. The U.S. Supreme Court upheld the rights of property owners to protect their land from being sold to non-whites.

1921   The Black Wall Street Massacre. In Greenwood, Oklahoma, 300 African Americans lost their lives and more than 9,000 were left homeless when the small town was attacked, looted, and literally burned to the ground by whites.

1923   Japanese businessman Takao Ozawa petitioned the Supreme Court for naturalization, arguing that his skin was as white as any Caucasian; Supreme Court ruled Ozawa could not be a citizen because he was not "white" within the meaning of the statute because science defined him as of the Mongolian race. In the same year, in U.S. v Bhagat Singh Thind, the Supreme Court recognized that Indians were scientifically classified as Caucasians but concluded that Indians were not white in popular understanding, reversing the logic used in the Ozawa case in the same year.

1924   Realtor Code of Ethics, Article 34 said, "A Realtor should never be instrumental in introducing into a neighborhood a character of property or occupancy, members of any race or nationality, or any individual whose presence will clearly be detrimental to property values in that Neighborhood"; this clause remained in effect from 1924 to 1950.

1924   Indian Citizenship act. Native Americans granted U.S. Citizenship.

1931   Alvarez v. Lemon Grove. Mexican parents overturned school segregation on the grounds that separate facilities for Mexican-American students were not conducive to their "Americanization" and prevented them from learning English.

1932   National Recovery Act. Forbade more than one family member from holding a government job. Removed from the workplace women who filled jobs while men were fighting in World War II.

1934   Federal Housing Administration (FHA) created in part by the National Housing Act of 1934. The mortgage lending system still in use today was created and enabled the white masses to purchase homes while denying home loans to Blacks, other people of color, and non-Christians. The FHA took advantage of racially restrictive covenants and insisted that the properties they insured use them. Along with the Home Owner's Loan Coalition, a federally-funded program created to help homeowners refinance their mortgages, the FHA introduced redlining policies in over 200 American cities. From 1934 to 1968, FHA mortgage insurance requirements utilized redlining. Redlining is the practice of denying or limiting financial services to certain neighborhoods based on racial or ethnic composition without regard to the residents' qualifications or creditworthiness. The term "redlining" refers to the practice of using a red line on a map to delineate the area where financial institutions would not invest. At the same time, the FHA was subsidizing builders who were mass-producing entire subdivisions for whites with the requirement that none of the homes be sold to African-Americans.

1935   California law declared Mexican Americans as foreign-born Native Americans, not citizens.

1935   Social Security Act. Established a system of old-age benefits for workers, benefits for victims of industrial accidents, unemployment insurance, aid for dependent mothers and children, the blind, and the physically handicapped; excluded farm workers and domestic workers from coverage, denying those disproportionately minority sectors of the workforce protections and benefits routinely distributed to whites.

1935   Wagner Act. Legalized the right to organize and create unions but excluded farm workers and domestic workers, most of whom were latinx, Asian, and African American.

1942   Executive Order 9066 ordered the internment of Japanese Americans.

1943   Zoot Suit riots. Police arrested only Mexican youth, not whites.

1946   Mendez v. Westminster. Court ended de jure segregation in California, finding that Mexican-American children were segregated based on their "Latinized" appearance and district boundaries manipulated to ensure Mexican-American children attended separate schools.

1954   Brown v. Board of Education. Overturned Plessy v. Ferguson "separate but equal" doctrine. Supreme Court ruled segregation in education is inherently unequal.

1961   Executive Order 10925 by President Kennedy. Federal contractors were to take "affirmative action to ensure that applicants are treated equally without regard to race, color, religion, sex, or national origin."

1963   Rumford Fair Housing Act. California act that outlawed restrictive covenants and the refusal to rent or sell property on the basis of race, ethnicity, gender, marital status, or physical disability.

1963   Martin Luther King Jr. jailed during anti-segregation protests. He wrote "Letter from the Birmingham Jail" arguing that individuals have a moral duty to disobey unjust laws.

1964   California Proposition 14 passed. Amended the California Constitution and nullified the Rumford Fair Housing Act. Proposition 14 remained in effect until it was declared unconstitutional by the California Supreme Court in 1966.

1964   Civil Rights Act of 1964. Outlawed discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. Prohibited discrimination in a number of settings including employment, housing, and public accommodations.

1965   Executive Order 11246 by President Johnson. Required all government contractors and subcontractors to take affirmative action to expand job opportunities for minorities.

1971   Serrano v. Priest. California case where students of Los Angeles County public schools and their families argued that the California school finance system, which relied heavily on local property tax, disadvantaged the students in districts with lower income. The California Supreme Court found the system in violation of the Equal Protection Clause because there was too great a disparity in the funding provided for various districts.

1972   Lau v. Nichols. The United States Supreme Court ruled that school programs conducted exclusively in English deny equal access to education to students who speak other languages. Determined that districts have a responsibility to help students learn English.

1972   Title IX, a portion of the U.S. Education Amendments of 1972. No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving federal financial assistance.

1973   San Antonio Independent School District v. Rodriguez. Texas case where parents of students in a Texas school district argued that the school finance system in Texas, which relied on local property tax for funding beyond that provided by the state, disadvantaged the children whose districts were located in poorer areas. Unlike the California state court in Serrano v. Priest, the U.S. Supreme Court found that the system did not violate the Equal Protection Clause after determining that the system did not intentionally or substantially discriminate against a class of people.

1973   Robinson v. Cahill. A New Jersey case where the public school funding system relied heavily on local property tax. The New Jersey Supreme Court found that this system violated the state constitutional guarantee of access to a "thorough and efficient" public education system.

1974   Milliken v. Bradley. The U. S. Supreme Court ruled schools may not be desegregated across school districts. The ruling clarified the distinction between de jure and de facto segregation, confirming that segregation was allowed if it was not considered an explicit policy of each school district.

1978   The Indian Child Welfare Act. Native American parents gained the legal right to deny their children's placement in off-reservation schools.

1982   Plyler v. Doe. A Texas law allowed the state to withhold school funds for undocumented children. The Supreme Court found that this law violated the Fourteenth Amendment rights of these children because it discriminated against them on the basis of a factor beyond their control and because this discrimination could not be found to serve a large enough state interest.

1995   Hate Crimes Sentencing Enhancement Act. Allowed a judge to impose harsher sentences if there is evidence showing that a victim was selected because of the "actual or perceived race, color, religion, national origin, ethnicity, gender, disability, or sexual orientation of any person."

1996   California Proposition 209. Prohibited state governmental institutions from considering race, sex, or ethnicity in the areas of public employment, public contracting, and public education. Ended affirmative action in California.

2010   Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors Act of 2010 (DREAM Act of 2010). Authorized the Secretary of Homeland Security to cancel the removal of, and adjust to conditional nonimmigrant status, an alien who: (1) entered the United States before his or her 16th birthday and has been present in the United States for at least five years immediately preceding this Act's enactment; (2) is a person of good moral character; (3) is not inadmissible or deportable under specified grounds of the Immigration and Nationality Act; (4) has not participated in the persecution of any person on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion; (5) has not been convicted of certain offenses under federal or state law; (6) has been admitted to an institution of higher education (IHE) or has earned a high school diploma or general education development certificate in the United States; (7) has never been under a final order of exclusion, deportation, or removal unless the alien has remained in the United States under color of law after such order's issuance, or received the order before attaining the age of 16; and (8) was under age 30 on the date of this Act's enactment.

2012   Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA). Secretary of Homeland Security announced that certain people who came to the United States as children and who meet several guidelines may request consideration of deferred action for a period of two years, subject to renewal. They are also eligible for work authorization.

2017   President Trump issued a series of discriminatory executive orders banning muslims from travel to the United States. The first was Executive Order 13769 Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States, also known as the muslim ban; the Supreme Court allowed the third iteration of the muslim ban to stay in place pending further legal challenges. The order separated American families.

2018   Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) rescinded by President Trump. Left nearly 700,000 Dreamers eligible for deportation. Was to be effective as of March 2018, but a Supreme Court ruling postponed the effective date to October 2018.

2020   Memorandum on Excluding Illegal Aliens From the Apportionment Base following the 2020 Census issued by President Trump.