

Equity and Antiracism Planning Council Flow

Date: February 24, 2026
Time: 2:10-4:00 P.M.

Location: FTCL 9-154 OR <https://smccd.zoom.us/j/88326894898>

| Item | Presenter | Time (mins) |
|------|-----------|-------------|
|------|-----------|-------------|

1. Welcome to this Space

Land and Labor Acknowledgement and Commitment: We acknowledge that Cañada College is situated on the traditional unceded land of the Ramaytush (Rah-my-toosh) Ohlone (Oh-LOW-nee) peoples, and we respect our past elders and honor the present community. Long before Cañada College existed, this area was home to the Ramaytush Ohlone peoples, who still have a presence in the Bay Area today.

We have a responsibility to acknowledge that we as a Cañada community have benefited from the use and occupation of this land and that the tragic legacy of colonization, genocide, capitalism, racism, and oppression still impacts people today.

We also recognize the labor upon which this educational institution, state, and country is built.

We acknowledge the peoples of African ancestry who were enslaved and forcibly brought to this land, and whose forced labor played a major role in the formation of this country. We are indebted to their uncompensated labor and their unwilling sacrifice over hundreds of years—which continues to impact generations today. We honor the legacy of the African diaspora and the continued contribution of their survivors.

Karen 5

We acknowledge the contributions of all immigrant labor, forced labor, and undocumented people who contributed, and continue to contribute, to the building and feeding of this land. We acknowledge their immeasurable sacrifices and work that allow us to gather in this space today.

Let us not forget. Let us honor and engage with the people who have stewarded and labored on this land for generations, and let us honor these truths—by taking responsibility as a college community to continually educate ourselves about these realities, to affirm our commitment to justice through continual action, and to protect and sustain this land.

EAPC MISSION: The mission of the Equity and Antiracism Planning Council is to disrupt and dismantle systemic racism and White supremacy for our Cañada College community in pursuit of equity, antiracism, justice and liberation.

Kim 1

Community Agreements for Respectful Dialogue:

Linked are some community agreements upon which we hope to continue respectful dialogue throughout our time together. A reminder that EAPC is not Brown Acted, and has chosen to uplift community discussion and dialogue in EAPC that does not utilize Parliamentary Procedure.

1

Time Keeper

There are so many important things to discuss together. Who is willing to help us keep time?

[Check out this video link on how to do timekeeper easily on Zoom!](#)

Rosie volunteered to keep time.

Chris 2

2. What Have We Done?

a. What we covered at the last EAPC

Kiran 5

[Found on the EAPC website here.](#)

Do we agree these notes of what we covered at the last meeting at correct? (Those of us who were at that meeting.)

Minutes approved by the consent of those present.

3. Who's Here?

Michiko 1

Appointed voting members: 15 = 9 for quorum

| | |
|---|---|
| Aarya Ayyar - Student | Kassie Alexander - Faculty: Counseling |
| Alyssa Lucchini - Classified | Katie Dominion - Classified |
| Chris Wardell - Tri Chair: Classified | Karen Engel - PRIE |
| Chris Rico - Faculty: At Large (Counseling) | Kristina Brower - Faculty: BDW |
| Eddy Harris - Faculty: KAD | Michiko Kealoha - Tri-Chair: Administrator |
| Ellen Young - Faculty ASLT | Shanda DeRosans - Student |
| Helena Almassy - Faculty: S&T | Wisseem Bennani - Administrative Representative |
| Jasmin Padilla Valencia - Classified | Zorie Gomez - Classified |
| Kiran Malavade - Tri-Chair: Faculty, HSS | Faculty: HSS - VACANT--Yet we have 2 counselors so total # of faculty is correct. |

Guests: Kim Lopez, Max Hartman, Diva Ward

4. What are we doing?

a. EAPC Flow for Today

Chris 2

Review what is on the agenda for today. Any proposed changes?

Announcements
 EAPC in Practice
 SEAP Plan Actions
 Campus Climate Survey Review and Discussion

Chris explained that the group would be reviewing EAPC-related announcements and holding another EAPC in-practice session. He stated that the group would hear two Student Equity and Achievement Plan action updates, focused on centralizing and expanding student work opportunities and increasing culturally relevant curriculum across all courses. He added that the meeting would conclude with a review and discussion of the Campus Climate Survey. He then asked if anyone had proposed changes to today's flow. Kiran mentioned that Annika was unable to attend, clarifying that she would be the sole presenter for the presentation, *Increase Culturally Relevant Curriculum in All Courses*. President Lopez suggested moving Diva's agenda item, *Review the Campus Climate Survey and Brainstorm Appropriate Action*, to the first presentation slot, as Diva would be attending an off campus event at 4 p.m and President Lopez wanted to be mindful of her time and schedule. Diva and the other presenters expressed their willingness to be flexible, and the group agreed to move her presentation earlier, with Diva shared her appreciation.

5. EAPC Related Announcements

a. This is a time to share upcoming equity and antiracism events, activities, and open learning opportunities that are coming up before the next EAPC. Please put your announcements in the Zoom chat or on a provided sticky note in-person.

Chris 9

Chris invited attendees to share any upcoming equity and anti-racism events, activities, or open learning opportunities taking place before the next meeting, encouraging those online to post announcements in the chat and those in person to share aloud. He noted that there were many events scheduled—around 15 before the next meeting—and encouraged everyone to check the events calendar because there was too much to highlight individually. After asking if anyone at the meeting had additional comments and hearing none, Michiko transitioned the group into the EAPC practice session.

6. EAPC in Practice

a. Entitlement Inventory Practice and Connection to Flex Day Offering

Tri-Chairs

10

Continue to dive deeper into the the "Habits of Entitlement" worksheet from Dr. Myhre who Faculty Equity Coordinator brought to campus for two sessions.

This inspired by Eileen's quote from last EAPC after IDI, "If we're going to do the work out there, we need to do the work in here."

In the Practical Tips and Tricks- we will dive deeper into each action--this meeting's action will focus on "Make plans in advance with a buddy to signal or call each other in when appropriate" -- what is an action you need support on? Who could be your buddy?

[Habits of Entitlement Handout](#)

Michiko expressed appreciation for Jackie's suggestion from the previous EAPC meeting to focus more intentionally on the "Habits of Entitlement" worksheet. Referring to the handout, Michiko proposed that the group dive deeper into each action by spending about 10 minutes in small groups of two or three. Participants were asked to discuss how they could make plans in advance with a buddy to signal or include each other when appropriate, identify actions they might need support with in the coming month, and consider who could serve as their 'buddy' in real life situations. Drawing on a prior small-group discussion, Michiko suggested thinking of a specific recurring situation--such as a meeting or classroom setting--where entitlement behaviors or discomfort speaking up tended to arise, and then collaboratively identifying strategies and support partners to address those situations. Michiko emphasized the value of sharing concrete examples and thinking together about who could serve as a thought partner or support person in navigating those recurring challenges. After returning from breakout groups, Michiko expressed hope that the small-group discussions had gone well. She invited participants on Zoom to share their reactions using emojis to indicate whether the activity went well, felt challenging, or left them unsure. Seeing positive responses, Michiko thanked everyone and encouraged participants to share ideas for future sessions, including specific items from the worksheet they might want to focus on next time, so the group could continue exploring different areas in greater depth.

7. Presentation

REVIEW THE CAMPUS CLIMATE SURVEY AND BRAINSTORM APPROPRIATE ACTION:

Connecting in with work from District Antiracism Council and Equal Employment Opportunity

District-Wide Campus Climate Results and Cañada Specific Campus Climate Results

-Review the most recent CAN Campus Climate Survey.

c.a. -What are trends and themes do you see? What critical interventions do you think is appropriate, utilizing an EAPC lens?

-What type of action or recommendations would we like to flush out after seeing this data?

-Think, pair, share

*Michiko & Diva
(10 minutes presentation
and 30 minutes discussion)
(15 minutes looking at the
plan and talking)
(15 minutes big group)*

40

This item is for review and discussion; potential recommendations for action can come for vote at the next meeting.

[Campus Climate Survey Results](#)

Michiko opened the discussion on the Campus Climate Survey by expressing gratitude to Diva Ward for providing background and framing the session's purpose. She explained that the group would first review College-specific survey results, then break into small groups to identify emerging themes and brainstorm possible recommendations to address the findings.

Diva provided an in-depth overview of the survey process. She explained that the survey had been administered districtwide the previous April as part of the district's Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) plan, receiving a total of 507 responses, which represented a 23% response rate. The survey included 14 questions developed collaboratively with a third-party vendor, the district's Anti-Racism Council, and a planning group that ensured alignment with equity goals. Diva clarified that survey results were presented both in aggregate and disaggregated by factors such as race, ethnicity, job category, district office, and individual colleges, allowing for analysis of trends across different employee groups.

Focusing on Cañada College, Diva highlighted generally positive feedback regarding representation, belonging, and inclusion. Employees reported feeling respected and included in many aspects of campus life. However, she flagged areas of concern, particularly around career advancement and institutional processes: approximately 40% of respondents indicated they were unsure about how to report incidents of bias or harassment, while others expressed perceived barriers to promotions and concerns about favoritism in decision-making. The group split into small groups, further reviewed the survey, and discussed the following questions: "What trends and themes do you see? What critical interventions do you think are appropriate, utilizing an EAPC lens? What type of action or recommendation would we like to flush out after seeing this data?"

Max Hartman opened the discussion by asking a series of methodological questions about the survey data, specifically whether responses had been analyzed by job classification (administrator, faculty, classified staff) and race, how closely those breakdowns matched district-wide proportions, and whether any statistical "norming" or weighting had been done to adjust for underrepresented or overrepresented groups. In response, Michiko said disaggregation by race and ethnicity was available at the district level but not clearly by college, and attempted to pull up the data. Karen Engel also raised a concern about sample size, noting that only 72 people from the college had responded. Michiko asked whether that made the data unreliable. Karen answered that 72 responses out of roughly 220 full-time employees (or more if adjuncts were included) was not an ideal number and agreed that weighting by role or demographics would be worth considering.

Michiko asked for group recommendations, and a councilmember reflected that their group focused less on solutions and more on how responses might vary based on identity and role, and that race and ethnicity likely influence how questions are interpreted. They also questioned the clarity of survey wording, asking how respondents interpret terms like "favoritism," suggesting the question might need refinement. Kiran agreed, adding that the favoritism question measured perception rather than objective reality. She also pointed out that the term "promotion" was confusing because formal promotions do not function in a typical way in the district workplace.

Kim highlighted the finding that about 40% of respondents did not know how to report harassment or discrimination. She suggested a practical solution: improving awareness through a marketing campaign or clearer communication, with Kiran noting that reporting information was not easy to find on the website and suggesting it could be made more prominent.

Chris shared a recommendation from his group to modify hiring practices, referencing a prior presentation on cluster hiring and suggesting the inclusion of a neutral, trained representative on hiring committees to help ensure fairness and equity without influencing decisions. Michiko asked whether additional training could help employees better understand the hiring feedback process, including whether candidates could request feedback after not being selected and to what extent. Rosie Morrison responded that candidates were allowed to request feedback, though it would typically be limited to documented strengths and weaknesses provided by the hiring manager.

Kiran raised concerns about a new hiring procedure, describing it as “incredibly problematic” and asking implicitly how it aligned with equity goals. She explained that the process was overly robotic and numerical, removing human interaction and discussion from hiring committees. The council discussed that HR was aware, and was collecting feedback. Rosie Morrison shared that to her knowledge, HR was already modifying parts of the process, such as reducing the number of evaluation criteria, but acknowledged that the process still limited discussion and relied heavily on numerical scoring.

Wissem Bennani summarized that his group identified two main “red flags” from the survey: high concern about favoritism (around 40%) and issues related to sense of belonging. Rather than proposing solutions, the group ended with a key question: “What is the plan at the local level and at the district level to address the survey,” especially given concerns about data validity.

Kiran prompted Kristina to expand on advancement concerns, asking how to address perceptions of limited promotion opportunities. Kristina responded that the issue might stem from a lack of knowledge about pathways to advancement and suggested mentorship or more transparent conversations about career progression, noting that such guidance often happens informally among administrators but is not widely accessible.

Michiko raised a broader question about responses indicating that employees felt they had to hide parts of their identity, asking what kinds of interventions—such as a flex session or other activity—might build trust. Kristina responded that the issue was rooted in relationship-building and discomfort with authentic conversations, with Kim suggesting more intentional opportunities for people to connect beyond formal agendas. Jasmin built on this by reflecting that meetings could incorporate structured community-building activities to help colleagues better understand each other’s roles, workloads, and personal contexts, highlighting that a lack of awareness about others’ responsibilities and experiences contributes to disconnection. Michiko stated that these ideas could be developed into future recommendations, and proposed the group could review reporting resources or create materials like a webpage or pamphlet at a future meeting. The group planned to synthesize the discussion into actionable recommendations that could meaningfully improve the college climate, transparency, and equity practices.

Student Equity and Achievement Plan Updates

CENTRALIZE + UPDATE STUDENT WORK OPPORTUNITIES:

- a.b. Increase the number of on-campus departments partnering with the Career Center for a clear, consistent, and central way for students to access information and applications for on-campus student jobs through a job posting and search tool like College Central.

Max
(10 minutes presentation
and 5 minutes Q&A)

15

[Presentation: SEAP Update: Centralize and Update Student Work Opportunities.](#)

Max explained that his focus was on the SEAP action of centralizing and updating student work opportunities through the Career Center as part of a broader equity initiative aligned with the Educational Master Plan (EMP). He described how the semester began with pilot programs designed to increase access and support for students, including monthly Career Cafés, Career Pathways workshops, and drop-in sessions that offered personalized assistance with resumes, applications, and job searches. These programs were intentionally low-stakes and practical, allowing students to explore employment options without pressure, and were designed to reach a diverse student population, including first-generation and historically underserved students.

Max emphasized the collaborative nature of the work, noting partnerships with faculty, retention specialists, counselors, and community stakeholders such as alumni. He highlighted that these partnerships helped the Career Center offer guidance rooted in real-world experience while also bridging academic learning with professional opportunities. A key component of the initiative involved centralizing job postings through the College Central job board, with ongoing coordination across campus offices, including Financial Aid, Athletics, and other departments. Max also mentioned plans to expand outreach, encouraging more departments to actively post student employment opportunities, particularly through the SEAP action, which specifically aimed to increase departmental participation in job posting.

Following Max’s presentation, councilmembers engaged in a discussion about implementation and alignment with the SEAP action. Kristina asked whether Max or his team could present this work at division meetings to better connect CTE and workforce students with Career Center resources; Max agreed and noted that ongoing collaboration meetings already included representatives from those areas, while also welcoming additional outreach and partnership opportunities. Kiran shifted to clarifying the specific SEAP objective: SEAP ACTION LANGUAGE--Increase the number of on-campus departments partnering with the Career Center for a clear, consistent, and central way for students to access information and applications for on-campus student jobs through a job posting and search tool like College Central. Kiran emphasized that although the Career Center was doing a wide range of valuable work, the request itself was very narrow. Kiran sought clarification on the baseline data, including the number of participating departments and asked how progress would be tracked over time, specifically whether that number would increase during annual check-ins. Kiran also raised a concern that some departments, like the Learning Center and library, had previously declined to participate because they relied on word-of-mouth hiring, and suggested that the college should revisit those departments and explicitly ask them to use a centralized system to ensure more equitable access for students.

Max responded by explaining that a centralized job board already existed and that newer strategies—such as organizing opportunities by student interest areas—were meant to strengthen partnerships. Max identified two key challenges: increasing student awareness and use of the existing job board, and getting more campus departments to post their opportunities there. Max explained that efforts would include more intentional outreach, events, and direct engagement with students, as well as reminding campus programs that the job board was available and aligned with equity plan goals. Max also invited additional suggestions for how to incentivize or encourage departments to participate. Kim noted that the SEAP plan had only recently been submitted and that early conversations like this were meant to help stakeholders better understand and gradually implement the action over time. By the end of the year, the group would need clear data showing growth—such as how many students or departments initially used the job board compared to after specific outreach efforts. Kiran clarified that the primary metric defined in the plan was not student usage but rather the number of on-campus departments posting jobs through the centralized system, though participants agreed that student engagement data could still be useful as a supplementary measure. The group discussed barriers to participation, with Michiko noting feedback that some employees found the system confusing or assumed it was difficult to use, and suggested sharing success stories from departments like Financial Aid or Athletics, along with demonstrations to show how simple the platform could be. Max also encouraged colleagues to test the system themselves and provide feedback on any difficulties students might face when creating accounts or navigating the tool.

The conversation highlighted equity concerns, particularly regarding undocumented students. Jasmin raised questions about how these students could benefit from Career Center resources when many lack work authorization, especially in fields requiring formal employment processes. Max acknowledged that while the SEAP action language was narrow, it was important not to overlook undocumented students in implementation efforts. Chris explained that, despite tools like College Central, institutional barriers—such as HR requirements for I-9 documentation—effectively prevent undocumented students from accessing many on-campus jobs, though some limited workarounds like the Dream Act Service Incentive Grant exist. The council concluded discussion with recognition of these structural challenges and the need to incorporate more inclusive solutions into future planning and updates.

INCREASE CULTURALLY RELEVANT CURRICULUM IN ALL COURSES:
b-c. Provide professional development opportunities to all faculty across disciplines to develop culturally relevant courses and pedagogy. Increase faculty attendance to culturally relevant professional development opportunities by 3% since last SEAP plan cycle. (Collect data that includes on and off campus participation.)

Kiran
(10 minutes presentation
and 5 minutes Q&A)

15

[Presentation: Increase Culturally Relevant Curriculum in All Courses](#)

Kiran presented an early-stage overview of the SEAP action focused on increasing culturally relevant curriculum across all courses. Kiran explained that the core goal was not to directly measure what happens inside individual classrooms—which is difficult to track—but rather to expand professional development (PD) opportunities that help faculty across all disciplines (not just fields like English or Math) develop culturally relevant pedagogy. The proposed metric, therefore, was to increase faculty participation in PD related to culturally relevant teaching, with an initial target of a 3% increase from the previous year, though Kiran acknowledged this number was somewhat arbitrary and that establishing a clear baseline was still in progress. Responsibility for this work was described as shared primarily by the Professional Development Planning Committee (PDPC), including Kiran as Faculty Equity Coordinator, Faculty Teaching and Learning Coordinators, and the Director of Equity, with input from the broader committee on what types of training should be offered.

Kiran also outlined an emerging working definition of culturally relevant curriculum, drawing on three key components from the California Department of Education: maintaining high academic expectations, supporting students' cultural competence, and fostering critical consciousness so students can analyze social inequities. Examples of what this might look like in practice included incorporating diverse content, using inclusive language, addressing local social issues, and offering multiple forms of assessment such as self-assessment. Kiran emphasized that the group was in the process of discussing how to track numbers and impact. Current data—such as overall faculty attendance at Flex Day or conferences—had not yet been disaggregated to determine how many of those activities were actually related to culturally relevant pedagogy. Kiran explained that the next step would be to break down (disaggregate) participation data to identify which events aligned with the goal and who attended them. A baseline percentage needed to be established so that a goal for the next 3 years was defined (increase of 3% each year).

Kiran described several initiatives in development to support the effort. These included organizing faculty-led sessions where instructors from different disciplines (such as Business, History, Biology, and English) would share culturally relevant teaching practices; promoting equity-focused conferences and using sign-in or reporting tools to track participation; and bringing training directly into division meetings to reach faculty where they are already gathered. Kiran stressed that the work was still largely in the planning phase, with an emphasis on building systems for tracking participation and gathering input on what types of PD would be most useful.

Following Kiran's presentation, councilmembers asked how the initiative would measure impact beyond increasing participation in professional development (PD). Max clarified whether the metric was about increasing PD opportunities, and Kiran confirmed that it largely was, because there was no direct way to measure how many faculty were implementing culturally relevant practices in their classrooms. In response, Max suggested using peer evaluations or student survey feedback to assess how representative the curriculum felt. Kiran acknowledged that some of this information might already exist in evaluation forms but was unsure whether it was accessible, raising the possibility of creating new evaluation tools that were equity-centered.

Another key question raised was whether attending PD actually leads to changes in teaching practice. Kiran agreed this was a central challenge and noted that while PD attendance is measurable, it does not guarantee implementation. Councilmembers discussed whether it was reasonable to assume faculty apply what they learn, with Kiran suggesting that many likely do, but acknowledging this is not always the case. This led to suggestions for better tracking, such as collecting data on which faculty attend trainings and then following up on their teaching practices over time.

Councilmembers also proposed alternative, more supportive approaches to assessing impact, including peer review models where faculty could voluntarily share syllabi or invite feedback on their courses, similar to existing online course review processes. Kiran responded positively to these ideas, emphasizing the importance of keeping the process supportive rather than punitive. In response to the question about possible metrics, Karen described a prior example from a grant where faculty who completed PD were tracked in aggregate against course outcomes, noting this could be one way to evaluate effectiveness, even if imperfect.

Finally, Kiran raised concerns that the faculty most in need of training might not attend PD at all. In response, Karen suggested that many faculty may believe they are already using effective practices until given opportunities for deeper reflection, emphasizing the need for collegial, supportive engagement. The discussion concluded with agreement that measuring impact would require a combination of strategies—tracking participation, exploring feedback mechanisms, and creating spaces for reflection and peer support—rather than relying solely on attendance data.

8. Future Agenda Items

Review recent program reviews for the "what equity trainings/professional development (PD)" is needed and discuss with potential recommendations for future PD.

In the interest of time, the group was invited to email ideas for future agenda items to the tri-chairs.

Meeting adjourned at 4:03pm