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Portland Community College aspires to become an institution of higher education that operates with the theory of social justice as part of its foundation, mission and values. We are taking intentional steps as an institution to make PCC a more inclusive and welcoming learning/working environment.

In 2014, we adopted a strategic plan that commits PCC to applying Critical Race Theory (CRT) as part of our business practice, policy, and decision-making. CRT is both a paradigm and a practice that challenges dominant systems on race, racism, and inequality. CRT asks us to examine how and why practices and policies were created-and who they ultimately serve-as a means of challenging institutionalized forms of oppression. CRT is a theory that is still evolving and growing. We have chosen to base this work mostly on Kohli (2009)1 because this author operationalized the theory in a higher education context.

The following tools and resources are a result of the District Leaders of Diversity Council looking at intentional ways to make CRT part of our everyday learning and work here at PCC. As shorthand for examining our practice, based on CRT, we ask you to “Take 5”-to take a moment to pause and reflect on the intention, identities and the beneficiaries of the proposed action.

The “Take 5” process incorporates CRT principles according to Kohli’s (2009)1 “CRT Litmus test” and makes them more accessible to PCC’s current operational model. Whatever your role at the college may be, we encourage you to engage fully with this practice and to “Take 5” as you make decisions on behalf of PCC, its students, staff and stakeholders.

We hope that many will find the toolkit useful and actionable. Please feel free to contact the Office of Equity & Inclusion if you have any questions.

Warmly,

Kim Baker-Flowers
PCC Chief Diversity Officer

---

1. The centrality and intersectionality of race and racism.
   CRT asserts that racism is a permanent component of American life.

2. The challenge to dominant ideology.
   CRT challenges the claims of neutrality, objectivity, colorblindness, and meritocracy in society.

3. The commitment to social justice.
   CRT is a framework that is committed to a social justice agenda to eliminate all forms of subordination of people.

4. The centrality of experiential knowledge.
   CRT asserts that the experiential knowledge of people of color is appropriate, legitimate, and an integral part to analyzing and understanding racial inequality.

5. The interdisciplinary perspective.
   CRT challenges historical inaccuracies and the unidisciplinary focuses of most analyses and insists that race and racism be placed in both a contemporary and historical context using interdisciplinary methods.
We “Take 5” when we need to pause to make a decision:

1. Recognize Intersectionality:
2. Challenge the Dominant Perspective:
3. Commitment to Social Justice:
4. Value Experiential Knowledge:
5. Use an Interdisciplinary Approach:

Important Considerations:

1. During the “Take 5” Process, consider how the status quo (or how PCC typically operates) has not been working effectively and equitably for all.
2. Recognize the power you do have to make change at PCC. This is a process to discuss potential outcomes and possible solutions.
3. Assigning roles, a time limit, and using group agreements help provide important structure for this process.
4. Circle back to the issue of race and make sure the group concurs as to whether race could be a factor (it is embedded and therefore hard to see initially).
5. Make some time (at a later date) to reflect on this process and what it might say about your particular work group.

Assign roles:
Facilitator: leads group through the process
Note-taker: records group responses
Time-keeper: keeps track of the time
Use the following worksheet to document your process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identify the Problem or Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Critical Race Theory Decision Making Toolkit
Fill out this worksheet as your group works through the Take 5 Process on the next page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Recognition of Intersectionality</th>
<th>2. Challenge of Dominant Perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Commitment to Social Justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Value of Experiential Knowledge</td>
<td>5. Interdisciplinary Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Recognize Intersectionality:
With race at the center of the analysis, consider the identities of the individuals who will be impacted by the decision.
   A. First of all, what are the implications of race in this particular policy?
   B. Using the Identity cards, list the other identities involved in addressing the issue (pick 5 most relevant).
   C. How does PCC currently address this issue? How does that impact the identities involved?
   D. Who has power in this policy? Who benefits from this power? Who has less power, and what do they have to lose in this interaction?

2. Challenge Dominant Perspective:
Identify inequities involved in the issue and consider what would challenge the dominant perspective*, i.e. the usual way of doing things.
   A. Brainstorm a list of ideas that would challenge dominant thinking or current practice at PCC.
   B. Consider how non-dominant groups (Ex: Trans bathroom-user) benefit or don’t from the brainstormed list of ideas. [Facilitator note: indicate “yes”, “maybe”, “no” next to each listed idea. The group needs to determine whether there is a benefit or not]

3. Commit to Social Justice:
Address systemic inequities and commit to not do further harm.
   A. Using the list of brainstormed ideas from step 2, ensure that the possible solutions or ideas from the list do not do further harm but rather benefits those impacted by inequities.

4. Value Experiential Knowledge:
Consider the real-life experiences of the individuals impacted to inform the issue/decision.
   A. Use the identity cards to consider the potential life experiences of those impacted by the issue/decision.
   B. Has anyone asked the individual(s) who are being impacted?

5. Use an Interdisciplinary Approach:
Identify all the stakeholders, collaborators and potential solutions.
   A. Identify the multiple stakeholders.
   B. Have multiple perspectives been considered and incorporated into the process? (Ex. Faculty proposes XYZ, Students propose ABC, PCC lawyers propose XXX, etc.)

Next Steps:
• Determine exactly what group is voting on.
• Vote with Fist of Five (see handout) to build consensus and finalize the decision.
• Note that the Take 5 process can also be used to evaluate and reevaluate decisions not only for new ones.
Imagine you have a topic that you want to get a vote on. Let’s use a simple one: you have family or friends visiting and you are trying to decide on where to go to dinner. You talk and talk about options and it seems like everyone is okay with Indian food. You ask for a show of hands and seem to have a majority. So you start to call a local Indian restaurant and someone suddenly says, “I don’t want that.” HUH? I thought we agreed… This happens often in our personal and work lives.

1. State the question: “Is everyone okay with Indian food for dinner?”

2. Count: 1, 2, 3, vote! Everyone votes at the same time and hands must be held high. This may seem trivial but, for more contentious topics (although this could be one), it is important that people do not look to others in the room to see how to vote.

3. Each person votes by holding up 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 fingers.

4. The facilitator (or vote caller) looks around the room and quickly tallies the votes [and articulates to the group the result of the count]. The votes breakdown like this:
   - 0 fingers (a fist): No way, terrible choice, I will not go along with it. A way to block consensus.
   - 1 finger: I have serious reservations with this idea, but I vote to move forward, but I’d prefer to resolve the concerns before supporting it.
   - 2 fingers: I have some concerns, but I’ll go along and try it.
   - 3 fingers: I will support the idea.
   - 4 fingers: I like this idea, sounds good.
   - 5 fingers: Absolutely, best idea ever! I’ll champion it.
5. Based on the goal of the vote (as noted above), the facilitator takes the next steps…

A. Goal: Check-in — The facilitator uses the results to adjust the session, make changes, start a discussion, or other actions based on how the vote went and how he/she sees the process progressing. Was the vote what you expected? Different? Do you believe changes are required?

B. Goal: Learn and gain consensus — If you have some 0s, 1s, or 2s, ask for reasons. What reservations do they have? You ask for a brief summary or a bottom-line of the reasons. Ask for other bottom-line comment from others. Then call another vote. You may learn new information to restate the question and vote again.

C. Goal: Vote and move forward — If everyone has fingers up, that is a yes. If everyone has a fist up, that is a clear no. If there is a mix, it is a winner take all, number of hands with fists, vs. number of hands with fingers up (1 thru 5).

If you decide you want to learn more about people’s reservations to develop a stronger decision, you can use the ideas from the goal ‘Learn and gain consensus.’ If you choose this, it is important to have a clear plan to move on, and for everyone to understand that you are not aiming for consensus, but instead Deep Democracy (you want all voices to be heard). The learning variation can be a challenge, since the facilitator will at some point have to decide when the vote stands. This can be very hard to do if you do not have an alliance developed with the group (certainly if you are not impartial and were just the one to call the vote). Everyone does not have to think this is the best idea ever, but Fist of Five voting provides a way for people to voice a spectrum of opinions. You may have some people that are willing to support the idea, even with some reservations. The process also airs different ideas and provides a clear way to discuss differences.

*Learning with Fist of Five Voting, September 23, 2014 by Jake Calabrese
**Scenario**

Omar is a 17 year old first generation student, originally from Yemen. He is attending PCC and identifies as a transgender man. Omar does not feel comfortable with the multi-stall restroom designated for men as he has encountered harassment, fear, and surprise among other reactions when all he wants to do is go to the restroom. The building where he takes most of his classes only has multi-stall restrooms. Omar has separated from his family/community in California and is currently living in his car. He is fearful of talking to the staff at PCC due to his concerns of governmental involvement. He has confided about this issue to a female custodian.

**The group assigned roles:**
- **Facilitator:** led group through the process
- **Note-taker:** recorded group responses
- **Time-keeper:** kept track of the time

**The group had to answer the following questions:**

1. **Recognize Intersectionality**
   - With race at the center of the analysis, consider the identities of the individuals who will be impacted by the decision.
     - A. First of all, what are the implications of race in this particular policy?
     - B. Using the Identity cards, list the other identities involved in addressing the issue (pick 5 most relevant).
     - C. How does PCC currently address this issue? How does that impact the identities involved?
     - D. Who has power in this policy? Who benefits from this power? Who has less power, and what do they have to lose in this interaction?

2. **Challenge Dominant Perspective**
   - Identify inequities involved in the issue and consider what would challenge the dominant perspective*, i.e. the usual way of doing things.
     - A. Brainstorm a list of ideas that would challenge dominant thinking or current practice at PCC.
     - B. Consider how non-dominant groups (Ex: Trans bathroom-user) benefit or don’t from the brainstormed list of ideas. [Facilitator note: indicate “yes”, “maybe”, “no” next to each listed idea. The group needs to determine whether there is a benefit or not]

3. **Commit to Social Justice**
   - Address systemic inequities and commit to not do further harm.
     - A. Using the list of brainstormed ideas from step 2, ensure that the possible solutions or ideas from the list do not do further harm but rather benefits those impacted by inequities.
4. Value Experiential Knowledge
   Consider the real-life experiences of the individuals impacted to inform the issue/decision.
   A. Use the identity cards to consider the potential life experiences of those impacted by the issue/decision.
   B. Has anyone asked the individual(s) who are being impacted?

5. Use an Interdisciplinary Approach
   Identify all the stakeholders, collaborators and potential solutions.
   A. Identify the multiple stakeholders.
   B. Have multiple perspectives been considered and incorporated into the process? (Ex. Faculty proposes XYZ, Students propose ABC, PCC lawyers propose XXX, etc.)

Next Steps:
   ● Determine exactly what the group is voting on
   ● Vote with Fist of Five (see handout) to build consensus and finalize the decision.
   ● Note that the Take 5 process can also be used to evaluate and reevaluate decisions not only for new ones.
What follows are the notes for how the group responded to the situation faced by Omar:

1. **Intersectionality**
   A. How does race impact this situation? As a Person of Color (POC), the student chose to communicate with a woman of Color custodian rather than going through more mainstream channels. As a POC, this student reached out to another POC. As a POC, this student experiences less access to institutional resources. It does not matter if the student’s experiences of institutional access are real or perceived.
   B. Which identities are involved? (and 5 most relevant)? Race, undocumented, Yemeni, immigrant, food avail., first gen., Muslim, ESOL, transgender male, teen, no disability, houseless, skin color, geographic location.
   C. Current practice? We have insufficient gender neutral restrooms; no written policy, no viable option for Omar, student invisibility, unequal access to education, physical/emotional discomfort, promotes gender normative discourse (current PCC policy and how it impacts those identities)
   D. Who has power? PCC Admin, cisgender members of PCC. Who has less power? Queer community, LGBTQIA.

2. **Challenge Dominant Perspective**
   Brainstorm list of ideas.
   A. Non-gender specific restrooms everywhere (YES, it challenges dominant perspective)
   B. Education for staff- restroom etiquette (YES, it challenges dominant perspective )
   C. Change signage (MAYBE, challenges dominant perspective)
   D. Focus groups & dialogue (NO, this is a status quo practice and it does not benefit non-dominant groups)

3. **Commitment to Social Justice**
   Using the list, ensure no further harm.
   A. If the restrooms are single stall, there is no further harm. (Consideration: could sexual violence occur in single stall due to isolation?) If multi-stall, there are lots of implications and potential for further harm:
      -how it impacts other identities, such as religion
      -fewer women’s restrooms as these would be converted
   B. Education for staff: restroom etiquette, gender-diverse education- potential for further harm
      -Who determines PCC restroom etiquette & how to do this in non-dominant way
      -negative behavior/attitude towards trans-presenting and/or trainers
      -Additional responsibilities for non-dominant trans educators/ add to workload
   C. Change of signage - potential for further harm
      -trans person who is accessing rest room per new policy/interacting with someone operating by old rules
      -depends on what is source of signage
   D. Focus groups & dialogue  NOT NECESSARY TO EXPLORE as it does not challenge dominant perspective.
4. Value Experiential Knowledge
   A. - Omar would benefit from single stall restrooms
      - Multi-stall restrooms would be problematic for Omar due to religion, trans, age, language;
      - Omar lacks institutional power
   B. Has anyone checked with the non-dominant person impacted? Talked to Omar?
      What are the solutions proposed by the folks most impacted by the decision?

5. Interdisciplinary Approach
   A. Stakeholders: admin, students, staff, general public, all restroom users, city regulators
   B. Multiple perspectives: trans, religious, gender rigid, gender fluid, age
   C. Various perspectives:
      - Dominant perspective: status quo
      - Trans perspective: single or multiple, perspectives varies
      - City regulators and admin: what is the cost?
      - Facilities personnel/lawyers: “follow the legal parameters”
   D. Whose perspectives weren't considered?

The decision:
   - Use Ideas from stage 3 and 4 to determine decision and vote on the outcome.
   - Does PCC move forward to provide single and multi-use rest rooms in a significant way?
   - Spend some time clarifying what needs to be voted on.
   - Understand this is a process and it may not all be decided today.

Using Fist of Five, group voted on:
   - Status quo—keep things the same?
   - Increase single stall?
   - Increase multiple stall?
   - Education to be led by LGBTQIA staff?
Adultism
Behaviors and attitudes based on the assumption that adults are better than young individuals, and entitled to act upon young individuals without their agreement.

Ageism
Prejudiced thoughts, stereotyping and discriminatory actions based on differences in age; usually that of younger persons against older.

Ally
An ally is typically a member of advantaged social groups who uses social power to take a stand against social injustice directed at targeted groups (Whites who speak out against racism, men who are anti-sexist). An ally works to be an agent of social change rather than an agent of oppression. (Adams, et al.)

Asset-Based Approach
An asset-based approach is a methodology which focuses on strengths, potential and what is working well to support the growth of individuals and communities. It is a perspective that is based on the assumption that people have existing competencies and resources for their own empowerment. It assumes that people are capable of solving problems and learning new skills; they are a part of the process rather than just being guided.

Cisgender
A person who conforms to gender/sex based expectations of society (also referred to as “Gender-straight” or “Gender Normative”). For example, if a doctor said “it’s a boy!” when you were born, and you identify as a man, then you could be described as cisgender. In other words, ‘cisgender’ is used to describe individuals who are not transgender.

Classism
A system of power and privilege based on the accumulation of economic wealth and social status. Classism is the mechanism by which certain groups of individuals, considered as a unit according to their economic, occupational, or social status, benefit at the expense of other groups.

Collective Decision-Making
Collective or group decision-making (also known as collaborative decision-making) is a situation faced when individuals collectively make a choice from the alternatives before them. The decision is then no longer attributable to any single individual who is a member of the group.
Co-optation
Various processes by which members of the dominant cultures or groups assimilate members of target groups, reward them, and hold them up as models for other members of the target groups. Tokenism is a form of co-optation.

Critical Race Theory
A critical race theory in education challenges the dominant discourse on race and racism as they relate to education by examining how educational theory, policy, and practice are used to subordinate certain racial and ethnic groups.

There are at least five themes that form the basic perspectives, research methods, and pedagogy of a critical race theory in education (Kohli, 2009):

1. The centrality and intersectionality of race and racism
2. The challenge to dominant ideology
3. The commitment to social justice
4. The centrality of experiential knowledge
5. The interdisciplinary perspective

Culturally Responsive Pedagogy
Culturally responsive pedagogy facilitates and supports the achievement of all students. In a culturally responsive classroom, reflective teaching and learning occur in a culturally supported, learner-centered context, whereby the strengths students bring to school are identified, nurtured and utilized to promote student achievement.

Culture
A social system of meaning and custom that is developed by a group of individuals to assure its adaptation and survival. These groups are distinguished by a set of unspoken rules that shape values, beliefs, habits, patterns of thinking, behaviors and styles of communication. (IDR) [anthropological/sociologist: culture is comprised of four components: symbols, language, norms and values/beliefs.]

Deficit-Based Approach
A deficit-based approach is a methodology for problem-solving which focuses on barriers or weaknesses, and emphasizes where there is failure, helplessness, and low expectations which need to be addressed. Current dominant culture approaches often create a dependency on outside resources and solutions.

Disability
A person experiences disability when impairment substantially limits a major life activity, or when there is a history or perception of such a limitation. In a medical model, disability refers to abnormalities documented within the person. The solution is to accommodate the individual. In a social or cultural model, disability is recognized as a result of the interaction between the person and the environment. The solution is to proactively remove barriers. In practice, a person may be disabled in some environments, but not in others.

Disablism
The belief that disabled individuals are inferior to non disabled individuals, leading to discrimination toward and oppression of individuals with disabilities and physical differences (Miller, Parker, and Gillinson, 2004)
Diversity
Individual differences (e.g., personality, learning styles, and life experiences) and group/social
differences (e.g., race/ethnicity, class, gender, sexual orientation, gender expression, country of origin,
and ability as well as cultural, political, religious, or other affiliations). (AAC&U)

Dominant Perspective/Dominant Culture
The dominant culture in a society refers to the established language, religion, values, rituals and social
customs. These traits are often considered the norm for the society as a whole. The dominant culture
is usually, but not always, in the majority and achieves its dominance by controlling social institutions
such as communication, educational institutions, artistic expression, law, political process, and business.
In a multicultural society, various cultures are celebrated and respected equally. Dominant culture is
deliberately promoted via the suppression of other cultures or subcultures.

Ethnicity
A social construct which divides individuals into smaller social groups based on characteristics such
as shared sense of group membership, values, behavioral patterns, language, political and economic
interests, history and ancestral geographical base. Examples of different ethnic groups are: Cape
Verdean, Haitian, African American (Black); Chinese, Korean, Vietnamese (Asian); Cherokee, Mohawk,
Navaho (Native American); Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican (Latino); Polish, Irish, and Swedish (White).
(Adams, et al.)

Equity
Takes into consideration the fact that the social identifiers (race, gender, socio-economic status, etc.)
do in fact affect equality. In an equitable environment, an individual or a group would be given what
was needed to give them equal advantage. This would not necessarily be equal to what others were
receiving. It could be more or different. Equity is an ideal and a goal, not a process. It ensures that
everyone has the resources they need to succeed.

Experiential Knowledge
Experiential knowledge is knowledge gained through lived experience. This type of knowledge can
be contrasted with academic knowledge and “common sense”, and may be perceived by dominant
culture as having less value.

Gender Expression
The manner in which any individual’s gender identity is expressed, including, but not limited to,
through dress, appearance, manner, or speech. Examples of gender expression include but are not
limited to femininity, masculinity, and androgyny.

Gender Identity
The manner in which any individual experiences and conceptualizes their gender, regardless of
whether or not it differs from the gender culturally associated with their assigned sex at birth.
Gender identity is not necessarily visible to others.

Genderism
The system of belief that there are only two genders (men and women) and that gender is inherently
tied to one’s sex assigned at birth. It holds cisgender individuals as superior to transgender
individuals, and punishes or excludes those who don’t conform to society’s expectations of gender.
Heterosexism
Assuming every person to be heterosexual therefore marginalizing persons who do not identify as heterosexual. It is also believing heterosexuality to be superior to homosexuality and all other sexual orientations.

Identity
Refers to your own individual (focus is on the self) race and culture you identify most with.

Interdisciplinary Approach
An interdisciplinary approach combines or involves two or more academic disciplines, fields of study, professions, technologies, departments, businesses or industries. This approach encourages coalition-building and recognizes the necessity for including stakeholders in the decision-making process.

Internalized Homophobia
Among lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals, internalized sexual stigma (also called internalized homophobia) refers to the personal acceptance and endorsement of sexual stigma as part of the individual's value system and self-concept. It is the counterpart to sexual prejudice among heterosexuals.

Internalized Oppression
The process whereby individuals in the target group make oppression internal and personal by coming to believe that the lies, prejudices, and stereotypes about them are true. Members of target groups exhibit internalized oppression when they alter their attitudes, behaviors, speech, and self-confidence to reflect the stereotypes and norms of the dominant group. Internalized oppression can create low self-esteem, self-doubt, and even self-loathing. It can also be projected outward as fear, criticism, and distrust of members of one’s target group.

Internalized Racism
When individuals from targeted racial groups internalize racist beliefs about themselves or members of their racial group. Examples include using creams to lighten one's skin, believing that white leaders are inherently more competent, asserting that individuals of color are not intelligent as white individuals, believing that racial inequality is the result of individuals of color not raising themselves up “by their bootstraps” (Jackson & Hardiman, 1997)

Intersectionality
An approach largely advanced by women of color, arguing that classifications such as gender, race, class, and others cannot be examined in isolation from one another; they interact and intersect in individuals’ lives, in society, in social systems, and are mutually constitutive. Exposing [one’s] multiple identities can help clarify the ways in which a person can simultaneously experience privilege and oppression. For example, a Black woman in America does not experience gender inequalities in exactly the same way as a white woman, nor racial oppression identical to that experienced by a Black man. Each race and gender intersection produces a qualitatively distinct life.

“Isms”
A way of describing any attitude, action or institutional structure that subordinates (oppresses) a person or group because of their target group, color (racism), gender (sexism), economic status (classism), older age (ageism), religion (e.g. Anti-Semitism), sexual orientation (heterosexism), language/immigrant status (xenophobism), etc. (Institute for Democratic RenewaO (Adams, et al.)
Lines of Difference
A person that operates across lines of difference is one that welcomes and honors perspectives from others in different racial, gender, socioeconomic, generational, regional [listing is not exhaustive] groups than their own.

Lookism
Discrimination or prejudice based upon an individual’s appearance

Microaggression
Commonplace daily verbal, behavioral, or environmental indignities, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicate hostile, derogatory racial slights. These messages may be sent verbally (“You speak good English.”), nonverbally (clutching one’s purse more tightly) or environmentally (symbols like the confederate flag or using American Indian mascots). Such communications are usually outside the level of conscious awareness of perpetrators.

Microinsults
Verbal and nonverbal communications that subtly convey rudeness and insensitivity and demean a person’s racial heritage or identity. An example is an employee who asks a colleague of color how she got her job, implying she may have landed it through an affirmative action or quota system.

Microinvalidations
Communications that subtly exclude, negate or nullify the thoughts, feelings or experiential reality of a person of color. For instance, white individuals often ask Asian-Americans where they were born, conveying the message that they are perpetual foreigners in their own land.

Non-dominant Groups
Groups who have been historically oppressed and marginalized (and still are today) such as Asian, Black, Indigenous people, Latinx, LGBTQ+, people who are not Christian, people with disabilities, and women. Can also refer to groups without privilege such as PT faculty, casual workers, or student workers in the higher educational setting.

Oppression
Conscious and unconscious attitudes and behaviors directed towards a subordinate group coupled with the power and privilege of the advantaged group and manifested at individual, cultural, and institutional levels.

Prejudice
A prejudgment or preconceived opinion, feeling, or belief, usually negative, often based on stereotypes, that includes feelings such as dislike or contempt and is often enacted as discrimination or other negative behavior OR: A set of negative personal beliefs about a social group that leads individuals to prejudge individuals from that group or the group in general, regardless of individual differences among members of that group.

Privilege
Unearned access to resources (social power) only readily available to some individuals as a result of their social group.
Privileged Group Member
A member of an advantaged social group privileged by birth or acquisition, examples: Whites, men, owning class, upper middle class, heterosexuals, gentiles, Christians, non-disabled individuals.

Protective Factor
A protective factor is any attribute, characteristic, condition or behavior that increases the likelihood of a positive impact. (Identity characteristics that are associated with dominant culture norms may result in protective factors).

Race
A social construct that artificially divides individuals into distinct groups based on characteristics such as physical appearance (particularly skin color), ancestral heritage, cultural affiliation or history, ethnic classification, and/or the social, economic, and political needs of a society at a given period of time. Scientists agree that there is no biological or genetic basis for racial categories. (Adams, et al.)

Racial Equity
Racial equity is the condition that would be achieved if one’s racial identity no longer predicted, in a statistical sense, how one fares. When we use the term, we are thinking about racial equity as one part of racial justice, and thus we also include work to address root causes of inequities not just their manifestation. This includes elimination of policies, practices, attitudes and cultural messages that reinforce differential outcomes by race or fail to eliminate them.

Racism
A system of advantage based on race and supported by institutional structures, policies and practices that create and sustain advantages for the dominant white group while systematically subordinating members of targeted racial groups. This relative advantage for Whites and subordination for individuals of color is supported by the actions of individuals, cultural norms, and values and the institutional structures and practices of society. (Adams, et al.)

Risk Factor
A risk factor is any attribute, characteristic, condition or behavior that increases the likelihood of a negative impact.

Safe-space
Spaces that are created by and for members of groups that seek support and the opportunity to just “be” in the context of the culture, institutions, environments that they must interact within.

Sexism
A system of advantages that serves to privilege men, subordinate women, denigrate women-identified values and practices, enforce male dominance and control, and reinforce forms of masculinity that are dehumanizing and damaging to men. (Adams, et al.)

Sexual Orientation
Any individual’s romantic, emotional, and/or physical attraction to or lack of attraction to other persons. Sexual orientation is distinct from a person’s gender identity and expression and exists on a continuum rather than as a set of absolute categories.
Social Justice
Social justice includes a vision of society in which the distribution of resources is equitable and all members are physically and psychologically safe and secure. Social justice involves social actors who have a sense of their own agency as well as a sense of social responsibility toward and with others and the society as a whole. The goal of social justice education is full and equal participation of all groups in a society that is mutually shaped to meet their needs. Social justice includes a vision of society that is equitable and all members are physically and psychologically safe and secure. (Adams, et al.) [Social justice is both a goal and a process]

Stereotype
An undifferentiated, simplistic attribution that involves a judgment of habits, traits, abilities, or expectations and is assigned as a characteristic to all members of a group regardless of individual variation and with no attention to the relation between the attributions and the social contexts in which they have arisen.

Systemic Disparities
Systemic or institutional disparities are distinguished by the existence of laws, policies, practices, as well as economic and political structures which place non-dominant groups at a disadvantage. Transphobia is an irrational fear of, and/or hostility towards, individuals who are transgender or who otherwise transgress traditional gender norms. It is often associated with homophobia

Transphobia
Is an irrational fear of, and/or hostility towards, individuals who are transgender or who otherwise transgress traditional gender norms. It is often associated with homophobia

White Supremacy
White supremacy is a historically based, institutionally perpetuated system of exploitation and oppression of continents, nations and individuals of color by white individuals and nations of the European continent; for the purpose of maintaining and defending a system of wealth, power and privilege.

Xenophobia
Hatred or fear of foreigners or strangers or of their politics or culture.
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Mark A. King, Anthony Sims, and David Osher, "How is Cultural Competence Integrated in Education?" http://cecp.air.org/culturaVQ_integrated.htm


Racial Equity Tools, https://www.racialequitytools.org/home


Teachingtolerance.org

UC Berkeley Gender Equity Resource Center, http://geneq.berkeley.edu