LDC Program Review – Annual Discipline Update for 2021-2022
PART A

SECTION 1: BASIC PROGRAM/DISCIPLINE INFORMATION

SAC Name: Race, Indigenenous Nations, and Gender and Women's Studies

Disciplines included in this SAC: Gender and Women's Studies, Native American Studies, Chicanx/Latinx Studies, Social Justice, and Ethnic Studies

SAC Chair(s): Michele Wilson and Jimena Alvarado

Faculty Department Chair(s): Jimena Alvarado (WGS), Blake Hausman (NAS), Christopher Rose (CHLA), Various (SJ), and Gabriel Higruera (ES), Teela Foxworth

Program Dean/ SAC Administrative Liaison: Dana Fuller (for RING fields).

- Also, for equivalent NAS courses: Christopher Rose (ENG), Dean Flores (ART)

Pathway Dean: Jeremy Estrella

Please highlight where your classes are offered.

Classes/Services offered at: CA / RC / SE / SY / NB / HC / WCC / Metro / CLIMB
Other: Online

SECTION 2: REFLECTING ON DATA

All data cited below can be found here:

https://www.pcc.edu/institutional-effectiveness/program-profiles/
***Note the row of Tabs just below your Bookmarks Bar. Begin on the Home Tab. This is where you will choose your selection criteria for your data. Return to the Home Tab whenever you want to change your selection criteria. See the Help and Data Dictionary Tabs as well as the Data Directions Document included in the email with this template for more information.

Please include data from at least the last three years and up to the last five years. A 3-year enrollment review is recommended. SACs may have unique circumstances and reasons for looking more or less broadly.

This section presents SAC's with a series of questions here in Fall 2021. However, it was not that long ago when we completed the same series of questions for the previous year's ADU. And while we recognize that the annual nature of these updates is meant to make them more relevant and applicable than the previous 5-year intervals between Program Reviews, it would also seem that there are significant barriers and problems that will arise with only a 1-year interval between ADU's. Many of the conclusions that we might draw are not very different from what they were last year -- even if some courses have numbers that went up someplace and went down in another place, these modulations are presented out of context, and we still lack access to more intentionally intersectional data and contextualizing information which could help us to draw more meaningful and actionable conclusions.

When considering this year's data sets in comparison to the conclusions we drew for the 2020-21 ADU for our SAC, it seems quite difficult to draw any new conclusions from the data this year, with only one more year's worth of data. We are left trying to generate meaningful hypotheses based on the numbers gleaned from enrollments and pass rates in 2020-21, but it's not clear to us how only one additional year of information, presented to us in this way, enables us to detect notable or actionable changes. And to be sure, last year was characterized by the fact that all courses in our SAC were delivered through either remote or online modalities, and drawing conclusions based on campus locations during a pandemic when we could not teach on campus is problematic, and thus any conclusions should be accompanied by an asterisk (or perhaps several asterisks) because the data sets themselves may be problematic.

Additionally, many of the questions and potential conclusions which could emerge from studying the data sets may actually speak less to SAC issues and more to department/division issues of hiring and scheduling. As we know, SAC's are currently barred from engaging in contractual issues. Perhaps these concerns will be addressed by future steps in the college's reorganization, but at present, they remain unresolved points of tension.

Our answers to the section below are honest answers. And honestly, it is incredibly difficult to draw any new meaningful conclusions from the data sets now, only 9 months after the last time we did this. We offer these answers with a sense of the value of honesty, as well as with hope that the ADU process will continue to change in the years ahead in ways that dovetail with and support PCC's structures for faculty organization (SAC or Department or both?) and the multiple demands on faculty labor.

2A. Enrollment (SFTE) per year; Location (where course is taught); Modality
SEE Student FTE Tab

2A1. Does this data suggest any questions that the SAC would like to pursue?

In its current format, we are still unable to identify BIPOC and AAPI students among the "Multiracial" category. We are also unable to track pass rates for BIPOC and AAPI students in courses where their numbers are deemed statistically insignificant or potentially revealing. These aspects of the data representation really should change.

Please consider the example of NAS, Native American Studies, in relation to how BIPOC students are identified or not identified in this data. Many, if not most, Native American students at PCC will identify as Native *and* another racialized identification (and perhaps several). This reflects the fact that Native identities are both political identities and racialized identities, but it is ultimately important that institutions recognize Native identities as political identities first, because recognizing Native identity as a political status is recognizing Native sovereignty. But without access to data regarding Native students who are classified by PCC's system as "Multiracial" in relation to their relative success in our NAS classes, it is difficult to draw meaningful conclusions about the relative effectiveness of individual NAS courses for Native students.

Additionally, it is difficult to see the connections to other fields with equivalent courses. Specifically, the data for NAS 203 and NAS 240 are related to data for ART 203 and ENG 240. But in order to compare relative completion and pass rates for the NAS side of the pairings versus the ART or ENG side, one has to go in a roundabout way through the data sets, rather than see the courses paired in the data.

While the above paragraphs are specific to NAS, they speak to larger barriers to and questions about reaching meaningful conclusions in all our fields.

2A2. Do the data suggest adjustments be made in your discipline, such as schedule or course offerings, with to enrollment? If yes, what ideas/strategies do you have that you would like to implement or have help with in the upcoming academic year?

As noted above, even though the district-wide organizational structure of the college is changing, SAC's do not do contractual issues -- such as the schedule of course offerings. The RING SAC actually has several ideas on how to improve district scheduling processes for RING courses and for RING-adjacent courses, but it is unclear to us whether any information which we present here will have any impact on these scheduling practices.

Looking back to last year -- while completing the last ADU report in March 2021, we appreciated the efforts to gather disaggregated demographic data and to encourage data-based reflections and priorities in the new APU process. We also appreciated the ways that all programs have data publicly available, making the data visible both internally and externally. However, as in March it's still not possible at the time to see intersectionality in these data sets. Intersectionality is integral to equity and it's important that we are able to combine disaggregated categories to analyze patterns.

What we continue to observe in these data, and the questions these observations continue to inspire include:

- WS 101: Such significantly higher enrollment numbers for women students raises questions about socialization, and how gender socialization patterns are reproduced

through advising practices. How often do advisors encourage students to consider WS 101, particularly students who do not identify as women?

- SJ 210: Currently, SJ is only taught at SY and CA. We'd like to see the class scheduled on all campuses and to add an OL modality.
- How and where are RING classes promoted?
    - Which students are tracked and steered toward RING courses? Which students are discouraged from taking RING courses?
    - As a SAC, we have had conversations about the ways that PCC and higher ed in general perceive the "relevance" of RING curriculum. We remain deeply concerned.
    - RING faculty have collected a conspicuous number of stories from students that advisors have stated that courses with ethnic or gender focused content are "worthless" or "useless," which deters some students from registering -- this deeply concerns us. This deeply concerns us.

2A3. Are there other data reports that you would find informative/useful with regards to enrollment? How would this information support decision-making for the SAC/discipline?

We continue to have much interest in additional, more comprehensive data which can be disaggregated and seen with more potential for intersectionality. As we discussed in the March 2021 report:

- It was great that we were able to get spreadsheets with raw data, however that data came pretty late in the process and took many hours to process so we could determine patterns. It would be useful to receive processed spreadsheets that include: the gross numbers and percentage rates for enrollment and success in all demographic categories. We would love to get this data separately for each course by year, as well as the data for the past 3 years combined.
- Likewise, we would like to see the college-wide percentages for enrollment for each of the years, as well as the past 3 years combined.
- Greater ability to disaggregate the data: We cannot see intersectionalities in the data, just mostly binaries and box-checking categories. And we're unable to cross-reference one table with the next.
- Race/ethnicity data are problematic, particularly in relation to how we see multiracial students in the data as generically multiracial in relation to community-specific curriculum -- could we have more detailed multiracial associations in the data?
- We are curious if students who identify with the communities/content in question have better pass rates.
- How do students with certain identities register for and pass courses in other fields? We have the data sets available for all SACs doing APU, but to get this info, one has to dig, and it's unclear if what we find from that digging is accurate.

2A4. Is your program aware of any external influences that strongly affect recent enrollment? For example, state requirements, transferability challenges, other university policies, etc. Please explain.

- **COVID**: National and Oregon State data confirm that the pandemic accentuates existing and generates its own barriers to enrollment, access, and completion (e.g., food and housing insecurity, income inequality, mental health, motivation, etc.). Conversely, because of job loss and a need to obtain new skills, enrollment has slightly increased within certain communities.
- **Immigration Policies:** Accessing higher ed is complicated by xenophobic rhetoric that continues to Other whole communities who've come to Portland seeking asylum as refugees, to engage in season work, and to pursue a dream to begin new lives.
- **Parochial curriculum:** Students who enroll in RING classes continue to tell us that our's are some of the few where their identities and experiences are not only represented but valued and protected. We do not *study* other people as objects of curiosity (as is the case in many RING-adjacent classes) -- instead, RING classes are highly conscientious of identity and lived experiences, and students explore their lives in the context of history, generational relationships, and modernity. Lived experiences are also aggregated to reveal patterns which then frame the exploration of social systems, institutions, and cultural norms.
  - Importantly, our classes are also by nature generally free from debates over the veracity of critical theories, from accusations of politicization, from dismissiveness, and from minimization of students' lived experiences; if push-back shows up, we've built in a robust system to respond to and to stop harm. RING-adjacent classes continue to struggle with recognizing and managing harm.
  - Students also tell us that RING classes allow them safety and bravery to create affinity spaces and small communities throughout and outside of the college. The recent large scale protest movements -- like #MeToo, Black Lives Matter, and Land Back -- around the world and in Portland, specifically, have increased student interest in RING SAC classes. Students are motivated by what's going on in their own communities but also what's going on in other communities as they recognize the interrelatedness of all oppression and draw strength from their shared experiences. They bring a desire to better understand privilege and oppression and are eager to engage in system disruption.
- **Trauma:** Historical and generational experiences with racism, sexism, ableism and xenophobia.
- **Lack of representation in higher ed:**
  - A dearth of Faculty of Color is even more salient given that 45% of our students identify as People of Color and 80% of our faculty identify as white.
  - Curriculum that continues to be burdened by Whiteness, and that excludes or is uninformed about anything other than settler-colonial communities and experiences.

- **Microaggressive and mixed-messaging**: From the college leadership, staff and non-RING faculty.
- **Educational Investment realities:** The increasing cost of higher-ed without a satisfactory guarantee of employment or a living wage (especially for students who come from communities that are historically disempowered) heavily influences potential students' willingness to accept debt and current students' willingness to take on more.

2B. Course Success Rates

Data Definition: Success rate represents the percentage of students who successfully complete a course. It is calculated as:

$$\% \ S = \frac{\textit{Number of students receiving a grade of A, B, C, P, PR, or CM}}{\textit{Number of students receiving a grade of A, B, C, D, F, P, NP, I, W, PR, CM, N, UP}}$$

PR, CM, N, and UP are non-credit grades used in the Adult Basic Education program.

Success rates for gender and race are not calculated when the enrollment is less than 5. For any success rate that is not calculated, the total for that column is also not calculated.

% Success By Course and Modality

SEE Modality Tab

2B1a. Are there any courses with lower or higher pass rates than others (over time, over many sections, or a notably higher or lower rate)? If so, which ones?

We are unable to provide a statistically-meaningful answer to this question because there are too little data to generalize about modality (e.g., SJ 210 or a few ES courses), IE data collection and reporting challenges, and the many completion barriers associated with COVID.

2B1b. Are there any modalities with lower or higher pass rates than others (over time, over many sections, or a notably higher or lower rate)? If so, which ones?

We are unable to provide a statistically-meaningful answer to this question because there are too little data to generalize about modality (e.g. SJ 210 has only been taught in person until recently when synchronous remote was instituted), IE data collection and reporting challenges, and the many completion barriers associated with COVID. Generally, in-person pass rates tend to be higher in all of our classes.

2B2. Strategy Insights

What strategies have you used to maintain high success rates? What can be learned that might be applied to courses with lower success rates? What are possible actions to be taken to understand/address lower success rates? Please clearly explain how your discipline intends to explore content/curriculum, pedagogy/teaching, course material selection, etc. using culturally responsive teaching approaches throughout the next year. Try to identify a realistic one year goal.

This was discussed in 2A4.

Enrollment and % Passing By Course and Student Demographics

SEE Gender, Race, and Pell Tabs

2B3. The data may indicate a pattern of inequities (in gender, race, or Pell eligibility) in student enrollment or success. Please clearly explain how your program intends to explore content/curriculum, pedagogy/teaching, course material selection, etc. using culturally responsive teaching approaches throughout the next year. Try to identify a realistic one year goal.

Pell eligibility

From the SAC's report in March 2021:

> The college-wide gap is about 5%, in favor of non-eligible students.
>
> Unfortunately, we are seeing unfavorable success gaps in Pell-eligibility in some of our courses. A reminder that these are not our high-enrolling courses, so limited sample sizes mean that our conclusions are not based on strong data. ES101, CHLA203, WS201 and WS202 are showing success gaps between 9-23% in favor of students who are not Pell-eligible.
>
> All of our other courses have a smaller gap than the college-wide rate of 5%.
>
> Two of our courses had higher rates of success for pell-eligible students: CHLA 202 with a rate of +7%, and NAS201 with a rate of +10% favoring Pell-eligible students.

Gender patterns

From the SAC's report in March 2021:

> The college-wide gap is about 3%, in favor of female students.

Of our Women's and Gender Studies courses WS202 seems to be reversing the college-wide gender pattern, with a gap of 6% favoring the male students. The rest of the WS classes are unsurprisingly showing more female success rates.

CHLA 201 is one of our high-enrolling courses, and the gender success patterns match the college-wide trend.

Other courses seem to reverse the college-wide pattern, showing more success for male students, with gender gaps between 3-8% in CHLA202, NAS201, and ES101.

Racial patterns

From the SAC's report in March 2021:

We will address our high-enrolling courses, since a lot of other courses have small sample sizes and it's hard to draw strong conclusions with so many categories for analysis and such small groups.

In CHLA 201 there is a very high enrollment of Latinx students at 60% of enrollment. Their success rates were 74.73%, about the same rate as the college-wide 75% for Latinx students. The 2 other highest racial categories in the course were White and Unknown, their pass rates were 77 and 69% respectively, a few percentage points below the college average.

In WS101 we cannot compare the enrollment rates since we don't have college-wide data. In terms of success rate, every racial group exceeded the success rates of the rest of the college, with the exception of white, which was 1-2% below the college-wide rate.

Also, while it may be problematic and premature to draw any conclusions about the relative success of NAS 201 as a course that serves Native American students, it is worth recognizing that we have a 100% pass rate in NAS 201 for students identified in this data as Native students.

2B4. What support does your SAC need to fully explore inequities in enrollment or student success? For example, are there any other data reports you would find useful to have related to student success?

Previously answered.

SECTION 3: REFLECTION ON ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

3A. Assessment Reports

Please note: The following questions link directly to your Annual Learning Assessment Reports for the Learning Assessment Council. Feel free to cut and paste between this document and your other assessment documentation.

3A1. Which student learning outcomes from your SAC's available courses will you assess this year and will you use direct assessment strategies?*(These can be larger, program-level outcomes or course-level outcomes from your CCOGs).*

Although our assessment plan from 2020-21 indicated an intention to gather artifacts and assess Gen Ed courses across our various fields, now that we are in the 2021-22 AY, we are in a position where we must push the collection of artifacts back at least one more year. In the boxes that follow, we will attempt to respectfully articulate why we are taking this path in 2021-22.

After RING faculty contributed a remarkable amount of time and labor to the transformation of the "Cultural Literacy" Gen Ed outcome into the new "Social Justice" Gen Ed outcome, we are glad to have arrived at this plateau. However, we also recognize that this plateau is not a place from where we can really conduct an initial assessment or a reassessment. In terms of Social-Justice-designated courses, we have not actually reached a stopping point, or a point where we are ready to begin artifact collection for compliance-oriented assessment within either the RING SAC or the SJ DSAC. Indeed, it is currently quite unclear to us how exactly compliance-oriented Gen Ed assessment is supposed to intersect with and drive more genuine field-specific assessment that catalyzes continuous improvement in terms of curriculum and teaching practices.

3A2. Which courses do you plan to assess this year; how and why will your SAC choose the sections?

All of the RING courses which are Gen Ed courses are currently classified as "Arts & Letters" courses. However, several of these courses -- such as WS 101 and NAS 201 -- involve content and outcomes that speak to both Arts & Letters and Social Science courses. Indeed, we are wanting to develop new cross listed/equivalent courses between RING fields and Environmental Science, which would mean that we have RING courses which fulfill the STEM Gen Ed fields as well.

This is to say, before we conduct a SAC-based course-level assessment in relation to the new Social Justice outcome, we need to pause.

We need more clarity about how our individual courses will ultimately relate to the Gen Ed discipline areas. And we need more clarity about how courses in these discipline areas -- and perhaps courses which straddle multiple discipline areas -- are supposed to relate to SAC-specific assessment projects in terms of realistic limits to faculty labor and pragmatic processes for continuous improvement.

For 2021-22, our primary SAC-specific assessment related goal is to develop a clearer understanding of the process for designating certain courses from the three Gen Ed discipline areas to have the Social Justice designation.

RING faculty will continue to participate in the development of the Social Justice Gen Ed outcome and PCC processes for doing this well. However, we need a more coherent college-wide understanding of the process for this outcome before we can actually conduct a SAC-specific assessment project in a good, practical, and actionable way.

3A3. In general terms, describe the assessment project for the year from implementation to data collection. What steps will you take in carrying out the project?

RING SAC will be well represented in the ongoing Social Justice DSAC work. We look forward to learning more about how SJ assessment projects can be carried out in the future -- in particular, how they can be carried out in way that not only demonstrate compliance with accreditation requirements but, more importantly, actually have a direct relationship to continuous improvement in the curriculum and teaching practices for all courses with the SJ designation. Essentially, we'd like to better understand how compliance-oriented assessment relates to actual faculty labor and realistic practices for continuous improvement.

3B. Response to LAC Assessment Question

Please respond to the question below, which relates to your SAC's 2020-2021 Learning Assessment Report to the Learning Assessment Council (LAC).

Commendations: While the RING SAC did not take on a traditional assessment project this year, they were engaged in crucial work that supports equitable student learning and assessment at PCC. For that, many commendations and thank you for your work in creating this new Gen Ed outcome to fulfill the Cultural Literacy AAOT requirement.

Suggestions: The obvious suggestion is something the SAC already plans to do during the 2021-2022 academic year: test out the new Social Justice (SJ) rubric in SJ-designated courses.

Question: Will, or how will, assessment results inform decisions about which courses retain the SJ designation?

This is a good question about the decisions related to which courses retain the SJ designation.

However, it is not entirely clear to faculty what the process for retaining this designation will involve. How will GEARS organize itself in the future? How will the immense labor involved in the GEARS process and the forthcoming need to gather and assess signature assignments be recognized and compensated? How will this labor be folded into current compensation practices, and/or how will it be expanded in the future in the interest of "continuous improvement"?

When we have more information about the structures and processes for determining SJ Gen ED designation, then we will be in a better position to begin to answer this sort of question.

SECTION 4: ADDITIONAL ACHIEVEMENTS, CHALLENGES or OPPORTUNITIES

4A. Is there anything further you would like to share about your program's achievements at this time?

1. **RING faculty labor shaped, guided, and directed the district's Culturally Responsive (CR) Hiring program in AY 2020-2021.** The success of the program influenced administration to adopt the program for all new LDC hiring (and likely CTE) in AY 2021-2022 and beyond. We are currently growing the program in real time. We see a whole lot of value in having faculty lead this work (particularly people who have teaching expertise in cultural responsiveness, intersectionality, decolonization and anti-racism), and recognize a few important changes taking place.
    a. First, it indicates that leadership is listening to faculty's request that we be included in decision-making more frequently and routinely, especially when it impacts students.
    b. Second, we've also asked that leadership become DEI (B-JEDI) competent especially before implementing policies and programs. This is one of the first suggestions of comprehensive CR work we've seen at the college in many years and since reorganization.
    c. These two changes are, in part, responsible for a third - the development of a new equity and inclusivity model at the college. Generally, Jeremy Estrella and Karen Paez have been very open to our recommendations and continue to provide financial, programmatic, and outreach support with little exception. And, they've responded quickly.
2. **Collaboration** with individual faculty, whole SAC's, and administration to increase CR competency.
3. **Social Justice Gen ED Outcome replaced Cultural Literacy** due in large part to RING participation and advocacy.

4B. Are there any challenges not described above that you would like to note here?

1. **Retention of Faculty and Staff of Color**:
   a. With several new FT RING hires expected to start in 2022, as well as new FT hires across the curriculum who will be hired with the help of RING faculty on the search committees, we have a situation where it's possible that we could have several new FT BIPOC faculty starting next year.
   b. RING needs a Director or its own Dean with enough relevant experience to recognize how BIPOC faculty may experience the institution.
2. **Cross-listing and Gen Ed Silos**: Classes like NAS/ESR, NAS/ATH, NAS/HST (218) in particular.
   a. We will be pursuing the creation of several new cross-disciplinary equivalent courses. We are bound to encounter challenges in this process.
3. **Identity Classes in non-RING disciplines**: Instructor Quals/Lived Experience, Curriculum, Teaching Philosophy, lack of CRT lens, harming students.
   a. Faculty teaching RING-adjacent courses (e.g., ENG 244 or HST 218) need to have relevant lived experience in order for students from the communities being studied to not only see themselves in the course delivery, but also to have affirmation that the course content does indeed belong to their community
   b. Simply having a Masters degree in a field does not adequately prepare faculty to teach identity-specific content, whether in RING courses or in RING-adjacent courses, especially if the faculty in question do not themselves carry the identity in question. While RING recognizes this, RING-adjacent fields do not always do so. Even when these courses (e.g., HST 218) are housed in the same "Program" with the same "Program Dean" as RING, there do not currently exist any safeguards to prevent unqualified faculty from teaching these courses. This is a challenge, and it is another challenge that speaks to the relative value of having a RING Director or Dean.
4. As the RING CR process grows and evolves, it's become clear that we need **more support** if we are to continue and do justice to this work.
   a. There has been a suggestion that RING needs a Director to facilitate our work across the college (to liaise with OEI and HR, etc., to schedule within the One College landscape, to facilitate our CR work, to advocate for RING). Thus far, we've coordinated a team to determine this person's actual role. Perhaps, though, we ought to be having a different conversation…
   b. Given the complexity of RING's work and contributions to the college, we'd like to discuss the possibility of acquiring Program status with a Dean. This is certainly a bigger ask than for a Director, but Programs are more easily budgeted, and have greater influence with both HR and IE, for example, than a Director would. There is clearly much to consider, and we look forward to participating in these discussions.
5. **Outsourcing aspects of B-JEDI work to the RING SAC:** CR hiring advisement and other consultation and collaborations - isn't without risk:
   a. Funding to date is discretionary and we'd like to see that change to a dedicated budget. There is valid concern that both RING faculty and those we've trained to do this work may be exploited. We've reached an agreement for AY 2021-2022

that allows PT faculty to log 30 hours at the special projects' rate ($33.60) and FT faculty to receive one .25 course release (this was a bit complicated for FDC's, and for faculty who teach classes with labs since .25 does not translate). And, on a case-by-case basis, PT faculty are allowed to go over 30 hours *with permission*.

 b. Leadership, etc., needs to be more deliberate and transparent regarding their decision to adopt our CR program. The stakes are high for RING faculty for a few reasons including but not limited to:

  i. We worry that when process and buy-in issues emerge, RING as a SAC and individual faculty will be blamed.

  ii. While necessary, compulsory implementation of the process puts RING faculty (and others we've trained) in precarious and perhaps adversarial positions with our peers. We've already intervened on a few Hiring Committees. Again, stronger support from leadership is necessary.

6. **HR and OEI capacity issues in leading B-JEDI work**: Both continue to underperform as they either lack experienced personnel, funding, or a willingness to adapt to the new landscape.

 a. OEI: Our experience with the Office, as well as other RING-affinity committees like the NNIE indicate that OEI needs more support, perhaps a RING representative housed in their division to provide expertise.

 b. HR: Bias Training has improved (some new lexicon and emphasis on inclusion) but it still lacks a comprehensive CR focus (anti-racist, intersectionality, etc.). Alisa Hampton has expressed an openness and desire to not only collaborate with RING but to also learn from us.

7. **Failure to support Native Students, Faculty, and Staff**: The RING SAC is deeply concerned about the on-going erasure of and structural violence towards the Native Community at PCC. The college continues to overlook or outright dismiss Native experts and expertise in planning, hiring, collaboration, and community engagement. And, as we underscored in previous sections of this report, Native students continue to be statistically underrepresented. Other issues include but are not limited to:

 a. The utterly disrespectful Land Acknowledgement played during Fall 2021 Inservice (and other optical performances).

 b. No dedicated cultural spaces for Native students, faculty, and staff.

 c. No dedicated budget (except for Powwow).

 d. No investment in Tribal relationships; instead the college continues to rely on a few Native Faculty and Staff's external relationships.

 e. No intentional recruitment of Native students.

 f. No discussions of reparations.

 g. Continuing to schedule problematic NAS-affinity courses, and to use instructors with little to no Indigenous or Native pedagogical competency or lived experience.

These issues have been raised for many years, but continue to be neglected. PCC fails to live up to the Strategic Plan's premise of "Belonging", the Vision and Goals of YESS, several of the Mission's *Core Themes* including "Access and Student Success" and

"Quality Education" and *Core Outcomes* including "Community and Environmental Responsibility". There simply isn't any evidence that leadership's decision-making is informed by Critical Race Theory -- absent is the centrality and intersectionality of race and racism for Native Peoples, challenges to settler colonial dominant thinking, a commitment to a Native social justice agenda, a centrality of experiential Native knowledge, and a Native interdisciplinary perspective.

The RING SAC will continue to support the NNIE SAG; we're also discussing ways that we can more effectively engage the college around these issues.

4C. Do you see any opportunities in the near or long term that you would like to share?

When addressing challenges above, we also speak to opportunities. All of these challenges are also opportunities. It is difficult to separate them into one or the other.