

## Equitable Policy Review Checklist Tool

This mini tool is designed to assist the CCC Board of Education in reviewing existing or proposed policies through the lens of equity, empathy, and cultural responsiveness, drawing directly from the college's "Cougar Pause" equitable decision-making framework tool. It encourages a deep, intentional reflection to ensure policies lead to more equitable outcomes, incorporate inclusive language, and are consistently applied.

### Guiding Principles for Review:

**Alignment with Mission, Vision, and Values:** Ensure the policy actively supports and reflects the college's mission ("As our community's college, we cultivate

**Trauma-Informed:** Always consider how the policy impacts various identity groups, especially those historically marginalized.

**Empathy and Cultural Sensitivity:** Reflect on the human experience and diverse cultural contexts affected by the policy.

**Inclusive Language:** Scrutinize the language for gender neutrality, consistency, and avoidance of jargon or exclusionary terms.

**Clarity and Consistency:** Ensure the policy is clear, unambiguous, and consistently applied across all relevant contexts.

Policy Goal & Deeper Purpose			
Check For : Clarity and alignment with equity mission.			
	NO	YES	COMMENTS/NOTES
Is the primary goal of this policy clearly articulated?			
What is the deeper purpose behind this policy, and how does it align with the institution's equity values?			
Centered Audiences & Impact			
Check For : Explicit consideration of diverse groups; potential for unintended negative consequences.			
	NO	YES	COMMENTS/NOTES
Who are the specific identity groups (e.g., students, staff, community members, specific racial/ethnic groups)?			
How will this policy specifically support, benefit, or potentially challenge those centered audiences?			
Assumptions & Biases			
Check For : Unstated assumptions; language that perpetuates stereotypes or historical inequities.			
	NO	YES	COMMENTS/NOTES
What underlying assumptions or historical biases might be embedded in the policy's current wording or implementation?			
Are there any implicit biases that could lead to disparate outcomes for different groups?			

**Foundation:  
Purpose &  
Centered Impact**

	<b>Parameters &amp; Trade-offs</b> <i>Check For</i> : Transparency about limitations; equitable distribution of benefits and burdens.			
		NO	YES	COMMENTS/NOTES
	What are the stated or unstaed parameters or constraints informing this policy?			
	What are the potential trade-offs, and have they been considered in terms of equitable impact?			
<b>Collaboration: Engagement &amp; Diverse Perspectives</b>	<b>Mitigating Power Dynamics</b> <i>Check For</i> : Active efforts to empower marginalized voices; policy language that acknowledges power dynamics.			
		NO	YES	COMMENTS/NOTES
	How was a courageous space created for diverse opinions to be shared without fear of retribution or di			
	Does the policy reflect an understanding of historical power imbalances and actively seek to mitigate them?			
<b>Communication: Clarity &amp; Cultural Responsiveness</b>	<b>Culturally Responsive Communication</b> <i>Check For</i> : Multiple communication channels; use of plain language; availability in different languages or accessible formats.			
		NO	YES	COMMENTS/NOTES
	Is the policy communicated in a culturally responsive way/format and centering the appropriate audien			
	<b>Impact &amp; Benefit Clarity</b> <i>Check For</i> : Transparency about benefits/impacts; accessible language.			
		NO	YES	COMMENTS/NOTES
	Does the policy clearly articulate how it will impact and benefit different audiences?			
	Is the language used clear, concise, and free of unnecessary jargon that might exclude some readers?			
	<b>Outcomes &amp; Consequences</b> <i>Check For</i> : Mechanisms for collecting feedback on impact; commitment to addressing negative consequences.			
		NO	YES	COMMENTS/NOTES
	What outcomes, successes, and/or unintended consequences (positive or negative) are observed across			
	How will these reflections influence future policy decisions or revisions?			
	<b>Language &amp; Consistency Checklist:</b> <i>Check For</i> : Gender-inclusive language, consistent terminology, clarity & accessibility, and respectful & empathetic tone			
	NO	YES	COMMENTS/NOTES	

**Evaluate, Learn,  
Revise:  
Continuous  
Improvement**

Are gender-specific pronouns (he/she) avoided in favor of gender-neutral terms (they/them, individua			
Are titles and roles gender-neutral (e.g., "chairperson" instead of "chairman")?			
Does the language avoid assumptions about gender roles or identities?			
Is key terminology used consistently throughout the policy (e.g., "student," "employee," "stakeholder")?			
Are acronyms defined upon first use and used consistently thereafter?			
Is the language clear, concise, and easy to understand for a broad audience, avoiding unnecessary legalistic or academic jargon? Are complex concepts explained simply?			
Does the policy avoid culturally specific idioms or references that might not be universally understood?			
Does the policy's language convey respect and empathy for all individuals?			
Does it avoid language that could be perceived as blaming, judgmental, or prescriptive in a way that diminishes agency?			