

**SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT  
BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
AGENDA AND ORDER OF BUSINESS  
Special Meeting/Board Study Session, Wednesday, November 10, 2021**

**South San Francisco Unified School District  
Board Room  
398 B Street, South San Francisco**

**OPEN SESSION - 6:00 p.m.**

- A. CALL TO ORDER**
- B. ROLL CALL**
- C. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- D. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT**

We acknowledge that the South San Francisco Unified School District is located on the unceded ancestral homeland of the Ramaytush Ohlone peoples who are the original inhabitants of the San Francisco Peninsula.

We wish to pay our respects by acknowledging the Ancestors, Elders, and relatives of the Ramaytush Community and by affirming their sovereign rights as First Peoples.

**E. COMMUNICATIONS**

**To comment prior to the meeting:**

Public comments may be submitted in advance of the meeting through the following link: <https://bit.ly/equitynetworknov10> beginning at 3:00 p.m. on Friday, November 5, until 3:00 p.m. on Wednesday, November 10. These comments will be read by all Board members and posted on the District website's 2021-22 Board meetings page [www.ssfusd.org/20212022boardmeetings](http://www.ssfusd.org/20212022boardmeetings) prior to the meeting.

**To comment during the meeting:**

Public comments are limited to one to three minutes per individual (per Board Bylaw 9323). Name/address cards are placed in the back of the room to be completed and given to the secretary. The Board President will call upon individuals in random order who have requested to speak. Each person may only speak once, and is required to address the Board from the podium. The meeting is recorded and streamed live. Individuals may address the Board concerning school business not on the agenda, but public comment cannot be acted upon or discussed by the Board unless placed on the agenda at a subsequent meeting, in accordance with the law, the Brown Act. The Board may request staff to respond orally at the meeting or in writing at a future time.

**INFORMATION/DISCUSSION**

**1. ADMINISTRATION**

**a. 2021-22 Equity Network 2.0 Session #1**

The Board of Trustees and Superintendent will have quarterly meetings this year with a focus on leading through the lens of equity. The Board Governance Team will discuss and take action on local Board policies through the lens of educational equity in SSFUSD.

	<b><u>PAGE</u></b>
<b>Documents:</b>	
Effective Governance Agenda	1 - 2
The Curb-Cut Effect	3 - 18
Board Governance with Equity Lens Self-Assessment	19
BP 0415: Equity	20 - 23

**ADJOURNMENT**

The agenda is available for review at the District's website: [www.ssfusd.org](http://www.ssfusd.org) (Click on *Board Meeting Agendas and Minutes*).

A recording is made of the Open Session of each meeting. Telephone--(650) 877-8705, Fax--(650) 588-8113 or e-mail: [ncantley@ssfusd.org](mailto:ncantley@ssfusd.org)

**South San Francisco Unified School District  
Board Study Session Agenda  
“Effective Governance with an Equity Lens 2.0”**

**November 10, 2021**

**6-8pm**

**Facilitator(s):**

**Nicole Anderson and Associates Consulting, LLC  
The Write Keys 2 Consulting, LLC**

**Agenda Purpose:** *Governance team will reflect on effective governance practices and build deeper content awareness of educational equity through application and monitoring of policy.*

---

**Pre-work for November Study Session:**

1. *Read Curb-Cut Effect article and review reflective questions in preparation for discussion*
  - *In what ways can the school community benefit from the success of targeted student groups?*
  - *What mental models currently exist in your district around the idea that supporting one group of students may hurt another?*
  - *What is the role of school boards and local politicians in creating paths forward for all students through equity?*
  - *Name some unintentional consequences of equity focused policy?*
  - *What “curbs” can your board “cut” to ensure equity for targeted students groups while positively impacting all students in your district?*
  - *What connections to the article can you make to your current board priorities and policies?*
2. *Review equity statement with reflective questions to support application of the statement*
  - *Does your equity statement have the following components?*
    - i. *Communicates clear and common language about equity as a lens for all district policy work?*
    - ii. *Is a key component of your equity policy?*
    - iii. *Is student centered, explicitly calling out inequities in trend data that negatively impact outcomes for historically marginalized student groups (gender, ethnicity, socio-economic status, language, etc.) as well as all students?*
    - iv. *Can be measured by quantitative/qualitative data?*
    - v. *Is aligned with your district’s mission and vision?*
    - vi. *Includes diverse stakeholder groups in the process of developing the statement?*

**Pre-work for January Study Session (overview to be given in November Study Session):**

*Review your current equity policy and be prepared to respond to the following reflective questions:*

***Does your equity policy have the following components?***

1. *Background/Purpose: What does this policy seek to accomplish?*
2. *Equity Statement: Is there clear and common language about equity as a lens for all policy work?*
3. *Board direction: Does your policy include guidance for the board and district staff in making important decisions on education matters for effective implementation of equity work?*
4. *Superintendent direction: Does your policy include guidance for the Superintendent and District staff in the development of Administrative Regulations that guide procedural action steps for carrying out the policy?*
5. *Goals/Priorities: Are the actions steps listed in the policy aligned with the board’s key priorities? (i.e. Budget, Human Resources, Teaching/Learning, and School Climate/Discipline)?*
6. *Evaluation/Monitoring: Does your policy have guidance to evaluate programs and measure the impact of policy through qualitative/quantitative metrics to ensure decisions impact goals student outcomes illustrated in the equity statement and plan*

Agenda Topic(s)	Notes
<b>Welcome/District Update:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Call to Order, Roll Call, Pledge, Agenda approval</li> <li>○ Public comment</li> </ul>	Superintendent Board President
<b>Session Overview:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Purpose/outcomes</li> <li>○ Revisiting the 4 agreements</li> </ul>	Nicole
<b>Effective Governance Team Practices:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Effective governance practices: Governance Core book study overview</li> <li>○ 8 Characteristics of Effective Boards: Board assessment recap</li> <li>○ Role of the Board/Superintendent recap</li> </ul>	Deborah  Handout reference: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <a href="#">Board assessment</a></li> </ul> Book reference: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <a href="#">The Governance Core by Davis Campbell/Michael Fullen</a></li> </ul>
<b>Prioritizing Governance and Equity Work:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Aligning priorities with equity policy</li> <li>○ Developing administrative regulations</li> </ul>	Deborah
<b>Equity Impact Action Planning:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Applying equity policy overview               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Board decision making</li> <li>○ Measuring the impact of policy actions</li> <li>○ Questions with purpose</li> <li>○ Effectively responding to community needs</li> <li>○ Developing common language/talking points</li> <li>○ Developing a culture of effective governance (norms, protocols)</li> <li>○ Agenda building through priorities</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Leveraging the Equity Task Force/Committee</li> </ul>	Deborah/Nicole  handout reference: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <a href="#">Equity Policy</a></li> </ul>
<b>Content Building:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Redefining student success for all with an equity lens through the Curb-Cut Effect article discussion</li> <li>● Unpacking the equity statement</li> </ul>	Nicole  Handout reference: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <a href="#">Curb-Cut Effect article</a></li> </ul> Handout reference: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <a href="#">Equity Policy</a></li> </ul>
<b>Next Steps/Adjournment:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Future board workshops/study sessions focused on each priority on board assessment, book study, and equity leadership               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Session 2: Jan. 5 (Ch. 1-3)</li> <li>○ Session 3: March 16 (Ch.4-6)</li> <li>○ Session 4: May 22 (Ch.7-9)</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Application and monitoring of equity policy</li> <li>○ Equity walk (tbd)</li> <li>○ Board member coaching/consultation between sessions</li> </ul>	Nicole

CIVIC ENGAGEMENT

## The Curb-Cut Effect

Laws and programs designed to benefit vulnerable groups, such as the disabled or people of color, often end up benefiting all of society.

By [Angela Glover Blackwell](#) | Winter 2017

One evening in the early 1970s, Michael Pachovas and a few friends wheeled themselves to a curb in Berkeley, Calif., poured cement into the form of a crude ramp, and rolled off into the night.<sup>1</sup> For Pachovas and his fellow disability advocates, it was a political act, a gesture of defiance. “The police threatened to arrest us,” Pachovas recalls. “But they didn’t.”<sup>2</sup> It was also pragmatic. Despite their unevenness, the makeshift sloping curbs provided the disabled community with something invaluable: mobility.

At the time, getting around Berkeley—or any American city—in a wheelchair was not easy. The Architectural Barriers Act of 1968 required government buildings to make themselves universally accessible, but traversing the streets in a wheelchair resembled the running of an obstacle course: Wheel to the driveway in an alley



Illustration by Alex Eben Meyer

or at a loading dock; roll into the street until you reached another driveway; hope all the while that a truck didn't pull out. Students with disabilities at the University of California, Berkeley, housed in Cowell Hospital—the only space that could accommodate them<sup>3</sup>—planned their class schedule according to which class was downhill from the previous one.

Yet this was Berkeley in the era of political activism. There was a Free Speech Movement, an antiwar movement, a civil rights movement. Why not a movement for movement? Pressed by disabled activists, in 1972 the city installed its first official “curb cut” at an intersection on Telegraph Avenue.<sup>4</sup> It would become, in the words of a Berkeley advocate, “the slab of concrete heard 'round the world.”<sup>5</sup>

Curb cuts were not an entirely new invention—the first appeared in 1945, in Kalamazoo, Mich.<sup>6</sup> But the one on Telegraph changed the way the country thinks about access and opportunity for a population that has faced barriers at every turn. This turnabout and the remarkable ripple effects are salient today, as the nation confronts the anguish of rising inequality and the mounting barriers to economic mobility.

Hundreds more curb cuts followed Berkeley's. Then hundreds of thousands, all across the country. Disabled advocates continued to push for access to the basics that many Americans take for granted—sidewalks, classrooms, dorm rooms, restrooms, buses. At last, on July 26, 1990, President George H.W. Bush signed the landmark Americans with Disabilities Act, which prohibits disability-based discrimination and mandated changes to the built environment, including curb cuts. “Let the shameful wall of exclusion finally come tumbling down,” he proclaimed.<sup>7</sup>

Then a magnificent and unexpected thing happened. When the wall of exclusion came down, everybody benefited—not only people in wheelchairs. Parents pushing strollers headed straight for curb cuts. So did workers pushing heavy carts, business travelers wheeling luggage, even runners and skateboarders. A study of pedestrian behavior at a Sarasota, Fla.,

shopping mall revealed that nine out of 10 “unencumbered pedestrians” go out of their way to use a curb cut.<sup>8</sup> As journalist Frank Greve has noted, the barricades stormed by disabled advocates in Berkeley 40 years ago were a few inches high, “yet today millions of Americans pass daily through the breaches.”<sup>9</sup>

An economist might call it a “positive externality.” A military officer might call it a “force multiplier.” I like to think of it as the “curb-cut effect”—and it’s changing the way the country thinks about the struggles of the most vulnerable communities.

## Access, Opportunity, and the New Demographics

There’s an ingrained societal suspicion that intentionally supporting one group hurts another. That equity is a zero sum game. In fact, when the nation targets support where it is needed most—when we create the circumstances that allow those who have been left behind to participate and contribute fully—everyone wins. The corollary is also true: When we ignore the challenges faced by the most vulnerable among us, those challenges, magnified many times over, become a drag on economic growth, prosperity, and national well-being.

This has become painfully evident as inequality has reached toxic levels in the United States. Since 1979, the income of workers in the top 10 percent has grown nearly 15 percent.<sup>10</sup> For workers in the bottom 10 percent, incomes have fallen more than 11 percent.<sup>11</sup> The top 25 hedge fund managers earn more than all kindergarten teachers in America put together.<sup>12</sup> Only 9 out of 100 children born to parents in the bottom fifth of the income distribution can expect to rise above their circumstances, the cornerstone of the American Dream.<sup>13</sup>

A wave of recent publicity has focused attention on the toll that these trends are taking on white America. In a paper published in November 2015 in the *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, Princeton University economists Anne Case and Angus Deaton revealed that the death rate for middle-aged whites without a college education jumped more

than 20 percent from 1999 to 2013,<sup>14</sup> a staggering increase attributable largely to drug- and alcohol-related deaths and suicides. Case and Deaton see the spikes in addiction and suicide as a response to financial insecurity and economic despair. They write: “After the productivity slowdown in the early 1970s, and with widening income inequality, many in the baby boom generation are the first to find, in midlife, that they will not be better off than were their parents.”

While commentators debate the extent to which economic shock is driving white mortality, one thing is indisputable: Economic distress is deepest and the inequities are widest in communities of color. In 149 of the country’s 150 largest metro areas, the percentage of college-educated whites exceeds the percentage of African-Americans and Latinos with college degrees.<sup>15</sup> The national unemployment rates for blacks and Latinos are 9.5 percent and 6.5 percent, respectively, compared with 4.5 percent for whites.<sup>16</sup> One in four black and Latino Americans live in poverty, more than twice the rate for whites.<sup>17</sup> People of color lag well behind whites on just about every measure of well-being, including health, homeownership, wealth, and (Case and Deaton notwithstanding) longevity.

The point is not to argue about who is suffering more, but to identify the best solutions to remedy these inequities. And here, another number should command attention: 2044. That is the year in which people of color are expected to become a majority of the US population.<sup>18</sup> The nation—80 percent white in 1980, 63 percent white today<sup>19</sup>—is already well on its way. Since 2012, the majority of babies born in the United States have been children of color.<sup>20</sup> By the end of the decade, the majority of Americans under age 18 will be people of color.<sup>21</sup>

These demographic shifts matter to every American. Not because there is something frightening about a nation where whites are no longer the majority. Rather, it is because the costs of society failing people of color are climbing as the population grows—and because the benefits of strategies that expand opportunity for people of color would extend to all. Knock down walls of exclusion and build accessible pathways to success, and everyone gains.

The curb-cut effect applies to America's new demographic profile in two important ways. First, curb-cut thinking is animated by the idea of equity. This should not be confused with the formal legal equality conferred by landmark laws such as the Civil Rights Act. Equality gives everyone the right to ride on the bus. Equity ensures that there are curb cuts so people in wheelchairs can get to the bus stop and lifts so they can get on the bus, and ensures that there are bus lines where people need them so they can get to wherever they need to go. Equity means promoting just and fair inclusion throughout society and creating the conditions in which everyone can participate, prosper, and reach his or her full potential.

Second, the curb-cut effect illustrates the outside benefits that accrue to everyone from policies and investments designed to achieve equity. The country must choose: Will we make these investments? Will we make sure that everyone has access to the essentials for living productive lives—things like jobs and reliable transportation? Or will we neglect entire communities and waste the talents and potential of tens of millions of people?

There's really no choice. Continuing to write off poor people and people of color is not an option. Not when the American Dream is nearly unattainable for all low-income people, regardless of their ethnicity. Not when age-old health disparities between whites and people of color are narrowing because whites are sicker than they used to be and more are dying younger. Not when popular fury is growing over an economic system in which a single American family (the Waltons) has more wealth than 41 percent of Americans combined.<sup>22</sup>

Policymakers tend to overlook the ways in which focusing on one group might help all groups and strengthen the whole nation. Cut into the curb, and we create a path forward for everyone.

## Curb-Cut Effects, from Streets to Schools to the Sky

Once you know what you're looking for, the curb-cut effect is on display all around. It happened when seat belt legislation, adopted initially to protect young children, led 49 states

to adopt seat belt laws that have saved an estimated 317,000 lives—children and adults—since 1975.<sup>23</sup> It happened when affirmative action was created to open the doors of higher education to black people—and ended up emboldening vast numbers of white women, and other racial and ethnic groups, to push for greater access as well. It happened when fed-up flight attendants spearheaded a national fight to end smoking on planes, setting in motion a decades-long public-health campaign that has largely banished smoking from public spaces and cut tobacco consumption in half since the 1960s.<sup>24</sup>

And it happened, spectacularly, with another improvement to America’s streets: bike lanes. After years of enduring injuries and fatalities, beleaguered bicyclists—backed by environmental advocates—have pressured a number of cities to install protected bike lanes. As of 2014, New York City had added roughly 30 miles of these lanes.<sup>25</sup> My hometown of Oakland is installing a similar amount.<sup>26</sup>

The verdict? In city after city, despite a “bike-lash” of critics who warn of more congestion and less parking, we’ve seen that—like a bicycle wheel—what goes around comes around. From 2000 to 2013, the risk of serious injury dropped 75 percent for New York City cyclists<sup>27</sup>—and pedestrians, a much larger group and not the intended target of the bike lanes, are 40 percent less likely to be injured.<sup>28</sup> In a 2011 survey of Chicago drivers, half believed that they noticed improved driving behavior on a street with bike lanes.<sup>29</sup>

In addition to creating safer and saner streets, bike lanes add tremendous economic value to a neighborhood. One stretch of Ninth Avenue in Manhattan saw retail sales rise nearly 50 percent after bike paths were installed, compared with a 3 percent rise borough-wide.<sup>30</sup> Rents along the Times Square bike paths grew 71 percent in 2010, the largest increase in the city, as people flocked to pedestrian- and bike-friendly neighborhoods.<sup>31</sup> A single block in Indianapolis saw the value of its property jump nearly 150 percent after adding bike lanes.<sup>32</sup>

Then there are the benefits to public health and the environment. A study of the San Francisco Bay Area found that a slight increase in walking and biking each day can reduce the prevalence of diabetes and cardiovascular disease by 14 percent,<sup>33</sup> while decreasing greenhouse gas emissions by 14 percent as well.<sup>34</sup> If just 5 percent of New York City commuters began biking to work, the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions saved would be equal to planting a forest 1.3 times the size of Manhattan.<sup>35</sup>

## The Making of a Middle Class

The most illuminating example of the curb-cut effect is the Serviceman's Readjustment Act of 1944, more commonly known as the GI Bill. It's no overstatement to say that the legislation created the white American middle class. The sponsors of the bill, initially scrawled by an American Legion lobbyist on a piece of hotel stationery, didn't expect to do more than provide job training to some World War II veterans looking to reintegrate into society.<sup>36</sup> Supporters of the legislation predicted that just a few hundred thousand of the 16 million returning veterans would use it to go to college. Even that was too much for educators like Robert Hutchins, the president of the University of Chicago, who direfully predicted that campuses would be turned into "hobo jungles." <sup>37</sup>

To the surprise of nearly everyone, nearly eight million veterans went to college on the GI bill,<sup>38</sup> and contrary to Hutchins' warning, they earned better grades, on average, than their civilian classmates. Journalist Edward Humes has catalogued their ranks to include 14 future Nobel Prize winners, three Supreme Court justices, three presidents, a dozen senators, 22,000 dentists, 67,000 doctors, 91,000 scientists, 238,000 teachers, and 450,000 engineers, along with numerous lawyers, nurses, businessmen, artists, actors, writers, and pilots.<sup>39</sup> New campuses sprang up to handle the influx, including Claremont McKenna College, Marlboro College, and the State University of New York at Binghamton. In 1944, the United States was home to 58 two-year community colleges. By 1947, there were 358.<sup>40</sup>

The results of the bill, however, could have been even better. The GI Bill included black veterans in the deal but let local governments decide how to allocate the money. All too predictably, black GIs received much, much less generous subsidies.<sup>41</sup> The bill that opened doors of opportunity to so many people who had previously been left out effectively barred entry for too many others.

Despite its shortcomings, the GI Bill demonstrates the transformative effects of smart, targeted investments. The beneficiaries did not just rejoin society; they remade it. The second pillar of the GI Bill, low-interest home loans, boosted homeownership from 44 percent before the war to 60 percent by the mid-1950s.<sup>42</sup> (Here, again, black GIs were largely excluded.) This, in turn, spurred the tremendous growth of the suburbs and buoyed an already-booming economy. All told, historians estimate that for every \$1 invested in returning World War II veterans, the country recouped \$8.<sup>43</sup> But the true benefits are incalculable.

## Creating a Prosperous Future

Many years ago, trying to get across Los Angeles to a job interview in Watts, I budgeted an hour and a half to take the five buses from my house to my destination. Two and a half hours later—well after my interview would have ended—I got off bus number four and turned around, defeated.

Frustration like this—to say nothing of lost opportunity—reflects a reality still common to people of color living in low-income neighborhoods. Connections to jobs, schools, hospitals, and grocery stores, and often to each other, are few and far between. One in five African-Americans—and 12 percent of Latinos—live in households without access to a car.<sup>44</sup> Two-thirds of the roads on Native American reservations are unpaved.<sup>45</sup> Half of the people who use public transit are people of color, yet far too many cannot get where they need to go.<sup>46</sup> In Chicago, four out of five residents cannot reach their jobs in 90 minutes or less using public transit.<sup>47</sup>

“Transportation touches every aspect of where we live, work, play, and go to school, as well as the physical and natural world,” writes author and scholar Robert Bullard, often described as the father of the environmental justice movement.<sup>48</sup> “Transportation also plays a pivotal role in shaping human interaction, economic mobility, and sustainability.”

If the United States can get equitable infrastructure right, the benefits will ripple far and wide. Transportation investments, particularly public transit projects, create many jobs and contracting opportunities building and maintaining infrastructure. With the right policies in place, those investments can do the double work of building the physical infrastructure that connects residents of underserved neighborhoods to economic opportunities while also delivering jobs and business opportunities to those residents.

Over the next five years, the country could generate more than one million transit-related jobs if the 20 largest cities in America merely shifted half of their transportation budget from funding highways to funding transit.<sup>49</sup> No new spending, just shifting our priorities.

Businesses would benefit, too. A Harvard Business School survey of business leaders’ priorities found that more and better public transportation was at the top of their wish list,<sup>50</sup> and it’s easy to see why. Better transportation leads to less absenteeism, and it gives businesses a larger pool of candidates to choose from to fill the available jobs.<sup>51</sup> In a 2013 study, urban planning scholar Daniel Chatman of the University of California, Berkeley, and Robert Noland of Rutgers University calculated that when metro areas added even just a few bus or rail seats—four for every 1,000 residents—this increased the number of employees working in the central city by 320 per square mile, nearly a 20 percent increase on average.<sup>52</sup> Similarly, the researchers found that expanding public transit 10 percent boosted the city’s total economic output between 1 and 2 percent. Chatman and Noland estimate that the “hidden economic value” of public transit was \$45 million in the average metro area, with a range between \$1.5 million and nearly \$2 billion depending on the size of the region.

The ripples don't end there. When people have access to public transit, they can more easily attend good schools and take advantage of higher education, which creates a more prepared workforce for the region. They can more readily get to health clinics and hospitals, allowing for greater preventive care and lower health care costs. Evidence also suggests that public transit leads to a decrease in crime. Simply put, better transit means better access to opportunity. Indeed, the pioneering Stanford University economist Raj Chetty has identified the top 10 cities for upward economic mobility. Five of them—New York, San Francisco, Boston, Washington, D.C., and Seattle—are also in the top 10 for physical mobility.<sup>53</sup>

To maximize benefits like these, metropolitan regions around the country are rethinking their transportation strategies and investments. The neighboring cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul offer a glimpse of how this is playing out. People of color—more than a quarter of whom are poor—have long been concentrated in disinvested neighborhoods and cut off from opportunity.<sup>54</sup> Initial plans for a new Green Line light-rail corridor overlooked these neighborhoods—reminding me of Bullard's observation, "Follow the transportation dollars and one can tell who is important and who is not."<sup>55</sup> But local activists worked with the federal government, city government, and others to rewrite the old rules.<sup>56</sup> Now, when the city evaluates the viability of a transportation project, planners assign points based on whether the proposed road or rail will enhance racial equity.<sup>57</sup> In other words, equity—not just safety or usage statistics, the traditional metrics for transportation considerations—has become central to transportation decisions.

The Green Line is a model of inclusive growth. People of color have made up nearly a fifth of the work hours on the project.<sup>58</sup> Women- and minority-owned small businesses have earned nearly 20 percent of construction contracts, worth \$115 million.<sup>59</sup> The light rail now stops in previously neglected neighborhoods, connecting those residents to the more robust job markets in downtown Minneapolis and St. Paul.

The nation can apply curb-cut thinking far beyond transportation infrastructure, to strengthen

the entire economy. The misshapen way in which the economy has grown is a problem not only for those at the bottom. As everyone from the OECD<sup>60</sup> to the International Monetary Fund<sup>61</sup> has concluded, widening inequality leads to declining economic growth. When a country fails to include a large number of people in its economy—when it restricts the circle of opportunity—the economy is weakened and the whole nation suffers.

There's no mystery about how to decrease inequality and increase economic growth. The answer is not easy credit or subprime mortgages or the privatization and parceling off of the social safety net. The antidote to inequality is equity. That means growing good jobs and improving the pay and quality of low-wage jobs. It means building human capabilities by upgrading the education and skills of today's workforce, and tomorrow's. It means eliminating barriers to economic inclusion and civic participation—for example, by revamping a criminal justice system that has trapped seven million people, the vast majority of them black and brown.<sup>62</sup> And it means expanding opportunity by investing in the most distressed places in America, and in the people who live there.

If the chasm between the gleaming skyscrapers of Manhattan and the barrios of East Los Angeles is holding the entire country back and limiting American economic potential, just think what closing that chasm with well-chosen policies would do. In 2012, blacks, Latinos, and Asian businesses grew more than three times faster than whiteowned businesses<sup>63</sup>—so imagine the entrepreneurial energy waiting to be unleashed if the country strengthens programs to boost business owners of color. Imagine the impact of connecting poor people and young people of color to high-growth industries like technology. The term “equity” in a corporate context is currently defined as a mere tally of assets and liabilities. But with racially diverse companies 35 percent more likely to outperform their peers,<sup>64</sup> imagine the rewards to be reaped if equity came to mean so much more.

Shrinking the racial gap in the US economy—simply employing and paying workers of color at the same rates as white workers—would boost the total GDP of America's 150 largest metro

areas by nearly a quarter.<sup>65</sup> New York City metro would add 31 percent—\$409 billion—to its GDP. Miami’s GDP would grow 41 percent, adding nearly \$113 billion. In Brownsville, Texas, GDP stands to grow 131 percent. In total, building a racially equitable economy would add \$2.1 trillion to America’s annual GDP.

The curb-cut effect underscores the foundational belief that we are one nation, that we rise or fall together. Without equity, there can be neither progress nor prosperity. Despite years of politicians insisting otherwise, the laws of economic gravity have always run in reverse. Opportunity doesn’t trickle down; it cascades out and up.

The initiatives described here are not handouts or giveaways; they are investments in the broader well-being of society. They are highly efficient. They are not a sweeping takeover by the federal government. In fact, many—if not most—rely on policies implemented at the state and local levels.

This is not a liberal or a conservative issue. It is not strictly a question of morality or efficiency. All of us—Democrats and Republicans, businesses and nonprofit organizations, city dwellers and suburbanites alike—have an interest in developing targeted, achievable reforms that yield real results and make noticeable differences in the lives of our most vulnerable. The inescapable conclusion is that it is right and smart to let hard-working Americans see more of the benefits of their hard work. It is right and smart to give more Americans, indeed all Americans, the chance to contribute to this country. It is right and smart to build a future in which every American, regardless of skin color or economic quintile, can participate and prosper. What is called for is nothing less than a return to the notion of a common good.

Half a century ago, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. prophetically wrote from a Birmingham, Ala., jail cell, “We are caught in an inescapable network of mutuality, tied in a single garment of destiny. Whatever affects one directly, affects all indirectly.”<sup>66</sup> Outside that building today, a plaque commemorates its most famous inmate. Along the sidewalk, at regular intervals, are

curb cuts.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> “Builders and Sustainers of the Independent Living Movement in Berkeley: Volume IV,” Disability Rights and Independent Living Movement Oral History Series, University of California.

<sup>2</sup> Frank Greve, “Curb ramps liberate Americans with disabilities—and everyone else,” McClatchy Newspapers, January 31, 2007.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

<sup>5</sup> Steven E. Brown, “The Curb Ramps of Kalamazoo: Discovering Our Unrecorded History,” *Disability Studies Quarterly*, vol. 13, no. 3, 1999, pp. 203-205.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

<sup>7</sup> “Remarks of President George Bush at the Signing of the Americans with Disabilities Act,” EEOC History: 35th Anniversary: 1965-2000, US Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

<sup>8</sup> Greve, “Curb Ramps.”

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

<sup>10</sup> “Data Summaries,” National Equity Atlas, PolicyLink and the USC Program for Environmental and Regional Equity.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid.

<sup>12</sup> Phillip Bump, “The 25 top hedge fund managers earn more than all kindergarten teachers combined,” *The Washington Post*, May 10, 2016.

<sup>13</sup> Raj Chetty, Nathaniel Hendren, Patrick Kline, Emmanuel Saez, and Nicholas Turner, “Is the United States Still a Land of Opportunity?” *American Economic Review: Papers & Proceedings*, vol. 104, no. 5, 2014, pp. 141-147.

<sup>14</sup> Anne Case and Angus Deaton, “Rising morbidity and mortality in midlife among white non-Hispanic Americans in the 21st century,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, vol. 112, no. 49, 2015, pp. 15078-15083.

<sup>15</sup> Ronald Brownstein and Janie Boschma, “Education Gaps Pose Looming Crisis for U.S. Economy,” *National Journal*, May 20, 2015.

<sup>16</sup> “Labor Force Statistics from the Current Population Survey,” Bureau of Labor Statistics, US Department of Labor.

<sup>17</sup> “Poverty Rate by Race/Ethnicity,” State Health Facts, The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation.

<sup>18</sup> Sandra L. Colby and Jennifer M. Ortman, “Projections of the Size and Composition of the U.S. Population: 2014 to 2060,” US Census Bureau, March 2015.

<sup>19</sup> Frank Bass, “White Share of U.S. Population Drops to Historic Low,” *Bloomberg News*, June 12, 2013.

<sup>20</sup> “Most Children Younger Than Age 1 are Minorities,” U.S. Census Bureau, May 17,

2012.

<sup>21</sup> Colby and Ortman, "Projections of the Size."

<sup>22</sup> Josh Bivens, "Inequality, exhibit A: Walmart and the wealth of American families," Economic Policy Institute, July 17, 2012.

<sup>23</sup> "Policy Impact: Seat Belts," Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, January 2011.

<sup>24</sup> Poncie Rutsch, "Will Vaping Reignite the Battle Over Smoking On Airplanes?" *National Public Radio*, February 24, 2015. "Trends in Current Cigarette Smoking Among High School Students and Adults, United States, 1965-2014," Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

<sup>25</sup> "Protected Bicycle Lanes in NYC," New York City Department of Transportation, September 2014.

<sup>26</sup> Will Kane, "Oakland racing to meet demand for bike lanes," *San Francisco Chronicle*, April 27, 2014.

<sup>27</sup> "Protected Bicycle Lanes in NYC."

<sup>28</sup> "Sustainable Streets: 2013 and Beyond," New York City Department of Transportation, 2013.

<sup>29</sup> "Initial Findings: Kinzie Street Protected Bike Lane," Chicago Department of Transportation, September 21, 2011.

<sup>30</sup> "The Economic Benefits of Sustainable Streets," New York City Department of Transportation.

<sup>31</sup> "The Re-Design of Broadway Moving All Modes," New York City Department of Transportation, July 2010.

<sup>32</sup> Jessica Majors and Sue Burow, "Assessment of the Impact of the Indianapolis Cultural Trail: A Legacy of Gene and Marilyn Glick," Indiana University Public Policy Institute, March 2015.

<sup>33</sup> Neil Maizlish, James Woodcock, Sean Co, Bart Ostro et al., "Health Cobenefits and Transportation-Related Reductions in Greenhouse Gas Emissions in the San Francisco Bay Area," *American Journal of Public Health*, vol. 103, no. 4, 2013, pp. 703-709.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid.

<sup>35</sup> "Environmental Statistics," Statistics Library, People for Bikes.

<sup>36</sup> Meredith Hindley, "How the GI Bill Became Law in Spite of Some Veterans' Groups," *Humanities*, vol. 35, no. 4, 2014.

<sup>37</sup> Thalia Assuras, "How the GI Bill Changed America," *CBS News*, June 22, 2008.

<sup>38</sup> Claudio Sanchez, "How the Cost of College Went From Affordable to Sky-High," *National Public Radio*, March 18, 2014.

<sup>39</sup> Edward Humes, *Over Here: How the GI Bill Transformed the American Dream*, San Diego, Harcourt, 2006.

<sup>40</sup> William Celis III, "50 Years Later, the Value of the G.I. Bill Is Questioned," *The New York Times*, June 22, 1994.

<sup>41</sup> Chuck Leddy, "A critical look at the GI Bill's impact," *The Boston Globe*, September 10, 2009.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid.

- 43 Jared Lyon, “[The GI Bill’s Impact on the Past, Present and Future](#),” Institute for Veterans and Military Families, Syracuse University, June 21, 2013.
- 44 Elaine Murakami and Liang Long, “[Vehicle Availability and Mode to Work by Race and Hispanic Origin](#),” Census Transportation Planning Products, US Department of Transportation, October 20, 2015.
- 45 [Demographics](#), About Tribes, National Congress of American Indians.
- 46 Mike Maciag, “[Public Transportation’s Demographic Divide](#),” *Governing*, February 24, 2014.
- 47 Adie Tomer, Elizabeth Kneebone, Robert Puentes, and Alan Berube, “[Missed Opportunity: Transit and Jobs in Metropolitan America](#),” Metropolitan Policy Program, Brookings Institution, May 2011.
- 48 Robert D. Bullard, “[Addressing Urban Transportation Equity in the United States](#),” *Fordham Urban Law Journal*, vol. 31, no. 5, 2003, pp. 1183-1209.
- 49 Todd Swanstrom, Will Winter, and Laura Wiedlocher, “[More Transit Equals More Jobs](#),” Transportation Equity Network.
- 50 Michael E. Porter and Jan W. Rivkin, “[An Economy Doing Half Its Job](#),” Harvard Business School Survey on U.S. Competitiveness, September 2014.
- 51 Eric Jaffe, “[Public Transit Is Worth Way More to a City Than You Might Think](#),” *CityLab*, August 14, 2013.
- 52 Daniel G. Chatman and Robert B. Noland, “[Transit Service, Physical Agglomeration and Productivity in US Metropolitan Areas](#),” *Urban Studies*, vol. 51, no. 5, 2014, pp. 917-937.
- 53 “[2016 City and Neighborhood Rating](#),” Walk Score.
- 54 “[Choice, Place and Opportunity: An Equity Assessment of the Twin Cities Region](#),” Metropolitan Council, 2014.
- 55 Robert D. Bullard, *Growing Smarter: Achieving Livable Communities, Environmental Justice, and Regional Equity*, Cambridge, Mass., The MIT Press, 2007.
- 56 John McCarron, “[Building Equity By the Tracks](#),” *Next City*, August 30, 2013.
- 57 Rachel Dovey, “[Transportation Funding Change Aims for Equality in Twin Cities](#),” *Next City*, September 24, 2014.
- 58 “[Central Corridor Green Line DBE and Workforce Story](#),” Metropolitan Council, June 2014.
- 59 “[Council Meets Contracting Goals for Green Line Construction](#),” Metropolitan Council, July 17, 2014.
- 60 “[Inequality hurts economic growth, finds OECD research](#),” OECD, September 12, 2014.
- 61 Era Dabla-Norris, Kalpana Kochhar, Nujin Suphaphiphat, Frantisek Ricka, and Evidiki Tsounta, “[Causes and Consequences of Income Inequality: A Global Perspective](#),” International Monetary Fund, June 15, 2015.
- 62 Lauren E. Glaze, Danielle Kaeble, “[Correctional Populations in the United States, 2013](#),” Bureau of Justice Statistics, US Department of Justice, December 19, 2014.
- 63 Vanessa Cardenas and Sarah Treuhft, eds., *All-In Nation: An America That Works for All*, Center for American Progress and PolicyLink, 2013.
- 64 Vivian Hunt, Dennis Layton, and Sara Prince, “[Why Diversity Matters](#),” *McKinsey*

*Insights*, January 2015.

<sup>65</sup> Sarah Treuhart, Justin Scoggins, and Jennifer Tran, “[The Equity Solution: Racial Inclusion Is Key to Growing a Strong Economy](#),” PolicyLink and USC Program for Environmental and Regional Equity, October 22, 2014.

<sup>66</sup> Martin Luther King Jr., “[Letter from a Birmingham Jail \[King, Jr.\]](#),” African Studies Center, University of Pennsylvania, April 16, 1963.

---

**Angela Glover Blackwell (@agb4equity)** is the CEO of PolicyLink. She was previously a senior vice president at the Rockefeller Foundation and a partner at the public interest law firm Public Advocates. She is also the coauthor of *Uncommon Common Ground: Race and America's Future*, Norton, 2010.

If you like this article enough to print it, be sure to subscribe to SSIR!

Copyright © 2019 Stanford University.  
Designed by Arsenal, developed by Hop Studios

## School Board Governance with Equity Lens Self Assessment

According to the Center for Public Education Report in 2011, there are eight characteristics of effective school boards. School board members are encouraged to embrace each of these characteristics with an equity lens in addition to three board actions to guide equity work. Please complete with fellow board members to assess the basic functioning of your governance team as a precursor to the examination, revision, and creation of equity focused policy and practice.

To what extent does your school board effectively demonstrate the following characteristics?	Not Effective	Seldom effective	Somewhat effective	Effective	Very Effective
1. Our school board <b>commits to a vision for equity</b> through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ high expectations for student achievement and quality instruction</li> <li>○ defining clear goals toward that vision</li> </ul>					
2. Our school board has <b>strong shared beliefs and values about equity</b> for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ students and their ability to learn</li> <li>○ the school system’s ability to teach all children at high levels</li> </ul>					
3. Our school board has <b>collaborative relationships</b> with the Superintendent, staff, as well as the community through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ a strong communications structure to inform and engage both internal and external stakeholders in setting and achieving district goals around equity.</li> </ul>					
4. Our school board is <b>accountability driven</b> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ spending less time on operational issues</li> <li>○ spending more time focused on policies and priorities to close equity gaps</li> </ul>					
5. Our school board is <b>data savvy</b> through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ embracing and monitoring quantitative and qualitative data, even when the information is negative</li> <li>○ using data to drive continuous improvement to close equity gaps</li> </ul>					
6. Our school board <b>aligns, monitors, and sustains resources</b> , such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ equity focused professional development to meet district goals</li> <li>○ establishing metrics to measure the impact of resources</li> </ul>					
7. Our school board <b>leads as a united team</b> with the superintendent through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ establishing mutual trust within the respective roles of the team</li> <li>○ engaging in strong equity focused collaboration</li> </ul>					
8. Our school board <b>participates in team development and equity focused training</b> , with our superintendent to build: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ shared knowledge of equity focused concepts</li> <li>○ core values as principles to guide equity work</li> <li>○ norms to guide board culture</li> <li>○ protocols to guide board operations</li> <li>○ commitments to equity work</li> <li>○ self-assessment of governance practices</li> </ul>					
To what extent has the school board developed and implemented the following:	Not drafted	Not adopted	Drafted	Adopted	Implemented/ applied
9. Our school board has developed an <b>equity statement</b>					
10. Our school board has developed an <b>equity policy</b>					
11. Our school board has developed an <b>equity impact action plan</b> to strategically address and measure the impact of the district’s equity policies and practices on closing equity gaps					

*Adapted by Nicole Anderson and Associates Consulting, L.L.C. 2021*

**Policy 0415: Equity**

Status: ADOPTED

Original Adopted Date: 04/26/2018 | Last Revised Date: 08/12/2021 | Last Reviewed Date: 08/12/2021

## Equity

### Students

Proposed – it is our obligation to eliminate practices that perpetuate negative impacts on student learning. The Board acknowledges educational equity is integral to the District’s overall mission and core values.

(cf. 0200 - Philosophy, Goals, Objectives and Comprehensive Plans)

(cf. 0460 - Local Control and Accountability Plan)

#### Statement & Definition

**It is unacceptable that the educational outcomes of students in our district are overwhelmingly predictable based on students’ race, socioeconomic, ethnicity or learning differences.**

**In South San Francisco Unified School District, equity is a means to ensure equal access to educational opportunity for all students by dismantling inequitable systems in order to minimize or eliminate the impact of disparities, available resources to prepare and study, and socio-cultural differences in achievement and performance so that all students may perform at optimum levels.**

**Definition: Equity, in SSFUSD, is defined as giving students what they need, when they need it to fulfill their potential.**

The South San Francisco Unified School District is strongly committed to maintaining high expectations for all of its students and to eliminate historical barriers, persistent disparities in achievement, performance and socio-emotional adjustment among subgroups based on race, ethnicity, language, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, socio-economic status or disability.

Educational equity is a means of ensuring the decisions, policies and practices in our system are culturally sensitive and provide all students with access, opportunity, resources and support to: meet students’ individual needs to learn, grow, and develop in a safe and healthy environment; support all stakeholders in advocating for fairness; and ensure the ultimate outcome of all students becoming college, career and life ready.

The Board understands that:

1. Generalizing and stereotyping any group of people devalues their contributions to the District and community as a whole.
2. Achievement and opportunity gaps and disparate discipline that exists amongst student groups construct barriers that prevent students from realizing their fullest potential and is unacceptable.

Therefore, the Board shall make decisions with a deliberate awareness of impediments to learning faced by students of color and/or diverse cultural, linguistic, or socio-economic backgrounds. To ensure that equity is the intentional basis of district decisions, the Board shall consider whether its decisions address the needs of

#### EDUCATIONAL EQUITY (continued)

students from racial, ethnic, and indigent communities and remedy the inequities that such communities experienced in the context of a history of exclusion, discrimination, and segregation. Board decisions shall not rely on biased or stereotypical assumptions about any particular group of students. All policies and practices will reflect the goals of eliminating gaps in access to educational opportunities for all of our students to ensure that they achieve academic success through their educational journeys.

1. The District will advance these goals by creating a culturally competent staff, maintaining uniformly high expectations for all, promoting rigorous curricula, promoting systems of curriculum, instruction, and assessment and professional learning opportunities, differentiating instruction and maximizing access for all

students to high-level educational opportunities. Given the urgency of this mission, the district is committed to emphasizing culturally responsive service delivery and consistently examining and monitoring policies, programs, practices, and written documents to ensure that they are consistent with these goals. Policies, programs and procedures are:

- a. In the Board's section (move) Fair, consistent and prohibitive of actual or perceived inequitable or discriminatory acts based on disability, ethnicity, gender, gender expression, gender identity, immigration status, language, culture, ethnicity, parental status, race, religion, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status or association with a person or group with one or more of these actual or perceived characteristics; and
- b. Aligned with long-term plans for implementing, reviewing and revising policies, programs and procedures that promote equity in the District in an effort to identify and remove systemic barriers that prevent students, staff and other stakeholders' full participation or access and benefits of District programs, services and activities.

Therefore, the Superintendent or designee shall ensure:

2. Financial and human resources are provided to support the work of staff, students, families and community groups in promoting equity and inclusion in our District. This includes analyzing expenditures and allocating financial and human resources in a manner that provides all students with equitable access to district programs, support services, and opportunities for success and promotes equity and inclusion in the district. Such resources include access to highly-qualified administrators, teachers, and other school personnel; funding; technology, equipment, textbooks, and other instructional materials; facilities; and community resources or partnerships.
3. An active approach to recruit, develop and retain District staff, administrators and teachers will be utilized, so that the District reflects the cultural and ethnic background of students and the community.
4. District discipline policies shall be designed to mitigate disproportionality in exclusionary practices, suspensions and expulsions amongst all student groups based on disability, ethnicity, gender, gender expression, gender identity, immigration status, language, culture, ethnicity, parental status, race, religion, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, cultural awareness, or association with a person or group with one or more of these actual or perceived characteristics.
5. District stakeholders are provided with fair and effective processes for resolving concerns and have the opportunity to challenge alleged inequitable practices with the expectation of remedy without fear of retribution. (cf. 1312.3 - Uniform Complaint Procedure)

#### **EDUCATIONAL EQUITY (continued)**

6. Enabling and encouraging students to enroll in, participate in, and complete curricular and extracurricular courses, advanced college preparation programs, and other student activities
7. Adopting curriculum and instructional materials that accurately reflect the diversity among student groups.

culturally responsive instructional practices.

(cf. 4100 - Certificated Personnel) (cf. 4131 - Staff Development)  
(cf. 4200 - Classified Personnel)  
(cf. 4222 - Teacher Aides/Paraprofessionals)  
(cf. 4300 - Administrative and Supervisory Personnel) (cf. 4331 - Staff Development)  
(cf. 6173 - Education for Homeless Children)  
(cf. 6174 - Education for English Language Learners) (cf. 6175 - Migrant Education Program)  
(cf. 9240 - Board Development) **Legal References: EDUCATION CODES**  
200 Educational Equity Purpose  
201 Legislative Declarations and Intent (A-G)  
210 Article 2. Definitions  
220 Prohibition of Discrimination  
234 - 234.5 Safe Place to Learn Act  
32280 - 32289 School Safety Plans  
51000 - 51009 George Miller, Jr. Education Act of 1968  
51019 Definition of Philosophy  
51020 Definition of Goal  
51500 Prohibition of Instruction or Activity  
51513 Personal Beliefs  
52060 - 52077 Adoption of Local Control and Accountability Plan  
60040 Portrayal of Cultural and Racial Diversity  
60044 Prohibited Instructional Materials

#### CODE OF REGULATIONS, TITLE 5

5 CCR 3940 Maintenance of Effort

#### UNITED STATES CODES

20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. Individuals with Disabilities in Education Act  
20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq. Patsy Takemoto Equal Opportunity in Education Act  
20 U.S.C. 2301 et seq. Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006  
20 U.S.C. 5801 et seq. Education Flexibility Partnership Act of 1999  
20 U.S.C. 6801 et seq. Technology for Education Act of 1994  
29 U.S.C. 794 Nondiscrimination under Federal Grants and Programs

#### EDUCATIONAL EQUITY (continued)

42 U.S.C. 2000d Section 1-101, Section 1-102 et seq. Title VI, Civil Rights Act of 1964  
42 U.S.C. 2000d-7 Civil rights remedies equalization  
42 U.S.C. 12101-12213 Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990

#### CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS

28 C.F.R. 35.101 Americans with Disabilities Act  
34 C.F.R. 100-110 Chapter 1-Office for Civil Rights, Department of Education

#### OTHER PROFESSIONAL REFERENCES

Cincinnati PS Board Policy 2255 Equity and Excellence in Education (4/11/2016) Minneapolis PS Policy 1304 Equity and Diversity (10/08/2013)  
San Jose USD Equity Board Policy 0210 Philosophy, Goals, Objectives and Comprehensive Plans (5/13/2010)  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS PUBLICATIONS: Dear Colleague Letter on the Nondiscriminatory Administration of School Discipline, January 2014

November 10, 2021

CSBA PUBLICATIONS: Providing a Safe, Nondiscriminatory School Environment for Transgender and Gender-Nonconforming Students, Policy Brief, February 2014

Lindsey, R.P., Robins, K. N., & Terrell, R.D. (2009). *Cultural proficiency: A manual for school leaders*. (3rd Ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

#### WEB SITES

CSBA: <http://www.csba.org> (<https://simbli.eboardsolutions.com/SU/endNqaxyiGQAmOk5HoBoUw==>)

California Department of Education: <http://www.cde.ca.gov>

U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights: <http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr>

Gamut Online: <http://www.gamutonline.net/district/elkgrove/>

(<https://simbli.eboardsolutions.com/SU/v9dBVlqsn9tCC4wAmEeUUA==>) APA: [www.apa.org](http://www.apa.org)

Ed Glossary: [www.edglossary.com](http://www.edglossary.com)

Cambridge Dictionary: [www.dictionary.cambridge.org](http://www.dictionary.cambridge.org)

National Education Association Diversity Toolkit Introduction: [www.nea.org](http://www.nea.org)

---