

DOCUMENT REVIEW PROTOCOL

This tool that helps practitioners review their documents and reflect on the extent to which the policies, practices and approaches reflected in the document address equity. Reflecting on your documents gives you a window into how your campus is addressing equity now and provides information that can generate a dialogue about how your campus might improve.

PROMPTS

What does the document tell you about your campus? Generally documents communicate what you envision or expect. But what are the "hidden" messages? What is the reader seeing and experiencing that the creator of the document may not have intended? What values and attitudes are reflected?

Document Description:

- 1. Message
 - a. From your point of view as the reader, what does the writer care most about?
- 2. Communication of Expectations of Equity
 - a. Are specific ethnic groups mentioned in the document?
 - b. Are goals and metrics (if applicable) expressed for sub-groups, including by race/ethnicity?
 - c. Does the document convey a belief that all students are capable of being represented in the full range of postsecondary opportunities (i.e., are some students referenced only in the context of certain types of higher education)?
 - d. Would the descriptions of students in this document indicate that the college believes students of color in particular can meet expectations and excel in higher education?
 - e. What terms or phrases were used to refer to the campus' goals vis a vis students of color? (i.e. equity, diversity etc.)
 - f. What information was included on the commitment of the college to equity?
 - g. How were the benefits of improved equity illustrated?
- 3. Incorporation of a critical lens
 - a. Was the reader encouraged to think critically about why equity does not exist in higher education?
 - b. Did the document include analysis, synthesis, and evaluation that took structural racism into account?
 - c. Were individuals or programs that successfully address equity used as models or were their accomplishments highlighted?
 - d. Was there sensitivity to students' possible past-experiences in inequitable and poorly resourced schools?



1

Copyright 2014, University of Southern California, Center for Urban Education Rossier School of Education. All Rights Reserved. The contents cannot be copied or disseminated without express written permission from the Center for Urban Education



- 4. Equity Strategies
 - a. In general, where does the document explicitly convey the college's equity imperative? Highlight in yellow those areas that reflect the equity imperative. If you identify equity "cues" in the document list them on the right hand side column.
 - b. Which forms of influence listed below are being leveraged in support of equity?
 - Symbolic / Language
 - Social Networks
 - Visibility / Information
 - Resources

Recommendations

- a. Were their elements of the document that were creative or innovative?
- b. What recommendations would you make to the Student Success and Equity Committee about how it might approach implementation of this plan given your findings?
- c. What are some guidelines you might develop for those writing future plans or documents?
- d. Where in the plan could these forms of influence be leveraged to advance a more intentional and explicit commitment to equity? Highlight in pink where you could insert the following.
 - Symbolic / Language
 - Social Networks
 - Visibility / Information
 - Resources
- e. In what ways could the document/artifact embed equity more explicitly?
- f. What might stand in the way of embedding equity more explicitly in the document? What would you need in order to address potential barriers?

Discussion Guide

- a. What do the documents reveal about our attitudes towards students of color?
- b. Think about the equity-minded indicators in the protocol, for example explicit references to race/ethnicity, and a clear expression of the belief that all students should be represented in the full range of higher education programs and institutions. Which of these types of indicators are generally present in the documents we reviewed? Which are generally missing?
- c. Did any of the documents strike us as creative or innovative? Why? Can these creative or innovative features be adapted for other documents?
- d. What are some guidelines we could develop when developing future plans or documents? How do we want to disseminate these guidelines?

References: Chism, N.V.N. (1999). Peer review of teaching: A Sourcebook. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Co., Inc.



School of Education Center for Urban Education Copyright 2014, University of Southern California, Center for Urban Education Rossier School of Education. All Rights Reserved. The contents cannot be copied or disseminated without express written permission from the Center for Urban Education