

RIVERSIDE CITY COLLEGE
Resources Development & Administrative Services Leadership Council (RD&AS LC)
November 30, 2020
3:00 p.m. – 5 p.m.
Via Zoom

Chair: Tucker Amidon, Faculty

Co-Chair: Dr. Chip West, Administrative

Co-Chair: Stephen Ashby, Staff

Members Present

Chip West, Jennifer Lawson, Leo Truttman, Stephen Ashby, Amber Casolari, Charles Richard, Dan Hogan, Natalie Halsell, Gabriel Rivera, Patrick Scullin, Tonya Huff, Robert Beebe, Ismael Davila, Skip Berry, Marlon Haddock, Tucker Amidon, Liz Tatum, Elia Blount, and Kimberly Reimer.

Guests

Sydni Marquardt

Call to Order: 3:04 p.m.

Approval of the Agenda

Amber Casolari motioned to approve and Dan Hogan seconded. Motion carried.

Approval of October 26, 2020 Minutes

Stephen Ashby motioned to approve and Natalie Halsell seconded. 1 abstention. Motion carried.

Action Items

Guided Pathways Plan Review

The council went through the plan page by page and agreed upon these changes/clarifications (Grammar edits will be sent directly to Monique Greene):

- Though important, the plan should not only be about closing equity gaps. It needs to be broad and have inclusive language to cover the full face of the institution. It needs to be about shortening the amount of time all students attend RCC regardless of equity gaps and sending them on to their next stage of education.
- There is no mention of COVID 19 nor online learning.
- On page 1 and the whole plan there is a focus on African American students though there is mention of other marginalized groups but not by name. It is mentioned in the plan that the majority of RCC students are Latinx but they are ignored through the plan. On page 4, the council was bothered by the sentence, "While Hispanic students are not within the primary focus, they were also identified as disproportionality impacted across multiple metrics (Transfer and Math and English)." The plan needs clearer language that specifically addresses the need to add in Latinx as an equity part in the Guided Pathways plan. The opening explanation should be

clarified that this is the emphasis for Guided Pathways for the next few years, not forever, then the document would be stronger. The conclusion might be a better opener.

- OER is central to Guided Pathways but it's only mentioned once. A plan from faculty development should be obtained to better flesh out the OER/equity/faculty development section on page 11.
- Sustainability needs to be mentioned in the plan. Equity and sustainability are closely related.
- CTE should be emphasized in the document since there is a push to get an education to work, not just transfer.
- Page 2, bullet point 4: Brave space needs to be defined somewhere, maybe in a footnote. Within the same line, what does "understanding limitations" mean?
- Page 2, bullet point 1: Include classified support with faculty support.
- The entire document needs to be edited so all references are not exclusive to individual constituent groups unless we are talking about specific areas, i.e. referencing faculty in regard to the academic classroom. Administrators, classified professionals, and faculty contribute to the college as a whole and it needs to be reflected in the plan.
- Page 2, *Our Why?*: The plan excludes Asian students from being students of color. The language needs to be clarified. Maybe don't use the term students of color since Asian students would fall within this category. Simply use *these groups*.
- Page 3: Same problem with students of color on one side and Asian and white students on the other.
- Page 4, number 1: After degree put parentheses and mention degree categories (CTE, Standard Associates, etc.)
- Page 4, number 3: Is there more metrics for Access? Needs clarification. Add a note on equitable access, can students enroll in the classes they need.
- Page 5, third bullet point: After "state-wide," the word survey is missing.
- Page 6: The two bullet points under the graph seem out of place.
- Page 7, Connection Stage (Pillar 1): There needs to be a timeline to define these actions.
- Page 7, Onboarding bullet, second action: The sentence ends with attend. Attend what? Also, mandating students to attend the engagement sessions is not equitable, especially if they are penalized for not going. Remove mandate and rework bullet point to be more equitable. Maybe create recorded/online sessions so it's accessible to all students.
- Entry Stage (Pillar 2), bullet point 1, EDUNAV action: Make a direct connection to the EARP.
- COVID should be clearly identified as a concern over the entirety of the plan.
- Progress/Completion Stage (Pillar 3): Reference the follow-up of student comprehensive education plans and confirming there is progress being made.
- Pillar 3, second bullet point: Expand on academic engagement centers as well - STEM, LHSS, Fine and Performing Arts, Honors, CTE, etc.
- Page 9, Equity in Counseling/Advising Practices bullet point: More counseling/advising comes from people who have experience in the disciplines that they are advising in.
- Page 10, action item on top of page: OER action item needs to have a timeline attached to it.
- Page 10, CARE bullet points: Needs more communication about the CARE team, what it is, and procedures for faculty and staff to report conduct issues. Clarify what CARE means in a footnote.

- Page 11, second bullet point for Faculty and Staff Development: Title indicates this is a Faculty and Staff Development action item however the action item is only reflective of faculty development. In general, the document does not highlight the ways in which classified professionals and managers will receive professional development training and opportunities to support their participation in the Guided Pathways redesign. Employee Development. Regarding sentence “Alignment of all professional learning opportunities to equity and guided pathways redesign,” There are other professional development items that need to get done that are not focused on equity and guided pathways. Reword: “Development of additional professional development learning opportunities to enhance equity and guided pathways” or “Expansion of professional learning opportunities to include...”
- Page 11, first action item from Integrate more Effective Communication bullet point: It’s vague, not really an action item. It needs to be more specific.
- Anti-racism and combating anti-blackness should be at the beginning, not just the conclusion.
- Page 12, first bullet point and action item: Which departments? Remove semesterly, that’s an unrealistic turnaround.
- Page 12, Faculty Flex bullet point, action item: Are there state faculty professional development guidelines, and if so can we change that in RCC’s faculty contract? Natalie Halsell will ask Patricia Avila.
- Page 12, Department Leadership Council Action item: Contractual issues, curriculum issues, academic freedom. If not worded correctly (mandating this of students), it’s a potential equity barrier.
- Page 13, Integrate Student Engagement bullet point, action item: And who hires them? Who do they report to? Who is their supervisor? How do you monitor this? It seems more ambitious than its resources.
- Page 13, Career and Transfer bullet, action item: The sentence in the action statement represents a lot of complicated and intensive actions. This is sweeping and unachievable.
- Page 13, Conclusion: We need to look at other factors beyond race and ethnicity, such as socioeconomic status.
- The final statements in the Conclusion seemed odd. They should be footnotes.

Stephen Ashby moved to send the document back with these recommendations/suggestions/edits. Charlie Richard seconded. Motion carried.

Informational Items

Subcommittee Discussion

Subcommittee reports were emailed out to the council. There was no time for further discussion.

Adjourned: 5:00 p.m.