

Faculty Professional Development Committee Minutes

September 11, 2024

**Members Present:**

Ruby Payne, Chris Taylor, Jennifer Altenhofel, Tabitha Raber, Jon Farmer, Leslie Minor, Wendy Berry,

**Members Absent:**

Amanda Clark, Julián Martínez, Mariza Martínez, John Eigenauer,

**Guests:**

**Welcome:**

Meeting started: 12:13 pm

**Action Items:**

**1. Approval of Minutes from April 10, 2024**

There were no revisions or corrections made to the minutes.

**2. Fall Faculty PDC meeting schedule**

The proposed meeting dates for Fall 2024 are: September 11, October 9, November 13, December 11. There was general agreement to these among those present.

**3. Approval to hold Oct 9 meeting via Zoom, if needed**

Those present agreed with the possibility of holding this meeting via zoom if necessary, because of quarantine or other circumstances. Jon Farmer offered that his office (in G1) could be the physical location for a guest to attend remotely.

**4. Review committee charter**

Jon Farmer asked about the possibility of including recommendations for staff when trainings or other opportunities become available that might be of interest to staff. There was discussion between Jon Farmer and Ruby Payne about the process by which staff and faculty professional development committees separated several years ago, in part because of concerns that the two groups had different professional development interests and needs.

With regard to the existing charter, Ruby Payne clarified that PDC disseminates information about professional development and coordinates scheduling for the August and January in-service calendars, but it lacks the formal power or funding to mandate that a particular professional development item happen.

Jennifer Altenhofel said that she would like to have one faculty on the committee from each division to be responsible for professional development opportunities that are relevant to their division.

Ruby Payne noted that the committee composition is ultimately up to the Office of Instruction and the Academic Senate and asked for the specific wording that Jennifer Altenhofel would like to include in the charter.

Jennifer Altenhofel stated that she would like to change the charter to include ‘one representative from each division who is responsible for researching and presenting professional development opportunities for their division.’

Ruby Payne noted that this would be a role for a program lead, and having it be part of a faculty member’s committee assignment would create a workload issue because of the additional uncompensated work.

Jennifer Altenhofel reiterated that she thought it should be the responsibility of the Faculty Professional Development Committee should be to find professional development opportunities.

Ruby Payne pointed out that the committee does not have access to a defined budget and has no formal power to negotiate with outside entities or unilaterally approve development events.

Jennifer Altenhofel said that she wanted the committee to be more active in looking for professional development.

Chris Taylor asked if it was important that this be specifically listed in the charter, and Jennifer Altenhofel replied that she thought it was.

Ruby Payne asked for a clarification about whether under such an arrangement the committee member would be responsible for representing all the departments in their division.

Jennifer Altenhofel asked why we should have the committee if its members are not more active in planning professional development.

Ruby Payne noted that the committee was responsible for coordinating in-service schedules, but that added workload should be discussed in Academic Senate as a compensated, formal position rather than tasking committee members with something that is not backed by authority or financial resources.

Tabitha Raber noted that it does seem like the In-Service calendar is fairly static and stays the same from term to term.

Ruby Payne said that ultimately, there are a lot of set things that need to be accomplished during that week, but that details do change depending on decisions made by administration.

**5. Review of Fall 2024 In-Service**

Ruby Payne noted that in May, the schedule had been for fall In-Service to have a half day for SLOs and a half day for DEIAA, but that this didn’t end up happening. There appeared to be confusion about which office or administrator was supposed to make a final decision on facilitators. The proposed changes to the board policy and administrative procedure for SLO day also did not appear to have been made.

Tabitha Raber brought up that the May session had ended with the definite implication that the facilitators would be back to work more with faculty in the fall.

This was followed by discussion between Ruby Payne and Jennifer Altenhofel about the status of the board policy and administrative procedure related to SLO day, with Ruby Payne noting that Faculty Professional Development Committee doesn’t have the authority to change either of these.

Tabitha Raber asked if there was, that the committee should do itself, or bring to Academic Senate in order to provide the committee with more input on professional development.

Ruby Payne noted that the committee does weigh in on professional development and provide a faculty voice when decisions are being made about the In-Service calendars, but that the committee cannot make particular development events happen. Ultimately, the committee has three primary roles: it develops and coordinates schedules for the August and January In-Services, and provides input on the May professional development events.

Ruby Payne summarized feedback on the August In-Service as being that faculty generally thought the In-Service had gone well. In particular, allowing counselors to meet with students throughout the week had worked well, and faculty appreciated having Monday as a possible flex day.

Ruby Payne asked Leslie Minor about the planned DEIAA session for August In-Service and the state of the board policy and administrative procedure governing SLO day.

Leslie Minor said that the DEIAA training would have gone through Human Resources, and that the board policy and administrative procedure were moving through the process with some changes. In particular the current revised versions did not specifically name DEIAA in the wording, because there may be a separate policy to specifically recognize DEIAA. The intent was to have something to the effect that SLO will continue to incorporate new mandates and guidelines from the State of California and/or the Chancellor’s office, so that it wouldn’t be necessary to update them every time there was a change in guidance or a new mandate. She also noted that the DEIAA committee would like to see a full day on DEIAA.

Jennifer Altenhofel indicated that she thought it would not be possible to fit a whole additional day of material in the In-Service calendar.

**Information/Discussion Items**

**6. Current Professional Development Opportunities**

Jon Farmer and Leslie Minor have both sent emails to faculty to advertise relevant professional development opportunities. In addition, Michelle Oja and Salvador Jimenez Murguia had sent emails about OER opportunities.

Leslie Minor noted that there was an opportunity to learn about noncredit courses coming up that she thought might be of particular interest to faculty. Noncredit courses can be created for a variety of subjects, including enhanced non-credit courses that are supported by the state through apportionments. For example, a non-credit walking for fitness course, which might also increase community member interest. Leslie Minor added that in general, noncredit courses could offer more community learning opportunities

Chris Taylor asked if minimum faculty qualifications are the same as for credit bearing courses.

Leslie Minor said that they were a little more flexible depending on course, and also that we can offer noncredit courses that address needs in remedial English and Math.

Jennifer Altenhofel asked how noncredit courses counted for load.

Leslie Minor noted that the collective bargaining agreement sets a 1:1 relationship for load, compared to credit bearing courses. She added that there are places where it is less, but that usually also means it comes with lower course prep expectations, and that the administration may want to revisit this, but that the details would have to go through curriculum committee.

**7. Building January In-Service Schedule (Jan. 9-17, 2025)**

Ruby Payne reviewed the handout and noted that in past years there have been optional workshops determined by faculty interest and that last time there was a SEMCOM meeting during the Thursday/Friday period that is flex-eligible. She added that she would like the committee to revisit the schedule for that Thursday and Friday later in the term.

Further items of note included the Sexual Harassment, Cybersecurity and EEEO trainings which can be taken any time during the week, but that Ruby Payne wants to make sure show up on the schedule to account for the faculty time commitment needed. She added that there are meetings that need to occur and/or have traditionally been early in the week, including Academic Senate Council, Academic Procedures and Polices (which has a new chair and may move its meeting time), two coaches’ meetings, and a TCFCBC meeting on Tuesday.

Ruby Payne asked Jennifer Altenhofel about her preferred day and time and length for faculty reports.

Jennifer Altenhofel said that she would like 2 hours and would prefer 10-12, or at least not 12-1, so that the meeting doesn’t fall over people’s usual mealtime.

Ruby Payne noted that faculty feedback on the Student Services update was positive and that having just the one session seemed to be working well for folks, and that she would contact the Office of Student Services and determine their preferred day and time. She clarified that the reason for having 2 sessions in the past was because there wasn’t a room large enough to hold everyone who needed to attend.

Ruby Payne also noted that she will contact the new SLO coordinator, Adam Bledsoe, for SLO day details, but that it was on the schedule for the Wednesday of In-Service week.

Ruby Payne said that Thursday was set aside for division meetings and planning.

Leslie Minor said that planning day was originally for program review, but that she doesn’t know if new schedule will change that and that it might be worth checking with Xiaohong Li.

Ruby Payne said that there used to be two planning days, but that one of those became program review day. A discussion followed about planning day, and what activities take place during that day. Leslie Minor raised a question about the purpose of planning day and how faculty use that time. Ruby Payne said that divisions can carry out a variety of tasks during planning day and that the details for how divisions use this time depends a lot on what is changing in the regulatory environment, or what challenges are faced by a particular division or department in the coming term.

Leslie Minor noted that she will check whether or not SEMCOM committee is planning to meet during In-Service.

Ruby Payne noted that Active Shooter Response Training was being moved to the January In-Service based on a past agreement, and that she was planning to put this on the first (flex-eligible) Friday.

**Other**

Leslie Minor brought up that there were probably updates coming from the state regarding the rules for flex time, but that these were relatively similar to how they had been for the past 10 years or so. She added that this is in the open comments stage right now and that it might be useful for this committee to look into that, since it will determine what kinds of activities are flex eligible.

Ruby Payne said she would add it to the agenda for the next meeting

**8. Next Meeting: October 9, 2024, 12:10pm in Cafeteria Conference Room**

**Meeting Adjourned:**

Adjourned by consensus at 1:02