

Faculty Professional Development Committee Minutes

September 13, 2023

**Members Present:**

Ruby Payne, Julián Martínez, Mariza Martínez, Chris Taylor, John Eigenauer, Jennifer Altenhofel

**Members Absent:**

Leslie Minor, Wendy Berry, Tabitha Raber

**Guests:**

None

**Welcome:**

Meeting started: 12:11 pm

**Action Items:**

**1. Approval of Minutes from May 10, 2023**

Motion: John Eigenauer

Second: Mariza Martínez

Abstentions: Jennifer Altenhofel

Passed.

**2. Fall Faculty PDC meeting schedule**

No action was taken.

**3. Approval to hold October 11, 2023, meeting via Zoom, if needed**

It was proposed that members approve the possibility of holding this meeting via zoom if necessary because of quarantine or other circumstances.

Motion: Chris Taylor

Second: John Eigenauer

Passed unanimously.

**4. Review committee charter**

The existing charter was reviewed by the committee. Ruby Payne clarified that PDC recommends to Academic Senate but does not make policy.

John Eigenauer asked if the committee purpose is determined by the PDC committee or by the Academic Senate. He raised the concern that there are trainings that don’t directly lead to increased student achievement, and that if our stated purpose only includes trainings that directly lead to increased student achievement, we may not be totally complying with that purpose. There was some discussion about whether or not this was enough of an issue that it needed to be addressed, but no consensus was reached and no action was taken on it.

John Eigenauer made an observation regarding committee responsibilities: that under the charter, there is no provision for Academic Senate to make recommendations back to the committee. He indicated that he was not making a motion to change that, merely making an observation. Ruby Payne clarified that the committee’s position has been that Academic Senate is not empowered to dictate tasks to the PDC committee and clarified that typically PDC makes recommendations about what sorts of development opportunities would be useful and how best to organize them, but that PDC is not able to and should not be tasked with finding specific trainings/speakers/etc.

Jennifer Altenhofel raised a concern about the extent to which this indicated a limited function for the PDC committee. Ruby Payne provided context about past practices, in which many aspects (tracks for May, extent to which staff will provide trainings, etc.) are not under the control of the committee and noted that (for example) the administration controls programming on SLO day. But she also noted that PDC has several roles, including to make sure that flex days don’t have mandatory training, and to make requests and draft schedules for in-service.

John Eigenauer raised the possibility of revising the language to include something to the effect that ‘based upon suggestions from faculty, the Professional Development Committee makes recommendations to the Academic Senate.’ There was discussion about whether or not such a change would be helpful. Ruby Payne raised the concern that this might lead to outside bodies or individual faculty assuming that they are able to dictate tasks to the PDC committee. This concern was shared by Julián Martínez and Jennifer Altenhofel. Mariza Martínez asked for clarification about the overall process in which the recommendation ultimately goes to the administration or the board. Ruby Payne clarified that board approval is only needed if there is a monetary expense involved. Ruby Payne also noted that sometimes the administration brings items to PDC or adds items to in-service because of legal obligations that affect the college, but that last year was the first time Academic Senate had tried to dictate tasks to the PDC committee.

Jennifer Altenhofel raised the point that PDC is a subcommittee of the Academic Senate. In the discussion that followed, Julián Martínez and Ruby Payne clarified that while true, that doesn’t mean that Academic Senate dictates to the PDC committee. There was further discussion about which parts of the schedule are set by the administration.

Julián Martínez voiced support for keeping the existing charter. Chris Taylor asked about the extent to which feedback incorporation is implied, and changing the charter to make it explicit would be unnecessary. John Eigenauer withdrew the proposed change and no further action was taken.

Ruby Payne noted that although committee chairs need to post minutes and agendas, she is currently unable to, pending training that has not yet been offered. Ruby Payne also noted that PDC does not technically have a budget but can ask for funds from the Office of Instruction.

The remainder of the charter was reviewed.

Jennifer Altenhofel asked a question about how additional professional development opportunities were disseminated and Ruby Payne noted that Leslie Minor

runs the listserve and that she sends out most other trainings, and that Michelle Oja sends announcements for OER related opportunities.

A motion to approve the existing charter without changes was made.

Motion: Mariza Martínez

Second: Julián Martínez

Passed unanimously.

**5. Review of Fall 2023 In-Service**

Ruby Payne noted that the feedback about fall in-service was that there were too many events, and the schedule was too busy. Jennifer Altenhofel noted that she appreciated only having one student services update. Ruby Payne agreed. Mariza Martínez raised a concern about faculty who have scheduling conflicts with the single meeting and Ruby Payne noted that you are excused from conflicted events if there it is a work conflict – in essence, if you are required to be in two places at the same time, you are excused from one of them.

Ruby Payne relayed that she and the President discussed moving active shooter training to the January in-service as a flex day activity, and that this would mean having it in 4 and a half years rather than 5 years, in order to keep within the 5-year compliance deadline.

Ruby Payne noted that the policy clarifying that non-teaching faculty were excused from all faculty events if they had student appointments had worked out very well, and that feedback from administration, students and counselors was very positive.

Discussion returned to the student services update. Ruby Payne noted that under the format for this in-service, the logistical and policy information was sent out in the newsletter rather than presented at the meeting. Jennifer Altenhofel asked whether it was still necessary to have an in-person student services meeting in the future if the policy details are available via email. Ruby Payne asked for a general sense of the committee’s opinion on this. Julián Martínez was supportive of dropping the in-person meeting, Mariza Martínez raised a concern about orienting new faculty and faculty in new positions. The possibility was raised of doing introductions and other orientation during the welcome back breakfast instead. Jennifer Altenhofel noted that in the past there have been changes and we needed to ask specific questions, but if policies are the same from year to year, it is unclear why a meeting is needed. Julián Martínez and Chris Taylor voiced general agreement that the benefit of in-person student services meetings was unclear.

**Information/Discussion Items**

**6. Current Professional Development Opportunities**

No items were raised for discussion.

**7. Building January In-Service Schedule (Jan. 4-12, 2024)**

Ruby Payne noted that in the event we have a DEIA training as part of in-service, PDC should recommend an outside source and should not be responsible for choosing that source given that PDC is not qualified to select a specific DEIA training, and doesn’t have the authority to budget for one.

There was discussion about doing this through NISOD, and that the head of NISOD would be able to clarify which trainings qualified. The discussion also included questions about the extent to which this is a state mandated training, and is perhaps properly an HR function that is handled in the same way as other state mandated trainings.

**8. Next Meeting: October 11, 2023, 12:10pm in Cafeteria Conference Room**

**Other**

No additional items were raised.

**Meeting Adjourned:**

Motion: Chris Taylor

Second: Jennifer Altenhofel

Adjourned by consensus at 1:00