

Faculty Professional Development Committee Minutes

March 13, 2024

**Members Present:**

Ruby Payne, Leslie Minor, Chris Taylor, Jennifer Altenhofel, Tabitha Raber, John Eigenauer,

**Members Absent:**

Julián Martínez, Mariza Martínez, Wendy Berry,

**Guests:**

**Welcome:**

Meeting started: 12:12 pm

**Action Items:**

**1. Approval of Minutes from February 14, 2024**

Motion: Jennifer Altenhofel

Second: Ruby Payne

Passed unanimously.

**2. Approval to hold April 10, 2024, 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: Jennifer Altenhofel

Passed unanimously.

**Information/Discussion Items**

**3. Current Professional Development Opportunities**

Ruby Payne noted that Jon Farmer sent out an email about a skillup Friday training (Website Design for Accessibility). Ruby Payne asked Leslie Minor about any additions. Leslie Minor noted that she had sent additional opportunities via email and Ruby Payne thanked her for those.

**4. Building May In-Service Schedule**

Ruby Payne said that the final decision from the President/Superintendent was that there would be one track for the May In-Service, that it would be face-to-face only, and that it would be one day of Accessibility training run by Distance Education, and two days of DEIAA content from an external provider. Ruby Payne asked the minutes to reflect that she had voiced the concern to the President/Superintendent that the May In-Service may not be the best venue for training material that addressed the OCR findings, because the May session is optional for faculty. Leslie Minor indicated that this would be one of an ongoing series of opportunities for faculty to learn about these topics.

Ruby Payne asked Leslie Minor which administrator was the point of contact for the portion of the In-Service that involved outside facilitators. Leslie Minor indicated that herself and Heather del Rosario are coordinating it.

Ruby Payne asked about details – which days would the facilitated session be held, would they be stand alone (in which a person could just come to one day) or would it be both-or-nothing. Leslie Minor voiced a preference for faculty attending both days to maintain continuity through the two days of material. There was also some discussion of the extent to which HR preferred not to track faculty attendance across individual days.

Ruby Payne asked about a detailed schedule for the two days. There was discussion between Ruby Payne, Leslie Minor, and Jennifer Altenhofel about whether the days would be 7 or 8 hours, and how lunch would be handled. Jennifer Altenhofel also asked that the sessions have detailed descriptions so that faculty could decide whether to attend based on the topics being discussed. Ruby Payne noted the importance of these sessions counting for 8 hours of flex credit. Leslie Minor agreed that 8 hours was reasonable but noted that if the lunch hour counted as part of the hourly count, it would need to be a ‘working lunch’ for compliance reasons.

Ruby Payne also noted that alternatively, the lunch could be shorter than an hour if that was necessary to make the schedule work.

Ruby Payne and Leslie Minor confirmed that the plan was that the DE/Accessibility session would be held on Monday, May 20th, and that the other two sessions would be held on Tuesday May 21st, and Wednesday, May 22nd.

Leslie Minor will contact the facilitators and find out what they plan to cover. She also noted that the facilitators had raised the possibility of surveying the faculty to get a sense of their audience. There was discussion between Ruby Payne, Jennifer Altenhofel, and Leslie Minor about the best way to encourage faculty to fill out such a survey, the extent to which it would be anonymous, and how long it would likely take. Ruby Payne and Jennifer Altenhofel both voiced that they didn’t think of flex time as much of an incentive. Ruby Payne also raised the concern that if the survey was for the whole faculty, the results may not be representative of the faculty planning to attend the May In-Service. Leslie Minor noted that there was a possibility that these would be the same facilitators for future sessions, and it might be helpful for them to have a sense of the faculty as a whole. In response to the discussion, Leslie Minor indicated that she would check in with the facilitators, and that the survey may also be something that faculty could fill out the first day of In-Service.

Ruby Payne raised that she would like to finalize details for this in-service as soon as possible in order to send out the announcement to faculty and move on to scheduling the next round of In-Services.

Leslie Minor noted that in general, it was better to consider the upcoming sessions as being about working with students, as opposed to DEIAA. Jennifer Altenhofel asked if these sessions would be a repeat of the past Title IX training and said that she had no interest in attending if that were the case. Ruby Payne voiced a preference for training about working effectively with a changing population of students.

Jennifer Altenhofel expressed concern about the Professional Development Committee not being sufficiently involved in determining the content for the May In-Service. Ruby Payne clarified that the May In-Service is a contractual obligation for the district, but that the language doesn’t require the district to get faculty approval for the content of the sessions.

Leslie Minor asked for clarification about the committee’s position on the length of the sessions, and whether the agreement was for 7 hours of ‘seat time’ and a 1 hour paid lunch, which would need to be a working lunch. There was discussion of the definition of a working lunch, and Leslie Minor indicated that it could involve lunch being held during a session, or discussion taking place in the lunchroom, but it couldn’t be a break for faculty to go off on their own and then reconvene later.

**5. Building August In-Service Schedule (Aug. 19-23, 2024)**

Ruby Payne asked for confirmation that August 19 – August 23 were the correct dates, and Tabitha Raber confirmed them.

Ruby Payne noted that she is working with session coordinators to finalize the schedule, including a request that the Library Workshop come after Faculty Reports, and that Faculty Reports be two hours. There was discussion of whether or not faculty reports have always been two hours. John Eigenauer suggested that the committee budget two hours and modify that if needed.

Further updates from Ruby Payne were that Friday would likely be faculty reports, followed by the library workshop. And that, because Monday is one of the only days faculty can use flex time, the committee does not think that mandatory events should be scheduled on Monday. Ruby Payne has spoken with Student Services, and the language that Student Services staff can prioritize student appointments during In-Service week has been working well. Other highlights include Tuesday’s welcome back breakfast (1 1/2 hours) and a single offering of the Student Services update.

Ruby Payne raised a question about the plans for Wednesday. In particular, about whether it would be half a day of SLOs and half a day of DEIAA content. She also made the point that we don’t have many new faculty, and that it would be possible to supplement a half day of SLO content with additional training during the term as needed.

A general discussion followed about what would be necessary in terms of Board Policies under these circumstances. Leslie Minor noted that different BPs are linked to different units, and that it was necessary to make sure that there was not a direct conflict between two existing BPs. Jennifer Altenhofel voiced a concern about the process by which the decision to have a BP related to DEIAA content had been made and Leslie Minor noted that this was not the venue for that concern. Leslie Minor also raised the possibility that the existing BP could be rewritten to accommodate the inclusion of both DEIAA and SLO content on a single day, and that given the extent to which the state is connecting SLOs to DEIAA, it is probable that it could be done under the existing BP. Ruby Payne noted that she preferred the BP specifically reflect both, in order to prevent confusion or issues during a time when the college may have new people in leadership roles.

John Eigenauer raised the point that SLO day usually includes time for faculty to work on the SLO data for their courses. Ruby Payne agreed, but said she thought this could be accomplished during a half day. John Eigenauer asked for clarification about whether a half day of SLO content would be just training, just time for faculty to work on their SLOs or some of each. Discussion followed in which both Ruby Payne and Leslie Minor indicated that they thought it was likely to be some combination of training and individual work, but that ultimately this would be decided by the new SLO coordinator. Ruby Payne brought up that depending on the details of common course numbering, there may be substantially less decision-making about SLOs at the local level. Leslie Minor also noted that the format of SLO day was in part a response to an ACCJC finding that the college was not doing enough work with assessment, but that those concerns had largely been addressed. There was additional discussion to the effect that the current arrangement was a result of negotiations between the union and the district, and that a half day of each topic provided time for important material without further complicating an already full week or removing one of the two planning days. There was further discussion about the use of planning day for program review and division planning.

Ruby Payne concluded by noting that Friday would likely have an additional coaches meeting. Leslie Minor asked for clarification and Ruby Payne noted that some coaches were not available for the Monday meeting. Ruby Payne reiterated that Friday would likely also have the academic senate, faculty reports, and the library workshop, but that EEO was still up in the air (but perhaps on Tuesday), along with whatever last-minute changes were made at the administrative level.

Ruby Payne noted that there was an additional email from the Faculty Senate President about a training. John Eigenauer suggested that it could go in faculty reports. Ruby Payne noted that Heather del Rosaria was likely to co-present. There was discussion about whether faculty reports can include an administrator as part of the presentation. Leslie Minor asked what the training topic was. Ruby Payne said it was ASCCC model hiring principles and procedures. There were concerns from the committee about using faculty reports for a hiring practices training that may not be applicable to all faculty.

John Eigenauer moved that the committee consider this item for the January In-Service instead. Ruby Payne seconded and Leslie Minor voiced agreement. Ruby Payne took a vote and the committee voted unanimously to consider this instead for the January In-Service.

Ruby Payne asked Leslie Minor if she had let Michelle Oja know that there were no plans to include an OER session in the May In-Service. Leslie Minor said that she had not but would during their meeting later this week.

Ruby Payne said that she would email a draft schedule for the August In-Service before the next meeting and hoped that the committee would be able to finalize it then.

John Eigenauer asked about the date for the final meeting this term.

Ruby Payne noted that the next meeting was April 10, and that if the committee finishes the business that it needs to, there will be no need for a May meeting.

**6. Next Meeting: April 10, 2024, 12:10pm in Cafeteria Conference Room**

**Meeting Adjourned:**

Adjourned by consensus at 1:03