



Staff Development

March 10, 2008, Room 1603

2:30-4:30 PM

(Approved) Meeting Minutes

Present: Carolyn Baranouskas, Bob, Jackie, Greg Johns, Ann Jones, Roni Jennings, Laurel Jones, Jeff Sperry, Nancy Wright

Absent: Toby Bielawski, Barbara Morrissey, Sylvia Rodriguez

1. **Call to Order:** 2:35 p.m. It was noted that Jackie would be facilitating, as Barbara was out ill.

2. **Agenda:**
It was requested proposal #40-08 be moved approval by consensus to discussion. Amended agenda was approved.

3. **Approval of Minutes:**
(B. D'Elena/A. Jones) to approve the minutes of February 11, 2008 as written.
Approved: unanimous.

4. **Committee Reports:**

A. Constituencies:

1. **Divisions:** Jackie reported that Joel Kinnamon attended the Division meeting for her group recently. It was announced that dean Birgitte Ryslinge is leaving the college in June.

2. **Classified:** No report.

3. **Administration:** No report.

B. Chair's Report:

Barbara Morrissey was out ill. No report was provided. It was noted that this is the first time since anyone can remember that Barbara has missed a meeting.

5. **Approval of Conference Proposals:**
The following conferences (37,38,39,42) were approved by consensus:

#37-08 LaVaughn Hart \$300

#38-08 Keith Level \$300

#39-08 Lisa Everett \$300

#42-08 Nancy Wright \$300

Two (2) conferences required discussion, one of which had already been approved via a virtual vote. The other required further clarification regarding expenses.

#40-08 Tiina Hukari – An inquiry was made regarding how the amounts were arrived at, specifically regarding transportation and meals. A written response provided by Ms. Hukari was read. After a brief discussion, the proposal was approved for \$300. Nancy inquired as to why the conference form asks for all expenses to be noted when the costs of the conference exceed the \$300 maximum eligibility. It was explained it legitimizes expenses for accounting/tax purposes.

#41-08 Marilyn Marquis, Richard Dry, Michelle Gonzales, Karin Spirn, Catherine Eagan – Conference proposal was approved via virtual vote. This was due to the timing of the conference and the Staff Development meeting date. Normally, multiple individuals on one proposal are not favored; however, at the request of Dr. Jones, an allowance was made. Dr. Jones provided a detailed accounting of the circumstances which led up to the manner in which this was submitted. It was explained the division dean has paid the costs and will likely require reimbursement. A discussion ensued regarding deadline enforcement and consistency. Many committee members felt overall enforcement is required; however, exceptions will arise and Staff Development should maintain overall flexibility. It was suggested perhaps Staff Development language for conference proposals could be reflected as “guidelines not deadlines.” Others noted deadlines are necessary for processing purposes.

Roni brought a situation to the attention of the committee regarding a conference proposal request for Angella VenJohn. As with the request made by Dr. Jones for #41-08, she requested flexibility from the committee. She explained that she believed Ms. VenJohn wanted to use her previously approved yet unused \$300 towards a new conference (she didn’t attend the one she was approved for.) Roni believed Ms. VenJohn may not have submitted any paperwork for the new conference believing that she had already been approved and the \$300 would “roll-over” to the new conference. It was requested an exception be made.

Concern was raised that paperwork was not submitted, and was not present at the meeting. Ms. VenJohn was contacted and within several minutes, a conference proposal form was presented. It was noted to have been located in the folder on Barbara’s door. *It was passed around for review; a motion was made to approve (G. Johns/L. Jones) for \$300. It was approved unanimously.* Roni kept the paperwork to obtain proper signatures. It will be forwarded onto Staff Development.

A discussion ensued regarding the meaning of Staff Development deadlines and rules. Several committee members highlighted “it is the nature of this campus to allow for exceptions to the rule; it is just part of our campus climate.” All were in agreement that specific rules and guidelines are required; however, it was unclear how much rigidity is desired or necessary. One suggestion was to consider taking “points off” for late conference proposal submittals. It was not clear what those “points” would be.

6. **Budget Update**

A simplified conference proposal budget sheet was distributed. Its intention was to allow committee members the opportunity to see what types of conferences their colleagues are attending, as well as provide a general idea of where Staff Development is as far as funding and approvals. Several procedural inquiries pertaining to notations and various abbreviations arose and were clarified. It was noted several individuals applied for and were approved conference monies in the Fall, but to date have not applied for reimbursement. Carie Kincaid provided a brief explanation and indicated reminder emails have been sent but no response has been received.

This prompted a discussion about whether or not a more "stringent" warning should be distributed one week prior to the 30-day deadline. No conclusion as to whether or not this should be a formal procedure was reached; however, it was noted one additional reminder would be distributed shortly. Also, many committee members felt it was not fair to keep the monies encumbered when others may desire going to conferences.

7. **Summer Conferences**

A brief discussion ensued and parameters were outlined. It was understood that funding will be taken out of next year's budget; the conferences will count towards that individual's 2008-09 eligibility, and will be on a first come, first served basis. It was proposed the same amount of conferences offered last year (6) be offered again for a total of \$1,800.00. A motion was asked for to approve six (6) \$300 summer conferences.

(G. Johns/R. Jennings) to approve \$1,800.00 for the funding of six (6) \$300 summer conferences. Approved: unanimous.

It was requested that Barbara send out an announcement such as she has done in the past.

8. **Program Planning**

In Barbara's absence it was unclear what this item might pertain to exactly. Initially, it was thought it may be the standard update on various programs Staff Development is working on. Dr. Jones noted it may pertain to the program review model she touched upon at a previous meeting. It was noted it may not be a bad idea to have Staff Development undergo a program review of sorts. This would create a "skeletal" outline which would be of assistance when seeking fiscal funding for Staff Development through the President's office. It was requested this be an agenda item next month. Dr. Jones inquired as to what type of activities the committee would like to see funded next year. Ideas consisted of:

- Flex Day(s) - It is believed there is one (1) Flex Day scheduled. It was clarified Flex Days are coordinated by the Academic Senate President and the Staff Development Coordinator.
- Motivational Speaker(s)
- Intellectual dialogue discussion opportunities - as commented upon by Dr. Pollard.

- A “college hour”
- More brown bag lunch topics.

9. **Conference Monies for Mid-year Resignations**

The discussion picked up from where it left off last month. Bob read a word smithed statement drafted by Nancy, which recently was distributed to all the committee members via email. Nancy volunteered to keep word smithing it should the committee decide they would like her to do so. As with the previous discussion, many of the same concerns were raised with determining a policy for mid-year conference monies. Concerns consisted of:

- How does information get shared/brought back to the college?
- How would the information be able to be used in the classroom to be effective?
- What if the individual in question has no one to advocate for them?
- Where is the line drawn considering there are so many variations and circumstances?
- How much enforceability does the committee want to have? Does the committee want to become the “conference police?”
- How is fairness to all maintained?
- Is it better to have a specific policy or review on a case by case basis? How flexible does the committee want to be?
- What happens if an individual is teaching or employed less than a fiscal year or semester? Late replacements? Should this be at the discretion of the committee?
- Setting consistent parameters or “one size fits all?”

It was suggested that since these situations appear to be rare occurrences, perhaps a policy is not needed. Does the committee want to invest the time and effort it may take to draft a policy that may be utilized only rarely? In the end, it was decided Nancy would continue to word smith it in an effort to broadly address the concerns highlighted. She will keep providing updates to the committee for feedback. The committee was leaning more towards a broad statement, which would serve as a guideline and allow for committee discretion rather than a specific policy; however, there was concern this could become to ambiguous.

10. **Good of the Order**

Bob reported he participated in a recent new faculty orientation workshop. Of the seven (7) new faculty, only three (3) were able to attend. It was hosted by LaVaughn Hart and Barbara Morrissey. There is expected to be at least one more workshop this semester. Due to the difficulty in getting faculty together with such diverse schedules, it was suggested the next event be held on a Friday morning in an effort to improve attendance.

11. **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.