



Staff Development
Approved Minutes
October 8, 2007, Room 1603
2:30-4:30 PM

Present: Carolyn Baranouskas, Toby Bielawski, Bob D'Elena, Jackie Fitzgerald, Roni Jennings, Greg Johns, Ann Jones, Laurel Jones, Barbara Morrissey (Chair), Jeff Sperry, Sylvia Rodriguez, Nancy Wright

1. **Call to Order:** 2:32 p.m.

2. **Agenda:**
Barbara reported the addition of 5A: Revising the conference proposal process, and 5B: Technology and Staff Development. Conference approvals will become 5C. The agenda was approved by consensus with revisions as noted.

3. **Approval of Minutes:**
A motion was asked for approval of the minutes for September 10, 2007 as written. (*G. Johns/B. D'Elena*) to approve the minutes as written. *Approved: unanimous.*

4. **Committee Reports:**

A. Constituencies:

1. **Divisions:**
Ms. Fitzgerald reported she did not attend her recent division meeting; however, Zina Rosen-Simon did, and drafted a report, which Ms. Fitzgerald noted was exceptional. Unfortunately she neglected to bring it with her. She will email it to the committee.

Ms. Morrissey reported she attended the MSEPS division meeting. The idea of increasing the Staff Development eligibility was touched upon but no feedback was provided in terms of an amount.

2. **Classified:** No report.

3. **Administration:** No report.

B. Chair's Report:

Ms. Morrissey reported she has met with Dr. Ted Kaye of the LPC Foundation. Official Foundation grant guidelines and criteria will be distributed to everyone soon. The grant program has been slightly modified; refer to Dr. Kaye's email for the specific changes. The deadlines are as follows:

Fall: November 15 due date, December 10 award date.

Spring: April 1 due date, April 25 award date.

The main criteria the Foundation would like to see are for projects that are "above and beyond" in nature. Ms. Wright inquired if these grants are applicable to assist in funding for conferences that are significantly over the \$300 Staff Development eligibility. Ms. Morrissey didn't believe so, but suggested Ms. Wright contact Dr. Kaye for more information. The Foundation budget allocation for the grants was approved at \$62,000 for faculty/staff, and \$100,000 for students. It is not known if there is a grant submittal limit.

Ms. Morrissey reminded everyone that the availability of classified funding is provided for within the Classified contract; Section 15.9. To summarize, it states the district has set aside a total of \$9000 for the use of college fee reimbursements. Any classified individual interested should complete and "Enrollment Fee Application" and submit it to Human Resources. Since Staff Development does not fund higher education units/credits, this can assist in providing funding over and above what they are currently eligible for under Staff Development.

5. **Approval of Conference Proposals:**

A. Revising Process of Proposals Idea:

In an effort to try and streamline the conference proposal review and approval process, Ms. Morrissey proposed setting up the agenda similar to that of the Board; in which the proposals would be approved by consent as a group, if there are no issues with them. In the case there are issues/concerns, they can be noted under a second agenda heading for content concerns, at which time they could be discussed more thoroughly. Ms. Jennings inquired if more than one applicant can be noted on the same form, as it seems it would be more economical to do this for multiple individuals attending the same conference. Ms. Morrissey explained this has generally been discouraged mainly for accounting purposes. It was also her belief that at one time Dr. Jones had also requested they try to be submitted individually. There was a brief discussion about the ramifications of this. Overall no clear consensus was reached. Ms. Morrissey asked everyone to ask themselves "what information do they need to know in order to review the conference proposals?" and give it thought. In the meantime, everyone was conducive to trying the new approach for the next meeting. Copies of the proposals will be copied and distributed as normal; however, it is hoped at some point in the future so much copying will not have to be done.

B. Technology and Staff Development

Mr. Sperry announced that he has partially created the conference request form as a PDF file. This will allow individuals to complete the form online and potentially forward it in an email to Carie Kincaid or the deans, etc. The only issues with this are how the appropriate digital signatures would be obtained and still maintain the security of the signer, and everyone would be required to have the appropriate version of Acrobat installed in order to be able to use it. Mr. Sperry indicated he is working on ways this might be accomplished. In the meantime, he indicated he will finish creating the complete form in PDF and email it to everyone with an example of it can be completed. The goal behind this is to minimize and in some cases eliminate the amount of paperwork being "pushed." An additional benefit would be the ability to create and maintain a digital library of all the proposals. Dr. Jones commented and indicated she is in favor and encourages going down a digital route as much as possible; however, more research especially regarding the security aspects would need to be researched.

C. Approval of Conferences

The following conferences were approved:

#06-08 Debbie Fields \$300

#07-08 James Dobson \$300, out-of-state, pending Board approval. A question arose as to the Staff Development policy, if there is one, for paying the registration fee if it includes a membership or convention fee in it. Typically, Staff Development does not pay for individual memberships, but in some cases when it is consolidated with the registration fee it is allowed.

#08-08 Dale Boercker \$300, out-of-state, pending Board approval. Mr. D'Elena inquired if there is a Staff Development policy for multiple individuals attending the same conference. Ms. Morrissey explained there is currently no policy.

Ms. Bielawski inquired if she should provide her Division report as she was not present during the time they were presented at the beginning of the meeting. She reported the division had a discussion about multiple individuals attending the same conference and voted overwhelmingly in-favor of allowing it. It was their feeling that anyone who wants to attend a conference should be able to. The division also voted in-favor of raising the minimum eligibility amount of \$300/year per person. It was reported that Elena Cole volunteered to attend a Staff Development meeting to present on this.

#09-08 Randy Taylor \$300, out-of-state, pending Board approval.

#10-08 Neva Bandelow \$300

#11-08 Jinna Wilson \$70 - was initially put on-hold for Dr. Jones. The issue with Ms. Wilson's conference request centered on the fact that she intends to apply for available units/credits at the end of the conference, which is being provided by a four-year university. Dr. Jones indicated she doesn't know of a precedent for this within our district, as every college does it differently. Since this is a units/step increase issue, it was proposed it be directed to Human Resources to ascertain if there is a District policy. It was decided it would be noted as "pending approval upon Human Resource review."

#12-08 Catherine Eagan \$168.30

#13-08 Janell Hampton \$145

#14-08 Robert Breuer \$300, out-of-state, pending Board approval.

#15-08 Meghan Swanson \$134.40

#16-08 Michelle Gonzales \$200

#17-08 Karin Spirn \$173.30

#18-08 Elena Cole \$168.30

#19-08 Justin Garoupa \$168.30

#20-08 Janell Hampton \$155

#21-08 Christina Lee \$300

#22-08 Greg Daubenmire \$300, out-of-state, pending Board approval.

6. Budget

A. Approve Draft Budget

A handout of the proposed draft budget was distributed. Ms. Morrissey noted she would like to get an approval of the document. Mr. D'Elena inquired if the term "unused" could be changed to state "un-allocated" for the remaining unused balance. There was an inquiry about how much was rolled over from last year. \$11,000 was rolled over from last year; however, Ms. Morrissey cautioned everyone that this is not the normal. In years past the President and the Business Office have allowed a roll-over, but with the coming of a new president this may change. One item noted a discussion may need to occur about is the reimbursement of mileage for the Great Teachers conference. In the past, requests have averaged between \$500-600.

There was a brief discussion about the cost of airfare versus driving, and whether or not some type of cap/ceiling should be

placed on it. Dr. Jones responded she thought the policy stated that if the mileage equaled or exceeded the cost of airfare, then airfare should be chosen. Ms. Morrissey indicated she was not aware of this and was unclear if it was a valid policy.

It was suggested it be noted on the budget document that this issue is "pending travel/mileage revision."

(B. D'Elena/R. Jennings) to approve the draft budget with changes as noted. Approved: unanimous.

7. **Focus Group for Accreditation - Dr. Amber Machamer**

Ms. Morrissey indicated that talking points would be done for this portion of the meeting. Discussion centered on the SLO assessment cycle and Dialogue. Some highlights were:

- Dr. Machamer provided a brief explanation of the handouts she provided. For the SLO assessment cycle it was reported a course embedded model has been chosen by the SLO Committee.
- There are three aspects to the cycle at the micro-level: Plan, Implement, and Feedback Loop. On a more macro-level, it is viewed at the course level and how the data aggregates upward.
- The software program chosen for this process is eLumen.
- Program level - what are the elements?
- It was explained that if there is no major, program level SLO's don't need to be done.
- Where does Staff Development "fit into" this process?
- Proposed future of Staff Development per BRB (Big Red Book) was to eventually move from a committee to a program. It is unclear if this is still going occur.
- Ms. Fitzgerald reported her division felt Staff Development could be more accessible as well as promote more within SLO's.
- The question was put forth as to when do we (Staff Development) see us in relation to SLO's?
- Ms. Bielawski commented that Staff Development is extremely important and crucial in assisting to provide funding opportunities to faculty/staff, especially for adjuncts working in conjunction with full-time faculty on various projects and mini-grants.
- Dr. Jones indicated she is anxious to see what "themes" start to emerge after the first cycle of assessments is complete.
- There was a brief discussion centered on resources and their allocation. A couple suggestions considered to be on-campus resources available to most are the Innovation Center, and the Computer Center in room 803. It was expressed that much of the time there appears to be a lack of communication about the availability/accessibility of resources in general.
- Dr. Jones indicated she would like to see an archiving/professional development site created and used as a resource.
- A definition of Dialogue was read. Several questions about dialoguing on campus were asked.
- It was suggested a student representative sit on the committee again.
- Mr. Johns suggested the creation of an anonymous suggestion box.
- Ms. Fitzgerald indicated she felt it was important to encourage others to attend Staff Development meetings and present their proposals and/or mini-grants in an effort to provide for greater understanding.

- Staff Development is/should be a catalyst for a cross representation of ideas and fostering interactions.
- Town Meeting: What is its purpose today? Is it still an appropriate venue to foster trust and does it provide an opportunity for dialogue?
- An opportunity and a choice to be a part of dialogue should be ever present.
- The difference between “sharing” and formal dialogue. What is it? Is there a need for both? How can both be accommodated?
- Is there enough time at meetings to discuss and sometimes make decisions on important items? Most committee members answered no.
- Ms. Wright indicated the sharing of materials and ideas to be of extreme importance. She highlighted the Brain workshop held last year. Staff Development can assist in the “percolation” of these types of ideas and events.
- It was suggested more positive guest speakers could be invited to speak on campus.

In conclusion Dr. Machamer was thanked for her presentation.

8. Good of the Order
No report.

9. Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.