



**ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE**  
**FACULTY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**  
**February 23, 2011**  
**2:00 p.m. – A140**

To conform to the open meeting act, the public may attend open sessions

- 1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**
- 2. OPENING COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIR**
- 3. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**
- 4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
  - a. December 8, 2010 (attachment)
- 5. ACTION ITEMS**
  - a. 4C/SD Membership 2011 – 2012 \$125.00
- 6. DISCUSSION ITEMS**
  - a. Spring 2011 WBD Debrief/Evaluation
  - b. Proposal Ranking Process (attachment)
  - c. SB 1440 Training (attachment)
  - d. 4C/SD Conference – March 25, 2011 (\$50.00 pp)
- 7. OTHER**
  - Review / Approve Plans/Contracts
- 8. ADJOURNMENT**

**NON-DISCRIMINATION POLICY**

Antelope Valley College prohibits discrimination and harassment based on sex, gender, race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry, age, disability, marital status, sexual orientation, cancer-related medical condition, or genetic predisposition. Upon request, we will consider reasonable accommodation to permit individuals with protected disabilities to (1) complete the employment or admission process, (b) perform essential job functions, (c) enjoy benefits and privileges of similarly-situated individuals without disabilities, and (d) participate in instruction, programs, services, activities, or events.



**ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE  
FACULTY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT  
COMMITTEE MINUTES**

**February 23, 2011  
2:00 p.m. – A140**

To conform to the open meeting act, the public may attend open sessions

**1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

Kathryn Mitchell, Faculty Professional Development Chair, called the meeting to order at 2:04 p.m.

**2. OPENING COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIR**

- Ms. Mitchell announced the committee received several complements on coordinating the Spring Welcome Back Day. Two appreciation cards were received from Ms. Melanie Parker, Student Learning Outcomes Co-Chair, and from Alpha Iota Club Members.
- The Exemplary Program Award was announced. The award went to Chaffey College and MiraCosta College. She offered her gratitude to committee members for supporting the nomination of the FPD Program.
- Ms. Mitchell reported she received a request for the committee to consider hosting a Faculty Welcome Back Day program for the Palmdale Campus. She informed the interested faculty to submit a proposal for committee consideration.

**3. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**

None

*A motion was made and seconded to amend the February 23, 2011 agenda to include the approval of minutes for the December 1, 2010 FPD meeting. Motion carried.*

**4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**a. December 1, 2010 (attachment)**

A motion was made and seconded to approve the December 1, 2010 FPD meeting minutes. Motion carried.

**b. December 8, 2010 (attachment)**

Ms. Mitchell reported the agenda included the inaccurate date for the FPD meeting minutes. The December 8, 2010 minutes have not been drafted for approval due to various reasons. The draft of the December 8, 2010 FPD meeting minutes will be created for approval at the March 9, 2011 meeting. This particular action item was postponed until the March 9, 2011 meeting.

**5. ACTION ITEMS**

**a. 4C/SD Membership 2011 – 2012 (\$125.00)**

A motion was made and seconded to approve the 4C/SD Membership subscription for the 2011 – 2012 academic year. Dr. Tom O'Neil inquired if the renewing the membership is worth the cost? Ms. Mitchell indicated the membership costs allows the college and the FPD Chair to maintain a direct connection with other college Chairs and programs. It is a great networking opportunity to see what other colleges are struggling with and how they go about resolving campus issues for professional development, so the costs are minimal in terms of the networking opportunity available to the committee. Several times throughout the year there are many emails that are distributed to members via a list serve to acquire specific program information. It is the only means to maintain immediate networking connections with other FPD Chairs and program requirements. Motion carried.

**6. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**a. Spring 2011 WBD Debrief/Evaluation**

The spring 2011 WBD Evaluation submission deadline is set for Monday, February 21, 2011. The Senate Office is currently tallying submitted evaluation forms and will provide a breakdown of the information at the next meeting. The overall response for the Spring Welcome Back Day (WBD) was more than anticipated. We had approximately 101 faculty sign up to attend the Online Open House

presentation. There was a serious problem reported by one of the faculty presenters of the Online Open House presentation. Upon the commencement of the spring term the faculty member realized his online course information had been edited. Some of the information had even been deleted. The faculty member didn't realize a participant edited and even deleted some of his online course material during the open house presentation. He had to scramble to recreate what was lost and informed the session coordinator about the issue. Ms. Jennifer Gross indicated she has a possible solution to avoid this from ever happening again for future online open house events. Committee engaged in a brief discussion on how this could have occurred and why there wasn't a guest access account made for this event. In order to provide guest access to individual course shells each participant would have a blackboard log in for each course shell they were showcasing. The process would have been too extensive to initiate in the time frame prior to the Spring WBD. In addition, it would be difficult to clearly identify individual participants for a workshop offered during a WBD. This particular event had 101 faculty signed up to attend which is a great deal of leg work to do prior to an event when not all registered participants actually attend due to various reasons. Ms. Mitchell reiterated that Ms. Gross had a possible solution for future events and the committee should wait to make any conclusions on this matter until Ms. Gross is able to elaborate her possible solution on this matter.

Committee members engaged in a brief discussion regarding the personal feedback they received regarding the Spring Welcome Back Day. The feedback many received was positive. Several committee members reported faculty expressed their hope to continue this Professional Development opportunity in future program years. In addition, several expressed the desire to keep the Welcome Back Days in the timeframe similar to the spring which is shorter. Furthermore, many faculty expressed their desire to keep the WBD as a Non mandatory day because the atmosphere was much more light hearted and had a different atmosphere. Ms. Mitchell informed committee members, the fall Welcome Back Day is mandatory and included in the contract language. We do not have authority to change the hour requirement but can suggest it to Administration, Senate, and Faculty Union. Committee members were encouraged to remember the Fall WBD includes a longer General Session and individual Division Meetings which is why the day is longer but will forward the suggestion to Administration, the Senate, and the Faculty Union.

**b. Proposal Ranking Process (attachment)**

Ms. Mitchell presented a draft of FPD Proposal Ranking Process language/schematic and requested for committee members to review drafted language/schematic for input. Last year committee members indicated the need to have a Proposal Ranking Rubric to have when rating submitted proposals for approval. She took the language used to establish guidelines and is soliciting the committee's input for finalization. Committee members reviewed the draft and identified the ranking numbers were reversed in order and inaccurately reflected. The ranking system was established to remove bias to presenters or topic but to establish criteria based system where committee members are merely determining if the proposed event meets specific standard criteria. Committee members engaged in a lengthy discussion on whether the criteria would be inclusion of the different elements within each guideline and whether the ranking system should be established as an "either" "or" system. The previous ranking system was established to rate individual proposal as "3" for an excellent proposal, "2" for a good proposal, and "1" for a fair proposal. Committee members were concerned whether there should be individual ranking systems for Faculty Academy proposals versus College Colloquia proposals. They discussed whether the rating system should be similar with separate criteria for each classification of proposals. Committee members had the following suggestions regarding the ranking process:

Ms. Casey Scudmore suggested removing the personal bias on ranking proposals by awarding a point for each area the proposal meets the criteria.

Mr. Ty Mettler suggested including a system where a rating of "3" would mean the proposal meets three or more of the stipulated criteria. A rating of "2" would reflect the proposal meets two or more of the stipulated criteria. A "1" rating would mean the proposal meets only one area stipulated in the criteria guidelines.

Dr. Cynthia Lehman suggested the committee review the guideline criteria and put them in order of most value to least, and establish a line delineating where the rating of "3" cuts off and then establish a line to delineate the criteria for "2" ratings, and so forth. She indicated the committee should be responsible to determine what the most valuable attribute of proposed events should be and not allow the guideline language to create a barrier to establish a rating system.

Mr. Mark Hoffer suggested adding language about innovative and timeliness of proposals in the new program language so that the language is inclusive of current topics.

Ms. Rona Brynin suggested creating a rating system that is in line of a rubric to eliminate any potential bias in rating submitted proposals.

Ms. Mitchell announced establishing a ranking process was something the committee requested to establish and the committee should really consider the current program guideline language, as well as take into consideration the Chancellor's Office requirements when determining the overall rating of a proposal. The ranking process is not to be biased based on what an individual committee member deems as an interesting event but if it meets the specified program requirements. Ms. Mitchell announced, she would take all the input provided by committee members and draft two models of a proposal ranking system for review, revise, and approve. She emphasized the importance of getting a ranking process approved in the next meeting as the timeline to approve submitted proposals is very tight and the Senate Office must have sufficient time to notify faculty of the outcome of submitted proposals prior to the end of the semester.

**c. SB 1440 Training (attachment)**

The committee received a request to consider awarding professional development credit for faculty required to attend and work on SB 1440 degrees. Mr. Tom Graves has requested the committee consider awarding credit to all faculty working on establishing SB 1440 degrees. A brief overview of SB 1440 was provided to committee members to provide pertinent background information. The Transfer Bill is required by the state and all community colleges must work towards establishing a minimum of two transfer degrees by the end of the 2010 – 2011 academic year. One of the degrees being established is the Communication Studies degree. Statewide Academic Senate and the California State University constituencies have been working collaboratively to establish core courses and elective opportunities for all transfer degrees. At this point, local faculty must simply determine if we have the courses required in the core and select elective courses to meet the minimum requirements established and approved by the Chancellor's Office. Mr. Graves indicated faculty are awarded credit for SLO and CurricUNET work and training. He deemed the work required to meet the Chancellor's Office SB 1440 requirements in line with what is required for SLO and CurricUNET. Committee members engaged in discussion regarding this matter and were in consensus that the webinar training merits two hours of Standard #1 credit, although the actual curriculum submission and identification is deemed part of a faculty's contractual obligation. Faculty are paid to create, revise, and submit course curriculum. Meeting the requirements established in SB 1440 is not any different than what is currently expected of discipline faculty. The Transfer Degree model for every discipline is currently being established or has been established for faculty to review discipline courses in efforts to match courses listed in specific discipline models.

**d. 4C/SD Conference – March 25, 2011 (\$50.00 pp)**

Ms. Mitchell reported there is a Professional Development Conference opportunity being hosted by the 4C/SD Consortium. The conference will include breakout sessions regarding current issues impacting Professional Development Programs. The most significant right now is the budget and required changes implemented at the State level in the Chancellor's Office. It will provide a direct insight on what other community colleges are struggling with and hear first hand the direction the Chancellor's Office will be moving in the upcoming year. Ms. Mitchell requested the committees to consider approving the registration costs for herself as well as Ms. Gloria Kastner, the Academic Senate Coordinator. Committee members were in consensus to approve the conference registration costs required to send both Ms. Mitchell and Ms. Kastner. An action item will be established for the February 23, 2011 FPD Meeting.

**7. OTHER**

- Review/Approve Plans/Contracts
- Dr. Tom O'Neil announced the TechEd Conference will be hosted in Palm Springs, CA during the month of March. It is a great opportunity to glean what new technological software and hardware is going to be available to implement in the classrooms.
- Beginning March 8<sup>th</sup>, Dr. Ed Beyer will be hosting orientation opportunities for faculty interested in learning about 2<sup>nd</sup> Life. This software is being used as part of instruction at well known universities. It

is a great orientation opportunity for faculty to consider implementing as part of their instruction. Look for flyer announcements which will be distributed in the upcoming weeks.

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the February 23, 2011 Faculty Professional Development (Flex) Committee meeting at 3:16 p.m. Motion carried.

<b>MEMBERS PRESENT</b>			<b>ABSENT MEMBERS</b>
Rae Agahari	Jack Halliday	Linda Noteboom	Jennifer Gross
Rona Brynin	Mark Hoffer	Dr. Tom O'Neil	Tatiana Konovalav
Magdalena Caproiu	Cindy Lehman	Santi Tafarella	Erin Stein
Richard Coffman	Ty Mettler	Casey Scudmore	Scott Tuss
Rosa Fuller	Kathryn Mitchell		Sharon Lowry
			<i>Vacant Confidential Mngmt. Union Rep.</i>