Professional Development Committee  
Thursday, March 6, 2104  
3:00 – 4:30 pm  

Attending: Kris Abrahamson, Katie Gerber, Scott Rosen, Mary Sandberg, Todd Straus.  
Absent: Tracy Ruelle, Amy Ethington, Sabrina Meyer, Deirdre Frontczak, Betsy Fischer, Jerry Thao

1) **Note-taker:** Mary (Todd volunteered for next meeting)

2) **Approval of minutes:** No Quorum, moved to next meeting for approval

3) **Reports:**
   - Co-chair report: Call for Proposals has gone out. Proposals are being submitted.
   - Campus Reports: No Report
   - Academic Senate: No Report
   - Human Resources: No Report
   - Academic Affairs: 2 Leadership trainings have been scheduled. One already held, 6 new Dean’s attended. Was opened to all. Next training by KC Greaney will take place in April.

4) **Spring PDA Debrief.** The group discussed spring PDA and reviewed the PDA summary to be sent to Senate and College Presidents. General consensus from the feedback is that this program seemed to have the right number of workshops and a good distribution between the sessions.

5) **Fall 2014 PDA Day.** Discussion on Theme - Due to time constraints and low committee attendance, it was decided to gather the input of all committee members via email and then proceed with submitting the agreed upon ideas by end of week for input from the senate and college Presidents.

   The committee put forward the following suggestion:

   **“Growing Together”**

   This theme captures multiple aspects of this moment in SRJC’s history:
   - We are launching the strategic plan which is aimed at common goals
   - We appear to be through the worst of the budget constraints and headed into a growth phase
   - This is an event that bring us all together to grow in our professional and personal development
   - It builds on the “Seeds of change” and “Cultivating Success…” theme of the most recent PDA days

   Mary will send an email to the committee with this information.

6) **PDC Charter Discussion.** Update on activities since the last meeting. At the last PDC meeting, the committee had voted to have Katie and Mary draft an e-mail to members of College Council to introduce the changes and the rationale for the revisions. In working on this, various questions about due process came up (had PDC committee voted to approve the changes? – there was no indication of this in past PDC meeting minutes), and when comparing the current charter with the proposed changes it appeared the new charter as drafted reduced the scope of the PDC committee itself.  
   
   (Was this what was intended?)

   Subsequently, a meeting between Scott, Robin and Mary Kay occurred. Scott reported that at this meeting the issue of the number of representatives to the committee came up, and it became clear that Academic Senate, and Academic Affairs were not in agreement with the proposed representation on the committee. Their position is faculty should have a greater representation because they have a requirement for Professional Development. The initial proposal had recommended increasing classified representation from 4 to 6, maintaining 6 faculty positions and 2 administrator positions. Kris had a separate meeting with the AFA
president, who also expressed disagreement with this part of the revisions. Based on this feedback, this piece of the proposed charter revisions would have difficulty getting approval through College Council, and further development by PDC would be required.

In PDC, this concern about equal representation raised questions about the committee’s authority. The proposed charter revision state PDC makes recommendations but actions required input and approval of the Presidents of the Senates and the College. (note: this issue was not addressed in this meeting; impact of revisions to the existing charter remains an open item for PDC discussion). Scott presented four bullet points raised by Robin and Mary Kay to support a faculty majority representation. A lively discussion ensued. Mary felt the issue of committee authority and number of constituent representatives needed to be addressed together. If the committee, as proposed by the revisions, is not a decision-making body, why would having an equal number of representatives matter? Kris offered the compromise of 5 classified positions; 2 appointed by SEIU, 2 by Classified Senate, and one by position (professional development coordinator). Due to lack of quorum and the low number of attendees to participate in this dialogue, no resolution was concluded in this meeting. The issue will be brought back to PDC for further discussion of the full committee.

7) **Spring All Staff Needs Assessment Survey**: Moved to next meeting. This item needs to be finalized so the survey can go out before summer break.

Next meeting: 4/3/14 - PDA workshop proposals to be reviewed.