

# Professional Development and Training (2019-2020)

## Meeting Notes

<b>NAME OF COUNCIL/TEAM:</b> Professional Development and Training (2019-2020)			
<b>OBJECTIVE OF MEETING:</b> Review & revise draft documents			
<b>DATE:</b> 11/15/2019 <b>TIME:</b> 1:30pm		<b>LOCATION/ROOM #:</b> Student Center Board Room <b>CALL-IN NUMBER:</b> <b>CALL-IN CODE:</b>	
<b>FACILITATOR(S):</b> Alisa Shubb & Olga Prizhbilov			
<b>TIMEKEEPER:</b>			
<b>ASSISTANT:</b> Olga Prizhbilov			
<b>MEMBERS PRESENT:</b> Yesenia Castellon, Alice Dieli, Emilie Mitchell, Olga Prizhbilov, Alisa Shubb, Christina Wagner, Cheri Jones.			
<b>SUPPORTING RESOURCES (ITEMS READ IN PREPARATION FOR AND/OR BROUGHT TO MEETING):</b>			
<b>UPDATES AND BRIEF REPORTS:</b>			
<b>Topic</b>	<b>Person(s) Responsible</b>	<b>Notes</b>	
PD meetings with Thomas Greene - report back	Alisa, Olga, Pam, Corrine, Jen	President Greene wants to get a jump start on potential recommendations prior to his departure as President of the college. President Greene was in support of ideas so far. He will now be able to look into the human and other resources based on the tentative recommendations. If we finish the competencies during this semester, we can present it at Spring Convocation and get feedback from faculty and staff about the categories and any other needed feedback.	
<b>ACTION ITEMS:</b>			
<b>Question</b>	<b>Person(s) Responsible</b>	<b>Notes and Decision(s)</b>	<b>Next Steps</b>
Which draft structure best suits our needs? 1) Version 3a - utilizing a thematic approach directly tied to elements of the Institutional Equity Plan 2) Version 3b - utilizing a simplified approach organized by competencies (to be determined)	Alisa	0	Version 3b seems better for the group. 3a is more about implementation whereas 3b is about our overall vision and plan and is closer to the charge of this group.
<b>DISCUSSION ITEMS:</b>			
<b>Question</b>	<b>Person(s) Responsible</b>	<b>Notes and Next Steps</b>	
Is there any additional feedback or input for earlier work? a) barriers to participation b) philosophy of professional development	Alisa	Barriers to Participation: - 9th bullet point - need to add "and student workers"	
		-for manager role: strong tie to equity -whatever roles we end up with, the reason for having a manager is to have the financial and advocacy pull that faculty or classified would not have. - The Institutional Effectiveness	

Review Essential Conditions: what feedback, input, or clarifications do we have for the following areas ? a) ample staffing b) thoughtful input c) appropriate space d) sufficient time e) supportive management culture	Alisa	<p>Council team makeup can potentially be modified in order to meet the goals of Institutional PD (e.g. Steering group or advisory committee for PD)</p> <p>-Reassigned time/A or B leaves - could potentially be integrated into PD (e.g. curriculum revisions, train the trainer PD).</p> <p>- Supportive management culture: this is one of the biggest essential conditions. Without it, most other things may not happen. Managers need to also attending/participating in PD.</p> <p>- some PD needs to not be outlined by classified/faculty/management. Viewing all employees as "educators". We can start using this verbiage in this PD Plan document to start the culture of calling everyone educators, sometimes pointing out what would be included in that (e.g. classified, faculty, management, students, temp staff, etc.).</p>
Considering the idea of individual PD plans: -are these an essential condition? - how can we clarify this idea? -how might individual PD plans be realized in our current system?	Alisa	<p>- Vision for Success from the State might help with this. We could link PD attended to someone's record (e.g. applications on LRCCD).</p>
Review Suggested Classified Employee Competencies and consider the following: - would these competencies comprehensively address classified professional development needs? - could these competencies also be used to accurately describe faculty and management professional development needs / if not, what additional competencies would need to be added? - how well do these competencies address PD needs described in the Institutional Equity Plan? - how well does the language/title of each of these competencies resonate?	Alisa	<p>- Competencies can be through an equity lens or can have a separate competency for Equity. Leaning toward the first.</p> <p>- 1st competency - could be title differently: maybe "Equity-minded Service"</p> <p>- As a team, will go through and see which things are not specifically addressing faculty and add them. Might need an additional competency related to faculty - for curriculum.</p>
<b>ITEMS FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION:</b>		
<b>Topic</b>	<b>Contact Person</b>	
How might we test the comprehensiveness of the PD competencies and how well they resonate with all ARC educator employees?		
How can new employee training ensure that incoming hired are prepared for their individual job function AND to support ARC goals and participation in the college environment?		