Professional Growth Committee
Minutes
September 9, 2014

Members Present: Katy Kelley, Kimberly Manner, Manish Patel, Bob Sprague
Guest: Mary-Jo Apigo

1. **Agenda** approved, with one change: Comparison of policies will be moved to the workgroup

2. **Approval of August 4, 2014 Minutes** by consensus

3. **Administrative/Technical Support for Conference Travel and Tuition Reimbursement**
   Helen Lin is still serving as the technical support for the conference travel and tuition reimbursement; however, Academic Affairs would like to see those duties assigned to Administrative Services staff. Bob Sprague noted that Adrienne Foster should raise this issue with the college president in her weekly consultation meeting.

4. **Criteria for Evaluating Tuition Reimbursement Requests**
The committee discussed the historical division of funds between conference travel and tuition reimbursement. Based on what has been allocated for tuition reimbursement over the past five years and based on the importance of ongoing professional development for all faculty, the committee decided to allocate 2/3 of this year’s budget to conference travel and 1/3 to tuition reimbursement. This means that $6265 will be available for tuition reimbursement for 2014-15.

The committee then established criteria for evaluating tuition reimbursement requests, following the guidelines in Article 23.H., which stipulates:

A. *Faculty must be regular, contract, or adjunct on a seniority list.*

B. *Approval of an educational plan that identifies the course or program the faculty member wishes to complete*
   1. priority for approval given to applications with clearly articulated educational plans
   2. priority for approval given to classes related to current job classification

C. *Explain the reasons the faculty member wishes to complete the course or program*
   1. priority given to plans that provide specific reasons the courses will improve their job performance

D. *Explain the benefits the faculty member and the college should derive from that completion*
   1. priority given to plans that provide specific reasons the courses will improve their job performance
2. priority given to programs where people are keeping current in their field because it is important to the institution that people keep current

E. within 60 calendar days of the end of the course, faculty must submit valid proof of tuition paid and successful completion

F. Further criteria need to be determined for years in which more funds are requested than available.
   1. One potential criterion is that a reverse priority system be developed, where faculty who receive funds one year are at the bottom of the priority list the next year in order to spread the wealth around.
   2. The committee discussed awarding a percentage of each approved request to allow more faculty to receive something (but none will receive as much as they requested). The possibility was also discussed of setting a floor below which the entire amount would be funded. Above the floor, faculty would receive a percentage of their request. No decision was made.

G. The committee recommends that future applications tie into Program Review, showing how the courses will advance the goals of the division and the college. Such applications would be weighted more favorably than applications without this connection.

H. The committee also recommends that faculty be provided with an example of an educational plan and a scoring rubric for future application cycles.

I. The committee discussed the possibility of faculty taking one course (not connected to a program). Those faculty could provide either an educational plan or a professional development plan, which shows a program of courses for professional growth. The criterion for evaluation would be how the faculty member plans to apply the proposed course. It should be directly related to his/her professional growth in his/her current field.

J. The committee determined three categories for notification:
   1. Qualified for funding
   2. Approved pending approval of an education plan
   3. Disapproved (with rationale)

K. Decisions on requests for tuition reimbursement:
   1. Five requests were approved.
   2. Four requests were approved pending approval of an educational plan.
3. One request was disapproved because the faculty member was part-time and not on a seniority list.

4. One request was disapproved because the faculty member did not have a clear educational plan, the courses were not related to the faculty member’s current job classification, and the reasons given did not adequately demonstrate benefits to the students, the classroom, or the college.

5. Two requests came in after the deadline and were disapproved.

L. There was consensus that a rubric needs to be developed.

5. **Conference Policy Workgroup**
   B. Sprague offered to have someone in academic affairs gather information about conference policies at other district colleges and put it in a table.

   The following faculty have volunteered to serve on the workgroup:
   - Grace Chee
   - Katy Kelley
   - Mary-Jo Apigo

   The following were suggested as people to invite:
   - Laurimar Escudero (ask her)
   - Chemist (ph.d. from USC)
   - Ask Carmen for recommendations
   - Yervant Boghos

6. **Future meetings**: 2\textsuperscript{nd} Tuesday of the month at 3:15 to 4:30

7. **Next meeting October 14**

Meeting adjourned at 5:15.