

## Faculty Professional Development Committee - Meeting Minutes

*Date | time* 02.26.26 | 1:30 PM – 2:45 PM | *Location* Senate Chambers, 145 Doyle <https://santarosa-edu.zoom.us/j/83825727766> (link did not work so we used <https://santarosa-edu.zoom.us/j/84236341327>)

### Members Present

<b>Voting Membership</b>	John Stover (Faculty - AS)	Rebecca Stoddard (Faculty - AS)	Jessica Harris (Faculty – AS)
	Ann Foster (Faculty - AS)	Robert Bisordi (Faculty - AS) <b>Absent</b>	
	Alexa Forrester (Faculty - AS)	Tim Melvin (Faculty - AFA)	

### Agenda Items

- **The Meeting was Called to Order:** 1:40 pm. by Committee Chair J. Stover.
- **Open Forum:** There were no requests or statements made during open forum.
- **Welcome:** Committee Chair welcomed all to the meeting.
- **Approval of the Agenda:** A. Forrester moved to re-number item #8 Tour of the Center for Excellence in Teaching, (CETL) to after #11 and finish the meeting with the tour of CETL. Seconded. The meeting agenda is approved with the recommendation to adjust the agenda order.
- **Approval of the Minutes:** A. Forrester moved to approve the minutes from the January 22, 2026, meeting. Seconded. All in favor.
- **Review of Internal Processes related to Discussion and Action Items and Making Recommendations:** Committee Chair reviewed the process which will help navigate the FPDC meetings along the same lines as Senate meetings.
  - Suggesting discussing items at least twice in Faculty Professional Development prior to taking the item to the Academic Senate.
  - If the item is straight forward, then it can go directly to Academic Senate.
  - Reviewed the process of proposing items as a committee for an agendized topic.
  - Making a recommendation then a second, then open for discussion.
  - Need a simple majority to pass a recommendation.
  - Note that when a recommendation is made to the Academic Senate it then goes to the Academic Senate as a Consent Item. If the Senators want to talk about the item, they can move it to a Discussion item.
  - The committee reviewed and agreed that this is reasonable, and transparent but not overly burdensome.
- Senator Melvin motioned that when discussing something controversial, that it is discussed at least two times in Faculty Professional Development and if approved then recommend that it go to Academic Senate as a Consent item. Seconded. All in favor.
- Senator Melvin motioned those non-controversial items, meaning that it is clear and unanimous and agreed

upon that it will not need to be discussed two times. Seconded. All in favor.

- ***Final Debrief and Next Steps on Vision Resource Center Adoption:***

The committee discussed experiences and concerns regarding the Vision Resource Center (VRC).

Committee Member, A. Foster reached out to the following sites to see if they are using VRC and how it is being used. College of Marin, De Anza, Pasadena, and Fullerton. The information gathered and shared with the committee. A discussion took place regarding:

- While some features are appreciated, overall usage has been inconsistent, and the system is described as cumbersome and requires significant time and knowledge to manage effectively.
- The system is currently used by managers and classified staff, but faculty do not have access. If faculty were included, they would be added to the existing structure.
- There are concerns about the time investment required to learn and manage the system locally, particularly given recent requests for additional release time and limited professional development funding.
- Questions remain about potential district costs, both financial and in terms of personnel training.
- Some existing systems are being phased out, a replacement will be needed.
- The platform lacks certain desired features, such as a calendar, and relies on templates for communication.
- There is interest in exploring limited or hybrid use of the system to at least access professional development opportunities, understanding that the tracking reporting will not be functioning.
- Reach out to Marin and ask if they can share their tracking model with SRJC.
  - A. Foster offered to reach out to Marin and see if they can give this committee a presentation.
- Ask HR to build a mock client and show the committee a demonstration.
- This item will come back with more information and presentations.

- ***PDA Day Related Concerns:***

- A discussion took place regarding the structure and purpose of Professional Development (PD) days, particularly in relation to required flex hours and IDEAA training. When IDEAA training was adopted, six hours were designated for that purpose. There have been increased requests for more department-specific activities during PD days.
- PD activities take place in the fall, typically on the Friday before classes begin or the Wednesday before the semester starts. As the calendar committee begins planning the 16-week academic calendar, could the group consider whether to make recommendations about how PD days are structured.
- Key discussion points included:
  - Whether PD days should prioritize bringing the entire college together or allow time for department-specific work.
  - A possible structure of 12 total flex hours, with six hours dedicated to IDEAA (or AFA-related requirements) and six hours designated for department-focused activities.
  - Possibility of dividing time differently 4 and 8.
  - The idea of reinstating or maintaining a department designated day.

- ***Future Agenda Items:***

- ***Announcements/Information:***

- ***Tour of the Center for Excellence in Teaching (CETL)*** – A tour of CETL took place by the committee. It was reviewed the location and the need for a conference table in the location. Concerns with privacy were raised with the location of the conference table. Suggestions made of where to locate the table.