

Summary Notes August 31, 2006

Attending: Stephen Woodhams, Barabara Worthington, Marcia Corcoran, Bill Johnson, Michelle Sherry, Arlene DeLeon, Gloria Meada, Roise Mogle, Dennis Chowenhill, Judy Young, Carolyn Arnold (guest)

Congrats to all for a peppy and perfectly segueing meeting...you're good.

- I. **Budget Update: Rosie Mogle** reported that we have \$15, 511.00 for the year, but that she thought this might be raised to 20,000 and "if she had anything to do with it, it would be."
- II. **Carolyn Arnold** presented information about "fronting" some money for an upcoming conference in San Diego. The Senate, IPBC, and other top dogs here think we should send a bunch of folks in order to continue with our charge of exploring SLOs and other new ideas for teaching and learning; there appeared to be an urgent need for funding, as in "right now" in order to get all interested parties registered, etc. She presented a chart that showed that SD was being asked to "loan" about \$4,800.00 to help the cause. **This was the purpose of my calling this meeting and the reason that Carolyn was there (see previous messages).**

Several members of our group expressed concern about this prospect:

Arlene reminded us that we don't usually fund "professional requirements" and that we don't usually grant more than \$300 per person. **Dennis** grimaced, and said that the whole process was questionable, though he felt certain that the conference would most likely benefit the college, etc...He was worried about setting precedents and encouraged us to draft language that reminded administration that this was not the usual process for funding through SD. **Bill** also expressed concern that the timing and process was off. **Michelle** reminded us that SD's funding has slowly been chipped away at over the last few years, and we should be cautious. **Marcia** reminded us that the amount was actually 1/3 of our whole budget, again, echoing caution. She also suggested that we keep an eye out for the grants on campus that include part of our work, and that maybe funding pockets were available in some of these areas. **Dennis** announced that he has no faith in getting the money back and had even suggested we write up some serious documentation for the "loan." **Judy** was adamant in her view that the college should not be coming to SD for these funds and should look elsewhere. **Rosie** suggested we charge interest on the loan and everyone nodded. **Rachel** (that's me) suggested that either way you slice it, it was "funky" because if we refuse to cooperate, we send the message to the Chabot community that SD is not a team player with the college's needs, but that if we just write a check, we aren't upholding the integrity of the process and we don't want to "bullied" into things. She hinted at the possibility that this brings up a trust issue between SD and Ad...again. **Carolyn**

S
t
a
f
f

D
e
v
e
l
o
p
m
e
n
t

reminded us that it was the college's intent to bring SD into "the loop" for projects that fall under the new strategic priorities, and in fact, involve SD directly

with this kind of work. Nods all around. Finally, we agreed not to front any money at this time, and this came after the fact that we all realized that the urgency had dissipated because the registration for the conference was "closed" (Carolyn's report). This brought a sigh of absurdity to the room. Our conclusion was that Rachel (that's me again) would report to Ron Taylor that the group was not at all comfortable with the process and would re-visit their request for funds if it returns to our table.

III. **Conference Requests: Rosie** circulated two other conference requests that had come through in July and they were easily approved by the whole committee.

IV. **Structural Items:**

Rachel LePell (me again) became the chair of the committee because no one else wanted to step up to the job. At the moment, it seemed like the right move.

Dennis reported on his role as new faculty coordinator. He is receiving re-assigned time to do this and his time is not part of the SD re-assignment, but that what he is doing, plans to do, wants to do, hopes to do, all fall under the umbrella of SD's "plans" at this point and therefore he is key to our committee. He reminded us that the reason that the new faculty group was formed to begin with was with an assumption: not everyone hired here is an experienced, "mature" teacher and that when we take the time to explore teaching with them (the new-hires), it sends the important message that Chabot is primarily a teaching institution. Yum Yum... more nods. This reminded most of us in the room that not only did new faculty want to do these things, but all of us wanted to do these things, and that whatever **Dennis** does with new faculty might be able to spill into the rest of the faculty and staff too. **Arlene** reminded us that we must include classified staff in these discussions because of their close contact with students deeply involved in a "learning moment" (my words there). **Dennis** remembered that various issues came up last year, including classroom management and teacher "persona" complexity.

V. We moved to quick discussion about the definition of "consensus" prompted by **Arlene's** pithy question "what does that mean?" **Marcia** helped us out with some jargon from the governance docs. The salient point was that everyone had the chance to speak his/her mind in a meeting (duh). We all agreed that the "hand thing" was a great way to do it, and we used our "hand expressions" the rest of the meeting to complete success.

VI. We turned to meeting times, and decided to meet twice in September, (the 14 and 28) because of the many things on our collective plate at 3 pm in 1103. We would take up the question of "virtual meetings" later.

S
t
a
f
f

D
e
v
e
l
o
p
m
e
n
t

VIII. We agreed that next time we take up the following:
Representation: who/where from/how many members? We will see who shows up, and then mold our official membership from there. **Marcia** graciously

reminded us what the governance handbook says about our membership, so we will keep that at the front of the stove.

We will take up the whole question of “what is our charge?” this year. **Rachel** (hello again) reminded the group that one of the inviting ideas last month was the notion that we might be able to spend a year talking about reading – **Dennis?** This will top the items of discussion when it comes to our overall mission. **Rachel** will draft a very rough mission statement to get the ball rolling for next meeting.

We will then turn to the sticky wicket of process and look at what’s worked in the past (**Gloria? Arlene? Michelle?**) and how we will allocate funds for the year. This may require a sub-committee project...**Arlene?** We will also consider each members’ strengths and see if we might deal them a hand they might want to “play.”

We will be rotating the summary notes in the future.

We adjourned at 5 p.m.

“Summary” by Rachel LePell, Sept. 1 2006