

12/6/10

Dear Senate Officers and all Senators,

1. The Faculty Professional Development Committee (FPDC) members were not involved in any proposal to modify its structure, nor aware that such a proposal was being drafted, until after such a proposal was sunshined at last Monday's senate meeting (11/29.)
2. Note that faculty have now for many years been free to satisfy their professional development requirements independently of flex-week or of any planned FPDC events. Nonetheless, the committee is currently composed of hard-working individuals, that work amazingly well together, and that invest a great deal of time and effort into producing Flex Week each semester. The exemplary record of success by this committee is itself a testament to how well current compositional guidelines work. As current co-chair Clif Quinn states, "If it ain't broke, don't fix it".
3. When the SLO, CATL, or Student Success Steering Committee coordinators need to give input and suggestions for professional development opportunities, the FPDC has always welcomed those ideas and suggestions, and has a track record of inviting those coordinators and committee representatives to the appropriate FPDC meeting to discuss their needs with the committee. The revised composition, whether they are voting or non-voting, is of no direct benefit to the FPDC or to these coordinators. In addition, why add additional unnecessary workload to the schedules of the SLO, CATL, and Student Success Steering Committee coordinators by requiring that they attend FPDC meetings?
4. We actively seek out ideas and input from all areas of campus (*i.e., the latest email survey*) and incorporate faculty needs, college needs and state-level mandates into a well-balanced program through time. (*From time to time, we invite the senate president, former chairs, the deans, other committee coordinators, etc.*)
5. The charge of the FPDC involves hard work and is demanding of time. Limiting our pool of future committee members to a narrow area of the campus for available seats, rather than have it open to all, by mandating a committee composition that is more exclusive than inclusive would make it more difficult to keep the committee appropriately staffed. (*i.e., if we already have someone on the committee from Fine Arts, then we cannot have someone from Foreign Languages as well because they are both in the same division category on the "revised composition"*) What if someone really motivated and hard-working has a specific interest in joining the FPDC, but cannot simply because of the revised composition limitations?
6. The proposed revision suggests adding an "Instructional Dean" to the committee composition. This suggestion goes against the very grain of what the FPDC represents (*Note, the "F" stands for "Faculty".*) This is not merely a Grossmont-derived title for the committee. The Faculty Professional Development Committee operates under the purview of not only our local senate, but also under the Academic Senate of California Community Colleges (ASCCC), in cooperation with the State Chancellor. Hence, there are guidelines in place established by those that designed the program that highlight the basic premise that the committee should be faculty-run for the benefit of the faculty.

The current committee and past chairs remain unaware of where the impetus for such sudden change originates. They urge senators to vote to leave the committee composition as is, with "7 Faculty Representatives".

Clif Quinn (current chair)
Shina Alagia (current member)
Judd Curran (former chair, current member)
Nadra Farina-Hess (current member)
Mark Goodman (former chair, current member, future chair)
Jane Nolan (current member)
Edda Temoche-Weldele (former chair, current member)
Mary Rider (former chair)
Jeff Lehman (former chair)
Renee Tuller (former chair)