| **Page #** | **Line #** | **Comments** | **Response** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Reference the page # in the document** | **Reference the line number in the document** | **Include the specific language changes, comments, and/or questions. If recommending new language for consideration, please include the new language.** | **DO NOT USE THIS BOX.** |
| 1 | 7 | Recognize the role of Classified, Managers and Administrators in the success of the institution and our students. |  |
| 1 | 9 | Continue the original scope of the Mentor Program. Student Services may have a program for students? Not sure if it’s the appropriate name. |  |
| 1 | 24 | Pedagogy and Instructional Development—while I agree that this certainly should be an area of focus for PD, what methods specifically are we using as a campus? What model of learning does the PD committee and/or the academic senate espouse? To quote R.F. Elmore (2002, Bridging the gap between standards and achievement), “The point here is that professional development, if it is to be focused on student learning, at some point must be tailored to address the difficulties encountered by real students in real classrooms as well as broader systemic objectives. Similarly, effective professional development is connected to questions of content and pedagogy that educators are asking—or should be asking—about the consequences of their instructional practices on real students as well as in general questions about effective teaching practice.” I suppose that I’m wondering what kind of research has been done on our faculty and staff and on our students that is guiding this plan and the categories that are in this plan? And not research about what people want, but research about the knowledge, skill, and motivation gaps among our faculty and staff that would allow us to incisively address performance problems that would directly affect staff and faculty practice, student learning, and student success. Why are we focusing on these things? What data suggests that these things are the things our campus needs? What is the process by which we even arrive at a document like this, and is it a sufficient process? I think that the lack of participation in PD is directly related to this issue—many faculty and staff simply don’t see the relevance to their own practice, and they don’t have the time or see the point in attending activities that they aren’t sure will be strategically beneficial to them getting better as teachers or support staff. |  |
| 2 | 51 | Whatever happened with the New and Aspiring Teachers program for classified and new part-time faculty interested in teaching/improving skills. This should be called out. |  |
| 2 | 57 | What are offering for classified staff and administrators specifically? How and why is it different than faculty? The faculty have numerous specific bullets, but classified needs seem mysterious. Classified are evaluated every two years, and a part of our evaluation are specific areas for improvement and development needs. Perhaps HR can share these needs at an aggregate level, so PD has a better understanding of what kind of PD we are told we need. Also it’s hard for me to know what I don’t know. |  |
| 2 | 66 | The literature on PD and motivation indicates that extrinsic motivations are unlikely to be effective in this context because, unless the extrinsic reward is substantial enough to motivate people to attend many PD events (like earning a stipend of $400/month), extrinsic motivators should first be grounded in interest. I would suggest that instead of a plan to increase incentives, rather shift professional development offerings to increase their overall utility to faculty and staff by making the overall goals for PD more strategic and focused. |  |
| 3 | 71 | Faculty receive credit for PD participation and are required to participate in a certain amount of PD each year. Classified have to squeeze it into our workload, because it’s “extra.” We need a culture that recognizes and encourages classified for being away from their desk to participate in shared governance and PD activities. |  |
| 3 | 72 | Sometimes the goal may be more than improving skills, knowledge, and abilities we already possess. Sometimes it’s about creating skills, knowledge, and abilities where some may not exist. Perhaps we need a needs assessment that’s more than “what do you want?” and a more thoughtful assessment of what skills, knowledge, and abilities is lacking at the college overall. |  |
| 3 | 72 | This is good, but in addition, I would recommend doing some research on what knowledge, skills, and motivations are lacking among our faculty and staff that are needed in order to see greater student success. |  |
| 3 | 74 | Create non-credit courses, so we can begin having deeper skills, knowledge, and abilities development. |  |
| 3 | 82 | I don’t believe that this strategy will increase faculty and staff participation in a meaningful and long-term way as to increase student success or student learning. Not that I’m opposed to doing fun things! But if this is a strategy for increasing participation, which I think it is, I’m not certain it will be effective. |  |
| 3 | 84 | And I think the way we do this is to do empirical research to find the areas that are most needed that are related to performance. Then, once that data comes out we share it with the campus and its constituencies, and this will help contribute to people seeing the necessity and the utility of such training, because it will fit a gap that faculty and staff have seen in their own practice. |  |
| 3 | 90 | I would rearticulate this to have it be something like: offer meaningful and strategic PD resources to staff and administration. |  |
| 3 | 91 | Again, here I would suggest we go back to doing research on what the needs of staff are. Not just what is wanted, but how does PD offerings for staff relate to, say, the skills that need improving that are identified by managers in evaluations, or by staff themselves in self-evaluations? Is there a mechanism that can relate one of these things to another? I don’t think anyone on the campus actually has a clue about what staff actually need because there have been no gap analysis studies. I would suggest that ensuring such a study happen would be priority 1 for serving classified staff (and faculty and administrators, too, for that matter). |  |
| 3 | 93 | I think the intention behind this is great, but rather than tell staff how necessary they are, let’s get them the training they need to perform at a higher level. One question that I have about this is about specifics—how will this realistically happen? Changing the culture of the campus is how this will change long-term, so what specific things does PD see itself doing to address this? |  |
| 3 | 96 | I think this is great—one PD calendar, one place to look! Great job on this recently, by the way! I can tell a big difference! |  |
| 3 | 100 | What does “Work to bring Classified Training back under one PD umbrella” mean? Is this to bring Classified Professionals Week under PD control? I’m not OK with this until there is significant change in how PD is developed and offered. Changes and improvements in how PD is developed and offered must be institutionalized first before the Classified Senate will allow PD to develop the week’s training. When was classified training even under the PD umbrella anyway? PD has consistently been faculty-focused and classified have historically been told they can’t leave their work to attend PD. Classified Professionals Week was created as a specific week scheduled when classified can be released from their work to receive PD that is specific to our needs. It should stay that way until the institution proves there is stability in PD offerings for classified. |  |
| 3 | 103 | I think this is cool, but my question is how would this work? More specifics? Maybe a more specific vision or the adoption of a theoretical learning framework could help scaffold this and provide more specifics. |  |
| 4 | 105 | I think this is cool, but to what end? |  |
| 4 | 109 | This document gets into union-related issues, but is silent on classified being provided FLEX. Perhaps this is something that can be investigated with CSEA and the district? |  |
| 4 | 122 | We don’t do this already? Then heck, yes, I think we should absolutely do this! |  |
| 4 | 123 | Equity, Basic Skills and Instruction for funding? How about classified who want to attend conferences outside of equity? We can’t qualify for funding from BSI or Instruction. These sources limit access for classified. |  |
| 4 | 124, 125 | This goes back to strategy. We must know why we are doing the programming we are doing, and it cannot be based on guesswork any more. We need to 1) identify and adopt a clear philosophy of learning that can be used to scaffold all PD offerings, and then we need to 2) do research to find out the knowledge, skills, competencies, and motivation issues that are lacking among our staff and faculty that could be affecting performance, student learning, and student success. |  |
| 4 | 125 | Just Academic Senate? This sentence speaks directly to how the institution views classified input and needs. |  |
| 5 | 147 | And the needs of the institution. |  |
| 5 | 157 | But will these certificates have any teeth? If they’re just a college thing, I don’t’ think people will care, quite frankly. But if they can earn a certificate from a professional organization by doing some PD sequences here on campus, I think people would jump at that. |  |
| 5 | 162 | The program already included classified, but thanks for the thought, I suppose. |  |
| 5 | 165 | I think this is really great to do! How will it be structured, though? I would argue that the design of the online content should be aligned with the learning philosophy espoused by the PD committee and the college. The online training should use the adopted learning philosophy/approach in the coursework design. I imagine something like Information Processing System Theory that is simple, easy to apply, helpful, and has decades of practical use from the practitioner field. |  |
| 6 | 175 | I think this is very important, and I applaud that it’s identified in the plan. Next question: which roles are needed? I would argue that an instructional designer should be part of PD, or someone who has some knowledge with instructional design. |  |
| 6 | 179 | I think working specifically on equity issues is good, but I would argue that there needs to be more clarity between what the college as a whole needs to do re. equity and PD’s role. What should PD do specifically? What is in the purview of PD? Where’s the boundary? |  |
| 6 | 184 | I think this is a great piece of a vision. The next question of course is what priority is this/should this be for PD? Additionally, I would argue that if we don’t’ have a strategic approach to PD in general, with a strong theoretical base that provides scaffolding to our instructional approach and guidance for how to train faculty and staff well, as well as a robust empirical data-driven internal assessment process, then we won’t get here. I’d love to see how this goal will be worked toward, because I think it’s a really great vision piece, probably for 4+ years out from now. |  |
| 6 | 192 | I think this is also a cool vision piece, but I don’t’ think it should be implemented until we have strategic, data-driven PD for our staff and faculty. I’d ask that this be more specific to align this vision piece with the mission and charge of PD. Should this be something PD does at all, or is it something the larger organization or some other part of the organization should be doing? Don’t’ know the answer to this. |  |
| 6 | 196 | This already exists and is a union issue. Perhaps specific recommendations can be developed, so the district has a starting point for negotiations. |  |
| 6 | 196 | This is a good idea, but I think it needs to be clarified a lot before proceeding. Classified currently have reimbursement opportunities written in to their contract, so we’d have to work with/around that. But I really like the idea of requiring someone who has been reimbursed to use that knowledge in a practical way and report out on it. Not only is that a helpful accountability structure, but we need to use the expertise that our staff and faculty have much more strategically. I think this could help do that if it was developed. |  |
| 6 | 200 | This is interesting. I’d like to see more specifics here, but I think, again, some empirical research is needed before proceeding so that the resources put into this yield results. |  |