

SENATE COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL RELATIONS

Minutes

11 a.m., Tuesday, January 16, 2024

Zoom

Call to Order: 11:05 a.m.

Quorum Met: Yes

Facilitator: Chad Greene

Members Present:

Sherryl Carter, ACCME – Adult Education
Michelle Fagundes, Liberal Arts
Berenice Gallardo, Counseling
Kari Hemmerling, Kinesiology
Phuong Nguyen, Science, Engineering, and Mathematics
Fatima Oregon, ASCC
Paula Pereira, Library
Rossi Petrova, Technology
Sarah Pirtle, CSEA – Media Services
Veronica Sanchez, Humanities and Social Sciences

Members Absent:

Robert Campolo, Fine Arts and Communications
Lydia Cosio, Health Occupations
Dahlene Holliness, Student Accessibility Services
Peter Moloney, Business Education
Pamela Sepulveda, ACCME – Falcon’s Nest

1. Approving: Minutes from December 12 Professional Relations Committee Meeting

a. Michelle Fagundes made a motion to approve the minutes from the committee’s meeting on December 12, which was seconded by Sarah Pirtle. The minutes were approved.

2. Reviewing: Timeline for Our Review of Nominations for Outstanding Faculty Awards

a. The members of the Professional Relations Committee refreshed their memories of the traditional timeline for the review of the nominations for the Outstanding Faculty Awards:

- i.** November: Nominations for Outstanding Faculty Awards close at end of month; committee finalizes timeline for review of nominations
- iv.** December: Committee members begin their review of nominations
- v.** January: Committee members discuss nominations and rank finalists for awards
- vi.** February: Committee members cast final votes for award winners, including one Most Outstanding Faculty, up to ten full-time Outstanding Faculty, and up to

ten part-time Outstanding Faculty; chair presents information on award winners to president of the Faculty Senate

3. Discussing: Our Preliminary Rankings of the Nominees for the 2023-2024 Outstanding Faculty Awards

- a.** Based on the top-ten lists that Professional Relations Committee members emailed to chair Chad Greene, he created a spreadsheet to tabulate the preliminary rankings of the nominees. To generate scores for the nominees, each ranking was translated into a number between one and ten. For example, a number-one ranking from a committee member translated into a score of a ten. And a number-ten ranking translated into a score of a one.
- b.** A suggestion from the past co-chairs of the committee, Lydia Cosio and Clara Ross-Jones, was to see if there seemed to be a natural “cut-off” point in the scores. Just because the committee can present one Most Outstanding Faculty Award, up to ten Outstanding Faculty Awards to full-time faculty, and up to ten Outstanding Faculty Awards to part-time faculty, that does not mean it has to give out the maximum number of twenty-one. With that in mind, the committee discussed if it detected a natural “cut-off” point in the scores for either full-timers or part-timers, as tabulated.
- c.** The members of the committee also discussed if there should be a policy about repeat winners of the awards. Ultimately, they reached a consensus that there did not need to be such a policy for 2023-2024 because the Outstanding Faculty Awards have not been presented since 2019-2020. They decided to revisit this discussion in 2024-2025.

4. Deciding: Our Next Steps

- a.** Because the preliminary numbers considered during this meeting did not yet include all the committee members’ rankings, the consensus was that the deadline to submit top-ten lists would be extended by one week until Tuesday, January 23. Greene promised to then update the spreadsheet tabulating the preliminary rankings of the nominees and email the revised numbers to the committee members by Friday, January 26 for their consideration.
- b.** As scheduled in the traditional timeline, the committee planned to select the award winners at its February meeting.

5. Soliciting: Items from the Floor

- a.** There were no items from the floor.

Meeting Adjourned: 11:50 a.m.