

Professional Development Committee

September 30, 2009, 2:45 - 3:45 P.M.

PDC

Members Present: Don Gamble, Mary McCarty, Paul Molinelli, Jan Mullen, Chuck Murphy, Carole Nickolai, Patrick Ruff, Shannon Vanderpol, Dan Vollert

Absent: Katy Dumas, Meegan Whelan, Chad Zullinger

The meeting began with a prayer.

PD Overview – Paul welcomed new members to the committee and gave a brief overview of the committee’s work for the year. As in years past, the PDC will be asked to help plan and provide feedback on in-services, evaluate summer grant applications, and provide general feedback about professional development planning and priorities.

Paul reminded the committee of our Professional Development “curriculum” focus for the year, of evaluating our curriculum through the lens of our mission. He added that in addition to our in-services, we’ll also offer several after-school workshops to assist our work of systematic curriculum review.

Summer Grant Update – Paul then provided a brief update on the status of 2009 Summer Curriculum Grant projects. Each of the four grants had been completed or was near completion, and he noted that grant recipients had appropriately incorporated the Committee’s recommendations made last spring during the application and review process.

- AP Science Laboratory Curriculum Development (*Christine Wilkinson, Byron Philhour, Michelle Wynn*)
- The Ethics & Justice of the RS 300 Reader (*Anne Stricherz, Chad Evans, Jason Beyer, SJ*)
- Wellness Course: An Integrated, Multidimensional Approach to Modern Health and Wellbeing (*Carol Devincenzi, Hillary McKinney, Mike Thomas, Scott Plymale*)
- Curriculum Development for Science & Religion: A New Senior Elective in Religious Studies (*Adrian O’Keefe, Bill Haardt*)

In-service & Ministry Morning – The Committee reviewed the draft agenda for the October 15th Ministry Morning and In-service (below). The day will begin with our Ministry Morning, which features a presentation from Fr. Kevin Burke, S.J., who will provide a contemporary commentary on Arrupe’s “Men for Others” speech.

Paul pointed out that a small planning team has been meeting the past few weeks to assist in the development of this in-service (Katy Dumas, Chad Evans, Carole Nickolai, Charlie Stanley, Barbara Talavan). Their feedback has been extraordinarily helpful in developing the structure for this day.

8:30 – Continental Breakfast (Commons)

9:00 – Ministry Morning: Fr. Kevin Burke – Commentary on Arrupe’s “Men for Others” (Orradre)

10:00 – *Break*

10:15 – In-service: Engaging in the Curriculum Design and Review Process (Orradre)

Outcomes:

1. Understand the process and value of CDRP
2. Using CDRP lens, identify strengths and growth areas within this process

	Agenda:
10:15	Part 1 - Overview of CDRP
10:40	Part 2 - Examples from the Field (5 classrooms with repeating sessions). Faculty share curriculum, focusing upon one or more area of the CDRP
11:45	Part 3 - Wrap-up: What have we learned? Where do we go from here?
12:15	<i>Lunch</i>
12:45	Part 4 - Department work (<i>CDRP Self-Assessment Task</i>)
2:00	End

Paul asked the Committee to review the agenda, as he reviewed its basic structure – (1) an overview of the curriculum design and review process, (2) examples from colleagues about their curriculum using the CDRP lens, (3) summary discussion, (4) department-level self-assessment. Paul asked the Committee to pay particular attention to Part 2, which will consist of multiple rotating mini-sessions by faculty about how they engage in this curriculum design and review, with particular attention paid to how they evaluate their curriculum. In these presentations, faculty presenters will also address areas of strength and growth with this process.

Committee members had several questions and numerous suggestions. For example, the question about whether to assign or select faculty to groups led to a discussion about the focus or specific outcome for these faculty presentations, which is to provide insight into the *process* of curriculum design and review. Providing opportunities for our colleagues to learn what this looks like in other departments is important, since the focus remains on process (not content) and it helps foster cross-curricular dialogue.

One Committee member expressed his desire to see all these presentations. Perhaps these sessions could be videotaped? More discussion followed about the specific outcome of the final session (Part 4 – Department Work), and whether this work was more appropriately done by department levels (which would require most faculty to split time and juggle multiple meetings) or by departments as a whole. The Committee agreed that the primary outcome for this session was to begin the work of formal curriculum review, and that this would be best accomplished at the department level. Here the department could identify for itself areas of strength and areas of growth, and from this exercise make appropriate goals. From these discussions, department levels could begin the more specific work of applying these review principles to their specific levels and courses.

More discussion followed about whether there was too little time for these presentations and follow-up discussion. The Committee agreed that lunch start time ought to be 12:30.

Meeting adjourned.

Next Meeting: Wednesday, 10/28