

Professional Development Committee Meeting
December 5, 2006, 2:45 - 3:45 P.M.
Principal's Conference Room

Members Present: Eric Castro (for John Stiegeler), Grace Curcio, Meredith Galvin, Kate Kodros, Susan Lee, Hilary McKinney, Paul Molinelli, Patty Zatkan
Excused: Steve Bluford, Charlie Dullea, Elizabeth Purcell, Kevin Quattrin

In-service Evaluation

The Committee reviewed the results of the October In-service evaluation, which included eleven survey items and four free-response items. Paul summarized the breakdown provided by Tom Casey. He noted that, based upon the 72 faculty and staff who responded to the online evaluation, people generally agreed that most of the in-service was effective, with the exception of the Internet safety segment. Faculty and staff overwhelmingly agreed that we should continue combining our in-services with ministry mornings (23-1 margin), while the majority of respondents believed (by a roughly 2-1 margin) that we should keep these in-service/ministry mornings on the Thursday after midterms (as opposed to the Monday before) and that the start time should remain at 9:00, not 8:30.

These results should help us plan our March 8th in-service, to be facilitated by Denise Pope, founder and coach of the Stressed Out Students (SOS) program at Stanford. At the next PDC meeting, the Committee will review a proposed agenda for the day. It was suggested, and universally agreed, that in preparation for that meeting we should obtain a copy of the SOS program's stated outcomes.

2007 Summer Curriculum Grant Application

The Committee reviewed a revised Summer Curriculum Grant application. Paul repeated that the central goal of this revision process is to clarify grant and to align these criteria with the rest of the application, including the new rubric. Furthermore, the Committee should decide upon a streamlined funding structure for award categories or levels. Paul said it was his hope to announce the new application and rubric next week.

The Committee reviewed the six "Criteria for Grant" listed on the first page. The question was raised about whether each criteria must be met for a grant to be awarded. Specifically, the "cross-curricular" criteria will be particularly difficult for most applications to meet. While the Committee agreed that it should encourage interdisciplinary and cross-curricular collaboration wherever possible, members suggested moving this item out of "criteria" and placing it elsewhere, perhaps labeling it as a "desirable feature" or giving it some other designation. A similar question was raised about the "collaboration" criteria, but it was agreed that "collaboration" should remain among "criteria." Furthermore, keeping "collaboration" as a separate rubric category will give it appropriate weight, which may be particularly useful in helping the Committee determine an appropriate award level (i.e., more collaborators = higher award).

Discussion about the structure of award levels followed. It was suggested that perhaps the categories should be awarded per person, not per project, since awarding strictly per project might be a disincentive to collaboration. The Committee discussed whether applicants should apply for a particular grant funding level, or whether the Committee should award at

a particular level based upon the overall significance and scope of the application. The Committee decided that it should develop some descriptive guidelines or examples for the various funding levels. Again, it was agreed that the overall scope of a grant project (i.e., time, manpower) should have substantial impact on the award level.

The Committee continued discussing how the number of project collaborators should affect award level. In the course of this discussion, members suggested including two additional levels, one “less than \$4,000” and another “greater than \$8,000.” Doing so would provide the Committee the latitude it would need to fund smaller follow-up projects *and* to support large collaborative projects more fairly, particularly when such projects involve three or more colleagues (e.g., a department level team).

The Committee reviewed the applications guidelines page, suggesting several changes, including the decision to eliminate the requirement of applicant’s resume-like background information. Members suggested that the “Project Description” should include language that addresses course, department, and school outcomes/ESLR’s. Committee members also suggested that this section should ask applicants to delineate percentage of work for each member and/or spell out individuals’ responsibilities.

Discussion about the rubric draft followed. A question was raised about the meaning of the “Impact” category, and it was suggested and agreed that the more accurate descriptor of this category is “Scope of Project.” Committee members made suggestions about merging categories and clarifying rubric language. At the end of this discussion, Paul agreed to incorporate today’s suggestions into the final draft of the application and rubric.

Next Meeting(s): January 30, 2007