

Professional Development Meeting

February 28, 2006, 2:45 - 3:45 P.M.

Principal's Conference Room

Members Present: Kevin Quattrin, Susan Lee, John Stiegeler, Meredith Galvin, Grace Curcio, Hillary McKinney, Steve Bluford, Kate Kodros, Charlie Dullea, Paul Molinelli

Absent: Elizabeth Purcell

1. Summer Curriculum Grants

2005 Summer Curriculum Grant recipients either met with Paul or submitted their written reflections about the successes and challenges of their grant projects. Members of the Committee were asked to review a summary of these reports. Generally speaking, faculty recipients have been pleased with the results of their work and feel that it has been implemented successfully. Meredith said that she simply enjoyed seeing what people had done, and learning about what their professional interests. Paul said that he was pleased with the general quality and reflection of the feedback provided by grants. In future grants, an assessment tool (such as a survey, pre-post test, etc.) must be included with the grant proposal itself. Kevin thought that the reflections were good, but that perhaps more concrete, statistical data showing whether student learning has increased, at least for those courses designed to address such measurable outcomes. Hilary noted that typically, assessment is lacking in any new curriculum, and that we should provide examples and/or tools for assessment to help the grant recipients.

The committee discussed the process for 2006 applications, including the need for a special meeting for applicants to give presentations to the committee. Presumably, presenters should already have met with their department chair, and this should be reflected in department meeting minutes. In the presentation, applicants will need to explain how they plan to assess the success of the grant project. The committee determined that they should have one or two weeks to read the proposals, and then they should meet to hear presentations. The committee agreed that we'll need to inform applicants to sign-up for a 10-minute presentation slot, and they agreed to hold this meeting on Wednesday, March 22nd, at 2:45 in Room 103.

The SCG Rubric Subcommittee is currently constructing a rubric that they hope can be piloted during this round of applications.

2. March 13th In-Service

The committee reviewed a proposal to combine Faculty Ministry Morning with Faculty In-service, thus allowing for a more regular (and less choppy) short week. Everyone agreed that this will probably put us all in a better frame of mind for doing FOL work. The focus of department work scheduled for the afternoon will likely be determined by department chairs, and could take the form of handbook revision, level work, or whatever else is needed. Regarding the Focus Group work, it was agreed that Focus Groups should be provided with template for suggesting areas of growth and/or possible action plan items, thus helping provide "focus" for the Focus Groups! It was agreed that some time during this day should be provided for those faculty who had not yet completed faculty survey.

3. October In-Service/Long-Term Planning

Paul asked the committee to review the list of possible in-service topics raised from the last meeting. He asked the committee to consider using the October date for a

final review of the FOL self-study. This would allow Focus Groups the opportunity to provide final and comprehensive feedback about the report and proposed action plan items. Kate suggested that if we did use the October date for FOL review, we might once again combine it with an adult spirituality event.

In reviewing and discussing other ideas, Kate also suggested that perhaps the Action Plan should include a proposal for PD to develop a five-year-plan and/or cycle for in-services. Meredith suggested that an October date would be nice for sharing summer PD activities. Charlie spoke about the "Teen Screen" program at UCSF for sophomores, and that perhaps a day should be dedicated to health issues and reducing stress. Susan suggested that it would be great way to follow-up ideas presented at retreats. Kevin noted that it gives us a chance to explore the idea of *Magis* and gain perspective on how to consider what activities students should/shouldn't participate in. Susan then suggested that perhaps in-service days ought to be cyclical: one date is "open," while the other is planned, topic-specific, and facilitated.

Next Meeting: March 28, 2006