

Professional Development Committee

November 30, 2016

Room 420

Members: Steve Bluford, Gillian Clements, Tim Egan, Emily Goodell, Helena Miller-Flieg, Paul Molinelli, Kristen Moraine, Carole Nickolai, Jeff Noblejas, Ray Orque

Excused: Patrick Ruff

The meeting began with a prayer.

Announcements

- a. Diversity Social: Tuesday, 12/13. Please encourage all to attend!
- b. Summer Curriculum Grants: call for proposals to be sent shortly. Grant applications are due March 20, 2017. Please see Paul before March 3rd to discuss your proposal ideas before completing an application. Summer Grant info is available at <http://www.siprep.org/page.cfm?p=5931>.
- c. Teaching Fellows: have been working on their projects and have begun sharing their work through Canvas modules, available at <https://canvas.siprep.org/courses/1781>.
 - *Katie Wolf*: is exploring the creation of an on-site Urban Farm.
 - *Kevin Quattrin* is exploring forms of blended learning in BC Calculus.
 - *Daniel Brown* is exploring how to incorporate regular movement in a French classroom.

Info about Teaching Fellows can be found at <http://www.siprep.org/page.cfm?p=10685>.

Data & Assessment

The committee picked up its last discussion about moving forward with our PD work in the area of classroom assessment. They were asked to consider these proposed outcomes for the rest of the year:

- Develop common language around classroom assessment
- Deepen our repertoire of formative assessment practices
- Effectively engage in collaborative inquiry around classroom assessment

The committee was then asked to consider these outcomes in light of the priorities identified from our last meeting (appended below). How do these priorities align with these proposed outcomes? Items that emerged from our small group conversations:

- Need more accountability for ourselves; outcomes need to be more specific, measurable, time-bound, etc. (S.M.A.R.T. goals).
- For example, we might identify the 10 words/concepts we need to know and be able to use (similar to what we did with diversity). Our faculty know the difference between formative and summative assessments, but there are other, more specific concepts that are foundational to talking about assessment.
- Is there a way we could put this online? Way to learn and demonstrate your knowledge? Something similar to the "digital badges" used more commonly with online learning.
- We need an objective about how to construct valid assessments. How do I know that my assessments are measuring what I think they're measuring? How do I know that my assessment is targeting the "understandings" or the "constructs" I'm trying to assess?
- It would be helpful to apply this validity question to all kinds of assessments — multiple-choice, short answer, extended response.
- Are my questions too "low-level"? Do they focus primarily on "factual" recall, as opposed to higher order application or strategic thinking? (e.g., [Bloom's Taxonomy](#), [Depth of Knowledge](#) model)
- Would like to see discipline-specific models of well-constructed assessments.
- Maybe this is part of a conversation about how we grade, but how do we evaluate student performance consistently? (the question of "reliability")
- Related to how we articulate the criteria for success, how we design clear rubrics, calibrate ourselves to these rubrics (e.g., Jr. Writing Exam in English).
- While reliability is important, we should address the validity question first – do our assessments measure what we think they measure?

The committee then discussed how we might address some of these priorities and proposed outcomes through our current schedule and PD practices:

- Maybe use our 2/21 PD day to analyze end-of-unit/semester exam data? (use summative exams)

formatively)

- Maybe use our 3/27 PD day to host an EdCamp on a variety of assessment topics from which faculty can choose to lead/participate in?
- Departments/levels might choose several "short-cycle" formative strategies that they can experiment with and share out at subsequent meetings.
- Host voluntary after-school socials where we feature an assessment "innovator"?
- Definitely offer tracking/choice at our next in-service.
- Maybe provide some kind of targeted, specific instruction on assessment during the first part of 2/21 PD day, then work in departments to apply and practice? (e.g., doing error analysis, writing valid questions, etc.)
- If we did this, maybe we then come back on our 3/27 PD day to consider what we practiced, take the next step.
- Also, it would be helpful to keep the same table groups, preferably organized by departments since we'll be working with relevant assessments in our specific disciplines.
- Whatever we do, make sure people know in advance what they're doing and what's expected of them.

Paul will consider these recommendations and options with Carole and committee members as we continue to plan for the spring.

Professional Development Days

The committee briefly considered how we might structure or schedule our PD days differently, how we might move away from the current full-day, after-midterms schedule:

- Preference for structuring PD in smaller chunks, as opposed to current, all-day structure.
- Definitely a strong preference to explore alternatives that keep these days away from midterm exams!
- Maybe look at early release days, similar to what many school districts do.
- Maybe shorter days that begin with ministry, followed by PD for a couple hours, followed then by one of our voluntary after-school socials?

These and other options will be considered as planning begins on next year's schedule.

Meeting adjourned.

Next Meeting: January 25

From 10/26 PDC meeting (learning priorities related to classroom assessment):

- We need to continue developing a common language around assessment.
- We would benefit from having a deeper understanding of the connection between intrinsic motivation and formative assessment (not relying on extrinsic grades to motivate); seeking ways to make students active users of their assessment data.
- Learn more about the research on grading and on homework in an assessment system. For example:
 - balancing/reconciling formative assessments and grading;
 - the role of homework (giving less and/or not grading it);
 - looking at the role of and approaches to re-assessment.
- More sharing of assessment resources and strategies at department levels; interested in learning about what people are doing.
- Also a desire to work with colleagues from other departments who teach the same level; interested to see how others assess learning in their disciplines in a developmentally appropriate way.
- Interested in using criteria analysis (or other protocols) with department/level colleagues to analyze student assessments.
- Need to practically align our courses; for many levels what is actually taught does not always reflect the core curriculum; summative assessments are not always in common or have common elements.
- Need to work on developing well-written, valid assessments — good writing prompts, multiple-choice questions, etc. How do these items/prompts reveal the depth of students' understanding we seek to measure?
- Perhaps make assessment part of our end-of-year reflection. What have we learned, tried, worked on this year? Identify some assessment goals for ourselves (individual, level/department).