

Professional Development Committee

October 30, 2013

Room 430

Present: Gillian Clements, Yosup Joo, Deirdre McGovern, Rob Hickox, Katie Paul, Mike Shaughnessy (for Patrick Lannan), Nora Miller, Paul Molinelli, Carole Nickolai, Sandy Schwarz

Excused: Grace Curcio, Patrick Ruff

The meeting began with a prayer.

In-service on Mission Effectiveness

The Committee reviewed the in-service evaluations prior to the meeting, and they were asked to consider how we might follow-up and support the in-service's goal of deepening our understanding of our shared Ignatian mission, specifically as this relates to the in-service's primary objectives:

- Increase familiarity and capacity to interpret perception data relating to our mission (& Grad-at-Grad)
- Apply these data to the various roles and programs we serve
- Defining for ourselves a balanced approach to mission

Paul began by offering a brief summary, noting that 107 faculty and staff had completed the evaluation. (Results are available at <http://bit.ly/1aocPWk>.)

With regard to the three multiple-choice items relating to the data carousel objectives, most respondents felt that the carousel experience increased their familiarity with mission-related data (70% "agree" or "strongly agree"), while significantly fewer agreed that the carousel increased their capacity to *interpret* (46% "agree" or "strongly agree") and *apply* (37% "agree" or "strongly agree") these data to their work. Commenters frequently noted the experience of "data overload" of moving through so many rooms, and many others spoke of the desire for more direction about how to look at the data and for opportunities to discuss and unpack these data as they relate to their work.

With regard to "defining a balanced approach to mission," only 40% "agreed" or "strongly agreed" that the in-service deepened their understanding of how this is accomplished. For example, while many enjoyed hearing from their colleagues on this topic, commenters mentioned that panel members' responses seemed to emphasize the struggle to find balance over successful strategies for achieving it. Several commenters also noted that the question of "balance" may more appropriately revolve around greater clarity about professional expectations.

Discussion points from the Committee:

- Essential questions for each data carousel room would have been helpful in guiding the conversation.
- Too many rooms produced data overload — not enough space for conversations about mission that these data address; instead, conversations

- focused just on the data themselves (i.e., how to interpret, unpacking confusions, mistakes, etc.).
- Needed more time to talk about how we live out the mission, especially important in an era where expectations are high and a perception exists that we need to be “excellent” in all areas.
 - RE balance, maybe we need to articulate for ourselves what’s “excellent” vs. what’s “proficient” (i.e., meets professional expectations).
 - Not everyone (students and faculty alike) can be expected to be “excellent” in all areas of the work.
 - We need more conversations about this — how do we structure them? Do we hold after-school, lunchtime conversations?
 - RE students: how do we celebrate “excellence” without stressing them out, creating (unintentionally) the expectation that everyone must be like those who achieve excellence? How do we reinforce instead the importance of participating, getting better, giving something your best?
 - Where did these definitions of student excellence come from? Answer: AP’s were solicited a few years ago about what constituted “excellence” in their areas.
 - We need to ask the question, “At what cost do we achieve ‘excellence’?”
 - As reinforced in the book *The Talent Code*, we need to nurture a growth mindset, the importance of tapping desire and effective effort.
 - Discussed the importance of having clear professional standards and expectations.
 - Agreement that any misconceptions about the intent of the day (particularly the afternoon panel) need to be unpacked and addressed.
 - Agreement that we need more discussion about how to apply these in-service topics (using mission data, defining balance) more explicitly to our jobs.
 - Important that we support more department-focused conversations about these data.
 - Perhaps we can use time on the faculty retreat to continue conversations on mission and balance.
 - Similarly, maybe use some time at future faculty meetings to respond, and extend conversations about mission and balance.
 - Committee members expressed surprise at some of the comments that struck them as inappropriate, and not reflective of the kind of professional discourse we expect of ourselves (analogous to some student feedback we receive from student questionnaires).
 - Some of the strong critical feedback may be attributable to the timing of the in-service.

PD Requests and Evaluations

Paul offered a brief overview of the new online request and evaluation process, and asked the Committee for feedback and suggestions. The new request system (<https://www.siprep.org/page.cfm?p=4947>) will replace the previous system of submitting paper or PDF versions of the old request form. Paul noted that the new evaluation form now provides the option for uploading resources that might be worth sharing with our colleagues (<http://survey.siprep.org/s3/PDEval>). Committee

members offered several suggestions:

- Consider asking evaluators to be guest authors on “Restless Pedagogue,” the teaching and learning blog hosted by Eric (www.restlesspedagogue.com).
- Change “attend an advanced workshop” to “would you recommend this event to a colleague.”
- Continue investigating ways to measure the “lasting effect” of these PD experiences we support, beyond the perception information we currently collect.

Meeting adjourned.

Next Meeting: December 4th