

**Academy of Process Educators**  
**Agenda for the July 11, 2009 Academy Meeting**  
**LOCATION: Holiday Inn Express, Gastonia, NC**

8:00am - 5:00pm

**Agenda**

<b>1</b>	<p><b>OPENING DISCUSSION - 15 min</b> (led by Steve)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• important outcomes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Conference Plan for 2010 -- includes key roles &amp; responsibilities</li> <li>◦ IJPE Plan for 2010 -- includes milestones &amp; publication format(s)</li> <li>◦ Research Plan for 2010 -- includes collaboration tool &amp; method</li> <li>◦ Member Communication/Services Plan for 2010</li> </ul> </li> <li>• revise agenda as needed</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<p><b>CONFERENCE ASSESSMENT/PLANNING - 1 hr</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• results from conference assessment surveys (Mohamed)</li> <li>• SII of conference (Tris)</li> <li>• 2010 Conference venue (Kettering?)</li> <li>• needed roles/recruiting (Steve &amp; Vicky)</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<p><b>IJPE OVERVIEW ASSESSMENT - 1 hr</b> (led by Jackie)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• discussion based on workshop discoveries/insights <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ vision/mission/guiding principles</li> <li>◦ submission/review/editing/production process</li> <li>◦ future dissemination</li> </ul> </li> <li>• IJPE webpage</li> <li>• article ideas for 2nd edition</li> <li>• use of Blackboard for article tracking/development</li> <li>• timeline for 2nd edition</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<p><b>PACIFIC CREST OVERVIEW</b> (led by Joann) - <b>30 min</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insights &amp; Dialogues</li> <li>• new publications</li> <li>• advances in faculty development events</li> </ul>
<b>5</b>	<p><b>RESEARCH OVERVIEW</b> (led by Cy) - <b>1 hr</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• performance measurement project</li> <li>• organization for reliability studies (including Blackboard site)</li> <li>• publication opportunities</li> <li>• grant opportunities</li> </ul>

<b>6</b>	<b>MEMBER COMMUNICATION</b> (led by Vicky & Betty) - <b>30 min</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Academy brochure</li> <li>• conference/Academy write-ups in Reflections newsletters</li> <li>• Academy webpage</li> <li>• lapsed member recruiting</li> <li>• 2010 conference recruiting</li> <li>• Academy marketing in PCrest events</li> </ul>
<b>7</b>	<b>CONCURRENT GROUPWORK</b> - <b>2 hr</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2010 Conference planning</li> <li>• 2010 IJPE planning</li> <li>• Member communication/services</li> <li>• Collaborative research on performance measurement</li> </ul>
<b>8</b>	<b>GROUP REPORTS/WRAP UP</b> (led by Steve) - <b>1 hr</b>

#### ACADEMY MEETING SUPPORT RESOURCES INCLUDED IN THIS BINDER

- IJPE Vision/Mission/Guiding Principles (from IJPE website) page 3
- Guidelines for authors (from IJPE website) page 4
- Review/editing process (from IJPE website) page 6
- Academy brochure (from Academy website) insert in binder pocket
- Measurement proposal (from Cy) page 7

## IJPE Vision/Mission/Guiding Principles (from IJPE website)

*The International Journal for Process Education* is a peer-reviewed international journal published biannually by the **Academy of Process Educators**. It also serves as an archival media for a community of practice encompassing scholars and educators dedicated to transforming higher education.

<p><i>Vision</i></p>	<p>The International Journal of Process Education will be a catalyst for the scholarship of teaching and learning in support of the efforts of the Process Education Academy to transform higher education.</p>
<p><i>Scope</i></p>	<p><b>Journal topics include (but are not limited to) the following processes and tools used by educators when implementing the philosophy of Process Education:</b></p>
<p><i>Mission</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To provide a forum for, and an archival record of, scholarly research in process education</li> <li>• To elevate skills in the discipline of the scholarship of teaching and learning</li> <li>• To explore promising new research areas in process education</li> <li>• To foster classroom-based research</li> </ul>
<p><i>Guiding Principles</i></p>	
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All faculty, staff, administrators and students can contribute to classroom research.</li> <li>2. Every researcher's methods can be continuously improved.</li> <li>3. The term "classroom" is a metaphor for all learning environments.</li> <li>4. Mentorship can accelerate the development of research skills.</li> <li>5. There is a role for both quantitative and qualitative educational research.</li> <li>6. Collaboration among authors, reviewer and editors is critical for a vibrant research environment.</li> <li>7. Increasing societal complexity and pace of change make it imperative to accelerate the transition from classroom discovery to disseminated findings that are the basis of shared practice.</li> <li>8. An educational journal can be improved by regularly assessing all aspects of its operation.</li> </ol>

## Guidelines for authors (from IJPE website)

Articles are expected to report an original contribution on a significant research topic related to process education as outlined in the aim and scope of the journal. To empower the readers significant commentaries may be published as Briefs. In addition to the journal selected articles may be invited for submission as a module to the Academy Faculty Guide Book.

### Submission of Manuscripts

Submitted manuscripts must include the following elements:

- Manuscript title
- Authors' name and affiliations
- 100-150 word abstract
- Introduction section following the abstract and preceding the main body of the manuscript
- The main body of the manuscript, divided into appropriate sections
- Figures and tables, if any, embedded at appropriate locations within the manuscript
- A conclusion or summary section following the main body of the manuscript
- List of references
- Manuscripts may include acknowledgments, appendices, a glossary of words and symbols

All manuscripts will be refereed in a double-blind review process, therefore, two manuscripts should be submitted, one with no identifying information. Manuscripts are submitted in electronic form only at the journal's Web site. An automatic and immediate e-mail confirmation will be provided if the submission process is completed successfully. Following the submission the editors an initial assessment of the manuscript based on the criteria of compatibility with the journal's mission will be conducted. The editors will perform the initial assessment and inform the author within a month of the submission of the manuscript. If the manuscript is deemed compatible, it will be submitted by the editors to the peer review process, which should be completed within three months.

### Style Guide

The writing and formatting conventions used should follow those used in the *Faculty Guidebook (FGB)*. *The Faculty Guidebook* is written in the scholarly-popular style of publications like *Scientific American* or the *New England Journal of Medicine*. It addresses a wide audience and does not give priority to a particular academic discipline. [Click here to view the Faculty Guidebook Style Guide.](#)

### Review/Assessment Criteria

The submitted manuscript will be assessed by at least three reviewers. Reviewers for the journal will use the *Strength, Improvement, and Insight (SII) assessment method*, the official assessment adopted by the Academy to select the published manuscripts. The authors will receive the reviewers' SII assessment of their manuscript at the end of the review process. The assessment of the manuscripts will be conducted according to the following two sets of criteria and established measures for each.

The first set of criteria concerns the document's scholarly content and its contribution in one or more of the following ways:

- Addresses issues relevant to Process Education philosophy and implementation
- Employs Process Educational principles and methodologies
- Presents an original contribution to Process Education knowledge map
- Appeals to wide range of Process Educators
- Expands upon relevant Process Education references and bodies of knowledge

The second set of criteria concerns the quality and presentation of the manuscript:

- Provide a clear, concise, and accurate representation
- Use appropriate and well-defined terminology
- Adhere to journal standards and style
- Be self-contained and well integrated
- Exhibit a high level of quality and attention to details

## Editorial Inquiries

Editorial questions and inquiries should be directed to: Dr. Jacqueline El-Sayed, Director, Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, Kettering University (previously General Motors Institute), Flint, Michigan, 48504, USA; Phone: (+1) 810-762-9685; fax: (+1) 810-762-9684, e-mail: [jelsayed@kettering.edu](mailto:jelsayed@kettering.edu).

## Review/editing process (from IJPE website)

Articles are expected to report an original contribution on a significant research topic related to process education as outlined in the aim and scope of the journal. To empower the readers significant commentaries may be published as Briefs. In addition to the journal selected articles may be invited for submission as a module to the Academy Faculty Guide Book.

### Review/Assessment Criteria

The submitted manuscript will be assessed by at least three reviewers. Reviewers for the journal will use the *Strength, Improvement, and Insight (SII) assessment method*, the official assessment adopted by the Academy to select the published manuscripts. The authors will receive the reviewers' SII assessment of their manuscript at the end of the review process. The assessment of the manuscripts will be conducted according to the following two sets of criteria and established measures for each.

The first set of criteria concerns the document's scholarly content and its contribution in one or more of the following ways:

- Addresses issues relevant to Process Education philosophy and implementation
- Employs Process Educational principles and methodologies
- Presents an original contribution to Process Education knowledge map
- Appeals to wide range of Process Educators
- Expands upon relevant Process Education references and bodies of knowledge

The second set of criteria concerns the quality and presentation of the manuscript:

- Provide a clear, concise, and accurate representation
- Use appropriate and well-defined terminology
- Adhere to journal standards and style
- Be self-contained and well integrated
- Exhibit a high level of quality and attention to details

### Editorial Inquiries

Editorial questions and inquiries should be directed to: Dr. Jacqueline El-Sayed, Director, Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, Kettering University (previously General Motors Institute), Flint, Michigan, 48504, USA; Phone: (+1) 810-762-9685; fax: (+1) 810-762-9684, e-mail: [jelsayed@kettering.edu](mailto:jelsayed@kettering.edu).

## **Academy brochure (from Academy website - included as insert in pocket of binder)**

### **Measurement proposal (from Cy)**

**Draft Model for Academy Members  
Kettering/Academy/Pacific Crest Measurement Grant Proposal  
Cy Leise, Mohamed El-Sayed, and Bob McKinley (Pacific Crest Board Member)**

#### History:

In fall 2008, a series of conference calls resulted in a grant proposal for the development of a large number of well-developed measures to be included in the online measurement system proposed by Pacific Crest. The original concept, which was approved for expansion and evaluation by the Pacific Crest Board with board member Bob McKinley as its advocate, was an institute-based process involving measurement design and development that was planned to be a context for gathering enough diversity of disciplines and perspectives to be the foundation for universally-valid measures. This real-time, on-site concept was submitted but not funded. An alternative that the Academy of Process Educators might consider is to do all the work on a Blackboard site such as Kettering's, which is available to members.

#### Overall Purpose:

Develop measures for a dynamic, growth-inducing educational measurement system that produces consistent, integrated, performance outcomes at the institutional, program, faculty, and student levels.

#### Outcome Levels:

This section of the proposal suggests multiple measurement levels and targets that might be considered by Academy researchers. The only element that was included in the submitted version of the Pacific Crest proposal was the items involving student learning and growth. The other elements were suggested by Cy Leise, based on the *Faculty Guidebook* "star diagram." Current educational psychology research is also trending toward a fuller conceptualization and implementation of measurement in order to get beyond testing for concept knowledge. Measures of various types are needed for all of the following categories, which are also areas of interest of many Academy members.

1. Administrative buy-in and financial support
  - a. Specific initiatives
  - b. Benefits to faculty
  - c. Quality monitoring
  - d. Advocacy quality with external stakeholders
2. Measure/monitor system integrity, over the span of a year or more, in terms of averages or trends for:
  - a. Facilitation consistency (e.g., following instructional plans)

- b. Engagement quality of learners (e.g., teamwork behavior)
- c. Quality of instruction opportunities (e.g., match of assignment levels to objectives)
- 3. Faculty Growth
  - a. Curriculum Integrity (e.g., completeness and quality of activities for each course)
  - b. Professional development (e.g., quality of self-assessment and follow-up with growth opportunities)
  - c. Scholarship: For each measure follow up with a module that includes the measure but also identifies assignments, tasks, and roles at different levels to assure a "fit" between what instructions and measurable outcomes. (This might be an expanded "measures" book.)
- 4. Student Growth
  - a. Learning Skills
    - i. Key skills addressed
    - ii. Balance of learning skills by domains
    - iii. Balance of learning skills for discipline emphasis and way of being

Specific Purpose:

Work in teams of five to develop six new measures per year, with at least one independently developed by two teams for consistency assessment of the methodology.

Identification of Measures:

The grant-writing team will select a set of measures with most potential for use in the Pacific Crest software system and then recruit teams.

Mode/Resources:

100% distance work with tools including Blackboard discussion boards, Betty Lawrence's headphone/shared document system, conference calls, telephone, and email.

Rationale: If the measures methodology is broken into appropriate steps it will be more efficient to use a process spaced over time to maintain continuous progress on multiple projects, to avoid the fatigue of long hours at meetings, to reduce travel costs, and to make time management feasible for more academy members.

Team Members:

1. Facilitator (F)
2. Four other team members (TM)
3. Principle Investigator
4. Pacific Crest editor (Ed)
5. Pacific Crest consultant (C)

Tentative Work Plan:

Task	Tool/Outcome	F (hr)	TM (hr)	PI (hr)	Ed (hr)	C (hr)
1. PI, C, and TM agree on six potential measures to be developed; PI & C agree on cross-developed measure		1	4	1		1
2. Team rank-ordering of six measures	Conference call; six measures ranked	1 hr	4 hr			1 hr
3. Initial brainstorm of factors likely to be relevant for first measure	Blackboard discussion board; list of 15-20	1 hr	4 hr	1 hr		1 hr
4. Literature review to expand background knowledge of available research; E assess for completeness, relevance	Blackboard; at least one citation per team member with summary and list of evidence for factors	5 hr	20 hr		1 hr	
5. Facilitator prepare draft list of non-duplicative factors	Email	2 hr				
6. TM assess list of factors & champion five; eliminate five	Conf./identify top factors	1	4	1		1
7. F prepare second draft list of top factors	Bb/ Draft of top factors posted	2		1		1
8. TM, F assess second draft list and "lock in" one each; negotiate top 10	Conf./identify lock in factors; agree on top ten	1	4			
9. F edit top ten factors to produce ten statements	Bb/ten statements	2				
10. TM, F put ten statements into pairs; brainstorm labeling for five levels to prepare holistic rubric	Conf.	1	4			
11. F edit statements for five pairs and labels five levels	Bb/Edited draft of pair statements and labels for holistic rubric	2				
12. TM, F agree on holistic descriptors and labels; identify level distinctions	Conf./agree on main level distinctions	1	4			
13. F draft holistic rubric; PI, E, assess	Bb/produce draft of holistic rubric	3		2	2	2
14. TM, F decide on how to draft analytic rubric	Conf./Outline of analytic rubric	1	4	1		1
15. F prepare draft of analytic rubric	Bbl/draft of analytic rubric					
16. PI, E, C assess draft of holistic and analytic rubrics	Bb, Conf./assess and recommend changes	1		2	2	2
17. Prepare outline of scholarly module on recommended assignments and use of measure	Bb	1	4		1	
18. Final editing and coordination	Conf./Final tasks to move to software editor	1		1	1	1
<b>Totals:</b>						