Committee Members Present:

Tracy Hoover	Penn State	North Central	Tsh102@psu.edu
Matt Spindler	SUNY Oswego	North Central	spindler@oswego.edu
Deborah Boone	West Virginia University	North Central	Debby.boone@mail.wvu.edu
Amy Smith	University of Missouri	North Central	smithamyr@missouri.edu
Grady Robersts	University of Florida	Southern	groberts@ufl.edu
Tracy Irani	University of Florida	Southern	irani@ufl.edu
Robin Peiter-Horstmeier	University of Kentucky	Southern	rpeiter@uky.edu
Jon Ulmer	Texas Tech	Southern	Jon.ulmer@ttu.edu
Vern Luft	University of Nevada	Western	luft@unr.edu
Ben Swan	University of Idaho	Western	bswan@uidaho.edu
Brian Warnick	Utah State	Western	Brian.warnick@usu.edu
Shannon Arnold	Montana State	Western	Shannon.arnold@montana.edu

AAAE Members Present:

Tom Broyles	Virginia Tech
Chris Morgan	University of Georgia
Helen Barela	Texas Tech
Alyk Shultz	Texas Tech
Becki Lawver	University of Missouri
Seburn Pense	S. Illinois University
John Tummons	University of Missouri
Ryan Saucier	University of Missouri
Andy Baker	W. Illinois University
Tracy Rutherford	Texas A&M
Bill Camp	Cornell University

The meeting was called to order at 11:05 am by Chair Brian Warnick. The 2009 meeting agenda, the 2008 professional development evaluation, the 2007 committee minutes, and the committee membership roster were distributed to the AAAE members attending. The 2009 agenda and the 2008 meeting minutes were approved and there was an introduction of the meeting participants.

The two concurrent 2009 professional development workshops received high praise from the participants via the work shop evaluation summary (see attachment). However, some concerns were raised regarding the concurrent arrangement of the workshops. The fact that registration for the professional development sessions was seamless with the conference registration seems to have raised participation significantly. Participation in the professional development workshops was nearly double what is has been in the recent past with approximately 135 individuals participating in one of the two workshops offered. It was discussed that the RFP for 2010 professional development proposals would go out in early September with a November 1st due date.

The committee's primary discussion was around the 2010 professional development workshop in Omaha. The committee discussed sending out two calls one for a research centered professional development proposal and one for a teaching centered professional development proposal. However, it was concluded that it would be better to leave the RFP as it was to allow those that apply flexibility in the design of their workshop. In

addition, it was determined that the RFP should request a budget section in the proposals. Based on the professional development session evaluations and committee discussion the following topics arose as possible topics for the 2010 professional development sessions: grants / grant writing; collaboration in research; identifying research problems; integration of teaching and research. The idea of professional development tours arose from discussion. It was suggested that the 2008 North Central Conference may serve as a model for such professional development tours.

The idea of incorporating Gallup Consulting into the professional development at the 2010 conference arose and much discussion ensued. Gallop consultants assist individuals in identifying the way in which they most naturally think, feel, and behave as unique individuals, then build assist in building those talents to create strength and high performance. Tracy Rutherford volunteered to gather information about the idea and report back to the committee.

The committee members raised a question about the budget available for the professional development workshops. Brian Warnick indicated that the committee would have $1,500.00 to spend for the 2010 conference. The committee discussed the idea that perhaps the professional development budget should be increased. However, no motion was made regarding the issue.

In 2008, the committee forwarded the idea that a time should be set aside during the 2009 AAAE conference for program leaders to meet and discuss. Committee members that were present at the program leader meeting believed that the meeting resulted in positive outcomes and agreed that the practice should be continued.

The committee recommended (Vern Luft moved, Tracy Hoover 2nd, motion passed) **to change the name from AAAE fellow award to AAAE Academy of Fellows.**

The committee recommended (Vern Luft moved, Tracy Hoover 2nd, motion passed) **to change the limit on the number of senior fellows from 1 to 3 in any one year.**

The committee recommended (Vern Luft moved, Tracy Hoover 2nd, motion passed) **to assign the Academy of AAAE Fellows as a standing committee of AAAE with the responsibility to meet at least annually to examine priorities of the association and undertake leadership initiatives appropriate to recognized leaders of the association at the request of the President and Board of AAAE.**

The discussion surrounding the three motions was related to the following three ideas: 1) the first motion creates an organization or body of people; 2) that many people in the profession with over 20 years of experience may not have an opportunity to become a Senior Fellow because of the 1 person limit in any one year; 3) that it may be an opportunity to engage the recognized leaders in AAAE as a coordinated group of professionals.

The 2009 committee officers will rotate into the 2010 positions: Ben Swan from the University of Idaho as Chair and Matt Spindler of SUNY-Oswego as Vice Chair, while Brian Warnick rotates off committee. Shannon Arnold from Montana State University was voted in as Secretary.
The meeting was adjourned at 12:13 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Matt Spindler
Professional Development Committee Secretary

Evaluation of Research Manuscripts: Improving Reliability

Level of Agreement	M	SD
This workshop was useful to my research/practice…………………………	3.93	0.25
This workshop was practical and relevant to me………………………	3.90	0.31
This workshop was useful to my professional networking…………………	3.67	0.48
This workshop was engaging………………………………………	3.87	0.35
The workshop presenters were well prepared…………………………	3.93	0.25
The presenters were able to accomplish the workshop objectives…………	3.86	0.35

Scale: 1 = Disagree, 2 = Somewhat Disagree, 3 = Somewhat Agree, 4 = Agree

What do you consider the most beneficial part of this workshop?
➢ APA
➢ As a young faculty member, this activity brings out items of discussion which are usually neglected. I shouldn't have to learn all of this by experience. Good Stuff.
➢ Conceptual/theoretical framework (CF/TF) (6)
➢ Dialogue with others – open discussion (4).
➢ Explanation of score sheet w/ concrete examples.
➢ Q&A with panel of presenters (3).
➢ Qualitative Research by Ball & Hains.
➢ Research strategies discussion a "refresher".
➢ Re-visit topics in future conferences. Very helpful. Excellent work by presenters.
➢ Shared ideas, very valuable! Awesome
➢ Small round tables w/ discussion on specific papers related to ranking sheets (6).
➢ The opportunity to start discussions on how to improve the review process (2).
➢ The overall synthesis of material.
➢ Very practical and useful information.

Do you have any specific recommendations for improvement of this workshop that you would like to share with the presenters?
➢ Add discussion of mixed-methods research.
➢ As young grad student, I would prefer more comfortable method of Q & A (write down Qs)
➢ Conducted w/ entire profession more regularly
➢ Good Materials, well organized, continue large & small groups w/ support materials.
➢ More hands on – engaging on evaluating articles
➢ More hands on – reviewing
➢ Need more time (8): panel discussion (1), cf/tf (2), breakout sessions (3). Suggested 1.5 hours.
➢ TF/CF talk, some literature/references would have been helpful, handouts etc. Need more info.

What suggestions do you have to improve on the Professional Development workshops in the future?
➢ Continue PD that is relevant to faculty!
➢ Continue to involve many/diversified presenters (i.e. universities, gender, ethnic/racial origins).
➢ Continue w/ topics; qualitative & changes in APA. Is AAAE going to accept APA changes?
➢ Continued increase in topics focused on application in the field and reform when needed.
➢ Don't have 2 workshops offered @ same time
➢ Follow this model.
➢ Liked having 2 choices, please continue
➢ More workshops on topics like this with opportunities for audience engagement interaction and Q&A.

To help the Professional Development Committee plan further activities for the membership, what are some areas/topics that need to be addressed?
➢ Additional qualitative training (3) Suggested 2 – 3 hours for everyone to attend (Teacher Ed).
➢ Content Knowledge
➢ Continue this line… Reviewing manuscripts… submitting quality manuscripts.
➢ Effective grant writing
➢ Effective teaching
➢ Engage in service activities
➢ How do we get reviewers on same page? Increase inter-rater acceptance of JAE reviewers.
➢ How technology (course management systems, google, etc.) changes T & L process.
➢ Involvement in international programs
➢ Mixed-Method how-to workshop
➢ More TF
➢ Need more activities related to review process
➢ New changes in APA
➢ Structural equation modeling
➢ Teaching strategies in response to "Xer" learning styles teaching technologies employed through distance education and blended courses – use technologies to strength or distract from classroom teaching (YouTube, podcasts, webinars, twitter, etc.)
➢ Teaching w/ utilization of research from other Journals (ex: AERA, Admin, Negro Education)
➢ This was the best professional development I have attended! Best in several years! Do again.

Conducting Research that Informs Practice

Level of Agreement	*M*	*SD*
This workshop was useful to my research/practice.	3.82	0.39
This workshop was practical and relevant to me	3.84	0.37
This workshop was useful to my professional networking	3.14	0.88
This workshop was engaging.	3.56	0.55
The workshop presenters were well prepared	3.95	0.21
The presenters were able to accomplish the workshop objectives	3.89	0.39

Scale: 1 = Disagree, 2 = Somewhat Disagree, 3 = Somewhat Agree, 4 = Agree

What do you consider the most beneficial part of this workshop?

Time management tips (10)

Hearing what others are doing (9)

New Strategies for improved productivity (8)

Panel discussions/multiple viewpoints (4)

Focused research session (3)

Balancing work duties including research (2)

Consultant portion of the workshop (2)

Enjoyable; no suggestions (2)

Remind us of our role as teachers/researchers (2)

Allowed time for us to apply ideas

Collaborative thoughts

Honest discussion

Liked the "next action" part

Motivational

Not what I was expecting considering the title

Understanding primary reason for research

Various speakers with different perspectives

Do you have any specific recommendations for improvement of this workshop that you would like to share with the presenters?

Break-out groups to brainstorm/network/write (5)

It was good; no recommendations (4)

More audience interaction (2)

It was excellent!

Fresh way to look at setting priorities, solving problems, & time management

Show research program models

Have discussions surrounding "scholarly creative effort"

I cold spend a full day on this workshop

More time with Marion

Wanted more focus on "research that informs practice."

Love the practical tips; keep 'em coming

More time from panel

We saw how we can allocate time for research but how can we "conduct research that informs practice?"

Panel had one non-teacher ed; could have been more diverse

Do this more often!

Add samples of conceptual models

What suggestions do you have to improve on the Professional Development workshops in the future?

Continue concurrent session format (3)

More audience interaction (2)

I would really like to attend a workshop on "Conducting research that informs practice" (2)

Continue to use panels

Expand PD opportunities beyond research

Gain input from AAAE members

Grant writing workshop

Hands-on/minds-on; Questions/activities

It was good; keep up the good work

Make all day so everyone can go to both

Maybe more examples in the notebook

More of this

Provide contents of notebook online as a pdf

Research for our stakeholders – what do our customers value and are willing to pay for

To help the Professional Development Committee plan further activities for the membership, what are some areas/topics that need to be addressed?

Continuation of topic: how to engage stakeholders (4)

Building collaborative teams (2)

Grant writing (2)

Address research priorities

Best practices for Teacher Education

Collaboration in research

Conceptual model

Conducting outreach, engagement, or extension programs

Continue connecting PD to the "whole" of ag. ed.

Scholarship of teaching

Determining how local research fits into national agenda

Different teaching methods

Fellows should collaboratively develop an annual workshop

How to write for publishing work in journals

Identifying research problems

Integrating teaching and research

Navigating the P/T process

Planning graduate programs in agricultural education

Similar workshop on teaching