**Faculty Development Meeting Minutes**
**May, 8, 2014, 1-2PM - Board Room**
**In attendance:** Marianne Prout, Lora Sabin, Debora Fournier, Nafisa Halim, Lisa Fredman, Bobbie White

1. Approval of April Meeting Minutes

   - Approved

2. Junior Faculty Luncheons

   - The junior faculty luncheons were developed in response to the junior faculty survey report indicating that new faculty are unaware of many faculty development opportunities.

   - The Dean approved the luncheons and the FS is on board with it.

   - The question has been raised whether these should be limited by time at the institution, i.e. early career, or by appointment level.

   - Currently, there are 37 assistant professors scattered across departments that range in time since appointment from less than a year to 13 years; the median time is less than 4 years. The Mid Career faculty program takes assistant professors that have been here for 7+ years.

   - Pros and cons of including all assistant professors: If assistant professors who have been in place for an extended time need a plan to spearhead their career, this should be an individual conversation. For newer assistant professors who need information about general opportunities, there is a benefit for having a group meeting because there is networking and exchanging of information.

   - Separating the early and long-standing assistant professors into different groups could allow for better focus and understanding of needs of each group.  For those who are stalled in place, participation in a focused group discussion could provide insight into what has happened to those people.  Many suggestions were offered, including reduced time work, child-bearing, personal preferences but better understanding of the issues is needed.

   - Marianne will begin with an invite to people who have been assistant professors for 5 years or less, and then have a special luncheon for those who have been assistant professors longer to get the purposes separate. They will have different agendas and questions so it is best to keep the groups separate.

3. Mentoring recommendations

- The CTSA is planning a training for research mentors and it is going to include a web-based training and a semester long case-based discussion. At the end of this program, people will receive a certificate. This would be beneficial to those who are going to start mentoring.
- Johns Hopkins Model
    a. This model cannot work in a small department like EH. In a small department, it can get very personal and cumbersome.
    b. There has been a lot of mixed messages about this model. Biostats and CHS have adapted it. Lisa advocated at the last FS meeting that promotion has become a team effort and this is where this model is getting momentum in some departments.
    c. It is difficult to say what the average time is before promotion to associate professor because there are so many variables.
    d. Based on what has been learned, what matters most in promotion is name recognition in the field which can be addressed in letters. More than making it a team effort, there needs to be a strategy to get people to make contacts and network.
    e. This point explains the process but it doesn't define what success might look like. Is there a basic metric of success such as sharing pubs with senior or mid-career faculty? Chairs can be asked for their opinion on what success might look like.
    f. The name "John Hopkins Model" should be changed. Marianne will rewrite this section.
    g. Some Faculty Senate members were concerned that they don't want people to be looking over their shoulder.
- There have been successful promotions since the new system but some have not made it through on a second try. Reputation seems to be the main hurdle.
- It would be beneficial to learn the barriers to promotion for those who have been promoted and learn about their experiences.
- Some people just might not be presenting themselves well on their CV and this could be a development opportunity for some.

- There is an emphasis on the "impact factor" such as publishing in high impact journals and looking at the extent of faculty collaborating on grants and papers. There is a lot of data on academic analytics that could be used to see how people are linked. A baseline analysis could be done in each department in terms of these variables. This data and digital footprint could be used to make cases for the impact factor in letters.
- In EH, a project like the Superfund is passed on to different investigators to promote the junior faculty's work. It is the culture of EH.
- When presenting the recommendation to the chairs, there should be an emphasis that these can be adapted to each department and geared for the individual faculty to recognize that they are all different.