

Committee for Faculty Development Meeting Minutes
February 2, 2011 – 10:00-11:00 am
Telephone Conference

Called to order: 10:00am

In attendance: Deb Bowen, Yvette Cozier, Sue Fish, Deborah Fournier, Marianne Prout (Director of Faculty Development), Lora Sabin, Lisa Sullivan, Janice Weinberg, Roberta White

Absent: Stephen Haley

Recorder: Justine de Marrais

Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions
 - a. Initial meeting of the committee held via telephone conference due to inclement weather
 - b. Welcome from Director
 - c. Introduction of members, including interests in faculty development: Interests emphasize importance of needs assessment for faculty development at SPH; review of current faculty development initiatives; evaluation of programs both at SPH and on Medical Campus; faculty recruitment and retention; and diversity
2. Mission for Faculty Development at SPH
 - a. Selection of literature, including Coleman (BUSM) presentation, to help define what faculty development will mean at SPH. Most available literature focuses on junior faculty and medical school models. Committee members encouraged to forward relevant fac dev literature to Justine to help create learning resource.
 - b. Expansion of current SPH faculty development initiatives from department level to school-wide approach
 - c. Support for mentoring in teaching and research
3. Mission of the Committee for Faculty Development
 - a. Clarification of Committee as long-term advisory group and the extent of the school's support. SPH 2011-15 strategic plan includes support of faculty development initiatives. Intent is for position of Director of Faculty Development to become permanent.
 - b. Committee agreed with no dissents to an intensive commitment for first 6-12 month, involving monthly meetings to propose ideas, edit materials, and establish an effective faculty development program. Once maintenance phase is achieved, meetings likely to become quarterly.
4. Tasks for Year One
 - a. Letter from Dean Meenan to Marianne Prout regarding position as Director of Faculty Development, committee goals, and first year tasks.
 - b. Request for Committee to take over responsibility of FDA next year.
 - c. Needs assessment:
 - i. Suggestion to review previously collected survey results, based on interviews the Faculty Senate had with chairs, and pool data on

- current faculty development practices. Use this as foundation for new ongoing discussions with chairs: allow chairs to define needs, learn from each other, and arrive at consensus on best practices and means of improving school efforts.
- ii. Participate in faculty chair meetings to formalize discussions of faculty development activities, policies, and proposals. Frequency of meetings TBD, perhaps on monthly basis.
- d. Develop new survey tool
- i. SPH doesn't fit existing survey models; most formats tailored for mentoring junior faculty and medical settings. See sample survey of needs assessment used by DOM junior faculty program – use as base framework for SPH-revised survey tool, to allow for collection of comparative data.
 - ii. Committee members encouraged to review and critique this survey. Is it applicable only to junior faculty? How would we like to modify it to suit SPH needs?
 - 1. Suggestion that this survey can apply to more senior faculty too, particularly if we add questions to elicit the needs of higher faculty.
 - 2. Add questions: Have faculty acted as mentors/ Do they have mentors?
 - 3. What activities do faculty participate in that could represent faculty development efforts or initiatives?
 - 4. How aware are faculty of available fac dev programs at SPH or on the Medical Campus? Identify gaps in awareness or areas of disconnect on campus.
- e. SPH mentoring model: Do we want to confine mentoring within department, make it broader (school-wide, campus-wide, national), or both? Agreement to have both: Create distributed model that is anchored in the department, with different mentors to meet different needs. Some mentors have to come from within department, in part because SPH is structured that way, but mentees can be encouraged to have advisors outside the dept/school, extending to national level. Good idea to have this discussion with dept chairs. (BU School of Management – good model of distributed mentoring.)
- f. Evaluation of available BUMC fac dev resources:
- i. Identify resources
 - ii. SPH faculty awareness and participation
 - iii. Obstacles to participation – e.g., convenient times/logistical concerns; securing permission for SPH faculty
 - iv. Are these resources appropriate to meet SPH faculty needs? Are they applicable to SPH faculty or mainly medical faculty?
- g. Identify goals related to fac dev efforts now underway. Per Dean Meenan, “Review and update the plan for BUSPH faculty development that was crafted by Deb Bowen as part of her ELAM fellowship....This can be

done in conjunction with the departmental planning efforts that Mark Prashker will be coordinating.”

- h. Consider expansion of SPH faculty dev initiatives to BUMC community
 - i. Communication strategy
 - i. Develop SPH web page
 - ii. Committee agrees to review strategy and evaluate materials for inclusion
5. Committee Priorities
- a. Teaching
 - i. Identified as a school-wide need, crossing all departments
 - ii. Peer review initiatives
 - 1. International Health – Faculty feedback in teaching
 - a. Evaluate syllabi
 - b. Attend a couple of classes
 - c. Make suggestions for improving teaching
 - 2. MCH
 - a. Peer observation in second year
 - b. Report submitted to Lisa Sullivan and Education Committee on first-year results. Can this report be shared with this Committee?
 - b. Research
 - i. Faculty report feeling isolated, needing collaborators
 - ii. How can school improve communications and interactions to enhance research collaborations?
 - iii. Deborah Fournier: Plan on BUMC to create faculty profiles, utilizing Pubmed MESH term search mechanisms; expected June rollout
 - iv. Bobbie White: Currently provides on-request consultation for new faculty, or faculty with new ideas, to facilitate collaborative relationships both within BU and with outside institutions
 - c. Balance of Work Responsibilities (Teaching/Research/Service) and Work/Life – going beyond “efficient time management”

Next steps:

Distribution of meeting minutes

Committee members to review

- draft of Survey instrument
- draft of Communication plan

Next Committee meeting in approximately 4 weeks

Meeting adjourned: 11:14 am