Committee for Faculty Development Meeting Minutes
March 8, 2011 – 2:00-3:00 pm
Talbot Board Room

Called to order: 2:00pm
In attendance: Deb Bowen, Sue Fish, Deborah Fournier, Marianne Prout (MP), Lisa Sullivan, Janice Weinberg (via conference phone)
Absent: Yvette Cozier, Stephen Haley, Lora Sabin, Roberta White
Recorder: Justine de Marrais (JdeM)

Agenda
1. **Welcome and Review of Minutes**
   a. Minutes from first meeting (2/2/2011) approved

2. **Outline for discussion of FDA with chairs**
   a. Review of discussion objectives
   b. Clarification of "case examples": ask chairs to provide illustrative, abstract/non-identifiable examples of faculty members whose FDA review was problematic, as well as examples of issues with the FDA process itself.
      i. One example of an issue with the process: confusion arising from distribution of a sheet with a "typical" FDA review. MP/JdeM will draft a letter that chairs can send out to faculty prior to next review clarifying that review is based on last year's personalized agreement between faculty and chair, not on the example on the sheet.
   c. Results from the two prior FDA cycles are available within each department, but school-wide aggregated data has not been systematically analyzed and shared with faculty. Starting this year, the FDA process will be web-based, so collecting and analyzing data will be easier going forward.
   d. In order to get around the problem of collecting and analyzing FDA results from the past two years, two suggestions were made:
      i. Quantitative data: Biostatistics did analyze last year's FDA quantitative data and shared the results with its faculty. Many judged it to be very valuable and informative. Biostats quant data has previously been shared with the Faculty Senate. The committee asked Lisa Sullivan to make a presentation re: the value of quantitative data analysis at the next chairs meeting.
      ii. Qualitative data: Collecting and analyzing FDA qualitative data re: individual faculty goals would allow the school to better define SPH faculty development needs, observe changes/trends over time, and strategically plan and develop specific training opportunities. One solution is to have each department examine its qualitative data and draft its own list of faculty needs, and then combine the lists to form a master list of SPH faculty needs.

3. **Committee feedback on outline of Faculty Development web pages**
   a. Design and organization approved. Built-in redundancy judged to be useful.
   b. Suggestion was made to pilot test outline with new faculty.
   c. Areas to password protect: Discussion board; examples of successfully funded SPH grant proposals.
   d. Deb Fournier suggested additional research-related resources, including an inventory instrument for research and a BU App which integrates many useful tools, some of which may have particular relevance to faculty development. JdeM will follow up.
   e. Add "expert" contact information within each section of the website, as well as on the final Contact Us page, to make it easier for faculty to request additional information or assistance.

4. **Committee feedback on draft of Faculty Development Needs survey**
   a. First survey question is one developed and used by Peter Cahn at BU Faculty Dev and Diversity, BUSM. Inclusion on the SPH survey will allow the collection and analysis of comparative data on the Medical Campus.
   b. Agreement that we should include a definition of *mentor* on the survey.
   c. Definition of Service: The committee agrees that there is some confusion regarding what is meant by Service. Do we need to provide a definition?
   d. Faculty Development Topics: Separate Teaching and Advising, Promotions and Publishing into separate topics. Add Leadership [in this section or elsewhere in survey?] as a topic. If we ask about Diversity, it should be in an open-response format, not a check-box.
   e. Question was raised if this committee was even charged with task of addressing issues of diversity or diversity training. Do we eliminate it from our survey? Larger question: Is it appropriate to consider a separate committee to address diversity/ diversity needs at SPH?
   f. Time did not allow us to address:
       i. Discussion of SPH's approach to mentoring
       ii. Collection of demographic data on survey
       iii. Who should be included in survey?

Next Committee meeting in approximately 4 weeks

Meeting adjourned: 3:30 pm