

Faculty Development Committee

July 9, 2012

Notes

Present: Marianne Prout, Janice Weinberg, Vicky Parker, Lisa Sullivan, Bobbie White (later)

MP: We have revised handouts from the last meeting. In the future, the workshop Deb Bowen offers will cover getting one's first grant, regardless of whether it is a K award or another grant. This will be good for Health Policy & Management and for International Health.

Peter Cahn has left to go to Massachusetts General Hospital. Emelia Benjamin, who heads up faculty development in the Department of Medicine is looking for someone to replace him. The Academy for Faculty Advancement will run for this year's selected faculty will begin in September.

One of the questions we considered last meeting is whether there is a lack of programs or a lack of participation in programs.

As we discovered, there are lots of programs at Boston University. The "cheat sheet" we developed was sent around to the chairs and Jon Simon sent it around to all of his faculty. Should we push this idea of distribution by chairs? Marianne will send a note to all of the chairs, suggesting that they do so. Marianne will also suggest to the chairs that all faculty participate in at least one faculty development activity each year and plans should be brought up at the annual meeting.

Peer Coaching was discussed with regard to teaching. Should the Peer Coaching program come out of the departments, out of the Education Committee, out of the Faculty Development Committee, or out of the Faculty Senate?

There is the problem of a lack of people and lack of resources within the Faculty Development Committee. We would have to recruit so many people.

VP: Where it sits will make a difference in what we want it to be. It's not meant to be a penalty.

LS: And semester after semester we have bad teaching.

JW: The issue of the chronically underperforming teacher is different than the issue of peer coaching. How many underperforming teachers do we have?

LS: Maybe 5 a semester.

VP: Bad teaching is more of a chair accountability issue. Chairs just say, "I'm working on it." Offering peer coaching to bad teachers seems disingenuous. It's a management accountability issue: the chairs are responsible.

MP: Everything we do gets critiqued, why should teaching be different?

LS: Peer coaching is done between two equals. I have to go to the chairs about bad teaching reports.

VP: Maybe we could have a small group of master teachers to do "911" coaching.

JW: Folks who don't care are a separate problem.

MP: Management of bad teachers has to be worked on with the chairs, but then it has to go to Bob Meenan and Pat O'Brien.

LS: How do you evaluate teaching?

MP: What about Master Teachers doing the evaluating?

VP: Maybe we need to reinstate that quality teaching is the fiber of the school instead of an emphasis on getting grants.

Teaching isn't just what happens in the classroom. There are discrepancies between how one sees one's own syllabus and how someone else sees it. Also, while some are not good in the classroom, they may be very good at other aspects of teaching..

Lisa needs the support of the chairs.

MP: Let's talk about faculty development at the departmental level vs. centrally.

International Health has great grant support and therefore more staff supporting research than in any other department. Why don't all departments have that kind of staff support. There is also a difference in support from people who work in a center.

There is a huge difference in what is available, department to department. Life for junior faculty at SPH depends on where you land – in what department.

JW: There should be uniform grant support for writing, especially since it's harder to get grants. We're all supposed to be writing grants.

VP: it goes back to the research committee. At the VA there is core infrastructure for supporting grants.

MP: We should go to Bob regarding the variability in departments, then to the research committee.

Let's ask again: what are our goals? Some of them have been inherited.

The department chairs rejected evaluation of mentoring.

VP: It should be good to evaluate mentors. If we aren't doing so, how can we say that mentoring is important.

JW: Not all people should be mentors. There is this idea of matching new people with mentors in Biostatistics. The Department chairs meets with new faculty to insure that the assigned mentor is working. We should have a pool of willing and good mentors.

MP: We should have a goal of making access to faculty development equitable across departments. There should be an expectation of chairs and of faculty. And it should be clear in the new faculty orientation. If we can't put resources into faculty development, we aren't doing it.