

Faculty Development Meeting Minutes

July 10, 2014, 2-3PM – Founders Room

In attendance: Marianne Prout, Emily Rothman, Lisa Sullivan, Sue Fish, Bill DeJong, Lora Sabin, Nafisa Halim, Lisa Fredman, Kathleen McVarish, Bobbie White

1. Approval of May Meeting Minutes (handout)
 - Approved
2. Report on faculty development funds distribution by departments this past fiscal year (handout)
 - Obtaining FD funds was considered one of the triumphs with the help and assistance of the faculty senate.
 - 80%+of the funds were spent which is a positive thing.
 - A qualitative assessment of these funds would be helpful (how they were used).
 - The budget is the amount that is available to the department. “Awarded” is the amount that the chair approved; spent is obvious. The funds are tracked by the department administrators. There might be a gap because reimbursements are in the pipeline.
 - Department chairs could have handled the funds two different ways – chairs pre-approved requests up to \$2000 per faculty with department administrators tracking the amounts or chairs approving requests only after submission by faculty member for a certain amount.
 - This spreadsheet may not be the final dispersals. There seem to be 2 different types of gaps: amount of funds awarded may be less than funds budgeted to department and amount of funds spent may be less than funds awarded. We need to review again with Suzette to understand how the funds are organized and distributed by department and then with chairs to understand the gaps.
 - Faculty development funds awarded to departments are not carried over to the next year
 - 3. Report on junior faculty luncheons
 - There have been three luncheons so far for Assistant Professors. The list of assistant professors was obtained and is being used to invites to “junior faculty” rather than using the term “early-career faculty”, which is based on time in faculty rank. The list obtained included 34 names of assistant professors although 2 are no longer based at SPH after e-mail contacts; the time at BU ranges from a few months to 13 years. Because of the organization of the list, the luncheons have included the most recent appointees first. In the most recent group attending the luncheon, there were no unmodified appointments (this includes the new hires with the increase in the number of admissions).
 - The next luncheon is scheduled in a couple weeks and will include faculty who have been longer in rank at Assistant Professor rank.
 - A junior faculty member has requested to learn what themes recur at these luncheons.

- Some faculty are uncertain what the requirements are for their types of appointments; some clarification may not be apparent with the issuance of new A&P guidelines. However, some faculty signed up for modified appointments with the sense that they could switch type of appointment easily.
 - A Faculty Development calendar is in discussion to pull events from all departments at the request of some junior faculty.
 - The Assistant Professor group feels even more isolated than other faculty and appreciates the connection to faculty from other departments based on immediate feedback. Impact over a longer time period needs to be assessed.
3. Discussion of voluntary mentoring consultations with Director of faculty development/FDC to chairs and to faculty members (see handout on developmental networks)
- Marianne doesn't see a pathway to impose school-wide mentoring. Approaches to mentoring in some departments are working well but variability is wide between and sometimes within departments. Authority to impose mentoring approaches is lacking.
 - Offering voluntary consultation sessions on developmental networks to chairs and/or faculty seems feasible and could potentially offer an alternative to faculty who feel the need for more development assistance than they are currently receiving. As noted in the handouts, works by Professor Kathy Kram at BU SMG emphasizes the density and intensity of developmental networks. Some people might benefit from a consultation on the current network and how it might be enhanced. Faculty could be referred by chairs or could self-refer. Dean Meenan did not oppose the voluntary approach.
 - i. It might be good for the Faculty Development Director to do it as opposed to volunteers. This way there will be consistent information given to others.
 - A suggestion that mentoring plans could be added To the initial offer letter was made but countered with the idea that they shouldn't be in the letter in case things do not go as planned; but perhaps addressed through an informational interview.
 - It would be helpful to hear mentoring options that are offered at other institutions.
 - People want an outside view for their mentorship and to lay out the pros and cons.
 - Profiles are a useful tool to connect junior faculty with senior faculty who can be content mentors etc.
 - There is a general mentorship guide that you should not be matched with someone in your hierarchy.
 - Having a mentoring proposal is worth a trial. This is one of the responses the FD can make while in transition.
4. Search for new FDC director, planned overlap time
- The search is underway and there is a plan for some overlap time. Hopefully the new director will be identified by the next committee meeting in September.
5. Mid-career faculty development program in progress
- There is anticipation that it is of limited utility for some, and maximum utility for others.
6. Further FDA data have been requested

- This year only summary data was available and not individual data. There are chair ratings only in 5 areas (scholarship, teaching, service, citizenship, financial); currently we don't have the qualitative data.
- The purpose of this data is to try to figure out if the efforts in FD are bearing any fruition.
- There is some hesitancy with the individualized data because it could be possible to identify someone even though it's de-identified.
- It is very important for faculty to understand their avenues of promotion in the revised A&P guidelines. Not only do people have to understand how they can get promoted, but it is important to educate faculty on the different criteria because faculty have to vote. People are going to impose the unmodified criteria on faculty that are on other tracks so there needs to be an understanding that the criteria are different based on tracks. This should be something the FDC talks about.