

## **Faculty Development September Meeting Minutes**

Monday, September 23, 2013, 3-4PM, T302c

**Attendees:** Vicky Parker, Emily Rothman, Sue Fish, Marianne Prout, Yorghos Tripodis

### **1. Review and approval of June 18 meeting minutes.**

- No further edits – formally approved

### **2. Review and approval of summary to governing council regarding the comments on the faculty development program.**

- No further edits – formally approved

### **3. Quick follow-up to faculty development funds**

- Marianne has been communicating with Suzette who reports that there are differences among departments as to handling of the faculty development funds – some departments have set aside funds for individuals and some have not.
- Given that some are setting up individual lines and some are not, will we be able to see how they have actually distributed the money and assess whether or not there is inequity among faculty? As Marianne has understood the computer database that has been set up, we will know rank and gender. However the way the form is being filled out and how it's being set up might be different.
- Marianne was not permitted to add faculty development spending on the 2013 FDA to collect baseline data
- Changes to the 2014 FDA form will be proposed to ask faculty if FD funds were made available to them to spend in x,y,z areas
- Committee members expressed concern about using the FDA to gather information on equity of use of FD funds within departments since FDA forms are reviewed by chairs
- A faculty survey was originally proposed to obtain faculty feedback after this year on the rules of the use of FD funds and how hard or easy it is to get things approved to use these funds

### **4. Miscellaneous**

- FD was left out from the annual report, Dean Meenan said this would be fixed
- In current Bylaws there is no mechanism for FD to bring proposals to the GC. Marianne reports directly to Dean Meenan, but prior proposals (eg, funding for faculty development for faculty) have been attributed to the FS
- The bylaws need to be edited to include FD as committee able to bring proposals to GC
- Research committee has flexible pilot funds which is why you don't need to use FD funds for research purposes

## **5. Follow-up of mid-career faculty development program (ACIT)**

- Posted on Insider and shared with many department chairs.
- Challenges: In the medical school, faculty are getting formal time for the program through their practice plan. The chairs at SPH refused to set aside time for this (~10%). This might deter people from applying for this unless the chairs are supportive and help faculty to find that time.
- A big emphasis on this program is on leadership development but as a school, there isn't a focus on developing faculty internally for leadership roles, almost like a succession plan.
- The school doesn't see as goal to develop faculty as a leader in their field to understand the importance of serving and leading on national/international committees.
- Perhaps they should identify one person from each department to go to this.
- For it to be sustainable, there needs to be funds for this past year 1
- The GC doesn't understand how small the faculty base is here in order to run elaborate programs within SPH
- Can we push chairs to identify people who are appropriate for sabbatical and for this mid-career faculty development program? The chairs should strongly encourage faculty to do this – it is part of the chair's leadership agreement.
- Marianne will set up a meeting with Dean Meenan to discuss this issue and how she can work with the chairs on faculty development

## **6. Follow-up of for the Academy for Faculty Advancement (AFA) – year 3**

- Chairs are all uniformly saying that AFA program is worthwhile.
- We have had 4 faculty every year from SPH and these faculty end up broadly connected across the medical campus.
- Given how strongly positive this program has been and that many SPH faculty feel isolated, we wonder if Marianne should write a pitch to encourage faculty to do this.
- In year 1 there were information meetings that faculty could attend. As a recruitment strategy, we could have an information session once a year and have faculty who have gone through give testimony and invite the chairs.

## **7. Update on faculty exit interviews**

- Marianne has received examples of exit interviews from several institutions and has created a first draft
- Vicky and Emily have edited the current version
- There are still questions that might be best to remove such as “did you feel like your chair wanted you to stay?” but instead have some more open ended questions. There could be more efficient ways to ask these questions
- What is the overall goal of exit interviews? How will this information be used?

- There might be mixed feelings when people fill out this exit interview but it is good to get a sense of what people are feeling. Departures might hurt the school's reputation so it is important to address and understand reasons for departure.
- Other faculty hear about faculty departures but perhaps not accurately, or perhaps not in a thoughtful way.
- Few faculty leave each year so keeping these anonymous might be challenging.
- Vicky and Emily prefer to cut the closed ended questions and provide more open ended questions
- Vicky and Emily will do next round of edits, FD will agree/disagree and then send it to Dean Meenan.
- In a related issue, there reportedly was a repeat Faculty climate survey this summer but many people did not receive. Marianne will follow-up on this issue
- 

#### **8. Update on FDA data 2012**

- Because of chair transitions, CHS has evaluation data is not reliable for 2012 and 2013
- Marianne spent some time working on the data on mentoring. She reviewed the comments to see if there was mentoring outside of SPH. It's very clear that SPH faculty is a mentoring resource for the medical campus.
- We currently don't have questions asking if faculty have a mentor, only if they are mentoring
- Maybe we could include a question about people's experiences with mentors
- The content of the goals might not be as important, but the barriers and enablers serve a purpose.
- Year-by-year improvements in the overall evaluation scores and by teaching, research, etc might be unrealistic since the baseline scores were Some of these improvement goals and the quantification of them is driven by accreditation