

Faculty Development Work Group
Call #2 Minutes
December 7th, 2005

Workgroup members/Staff Present: Chair: Lynn Blanchard (UNC), Juan Carlos Belliard (Loma Linda), Diane Calleson (UNC), Carol Tresolini (UNC), Rebecca Wilder (UNC), Kristine Wong (Staff), Sarena Seifer (Staff), Chris Hanssmann (Staff), Ken May (UNC), Ron Strauss (UNC)

Workgroup members Not Present: Barbara Brandt (Minnesota), Sarah Couch (Cincinnati), Wendy Duncan-Hewitt (Auburn), Chamika Hawkins (Minnesota), Tom Hazinski (Vanderbilt), Douglas Huenergardt (Loma Linda), Kathryn Karipides (Case), Lewis Lefkowitz (Vanderbilt), Jo-Anne Prendeville (Cincinnati), Cheryl Scheid (UMass), Nancy Young (IUPUI), David Hill (Colorado), Bonnie Miller (Vanderbilt), Kathleen Krichbaum (Minnesota)

Topic 1: Discussion of grids, models & competency areas for community-engaged faculty members

Workgroup members discussed and clarified expectations of competency areas (career phase grid) for community-engaged scholarship. The following comments were made and areas were discussed:

- Are we *enhancing* the existing lens through which scholarship is evaluated within competency areas, or *developing* a new lens through which to examine scholarship, a la Boyer? Overlap with Peer Review workgroup here—and we ought to be paying attention to both
- Inclusion of *practice* as an area of competency, along with other types of CES outside of CBPR, such as Action Research
- Focus on *attributes* of successful CES scholar, as well as the attributes of CES research, rather than labels
- To what extent are competencies profession-specific or cross-cutting? Both are needed
- More information on faculty development and RPT policies, etc. could be put up on websites

The following suggestions were made with regard to possible changes/edits in the competency areas and career phase grid structure:

- Kellogg's Community Health Scholars list can be broadened and language made more encompassing—we can use the result as a generic list of competencies from which to start, and then develop discipline-specific competencies
- Keep use of language broad in general in these documents: e.g. something broader than “service learning” (so that it encompasses a wider range of activities), “graduate professional students” rather than “graduate students”
- Replace “grad student” topic with “grad student/medical student/resident/fellow”
- Attach set of activities for each level
- Some information can be linked to Toolkit and referred to in grid

- Draft set of competencies will have multiple applications and can be linked to professional growth, RPT policies, and faculty development programs:
 - Individual focus → competencies
 - Institutional support → faculty development
 - Reward system → promotion and tenure

Topic 2: Additional information needed

The workgroup discussed items that may need further explanation or expansion in advance of the February meeting.

These included adding to changing the career phase grid by adding, for example, *participation* in research projects and opportunities for mentoring and internships for graduate professional students and post docs/residents.

The level-based grid was also discussed. The following information will be helpful to add/change:

- More specifics about what is meant by “association” level—e.g. distinguishing between associations with individuals as members and institutions as members (professional associations vs. the National Association of State/University and Land Grant Colleges, for example)
- Weblinks to examples on grid

A glossary that defines the various terms used within the “alphabet soup of engagement,” or an alphabetical list of members was also requested.

Action Items: Changes will be made based on workgroup suggestions to documents, and they will be sent out to the committee for review. We will put a call out before the 25th of January to obtain examples of CES-supportive or applicable faculty development policies within the Collaborative. Revised documents incorporating workgroup comments will be sent out by the 6th of January.

Topic 3: Possible topics for discussion and products to emerge from Feb. meeting

It was agreed that time should be set aside at the meeting in Nashville to discuss cross-cutting and overlapping issues amongst all workgroups. The topics that the workgroup itself would like to discuss in Nashville include the following:

- Present a set of generic CES-faculty competencies and use this as a base to be specifically tailored towards discipline-specific competencies
 - Expand on the concept of “mentorship”—how is it different between disciplines, and for faculty and students, etc.
 - Campus Compact has a glossary defining the aforementioned “Alphabet Soup” - list to start with in Nashville
 - Think towards creating a piece of scholarship about faculty development (a paper for publication, for example)