

**Faculty Development Work Group**  
**Call #3 Minutes**  
**January 25<sup>th</sup>, 2006**

Workgroup members/Staff Present: Chair: Lynn Blanchard (UNC), Kathryn Karipides (Case), David Hill (Colorado), Bonnie Miller (Vanderbilt), Nancy Young (IUPUI), Ron Strauss (UNC), Kristine Wong (Staff), Sarena Seifer (Staff), Chris Hanssmann (Staff),

Workgroup members Not Present: Barbara Brandt (Minnesota), Carol Tresolini (UNC), Rebecca Wilder (UNC), Juan Carlos Belliard (Loma Linda), Diane Calleson (UNC), Sarah Couch (Cincinnati), Wendy Duncan-Hewitt (Auburn), Ken May (UNC), Chamika Hawkins (Minnesota), Tom Hazinski (Vanderbilt), Douglas Huenergardt (Loma Linda), Lewis Lefkowitz (Vanderbilt), Jo-Anne Prendeville (Cincinnati), Cheryl Scheid (UMass), Kathleen Krichbaum (Minnesota)

---

**Goal:** Determine how to present at Nashville meeting and discuss desired outcomes

**Topic #1: Workgroup session**

We have 1 hour and 15 minutes in which to present. This is short time in which to present a lot of material—we will send materials out ahead of time with a note to people about “airplane reading” and a request to read and review, and ask people to bring examples of faculty development programs at their schools.

In the course the session, we would like to accomplish:

1. Presentation and fleshing out of grids (other possible ways to represent: feedback loop? Multiple pathways?)
2. Flashing out of competencies
3. Group discussion to discuss examples
  - Within this, discuss whether these linear models are realistic or usable, how we portray how faculty actually enter CES, and how to support faculty moving into CES from any point

We may not have time to do all of these in the time allotted. Important to get discussion of career paths.

**Topic #2: Discussion of faculty development grids**

*Career Phase Grid:* The underlying question is whether these can accurately represent CES faculty careers. It implies a linear progression, and that may not be the way in which CES faculty progress.

Two things to consider: 1) Current circuitousness of CES faculty progression *may* be due to lack of support and infrastructure, the possibility of linearity may be part of building this, 2) There may be a more representative way to portray faculty entry into CES in non-linear ways.

In the meantime, grid will be made as comprehensive as possible prior to meeting for discussion in session. Will change intro to reflect non-linearity.

*Levels Grid:* Important question to address is how to use this as development guide and not as a setting up “extra” competencies for CES faculty. We want to populate grid with more examples from the Collaborative—this can happen in session discussion.

→ Action item: CCPH will make changes on grids and send to workgroup

### **Topic #3: Competencies**

The competencies adapted from the Community Health Scholars Program should be fleshed out and framed both as competency *and* what can be done to demonstrate competency (knowledge, skills, and demonstration of these in practice). Again, the intent is not to set up “extra” competencies for CES scholars.

Competencies can be discussed in session in small groups, framed by examples, how these are demonstrated, and how this can be measured (this overlaps with RPT committee).

→ Action item: CCPH will cluster and rework draft competencies.

### **Conclusion**

Questions raised about both grids and competencies frame an important discussion for Collaborative meeting: what does a CES career look like? *Is* there a “career path” for CES faculty, or is there little overlap between career trajectories? What can we learn from “exemplars” in the field? Will a shift in support systems and infrastructure for CES scholars result in more linearity?

→ Action item: Ron and Lynn will talk to grad student about interviewing CES faculty about career trajectories.