

**Collaborative Faculty Development Workgroup
Teleconference Call #1: September 28, 2005
Call Minutes**

Workgroup members/Staff Present: Juan Carlos Belliard (Loma Linda), Lynn Blanchard (UNC), Diane Calleson (Staff), David Hill (Colorado), Jen Kauper-Brown (Staff), Kathleen Krichbaum (Minnesota), Bonnie Miller (Vanderbilt), Sarena Seifer (Staff), Carol Tresolini (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), Ken May (UNC), Jo-Anne Prendeville (Cincinnati), Cheryl Scheid (UMass), Ron Strauss (UNC), Rebecca Wilder (UNC), Nancy Young (IUPUI)

Topic 1: Review of the charge of the workgroup and what has already been done

Workgroup members briefly reviewed the charge of the workgroup and the topics of discussion at the workgroup meeting at the Collaborative's annual meeting in Nashville. The group reaffirmed that the focus of the workgroup should be narrowed initially to working on efforts in faculty development. This focus will provide the group with a concrete and attainable goal. It was also mentioned that faculty development activities will also assist with faculty recruitment and retention.

Topic 2: Review and discuss pre-call survey responses

Due to the size of the workgroup, a brief anonymous survey was conducted to obtain information from work group members about their current activities and needs to seed the call's discussion. The survey received 6 responses. The group briefly discussed the survey responses. One of the most interesting points was that all respondents are currently in schools where community-engaged faculty will be coming up for review in the next few years.

The following comments were made during the discussion of the survey responses:

- Although it is helpful to have lists of journals that publish community-engaged scholarship, it is often most important for faculty to publish in their discipline-specific journals.
- It was also noted that faculty development is very discipline specific and it will be important to collect and develop examples and models from each of the health profession fields. It may not be realistic to generate a generic model of faculty development that will be relevant.

Action: Workgroup members who have not previously completed the survey should do so by visiting <https://catalysttools.washington.edu/tools/webq3/?sid=8813&owner=jenbr>.

Topic 3: Identification of the expected outcomes of the group's priority areas/work

Workgroup members discussed the need to develop a framework of faculty development activities and programs (both general and those related to community-engaged scholarship) that take place at each stage in faculty member's careers. This framework should be filled in by conducting an inventory of activities at Collaborative schools and models and examples from other health professional institutions. This type of framework and inventory would allow the Collaborative to build on what's already happening. The following suggestions were made regarding the framework:

- It will be helpful for the framework to examine types and examples of activities at different transition periods for faculty members (e.g. students/post-docs, new/junior faculty, assistant to associate professor, associate to full professor, post-tenure).

- The cells of the framework should be filled in with examples from within and outside of the Collaborative schools.
- It was agreed that the framework should include information relevant to tenure-track, as well as non-tenure track faculty.
- The framework should include faculty development for community-engaged faculty and also development for other faculty who are not involved in community-engaged scholarship but whose support is necessary for the academy to understand and promote CES. What kind of faculty development or information needs to be provided for these faculty so they don't make negative assumptions about CES being second class? All faculty need to agree on what defines scholarship.
- It is important for information about CES to be incorporated into existing faculty development programs rather than developing new or separate programs.
- Once the framework has been drafted, the full Collaborative may be helpful in refining the matrix and contributing ideas of possible examples and models.
- It was also noted that Sarena Seifer will be giving an invited presentation on the Commission's report at the National Outreach Scholarship Conference: Transformation Through Engagement, next week in Athens, Georgia. She may learn of related resources at this meeting.

In conjunction with the framework, the group agreed to look at what competencies or knowledge and skills are necessary at key times in the faculty member's career. For example, these may include grant-writing skills, scholarly writing skills, partnering skills, etc. It was noted that the large body of literature on faculty development may provide some basic information about these competencies. The following resources were discussed:

- Ruth Marie Fincher at Medical College of Georgia, Deb Simpson at Medical College of Wisconsin, Carol Bland
- Recent piece in Academic Medicine that discusses redefining scholarship for medical faculty.

Topic 4: Determine actions plan for coming months

The workgroup agreed to work on drafting and filling in the framework described above for presentation at the Collaborative's second annual meeting in late February 2006. CCPH Staff and Bonnie, the workgroup chair, will draft and distribute minute from the call that aim to capture the major ideas about the framework. CCPH graduate research assistant, Chris Hanssmann, will assist the workgroup in collecting information to further develop and fill in the framework. Before the November workgroup call, workgroup members and staff will develop and review a draft framework and begin to fill in the matrix cells.

Action: CCPH Staff and Workgroup Chair Bonnie Miller will distribute call minutes and a draft framework to the workgroup listserv. **Workgroup members** will respond with review comments and examples for filling in cells from their own institutions and disciplines.

Note: Please see below for an Initial draft framework for faculty development that supports CES and an Initial draft set of areas of competency for community-engaged faculty members.

Next Call:

November 23rd at 4 – 5:30 PM Eastern/1 – 2:30 PM Pacific
 Dial-In Number: 1-800-791-2345
 Code: 72854

INITIAL DRAFT FRAMEWORK FOR FACULTY DEVELOPMENT THAT SUPPORTS COMMUNITY-ENGAGED SCHOLARSHIP

Some considerations:

Type of faculty appointment (e.g., tenure-track or not, clinician-teacher, research)

For each “cell,” can think about these components:

- What the person should/could be doing and pursuing on their own
- What the institution should/could be providing or facilitating

Examples of what the institution should/could be providing or facilitating are provided as a starting point for discussion and completion of this matrix

	Graduate student	Post-doctoral fellow	New faculty member	First year as faculty	Years 2-5 as faculty	Assistant to associate	Associate to professor	Post-Tenure/Emeritus	RPT Committee Member
For all	Courses offered in SL & CBPR	Courses offered in SL & CBPR	<p>Recruiting: Meet with community partners</p> <p>Orientation: Community & partners Introduce to faculty/centers doing CES Meeting with dept. chair to review RPT guidelines</p>	<p>Ongoing CES workshop series</p> <p>Partnership development mini-grants</p>	<p>Ongoing CES workshop series (e.g., developing partnerships, grantwriting, manuscripts)</p> <p>SL course development grants</p>	<p>SL course development grants</p> <p>Mini-sabbatical grants to work on portfolio</p>	<p>Mini-sabbatical grants to work on portfolio</p>		<p>Annual orientation to policies</p> <p>Mock portfolio reviews</p> <p>Provide examples of CES</p>
Specifically for those interested/involved in CES			Match to mentor with CES focus	<p>Regular meetings with mentor</p> <p>Ongoing CES faculty support group</p>	<p>Regular meetings with mentor</p> <p>Ongoing CES faculty support group</p>	Regular meetings with mentor	<p>Suggest they join RPT committee</p> <p>Regular meetings with mentor</p>	Invite to mentor junior faculty in CES	

INITIAL DRAFT SET OF AREAS OF COMPETENCY FOR COMMUNITY-ENGAGED FACULTY MEMBERS

Adapted from the Community Health Scholars Program Goals and Competencies,
<http://www.sph.umich.edu/chsp/program/index.shtml>

1. Understanding the concepts of community engagement and community-engaged scholarship (CES)
2. Understanding social determinants of health (economic, social, behavioral, political, environmental) and developing skills and commitment for fostering community and social change.
3. Knowledge of and skills in applying the principles of Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR) (e.g. community governance, equitable participation at all levels, local relevance of public health problems, dissemination of findings, trust building, benefits to community involved) including the principles, theoretical frameworks, models and methods of planning, implementing and evaluating CBPR.
4. Knowledge of and skills in applying the principles of Service-Learning (SL) and other community-based teaching and learning approaches (e.g., community partnerships, service & learning objectives, fostering critical reflection, meaningful community service activities in response to community-identified concerns) including the principles, theoretical frameworks, models and methods of planning, implementing and evaluating SL.
5. Ability to transfer skills to the community, thereby enhancing community capacity, and ability to share skills with other faculty.
6. Ability to work effectively in and with diverse communities.
7. Understanding of the policy implications of CES and ability to work with communities in translating the process and findings of CES into policy.
8. Ability to balance tasks in academia (e.g., research, teaching, service) posing special challenges to those engaged in CES in order to thrive in an academic environment.
9. Ability to write grants expressing CES principles and approaches
10. Ability to write articles based on CES processes and outcomes for peer-reviewed publications
11. Ability to effectively describe the scholarly components of the work in a portfolio for review, promotion and/or tenure
12. Ability to negotiate across community-academic groups.