Executive Leadership Committee
Strategic Planning Retreat
September 20, 2013

Summary

Attendees: Dr. M. Perri, Ms. A. Burne, Dr. R. Cook, Dr. L. Cottler, Dr. B. Curbow, Dr. S. Griffiths, Dr. S. Hanson, Dr. W. Latimer, Dr. A. Mainous, Dr. W. Mann, Dr. M. Peoples-Sheps, Dr. P. Qiu, Dr. T. Sabo-Attwood (for Dr. G. Gray), Dr. K. Vandenborne, and Ms. B. Dermott

1. Update from the Blended Learning Taskforce
   a. Dr. Hanson provided an overview of the taskforce's progress, including goals for blended learning, resources on campus, and the issue of accessibility.
      i. Goals
         • Per the survey of departments: there is interest in moving almost 80 courses over the next one to two years to a blended model.
         • Action items to coordinate this effort will be organized in a timeline and a framework.
      ii. Resources
         • CITT requires advance planning and faculty time commitment. This will be even more the case with the launch of virtual university.
         • Randy Graff, HSC Director of Educational Technology, interested in partnering with our College.
         • Sakai: university is making data-driven improvements to Sakai, while simultaneously considering shift to a new CMS. It was noted that Sakai is more robust than many think, but students and faculty need to be educated in using Sakai.
         • TAs: College needs to address how TAs will function in blended environment.
      iii. Accessibility: agreed that PHHP needs to be exemplary in this area.
         • Santa Fe has created an accessible online environment for students with learning disabilities and could be a good resource.
   b. Dr. Michael Marsiske presented his blended course and offered perspective on the process of moving to a blended format. He noted that his course includes a lesson on how to navigate Sakai and the structure of course. He also noted advantages of and challenges related to the blended model:
      i. Blending makes the transmission of knowledge easy and the application challenging.
      ii. It helps students develop confidence, reduces anxiety, and increases student participation.
      iii. Facilitates universal design—(what is helpful to students with a specific disability can help other students with other learning issues).
      iv. Time investment is large and there are technical hurdles and costs (investment in hardware, batteries and microphone, server space, software, etc.).
   c. Dr. Amy Cantrell presented a YouTube video about her experience with blended learning. The video showcased some of the recording techniques she employs in her course. There was a discussion
about learning outcomes and the evidence that learning is enhanced in a flipped classroom. It was also noted that student expectations of a blended learning environment will also drive this change.

d. Dr. Kristina von Castel-Roberts presented her course and discussed some efficiencies gained with blended learning model.
   i. Perennial content can be recorded once
   ii. Students are provided with a means of addressing questions that previously would have taken up time in office hours.
   iii. External content can supplement course material (e.g., PowerPoint slides from federal sources)
   iv. Ability for self-pacing and teaching to students at different levels.

e. **AP:** Andrea Burne agreed to investigate what software is used by Organizational Training and Development.

f. **AP:** College will investigate the possibility of a “master educator” program (akin to what is offered through COM). It was agreed that training in the blended learning model could be used as measure of distinction in teaching.

g. Discussion
   i. What is the major goal—efficiency or quality of teaching?
   ii. Faculty effort: it was noted that College recognizes the need for technical support. In addition to hiring an instructional designer, the College has a structure in place to assist with online education. The in-class blended piece is new. It was also noted that the blended model is not for all faculty, nor all courses.

2. Revision of the PHHP Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion: Dr. Perri introduced the topic and set some parameters for discussion. He suggested that the leadership should examine the philosophy behind the expectations for tenure and address what is desirable for the future of the College.

   a. Modified non-tenure tracks
      i. Non-tenure teaching track: The title “clinical assistant professor” tends to capture people who primarily teach (the norm for schools of public health). It was noted that it is important for the quality of the program to have courses taught by funded researchers. It was also noted that for accreditation (CEPH) instructors must have “professor” in their title to count as teachers.
      ii. Modifications must be in accordance with university standards and the HR categories established by the university.
      iii. Distinction in teaching and research. It was noted that it is hard to demonstrate distinction in clinical teaching and clinical service because the criteria are not as clear. Clinical faculty do not have outside letters for example.

   b. Distinction in research in tenure track
      i. The current standard is a national reputation in terms of research and publications. It was agreed to take out the phrase “significant contributor.” The group discussed if the expectation of federally funded research (i.e., RO1) should be made explicit. Would “major national” or “peer-reviewed/competitive” suffice?
      ii. K awards or teaching awards. At present the guidelines do not state that this is not sufficient. It was noted that if K awards are not counted toward achieving distinction this might tip the scales toward a longer timeline. It was suggested that “not sufficient” might be more appropriate wording. There was further discussion about mentored grants and career development grants. It was agreed that the College values mentored awards as a valuable step but they do not constitute distinction.
iii. Accessibility to NIH grants varies by discipline. It was noted that Academic Analytics will help set standards specific to each discipline.

iv. It was further agreed that the phrase "contributor to peer reviewed" needs to be removed as a criteria for distinction. It was noted that faculty need to achieve a level of professional autonomy.

v. Biostatistics was discussed because of their role as collaborators. It was suggested that the "other indicators" section might accommodate these contributions. However, it was noted that this does not substitute for being a PI.

vi. There was further discussion about limiting the tenure track and offering greater support and recognition for non-tenure track faculty. Topics included:
   - Accommodating exceptions to the tenure model within other tracks rather than adjusting the tenure criteria
   - Providing a role for people who can make valuable contributions but who cannot meet the criteria for tenure.
   - It was noted that non-tenure track modifiers should be for internal use only.

c. Teaching. Criteria for distinction include:
   i. Track record of classroom teaching, one or more classes per year and student evaluations at or above the mean.
   ii. Mentoring and graduating PhD students
   iii. It was agreed that explicit mention of innovation, advances in education would be a good addition to the criteria.
   iv. Student evaluations. It was agreed that some incentive for completing evaluations should be devised. It was noted that peer evaluations can be used to support/offset student evaluations.

d. Review process for tenure and promotion.
   i. Dr. Perri outlined the six-year review process followed in COM. The group discussed the benefits of initiating this review earlier in the tenure timeline. The College is not limited to having formal reviews at three and six years.
   ii. It was suggested that the three-year review should be encouraging but also offer real guidance in terms of steps faculty must take to meet criteria for tenure.

e. Progress toward tenure / promotion
   i. Annual letters: It was noted that UF requires that annual letter address progress toward promotion.
   ii. It was agreed that the College should have a process in place to guide chairs in their evaluation of faculty progress toward tenure.
   iii. Dr. Perri suggested that the worksheet developed by the grant workgroup (provided in binder) could be a goal-setting tool for junior faculty to be used in conjunction with annual review.
   iv. It was agreed to delete the comparison to the rate of publication among peers within the department from the annual letters as this is not always relevant.
   v. It was suggested that the College add a checklist or section to FAR about progress toward promotion.
   vi. It was noted that Academic Analytics will be important for establishing norms.

f. Mentoring. The group discussed the quality of mentoring.
   i. There was a discussion about the distinction between mentoring meetings and formal reviews.
- Content of mentoring committee meetings are not recorded and cannot be used as the basis for evaluation.

- Three-year review results in a written evaluation shared with faculty member.
  
  ii. Non-tenure track faculty members have not been included in the mentoring process.
  
  iii. Mentoring process should be explicitly documented with clear communication of opportunities and expectations.
  
  iv. It was noted that PHHP guidelines for mentoring must be made consistent with university.

i. Goals for College
  
  i. Strengthen mentoring
  
  ii. Provide direct and honest guidance early on
  
  iii. Assist faculty with goal setting

h. Department specific supplements to the College guidelines
  
  i. The group expressed an interest in department specific criteria to augment the College guidelines and Dr. Perri agreed to ask the provost’s office for models from other departments.
  
  ii. It was noted that historically department level criteria and expectations have been expressed in chair’s letter. It was agreed that the chair’s letter is a good place to provide context.
  
  iii. It was noted that department standards cannot lower than college.
  
  iv. Academic Analytics data will play a large role in setting standards in terms of objective comparisons.
  
  v. It was also noted that specific information and goals entered in FAR are helpful.

i. Areas of distinction: non-tenure track.

   i. It was agreed that multimodal faculty only have to show distinction in one area (and satisfactory performance in other area).

j. Process for change:

   i. Get feedback from constituents.
   
   ii. Form group to draft revised guidelines.
   
   iii. Present draft to leadership group
   
   iv. Present to faculty for vote.

3. Update Regarding PHHP PhD Programs

a. Dr. Hanson provided history of the PhD program review at UF. At the 2012 retreat, the leadership committee reviewed the list of best practices from college and university that were the outcome of the review process.

b. The College adopted many of these best practices and a topically organized list was sent to each program director.

c. One best practice is to evaluate programs’ progress with implementing best practices. All programs were asked to assess how they were doing currently in terms of the best practices. Dr. Hanson has received feedback from two-thirds of programs. It was noted that this review is intended to occur annually.

d. Action items from 2011 retreat were distributed for consideration. It was noted that these action items are meant to be evaluated and modified based on what is critical to programs. Discussion followed about some of the action items.

   i. Funding of students: Dr. Perri summarized the progress made in terms of T32s.
   
   ii. Invite program directors to attend ELC once or twice a year. Agreed that this would be good.

   Dr. Hanson will invite them in the context of meetings to look at five year plans.
   
   iii. Possible action items to address at the college level in the next few months.
• Marketing materials at the college level
• Issue of PHHP News about PhD programs
• Graduate faculty status and reinstituting the distinction between graduate and doctoral faculty status. It was suggested that this could be managed at the departmental level.

iv. Dr. Hanson will work with program directors on five-year plans. New chairs should review plans. Dr. Hanson will bring back for discussion at the ELC.

v. Council of program directors. It was agreed that this would be a helpful mechanism to share information across programs.

vi. Next steps were agreed up as follows:
• Five-year plans: Chairs will review. Modifications can be made as part of status tracking
• Invite Program Directors to meet with ELC at least once per year
• Formation of program directors council

4. PHHP: Planning for the Next Five Years
   a. Dr. Perri provided an overview of College’s history for context. Two key landmarks were discussed:
      i. 1999. Under the shadow of potential consolidation or closure, Dean Frank decided the College needed to grow in size and significance. The decision was made to add public health.
      ii. 2003. Plans to become a college of public health put into effect. College name was changed and plans for accreditation were initiated.
   b. Current context:
      i. Productivity in the College with respect to the growth of educational and research programs has been very strong despite scarce resources.
      ii. Growing recognition for College at the University and nationally.
      iii. Transition from College of Health Professions to PHHP is ongoing.
      iv. Goal set for 10% growth in research funds. Have met with the exception of this year (5%) due to sequestration.
      v. Clinics revenue has been negatively impacted by factors such as the recession.
   c. Dr. Perri charged the group to start thinking about future goals for the College. Some areas for consideration/points of discussion included:
      i. Collaboration: It was noted that collaboration is a strength of the College and should be continued and expanded going forward.
      ii. Student body
         • It was noted that growth at the undergraduate level is capped by UF.
         • Self-funded programs and Innovation Academy are two areas where the College can grow enrollment
         • A question about growing the MPH program was raised.
         • Growth needs to be paced with growth of infrastructure.
         • It was suggested that College should focus on quality—recruiting the best students—not quantity.
      iii. It was noted that the preamble to vision statement on the website is out of date and will be corrected.
      iv. Technology—simulation was suggested as an area for development.
      v. VA partnerships were raised as a means to facilitate research.
      vi. It was suggested that research into the job market both in professions and academe should inform discussions about growth.