College of Public Health and Health Professions  
Faculty Career Planning Retreat Summary  
December 9, 2016 at the Thomas Center  
8:30 am to 2:00 pm

Attendees: Attendees are listed below organized by group to which they were assigned for the small group discussions. Dean Michael Perri and Executive Associate Dean Stephanie Hanson facilitated the meeting but did not participate in small group discussions. In addition to these faculty, Mary Keramidas and Benita Harrison provided staff support from the Dean’s Office.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RETREAT GROUPS</th>
<th>GROUP 1</th>
<th>GROUP 2</th>
<th>GROUP 3</th>
<th>GROUP 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Burne – DO Assistant Dean</td>
<td>Lori Altmann – SHLS Associate Professor</td>
<td>Joel Bialosky – PT Clinical Assistant Professor</td>
<td>George Hack – DO Clinical Associate Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Chen – Epi Professor</td>
<td>Amy Blue – DO Clinical Professor</td>
<td>Amy Cantrell – Biomedical Clinical Associate Professor</td>
<td>Andy Kane – EGH Associate Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Dunleavy – PT Clinical Associate Professor</td>
<td>Linda Cottler – DO/Epi Professor</td>
<td>Conseulo Kreider – OT Research Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Rick Kates – HSRMP Clinical Assistant Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne Foss – OT Clinical Associate Professor</td>
<td>Gloria Miller – PT Clinical Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Volker Mai – Epi Associate Professor</td>
<td>Cate Price – CHP Associate Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie Gauger – SLHS Clinical Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Dorian Rose – PT Research Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Michael Marsiske – CHP Associate Professor</td>
<td>Peihua Qiu – Bio Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Hart – Epi Clinical Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Tara Sabo Atwood – EGH Associate Professor</td>
<td>Susan Nittrouer – SLHS Professor</td>
<td>Cathy Striley – Epi Assistant Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lednicky – EGH Associate Professor</td>
<td>Linda Struckmeyer – OT Clinical Lecturer</td>
<td>Cindy Prins – DO/Epi Clinical Associate Professor</td>
<td>Krista Vandenborne – PT Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chip Mainous – HSRMP Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Overview and Process: Dr. Perri provided an overview of the Faculty Career Plan (FCP), and Dr. Hanson laid out the event schedule for the day. The agenda and hand-out overviewsing the FCP are attached at the end of this summary. The only modifications to the agenda format as stated were that Dr. Hanson opted to keep the large group format for the afternoon session to discuss barriers rather than breaking back into small groups. She also opted to remove the agenda item on basic expectations of mentors and mentees in the interest of time.
II. Group Discussions of the FCP and Self-Assessment

A. Small Group Discussions of the FCP and Self-Assessment Components: The ideas each small group generated to shape the components of the Faculty Career Plan and Self-assessment are provided below. Small groups were provided with two examples of FCP’s (University of Minnesota and University of California – San Francisco) to review if desired.

1. Constructing the FCP Template – What should be included as core categories/questions in the FCP?

   SG1:
   - Research/Scholarship
   - Education, Teaching, Mentoring
   - Clinical Service
   - Other Service, Public Outreach
   - Professional Associations
   - Leadership, Administration
   - Expectations for Department and University

   SG2:
   - Mentorship, e.g., finding a mentor, development of mentorship skills
   - Leadership, e.g., internal/external, structured leadership, fellowship/internship
   - Professional Development, e.g., career exploration, cross training, apprenticeship (no-fault), sabbatical
   - Skill Development, e.g., taking a course, building teaching skills
   - University Vision and Plan
   - Work-Life Balance, e.g., targeted decision making
   - Research, e.g., grant development, developing collaborations/research team
   - Building national/international reputation

   SG3:
   - Skills assessment and goal development in Research, Teaching, Advising, Clinical, Service beyond Institutional, Leadership, Interpersonal Skills, e.g., Networking, Management, Mentorship
   - Alignment between self-assessment and FCP, e.g., outcome assessment linked to skills
   - Met a goal with reflection and evolution, e.g., personal, industry, field

   SG4:
   - Alignment to Department/College Mission and Track
   - Personal statement of vision/mission in Leadership/Administration/UF Service, Research Scholarship, Teaching, Mentoring, Clinical, Public Outreach, Professional Service
   - Skill development/mentoring, e.g., interpersonal skills
   - Professional networking/outreach
   - Interdisciplinary collaboration

2. Self-assessment Questions - What should be included in a self-reflection/self-assessment prior to developing an FCP? (for example, career direction, strengths, current skills, things to develop)

   SG1:
   - Current strengths, skills
   - What skills do I need to acquire
   - What professional development activities will aid me
• What resources do I need, e.g., time management
• With whom will I collaborate
• Who are potential mentors
• How will I measure outcomes and successes
• What timeline and benchmarks will I set
• How do my goals fit with expectations of the department and University

SG2:
• Career development resources, e.g., life coach
• Speakers
• Keep calm and discuss...
• Strengths/weaknesses in core areas, e.g., clinical, research, teaching, service
• Short/long term goals
• What is your dream/vision?

SG3:
• Met a goals change
• Continue to do well what is already being done well (keep stable job)
• “College guidance counselor”, e.g., could be UF resources

SG4:
• Understand college/department mission and track
• Review CV/update personal statement
• Strategic goals – 5 year goals
• Skills assessment relevant to personal statement categories

B. Large Group Discussion and Decisions on the FCP – Each small group presented a summary of their brainstorming. The general consensus of the large group in considering the small groups’ ideas was that there was enough overlap to create draft categories for the FCP and questions for a self-assessment. Dr. Hanson offered to draft the FCP and self-assessment question list.

III. Group Discussions related to Identifying Mentors and Mentees

A. Small Group Discussions of Mentees and Mentors- Faculty returned to small groups to discuss the specific questions noted below prior to returning to the large group for information sharing and decision making.

1. Who should complete the FCP? (Other than the requirement that those with assistant professor in their title should complete an FCP, for whom should the FCP be mandatory and for whom should it be elective?)
   SG1:
   • Mandatory for Associate/Assistant Professors, e.g., clinical and full professors not included
   • Mentor – Hub – Not to provide all the skills. They have a knowledge base to know the resources
   SG2:
   • All faculty
   • At least once per year for full professor and at least every two years for associate or assistant level
SG3:
- College or department meeting to discuss FCP and mentoring
- Expectation is for all faculty to complete, mandatory for assistant professors
- Reflective statement in FAR could serve as motivation for completing FCP
- Mentor reflection
- Not too proscriptive

SG4:
- Assistant Professors – required yearly for tenure track, clinical, research, and lecturers. FCP document discussed with the Chair and private discussions with mentor
- Associate Professors – required at year three for tenure track, clinical, research, and lecturers. Optional after year three. Mentor option for assistant professors
- Full Professors – optional but strongly recommended for all tracks. Mentor option for lower levels.
- Chair – FCP is optional. Mentor option.

2. Who should be eligible to serve as a mentor?
   a. Should faculty be at a specific rank or possess specific types of experience?
      SG1:
      - Yes, at the Chair level
      - How do you align career goals with annual chair goals
      - Can be across departments
      SG2:
      - Have the desire to serve as a mentor
      - Know the college and University culture
      - Experience in mentee’s area
      - Academic, one rank above
      - Clinical, X years of experience
      SG3:
      - Mentor “Training” to share experiences, mentors should be comfortable
      - Mentors should be comfortable in their mentoring role
      SG4:
      - Can be across departments
      - Mentors for lecturers
      - Clinical track may be best mentors
      - One level up for mentor assignment, i.e., Associate mentor assistant, etc.

Large Group Discussion and Decisions:
- Individual needs experience and must have the right qualities
- Rank above but could also be at same rank if they have experience
- Important to have experience at UF
- Multiple mentors important
b. *May a chair serve as a mentor, co-mentor, or secondary mentor for faculty inside and/or outside the department?*

SG1:
- Yes

SG2:
- No, not within one’s department for FCP

SG3:
- No, not formally within the department

SG4:
- Yes

c. *Are mentor-mentee relationships confidential or are there components that may be shared with the chair?*

SG1:
- Confidential not necessarily, e.g., almost impossible to be confidential

SG2:
- Confidential, e.g., at mentee’s discretion

SG3:
- Confidential, mentee has option to share

SG4:
- Confidential, aspects brought forth by mentee

d. *How should specific mentors be identified/selected?*

SG1:
- Department identifies a group of potential mentors

SG2:
- The chair plus existing mentor pool, e.g., include chair follow-up with mentee

SG3:
- Mentee suggests with “ratification”

SG4:
- Based on discussions between the chair and mentee

**B. Large Group Discussion and Decisions on the Mentee and Mentor**

Although the small groups differed somewhat on the mandatory nature of the FCP process for different faculty ranks and the chair’s potential role as a mentor, large group discussion resulted in general consensus as noted below. In addition, most faculty supported the idea that everyone can benefit from participating in the FCP process regardless of whether it is mandatory.

1. **Who should complete the FCP:** It was agreed that the FCP would be optional for professors, mandatory for associate professors every three years, and mandatory for assistant professors and all other faculty with assistant or lecturer in their title every year. (Please note: the FCP completion agreement noted above applies to all employment categories within each rank. For example, associate professor includes both associate professors and clinical associate professors.)
2. Who can serve as a mentor?
   - At least one rank above or experience
   - UF faculty either inside or outside department
   - A chair can serve as mentor but not within own department

3. Is mentor-mentee relationship and mentor selection confidential?
   - **Mentor-mentee discussions** – if topics impact assignments or resources the chair manages, the mentee needs to inform the chair; other topics can remain confidential at the discretion of the mentee
   - **Mentor selection** - potential mentors can be identified in various ways, such as chair recommendations, departmental mentor pool, mentee recommendations, etc.; consensus was that the chair be aware of final mentor selection

IV. Large Group Discussion on Striving for Successful Implementation: What are the anticipated barriers to successfully implementing the FCP that could potentially be reduced or eliminated?
   - **Large Group:**
     - Documentation/tracking mechanism
     - Availability of mentors
     - Mentors need to know the goals
     - Resources for mentors – e.g., mentorship training, workshops
     - Most recent FAR shared with mentor
     - Not everyone will be a good mentor, resources to be prepared
     - Mentor incentives
     - Where do you find mentors
     - Expectations should be realistic
     - Timeline – how long is mentor/mentee relationship
     - Metrics on outcomes/successes, e.g., use surveys to evaluate
     - FCP and annual evaluation – how to integrate processes
     - Faculty goals vs. Institutional goals
     - Faculty centered focus

V. Other General Comments from Large Group:
   - Leadership programs are available for developing mentorship skills
   - Workshops can be helpful for both mentees and mentors but pointless if mentors just push faculty through process
   - Mentoring is most critical for assistant professors but can be helpful for faculty who have already been promoted to think about continuing development/growth
   - Support provided by individual faculty regarding direction being taken and who indicated this type of program would have been useful had they gone through the FCP process prior to going up for tenure and/or promotion
   - Important to maximize the benefits of the FCP, especially for associate professors and professors
   - Professor level should be strongly encouraged to serve as mentors

VI. Next Steps – Dr. Hanson will review and integrate comments and decisions to create a draft of an FCP and list of self-assessment questions. She will then distribute this to the Executive Leadership Group and Faculty Council for feedback.
Fostering professional growth and development of our faculty is part of the PHHP Strategic Plan. One strategy included in our Plan to foster faculty success is to ensure each faculty member has the opportunity to create a career plan. The purpose of this retreat is to gain broad faculty feedback on the basic structure and process of career planning, specifically focusing on possible common plan components and mentorship guidelines that serve as a framework for career discussions. Ultimately, we hope to create facilitative tools and processes that are both useful and relevant as faculty move through their careers.

Faculty Career Plan (FCP) – What is it?
   a. An FCP is a tool to facilitate self-assessment and career planning
   b. It is intended to focus thoughtful consideration on current and desired skills impacting one’s career path
   c. Similar to an IDP, it contributes to the development of career goals and incorporates steps (i.e. strategies and tactics) and timeframes in which to accomplish these goals
   d. It provides an avenue for reflection on one’s career path at different developmental points
   e. An FCP helps promote success by considering both process and content (i.e. mentor-mentee relationship, establishment of a communication pathway, evaluation of one’s career aspirations and goals, and how one accomplishes these)
   f. An FCP can contribute to a positive environment for retention

Differences between a Faculty Career Plan and an Annual Evaluation
   a. An FCP is intended as a self-reflective, career advising tool; it does not determine one’s assignments
   b. An FCP is not used in the UF annual evaluation as a formal means of assessment
   c. An FCP is constructed primarily by the faculty member, not the chair or supervisor
   d. An FCP can include goals that transcend education, research, and service
   e. An FCP provides a structured mechanism for informal exploration of career development ideas
   f. An FCP includes both short-term and long-term goals as part of annual reflection
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8:30- 8:50am Overview – Large Group Presentation by Dean Perri
    2. Brief description of how the Faculty Career Plan (FCP) fits into the PHHP Strategic Plan
    3. Definition of an FCP – self assessment and career planning tool
    4. Brief description of how an FCP differs from an annual evaluation

8:50-9:00am Identifying 2 of Your Own Short-term Goals – Individually prior to small group break out
9:00-10:30am Constructing the FCP and Self-Assessment Template – Small Group Discussion
    1. What should be included as core categories/questions in the FCP?
    2. What should be included in a self-reflection/self-assessment prior to developing an FCP? (for example, career direction, strengths, current skills, things to develop)

If time is left, discuss the following
    1. Do you primarily prefer an open-ended response framework, a likert-type rating approach, or some combination to the individual self-assessment categories? (If the latter, describe what type of combination you would like to see.)

10:30-10:45am Break
10:45-11:15am Large Group Discussion and Decisions: FCP and Self-assessment Components
11:15am-12:15pm Identifying Mentors and Mentees - Small Group Discussion
    1. Who should complete the FCP? (Other than the requirement that those with assistant professor in their title should complete an FCP, for whom should the FCP be mandatory and for whom should it be elective?)
    2. Who should be eligible to serve as a mentor?
        a. Should faculty be at a specific rank or possess specific types of experience?
        b. May a chair serve as a mentor, co-mentor, or secondary mentor for faculty inside and/or outside the department?
        c. Are mentor-mentee relationships confidential or are there components that may be shared with the chair?
        d. How should specific mentors be identified/selected?

12:15-12:30pm Break
12:30- 1:00pm Working Lunch – Large Group Discussion and Decisions: FCP Mentees and Mentors
1:00-1:30pm Striving for Successful Implementation - Small Group Discussion
    1. What are anticipated barriers to successfully implementing the FCP that could potentially be reduced or eliminated?
    2. What are the basic expectations of the mentor and mentee once paired?

1:30-1:45pm Large Group Discussion of Barriers and Mentor-Mentee Expectations
1:45-2:00pm Wrap Up