
Effective Approaches to Faculty Development

Carole Bland, Ph.D.

*Transcript from Models that Work Conference
Carole J. Bland, Ph.D.
December 2, 1998*

Good morning. I am so excited to be here, surrounded by people interested in and engaged in faculty development. I know that I am going to learn a great deal at this conference that will help me in my faculty development work and am confident that you too will be delighted by and further empowered by the many wonderful sessions in this conference.

My job is to start us off by addressing these questions: What is effective faculty development? And how does one achieve the goal of providing effective faculty development? These are critical questions and ones that I suspect you have been asking yourself. In fact, these questions may have served as the impetus for coming to this meeting. I hope, in the next 30 minutes to begin to answer these questions and to provide a framework for you to take advantage of all the outstanding sessions at this conference as you design an effective faculty development program for your site.

But first you may be wondering, why now the emphasis on faculty development for primary care faculty? And why the emphasis now on assisting faculty developers in these fields? Of the medical specialties, one could argue that it is the primary care disciplines that have the most experience in faculty development and the most experienced faculty development professionals. In fact, I think this is true. But, I also think there are six major factors that make faculty development more essential now than ever before. I mentioned these in the videoteleconference. But, at the risk of being redundant for the participants in the audience who heard me describe these factors in the teleconfer-

ence, I would like to list them again. These factors are not new to most of you. But I highlight them because I don't think I can overemphasize how much the context has changed in the last few years for primary care faculty and how much this changed context and the forces behind it have increased the need for effective, efficient faculty development.

First, in the last few years the roles and expectations for many faculty have changed dramatically. As a result of extraordinary changes in health care delivery and medical financing, many medical schools are in crises, a few are literally fighting for survival. To survive, they are clarifying, refining, or actually changing their missions. Changes in missions require changes also in nearly every other aspect of the organization from appointment types, to reward systems, to faculty competencies. We are already seeing that fewer and fewer medical school faculty fit the previously typical faculty profile of a full-time academic with a somewhat balanced professional life divided among teaching, research, clinical, and service responsibilities. Rather, faculty today are often asked to focus on one or two of the traditional roles or to take on entirely new tasks and are hired on a variety of appointment types, each with different criteria for promotion.

Second, these role changes and new tasks, as well as advances in medicine, new instructional techniques, and increased emphasis on primary care, often mean that old skills may not apply or may be insufficient. Today's faculty members must acquire new abilities in areas such as computer literacy, evidenced based medicine, problem based learning, interdisciplinary teaching, complementary medicine, web based instruction—the list goes on and is slightly different for each setting.

Third, the emphasis on primary care has also resulted in major redesign of medical school and also some residency curricula and shifts of training from hospital sites into the community. This means more medical school faculty are now located in community sites that are in disparate, sometimes remote settings. Even family medicine, which has historically provided much of its education in the community, has increasing numbers of faculty in remote, disconnected sites.

Fourth, this shift to community settings also means that many schools are developing new sites for teaching and asking physicians who have not previously taught to take on the role of teacher, often on a part-time or volunteer basis.

Fifth, time for faculty development has also become extremely limited. Faculty have always spent long hours in their profession. Most surveys show an average of around 60 hours a week. But the decrease in funding for many schools and the demands for new curricula have placed unprecedented expectations on faculty members. Once priority needs in student and resident learning and patient care are met, little energy or time is left for individual growth and development.

Lastly, after 25 years of faculty development, many faculty in primary care have already participated in basic faculty development and are at a mid-level in their careers. These faculty now need more tailored, individualized, contextualized faculty development than they did when they were new faculty and we could gather them together in workshops and address a consistent set of basic topics.

In summary, the changing roles, expectations, and abilities necessary for faculty, the increased emphasis of primary care training, the incorporation of new community physicians as teachers, the increasingly disparate training sites, the decreased time and energy for participating in faculty development, and the large group of mid-level faculty who now need advanced, tailored training result

not only in the need for more faculty development but also in a need to rethink the purpose, scope, and design of faculty development programs. In short, more than ever, we as faculty developers need to be very good at identifying on what areas faculty development should focus and very good at building effective and efficient strategies for addressing these areas.

So let me begin by defining what I mean by faculty development. I define faculty development as efforts designed to facilitate faculty members' commitment to and ability to achieve both their own goals and their institution's goals. Given this definition, I think effective faculty development is characterized by two features:

1. A wide-perspective that continuously looks for and tries to address all the aspects that impact faculty success.

2. Systematic and rigorous attention to each of the steps in the faculty development process. Let me begin with the first feature, "a wide-perspective that continuously looks for and tries to address all the aspects that impact faculty success." You may have noticed that in the definition of faculty development I refer to both the faculty member and the organization. Most of us are part of larger organizations, such as residency programs, departments, colleges, universities, hospitals, or provider networks, and our faculty members are expected to collectively achieve the goals of the organization. Thus, it is important to understand not only individual faculty member's goals, but also what the organization—or organizations—want to achieve, when designing a program to arm faculty with new abilities. After all, from the organization's point of view, why support an individual's development if it does not contribute to the accomplishment of the organization's larger mission?

I include organization in my definition of and steps for faculty development for another reason. That is, we now know that for a faculty member to suc-

ceed it is insufficient for them to possess the skills and qualities of an effective faculty member. They must also be in an organization with a vision and values they share and in an organizational environment that has features that support and do not inhibit their ability to use these skills. Organizational features that facilitate faculty success include, for example, clear organizational goals, structures and mechanisms that coordinate individual goals and organizational goals, equitable personnel policies, effective reward structures, and a supportive climate. All these organizational features, as well as others, should be considered when trying to identify the areas that need to be addressed to help faculty succeed. For example, teaching faculty how to conduct problem based learning does not necessarily result in faculty being able to effectively use this skill if the organization does not provide sufficient space, time, and resources to use a PBL approach and does not reward faculty for taking this approach. Or concentrating primarily on improving teaching skills for faculty in tenure track positions in a research oriented institution does not necessarily result in faculty success if the organization expects not only good teaching but also research accomplishments.

In short, an essential part of building an effective faculty development program is to simultaneously and continuously attend to **all** the aspects that impact faculty success including: the faculty members' goals, the institution's goals, and the individuals' ability levels and the institution's features that inhibit or facilitate faculty members' ability to achieve their goals and collectively the institution's.

Keeping this "wide perspective" in mind, let's turn to the second feature of effective faculty development—Systematic and rigorous attention to each of the steps in the faculty development process. The steps for designing an effective faculty development program are these:

1. Identifying faculty members' goals,
2. Identifying the institution's goals,

3. Identifying the faculty members' needs by assessing their abilities to achieve their goals and collectively the institution's goals
4. Identifying organizational needs by assessing institutional features that inhibit or facilitate faculty members' use of abilities and goal accomplishment
5. Selecting which of the identified needs to address
6. Identifying optimal strategies for addressing this need
7. Delivering strategies
8. Evaluating the effectiveness of the strategies, both the process and outcomes. Were needs met? Are faculty and organization successful?
9. Revising program
10. Repeating steps.

These steps are well known, I am sure, to all of you. But, all too often we—myself included—do not really conduct these steps in a meaningful fashion. However, again and again as I plan faculty development programs and as I read manuscripts for journals, or read the published literature, I am reminded that truly effective faculty development programs are characterized by systematically and rigorously attending to each of these steps. So I would like to reinforce the importance of this by providing a bare bones description of these steps.

Those of you who are old hands at faculty development will recognize that a lot of the nuances are left out of my description, and that the actual process of faculty development doesn't always follow the steps in sequential order. Still, attending to each of the aspects described in the steps greatly increases the likelihood of providing effective faculty development.

In the videoteleconference that preceded this conference, and in the tape of that conference and materials sent to you, we addressed steps one through four. That is, we discussed the need to identify the organizational and individual goals and

how to conduct a needs assessment to identify what areas needed to be addressed to help faculty do their jobs and accomplish their goals, and collectively the organization's. I can't emphasize enough how important this step is. As people charged with faculty development, we must be very clear about the direction the organization is trying to go and very good at providing faculty the help necessary to go in that direction. We know that many medical schools are in crisis, some have even gone bankrupt. At the same time, faculty members are the most pressed for time and as stressed as I have ever seen them. This is not just happening, by the way, in medical schools. My University Senate, for example, is commissioning a study of faculty workload because the belief is that the hours and effort necessary have greatly escalated in the past five years. Thus, to get precious faculty time and attention and to truly help the organization, any faculty development effort must significantly contribute to the organization's and faculty members' success and be highly efficient. In the past, we have been somewhat loose about how rigorously we conducted needs assessment and about how much we used the results of assessments to guide our efforts. As a result, sometimes our programs were more enriching than essential. Today I believe faculty development efforts must be much more focused and efficient in order to serve their critical role in helping faculty and schools endure and thrive. Many of you, I know from our conversations and the needs assessment materials you have shared with me, are well aware of this and have conducted meaningful needs assessments and are now ready to address the next steps.

So, let me next address step five. A needs assessment nearly always identifies more needs than you can address at one time. So, your next step is to pick and choose from among the many needs; in other words, you must decide where to put the majority of your development efforts at any given time. Frequently I see universities, schools, residency programs, or departments offer a hodge-podge of structural changes and development strat-

egies meant to help faculty that have a much smaller impact than would a similar number of efforts guided by an overall plan. This hodge-podge of faculty development is often a result of the organization not having a comprehensive faculty development approach and from various individuals in the organization responding in an uncoordinated fashion to various funding agencies' initiatives. To get the most impact from faculty development, I recommend, as an alternative to this hodge-podge, a comprehensive approach to faculty and organization development that provides a rational foundation for selecting a combination of individual and organizational activities that together will have a larger impact. Having in mind a comprehensive approach allows you to optimally select where to focus efforts and when and where the focus of these efforts should change.

What is a comprehensive approach? A comprehensive plan addresses the three key aspects of an organization: the attitudes of people who perform the work (goals, values, morale, culture, expectations, dreams), the processes used to perform work (teaching, research, writing, advising, patient care, administration), and the structure designed to facilitate work (reward structures, lines of authority, procedures, functional units). To address needs in these three key aspects of an organization, over the years three broad development approaches have been used: personal development, functional development, and organizational development.

The organizational development approach assumes that people and organizations are improved by focusing on issues larger than the individual person; hence emphasis is placed on shifts in organization-wide structures, processes, and attitudes (culture) rather than individual factors. By contrast, the personal development approach assumes that individuals' personal characteristics are all-important. People bring to the organization not just their job skills but also unique characteristics and circumstances that affect their professional productivity

such as interpersonal skills, financial status, habits and prejudices, family situations, and personal life and career plans. From the personal development perspective, we influence and improve organizational functioning by improving the personal conditions and perspectives of those who work in the organization. The functional development approach concentrates on equipping people with skills, attitudes, and the knowledge required to be continually productive in a changing organization. Emphasis is placed on both the assessment of job performance and improvement in this performance.

As I mentioned, typically, development efforts are initiated in an uncoordinated fashion as a result of a crisis, individual agendas, or funding requirements or opportunities. For example, most medical schools have recently established courses on the responsible conduct of research because of the NIH requirement or because of notoriety from recent fraud in research cases. Similarly, colleges have offered courses on teaching or curriculum design as a result of a Foundation's call for such proposals; for example, the recent Robert Wood Johnson, WK Kellogg, and HRSA curriculum redesign initiatives. These are all worthy and important development efforts. But, often these were not initiated as a result of carefully deciding what faculty and institutional development efforts would best facilitate faculty and institutional vitality or what would best enable individuals to accomplish their goals or to collectively realize the organization's vision. Taking an integrated approach that identifies the simultaneous areas that need to be addressed to optimally facilitate individual and collective productivity will increase many-fold the impact of singular, uncoordinated efforts.

Which brings me to step six: Identifying optimal strategies for addressing needs. In this step your task is to identify which development approach best fits the priority needs you have decided to address now. As I mentioned, the strategies for addressing needs can be clustered into three types: organizational, functional, or personal. Most of

these examples at this conference are functional approaches. But keep in mind, the areas you decide to focus on may not be best addressed by a functional or instructional approach aimed at individual faculty members, but rather through an organizational strategy such as changing the appointment system, or the reward structure.

Step six actually involves two levels: identifying individual initiatives and designing frameworks for coordinating multiple initiatives. It is likely you will have more than one need you want to address at one time. In this case you identify not only the best way to fit each need but also how to optimally deliver multiple programs for addressing various needs. For example, later this morning Dan Benor will describe one approach for systematically coordinating, across an institution, the delivery of multiple initiatives to meet various needs. Deb Simpson and Mark Quirk will provide examples of how to put a multi-faceted effort together for a department audience. Other examples of how to coordinate multiple initiatives will be provided. Tom DeWitt will describe a model using workshops and seminars, Bill Anderson will describe the "On site/Off site" model at Michigan State Program and Kelly Skeff will describe the "Train the Trainer" approach of the Stanford program. However, it is important to note that these last two programs are not designed to serve a particular institution. Rather, these are national programs upon which the rest of us can draw when planning how to meet our faculty members' needs. Their experience, and collection of people focused on faculty development, and ability to marshal resources because of their national audience has allowed them to build very effective programs. So, these are very important programs, from which we can take some generalizable lessons. But most of us are not going to build programs to serve a national audience, rather we will likely send some of our faculty to these national programs as one part of our organization's multiple programs.

Finally, I want to also call your attention to Connie

Schmitz's session on evaluation, which is the eighth step in effective faculty development. You simply do not know if you have been effective and thus cannot be assured your faculty members are more able to succeed, nor can you revise your program without conducting a meaningful evaluation. Further, I would make a plea that when possible you design evaluations so that they can provide generalizable information and then publish this information. As I said in the beginning of this talk, we must be very effective and efficient in the development programs we provide. And presently, there is some but not a lot of information in the literature to guide us in this task. Only by carefully evaluating our programs and publishing the results can we together build this field and thereby contribute to the effectiveness of each other's faculty development efforts. In fact, it is so important to conduct and publish quality evaluations that I almost listed "publishes evaluation results" as a characteristic of effective faculty development programs. But, the truth is, you can deliver programs that help faculty succeed without publishing. But if I am correct, and you can't deliver highly effective programs without doing all the other steps, then you might as well go the final step and publish the results.

Now just because there is not as much published literature to guide faculty development as I had hoped there would be after 20 years of serious faculty development in primary care, I don't want to leave you with the impression that there is no literature, or that there is no guidance for conducting effective faculty development. In fact, I want specifically to call your attention to the May, 1997 issue of Family Medicine, a special issue devoted to synthesizing the literature to that point in faculty development. This issue contains hundreds of lessons from over 72 authors. Also, there is new information continually coming out, much of which can be located by searching Medline, ERIC, and Psych Abstracts. ERIC can be a particularly rich source of information as it contains the educational research and faculty development is an issue across

higher education. In fact, there is an entire association of faculty development professionals in higher education called The Professional and Organizational Network in Higher Education that annually publishes a book of tips on faculty and organizational development.

Well, I have covered quite a bit of information in my time. Basically, there are three important points I would like you to take away from my talk. Remember that there are two main characteristics of an effective faculty development program:

1. A wide-perspective that continuously looks for and tries to address all the aspects that impact faculty success
2. Systematic and rigorous attention to each of the steps in the faculty development process

Third, there is help available to you as you proceed through the steps from both the written literature and the practical wisdom of others experienced in the field.

Thank you for your time and attention and for allowing me to talk about one of my favorite topics. I look forward to talking with you more and to participating for two days in outstanding sessions on faculty development.