MEETING

| Stanford Medicine Teaching and Mentoring Academy Steering Committee |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| DATE                     | Wednesday, December 16th, 5-6 PM                             |
| ATTENDEES                | Voting Members: John Boothroyd, Linda Boxer, Sharon Chen, Gilbert Chu, Stanley Falkow, Douglas Fredrick, Miriam Goodman*, Lars Osterberg, Erika Schillinger, Gavin Sherlock, Wei Zhou* |
|                          | Ex-Officio Members: Preetha Basaviah, Sean Beckwith, Robyn Dunbar*, Cindy Ho, Shannon Jiang, Laurence Katznelson*, Sofie Kleppner, James Lau, Terrance Mayes, Sejal Parekh, Aarti Porwal, Charles Prober, Emily Strong, Cindy Irvine |
|                          | * = Absent                                                     |

**AGENDA ITEM** | **DISCUSSION** | **DECISION/ACTION** |
--- | --- | --- |
Welcome, Introductions and Appreciations | The co-directors of the academy, Drs. Lars Osterberg and Gavin Sherlock, acknowledged the work of the original academy planning group and reviewed the mission statement and goals. They noted that the academy is designed to be all-inclusive, serving all educators and mentors at Stanford Medicine. To this end, even with the steering committee assembly, they tried to balance clinical and basic science faculty, as well as all levels of trainees. | None |
Academy By-Laws | The steering committee was sent draft by-laws in advance of the meeting for review. The following modifications were suggested and endorsed:  
- Page 4, Section 3, Page 3 - We should change to it say that quorum is established as 45% of the voting members of the steering committee.  
- Page 5, Section 1 – It was noted that the text is ambiguous of the academy innovation grant work group. Minor grammatical edits were suggested and endorsed. | Follow-Up Items: 1. The revised academy by-laws will be sent to members for an electronic vote. |
| **Academy Working Groups** | The co-directors noted that an expectation of the steering committee members is that they lead the various working groups that are charged, but that they should include others in our broader community in these groups. For the steering committee request for applications alone, we had over 50 applicants and these would be great individuals to call upon who are passionate about teaching and mentoring. It was also noted that we should try to recruit more basic scientists to be involved since many of the applicants were not from this community. | None |
| **Junior Faculty Teaching and Mentoring Workshop** | The idea for a junior faculty teaching and mentoring workshop came up in the original academy planning group, acknowledging that faculty are recruited often for their research or clinical skills, and are often not well equipped to teach or mentor. Discussions have already been occurring with Dr. Kelley Skeff, Co-Director of the Stanford Faculty Development Center. The workshop is currently envisioned to be offered a few times per year for groups of 10-12 faculty and it would involve 3 ½ day sessions. The curriculum would focus mostly on how to be a better educator and a better mentor.  

**Discussion Items included:**  
- A broad desire and endorsement to extend our audience beyond just junior faculty, and could include residents, fellows, postdoctoral scholars, students, and | Follow-Up Items:  
1. Review future programming needs to scale and sustain similar workshops to an extended audience and for different teaching modalities.  
2. The video of Kelley Skeff’s grand rounds will |
other faculty. It was noted that we would like to start with getting faculty when they first come in the door, but we can extend the program from there.

- The Office of Academic Affairs is developing an orientation program for new faculty, and this program can be advertised during this time.
- We may want to consider the mode of teaching of the workshop and whether it could be a webinar that could be accessed and referenced after the live session.
- It was expressed that we have a responsibility to offer postdoctoral scholars and residents this type of training, and that training this group will make better young faculty elsewhere. Postdocs can also be valuable in teaching undergraduate courses so there are many opportunities to get this community even more involved in the teaching mission of the school. There is a dichotomy in our culture where although many postdocs want to teach more as they understand the importance to their future careers, they are not always supported by their lab supervisor. The postdoctoral affairs team has a few ideas to help better support this community that they would like to bring forward to the steering committee.
- We should consider offering workshops for different types of teaching (e.g. clinical effective teaching, 1:1 teaching, didactic, etc.) so people can take what is most relevant to their need.
- It would also suggested that we develop a program for instructing faculty on facilitation skills as we move towards more interactive learning.
- It was suggested that the steering committee should participate in Kelly Skeff’s workshop, and give him feedback so we can endorse it. The majority of members have already gone through one of his sessions. One of the limitations of the program is scalability and sustainability so they have the capacity to make it available and relevant to all trainees. As we think through a scalable strategy, we should stay in close collaboration with the offerings from the Vice Provost Office for Teaching and Learning at the University level.

3. Review the ideas from the postdoctoral affairs group.

---

**Academy Innovation Grant Program**

The co-directors asked for a volunteer to lead a working group to design the academy’s grants program, and Gil Chu accepted this invitation. Sofie Kleppner also expressed a desire to be involved. By the next meeting, the working group should propose a basic model for what the innovation grants program may look like including criteria, amounts, and timeline. The following suggestions were made for the program:

**Follow-Up Items:**

1. Gil Chu will lead a working group to design this program, and will...
| Academy Website | Shannon Jiang previewed the draft website, noting that many of the pages are simply placeholders for now. The following suggestions were made:
- We may want to allow other vetted resources to be on the site (for example a video on how to give a good lecture). This could be done through a wiki-type model or submission process.
- Add names to the steering committee page.
- Think about how to organize resources in a more functional way by category.
- Add hyperlinks to the articles in the teaching and mentoring resources.
- Suggestion that the home page and what’s highlighted there should be dynamic and promote what’s coming up (for example, calls for proposals that relate to scholarship in teaching and mentoring).
- We could add a section to highlight teachers, educational scholarship, and awards.
- We could add a left side navigation to make the site more functional.

It was suggested that we appoint a working group to do a deeper dive on the website, and Erika Schillinger and Gavin Sherlock agreed to lead this group. It was noted that we should aim to have the website live when the innovation grants program is launched. |
| --- | --- |
| | Follow-up Items:
1. Erika Schillinger and Gavin Sherlock will lead a working group to review and make suggestions to the Academy website.
2. A preview link to the current website will be sent to steering committee members so they can make further suggestions to the website working group. |