



MEETING	Stanford Medicine Teaching and Mentoring Academy Steering Committee
DATE	February 17, 2016
ATTENDEES	<p>Voting Members: <i>John Boothroyd, Linda Boxer*, Sharon Chen, Gilbert Chu*, Stanley Falkow*, Douglas Fredrick, Miriam Goodman, Lars Osterberg, Erika Schillinger, Gavin Sherlock, Wei Zhou**</i></p> <p>Ex-Officio Members: <i>Preetha Basaviah, Sean Beckwith, Robyn Dunbar, Laurence Katznelson*, Sofie Kleppner, James Lau, Cara Liebert*, Yvonne Maldonado*, Terrance Mayes, Sejal Parekh*, Charles Prober, Sumit Shah*, Christine Solari, Emily Sontag</i></p> <p>Guests: Heeju Jiang</p> <p>* = Absent ** = No longer a member</p>

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	DECISION/ACTION
Peer Coaching Update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An update on the Peer Coaching program was provided. Two faculty have signed up for coaching, and coaches will work with individual departments to recruit people. The coaches will also work with each other for practice and to get a sense of what it feels like to be coached. • Stephanie Harman recently presented use of the Torsch platform to video record teaching and provide coaching asynchronously. • Suggestions for increasing participation in coaching included: advertising the opportunity at the end of the Teaching Skills workshops as a way for participants to work more deeply on the goals they set in those workshops; present the program to postdocs participating in the teaching certificate program; coaches could work with 	

	facilitators in the microbiology pre-clerkship course	
Medical & Bioscience Education Seminar Update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An overview of Medical & Bioscience Education seminars to date was provided, along with a preview of the upcoming February seminar, which will be led by medical student Mariposa Garth-Pelly. 	
Portfolios Update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Douglas Fredrick provided an update on the teaching portfolio project. He piloted the instrument with 40 TMA members who replied to an initial solicitation, and as of the meeting 7 replies have come in; the deadline to respond is January 23. Preliminary feedback is that it is a good instrument, the amount of time needed to complete it ranged from 40 minutes to two hours. The instrument is somewhat long and Linda Boxer has requested a short document. The plan is to start with the longer instrument and pare it down with feedback from Dr. Boxer's committee. Discussion was held about different ways departments track teaching activity currently for awards and promotions. Pediatrics has a point system that provides a way to catalog academic activity: teaching, mentoring, community work, scholarship, leadership, teaching and mentorship significant subsets of scholarship. Primary Care and Public Health are piloting a model based on the Pediatrics' model. This tool is more of an enumerator (web app) that allows people to enter and what they are engaged in, with whom, and for how many hours. Suggestions for moving forward included considering how the final instrument we use will be feasible and inspire the A & P committee; consider a way to attach course evaluations for courses that are formally evaluated; look for models for an app that would allow faculty to enter information in real time so it can be compiled over time. Robyn Dunbar explained that there is interest on main campus for moving to a broader array of artifacts in their review process, and what we develop in the School of Medicine may be able to inform that work on main campus. Next step: once agree as group will send to everyone in Academy and ask to do it. Your participation in this is a teaching activity. Did in OPTH with teaching, mentoring, committee work, scholarship and added \$9K bonus to people who maxed out on activities. At least ppl feel got paid for doing these activities. LARS: once do and keep up not hard to keep up just initial inertia. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Once the model is finalized in the pilot version, it will be sent to the Steering Committee for further feedback and refinement.

<p>Evaluation: Baseline Survey Update</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Division of Evaluation is preparing to re-administer a survey to all SoM faculty that was originally administered as part of the development of the TMA. Heeju Jiang is in the process of determining whether the survey is sufficient as-is or needs modifications. She is talking with other medical schools with longer standing academies such as Colorado seeking validated measures and will compile questions, share with TMA leadership to determine if any other items add value. • Because the first survey administered was the baseline survey, moving forward it will be referred to as an attitude survey; it was recommended that questions not be changed as it will impact usefulness of baseline data. It was also suggested that this survey may provide an opportunity to learn • Another suggestion was to use this survey as an opportunity to collect some additional data such as: awareness of the Academy, participation in Academy programs and events, thoughts on what the Academy might do moving forward. 	
<p>Innovation Grants Update</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RFP for TMA’s 2017-2018 Innovation Grants will be issued in June. • TMA will be seeking Steering Committee and Academy members who can assist with coaching for grant writers, particularly to assist students who are new to the grant writing process. • It was suggested that a certain number of grant awards be held aside for student proposals. 	
<p>TMA Annual Report Discussion</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The TMA Annual Report was reviewed. • Feedback on the report included: a suggestion to increase postdoctoral scholar membership numbers through marketing; adding quantitative data to sections describing feedback on programs would be useful (numbers and ratings); breakdown the clinical faculty membership by appointment line (UTL, MCL, etc); extend the piece on looking forward; include concrete recommendations that emerged from the Strategic Planning retreat in July 2016; add photos. • It was suggested that we think of other audiences to whom we can present this report; the ideal audience would be the executive committee to increase visibility for the Academy and increase buy-in; we can also present it at other groups of faculty. We could also create a “roadshow” and present the information at different sets of grand rounds, as well as to student groups. 	

Steering Committee Membership Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Composition of the Steering Committee is changing due to faculty stepping down and leaving Stanford.• Discussion was held on how to replace these members. It was noted that we would like to maintain balance in terms of clinical and basic science faculty. It was also noted that we need to create a plan for staggering membership so that we are not replacing all members the same year and optimize transition times.	