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Purpose of this document

The purpose of this document is to outline an initial faculty development (FD) plan for individuals who will teach and/or support teaching in the E2P PharmD program (note: from this point forward, both these groups of individuals will be referred to as “instructors” whether they are interacting directly with students or not).

The ideas proposed in this plan have come from a variety of sources that include:

1. 2014 Faculty Curriculum Retreat
2. Participation in the planning of the Respirology Module
3. Contributions of the E2P PharmD Faculty Development Working Group (FDWG)
4. Informal conversations with colleagues
5. Peer reviewed literature

Given the rapid pace of change and the large number of new hires, this document proposes a plan for the next year only. This is an evolving document that will most likely need to be updated in 4-6 months.

Rationale for providing faculty development to instructors in the E2P Program

The new program will differ significantly from the existing undergraduate BSc.(Pharm) program and, as such, instructors will benefit from gaining additional skills, knowledge, and understanding of relevant teaching practices and principles. The major areas of difference are in planning the curriculum and delivery of the program as the new program will be competency-based, modular, and integrated, whereas the existing bachelor program is largely not.

Faculty development programs play a critical role in curricular and organizational change (Steinert, 2011). At the level of the individual instructor, they also have the potential to promote greater understanding of pedagogical practices, challenge orientations to teaching, and increase confidence as it pertains to teaching (Stes, Clement, & Van Petegem, 2007). Faculty development programs can contribute to instructors’ career satisfaction and aid with retention of qualified instructors (Andukar, Fjortoft, Sincak, & Todd, 2010).

Steps for building a successful faculty development program

Relevant literature suggests that there is no single “best” model for faculty development. Nevertheless, research on this topic indicates that there are established principles of good practice. McLean, Cilliers and Van Wyk (2008) provide an excellent summary of these in Table 4 of their Association for Medical Education in Europe (AMEE) Guide titled “Faculty development: Yesterday, today and tomorrow” (for Table 4, see Appendix 1 in this document).

Lancaster et al. (2014) propose that these steps be followed to establish a successful program:

1. Identify the areas(s) for faculty development
2. Identify the target audience(s)
3. Identify the Faculty’s biggest assets and challenges (since faculty development programs should lead with strength, it is important to identify strengths ahead of time)
4. Determine how success will be measured

Within the Faculty, steps 1-3 are ongoing and informal at this time and information has largely been gleaned from sources (a) – (d) above (see “Purpose of this document” section).

How success of the faculty development program will be measured has yet to be articulated; this will determined with the help of the FDWG.

Faculty development: Target audiences and areas

Target audiences for faculty development:

* *Instructors teaching in the E2P PharmD program*. This includes faculty members at various ranks and Office of Experiential Education (OEE) preceptors. Instructors may have titles that include, but are not limited to, the following: module leader, element coordinator, learning activities manager, integration activity coordinator, professor, instructor, lecturer, teaching assistant (these may be graduate students or pharmacist instructors), preceptor, and guest speaker.
* *Individuals who support the creation and delivery of the E2P PharmD program* (e.g., senior administrators, educational technology manager and support staff, educational measurement and assessment specialist, instructional designers, project manager, curriculum specialists, educational developer, program assistants, and others)

Broad areas in which faculty development initiatives are needed:

1. Module template development
2. Interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary/transdisciplinary curriculum design, teaching and team teaching
3. Facilitating case-based teaching and learning
4. Assessment of student learning
5. Teaching in large classes
6. Teaching with technology
7. Flexible learning
8. Change management
9. Teaching simultaneously in the BSc (Pharm) and the E2P PharmD
10. OEE preceptor training

Faculty development plan: Targeting the areas

The tables below outline proposed short-term faculty development initiatives to support instructors in this Faculty within each of the broad areas listed above

The FDWG recognizes that due to limited resources and time, there will be a need to prioritize the initiatives and target audiences. Priorities will be assessed and reviewed on an ongoing basis.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FD Area: Module framework and template development**  Desired overall short-term outcome: Construct a collection of detailed module templates that will serve as useful resources for individuals involved in planning, implementing and supporting modules in the E2P PharmD program.  Measurement of impact: (to be determined with help of FDWG) | | | | |
| **Faculty development initiative** | **Resources/details (What? How?)** | **Who?** | **When?** |
| Further refine module framework and development of templates | Drawing from the existing literature and our experiences with the Respirology module (including the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) projects undertaken as part of the Respirology module), we will develop and/or further expand upon a module framework and a series of module templates that may include:   * “Building a Medication Management Module” (expand on this document) * Developing learning outcomes (with reference to the Cognitive Model and Levels of Complexity) * Outline of roles and responsibilities (e.g., module leader, element coordinator, activity managers, support for educational assessment, integrated activities, and Connect) * Assessment (see below) * Principles for working together effectively * Documenting the module process for successes and lessons learned | Peter Loewen, James McCormack, Patricia Gerber and others as identified by the Associate Dean Academic  (with assistance from Karla Carlos and Maureen Tanney) | Completion date for developing the framework for “Building a Medication Management Module” templates:  January – February 2015. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FD Area: Integrated curriculum (including interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary/trans-disciplinary teaching [IMT teaching] and team teaching)**  Desired overall short-term outcome: Faculty members grow their understanding of teaching in an integrated fashion and augment their skills.  Instructors will be able to:  1) anticipate the potential challenges of planning and implementing an integrated module with colleagues from varied disciplinary backgrounds;  2) consciously reflect on the process of planning and implementing an integrated module and, from those reflections, derive a list of best practices to be shared with colleagues.  Measurement of impact: (To be determined with help of FDWG) | | | |
| **Faculty development initiative** | **Resources/details (What? How?)** | **Who** | **When?** |
| PAC Presentation: “Reflections on Planning and Implementing the Respirology Module” | Respirology module team presents to the Faculty on their experience of building and teaching in the Respirology module. | Colleen Brady, Kath MacLeod, + members of the Respirology Module + Medication Management Leads (Loewen, Gerber, McCormack) | 20-minute presentation  at FAC meeting in January 15, 2015. (confirmed) |
| Guided reflection/facilitated discussion about instructors’ experiences of IMT teaching. | Facilitated discussion and reflection to uncover “lessons learned” as instructors work in IMT teams and plan/deliver modules. This would be shared with other instructors who are planning modules. | OESD and module team (with assistance from Karla Claros/Maureen Tanney) | As part of module planning, implementation and debriefing meetings. Special scholarship of teaching and learning initiatives. |
| Interdisciplinary (team) teaching readings | <http://wiki.ubc.ca/Interdisciplinary_Team_Teaching>  <http://pedagogy.merlot.org/InterdisciplinaryTeaching.html> | Individual instructors to access | Ongoing |
| CTLT Interdisciplinary Community of Practice | <http://blogs.ubc.ca/ubcmix/about-the-icop-2/> (see for list of upcoming meetings)  All members of the UBC Community are welcome to join. | Individual instructors with members of the iCoP | The iCoP meetings occur several times throughout the year |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FD Area: Facilitating case-based teaching and learning**  Desired overall short-term outcome: Participants will be able to describe features of effective case-based teaching and learning.  Measurement of impact: (To be determined with help of FDWG) | | | |
| **Faculty development initiative** | **Resources/details (What?/How?)** | **Who?** | **When?** |
| Workshop on facilitating case-based teaching and learning | 2-hour workshop as part of the Faculty’s Celebrate Learning Week event. See: <http://www.pharmacy.ubc.ca/celebrate-learning-week>  Additional workshops may be planned for 2015 | Celebrate Learning presenters (Dr. Sally Krasne and Dr. Carol Hodgson) | October 28, 2014 |

Note:

At the September 30, 2014, FDWG meeting, there was a great deal of discussion and many ideas generated about this topic.

Members recognized that the ability to identify, select and use cases as an effective teaching tool is a priority. Questions included: How do the cases differ? How do I extract the relevant information? How do I use this in my teaching? A lesser though important priority is writing cases.

When it came to identifying and generating cases, the following issues were discussed/proposed:

* Finding good cases in the literature
* Creating a repository of cases
  + Can we use the cases from OEE to create a database (catalogue, tag these, put in Connect, key terms, body systems)
  + Using raw data from the Practice Clinic to develop cases?
* Engaging students in writing cases
* Directed studies

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FD Area: Assessment**  Desired overall short-term outcome: Faculty gain further awareness of the steps required for a robust assessment.  Measurement of impact: (To be determined with help of FDWG). Short-term success: all curriculum development teams have participated in at least 1 session. | | | |
| **Faculty development initiative** | **Resources/details (What?/How?)** | **Who?** | **When?** |
| Creation and refinement of assessment development templates | From templates for developing different format assessment items, through examination blueprinting and standard-setting, to templates for assessment program development. | Existing resources, Faculty leads for the respective units and methods, Educational Assessment Director | ongoing |
| Workshops: Creating meaningful formative assessments | 3-hour workshop on developing meaningful formative assessment. | Invited experts, local (Faculty) resources, Faculty leads for the respective units and methods, Educational Assessment Director | Late January/February 2015 (tentative) [and ongoing] |
| Workshops: Blueprinting assessment | 1 to 2-hour workshop with target audiences.  The workshops bring together faculty (education and content experts, involved in the planning and implementation of the respective curricular units), and educators, to work on developing the assessment blueprints (materials include the assigned learning outcomes, general plans for the assessments within the unit, and the curriculum maps) | Faculty leads for the respective units and methods, invited experts, Educational Assessment Director | Multiple (as per identified needs and groups) |

*Assessment continued on next page*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FD Area: Assessment (continued)** | | | | |
| Workshops: Setting standards for assessment measures | 1-2 hour workshops, thematically organized around the classes of assessment methods (i.e., written exams and quizzes, observation checklists and ratings (incl. OSCE/OSPE), preceptors of individual and group work, etc.) | Faculty leads for the respective methods, invited experts, Educational Assessment Director | Multiple (as per identified needs and groups) | |
| Workshops: Developing assessment items (Written-exam questions in different formats; practice exam material; observation checklists and ratings) | 1 to 2 hour sessions aimed at building capacity for developing the assessment “arsenal”. Each session will focus on specific method and include a more didactic “general principles” component (can be based on pre-workshop preparation), working together through examples, and facilitated hands-on practice. | Faculty leads for the respective methods, invited experts, Educational Assessment Director | Multiple (as per identified needs and groups)  (Already done with 1 group teaching therapeutics in years 2 and 3) |
| Training sessions: “Consistency of preceptors’/assessors’ evaluation standards” – related to any assessment program involving multiple-assessors | ~1 h session (length would depend on the amount of material on which to reach consistency). These sessions very often involve working through examples that portray performance of different quality, and checking (discussing) the agreement/disagreement. | OEE, Ingrid Price, invited experts, Educational Assessment Director . | Multiple (as per identified needs and groups) |

The aim of the following three faculty development initiatives (teaching in large classes, teaching with technology, flexible learning) is to support instructors in their ability to increase student participation in large classes. Though the focus appears to be technology, this is not so. The aim is augmenting active learning in large classes.

The Office of Educational Technology and Learning Design, which is taking a lead in developing, offering and supporting these initiatives, seeks to take a two-pronged approach to faculty development in this area: (1) ensure all instructors are able to confidently use the existing classroom technology and (2) encourage and support instructors to be innovative and experiment in their teaching so as to enhance student learning.

In addition to the activities listed below, Jon-Paul Marchand invites all instructors to contact him to arrange one-on-one consultations for the purpose of improving teaching and student learning.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FD Area: Teaching in large classes**  Desired overall short-term outcome: Instructors will:   1. become familiar with various different technologies to enhance teaching in large classes and be able to begin using these; 2. recognize where to access resources to improve teaching in large classes.   Measurement of impact: (To be determined with help of FDWG) | | | | |
| **Faculty development initiative** | **Resources/details (What/How?)** | **Who?** | **When?** |
| Technology hands-on sessions | Drop-in sessions in which instructors get hands-on practice using technology for large classes in a low-stakes environment.  Session 1: Polling: poll everywhere/UBC PulsePress (‘twitter’ like)  Session 2: Videoscribe/Smartboard | Office of Educational Technology and Designs (with Tony Seet, Barbara Gobis and Urs Hafeli and/or other faculty members when relevant) | All sessions are from 12:00 pm – 12:30 pm in 3340  Session 1: October 22, 2014 (Lucas Wright from CTLT and Paul Cubbon, Sauder).  Session 2 (to be determined) |
| Technology workshops (in other units on campus) | Direct instructors to existing resources/workshops on campus (via OESD Bulletin, email listserv, etc) | Office of Educational Technology and Designs and OESD | Ongoing |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FD Area: Teaching with technology**  Desired overall short-term outcome: Instructors will (1) become familiar with various different technologies to enhance teaching in large classes and will begin to describe how they might use these in their own teaching (2) recognize where to access resources to improve teaching in large classes.  Measurement of impact: (To be determined with help of FDWG) | | | | | | | |
| **Faculty development initiative** | | **Resources/details (How?)** | | **Who?** | | **When?** | |
| Technology hands-on sessions | | Drop-in sessions in which instructors get hands-on practice using technology for large classes in a low-stakes environment.  See Section on “Teaching in Large Classes” | | Jon-Paul Marchand | | See Section on “Teaching in Large Classes” | |
| Technology workshops (in other units on campus) | Direct instructors to existing resources/workshops on campus (via OESD Bulletin, email listserv, etc) | | Office of Educational Technology and Designs and OESD | | Ongoing | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FD Area: Flexible learning**  Desired overall short-term outcome: Instructors will be able to provide a basic description of best practices in flexible learning.  Measurement of impact: (To be determined with help of FDWG) | | | |
| **Faculty development initiative** | **Resources/details (How?)** | **Who?** | **When?** |
| Workshop (guest expert): Best practices in flexible learning |  | Expert (to be identified by Jon-Paul) | To be determined (during the academic year 2014) |
| Technology hands-on sessions | Drop-in sessions in which instructors get hands-on practice using technology for large classes in a low-stakes environment.  See Section on “Teaching in Large Classes” | Office of Educational Technology and Designs | See Section on “Teaching in Large Classes” |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FD Area: Change management**  Desired overall short-term outcome: (To be determined with help of the FDWG)  Measurement of impact: (To be determined with help of FDWG) | | | |
| **Faculty development initiative** | **Resources/details (How?)** | **Who** | **When?** |
| Workshops, various | UBC HR offers, via with Organizational Wellness program, a number of free workshops. For example, they have workshops on:   * Conflict resolution in the workplace * Effective communication in groups * Building working relations * Professionalism in the workplace   CTLT also has some individuals who specialize in this topic (ie Janice Johnson and Jessica Earle-Meadows) | UBC HR;  OESD | To be determined. |
| Leadership; achieving personal and work-related goals | Coaching @UBC | Individual instructors to access | Ongoing (individual instructor to initiate) |
| Email newsletter | Regular updates on progress of E2P PharmD program | Karla Claros | Ongoing, regular. |

The following important topics were raised by members of the FDWG and will be addressed by the Senior Management Team and/or Associate Dean Academic (they may or may not fall within the scope of the Plan):

* Workload analysis
* Teaching simultaneously in the BSc (Pharm) and the E2P PharmD
* Preceptor training.
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Appendix 1: Principles of good practice in faculty development

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table 4. Principles of good practice in faculty development (various authors) | |
| Employ effective change management strategies  Employ sound education practice  Accountable Practice  Other | * Work within the institutional culture and context (Hitchcock et al. 1993) * Change institutional culture (to recognize teaching as important) (Hitchcock et al. 1993) * Work to overcome barriers (e.g. resistance to change) (Steinert 2005) * Support and endorsement by leadership essential (Simpson et al. 2006) * Establish a faculty evaluation programme as a starting point (by students and peers) (Hitchcock et al. 1993; Prebble et al. 1994) * Develop ownership of faculty development by involving faculty in planning (Hitchcock et al. 1993) * Market faculty development approximately (to promote buy-in) (Steinert et al. 2006) * Appoint an effective leader for the faculty development programme (Hitchcock et al. 1993) * Experts should be involved in developing the programme (Hitchcock et al. 1993) * Use a multidisciplinary faculty development team (Simpson et al. 2006) * Prepare staff developers (Steinert et al. 2006) * Faculty developers should be risk-taking role models (Simpson et al. 2006) * Develop a purpose for faculty development (Hitchcock et al. 1993; Steinert 2006) * Conduct a needs assessment (Steinert et al. 2006) * Determine appropriate goals and priorities (Steinert et al. 2006) * Accommodate the diversity of participants (Steinert et al. 2006) * Use different formats for activities (e.g. online peer coaching) (Steinert et al. 2006) * Use a range of activities that are experiential and interactive (Steinert et al. 2006) * Incorporate principles of adult learning, including reflection (Steinert et al. 2006) * Task-centered with an emphasis on immediacy of application (Carroll 1003) * Immediate application of what has been learnt (Steinert 2005) * Ensure tangible products (team-driven, if possible) at the end of each module (Rust et al 2006) * Project-oriented faculty development programmes (Simpson et al. 2006) * Programmes should extend over time (Prebble et al. 2004; Steinert et al. 2006) * Create durable educational material linked to institutional needs (Simpson et al. 2006) * Promote collaborative peer/colleague relationships through role models, mentors, exchange of information (Prebble et al. 2004; Steinert et al. 2006) * Use the academic work group to build positive group dynamics (Prebble et al. 2004; Rust et al. 2006) * Collaborate across institutions in the region (Hitchcock et al. 1993) * Provide feedback (Steinert 2005; Steinert et al. 2006) * Providing affirming and actionable immediate feedback from peers and faculty (Rust et al. 2006) * Align educator roles, institutional needs and excellence (Simpson et al. 2006) * Evaluate/measure the effectiveness of faculty development (Hitchcock et al. 1993; Steinert et al. 2006; Simpson et al. 2006) * Secure funding to enhance programme structure and local credibility (Simpson et al. 2006) * Faculty development must be adaptable, responding to changing needs (Simpson et al. 2006) |

Source: McLean, Cilliers & Van Wyk (2008)