
2d. Creating Administrative Structure for: On-Site/Off-Site Models

William Anderson, Ph.D.

Just as the on-site/off-site model is a non-traditional approach to faculty development for academic physicians, so is the administrative structure. The goals established for this workshop were:

1. To identify the advantages and disadvantages of this administrative structure,
2. To identify the personnel required to implement this faculty development model,
3. To identify the time-on-task requirements to present various faculty skills,
4. To identify realistic outcomes of the on-site/off-site model
5. To discuss how to integrate this faculty development model into the on-going activities of the academic medical center.

These goals were achieved by having workshop participants address a case study. In the case, participants were members of the dean's ad hoc faculty development planning committee. The dean charged the group to design an on-site/off-site faculty development fellowship program for the primary care faculty at the medical school and the ten affiliated primary care residency programs. The dean was willing to commit \$75,000 of her discretionary funds for a one-year pilot, with the understanding that program results would be used to submit a Title VII training grant application the following year.

The participants were asked to respond in small groups to a series of questions related to the workshop objectives:

Question 1: What are the first tasks for your Planning Group? What additional data, if any, do you need?

Question 2: Where should the pilot faculty development program be placed for administrative purposes? Why?

Question 3: What should the pilot program look like? Using your Needs Assessment data, what are the curricular topics for on-site sessions? What are the activities, assignments and expectations for the off-site sessions? What is the length of time for the on-site component? Should there be release time for the off-site component?

Question 4: How should the \$75,000 be spent? What personnel should be involved, and for what amount of time? Should the departments and residency programs be required to pay a fee for the involvement of their faculty in the program?

Question 5: What strategies might be used to integrate the pilot faculty development program into the on-going activities of the primary care departments and residency programs?

Participants were to be divided into small groups to address each discussion question. Additional data were to be provided for each question. For example, for Question 1, participants were to receive the results of a Needs Assessment conducted with the dean, primary care chairs and residency directors, and with the potential participants, the primary care faculty. The participants were to use the new data to help answer each case question.

After completing each case question, the small group reporter was to present their group's responses to question and explain the rationale for their answer. Clear overhead transparencies and marking pens were provided to record responses to each case question.

Because there were too few participants attending the workshop, the planned activities were not implemented. In discussing why they thought not more people attended the workshop, the participants said most viewed the on-site/off-site faculty development model as a national resource, one that could be used in conjunction with in-house faculty development efforts, but not a model that could be easily duplicated at the local level.

The balance of the workshop time was spent answering questions and discussing the on-site/off-site models at Michigan State University and the University of North Carolina.

Suggested Reading

Anderson, WA, Stritter FT, Mygdal WK, Arndt JE, and Reid A. Outcomes of Three Part-time Faculty Development Fellowship Programs. *Fam Med* 1997;29(3):204-208

Case Study

You are a primary care faculty member (Pediatrics) at Enormous State University School of Medicine (ESU-SOM). Your Dean attended the “Models that Work” Conference and learned about On-site/Off-site faculty development programs. She thinks this model would be a great solution to her problem of developing the faculty skills of the young primary care faculty at the medical school and the 10 affiliated primary care residency training programs.

The Dean is willing to commit \$75,000 of her discretionary funds for a one-year pilot on-site/off-site faculty development program, with the understanding that program results will be used to submit a Title VII training grant application the following year.

Because you are a graduate of a faculty development fellowship program, she wants you to lead the planning of the pilot program.

You have assembled a small Planning Group of 3 additional faculty: Family Medicine, Internal Medicine, and Medical Education. They are now sitting in your conference room and you are about to begin your first planning meeting.

Question #1: What are the first tasks for your Planning Group? What additional data, if any, do you need?

Question #2: What should the pilot program look like? Administrative placement? Topics on-site? Expectations off-site? Length of time on-site? Release time off-site?

Question #3: How should the \$75,000 be spent? What Personnel are involved?

Question #4: What strategies might be used to integrate the faculty development program into the on-going activities of the primary care departments/residency programs?

Bibliography

Anderson WA, Stritter FT, Mygdal WK, Arndt JE, and Reid A. Outcomes of Three Part-time Faculty Development Fellowship Programs. *Family Medicine*, 29 (3): 204-208

Bland C.J., Schmitz C.C., Stritter F.T., Aluise J., and Henry, RC—Successful Faculty in Academic Medicine: Essential SUIs and How to Acquire Them. 96w York: Springer Publishing Company, 1990.

Bland C.J., & Schmitz C.C. (1988). Faculty renewal: Concepts, strategies and lessons from the past twenty years. In J.H. Schuster & D.W. Wheeler. (Eds.), *Enhancing faculty careers: Strategies for renewal*. San Francisco: Josey Bass, Inc.

Bland C.J., & Stritter F.T. (1988). Characteristics of effective family medicine faculty development programs. *Family Medicine*, 20:282-8.

Levinson W, Branch V;T, and Kroenke K. Clinician-educators in academic medical centers: a two part challenge. *Ann Intern Med.* 1998; 129: 59-64.

Osborn LM, Sostok M, Castellano PZ, Blount W, and Branch V;T. Recruiting and retaining clinician-educators: lessons learned from three programs. *J Gen Med.* 1997; 12 (Supp 2):583-9.

Stritter F.T., Bland C.J., and Youngblood P.L. (1991) Determining Essential Faculty Competencies. *Teaching and Learning in Medicine*, Vol.3, No.4, 232-238.

Ullian JA, and Stritter FT. Types of Faculty Development Programs. *Family Medicine*, 29 (4):237-241.

Needs Assessment Results

...from the dean:

1. She wants this pilot on-site/off-site faculty development program to represent the , “best practices” of this type of faculty development program.
2. She wants the majority of the on-site faculty development instruction and mentoring done by ESU-SOM faculty.
3. She wants the pilot program to be evaluated to document effectiveness.

...from the primary care department chairs and residency directors:

1. Most (n=8) are supportive of the concept of an on-site/off-site pilot faculty development program. Some are concerned about the time away and the loss of clinical productivity by program participants.
2. They are willing to “release” one faculty member per department/program for a total of three weeks (15 days) to participate in the pilot program.

3. They will pay the costs of travel, lodging and per them costs for their faculty during the on-site portion of the pilot program.

4. They believe their faculty need to improve their skills in the following areas: clinical teaching and research skills.

5. They want the pilot program to be effective and efficient, and they want their faculty to leave the program with something to benefit to the depart/residency program.

...from the primary care faculty:

1. Faculty most interested are junior, clinician-educator types.
2. Faculty believe they need to improve their skills in the following areas: Clinical teaching, clinical evaluation, computer usage, and evidence-based medicine.

Case Study

Question #1:

What are the first tasks for your Planning Group?
What additional data, if any do you need?

- Meet with chairs & residency directors to obtain their support and perspective.
- Conduct literature review of faculty development programs.
- Interview/visit similar on-site/off-site faculty development programs.
- Conduct needs assessment survey of target audience to determine perceived faculty strengths, needs and interests. Also, obtain information about preferred program format.

Question #2:

What should the pilot program look like?

- Administrative placement?
- Topics on-site?
- Expectations off-site?

-
- Length of time on-site?
 - Release time off-site?

Question #3:

How should the \$75,000 be spent? What personnel are involved?

- Personnel
- Consultants
- Equipment
- Supplies
- Travel
- Other/Miscellaneous Expenses
- Trainee Expenses

Question #4:

What strategies might be used to integrate the faculty development program into the on-going activities of the primary care departments/residence programs?

- Put someone in charge.
- Communicate with the Dean, primary care chairs and residency directors.
- Recruit and retain ESU-SOM faculty role models for the program.
- Continue to conduct faculty need and interest surveys.
- Make the program visible & publicize your successes.
- Conduct frequent evaluations of the on-site sessions, faculty, trainees, and the program itself.