

## **SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESULTS**

The large majority of attendees were overall *very satisfied* with the external planning retreat. Attendees felt content and strategic planning direction was *very well positioned*, and overall were *very satisfied* with logistics (date, time and space). Feedback shows that some faculty would have welcomed more open faculty discussion vs defined discussion, but that the *majority supported* priorities discussed. Attendees ranked their top 3 priorities as: faculty, education and third research. Of these priorities, attendees *unanimously* voiced need for recruitment at a city-wide level (Clinical Teachers and Scientists) to be able to advance the division to the next level. *Suggestions* included: finding alignment with other divisions, sharing space/clinic time/splitting time between sites and hiring a minimum of 3 full time faculty to support on-call and teaching needs. See below for survey results.

## POST RETREAT QUESTIONAIRE

Division of Dermatology, University of Toronto Tuesday April 24, 2018

## Dear Attendee:

Thank you for attending the Department of Medicine, Division of Dermatology Planning Retreat. Your feedback is important to us. Please help to complete the below questionnaire. Responses are anonymous and will be used to inform divisional planning.

Please return completed questionnaire to the front of the room at the end of the event.

1. Please rate on a scale of 0-10, where 0 indicates, "I choose not to answer", 1 is "not at all" and 10, is "Exceptional": *How useful was this planning meeting?* 

# of responses: 18 of 25

(invited speakers, PIC and organizer attendees did not respond)

```
1
2
3
4-1=1
5-1=1
6
7
8-1,1,1,1,4=8
```

9- 1, 1 = 2 10- 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1 = 6 TOTAL responses: 18

Of the 18 members to respond, 16 rated this planning meeting as very useful; majority of respondents ranked 8+ out of 10.

- 2. Please rate on a scale of 0-10, where 0 indicates, "I choose not to answer", 1 is "not at all" and 10, is "Exceptional": *How satisfied were you with?* 
  - a. Event \_\_\_\_ 9, 6, 10, 4, 9, 10, 7, 9, 5, 8, 8
    - 4- 1
    - 5- 1
    - 6- 1
    - 7- 1
    - 8-2+3
    - 9-3+2+1
    - 10-1+2

Of the 18 members to respond, the majority were very satisfied with this event. 14 or 18 ranked satisfaction 8+.

$$6-1$$
,  $1=2$ 

$$10-5, 2=8$$

Majority were very satisfied with date

$$6-1$$
,  $1=2$ 

$$9-2, 2=4$$

$$10-5, 3=8$$

Majority were very satisfied with the time.

d. Location  $\_\_\_$  10,9, 10, 10, 9, 10, 5, 10, 5, 2, 10

2-1 = 1 5-2 = 2 8-2=29-2, 3=5

10-6, 2 = 8

Majority were very satisfied with the location.

e. Speakers \_\_\_\_\_ 8, 8, 6, 4, 9, 10, 7, 9, 5, 8, 8

4-1 = 1

5-1 = 1

6-1 = 1

7-1 = 1

8-4, 3=7

9-2, 2= 4

10-1, 2 = 3

14 of 18 members were very satisfied with the speakers

f. Content \_\_\_\_\_ 8, 6, 8, 4, 9, 10, 6, 9, 5, 8, 8

4-1 = 1

5-1 = 1

6-2 = 2

7-1=1

8-4, 2, 1=7

9-2, 1=3

10-1, 2=3

Majority were very satisfied with the content (13 of 18 ranked 8+)

- 3. What did you like most about the event?
  - Content
  - Meeting members of DOM & have them speak from an organizational level re: research, education and advancement
  - Open and collaborative environment
  - Great to have multiple people across sites in one space to discuss ideas and strategies
  - Engaging speakers
  - Intimate group discussion
  - Good representation of the division

- Interactive discussion
- Emphasis on recruitment
- 4. What did you like least about the event?
  - No input on priorities
  - We had no time to sit down as a division to discuss on "OUR" direction as a division.
  - I feel like we had no input as to what the vision & direction of the division should be
  - More time/advanced notice would have been good
  - Not enough time for people in the division to think and provide feedback on the vision
  - Nothing
  - Still too many barriers and not enough solutions / real answers
  - Location of meeting
  - More time needed for discussion
  - More time for discussion would have been good
  - Why is research prioritized over faculty. Number 1 mission should be to support faculty
  - Wanted an opportunity to voice what does not work in the division
- 5. In your opinion, did the meeting meet its objectives?

Total # of responses 18

Majority felt the meeting met its objective of discussing division priorities to rank and inform the division's strategic direction. However, some felt more time for faculty discussion of priorities were needed, as well as wanted input into setting these priorities

## Please explain:

- I was hoping the strategic planning would involve more discussion with the division members
- Needed more discussion with input from a larger group
- Identified broad priorities opportunities and barriers
- Still no answers
- 6. What would have made this meeting better?
  - Knowing what a similar division has done successfully
  - Allow more time for group discussion



- Invite all faculty
- I think we need a division meeting with all full time faculty, staff, stakeholders within the division so we can collectively decide on our direction internally. It was nice to hear from DOM but I don't think we heard enough from each other in the division
- Longer meeting
- More time for meeting and discussion

-

- 7. Which topics would you like to see covered at future meetings?
  - Faculty
  - We didn't get to talk about undergraduate training or Off-service and CME- all of which takes up a lot of time from the members of the division..... also feel sick-kids was not included in the conversation and the site and members have contributed greatly to the research educational output of the division
  - Recruitment, efficiency support
  - Faculty wellness
  - Plan for on call not just ideas of tele-health and virtual coverage- it is not enough
  - What does the division plan to do to address burn out of faculty
  - How can we be better compensated for call?
- 8. Please rank from 1-8 as the below division priorities matter to you: 1= Most important, 8 = Low importance:

Geographic Presence/access to expertise: <b>9 of 14 respondents did not list this as a priority item</b> Responses: 4, 6, 6, 1, 6, 4, 5, 6, 4, 6, 6, 7  1-1  4-3  5-1  6-8  7-1
Fundraising: 10 of 15 respondents did not list this as a priority item in relation to other considerations  Responses: 7, 5, 5, 3, 4, 5, 7, 4, 5, 5, 7, 7, 7, 4, 4  3-1  4-4  5-5  7-5
Research: <b>8 of 12 respondents ranked research as a moderate-high priority</b> <i>Responses: 5, 4, 2,6, 7, 3, 4, 5, 3, 4, 3, 3</i>



3-5
4-3
5-2
6-1
7-1
Education: trainees: <b>8 of 10 respondents rank education as moderate-high priority</b> Responses: 3, 2, 3, 3, 3, 2, 5, 4, 3, 3  2-2  3-6  4-1  5-1
Education: faculty: <b>10 of 16 prioritize education of faculty very highly</b> **Responses: 2, 3, 4, 3, 4, 2, 2, 2, 4, 3, 5, 2, 4, 4, 2  2-6  3-4  4-5  5-1
Recruitment: faculty: 9 of 14 respondents prioritized recruitment as the most important priority (64%)  Responses: 1, 1, 1, 1, 5, 1, 1,2,2,2, 1, 1, 1,2, 1 1-9 2-4 5-1
Equity, gender and diversity initiatives: <b>9 of 14 respondents did not view this as a high priority</b> **Responses: 6, 7, 7, 2, 5, 6, 8, 7,5, 7, 5, 7, 5, 6  2-1  5-4  6-3  7-5  8-1
Other: (please specify): Of all respondents 3 ranked funding/compensation as a very high priority 2- compensation 2- compensation 2- Funding support

9. Do you have any other feedback you would like to share with us?



- I think, especially because the division is situated in several geographic sites, efforts should be made to have a more cohesive group with common goals and direction. I think if we move and advocate as a group, we will be heard better.
- I do appreciate the effort to bring us together
- Thank you

Thank you for your feedback!

Overall, the majority of meeting attendees were very satisfied with this planning meeting. Additional feedback included a desire for more discussion time, but equally the group was very satisfied with the meetings content and discussion output.