

Faculty Mentoring at the University of Minnesota

President's Emerging Leaders Program

2006-2007

Faculty Mentoring Project Team & Sponsors

Project Team:

Remi Douah
Coordinator
Multicultural/Academic Affairs

Nikki Letawsky Shultz
Director of Student Services
College of Biological Sciences

Shane Nackerud
Libraries Web Coordinator
Digital Library Development Lab

Peter Radcliffe
Senior Analyst
CLA Fiscal Administration

Todd Reubold
Assistant Director
Initiative for Renewable Energy and the Environment (IREE)

Project Sponsors:

Arlene Carney
Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs

Karen Zentner Bacig
Assistant to the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs

Table of Contents

Faculty Mentoring Project Team and Sponsors	1
Executive Summary.....	3
Background.....	5
Faculty Mentoring at the University of Minnesota.....	6
Faculty Mentoring at Peer Institutions	7
Survey Instrument and Data	9
Department Interview Summary	12
Recommendations.....	13
Best Practices.....	14
References	15
Appendix I: Characteristics of Common Mentoring Models.....	16
Appendix II: Characteristics of Effective Mentoring Programs	17
Appendix III: Survey Instrument	18
Appendix IV: Survey Results	19
Appendix V: Department Interview Protocol.....	23

Executive Summary

Our President's Emerging Leaders (PEL) project focuses on faculty mentoring for probationary faculty at the University of Minnesota. As the University of Minnesota seeks to become one of the top three public research universities in the world, we need to be attentive to issues concerning the life-course of faculty to support faculty success at all points of their careers. The Strategic Positioning Task Force on Faculty Culture, in their final report released in May 2006, pointed to faculty mentoring as a key strategy to move the University in the direction of excellence. In addition, the Provost's recent memo (June 2006) to department chairs regarding the revision of departmental standards for tenure and promotion (7.12 statements) requires the 7.12 statement to address faculty mentoring.

Our methodology to identify best practices and recommendations regarding faculty mentoring at the University includes:

- Reviewing relevant research literature on mentoring;
- Benchmarking faculty mentoring practices at peer institutions;
- Reviewing relevant University documents such as the Pulse Survey, Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) survey data, and the Report of the Task Force on Faculty Culture, among others;
- Surveying University departments concerning faculty mentoring activities; and
- Interviewing individuals or groups in University departments where exemplary forms of faculty mentoring are taking place.

Best practices

In addition to the recommendations below, through our research and consultations we identified the following best practices related to faculty mentoring:

- Research has shown that structured mentoring efforts, where senior faculty members are assigned to probationary faculty and there are established guidelines and expectations, are most effective (see Appendix I and II).
- Departments should spend time exploring and customizing mentoring programs that are best suited for their particular departmental culture and field.
- Inter-disciplinary faculty mentoring should be explored whenever feasible.
- Work/Life issues should be addressed, but not necessarily within the context of a departmental faculty mentoring program.
- To maximize the effectiveness of a faculty mentoring program, department chairs should check-in periodically with the mentoring that probationary faculty receive.

Recommendations

As a result of the online survey described in this report, interviews with department heads across the University of Minnesota Twin Cities campus, a review of the literature and relevant University documents, and research of mentoring activities at peer institutions, we propose the following recommendations to enhance mentoring of probationary faculty at the University of Minnesota:

- Supplement, at the central level, existing faculty orientation programs with workshops and training specifically focused on mentoring.
- Include an overview of strategies and best practices for faculty mentoring in programs for department heads/chairs.
- Define explicitly, at the department level, what role mentoring plays in the tenure process.
- Provide guidelines, from the Provost's Office, for an effective mentoring framework.
- Involve actively faculty in the development of a mentoring framework in order to build support for mentoring and future directions.
- Provide evaluation and measurement mechanisms centrally for the analysis of mentoring programs.
- Promote, recognize, and reward successful mentoring programs annually.
- Consider mentoring at the associate professor level in the next phase of this project.
- Designate an individual from the Provost's Office who will be responsible for working with faculty mentoring programs at the University of Minnesota.
- Provide centrally more online resources to guide the mentoring process.

Background

Mentoring is defined as the process of one person supporting, teaching, leading and serving as the model for another person (Buell, 2004). Mentoring can also be described as the process by which a person, usually of superior rank and/or outstanding achievement, guides the development of another person who may be new to a place of work or field. Although the concept of mentoring has been in place for many, many years, the idea of faculty mentoring in colleges and universities has only recently begun to be considered as an important strategy for new faculty hires. In a university setting, mentoring can and should be used to exchange ideas, strengthen departmental relationships, enhance productivity, and integrate new faculty into the University community (Savage, Karp, and Logue, 2004).

There is widespread agreement that mentoring in general is helpful for a variety of purposes and in a number of contexts. For example, mentoring is considered to be one of the best methods to increase self-esteem in young people (Buell, 2004). In regard to adults, mentoring has proven to be an important part of business culture, through senior executives or management assisting with the development of junior employees. In a recent survey of the 150 largest companies in America, 57 percent of executives responded that mentoring was "extremely important" while another 39% said it was "somewhat important" (Buell, 2004). When employees from businesses and corporations that have mentorship programs are surveyed, the results are remarkably positive, with reports of higher job satisfaction, better compensation, more promotions, and a desire to stay with their current employer (Sullivan & de Janasz, 2004). Clearly, mentoring is considered to be an important part of the private sector.

While there is a great deal of research being conducted regarding mentoring in the business world, there are comparatively fewer studies on the mentoring of university and college faculty. Some suggest this lack of research may suggest university or college administrators in general might consider mentoring as unimportant or unwarranted. Various reasons could explain this phenomenon. For example, Sullivan and de Janasz (2004) note that there may be an assumption that most faculty are already prepared for their careers due to extensive research in their field and because of their existing relationship with dissertation or theses advisors. These advisors obviously took on the role of a mentor of sorts during the new faculty member's pursuit of their graduate degree and as a result some university administrators may feel a new faculty member's training is complete.

While the amount of research concerning mentoring for faculty in an academic setting is small compared with research regarding other careers, the University of Minnesota is fortunate to have an expert in the field of faculty mentoring in Dr. Carole Bland. As a faculty member in the department of Family Medicine and Community Health and Director of the Bishop Fellowship for Medical Education Leadership, Dr. Bland has focused much of her research on the importance of faculty mentoring. In her book, *The Research Productive Department: Strategies from Departments That Excel*, Dr. Bland (2005) highlights how important formal mentoring is concerning scholarly research output. In fact, formal mentoring is highly correlated with research productivity, as scholars who collaborate with distinguished scientists or professors are more likely to become productive researchers themselves. Bland also reports that faculty who regularly associate with a faculty member of higher rank report higher satisfaction in terms of salary and the promotion/tenure process. In addition, Dr. Bland makes a strong case that formal mentoring programs should be preferred over informal or unstructured programs. Having a formally assigned mentor has been

shown to be an excellent predictor of high research productivity. The opposite, having an informal mentoring relationship, did not result in the same outcome (Bland, 2005).

Dr. Bland also presented some of her current research on faculty mentoring to the University of Minnesota Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs on May 8, 2007 (with Dr. Anne Taylor). At this committee meeting, Dr. Bland highlighted some of the reasons why faculty mentoring may be important for the University of Minnesota including the desire of the institution to increase faculty success (satisfaction, productivity, and retention), the need to recruit and retain the most talented faculty (including women and faculty of color), generational turnover, and to help achieve the University's strategic positioning goals. Dr. Bland also covered many of the benefits mentoring has on the faculty serving as mentors including cross-fertilization of ideas, a sense of satisfaction in sharing wisdom and ideas with younger faculty members, and an increase in productivity in the mentors themselves (Bland, 2007). Dr. Bland further discussed her own research findings in detail as well as other research before making the summative statement that the message "that emerges from this body of literature is that mentoring, when structured and done within a supportive relationship, can have a wide-reaching, positive impact on faculty success, especially in research (G. Engstrand, committee meeting notes, May 23, 2007)."

In the age of email and electronic relationships, new and entrenched faculty members alike often have more of an allegiance to colleagues and specialists around the world than to the faculty member in the office next door. As a result many faculty members, especially new faculty, express feelings of isolation, separation, fragmentation, and loneliness at their own institutions, which further causes them to seek out meaningful collegial relationships outside their own campus (Savage, Karp, & Logue, 2004). When done properly, possibly in a formal and systematic manner as Dr. Bland suggests, faculty mentoring can help break this cycle. Junior faculty can benefit from the experience and expertise of senior faculty members, and senior faculty members can learn and profit from new perspectives on research and pedagogy (Baldwin and Chang, 2006). In other words, strong faculty mentoring can benefit the department as a whole, and ultimately, the entire University.

Faculty Mentoring at the University of Minnesota

The Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) is a cooperative research and benchmarking project developed at the Harvard School of Education by co-investigators Richard Chait and Cathy Trower. At present, eighty colleges and universities are participating in the project. The project involves a survey administered to probationary faculty, and the University participated in December, 2005. The survey was sent to 433 tenure-track faculty on the Twin Cities campus (UMTC), and had a response rate of 58%. Eighty-nine percent of the respondents were in their first tenure-track position, but 50% of them did have post-doctoral experience. Comparative results were provided for the University of Minnesota with its selected peer institutions as well as with all responding institutions. The peer group was selected by the Provost and the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs by choosing the most similar institutions that also participated in the survey, and was composed of The Ohio State University, the University of Arizona, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and the University of Virginia.

The COACHE survey provides evidence on perceptions of both the clarity and reasonableness of tenure

standards at the University of Minnesota. Responding faculty were most clear about the tenure process and least clear about standards. UMTC scores on clarity were slightly higher than its peers overall, although not higher than all peers. UMTC faculty were less clear about tenure standards than peers. In the different roles and facets of faculty life, UMTC faculty felt tenure expectations were clearest as a scholar, and considerably lower as a teacher, landing in the 11th percentile for all responding schools. UMTC faculty felt tenure standards were most reasonable as a scholar and as a teacher. In addition, they ranked among the highest of participating institutions in the perception that tenure was based on performance, reaching the 97th percentile.

Probationary faculty were also asked about the importance and effectiveness of a wide variety of policies and programs. The three areas where the greatest gap was identified at the University of Minnesota between importance and effectiveness were professional assistance in obtaining externally funded grants, formal mentoring programs for junior faculty, and childcare. Both male and female faculty identified grant assistance and formal mentoring as being important but least effective at the University. Male faculty identified formal mentoring as well, while female faculty identified grant assistance. These two areas were also identified by Caucasian faculty and faculty of color. Among Caucasian faculty, grant assistance was listed, while formal mentoring was third. Among faculty of color, formal mentoring was cited, as well as grant assistance.

Work-life balance was also identified as a problem. Compared to peer institutions, UMTC probationary faculty perceived less balance, and this was particularly true for female faculty, where the University of Minnesota ranked in the 11th percentile of COACHE participating institutions. UMTC probationary faculty were also less satisfied than faculty at peer institutions with the interest senior faculty take in them, and in their collaboration, professional, and personal interactions with senior faculty. They were more satisfied with their professional and personal interactions with other junior faculty colleagues.

The COACHE findings demonstrate an interest in faculty mentoring and a concern with the quality of current practice. They also suggest that probationary faculty have a desire for more guidance and support, and for closer connections with their senior colleagues.

Faculty Mentoring at Peer Institutions

The University of Minnesota (2006) considers these public institutions to be our peers:

- University of California – Berkeley
- University of California – Los Angeles
- University of Michigan
- University of Wisconsin -- Madison
- University of Florida
- University of Illinois at Urbana -- Champaign
- University of Texas
- University of Washington
- The Ohio State University

- Pennsylvania State University

In addition to reviewing mentoring programs at the above peer institutions, our PEL group also reviewed faculty mentoring activity at these institutions:

COACHE Peer Group:

- University of Arizona
- University of Illinois at Urbana – Champaign
- University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
- University of Virginia

Other Comparison Institutions

- Purdue University
- Indiana University

Below is a sample of the types of programs we found:

University of Illinois - Urbana/Champaign (UIUC)

The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at the University of Illinois offers a Junior Faculty Mentoring Program (<http://www.las.uiuc.edu/teachingacademy/programs/mentoring/index.html>). In this program, new junior faculty members are paired with mentors from outside their home departments who share a common research interest or whose disciplines are related. These mentors provide helpful advice to their new colleagues on topics such as time management, working effectively with teaching assistants, and intervening appropriately when students experience academic problems or personal crises.

We spoke with the Associate Director of the Liberal Arts and Sciences Teaching Academy to obtain additional information. The faculty mentoring project is for new tenure-track faculty and is optional. All new faculty go through an orientation session and during this session they are introduced to the mentoring program. On average less than 50 percent of new faculty participate in this program. Most of the colleges at UIUC offer similar programs; however, there is not a campus-wide faculty mentoring program.

University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill (UNC)

Through our research, we were able to find a documented faculty mentoring program with UNC's Pharmacy department, (<http://www.pharmacy.unc.edu/labs/mentoring-program>). The Pharmacy Department received a \$1 million endowment to start this program, and it seems to be successful. Goals of the program include recruitment, retention (ending with promotion and tenure) and taking advantage of the

unique experience of existing faculty. Participation in the program is voluntary and participants are expected to meet with their mentoring teams on a weekly basis.

Indiana University (IU)

Administrative support for faculty mentoring at Indiana University seems to focus on faculty of color and is one of the very few examples of a faculty mentoring program not coming out of a specific academic department. The Office of Strategic Hiring and Support (SHS) manages the "informal" program for faculty of color. The program is voluntary, and mentoring teams can choose to continue after the year is completed. During the year, the SHS office may have various sponsored programs and workshops (<http://www.indiana.edu/~shs/fmp.shtml>).

It appears IU also previously had a faculty mentoring program for women faculty, although the links to the program's web site are now defunct. In addition, the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at IU has a faculty mentoring program that seems to help new faculty both in a general collegial sense, but also to help them learn about expectations and resources for the tenure and promotion process. New faculty are assigned a mentor usually within the first semester of their hire. Mentors are expected to be an advocate and adviser to the new hire, but not to be involved in the annual evaluation process. It is unclear how long the mentoring relationship is expected to last (<http://profile.educ.indiana.edu/academicaffairs/Faculty/Mentoring/CurriculumInstruction/tabid/476/Default.aspx>).

University of Washington (UW)

Like many of the institutions we analyzed, the University of Washington does not appear to have a coordinated, campus-wide faculty mentoring program. The two identifiable programs on campus are connected with organizations of faculty women. One is in the School of Medicine, and is tied to the Center of Excellence on Women's Health (<http://depts.washington.edu/uwcoe/newsletter/index.html>). The other is the UW ADVANCE program in the College of Engineering (<http://www.engr.washington.edu/advance/mentoring/index.html>), which is focused on "increasing the participation and advancement of women faculty in academic science and engineering careers." ADVANCE seeks to encourage women faculty to pursue positions of academic leadership, and programs are designed to emphasize "techniques for time management, obtaining consensus among faculty, and implementing a vision of excellence." ADVANCE also has a pre-tenure faculty mentoring program which utilizes group mentoring rather than the more traditional one-on-one mentoring model. These group settings include "informal lunches, topical workshops, and other opportunities to share resources and information."

University of Michigan (UMich)

The University of Michigan was, by far, the most comprehensive faculty mentoring program we discovered in our research and is housed in a central university administration office, specifically the Office of the Provost. In fact, the University of Michigan seems to take faculty mentoring very seriously and has actually produced a rigorous study entitled "Report of the Faculty Mentoring Study: The Provost's Advisory

Committee on Mentoring and Community Building"

(http://www.provost.umich.edu/reports/faculty_mentoring_study/index.html). The report includes survey results, recommendations and ideas concerning faculty mentoring on campus, and definitions of the various forms of faculty mentoring. Attempts were made to contact the University of Michigan concerning their program, especially in regard to its overall success, but these attempts at contact were unsuccessful.

Overall, only one institution had a formalized faculty mentoring program sponsored by University administration, the University of Michigan. All other institutions had pockets of activity, usually at individual departmental levels. This type of activity, departmentally sponsored and "grass roots," is also mirrored in current University of Minnesota practices.

Survey Instrument and Data

In order to gauge the current state of faculty mentoring practices on campus, an eighteen-question, web-based survey was sent to the heads of 122 departments on the Twin Cities campus. A total of 46 usable responses were received, for a response rate of 38%. This response rate is fairly typical for web-based or mail-based surveys. Since no budget was available to provide response incentives, attempts to increase responses were limited to reminders. Three reminder e-mails were sent, in addition to a reminder that if a department did not have a mentoring program, the survey consisted of only five questions. These reminders had a noticeable impact on the number of responses, leading to the eventual 38% response rate.

Of those departments that responded, 33 (72%) indicated that they had a faculty mentoring program. The majority of these programs have been in place for some time. Seventy-two percent have been functioning for at least five years, and another 19% have been running for at least three years. The structure and format of these programs varies across units. Departments were evenly split on whether their programs were formal or informal, with thirteen departments labeling their programs as formal, another thirteen labeling them as informal, and an additional six who considered their programs to be both formal and informal. A formal program was described by a respondent in the following way:

The program entails identifying two mentors... As a trio, the junior faculty member and his/her two mentors should meet once every 6 months to discuss specific goals... After each biannual meeting, a written summary of the goals and objectives will be forwarded to the... Head.

By contrast, an informal program was described as follows:

I informally assign faculty to serve as mentors for junior faculty. I then occasionally touch base with both the junior faculty member and the informal faculty mentor to see how things are going.

Another department described the mix of formal and informal contacts involved in their mentoring program:

A mentoring committee for each new probationary faculty member is named by the chair... Certain aspects of the process are formalized (an annual report); others are more informal

(conversations over coffee from time to time).

Departments also use a variety of organizational approaches, with various combinations of one-to-one, group, and other forms showing roughly similar frequency. Some departments use different structures for faculty at different stages of their careers (e.g., probationary faculty versus associate professors), or due to the different needs or interests of the junior faculty member.

Mentoring Program Format	# of Departments
One-to-One	11
Group	8
Both One-to-One and Group	7
Neither One-to-One nor Group	6

Mentors are primarily (72%) drawn from within the department, where a department head can most easily influence senior faculty members to participate. A number of departments (28%), however, also draw mentors from outside their home department. This practice is most common among departments that use group mentoring. No responding department used mentors exclusively from other departments.

The use of peer mentors was relatively rare, with only three departments reporting this approach. By contrast, senior mentors were used in almost all departments who had mentoring programs (88%).

Mentors are predominantly selected jointly by the department chair and the incoming junior faculty member. A fairly typical program was described by the department head in the following way:

Pre-tenure faculty are assigned two tenured faculty mentors -- these are selected by the head in conjunction with the pre-tenure faculty member in order to pair them with individuals who have strengths and experience in research, teaching... [and] who work in relevant fields or at relevant scales, and who are also individuals the pre-tenure faculty member feels they can work with.

Participation is generally required for the junior faculty member (69%), but is generally voluntary for the mentor(s) (75%). In just over one-third of the departments, participation is mandatory for both parties (36%), but in no case is it mandatory for the mentor but voluntary for the mentee.

		Mentor		Total
		Voluntary	Mandatory	
Mentee	Voluntary	10	0	10
	Mandatory	14	8	22
	Total	24	8	32

The length of the program is generally connected to the goal of achieving tenure. Roughly two-thirds of the programs (69%) run through the probationary period, while the rest were dependent on the interests of the faculty members involved. In some of those departments, the mentoring relationship might dissolve prior to

the tenure decision if the junior faculty member had found their own network of mentors and supporters, and in others it is viewed as a completely open-ended relationship that might last well into a tenured career.

Only one-third of responding departments with mentoring programs indicated that their programs had prescribed content. Most, however, (72%) indicated four or more aspects of professional and personal life covered by their mentoring program. The most common areas in which mentors provide guidance are helping with the tenure process, with publication, and with learning departmental and institutional norms (88% for each of these responses). Slightly lower numbers of departments report that mentors assist with grant writing and review and with the preparation of the tenure dossier (71% for each). The least common area was mentoring regarding work/life balance, with just over half (54%) the departments reporting mentors provide assistance.

Most departments (66% of those with programs) report that they do not have a method for assessing the effectiveness of their program. Those who do have methods for assessing effectiveness primarily indicate they rely on informal discussions and the annual review process. A handful of departments, however, have more formalized mechanisms for discussing their programs within their departments and providing feedback to mentors, mentees, or both.

Department Interview Summary

As a follow-up to the survey responses collected from University of Minnesota departments, several interviews were conducted with department heads to understand more fully the opinions of and complexities within faculty mentoring. Seven departments were selected for follow-up interviews, six who currently offer faculty mentoring for the probationary faculty and one who did not. The departments were selected to encompass a broad range of disciplines and collegiate units within the University of Minnesota, including: the College of Liberal Arts, the College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Sciences, the College of Biological Sciences, the Institute of Technology, the College of Design, and the Academic Health Center.

For the six departments that offer some sort of faculty mentoring for probationary faculty, all departments considered mentoring an important part of the tenure process, as mentoring was intended to support new faculty and convey expectations. Department chairs see mentoring as both a mechanism to welcome new faculty to the university and department and also a guide to navigate the complex roles of faculty life. One department referred to the process as a way to provide "*high collegiality and high expectations.*"

The majority of departments began the mentoring process by developing a list of current faculty, generally those with similar research interests/agendas to serve as potential mentors. The format of mentoring within each department varied, as some have individual mentors and others have a mentoring committee or multiple mentors to assist with different responsibilities, such as teaching or research. Departments also varied as to whether they assigned mentors or if probationary faculty were to establish mentoring connections with senior faculty on their own.

In addition, many department heads meet periodically with probationary faculty and/or the mentors to serve as a resource and to monitor both the relationship(s) and the progress of the probationary faculty member.

The majority of departments had little to no formal measurement or assessment tools beyond the granting of tenure for probationary faculty. Some departments gathered informal feedback from mentors and mentees, or discussed the mentoring relationship during annual probationary reviews.

The department interviewed that did not have explicit faculty mentoring felt that mentoring was an integral part of the success of probationary faculty. The department head was fairly new to the role and has seen the benefits of mentoring at the head's previous institution. In fact, this department head has plans to establish an intentional process for mentoring new faculty. Although supportive of the initiative, this department head also acknowledged caution regarding the role that mentoring can sometimes play in departmental politics. For example, the mentoring relationship may serve to enhance existing conflicts or strife among faculty by creating cliques, loyalties or alliances within the department.

All department heads interviewed were asked to consider at what level within the University structure faculty mentoring should be administered and what, if any, role central administration should play in such a program. All departments felt that primary leadership for faculty mentoring should rest in individual departments. Most department heads agreed that the department mentoring relationship should be constructed to address issues related to the tenure process, such as grant-writing and publication. Several department heads suggested that mentoring related to work/life balance issues would be best provided outside of the department mentoring relationship, either through central resources or others within the University. Often work/life balance issues involve personal values and judgment, and several department heads felt that support for these issues would be best served outside of the department mentoring relationship. In addition, today's probationary faculty often face different issues than senior faculty did during their probationary period, such as having a partner working outside the home, having young children, or caring for an aging parent. Also, many felt that central administration and/or Human Resources could supplement the mentoring program by incorporating programming regarding work/life balance issues, navigating the university, teaching, and lab management training.

Other ideas suggested by individual department heads for central administration's role include establishing guidelines for an effective mentoring framework and assessment strategies, providing information and resources for department heads regarding mentoring, developing supplemental materials and on-line resources for probationary faculty and mentors, and providing an opportunity for departments to share best practices and learn from other similar disciplines (i.e., at the Graduate School's Council meetings).

Overall, all of department heads interviewed are supportive of faculty mentoring for probationary faculty and see its importance within the tenure process. Also, all are supportive of a role for central administration to play in the process. Several noted that another area that remains somewhat untapped is mentoring for associate professors. Finally, several noted that mentoring could be a mechanism to introduce faculty across departmental lines and to encourage collaboration, as the University encourages more interdisciplinary approaches to research and operations.

Best Practices

In addition to the recommendations below, through our research and consultations we identified the following list of best practices related to faculty mentoring:

- Research (Bland, 2005) has shown that structured mentoring efforts, where senior faculty members are assigned to probationary faculty and there are established guidelines and expectations, are most effective.
- Departments should spend time exploring and customizing mentoring programs that are best suited for their particular departmental culture and field.
- Inter-disciplinary faculty mentoring should be explored whenever feasible.
- Work/Life issues should be addressed, but not necessarily within the context of a departmental faculty mentoring program.
- To maximize the effectiveness of a faculty mentoring program, department chairs should check-in periodically with the mentoring that probationary faculty receive.

Recommendations

As a result of the online survey described in this report, interviews with department heads across the University of Minnesota Twin Cities campus, and research of academic peer institutions, we propose the following recommendations to enhance mentoring of junior faculty at the University of Minnesota:

- The University of Minnesota's central administration can supplement existing faculty orientation programs with workshops and training specifically focused on mentoring.
- Department head training should include an overview of strategies and best practices for faculty mentoring.
- Departments should explicitly define what role mentoring plays in the tenure process.
- Central administration should provide guidelines for an effective mentoring framework.
- Faculty should be actively involved in the next phase of this process in order to build support for mentoring and future directions.
- Central administration can provide evaluation and measurement mechanisms for analyzing mentoring programs.
- Successful mentoring programs should be advertised and receive recognition on an annual basis.
- Associate to full professor mentoring should be considered in the next phase of this project.
- The Provost's office should designate an individual who will be responsible for working with faculty mentoring programs at the University of Minnesota.
- Central administration can provide more online resources to guide the mentoring process.

References

- Baldwin, R. G. & Chang, D. A. (2006). Reinforcing our "keystone" strategies to support faculty in the middle years of academic life. *Liberal Education*, 92, 28-35.
- Bland, C. J. (2005). Mentoring. In Carole J. Bland, *The research-productive department: Strategies from departments that excel* (pp 64-79). Bolton, Mass.: Anker Publishing.
- Bland, C. J. & Taylor, A. (2007, May 8). *Establishing a Mentoring Program*. Presented at the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs at the University of Minnesota.
- Buell, C. (2004). Models of mentoring in communication. *Communication Education*, 53, 56-73.
- De Janasz, S. C., & Sullivan, S. E. (2004). Multiple mentoring in academe: Developing the professional network. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 64, 263-283.
- Indiana University. *Mentoring policy curriculum & instruction*. Retrieved November 4, 2006 from <http://profile.educ.indiana.edu/academicaffairs/Faculty/Mentoring/CurriculumInstruction/tabid/476/Default.aspx>
- Savage, H. E., Karp, R. S., & Logue, R. (2004). Faculty mentorship at colleges and universities. *College Teaching*, 52, 21-24.
- University of Illinois. *Junior faculty mentoring program*. Retrieved November 4, 2006 from <http://www.las.uiuc.edu/teachingacademy/programs/mentoring/index.html>.
- University of Michigan. (2004). *Report of the faculty mentoring study: The Provost's advisory committee on mentoring and community building* [Electronic version]. Retrieved November 4, 2006 at http://www.provost.umich.edu/reports/faculty_mentoring_study/index.html
- University of Minnesota. (2006). *Advancing the public good: Transforming the U* [Electronic version]. Minneapolis, MN: Author.
- University of North Carolina. *Bill and Karen Campbell faculty mentoring program*. Retrieved November 8, 2006 from <http://www.pharmacy.unc.edu/labs/mentoring-program>
- University of Washington. *Faculty mentoring online newsletter*. Retrieved November 8, 2006 from <http://depts.washington.edu/uwcoe/newsletter/index.html>
- University of Washington. *Mentoring*. Retrieved November 8, 2006 from <http://www.engr.washington.edu/advance/mentoring/index.html>

Appendix I: Characteristics of Common Mentoring Models

Table 3.1. Characteristics of Common Mentoring Models*

Characteristic	Mentoring Model		
	Traditional	Peer	Group
Structure	hierarchical	peer	hierarchical
Format	one mentee with one mentor or a team of mentors	one-to-one or small collaborative group	one or small number of mentors with medium group of mentees
Typical career stage of mentee	early	any	early or mid
Typical career stage of mentor	mid or senior	any	mid or senior
Typical purpose and goals of the mentoring relationship	career planning and advancement socialization skill learning goal activity project centered	goal activity skill learning life issues relationship centered	career advancement socialization topic centered
Need for coordinator	high – contract, agreements, expectations, matching, nudging	medium – use of facilitator or consensus	medium – use of facilitators
Challenges	recruiting and training enough mentors to fill demand time commitment	recruiting providing training for peer mentoring time commitment changing group membership	differing needs of group members providing skill training for group interaction managing group dynamics time commitments changing group membership

* Adapted with permission from Carr, R. (2000). *A chart summarizing four different types of mentoring: intentional, traditional, peer, and transition*. Victoria, BC: Peer Systems Consulting Group (Retrieved September 10, 2006 from http://www.mentors.ca/Peer_Resources_Network.html/Projects)

(Bland, 2005)

Appendix II: Characteristics of Effective Mentoring Programs

Figure 3.1. Characteristics of an Effective Mentoring Program

- 1. Program has a clearly stated purpose and goals.**
 - Purposes and goals are agreed upon by all principles (e.g., director, coordinator, sponsor, mentors) of the program.
 - Purposes and goals are consistent with larger organizations goals and culture.
- 2. Program has support of faculty and administrators.**
 - Program enjoys visible support from administrators.
 - Faculty feel a shared ownership of the program.
- 3. Program is positioned appropriately within the larger organization.** This will depend on the scope of the program (e.g., part of initiative, internal to a department, college-wide).
- 4. Program design, ideally, includes the following elements or features:**
 - For each mentee, formal initiation and ending of program
 - Stated qualifications for mentors
 - Mechanism for matching mentors and mentees
 - Identified person or team of mentors for each mentee
 - Training for mentors and mentees
 - Recognition for mentors' effort, e.g., in promotions, financial incentives, mini-sabbatical, awards
 - Clear expectations for each mentor, or mentor team and each mentee, including outcomes to be achieved via mentoring and timing and type of strategies used to achieve these outcomes
 - In addition to common expectations across all mentor team/mentee pairs, each pair/team commits to a mentoring agreement which lists goals and activities specific to that mentee
 - Program wide activities to support mentors and mentees (e.g., teaching workshops, grant writing workshops, writing seminar, Web-based materials on HIPAA, Responsible Conduct of Research, promotion and tenure guidelines, human subjects proposals)
 - Regular meetings of mentor/mentor team and mentee
 - Systematic contact of coordinator with mentors and mentees to trouble shoot, provide assistance and monitor progress
 - Mechanism for mentor/mentor teams and mentee arrangements to change, when appropriate
 - A timeline for mentoring which indicates the end of the formal program, although mentor/mentee relationships may continue
- 5. Program is evaluated both to assure that program elements are being implemented as planned and to assess if the program and individual mentee goals are being achieved.**
- 6. Program is linked and coordinated with other similar programs** such as ones at other levels of the organization or for specific groups (e.g., women, minorities, faculty development).
- 7. Program has a clearly stated administrative structure.** For example, a coordinator is named, the person to whom the coordinator and program report is identified, sponsors/advocates/patrons are identified, an advisory committee is established (if appropriate).
- 8. Needed program resources are identified and acquired.** Resources might include staff (number, qualifications, and time committed), space, number and types of mentors and honoraria, Web materials, workshop expenses, etc.

Appendix III: Survey Instrument

1. What department do you represent?
2. Do you have a mentoring program for junior (probationary) faculty?
3. Please briefly describe your faculty mentoring program.
4. Which of the following characteristics describe your mentoring program? Check all that apply.
5. Are the mentors assigned?
6. Where do the mentors come from?
7. How long has the program been in existence?
8. Is participation in the program mandatory or voluntary for both the mentor and the mentee?
9. How long do junior faculty members participate in the program?
10. Do you have any mechanisms for evaluating the effectiveness of the program?
11. Do you believe mentoring has increased the proportion of faculty who are successful in the tenure process? Please describe below.
12. Does the mentoring program have specific content, or do the participants set their own agenda?
13. What aspects of professional/personal life do mentors cover? Check all that apply.
14. Are there staff or financial resources dedicated to the program? Please describe.
15. Do you have any documentation or a web site describing your program that you could share with us?
16. Are you planning a program? Please describe below.
17. Do you know of any exemplary mentoring programs outside of your department at the University of Minnesota? Please list.
18. Any other comments or thoughts?

Appendix IV: Survey Results

1. What department do you represent?

Total Respondents	46
(skipped this question)	0

2. Do you have a mentoring program for junior (probationary) faculty?

<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Total</u>
No (you will be redirected to question #16)	28.3%	13
Yes (you will be redirected to question #3)	71.7%	33
Total Respondents		46

3. Please briefly describe your faculty mentoring program.

Total Respondents	31
(skipped this question)	15

4. Which of the following characteristics describe your mentoring program? Check all that apply.

<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Total</u>
Informal	59.4%	19
Formal	59.4%	19
Group	46.9%	15
One to one	56.2%	18
Peer mentor	9.4%	3
Senior mentor	87.5%	28
Total Respondents		32

5. Are the mentors assigned?

<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Total</u>
No	12.5%	4
Yes, please describe who assigns mentors and how they are determined.	87.5%	28
Total Respondents		32

6. Where do the mentors come from?

<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Total</u>
Inside the department	71.9%	23
Outside the department	0%	0
Both inside and outside the department	28.1%	9
Total Respondents		32

7. How long has the program been in existence?

<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Total</u>
Less than one year	3.1%	1
1-3 years	6.2%	2
3-5 years	18.8%	6
5+ years	71.9%	23
Total Respondents		32

8. Is participation in the program mandatory or voluntary for both the mentor and the mentee?

<u>Person</u>	<u>Voluntary</u>	<u>Involuntary</u>	<u>Average</u>
Mentee	32% (10)	68% (21)	1.68
Mentor	74% (23)	26% (8)	1.26
Total Respondents		32	
(skipped this question)		14	

9. How long do junior faculty members participate in the program?

<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Total</u>
One-year	0%	0
Through the probationary period	68.8%	22
Open (not a set amount of time)	15.6%	5
Other, please specify	15.6%	5
Total Respondents		32

10. Do you have any mechanisms for evaluating the effectiveness of the program?

<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Total</u>
No	65.6%	21
Yes, please describe below.	34.4%	11
Total Respondents		32

11. Do you believe mentoring has increased the proportion of faculty who are successful in the tenure process? Please describe below.

Total Respondents	32
(skipped this question)	14

12. Does the mentoring program have specific content, or do the participants set their own agenda?

<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Total</u>
Specific content (go to Question 13)	35.5%	11
No specific content (go to Question 14)	64.5%	20
Total Respondents		31

13. What aspects of professional/personal life do mentors cover? Check all that apply.

<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Total</u>
Grant writing and review	70.8%	17
Tenure dossier preparation	70.8%	17
Help with tenure process	87.5%	21
Work/life balance	54.2%	13
Publication	87.5%	21
Orientation to the department	62.5%	15
Departmental/institutional norms	87.5%	21
Other (please specify)	20.8%	5
Total Respondents		24

14. Are there staff or financial resources dedicated to the program? Please describe.

Total Respondents	32
(skipped this question)	14

15. Do you have any documentation or a web site describing your program that you could share

with us?

Total Respondents	32
(skipped this question)	14

16. Are you planning a program? Please describe below.

Total Respondents	13
(skipped this question)	33

17. Do you know of any exemplary mentoring programs outside of your department at the University of Minnesota? Please list.

Total Respondents	36
(skipped this question)	10

18. Any other comments or thoughts?

Total Respondents	20
(skipped this question)	26

Appendix V: Department Interview Protocol

After tabulating the results from the survey administered in Appendix I, several interviews were conducted with department heads to understand more fully the opinions of and complexities within faculty mentoring. Seven departments were selected for follow-up interviews -- six who offered faculty mentoring for its probationary faculty and one who did not at the time of the study.

The departments were purposely selected to encompass a broad range of disciplines and collegiate units within the University of Minnesota, including: the College of Liberal Arts, the College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Sciences, the College of Biological Sciences, the Institute of Technology, the College of Design, and the Academic Health Center. The questions utilized to guide the interviews were as follows:

1. Why did you decide to establish a faculty mentoring program?
2. What is the focus of your mentoring program? Probationary faculty? Associate professors? Both? Other?
3. What is the purpose of your mentoring program? Mentoring through the tenure process? Mentoring for teaching or research? Other(s)?
4. What factors have led to the success of your program? Or what roadblocks have led to problems?
5. What has been the response of the faculty involved? Positive? Negative?
6. What has been the biggest benefit of faculty mentoring to your department? Do you feel mentoring is key part of retaining faculty? Of faculty success? (relative to tenure, promotion, productivity, etc.)
7. How do you define success? How do you assess the impact of your mentoring program?
8. At what level do you think mentoring programs ought to be administered? Departmental? Collegiate? Central? A combination?
9. What kinds of recommendations would you suggest to the University administration regarding faculty mentoring? What support could Central administration provide to your faculty mentoring efforts? What role ought Central administration to play in faculty mentoring at the University?