

**Recommendations to the Provost and
Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs
From the
Provost's Advisory Committee on
Faculty Mentoring and Community Building**
December 22, 2004

INTRODUCTION

In November 2000, the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs sponsored a retreat entitled, "Mentoring, Quality of Faculty Life and Community Building." Nearly 100 University of Michigan administrators attended the retreat, including deans, associate and assistant deans, and department chairs. In January 2001, the Provost's Advisory Committee on Faculty Mentoring and Community Building was established. The committee was charged with the task of identifying strategies to improve support for faculty, improving awareness and understanding of mentoring, and surveying faculty and administrators regarding their experiences with and their needs for mentoring.

During the 2003-2004 academic year, the Committee administered two surveys on faculty mentoring, one targeted to assistant professors and one targeted to academic administrators. Also, several focus groups were held with small groups of survey respondents, which allowed for more in-depth discussion of issues related to faculty mentoring. The results and findings of the surveys and focus groups are provided in a separate report.

The Committee developed the recommendations below after studying the findings from the surveys and focus groups, but they are also based on the work and discussions of the Committee since its inception.

Recommendations

1. The Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs should actively promote mentoring by establishing and distributing guidelines for faculty mentoring to the schools, colleges, departments, and academic programs.

The Provost should provide the guidelines below to the deans of the schools and colleges with an expectation that the deans, in turn, will provide them to department chairs and program directors (where applicable).

- a. Deans, department chairs, and academic program directors should ensure that junior faculty members who want mentoring receive it.

- b. Since each school, college, department, or academic program is unique, each dean, department chair, or program director should (1) identify the key skills and resources that junior faculty need, taking into account the unique mentoring needs that some faculty groups have above typical mentoring needs, and (2) offer appropriate mentoring and support, taking into account the good practices for effective mentoring that the Committee has identified through its work (see below).
 - c. Schools, colleges, or academic departments/programs should periodically assess the mentoring needs, interests, and experiences of junior faculty.
 - d. The schools, colleges, and academic departments/programs should take steps to ensure that all junior faculty members know about mentoring opportunities available to them.
 - e. Because some junior faculty members are reluctant to ask for guidance or help, each school, college, department, or academic program should ensure that some type of outreach to junior faculty members occurs periodically.
 - f. Deans, department chairs, and academic program directors should include mentoring junior faculty as a criterion in their reviews of senior faculty members (annual merit reviews and promotion reviews).
2. The Provost should ask the deans to describe annually in some manner (e.g., the annual school/college budget document) the state of faculty mentoring in the schools, colleges, or academic departments/programs and what efforts, if any, they or department/program chairs have taken to improve faculty mentoring.
 3. The Provost's Office should include faculty mentoring as a criterion for promoting senior faculty from Associate Professor to Professor.
 4. The Provost's Office should assign responsibility within the Provost's Office to pay attention to issues related to faculty mentoring.
 5. The Provost's Office should revise its current online mentoring resources to make them more generic and therefore relevant over time:

In some cases, a description of a mentoring effort might be ascribed to a school/college or academic department/program. But to keep the resource from becoming out of date, the Committee perceives this resource primarily as a repository of general ideas that deans, department chairs, academic program directors, and individual faculty members can draw from. *See Appendix A of the "Report on the Faculty Mentoring Study."*

The Provost's Office should also make available on the mentoring website the resource entitled "Five Approaches to Faculty Mentoring." The tool describes five types of mentoring approaches and a set of benefits and issues for each approach. *See Appendix B of the "Report on the Faculty Mentoring Study."*

6. The Provost's Office should consider offering grants to schools, colleges, and academic departments/programs for structured mentoring efforts and incentives (e.g., funds for programs or initiatives to promote or reward school, college, or department/program faculty mentoring initiatives).
7. The Provost's Office should sponsor opportunities for academic department chairs and program directors to discuss faculty mentoring and other topics of interest.

For example, this networking opportunity could take the form of several department chair lunches during the academic year.

Good Practices for Effective Mentoring (Based on Survey and Focus Group Findings)

- It is best to conceive mentoring as a *networking* effort rather than to conceive and talk about mentoring as a relationship with *one* faculty member who will meet all one's needs.
- Mentoring should address the specific department- and discipline-related needs of individual junior faculty members, but should not be conceived as “one-size-fits-all”.
- Faculty will generally need a combination of mentors within and outside the department.
- A mix of unstructured (informal) and structured (formal) mentoring efforts is most effective. Mentoring efforts can range from *formal* (e.g., scheduled meetings with the department chair, mentor assignments) to *informal* (e.g., academic and/or social events that give junior faculty members the chance to meet a variety of senior faculty members in a non-threatening environment—making a social connection is often an important first step to forming a professional connection).
- An important component of all mentoring efforts is advice about the “nuts and bolts” of academic work, as well as other information that demystifies the process of becoming a successful faculty member.
- Academic leadership and senior faculty should recognize publicly the importance of faculty mentoring as a tool for academic success
- Deans, department chairs, and academic program directors must also try to foster a culture of trust and collaboration in the school, college, or department/program, as these are key elements to effective faculty mentoring.
- An effective approach to mentoring junior faculty is to focus on the process of helping them become the best academics they can be, instead of focusing solely on the outcome of achieving tenure.

Members of the 2003-2004

Provost's Advisory Committee on Faculty Mentoring and Community Building

(The lists below cite the positions the contributors held at the time.)

Daniel Washington (Chair), Assistant Dean and Associate Professor, School of Music

Ellen Arruda, Associate Professor of Macromolecular Science and Engineering and Mechanical Engineering, College of Engineering

James Bean, Associate Dean of Academic Affairs and Professor of Industrial Operations Engineering College of Engineering

Izak Duenyas, Associate Dean and Professor, Ross School of Business

Barbara Therrien, Associate Professor, School of Nursing

Kathryn Tosney, Professor of Molecular, Cellular, and Developmental Biology, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts

Marilyn Woolfolk, Assistant Dean of Academic Affairs and Professor of Community Dentistry, School of Dentistry

Glenda Haskell (*ex officio*), Assistant Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs, Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs

With thanks to previous members of the Committee and our Research Assistants:

Jeffrey Alexander, Associate Dean and Professor of Health Management and Policy, School of Public Health

Valerie Castle, who served as a member of the Committee during her appointment as Associate Provost, which ended on September 1, 2003, when she assumed a position as Chair of the UM Department of Pediatrics

Martha Feldman, Professor, Ford School of Public Policy

Marilyn Lantz, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Professor, School of Dentistry (who also served as Chair)

Nancy Adair Birk, Doctoral Candidate, Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education, University of Michigan

Thomas E. Perorazio, Doctoral Candidate, Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education

REPORT OF THE FACULTY MENTORING STUDY

The Provost's Advisory Committee on Mentoring and Community Building

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

INTRODUCTION

In November 2000, the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs sponsored a retreat entitled, "Mentoring, Quality of Faculty Life and Community Building." Nearly 100 University of Michigan administrators attended the retreat, including deans, associate and assistant deans, and department chairs. The most immediate result of the retreat was the establishment in January 2001 of the Provost's Advisory Committee on Faculty Mentoring and Community Building was established, acknowledging the role mentoring can play in the careers of faculty. The committee was charged with the task of identifying strategies to improve support for faculty, improving awareness and understanding of mentoring, and surveying faculty and administrators regarding their experiences with and their needs for mentoring. The purpose of this report is to examine the results of the faculty and administrator surveys and focus groups regarding their experiences with mentoring.

FINDINGS AND INFERENCES

The findings and inferences outlined below are based on the Committee's analysis of the data from the surveys of both junior faculty and administrators, each of which was comprised of closed- and open-ended questions about the practices of and support for mentoring on campus. Additional data was obtained during the follow-up focus groups and several personal interviews. The findings are intended to be statements based on the data collected, while the inferences are offered as interpretations made by the Committee during their process of gathering meaning from the data.

General Findings

Current practices

Current means of mentoring junior faculty vary with unit size, the traditions of the discipline, and budget.

While both junior faculty and administrators believe mentoring is important, there is no consensus on what constitutes effective mentoring

There is a disjunct between mentoring preferences of faculty and administrators: Junior faculty members prefer structured (formal) mentoring efforts, whereas administrators prefer less structured (informal) approaches.

Administrator perceptions

- According to administrators, mentoring benefits both junior faculty and senior faculty and departments as a whole (e.g., by increasing faculty collaboration and providing an incentive for recruiting).

Junior faculty perceptions

- While junior faculty members are satisfied overall with the quality and frequency of the mentoring they receive, they would prefer that senior faculty members and administrators reach out to them more proactively.
- Junior faculty that want more mentoring would prefer that mentoring target their needs, particularly the practicalities of how to accomplish specific professional goals and meet department, discipline-specific and University expectations, so that the mentoring “demystifies” the process of becoming a successful and productive faculty member.
- Some junior faculty expressed frustration at receiving outdated, conflicting, or inaccurate advice from their mentors.
- Women faculty-reported significantly less mentoring contact than other groups and less satisfaction with contact frequency. They are also significantly more likely than men to seek mentoring outside the University, to want to be mentored by women, and to search more broadly to find appropriate mentors.

Major obstacles to effective mentoring

- Two major obstacles to effective mentoring are lack of time, and lack of incentives or rewards for mentoring faculty.

Key Inferences

The attitudes of individuals can influence mentoring success

- Some junior faculty members attach a negative stigma to mentoring because they are concerned that they will be perceived as weak. Some find a discrepancy between the message they received as graduate students, to become independent scholars, and the message they receive as junior faculty members, to be mentored. They may view mentoring as evidence of an unprofessional lack of independence, and therefore may not seek out the help they need.
- Some junior faculty members are comfortable seeking mentoring outside their academic unit, but others who do not seek such mentoring may be at risk.
- Some faculty may prefer formal mentoring efforts because they feel more secure asking for help when a senior faculty member has invited them to ask (and, in contrast, feel more vulnerable when they must take the initiative).
- Some administrators may attach a negative stigma to mentoring because they have hired “the best” and expect that “the best” will need little or no help.
- Some administrators may prefer informal mentoring because they believe that successful mentoring relationships can’t be forced but must evolve naturally.

Structural issues can influence mentoring

- Small departments may have too few senior faculty members to mentor junior colleagues. The lack of numbers may make it difficult to match junior and senior faculty based on common interests.
- Faculty members who hold joint academic appointments face the added challenge of meeting the demands of two or more departments, schools, or colleges. While these faculty may particularly need mentoring, they may have more difficulty receiving it.

Communication and training issues can influence mentoring

- The desire of junior faculty for increased mentoring may result from a communication problem, caused by units providing inadequate information about mentoring opportunities that are actually available.
- Senior faculty members may not be familiar with or may not pass on the practical information junior faculty members need, such as how the unit handles tenure reviews.
- Some senior faculty members may be unprepared to provide good mentoring.

Some junior faculty groups may have unique mentoring needs above and beyond the needs that typical mentoring addresses.

- These groups include: women; underrepresented minorities; international faculty; lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender faculty; and faculty with disabilities.
- Some of the challenges facing these faculty are: small numbers of “like” colleagues, a lack of role models, heavy service commitments and student advising loads, discrimination, issues related to the culture of the department (especially the tension of adapting to the culture and at the same time influencing it), and a lack of institutional support services.

Some current mentoring practices are clearly inadequate.

- Units should not assume that junior faculty members know what type of mentoring they need.
- Purely unstructured mentoring is insufficient. Units should assume junior faculty members need guidance or assistance from the school, college, or department to identify mentors.
- Senior faculty don’t necessarily know what type of mentoring junior faculty need or want.
- The concept of formal one-on-one mentoring is an impractical approach to meeting junior faculty members’ needs.
- Administrators perceive more mentoring activities being available (to junior faculty) than do junior faculty.

GOOD PRACTICES FOR EFFECTIVE MENTORING

These practices are offered here as ideas which the Committee has determined are applicable to the many purposes, models, practices, and contexts related to mentoring. They are intended to be general; more specific practices for implementation can be found in the appendix to the data report.

Good mentoring requires a diversity of approaches

- No one mentoring system meets all needs.
- Faculty will generally need a combination of mentors from both within and outside the department.
- A mix of unstructured (informal) and structured (formal) mentoring efforts is more effective than single programs.
 - Mentoring efforts can range from formal (e.g., scheduled meetings with the department chair, mentor assignments) to informal (e.g., academic and/or social events that give junior faculty members the chance to meet a variety of senior faculty members in a non-threatening environment).
 - Making a social connection is often an important first step to forming a professional connection).
 - Mentoring can be best conceived as networking, rather than as one-on-one interactions with a single mentor who must meet all needs.

Good mentoring addresses multiple topics

- Mentoring should address the specific department- and discipline-related needs.
- Mentoring should address the specific needs of individual junior faculty members.
- An important component of all mentoring is advice about the “nuts and bolts” of academic work.
- Mentoring must supply information that demystifies the process of becoming a successful faculty member.
- An effective approach to mentoring junior faculty is to focus on the process of becoming the best academics they can be, instead of focusing solely on achieving tenure.

Good mentoring arises from a culture that recognizes and supports the importance of mentoring

- Academic leadership and senior faculty should recognize publicly the importance of faculty mentoring as a tool for academic success
- Deans, department chairs, and academic program directors must foster a culture of trust and collaboration.-

DETAILED REPORT

I. BACKGROUND

1.1 FORMATION OF THE MENTORING STUDY

In the context of this study, mentoring is considered as either a *formal effort* that has been codified by the academic unit and is part of unit procedures or practice, or an *informal effort* that is not part of

stated procedures. The committee deliberately avoided a specific definition of mentoring, preferring to allow respondents to construct their own notions of mentoring.

1.1.1 Methods

The Faculty Mentoring Committee decided to conduct two surveys: one to learn about administrators' perceptions of and experiences with mentoring and one to learn about junior faculty members' perceptions of and experiences with mentoring. Due to budget and time constraints, the Committee decided to conduct the surveys online.

For the junior faculty survey, the Office of Human Resources and Affirmative Action (HRAA) identified 673 assistant professors on the tenure track. Of this group, 190 (or 28.2%) submitted survey responses. Although this is a rather low response rate, according to Couper and Nicholls (1998), the response rate on web-based surveys is often lower than the response rate on surveys that are mailed. Moreover, a lower response rate does not necessarily mean a lower quality of data.

The Committee obtained the sample for administrators by asking the deans' offices (in most cases, an associate dean) to complete the survey and also to ask their department chairs and academic program directors, where applicable, to complete the survey (using a snowball sampling procedure). A total of 78 administrators submitted survey responses.

Qualitative element

Both surveys included a number of open-ended questions. The responses to these questions were coded in two phases. The first phase (*open coding*) permitted the Committee's research assistants to identify ideas, themes, and issues from the open-ended responses. Then the research assistants conducted a second phase of coding (*axial or focused coding*). This phase was more fine-grained and sought to produce a smaller set of related ideas, topics, and theme, from which a set of important trends was identified.

In February and March 2004 the Committee convened one focus group of administrators and two focus groups of junior faculty. The focus group participants were survey respondents who indicated on their survey responses that they were willing to participate. A total of thirteen people attended the three focus group sessions. The focus group facilitator asked participants about such topics as their successful and unsuccessful mentoring experiences, the barriers they had encountered, their thoughts on formal and informal mentoring structures, and their perspectives on different mentoring models, such as traditional mentoring and network approaches. The Committee's

research assistants summarized the themes that emerged in each session and then produced a single document identifying the emergent themes that cut across all three focus groups.

Finally, members of the committee interviewed a small number of faculty members informally. These faculty members hold academic leadership positions in departments that were identified by survey respondents (or were otherwise known) as being actively engaged with faculty mentoring.

II. CURRENT STATE OF MENTORING, AS PERCEIVED BY FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATORS

1.1 INFORMATION ON RESPONDENTS/PARTICIPANTS

Table 1 provides information about the survey respondents, including their positions and, for faculty, key demographics.

Table 1: Respondent Demographics

Faculty (N=190)									
Rank	Freq.	Pctg.	Gender	Freq.	Pctg.	Ethnicity	Freq.	Pctg.	
Assistant professor	173	91.1	Male	110	57.9	Minority	45	23.6	
Associate professor	12	6.3	Female	68	35.8	White	106	55.8	
Professor	1	0.5	NR	12	6.3	International	18	9.5	
Graduate chair	2	1.1				NR	21	11.1	
Research scientist	1	0.5							
Other	2	1.1							
Administrators (N=78)**									
Position(s)	Freq.*								
Associate professor	7								
Professor	48								
Dept. Chair/Program Director	56								
Graduate Chair	1								
Research Scientist	1								
Dean/Associate Dean	14								
Other	4								

Note: * = Totals more than 78 because administrators were asked to check all the positions that applied to them.

** = Gender and ethnicity data was not collected from administrators.

The respondents adequately represent the overall population

- Women comprised 35.8% of faculty respondents a percentage comparable to the representation of women as assistant professors in Fall of 2003, 37% (University's Office of Budget and Planning)
- Non-minorities (White or European American) comprised 55.8% of respondents, 26.3% were American Indian or Alaskan, Asian American, Black or African American, Latino, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, or more than one race/ethnicity (biracial/multiracial), and 11.1% chose not to reveal their ethnicity. These percentages are similar to the representation among assistant professors in Fall 2003, 66% non-minority, 34% minority (University's Office of Budget and Planning)
- Respondents were primarily assistant professors (91%), with 6% being associate professors.
- Most faculty respondents held appointments in the College of LS&A, followed by the Medical School, the College of Engineering, and the School of Music, respectively.
- Among academic administrators, 49 (63%) were department chairs, graduate chairs, or program directors; 14 (18%) were deans or associate deans; and 19% did not identify their administrative roles.

The survey also asked faculty respondents to identify the schools or colleges in which hold faculty appointments. Nearly two-thirds of the 190 faculty respondents reported holding

appointments in two schools on campus—Literature, Sciences, & the Arts (29.5%), and the Medical School (32.6%). These were followed by Engineering (5.8%), the School of Music (4.7%), the Business School (3.7%), Social Work (3.2%), and Education (2.6%). Less than five responses each were received from faculty who hold appointments in seven other schools and colleges: Architecture and Urban Planning, Nursing, Kinesiology, Pharmacy, Public Health, Dentistry, and one other professional school. Five faculty members reported holding appointments in one of the Reserve Officers Training Corps (ROTC) units. Nineteen faculty members provided no school or college affiliation.

1.2 CURRENT STATE OF MENTORING ON CAMPUS

1.2.1 Types of mentoring activities occurring within units

Tables 2 and 3 summarize faculty and administrator responses about a designated list of mentoring activities. For each mentoring activity, respondents were asked to indicate whether or not the activity takes place in their units. (The data are presented as percentages of *yes* responses.) For each activity that did take place in their units, they were then asked to identify it as formal or informal. Two-variable Chi-square tests, as noted in the tables, reveal significant differences between faculty and administrators.

Table 2: Mentoring activities in units, as reported by faculty and administrators

	Junior Faculty		Administrators		χ^2
	N	(% Yes)	N	(% Yes)	
Dean meets with junior faculty	179	67.0	73	95.9	23.268 ***
Pairing of senior & junior faculty	183	60.1	72	70.8	
Orientation for junior faculty	183	52.5	71	57.7	
Placing junior faculty on committees	168	42.9	68	77.9	23.918 ***
Peer observation of junior faculty teaching	175	32.6	70	61.4	17.236 ***
Peer network group	180	27.2	68	41.2	4.489 *
Jr. faculty observe senior faculty teaching	179	26.3	69	59.4	23.926 ***
Seminars/workshops	175	24.6	67	50.7	15.301 ***
Junior faculty create development plan	173	17.3	72	31.9	6.396 *
Jr. faculty have a mentoring committee	182	15.4	73	28.8	6.011 *

Note: * = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$, *** = $p < .001$

Table 3: Mentoring perceived as formal/informal, faculty and administrators

	Junior Faculty			Administrators			χ^2
	N	% formal	% informal	N	% formal	% informal	
Dean meets with junior faculty	179	89.4	10.6	73	68.7	31.3	12.065 **
Pairing of senior & junior faculty	183	36.4	63.6	72	58.5	41.5	7.358 **
Orientation for junior faculty	183	85.1	14.9	71	65.8	34.2	5.960 *
Placing junior faculty on committees	168	66.2	33.8	68	57.1	42.9	
Peer observation of junior faculty teaching	175	37.9	62.1	70	24.4	75.6	
Peer network group	180	66.7	33.3	68	15.2	84.8	
Jr. faculty observe senior faculty teaching	179	8.9	91.1	69	4.8	95.2	
Seminars/workshops	175	100.0	0.0	67	100.0	0.0	
Junior faculty create development plan	173	57.1	42.9	72	45.8	54.2	
Junior faculty have a mentoring committee	182	36.4	63.6	73	40.0	60.0	

Note: * = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$, *** = $p < .001$

Administrators and faculty differ in their perceptions of what is formal and what is informal.

- With the exception of orientation for junior faculty, on each item a markedly higher percentage of administrators perceived more mentoring activities taking place than did junior faculty.
- Overall, faculty respondents tended to identify activities as formal more often than administrators did.

Open-Ended Responses

The open-ended responses from faculty members showed that many other types of activities exist in which junior faculty receive guidance from more experienced faculty. These activities range from senior faculty helping junior faculty to develop research plans to faculty women of color coming together on a regular basis. The faculty respondents judged many of these additional activities to be informal.

Administrator respondents described a variety of additional mentoring activities for junior faculty related to teaching, such as junior and senior faculty co-teaching, release time for junior faculty from teaching, and a variety of other teaching opportunities. Administrators also described activities both in the academic unit, such as workshops or meetings with the dean or department chair, and activities outside the unit, largely focused on professional societies. Respondents identified most of these additional activities as informal and unstructured.

Administrators reported on a variety of University-wide mentoring opportunities, most significantly CRLT programs, college/school activities, and other workshops that central offices

provide. Administrators also pointed to professional societies as an important source of mentoring for junior faculty. A handful of administrators listed additional activities that they support, such as mentoring junior faculty for administrative posts and helping them prepare for presentations outside the University. One administrator noted that some of their faculty members (with joint academic appointments) also hold appointments in departments that provide formal mentoring. Overall, administrators who responded to the open-ended questions believe there are ample mentoring opportunities for junior faculty at the University and beyond.

1.2.2 Current efforts to assess mentoring in departments/academic programs or schools/colleges

Administrators were asked to review a designated list of assessment data that their departments/academic programs or their schools/colleges might collect on the effectiveness of their faculty mentoring efforts and then to check all that apply. Table 4 below provides their responses.

Table 4: Types of assessment data collected on mentoring activities in units, as per administrators

N=78	Frequency	Percent
Feedback solicited from mentees	27	34.6
Feedback solicited from mentors	22	28.2
Quality and amount of teaching	20	25.6
Participation in and results of reviews	20	25.6
Amount and quality of scholarly work produced	17	21.8
Attendance at relevant training/workshops	11	14.1
Participation on committees	10	12.8
Types of faculty involved (rank, inside/outside department)	8	10.3
Frequency of mentor/mentee contacts	8	10.3
Advantages/disadvantages of mentor-mentee matching	6	7.7
Other	4	5.1
Flexibility of mentoring structure	3	3.8
Effect of incentives on faculty commitment to mentoring	2	2.6

Units seldom access mentoring activities directly

- Nearly two-thirds of the administrators indicated that their units do not assess their faculty mentoring efforts.
- Those administrators whose units do assess mentoring most frequently mentioned seeking feedback from mentees and mentors.
- The most common data collected—teaching, faculty reviews, and scholarly work—are activities that units would be required to assess for promotion and tenure review, rather than data specifically designed to assess mentoring per se.

- Very few administrators assess information related exclusively to mentoring. When they do, this information includes types of faculty involved in mentoring, frequency of contacts, advantages and disadvantages of mentor-mentee matching, the flexibility of mentoring structures, and the effect of incentives on faculty members' commitment to mentoring.
- The least frequently cited form of assessment was the effect of incentives on faculty commitment to mentoring.

1.2.3 Who do departments target with their mentoring?

Table 5 provides a summary of administrators' responses to the question, "To which levels of faculty are your faculty mentoring efforts targeted"? They were asked to check all the faculty levels they target.

Table 5: Groups of faculty to which the academic units target their faculty mentoring (according to administrators)

	Frequency	Percent
Assistant professor	72	92.3
Associate professor	37	47.4
Graduate student instructor	25	32.1
Instructor/lecturer	22	28.2
Research scientist	20	25.6
Professor	16	20.5
Clinical faculty	10	12.8
Other	5	6.4

Mentoring is largely assumed to target junior faculty.

- Most administrators (92%) reported that their mentoring efforts target assistant professors.
- Almost half (47%) indicated that their mentoring efforts also target associate professors.
- Only 20% reported that their mentoring efforts target full professors.

1.2.4 Resources directed toward mentoring

Administrators were asked to select the types of resources they direct towards faculty mentoring. Table 6 provides the results:

Table 6: Resources directed toward mentoring (according to administrators)

(N=78)	Frequency	Percent
Faculty time and effort	70	89.7
Support from staff members	34	43.6
Designated funding	24	30.8
Direct faculty compensation	3	3.8
Funds to attend off-campus programs	20	25.6
Other incentives	9	11.5

Mentoring efforts largely depend on the voluntary commitment of faculty

- By far, the academic units depend most heavily on faculty members' time and effort as the key resource for mentoring.
- Faculty members are not compensated directly for mentoring other faculty.
- One-quarter of the administrators said their units provide funds for faculty members to attend off-campus programs.

The nine open-ended responses identified additional resources that academic units could use to reward faculty for mentoring other faculty, such as funds for mentor/mentee lunches, reduced teaching load, and graduate student support.

1.3 WHO IS ENGAGED IN MENTORING ON CAMPUS?

1.3.1 From whom do faculty receive mentoring?

Faculty survey respondents were provided with a list of types of mentors and asked from which types of mentors they had received mentoring. In Table 7, "yes" means that faculty members gave an affirmative response by checking the item. The table provides responses by gender and by the ethnic groupings included on the survey.

Table 7: Providers of mentoring for junior faculty, as per administrators

	Total (% yes) n=190	Men (% yes) n=110	Women (% yes) n=68	Minority (% yes) N=45	White (% yes) n=106	International (% yes) n=18
Senior faculty within your department	84.2	87.3	79.4	77.8	84.0	94.4
Faculty from another university	47.4	41.8	58.8 *	51.1	48.1	55.6
Faculty outside your department	45.8	46.4	50.0	46.7	51.9	27.8
Junior faculty within your department	34.0	36.4	33.8	37.8	33.0	44.4
Faculty outside your school	20.0	18.2	23.5	26.7	22.6	5.6
Administrators within your department	13.7	13.6	14.7	13.3	13.2	22.2
Units outside your school/CRLT	9.5	8.2	11.8	8.9	10.4	11.1
Have not received any mentoring	5.3	5.5	4.4	4.4	6.6	0.0
Persons outside academia	4.7	2.7	7.4	4.4	2.8	0.0
Other	4.2	4.5	2.9	6.7	2.8	0.0
Administrators outside dept./ University	1.1	0.9	1.5	2.2	0.9	0.0

* p>.05

While most mentoring takes place within the home unit, more women, international and minority faculty seek mentoring from outside the university

- Across all faculty groupings, a high percentage of faculty had received mentoring from senior faculty within their units.
- Among all faculty groupings, international faculty respondents were most likely (94%) to have received mentoring from senior faculty in their departments, whereas women faculty (79%) and minority faculty respondents (78%) were less likely to have received mentoring from senior faculty in their departments.
- Higher percentages of women (59%), international (56%), and minority faculty (51%) had received mentoring from faculty at other universities, as compared to male faculty (42%).

1.3.2 Criteria used to select mentors

Administrators were asked to identify (from a list) the criteria that their schools, colleges, departments/programs, or subunits, commonly consider when selecting faculty to serve as mentors. Table 8 below provides the response frequencies and percentages.

Table 8: Criteria for selecting mentors for junior faculty (according to administrators)

	Frequency	Percent
Similar research interests	59	75.6
Interpersonal compatibility	55	70.5
Teaching effectiveness	49	62.8
Academic credentials	39	50.0
Roles/responsibilities in unit	38	48.7
Potential for collaboration on research & teaching	35	44.9
Time availability	28	35.9
Gender	22	28.2
Location/shared facilities	16	20.5
Race/Ethnicity	11	14.1
Other	8	10.3

Faculty administrators select mentors based largely on professional, rather than on race/ethnicity criteria.

- The largest percentage of administrators identified similar research interests (76%), interpersonal compatibility (70%), and teaching effectiveness (63%) as the three criteria they use most when selecting faculty mentors.
- Very few administrators (14%) selected race/ethnicity as a criterion their units use to select faculty mentors.

Administrators were invited to identify other criteria their units consider and were also asked to explain which criteria for selecting faculty mentors they believe to be very or critically important. “Other” criteria for selecting faculty mentors included willingness to serve, conscientiousness/good citizenship, and the ability to listen.

In the open-ended responses, administrators cited a long list of qualities that they believe are very or critically important in selecting faculty mentors, foremost among them the interpersonal compatibility of the mentor and mentee. Administrators assigned equal importance to the need for the faculty mentors to share research and scholarly interests with their mentees. Many believed that teaching effectiveness was important, although it wasn’t clear whether the administrators were referring to mentors, mentees, or both groups. Being conscientious and a good citizen was also listed as an important criterion to consider when selecting faculty mentors.

Willingness. The degree to which any policy functions successfully depends on the nature of the delivery mechanism. Mentoring can only be successful if the parties involved share an equal commitment to the process and the outcome. In that sense the activities directly related to sharing knowledge of and expertise in communication are central to the success of any mentoring relationship....Rather than fostering irrational dependency this awareness of our reliance on the strengths and attributes of each individual program strengthens our commitment to mentoring all of the junior faculty who come through our doors.

The critical features for an excellent mentor/mentee relationship depend on the specifics of each individual. By giving the candidate some say in the process, I think that we are able to identify a mentor(s), and ultimately a mentoring committee, that will be absolutely beneficial to the junior or associate professor colleague.

1.4 ATTITUDES TOWARD MENTORING ACTIVITIES

1.4.1 Frequency of/ Satisfaction with mentoring, as reported by faculty

Table 9 below summarizes responses to a question about how often the faculty members have interacted with their mentors, sorted by demographics.

Table 9: Frequency of faculty interaction with mentors

	Total n=179	Men n=105	Women n=64	Minority n=44	White N=98	International n=18
Daily	6.1	8.6	3.1	9.1	7.1	0.0
2-3 times/week	18.4	20.0	15.6	18.2	21.4	16.7
Once/twice-month	29.6	36.2	21.9	25.0	31.6	50.0
Once/twice-semester	26.3	21.9	32.8	29.5	24.5	16.7
Other	19.6	13.3	26.6	18.2	15.3	16.7

The frequency of mentoring interactions was variable, and was higher among males and whites.

- Although more than 25% of faculty reported that they interacted with their mentor(s) at least twice a week, a much greater percentage (56%) reported that they interacted with their mentor(s) far less frequently--once or twice per month or once or twice per semester.
- Male faculty met somewhat more frequently with their mentors than women faculty met with their mentors.
- White faculty met more frequently with their mentors than minority faculty met with their mentors. Of all the demographic groups, international faculty met with their mentors least often.

Table 10 below summarizes responses to a question about how satisfied the faculty respondents were with the mentoring they have received and with how often they have interacted with their mentors.

Table 10: Satisfaction with frequency and quality of mentoring contacts

	Frequency of Contact (% responding yes)	Quality of Contact (% responding yes)
Total	73.0 (n=174)	80.2 (n=167)
Men	79.2 (n=106)	80.8 (n=104)
Women	64.1 (n=64)	79.3 (n=58)
Minority	83.7 (n=43)	81.4 (n=43)
White	70.3 (n=101)	80.2 (n=96)
International	64.7 (n=17)	75.0 (n=16)

While satisfaction with mentoring was generally high, women, international faculty and minorities were less satisfied with the frequency of interactions, and international faculty were least satisfied overall.

- Overall, faculty said they were highly satisfied with the quality and frequency of the mentoring they have received
- Men and women were similarly satisfied with how often they interacted with their mentor(s).
- Faculty reported somewhat higher levels of satisfaction with the quality of the mentoring they received (80%) than with how often they interacted with their mentors (73%).
- Fewer women faculty (64%) and international faculty (65%) said they were satisfied with how often they interacted with their mentors than did minority faculty (84%) or male faculty (79%)
- For both quality and frequency of contact, international faculty respondents were the least satisfied.

Open-Ended Responses

The survey also posed two follow-up (open-ended) questions to faculty respondents:

- [If you are not satisfied with how often you interact with your mentor(s)], how much contact would you like to have?
- [If you are not satisfied with quality of the mentoring you receive], how could the contact be improved?

On the whole, the faculty respondents' open-ended responses consistently reflected their need for regular contact with mentors. Many respondents suggested regular meetings, be they weekly, monthly, or per semester. Other respondents liked the informal nature of mentoring. Some respondents emphasized factors other than time. For example, some said they had received conflicting advice from mentors. A few faculty members expressed strong feelings about the lack of

mentoring they had received and its effect on them. Others said they would favor more formal mentoring systems.

I am generally satisfied, although I have only a vague sense of what mentoring could be, what difference it could make at this stage of my academic career. I have no real models to compare my experience against.

Actually, for the most part I am happy with the mentoring [I receive]. My issue is more with the intangibles and 'unwritten rules' of navigating through a tenure-track career. The process would be much improved if each school/ department had set guidelines [for] expectations.

I think the problem is in the concept of assigning individual mentors to individual faculty....Perhaps instead, a new concept is in order: small groups of non-competing junior faculty with a facilitator.

I am not sure how you are defining the term 'mentoring'. I have received no formal mentoring, although the senior professors have been very open to providing informal mentoring and have been very accessible. However, I believe I would have benefited from a more formal mentoring system. Perhaps one meeting every month or two would have been sufficient.

It is not so much the contact time, but rather I have received conflicting advice on numerous issues.

1.4.2 Levels of mentoring support

The surveys presented junior faculty and administrators with a series of common academic tasks that faculty perform. For each task, faculty respondents were asked to indicate what level of mentoring support they would like to receive, whereas administrators were asked to report the level of mentoring and support they believe their units provide to junior faculty.

Table 11: Desired/ provided levels of mentoring support

	Faculty			Admin			Sig. ^a
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	
Progressing toward tenure	181	2.77	0.48	71	2.69	0.55	
Obtaining resources	184	2.64	0.56	72	2.40	0.62	0.004
Publishing	177	2.45	0.65	71	2.41	0.69	
Advice: Unit expectations	175	2.42	0.61	71	2.70	0.54	0.001
Manage Research grants/contracts	177	2.39	0.69	61	2.26	0.63	
Collaborate on research @UM	175	2.25	0.66	68	2.26	0.61	
Promoting my career-networking	177	2.24	0.74	67	2.06	0.67	
Advice re: dept politics	181	2.20	0.68	66	2.02	0.73	
Preparing Annual performance reports	177	2.15	0.68	67	2.13	0.76	
Accessing UM resource/services	180	2.11	0.65	69	2.19	0.60	
Collaborate -research outside UM	170	2.05	0.72	61	1.85	0.60	
Supervising research asst's	169	1.99	0.73	59	1.75	0.71	0.024
Becoming socially integrated	182	1.95	0.73	71	2.31	0.65	0.000
Serving as a role model	173	1.94	0.72	64	2.23	0.66	0.004
Advising/Mentoring students	179	1.92	0.61	70	2.09	0.65	
Serving on committees	180	1.91	0.60	69	2.17	0.66	0.003
Integration into UM culture	176	1.91	0.71	69	1.90	0.69	
Learning about pedagogy	183	1.91	0.66	67	2.10	0.68	0.039
Advice: balancing work/family	173	1.88	0.74	65	1.82	0.61	
Connecting to professional assoc.	174	1.82	0.77	67	2.19	0.56	0.000
Using teaching resources-dept	180	1.77	0.67	62	1.81	0.72	
Making contacts-industry	174	1.75	0.76	58	1.55	0.65	
Collaborate on teaching- in UM	168	1.73	0.66	63	1.81	0.56	

Note: 1=Provide/Desire little or no support, 2=Provide/Desire some support, 3=Provide/Desire high level of support

^a *p* values are for t-tests

A disjunction emerged between mentoring offered and mentoring desired

- Junior faculty and administrators agreed that junior faculty need mentoring and support with becoming integrated into the UM culture, but faculty respondents wanted more mentoring and support than the administrators said their academic units provide.

Administrators and junior faculty agree on only a subset of activities as proper topics for mentoring.

- Junior faculty want support for a cluster of activities that administrators do commonly provide. These activities are clearly linked to achieving tenure and include: progressing toward tenure, obtaining resources, publishing, understanding unit expectations, managing research grants and contracts, and collaborating on research at the UM.

- Junior faculty and administrators also agreed that junior faculty need mentoring for preparing performance reports, using departmental teaching resources, and balancing work and family.
- Junior faculty were much more likely than administrators to want mentoring on how to connect to professional associations, become socially integrated, serve as role models, serve on committees, and supervise research assistants.

1.4.3 Importance of mentoring

The survey asked administrators how important they considered mentoring to be. The results are tabulated in Table 12.

Table 12: Importance of mentoring, administrators

	Frequency	Percent
Somewhat important	9	12.5
Important	27	37.5
Very important	36	50.0
Total	72	100.0

Half of the administrators rated mentoring as *very important*, and an additional 37% rated mentoring as *important*. No administrators said mentoring was not important.

The administrators provided a small number of open-ended responses to this question, but those who did commented only on the role mentoring plays in helping both faculty members and departments to succeed. Some administrators suggested that mentoring should be incorporated into the teaching/research/service triumvirate. They also said that culture and climate seem to play a large role in how effective mentoring will be.

1.4.4 Administrators' perception of unique mentoring needs

Administrators were asked whether women and faculty of color have special mentoring needs. Results are provided in Table 13.

Table 13: Administrator perceptions of unique mentoring needs for populations

	For women		For faculty of color	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Yes	43	68.3	24	44.4
No	20	31.7	30	55.6
Total	63	100.0	54	100.0

A greater percentage of respondents said women faculty have unique mentoring needs (68%) than faculty of color have unique mentoring needs (44%).

It is a bit more frequently the case that women need support in making decisions about balancing family needs and career needs. Men as well as women need to grapple with this issue, but unfortunately, it remains the case in our culture that a larger proportion of the family tasks fall to women than to men.

Teaching strategies appear to have a gendered component, such that advice on how to deal with problems in the class room (e.g. asserting authority) may not apply equally to men and women. Women may not be as aggressive in asking senior faculty for feedback on their research or for strategizing about their career development. Some men seem to be more strategic and assertive here.

Because they are relatively few in number, faculty of color are overburdened by the needs of students of color, who seek them out as mentors and role models. Faculty of color are also frequently asked to serve on committees to increase their diversity.

Faculty of color are often surrounded only by senior faculty who are white. I think they are often not mentored as actively by white senior faculty, and may be less comfortable seeking, or trusting, advice. They also have unique challenges with respect to establishing their authority and student and faculty reactions to their expertise that many faculty do not understand.

In open-ended comments, respondents listed the overarching issues they believe women faculty face, the most salient of which is the balance between work and family life. Closely related is the issue of time to tenure. Like the issues that face women faculty, respondents offered their thoughts on the issues that faculty of color must address. These issues included being overburdened with committee work and advising responsibilities, dealing with stereotypes, and experiencing a lack of role models and mentors. As examples of women faculty being overburdened, respondents mentioned how often their departments tap women faculty for committee work and advising students. Administrators also recognized that women faculty must function in a male-dominated culture and would benefit from learning how to say no to excessive demands on their time. Other comments included the small number of role models for women faculty and that in the classroom women faculty are more likely to have their authority challenged.

1.4.5 Benefits from mentoring observed by administrators

Administrators were asked what benefits they have you observed at the school, college, department, or subunit level as a result of mentoring efforts. Table 14 summarizes the responses to this question.

Table 14: Observed benefits from mentoring, as per administrators (N = 78)

<i>Perceptions of benefits observed for junior faculty from mentoring</i>		
	Frequency	Percent
Achievement of promotion and tenure	49	62.8
Redirection of career path	22	28.2
Successful retention of faculty	36	46.2
Enhanced career satisfaction	42	53.8
Improved teaching	37	47.4
Other	12	15.4
 <i>Benefits for senior faculty from mentoring</i>		
	Frequency	Percent
Enhanced career satisfaction	41	52.6
Improved teaching	8	10.3
Mentoring rewarded in faculty review	20	25.6
Other	9	11.5
 <i>Unit benefits from mentoring</i>		
	Frequency	Percent
Enhanced recruitment efforts	25	32.1
Improved collaboration with other units	21	26.9
Other	0	0

While a multitude possible benefits were identified, for most administrators, benefits for junior faculty were their improved chances for promotion, while benefits for senior faculty were increased career satisfaction. Many identified multiple benefits for junior faculty: achievement of promotion and tenure (63%), enhanced career satisfaction (54%), improved teaching (47%), and successful retention (46%).

Few respondents responded to the related open-ended questions, and many who did respond said that their departments had so few junior members that they are unable to fairly evaluate the benefits of mentoring. The very few who cited benefits mentioned that mentoring improved understanding, improved research/publication efforts, bestowed peace of mind, increased salaries, improved the departmental atmosphere, increased collegiality, and renewed engagement among senior faculty. Benefits identified for the academic units were improved faculty recruitment and retention.

1.4.6 Impediments to mentoring

[I'm] not quite sure if I should be getting more [mentoring]-- if so then time is definitely an issue for the mentor.

Sometimes junior faculty have research interests not represented in the senior faculty. We often encourage such individuals to develop relationships with colleagues outside the Department or University, and help fund their travel for visits, or invitations to bring outside faculty in for a seminar or talk.

[There is a] sense that junior professors should figure things out by themselves, as part of the initiation into academia.

Both groups of respondents were asked to review a list of possible barriers to mentoring and indicate which barriers existed in their units. Table 15 compares the results.

Table 15: Perceived barriers to mentoring

Barriers	Junior Faculty (n=190)	Administrators (n=78)
Lack of faculty time	57.9	56.4
Lack of interest/impetus for senior faculty	33.7	26.9
Lack of resources for training	32.1	15.4
Difficulty matching – expertise	26.3	14.1
Difficulty matching – availability	24.7	20.5
Institutional organization does not facilitate mentoring	22.6	5.1
Insufficient trust among faculty	16.8	7.7
Difficulty matching – personalities	14.7	15.4
Lack of female role models	13.7	11.5
Lack of minority role models	13.7	20.5
Insufficient numbers of cross-department faculty members	13.2	10.3
Culture discourages mentoring	11.6	3.8
Lack of interest/impetus for junior faculty	11.1	24.4
Other	8.4	6.4
No barriers exist	0	5.1

Note: Items were “check all that apply”

Junior faculty and administrators concur that time is a significant barrier to mentoring, but they disagree on the importance of organizational structure and resources.

- High percentages of both junior faculty (58%) and administrators (56%) identified a lack of faculty time as the most formidable barrier to mentoring.
- Whereas 23% of junior faculty identified institutional organization as a barrier to mentoring, only 5% of administrators selected this item as a barrier.
- Similarly, 32% of junior faculty cited insufficient resources as an impediment to mentoring as compared to 15% of the administrators.

Although there were few open responses to this question, important themes emerged. Most significant was an emphasis on the lack of time for mentoring—for both for junior and senior faculty. Respondents also expressed concern about a lack of incentives, the culture, and the lack of skilled mentors.

APPENDIX A

IDEAS FOR FACULTY MENTORING

The list of ideas provided below is intended as a collection of ideas for faculty mentoring efforts that may be of interest to deans, associate deans, department chairs, academic program directors, and individual faculty members. The ideas can be applied in a variety of contexts.

Academic Leadership Initiative

Build a positive culture for mentoring

- Recognize publicly how important faculty mentoring is for junior faculty success
- Encourage department chairs and academic program directors to facilitate group and individual mentoring.
- Keep academic leaders and all faculty abreast of University policies and resources that concern mentoring and junior faculty issues
- Engage faculty members in dialogue about faculty mentoring

Develop programs and information nets for junior faculty

- Identify and make available (online or in a packet) central resources for junior faculty, such as information about grant writing and teaching support.
- Host research seminars in which junior faculty present current research and get feedback from other faculty.
- In consultation with the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching, develop workshops for creating better teaching portfolios.
- Offer seminars to help junior faculty members learn about mentoring issues such as how to approach potential mentors, how to manage the first year, and how to access relevant department policies.
- Invite junior faculty to observe senior colleagues who are known to be excellent teachers.
- Inform junior faculty about opportunities for internal and national awards.-
- Financially support junior faculty members who need travel funds to accept invitations to give presentations elsewhere.
- Encourage junior faculty to set both short term goals, for the coming year, and long term goals over the several years leading to the tenure review

Build connections between mentors and mentees

- Assess the potential mentor population. Identify senior faculty mentors willing to mentor, and determine the type and level of mentoring each is willing to provide. Make their names available to junior faculty. Consider appointing mentors for a defined period, such as an academic year.

- Inform junior faculty of the variety of mentoring opportunities available.
- Actively encourage junior faculty to connect with senior faculty, who are a key resource in helping junior faculty succeed academically.
- Actively help female faculty, minority faculty, and other faculty members connect with faculty members and other people who can provide appropriate mentoring.
- Ensure that faculty members with joint academic appointments receive appropriate mentoring. (See Guidelines for Joint Academic Appointments on the Provost's Office website: http://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/joint_appointments/Joint_Appts.html)
- Provide funds for mentors and mentees to have lunch together.
- Ensure the mentors meet their mentees regularly.

Incorporate mentoring into best practice guides for committees that mentor or review faculty

- Arrange a yearly meeting for senior faculty and/or administration to discuss junior faculty members' progress and to identify strategies for helping them to address weaknesses or problem areas.
- Periodically provide specific feedback to junior faculty regarding their performance and accomplishments in areas that will be key to the tenure review.
- Review junior faculty members' teaching, clinical, and service assignment to assess whether these loads are reasonable.
- In any formal reviews, and particularly in the third year and tenure reviews, consult with mentors before communicating with the junior faculty member.
- Ensure that faculty mentoring addresses the areas of research and of teaching.
- Insure that mentoring encourages junior faculty to set both short term goals for the coming year, and long term goals over the several years leading to the tenure review

Provide funding and Incentives to enhance mentoring

- Give incentives or recognition to senior faculty mentors; e.g., reduce their teaching load, support graduate students, or supply seed funds for projects.
- In annual reviews of senior faculty, recognize faculty mentoring as an important contribution of service
- When evaluating department chairs and academic program directors, include faculty mentoring as a performance criterion.

Periodically assess mentoring effectiveness

- Periodically ask junior faculty what they want from mentoring and whether or not their needs are being met.
- Periodically review and assess mentoring programs and practices.

Individual Faculty Initiative

Senior Faculty (Mentors)

- Senior faculty can mentor in several capacities:
 - Promoter
 - Nominate the mentee for awards and service opportunities that enhance visibility
 - Look for symposia/panels on which the mentee can be included
 - Assist in creating a “social network” in the department and in the field
 - Help mentees find appropriate collaborators
 - Advocate/Protector
 - Help the mentee navigate the “unwritten rules” of academia, e.g., dealing with reviewers, editors, research sponsors, as well as how to avoid pitfalls
 - Assist with practicalities of dealing with professional setbacks, such as manuscript/grant rejections, poor teaching evaluations, etc.
 - Help ensure that the mentee is not exploited in service or teaching loads
 - Become well-versed in current promotion and tenure policies, as well as university resources
 - Coach
 - Evaluate manuscripts and grant proposals prior to submission
 - Discuss mentee’s ideas and encourage the pursuit of promising lines of research
 - Offer guidance for preparing annual reports
 - Review curriculum vitae
 - Challenger
 - Provide candid but constructive feedback to mentors who come to you for advice.
 - Help junior colleagues expand into new areas and undertake new professional responsibilities, such as serving on an editorial review board.

Junior Faculty (Mentees)

- Take the initiative to learn about the available faculty mentoring resources, including resources and programs in the your department, school, college, academic program, and in central offices of the University.
- Create a relatively broad mentoring network, consisting of people within the department, institution, the field at large, other fields, and other institutions.
- When you encounter a specific problem, seek out one or more senior faculty members who have the expertise to help you.

- Initiate periodic meetings with a small group of faculty peers to address a common interest, such as setting writing goals, discussing research opportunities, sharing teaching experiences, and checking on one another's progress.
- Actively engage in establishing connections with potential senior faculty mentors.
- Act as peer mentors for other junior faculty.
- Identify areas in which you need improvement or need to develop skills, and ask for advice.
- Look for opportunities to interact with senior colleagues and academic leadership both formally and informally.

Also see the NSF-Advance Program's document, "Giving and Getting Career Advice: A Guide for Junior and Senior Faculty," which includes tips for academic administrators, senior faculty, and junior faculty (in progress) <http://www.umich.edu/~advproj/>

APPENDIX B

FIVE APPROACHES TO FACULTY MENTORING

The table below describes five general approaches to faculty mentoring. Each of the five summaries includes a description of the approach, how it might look in practice, and a brief outline of benefits and issues to consider for that approach.

The five approaches are:

- Informal Mentoring
- One-to-One Mentoring
- Cluster Mentoring
- Unit Oversight Mentoring
- Network Mentoring

We hope this document will be a helpful tool for deans, associate deans, department chairs, academic program directors, senior faculty, and junior faculty.

Informal Mentoring

Description	Benefits and issues
<p>Mentoring system</p> <p><u>Definition:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informal mentoring arising spontaneously, as individuals interact during normal professional activities. <p><u>Assumptions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formalized mentoring may be detrimental as it adds to faculty workloads. • Natural interactions allow junior faculty to seek out advice in accord with their individual needs. • The department is available as the definitive source of information, opportunities and resources. 	<p>Implementation and practices</p> <p><u>Relationships:</u></p> <p>Mentors are not formally assigned. Instead, mentoring arises as people interact during:</p> <p>Committee meetings Collaborations in research or teaching Casual encounters: lunches, coffees, hallway conversations, and social gatherings.</p> <p><i>Ad hoc</i> meetings are initiated by senior or junior faculty (“open-door” policy).</p> <p>Junior faculty are the usual initiators: Junior faculty solicit advice from senior faculty that they select. Junior faculty develop their own interaction networks. Junior faculty interact with one another, for peer support and networking. Junior faculty seek information and advice from Department sources.</p> <p><u>Benefits:</u></p> <p>Mentoring relationships are not imposed; instead, they develop naturally. Faculty become self-sufficient and interact without suffering from imposed formal arrangements. Mentoring strategies are flexible and thus are adaptable to each department.</p> <p><u>Issues:</u></p> <p>The onus is largely on junior faculty to seek mentoring. Junior faculty may be reluctant to seek out senior colleagues. Junior faculty may not know their needs, be able to articulate their needs, or understand what resources are available to address their needs. Senior faculty may not view mentoring activity as an important component of their work or the department’s mission. Interactions may not develop naturally. The unique needs of special faculty groups may be overlooked.</p>

One-on-one Mentoring

<i>Description</i>	<i>Benefits and issues</i>
<p><i>Mentoring system</i></p> <p><u>Definition:</u> In this system, mentoring is formally established as a one-on-one relationship between junior and senior faculty. Terms are variable and may include: Long-term commitments One-year terms Rotating assignments changed at regular intervals The mentoring may incorporate individual or departmental reviews.</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u> The administration is committed to mentoring. A single mentor can best satisfy the needs of junior faculty. Senior faculty have the knowledge needed to serve as mentors. Junior faculty benefit from interactions with someone familiar with their work. Faculty have sufficient time to foster meaningful mentoring relationships. Mentors and mentees can find areas of compatibility. Both junior and senior faculty benefit from mentoring relationships.</p>	<p><i>Implementation and practices</i></p> <p><u>Ways of assigning mentors:</u> Formally assigned based on research interests. Junior faculty selects mentor. Senior faculty selects mentee.</p> <p><u>Activities:</u> Meetings are regular and periodic. Issues are defined jointly or arise from either the mentee or the mentor. Junior faculty needs, timeframe, and expectations are discussed formally. Research and publications are discussed formally. The mentor oversees progress towards tenure. The mentor aids networking in the research field. The mentor facilitates participation in professional activities, grant writing, and reviewing. The mentor and mentee may collaborate in research and teaching.</p> <p><u>Benefits:</u> This system can lead to long-term professional relationships and friendships. Junior faculty may gain an ally and advocate. Senior faculty may become reenergized or more invested in the department.</p> <p><u>Issues:</u> Dyads may be incompatible. Changing partners can be awkward. One mentor may not satisfy all needs. Time constraints may prevent regular interactions. Senior faculty may lack incentives to invest time in mentoring. Departments may have too few mentors who are knowledgeable and willing to serve. Competitiveness may hinder good mentoring. Interdisciplinary appointments can complicate mentoring arrangements.</p>

Cluster Mentoring

Description	Benefits and issues
<p><i>Mentoring system</i> <u>Definition:</u> In this system, a group of senior faculty is formally assigned to each junior faculty member, to give advice on both personal and professional concerns. Mentees may meet with the entire committee, or with individuals.</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u> The administration is committed to mentoring. Senior faculty are preferred as mentors. Senior faculty may lack sufficient time to foster meaningful one-on-one interactions. No single individual possesses all the knowledge necessary for mentoring. Junior faculty need to receive multiple perspectives. Both junior and senior faculty benefit from mentoring relationships. Personal concerns can have an impact on professional development and are thus a valid issue for mentoring.</p>	<p><i>Implementation and practices</i> <u>Implementation:</u> The composition of the group may reflect the diverse needs of mentees. Committee members may be chosen based on research and teaching interests or other relevant experience. Assignments may be made yearly. Committees and junior faculty may be reviewed periodically.</p> <p><u>Activities:</u> Meetings are regular and periodic. Meetings jointly define junior faculty needs, timeframe, and expectations. Research and publications are discussed. The committee oversees progress towards tenure. Committee members aid networking in the field and facilitate participation in professional activities. The mentors and mentee may collaborate in research and teaching. The committee addresses personal concerns such as balancing work and family obligations. The group serves as the gateway for unit, school/college, and university resources.</p>

Unit Oversight Mentoring

<i>Description</i>	<i>Benefits and issues</i>
<p><i>Mentoring system</i></p> <p><u>Definition:</u> In oversight mentoring, the chair (or unit director), perhaps in consultation with a committee, mentors junior faculty and monitors their progress. Mentoring focuses on tenure and promotion. Existing tenure and promotion criteria provide specific guidelines.</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u> Administrative leadership symbolizes departmental interest in junior faculty development. Focusing on tenure and promotion is the most appropriate framework for mentoring. The chair is the most appropriate individual to mentor. The chair is the most accurate and relevant source of information for mentoring. Junior faculty benefit from ongoing interactions with the chair. Junior faculty can access campus resources as needed.</p>	<p><i>Implementation and practices</i></p> <p><u>Ways of assigning mentor:</u> The mentor is the unit chair. The chair may mentor in conjunction with a standing or <i>ad hoc</i> committee.</p> <p><u>Activities:</u> Meetings are regular and periodic. Research and publications are discussed. The chair and mentee jointly define junior faculty needs, timeframe, and expectations. The chair oversees progress towards tenure, grant writing and teaching. The chair aids networking in the field and facilitates participation in professional activities. The chair may provide assistance with personal concerns such as balancing work and family obligations. The chair serves as the gateway for unit, school/college, and university resources.</p> <p><u>Benefits:</u> Chairs are actively engaged in junior faculty development. Junior faculty receive feedback and information pertinent to their own unit. The emphasis on tenure and promotion keeps the mentee focused on activities that support professional development.</p> <p><u>Issues:</u> Linking mentoring to tenure and promotion could marginalize unassociated career development activities. Chairs may have a heavy burden if they are wholly responsible for the professional guidance of all junior faculty members. Other issues, such as personal concerns, may be ignored.</p>

Network Mentoring

<i>Description</i>	<i>Benefits and issues</i>
<p><i>Mentoring system</i></p> <p><u>Definition:</u> In network mentoring, the culture supports continuous mentoring, so that people within the unit serve as mutual resources for one another. This system blends administrative leadership, departmental involvement, and junior faculty initiative. This system is not an explicit mentoring program; instead, mentoring arises through ongoing academic work.</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u> Junior faculty mentoring is a unit responsibility. No one individual possesses all the knowledge needed for mentoring. Senior faculty may have insufficient time to foster meaningful mentoring relationships on their own. Junior faculty are expected to take advantage of resources that are available. Senior faculty and administrators are expected to readily assist junior faculty.</p>	<p><i>Implementation and practices</i></p> <p><u>Implementation:</u> A collaborative system arises through normal departmental activities. Junior and senior faculty work together on projects, committee work, and in professional societies. Structures can be flexible: Particular faculty may be responsible for providing particular types of information. An “open-door” policy can facilitate junior faculty willingness to seek advice. Senior faculty can periodically check up on the progress of junior colleagues. Chairs and directors can oversee junior faculty progress.</p> <p><u>Relationships:</u> Interactions can range from traditional dyads to collaborative partnerships with multiple colleagues. This system also promotes peer support and interactions among junior faculty. This system seeks to build a culture that incorporates mentoring into natural departmental functions.</p>
	<p><u>Benefits:</u> Mentoring becomes viewed as a collective responsibility. This system fosters greater collegiality among all members. Junior faculty become socialized to embrace collegial development and to serve in turn as mentors. Junior faculty receive multiple perspectives on professional issues, rather than relying on a single individual or group for guidance. All faculty make connections across a broader spectrum of professional interests.</p> <p><u>Issues:</u> Junior faculty must be willing to initiate contact. Senior faculty and administrators must be committed to continually participate in mentoring. Senior faculty commitment may be hampered by a lack of incentives. Responsibility for tracking progress of junior faculty may become too diffused.</p>