March, 2007

TO: Executive Vice President and Provost Michael Hogan

FROM: Usha Mallik and Susan Johnson, on behalf of the Mentoring Task Force

RE: Recommendations for Mentoring at the University of Iowa

The Mentoring Task Force has gathered survey and anecdotal information on UI mentoring attitudes and current UI mentoring programs; and on mentoring research findings and training program evaluation methodologies. Based on a synthesis of these data and available UI resources, the task force recommends implementing at the UI, for the purpose of supporting and enhancing mentoring at the UI, the mentoring programs described in the attached report. Beyond the previously described objectives, the overarching purposes for these initiatives are to increase the rate at which qualified faculty attain tenure, to improve the retention rate of qualified tenured faculty (thus guarding against the related loss of University resources), and to improve and enhance the UI environment by making it more supportive and welcoming.

Report of the Mentoring Task Force

Members:

Usha Mallik, Physics and Astronomy, Co-Chair
Susan Johnson, Associate Provost for Faculty, Co-Chair

Thomas Casavant, Biomedical Engineering, Electrical and Computer Engineering, and Ophthalmology
Catherine Cole, Marketing
Marcus Haack, Educational Policy and Leadership Studies
Pamela Geyer, Biochemistry
Michael Lovaglia, Sociology
David Manderscheid, Mathematics
Nancy Rosenthal, Pathology
Steven Ungar, Cinema and Comparative Literature, and French & Italian
Rachel Williams, Art Education

June, 2007

Table of Contents

MENTORING TASK FORCE REPORT
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Mentoring Task Force gathered information regarding the state of mentoring at the University of Iowa, as well as data and practices at other institutions.

Mentoring programs on this campus tend to be informal and managed at the departmental level by the DEO. The Task Force feels that central mandates for specific forms of mentoring programs would be resented by both mentor and mentee and thus would not be as successful as the continuation of the current voluntary mentoring practices. The most cited barriers to mentoring were scarcity of time and human resources.

Based on this review, the Task Force makes several recommendations intended to enhance mentoring on campus. The purposes for these initiatives are to increase proportion of faculty members who attain tenure, to improve the retention rate of tenured faculty and to improve and enhance the UI environment by making it more supportive and welcoming.

These initiatives are consistent with recommendations contained in three separate documents released by the Office of the Provost in 2006--The Iowa Promise, The Gender Equity Task Force Final Report, and the Diversity Action Committee's Final Report— namely that the University should pursue professional development of faculty as a means of achieving a welcoming community, and to recruit and retain faculty. Hence, this University needs to move forward aggressively along the lines suggested below.

Short-Term Recommendations

1. The Office of the Provost should begin an electronic newsletter focused on the needs of new faculty, including mentoring.

2. A centralized web site/clearinghouse should be developed that would provide information and web links to a variety of University resources for faculty (mentor and mentee).

3. A list-serve for interchange among mentors on campus should be implemented.

3. The Office of the Provost should offer a Workshop on Mentoring that could be offered to DEOs and to other faculty who serve as mentors.

4.   The following policy changes are recommended, which would have the effect of incorporating mentoring into the written framework of institutional goals and expectations:

   - **require that the offer letter to new faculty include a detailed mentoring plan that would be in place for the new faculty member coming to campus**;

- **require that a development plan (potentially developed by the candidate) and an assessment of mentoring to date, be included in the annual review of the faculty member, with documentation of the nature of mentoring that was received and of the mentoring plan for the next year**;
- **require an assessment at the three-year review of the probationary faculty member regarding mentoring received to date;**
- **require that as part of their reviews, Deans and DEO's would be evaluated on how successful their mentoring initiatives are**;
- **require that mentoring performance be reviewed for purposes of promotion to full professor and post-tenure review**;
- **require that annual faculty reports on accomplishments solicit description of mentoring activities similarly to requests for descriptions of service activities**;
- **require that the DEO regularly and at least annually communicate to faculty, e.g. via annual DEO address or newsletter, information about mentoring and mentoring expectations for post-tenure reviews**

Long-Term Recommendations

5. Each college should be required to prepare a mentoring plan, incorporating centralized mentoring support programs or ideas if considered appropriate, or identifying initiatives designed to meet the unique needs and characteristics of the college.

6. Create a Mentoring Advisory Board based in the Provost's Office that would have long-term responsibility for monitoring and evaluating mentoring at the UI, and for development of additional mentoring initiatives.

7. The Mentoring Advisory Board would be responsible for identifying two or three departments or colleges as the site for decentralized pilot projects which would serve as a parallel avenue for gathering experiential data on mentoring.

8. The outcome of mentoring initiatives over the short- and long-term should be monitored.

I. Current Environment at The University of Iowa for Mentoring

The Mentoring Task Force has gathered survey and anecdotal information on UI mentoring attitudes and current UI mentoring programs; and on mentoring research findings and training program evaluation methodologies. Based on a synthesis of these data and available UI resources, the task force recommends implementing at the UI, for the purpose of supporting and enhancing mentoring at the UI, the mentoring programs described in the attached report. Beyond the previously described objectives, the overarching purposes for these initiatives are to increase the rate at which qualified faculty attain tenure, to improve the retention rate of qualified tenured faculty (thus guarding against the related loss of University resources), and to improve and enhance the UI environment by making it more supportive and welcoming.

A. UI Mentoring Survey and Anecdotal Data; Summary of UI Attitudes Towards Mentoring and Mentoring Programs Currently In Place

A 4-questions survey mailing was sent to all DEO's (see Attachment A), which resulted in 30 individuals responding to at least two of the four survey questions. In several instances, unsolicited information was provided in addition to requested information. Given the open-ended questions and accompanying free-form nature of the survey responses, most of the data are summarized and reported below in a general manner appropriate to anecdotal information. Because many of the responses were selective, with responses to some questions or portions of questions omitted in their entirety, it is not possible to calculate meaningful response rates. (Further, it is important to note that the value of the survey data are further limited because the contexts in which mentoring occurs at the UI vary greatly, limiting the value of some comparisons and aggregations of responses.)

Nevertheless, **some general observations can be made**: of the 30 responses received, 12 respondents indicated that their **mentoring programs are informal and managed at the departmental level**; 9 responded that **they assign one or two mentors to new faculty**, though several noted that **this remained a voluntary arrangement**; 9 noted that the **DEO takes much if not all the responsibility for the mentoring** that occurs; 6 described some form of promotion/tenure, grant assistance or peer review committee, or regular seminar or workshop for new faculty; and 3 described formal mentoring programs. Many of the **one-on-one mentoring relationships are not formally assigned or mandated, but evolve naturally** between junior and senior faculty members for varied reasons, and some respondents indicated that these are largely successful.

In addition to survey data, the task force sought out and spoke with some individuals who have developed mentoring programs for their colleges. To the extent that views were expressed on the topic in these conversations and in survey responses, there is agreement that **mandates in the mentoring area, even with financial rewards or other incentives, would be resented by both mentor and mentee** and would not be as successful as voluntary mentoring and related programs.

In many instances, the monitoring of junior faculty progress, and assurance of appropriate mentoring, has been taken on and facilitated by the DEO, who also often takes on whatever mentoring duties are not formally assigned to, or handled by others. Some DEOs have employed mentoring matching strategies such as strategically assigning office and laboratory space to facilitate interaction by junior faculty with select senior faculty. Others individually encourage junior faculty to seek out mentors, and make suggestions for mentors based on professional specialty or backgrounds and interests. Others meet personally with new faculty on a periodic basis to review progress, and to provide individualized guidance and resources.

Other components of **many UI departmental mentoring programs include peer review committees or other structured means for providing probationary faculty access** to critiques and reviews of their grants/research and teaching, and varied information e.g. how to run labs and mentor students; and annual or more frequent structured reviews by DEO of probationary faculty.

While the survey did not ask about barriers to mentoring, a number of individuals, in responding to the question of what resources would be helpful, **identified impediments to mentoring:** 10 respondents identified **time**; 3 identified **human resources**—and an additional 4 identified **input from tenured and senior faculty**.

B. Collegiate Mentoring Programs

At least three UI Colleges—Education, Dentistry and Law--have developed more formalized mentoring programs for junior faculty, which they describe as successful in improving the promotion/tenure process for junior faculty. The second and third descriptions below are brief summaries of the components of these latter two programs. But the first **description of the program in the College of Education** is a longer narrative that **provides not only a program description, but also a broader picture of the issues and related opportunities that were considered and addressed in implementing mentoring within the College; and serves to demonstrate the kinds of unique needs that exist in UI's colleges and departments that would make a one-size-fits-all approach to mentoring programs at the UI less than optimal.**

1) College of Education (selected portions of summary description by Carolyn Colvin—see Attachment B)

2) College of Dentistry (summarized from telephone conversation with Dr. Jed Hand)

The College of Dentistry holds a monthly lunch meeting for new junior faculty, chaired by Dr. Hand and attended also by representatives from other key units, in which new faculty are given information about research in the college; professional development and personal productivity; about the promotion and tenure process; and about other expectations. New faculty are not formally matched with a mentor, but they are

counseled to seek out one or more mentors and seek advice if necessary rather than relying solely on the DEO for that purpose. Mentoring is voluntary (preferable to mandates which might be resisted) and not compensated except perhaps indirectly in individual faculty evaluations, where good mentoring may be acknowledged.

Currently Dr. Hand reviews DEO evaluations of new faculty with care, and assures that they are sufficiently evaluative as opposed to merely descriptive. Future plans include more intensive coaching of DEO's (perhaps through regular meetings with them as a group) to convey what the college expects of DEO's as mentors beyond counseling of new faculty regarding research and publications—such as conveying cultural and clinical kinds of things—and the expectation that DEO's will keep track of new faculty on an individual basis. A recent survey sent to junior faculty soliciting their perceptions of their mentoring experience in the College is expected to provide useful information that will shape the program in the future. Finally, the College wishes to provide attention also to Assoc. Professors—perhaps in the guise of "collaboration" rather than "mentoring"— to help assure that appropriate support is available as needed also after tenure has been achieved.

Beyond the monthly luncheon there is no formal social component in the mentoring program. However, this year the Dean invited the junior faculty to his home for dinner. There is a College out-of-town faculty retreat every other year with an overnight. A major value of that activity is social.

3) College of Law (from DEO survey)

Please note that the College of Law is relatively small and not departmentalized.

1. We appoint an official faculty mentor to all new tenure-track faculty members upon their arrival. The mentor retains that position until the conclusion of the tenure process.

2. A promotion and tenure committee assigned to work exclusively with the faculty member concerned is appointed at the beginning of his or her second year. The PTC provides a significant amount of formal and informal guidance about the tenure process. The formally appointed mentor is not part of the PTC.

3. The teaching of tenure-track faculty members is reviewed each semester by a committee appointed for that purpose. Part of the committee's duty is to offer encouragement, support, and constructive criticism on the teaching front.

4. When a tenure-track faculty member has had particular challenges in a specific area, say teaching, we have appointed a well qualified person to work intensively on that area with the faculty member. In recent years some impressive contributions of this kind have been made by senior members of the law faculty.

5. We invite and encourage junior faculty members to present papers in our in-house seminar series, receiving constructive criticism from senior colleagues. In addition, a

cultural norm of the law school is that we read each other's draft articles and provide feedback when asked.

6. With support from the dean (such as for meals), the junior faculty meet as a separate forum for sharing scholarship and potential scholarly projects. In that unthreatening setting they are free to try out ideas and react to each other's ideas. They serve as informal mentors to one another.

7. New faculty members are given support to attend an annual conference for new law teachers sponsored by the Association of American Law Schools.

In general, these practices have been quite successful. Of course, no mentoring can substitute for the ability and drive of a motivated tenure-track faculty member. But we believe we have been successful in creating a supportive environment in which junior faculty are nurtured.

II. Literature Review: Selected Mentoring Research Findings and Training Program Evaluation Methodologies

The following is a series of quotations (see reference list for complete bibliographical information) that provide an overview of key mentoring research findings that lend background and support for the conclusions and recommendations contained within this memo.

1. Mentoring is one professional development tool that has been successful in developing an organization's human assets and aiding in the retention of their most valued employees (Kreitner & Kinicke, 2004); Luecke, 2004; Murray, 2001). In the last decade, many American businesses have formalized their employee mentoring practices in recognition of how organizational context has changed in the three decades since Kanter (1977) identified the benefits of informal mentoring among managers and professionals (Jossi, 1997). Within the business sector, the concept of mentoring has evolved as a tool of professional development in tandem with the diverse human resource needs of contemporary organizations (Murray, 2001)…Academe, however, has been slower [than the business sector] to modify its faculty mentoring practices in response to the changing organizational dynamics and demographics of higher education (Carr et al., 2003; Luna & Cullen, 1995). (Zellers, p. 1) **[This is a key resource as it is a wide-ranging and thorough internal study of mentoring in higher education, including a study of faculty mentoring programs such as those of the University of Michigan Ann Arbor; the University of Indiana, Bloomington; Stanford University School of Medicine; the University of Wisconsin, Madison; the University of Oregon; the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine; and Iowa Sate University, among others.]**

2. Although the focus of mentoring is the growth and development of those less experienced, early and present day literature emphasize that organizations and mentors benefit from these learning relationships as well. In both business and

academe, **organizational benefits include: increased productivity and organizational stability** (Carr et al., 2003: Murray, 2001); **retention of valued employees** (Carr et al.,, 2003); Kreitner & Kinicki, 2003; Luecke, 2004; Murray, 2001); **preservation of intellectual capital and institutional memory** (Luecke, 2004; Murray, 2001); **support of cultural diversity** (Carr et al., 2003; Gunn, 1995; Jossi, 1997; Murray, 20001; **improved leadership capacity and succession planning** (Carr et al., 2003; Jossi, 1997; Murray, 2001); **and cost effectiveness** (Jossie, 1997; Luecke, 2004; Murray, 2001). Studies on the organizational benefits of mentoring stress that **optimal effectiveness is achieved when mentoring practices are integrated within an institution's larger human resource management strategy** and are likened to other personnel practices such as professional development training programs, performance appraisal, and systems of rewards and recognition (McCauley & Van Velsor, 2004; Murray, 2001). (Zellers, p. 4)

The advantages protoges [protégés] gain from mentoring are also similar in business and academe…With regard to mentors, many of the benefits of a mentoring relationship are intrinsic…(for detailed listing of protégé/mentor benefits see Zellers, pp. 4-5).

3. Mentoring was found to be positively associated with both career satisfaction and intrinsic job satisfaction; while size of the advice network was found to be positively related to intrinsic career success, the range (number of different social systems) of the developmental network was not.(Van Emmerik, p. 588)

4. Mentors and protégés generally agree in their perceptions of the mentoring functions provided and received. It seems intuitive that if mentors and protégés share the same values, attitudes, and perceptions of their relationship, they will feel more satisfied with the relationship and with their dyadic partner. Indeed, this has been shown to be the case among supervisors and subordinates and marital partners. However, challenges to this agreement occur when there are discrepancies in organizational tenure or age. Organizations should train mentor participants who are dissimilar to their protégés in tenure or age to be aware of and sensitive to the needs, values and expectations of their "dissimilar" proteges. (Fagenson-Eland, p. 471)

5. A thorough review of academic literature revealed that **descriptive studies of mentoring programs are sparse, particularly those that are institutionally-based.** Furthermore, **since most studies consist of self-reported data, they are admittedly not conclusive** (Murray, 2001; Fenner, 2004). Nevertheless, according to Murray (2001), "In most cases, **the best evidence that mentoring works is the praise of the mentors and protoges [protégés] who say that the mentoring experience was a benefit to both the organization and themselves"** (p.44)…Aside from the individual differences that influence the outcomes of mentoring studies, contextual factors also complicate the study of mentoring. Differences in language, organizational context, and formats make comparisons of studies precarious…Conversations with representatives of the selected faculty mentoring programs reinforced the findings in the literature: **Mentoring is so highly contextual and subject to such a wide range of interpretations within academe that direct comparison between any of the mentoring programs featured in**

this report are very difficult. Nevertheless, mentoring was found to be universally valued regardless of how it was conceptualized. (Zellers, pp. i-ii).

6. **Most current literature references a new mentoring paradigm which is epitomized by multiple mentoring relationships**. Within the context of multiple mentoring, reciprocity supplants hierarchy as a result of the knowledge and sophistication of today's young adults (Gunn, 1995; Murray, 2001) (Zellers, p. ii).

7. Kram (1985) expanded upon earlier organizational studies and was the first to articulate the **dual dimensions of mentoring: the career or technical functions and the psychosocial personal functions.** According to Kram, career functions involve sponsorship, coaching, protection, challenge, exposure, and visibility. Psychosocial functions include role modeling, counseling, acceptance, confirmation, and friendship. One's external performance is influenced by the career or technical dimensions of mentoring whereas the psychosocial dimension address one's internal values and attitudes, clarify one's identity, and enhance one's feeing of competence. (Zellers, p. 2)

8. Relationships with developers (those who have a positive influence on the protégé) are categorized as instrumental or expressive or some combination thereof. Instrumental ties are those relationships for which the main purpose is to advance the individual's career and professional interests. For example, instrumental ties may provide sponsorship, protection, visibility, and access to extended powerful networks. In contrast, expressive ties provide psychosocial support for the individual such as encouragement in trying times, a safe outlet for discussion of career troubles, advice about coping with the unique stresses of the job, and considerations about work/life balance…To date, the development research views protégé contact with high-level developers as evidence of a mentoring relationship [but] the assumption that "the more contact with senior executives, the better" may not necessarily hold…The shift from traditional protégé-mentor dyads to development networks (i.e. concurrent dyadic relationships that are specifically developmental in nature and include, but are not limited to, a primary mentor) provides an interesting and fruitful terrain for mentoring researchers. Further understanding of development networks would increase the validity of mentoring research and also enhance the ability to predict important individual-level (e.g. subjective and objective career success) and organization-level outcomes (e.g. commitment). (Molloy, p. 538)

9. In this paper, we have asserted that **an individual's developmental stage is an important antecedent to the nature of mentoring and developmental networks that are possible.** Further, we are suggesting that the developmental network is a key tool for learning, development, and successful performance outcomes in challenging assignments. The more we understand what individuals bring to these assignments, the more we can anticipate what will be needed domestically and abroad to maximize both individual and organizational outcomes. We have considerable knowledge about mentoring (given the last two decades of research) which is already useful to practitioners who are responsible for staffing and promotion decisions, as well as development policies and practices. With the recent work on developmental networks there are several important new ideas and propositions that should be considered. **A first step in this next phase of mentoring**

research is to examine how individuals' developmental stage shapes relationship opportunities and outcomes. (Chandler, p. 549)

10. A large portion of the Empathy-Edge group saw mentoring as fundamental to aid women's development, and the majority felt that electronic communication was effective in facilitating this mentoring when combined with other communication methods. **Our research so far has shown that ultimately the technology is not the central factor in e-mentoring; it is the quality of the mentoring and the mentoring relationships that are the most important.** CMC [computer-mediated communication] offers a set of tools that need to be mastered as a means of building positive developmental relationships. A recent European report recommends the "need to ensure that acquiring e-skills emphasizes not only the technological skills required but also the value of communication, creativity, and imagination in the use of ICT [information and communication technologies]." E-mentoring offers a means of promoting such positive and transferable qualities, in addition to career and personal development. (Headlem-Wells, p. 456)

11**. One challenge not specifically addressed in the literature that several programs are currently facing is the issue of sustainability. In comparing those programs whose sustainability was questionable with those in which it was not a concern, differences in one of three critical factors were observed most frequently: having the support of senior administration, being institutionalized within the organization, or having financial support.** (Zellers, p. ii).

…Literature in both business and academe is consistent in identifying the critical factors associated with the success of formal mentoring programs (Carr et al., 2003; Daloz, 1999; Gunn, 1995; Luecke, 004; McCauley & Van Velsor, 2004; Murray, 2001;Sorcinelli, 2000). **The following is a compilation of mentoring program success factors relevant to academe which were the criteria used to compare practices among our sample faculty mentoring programs: Support of senior administration; …Integration within an institution's larger human resource management strategy and linked to other personnel practices such as professional development training, performance appraisal, tenure and promotion criteria, and systems of rewards and recognition;…Voluntary participation of both mentors and mentees** (for complete list of criteria see Zellers, p. 14)

12. There are two realities about training programs…1) training programs produce very reliable results [some people will use the training, some will not, and everyone else is spread throughout the middle…a few people will find a way to put their training to use to lead to extremely valuable results, and a small percentage will not be able to use their training at all…we can learn from both groups when trying to improve training] 2) **When training works or does not work it is most often the case that non-training factors account for more of the success than features and elements of the training intervention or program itself….**With the Successful Case Method Strategy [SCM], we shift the focus from evaluation of "training" to an evaluation of how effectively the organization uses training. Thus we evaluate how well the organization uses training

systems and resources and leverages them into improved performance that in turn drives business results. This focuses inquiry on the larger process of training as it is integrated with performance management, and includes those factors and actions that determine whether training is likely to work to get performance results or not--i.e., the "performance system" that exists around the training program itself…One of the things we have learned in decades conducting evaluation studies and reviewing the research and theoretical literature on learning and performance is this**: training alone is never the sole factor in bringing about improved performance, and is often not even the major contributor**…In fact, the SCM has the additional goal of pinpointing exactly what additional factors played a role in the success of the training, such as a manager's commitment or a new incentive. **Training is always dependent upon the interaction of these other performance system factors in the improvement of performance [and at the same time] all performance impact begins with the individual.** (Brinkerhoff, Chapter 2).

III. Discussion and Analysis

The summarized survey data and selected research findings above provide a rationale for considering the suggested approaches delineated below for supporting and enhancing mentoring programs already in place at the UI; and for encouraging the development of some form of mentoring support in departments where there currently is no support. It seems clear that multiple factors work together in affecting the success of mentoring relationships and other support strategies, and that **self-selected, voluntary approaches seem to be better-received than mandated approaches.**

Although the precise monetary value of mentoring cannot be calculated, the Task Force believes that there is money to be saved by the university with better mentoring via fewer assistant professors dropping out of the tenure stream and better a tenure rates for the group that remains; and better retention of tenured faculty members. Approximately half of all newly hired assistant professors here (and at our peer institutions) resign prior to the year of tenure review. In 2005-06, 22 tenure track faculty and 25 clinical track assistant professors left the UI. If we assume that even 5 of these 47 faculty (about 10%) would have stayed had they received better mentoring, the University would have saved the cost of searching for and hiring replacements, including the attendant start up costs. At a bare minimum, this represents several thousand dollars, plus the associated faculty time.

Given the lack of evidence supporting any one particular strategy (and evidence suggesting that multiple approaches offered simultaneously are helpful), it appears that offering **a combination of approaches**—e.g. dyadic relationships and developmental networking; in-person, telephonic and electronic communication; purely professional as well as personal/social information sharing—**seems to provide the best opportunity for positive results. This approach seems further merited given the decentralized nature of the UI and the widely divergent departmental needs and programs that have been developed to serve the unique needs of individual units. Offering programs and ideas centrally, to supplement and/or complement programs**

already in place, seems ideally suited for the UI's structure. The strategies suggested below are relatively revenue neutral, and simultaneously respond to some of the DEO's suggestions or requests for assistance made in survey responses.

Other information that may be worth exploring further (and perhaps posting on the web with other shared information such as mentoring models) has to do with the numerous training and mentoring contexts in which mentoring training and support is offered at the UI. When viewed in the light of Robert Brinkerhoff's assertion that non-training factors surrounding the training programs account as much or more for success or failure of the application of training as does the quality of the training program itself, one is tempted to consider whether this assertion has broader implications for mentoring as well. Certainly there are elements of mentoring that fit the narrower industry meaning of the word "training," though many aspects of mentoring fall outside of that definition. Notwithstanding that fact, **it may be worth considering whether Brinkerhoff's assertions and observations might apply also to mentoring, broadly. This would lead to the question of whether not only non-training, but non-mentoring, factors surrounding training and mentoring account as much or more for success or failure of the training/mentoring than does the training/mentoring itself. Such a probability would suggest that the strategy of encouraging and facilitating a broader look at individual departmental contexts, while simultaneously providing mentoring program support, may be equally helpful and important in improving UI mentoring programs—and the promotion and tenure process--overall.**

IV. Mentoring Task Force Recommendations

Mentoring has not been defined by the task force, nor have prescriptive strategies been recommended. This is because departments and colleges vary greatly, and the mentoring experience needs to be tailored to their unique needs. A number of results and benefits would flow from implementing the task force recommendations detailed below: 1) enhanced recruiting, retention and development (resulting in preservation of University resources due to less turnover; 2) an improved collaborative and supportive environment that fosters commitment on the part of individual faculty to this university; and 3) an improvement in the quality of scholarship, overall competence and confidence of young researchers-- potentially achieved at earlier stages of development than before. These initiatives would also be consistent with recommendations contained in three separate documents released by the Office of the Provost in 2006--The Iowa Promise, The Gender Equity Task Force Final Report, and the Diversity Action Committee's Final Report— namely that the University should pursue professional development of faculty as a means of achieving a welcoming community, and to recruit and retain faculty.

Given the potential benefits that could flow from effectively-implemented new mentoring initiatives described below, the Committee believes that it is imperative that these recommendations be seriously considered. In most cases these initiatives are revenue neutral. Given the possible benefits, it is difficult to imagine that this University could afford not to move forward aggressively along the lines suggested below.

The recommendations below fall into "short-term" and "long-term" categories—in terms of the time that would be required from initial to full implementation. In the short-term, specific, circumscribed initiatives identified below could be implemented relatively quickly at all levels. For example, in the short-term, it will be important that both the junior faculty member and the DEO describe in the annual review their mentoring experience and express their views on what has been achieved and/or remains to be achieved. Over the long-term, on the other hand, with proper incentives and under Decanal leadership, comprehensive collegiate-based mentoring approaches could be developed that respond to the unique characteristics and needs of individual colleges. Also, mentoring should become a criterion to be considered in departmental and collegiate reviews—in fact, it should be inserted as a general question in each review. This would allow each department and college to describe what they understand mentoring to be, and could be a useful informational resource to the ongoing evolution of mentoring at the UI—over the long-term.

Short-Term Recommendations

1. The Office of the Provost will begin an electronic newsletter and will maintain a web link containing a newsletter archive. This newsletter should be used as a vehicle to share pertinent mentoring information, and should include an archive of the faculty newsletter.

2. A number of survey respondents indicated a wish for online mentoring resources and/or access to information about mentoring models. A centralized web site/clearinghouse should be developed that would provide information and web links to a variety of University resources for faculty (mentor and mentee, e.g. the new faculty newsletter, orientation programs, human resource links, faculty policies, housing, as well as mentoring models from the UI and shared related suggestions/ideas on mentoring submitted by UI faculty etc.) A list-serve for this kind of dialogue, or to enable electronic matching for intra-departmental contact with peers or potential mentors should be implemented, and further publicized in the faculty newsletter, fyi, etc.

3. The Office of the Provost should develop and offer a DEO Workshop on Mentoring. This workshop could be made available not only to DEO's but a broader audience, as desired. In addition, training materials should be developed and made available to everyone. These might include discussion of general mentoring issues as well as more specific considerations such as reported gender-linked differences in mentoring experiences and/or expectations. Simultaneously, it would be worth exploring whether the evolving mentoring initiatives should be extended to graduate students and post-docs, where appropriate.

4. Because of the importance of incorporating mentoring into the institutional culture of the University of Iowa, the following policy changes are recommended, which would have the effect of incorporating mentoring into the written framework of institutional goals and expectations:

- **require that the offer letter to new faculty include a mentoring plan that would be in place for the new faculty member coming to campus**;
- **require that a development plan (potentially developed by the candidate) and an assessment of mentoring to date, be included in the annual review of the faculty member, with documentation of the nature of mentoring that was received and of the mentoring plan for the next year**;
- **require an assessment at the three-year review of the probationary faculty member regarding mentoring received to date;**
- **require that as part of their reviews, Deans and DEO's would be evaluated on how successful their mentoring initiatives are**;
- **require that mentoring performance be reviewed for purposes of promotion to full professor and post-tenure review**;
- **require that mentoring performance be included for purposes of merit salary increases**;
- **require that the DEO regularly and at least annually communicate to faculty, e.g. via annual DEO address or newsletter, information about mentoring and mentoring expectations for post-tenure reviews**

Long-Term Recommendations

5. Each college should be required to prepare a mentoring plan, incorporating centralized mentoring support programs or ideas if considered appropriate, or identifying initiatives designed to meet the unique needs and characteristics of the college.

6. Create a Mentoring Advisory Board based in the Provost's Office, and with campus-wide representation, that would have long-term responsibility for monitoring and evaluating mentoring at the UI, and for development of additional mentoring initiatives that incorporate experiential data from other UI mentoring initiatives (e.g. development of Faculty Career Development Program Mentoring Training).

7. The Mentoring Advisory Board would be responsible, in addition to monitoring centralized mentoring initiatives, for identifying two or three departments or colleges as the site for decentralized pilot projects which would serve as a parallel avenue for gathering experiential data on mentoring. The DEO or Dean of the selected units would have access to a variety of resources and ideas on mentoring, and would select one or more mentoring strategies for implementation on a pilot basis, deemed by them to meet the specific needs of the department or college. Not only would the Mentoring Advisory Board benefit from feedback on the results of these pilot efforts; but the individuals involved in designing and implementing the pilot projects could also serve as future resources to DEO workshops on mentoring and to others as appropriate.

8. It will be important to evaluate the outcome of mentoring initiatives over the short- and long-term and to develop instruments for outcomes assessment. Satisfaction surveys sent by the Provost's Office also could be a useful tool in measuring outcomes. As an aid

in ongoing outcomes assessment, all goals and specific initiatives that are proposed for implementation should include proposed timeframes for implementation.

V. REFERENCES

Brinkerhoff, Robert O. (2006). *Telling Training's Story: Evaluation Made Simple, Credible, and Effective.* Berret-Koehler Publishers

Chandler, Dawn E. and Kathy E. Kram (June, 2005). *Applying an adult developmental perspective to developmental networks.* Career Development International, Vol. 10. No. 6/7, pp. 548-566. Retrieved at www.emeraldinsight.com/1362-0436.htm

Fagenson-Eland, Ellen, S. Gayle Bauth, and Melanie J. Lankau (June, 2005). *Seeing eye to eye: A dyadic investigation of the effect of relational demography or perceptions of mentoring activities.* Career Development International, Vol. 10, No. 6/7, pp. 460-477. Retrieved at www.emeraldinsight.com/1362-0436.htm

Headlam-Wells, Jenny, Julian Gosland, and Jane Craig (June, 2005). *There's magic in the web: e-mentoring for women's career development.* Career Development International, Vol. 10, No. 6/7, pp. 444-459. Retrieved at www.emeraldinsight.com/1362-0436.htm

Molloy, Janice C. (June, 2005). *Developmental Networks: literature review and future research.* Career Development International, Vol. 10, No. 6/7, pp. 563-547. Retrieved at www.emeraldinsight.com/1362-0436.htm

Van Emmerik, Hetty, I.J. (April, 2004). *The more you can get the better: Mentoring constellations and intrinsic career success.* Career Development International, Vol. 9, No. 6, pp. 578-594. Retrieved at www.emeraldinsight.com/1362-0436.htm

Zeller, Darlene, Valerie M. Howard and Maureen A. Barcic (2005). *New professional development paradigms in practice: A benchmarking study on faculty mentoring programs in higher education.* Internal Report, The University of Pittsburgh.

DEO Survey Instrument

Dear Friends:

We are writing to you as members of the Provost's Mentoring Task Force Committee, in order to gather information and ideas from you, who have responsibility for departments and the mentoring of faculty. (Attached is the Provost's charge to the task force, should you be interested in a description of the scope of our work.)

We hope that each of you will answer at least the first three questions. If you can take a bit more time, please answer the rest. In addition, if you would like to comment on any other aspects of mentoring, feel free to share your insights.

Please provide your responses by March 28. If you would prefer to speak to someone from the committee, please let us know by return e-mail.

1) Please describe any current formal and informal mentoring practices in your department.
2) What has been successful, and what has not?
3) What resources are important to the success of mentoring? Are there resources you don't have that you think would be helpful?

4) What do you consider positive or negative about mentoring?
5) Did you personally benefit from mentoring either here or elsewhere?
6) What would be the ideal mentoring program for your department?
7) Are there other good mentoring practices with which you are familiar?
5) Any other ideas you would like to share?

Co-chairs:

Usha Mallik; usha-mallik@uiowa.edu
Susan Johnson; susan-johnson@uiowa.edu

Members:

Casavant, Thomas L; tom-casavant@uiowa.edu
Cole, Catherine A; cathy-cole@uiowa.edu
Geyer, Pamela; pamela-geyer@uiowa.edu
Haack, Marcus J; marcus-haack@uiowa.edu
Lovaglia, Michael J; michael-lovaglia@uiowa.edu
Manderscheid, David C; david-manderscheid@uiowa.edu
Rosenthal, Nancy; nancy-rosenthal@uiowa.edu
Williams, Rachel M; rachel-williams@uiowa.edu

<u>Description of Mentoring Program in College of Education (selected portions of summary description by Carolyn Colvin)</u>

In August, 2002, I assumed the position as Associate Dean for Graduate Programs and Academic Affairs. As part of these duties, I was also charged with mentoring all new (not just junior) faculty in the College. There had been a mentoring program in place but in conversations with the individual who had been in charge of the program, it became clear that he was frustrated. His approach had been to purchase books that new faculty read and discussed. It seemed that it might be useful to try a different approach—a description of which follows.

I decided that the College/Dean's Office would be well-served if we provided an Orientation for new Faculty. I hoped to set a particular tone at the Orientation, generate some energy and a sense of community during this event and build from there.

In preparation for the Orientation, I pulled together a packet of materials about the College and the University and sent it in early July under a cover letter of welcome from the Dean. In this letter that I authored for her, we provided details of our Orientation, as well as for the University Orientation--so they could get it on their calendars and could plan to attend. A few weeks later, I sent my own letter informing new faculty of our collegiate mentoring sessions, and inviting them to participate.

The mentoring sessions were scheduled to begin in the first month of school. We tried to meet about an hour every 3-4 weeks, and the lunch hour turned out to be the best time. When I could provide food (even it if was cookies), this was a nice addition. While some topic choices for our sessions were predictable, I also tried to be very attentive to hear what issues were of concern for new faculty, and then scheduled additional topics accordingly. As much as possible, the topics of the sessions were generative and changed somewhat according to the needs of each group.

Fall mentoring sessions focused on preparing dossiers, submitting Old Gold Proposals and adding to the depth of information related to grant opportunities on campus. In early October, I invited the Dean and faculty who were new in their first three years to gather at Givanni's for drinks and appetizers – a purely social gathering. This provided the new faculty the opportunity meet with the Dean and chat. I also used these gatherings as opportunities to talk individually with different groups of faculty. In addition, I invited each new faculty member out to lunch and tried to take all of them out during the Fall Semester. I also 'dropped' by their office just to talk and see how things were going. As it was appropriate, I also worked behind the scenes to make sure that their colleagues were connecting with them and inviting them to lunch, etc. For some new faculty, this was absolutely not necessary; for others, it seemed to help them become more integrated into the College. I was aware when they went to lunch with each other or with others.

As appropriate, I drew on the talents of new faculty to share drafts of dossiers, Old Gold proposals and invited them to attend and share advice on areas of expertise but nothing that would be threatening. It was another way to establish bonds between and among the new faculty.

We also had lots of conversations often led by new faculty where they discussed how to find a balance between the demands of work and allowing themselves time away on the weekends, during holidays, etc. These were heartfelt conversations and seemed to indicate how valuable it was to create a forum for new faculty to talk in a reasonably safe environment.

During the spring semester, we would typically meet for fewer meetings. I sensed that they had less need of the mentoring sessions and had begun to rely on support in their program/departments, and their designated mentors. The spring social gathering was scheduled and well-attended. My contacts with new faculty moved more to individual meetings as needed rather than relying on the whole group. One particularly successful spring session was when our human resources person and I collaborated on a session that focused on how new faculty could work effectively with Staff. We invited Jane Holland, from Human Resources to talk about staff perspectives. As we learned from this session, many new faculty had never been in a position where staff were there to assist them so they were very uncertain as to how to ask for assistance. In fact, they often struggled with whether they could ask staff to do work for them.

As I reflect on those sessions, it mattered less what we discussed (because to be honest, the new faculty was hit with SO much information, I wonder how much they remembered). What seemed to matter most was the fact that they became acquainted with each other and established a bond. One of the nicest moments of the program was the tour of the College where new faculty was introduced to the Staff. Not only did this make a huge difference to the staff who often are ignored when new faculty from other departments come to the College; but to a person, the staff was so welcoming – providing just that genuine and personal welcome that new faculty need. At the close of the tour, we took pictures of each new faculty member and under each picture we included their office location, their office phone number, and email address, and sent this information as an email attachment to each new faculty member and to other appropriate parties, e.g. to department secretaries, DEOs, etc.

The Orientation ended with a luncheon to which other "newer" (not quite as new) faculty were invited. We urged new faculty to sit with DEOs other than those in their own departments. We urged the "newer" faculty to invite a new faculty member outside of their department to join them at a table for 4 – so we created a broader network of faculty. Since the "newer" faculty had been new once, they were able to share valuable advice, invite them for lunch, and make time to meet later. In the Orientation, the new faculty was asked to introduce themselves to us. I had prepared the DEOs to take notes so that they could introduce the new faculty at the Fall Faculty meeting, two days later.

Early on, I had a discussion with all new faculty about mentoring by other faculty. When I was a new faculty member, I was told that I wouldn't succeed without a faculty mentor. I was also told it was the expectation that a faculty member would be assigned as my mentor. I often shared with the new faculty that I resisted these formal assignments, and instead found my own mentors; and so, for that reason, I leave new faculty the option to choose their own mentor if they'd like. But I also told them I would help identify faculty if they needed suggestions. I encouraged them to consider more than one mentor and said that a mentor outside the College was perfectly appropriate and often desirable. So, I often called on faculty across campus to participate by meeting new faculty for lunch, coffee, etc. (I must say that faculty in other Colleges were invaluable in how dedicated they were to supporting College faculty.) I urged them to consider faculty outside their departments but within the College. On balance, most faculty opted for a mentor but some found their own.

Challenges:

1)   Effectively including both tenure-track faculty and clinical faculty because their needs were sometimes the same but for very important reasons were different.
2)   Attendance was not always 100%. When we had new faculty who had been at other institutions prior to coming to Iowa, they had less need of the mentoring program.
3)   Ensuring that during their 2nd and 3rd years, new faculty had appropriate support. Our program seemed more effective for first year faculty but is this enough?