R·I·T

Faculty Mentoring @ RIT
Program Assessment: Year 3
Academic Year 2013-2014
September 22, 2014

Prepared by
Faculty Career Development Services
The Wallace Center
Anne Marie Canale, Cheryl Herdklotz, Lynn Wild

Table of Contents

Appendix A: Academic Year 2013-2014 Mentoring Activities and Feedback
Appendix B: College Mentoring Survey Results (Year 3)
Appendix C: Mentoring Program Timeline

Introduction

The Faculty Mentoring @ RIT program, coordinated by Faculty Career Development Services of The Wallace Center, recently concluded its third year of providing guidance and support to RIT faculty as they foster mentoring relationships and collaborative partnerships. The Mentoring program's reputation, as a valuable resource for faculty throughout the continuum of their careers at RIT, continues to grow.

Mentoring Program Resources

The Mentoring program offers faculty resources, grant funding, awards, events and professional development activities to support their efforts in building and fostering mentoring networks. The resources offered and events sponsored are typically well attended with positive feedback, thus validating the program's value for faculty success, student success, and the RIT community. Resources provided are outlined below:

- **Resources** - website (rit.edu/facultydevelopment/mentoring) that includes resources, online guidebooks for new faculty, mentors, and department/unit heads, and more.
- **Mentoring Grants** - these funds support the professional development efforts of mentoring groups. The projects carried out will continue to support the mentoring program and further develop awareness of the value of mentoring for all faculty ranks.
- **Provost's Excellence in Faculty Mentoring Award** - established to recognize RIT faculty who demonstrate an outstanding commitment to mentoring.
- **Events** offered throughout the academic year, including New Faculty Orientation, a "Power Reception", Destination Intersession (3 weeks of professional development activities), two panel discussions, webinars and guest speakers. See Appendix A for events.

Year 3 College Mentoring Survey Results

For the third year, all tenure track faculty were surveyed on their mentoring experiences at RIT to gain a better understanding of how mentoring relationships form at RIT, the quality and nature of these relationships, the mentee's level of satisfaction with the relationships, and general experiences with the Mentoring program. The Executive Summary may be found in Appendix B; key findings are listed below.

- Overall, general awareness of the Faculty Mentoring @ RIT program was 89%, up from 75% in year 1.
- Among faculty responding, 81% indicated having an RIT mentor, up from 72% reported in year 1 survey (varied by college).
- Females showed higher activity and awareness within the Mentoring program in almost all areas.

In addition to the statistical data collected from the survey, faculty responded to four open-ended questions revealing their thoughts on the *most beneficial activities done with their mentors*, the *most beneficial changes in themselves as a result of the mentoring relationship*, *key points of guidance from their mentor*, and *suggestions on how the mentoring relationship might be more effective*. General responses may be found in Table 1; a complete summary is available in Appendix B.

Table 1: Faculty Responses to Open-Ended Questions

Most Beneficial Activities Done With Mentors	Most Beneficial Changes in Themselves
▪ Professional Improvement	▪ Self-Improvement
▪ Grants (guidance)	▪ Classroom (teaching strategies)
▪ Networking and events	▪ Writing (grant/paper writing/publishing)
▪ Publication (strategies/peer-reviewed publications)	▪ Research (productivity/focus)
▪ Research (encouragement/guidance)	▪ Tenure (more knowledgeable)
▪ Tenure (guidance/advice)	
Key Points of Guidance From Mentor	**How the Mentoring Relationship Might be More Effective**
▪ Personal Improvement	▪ More structured guidelines
▪ Networking	▪ Multiple mentors across colleges/departments
▪ Student Help	▪ Less structured/formal
▪ Additional Help (publishing, grant writing, external funding sources, research, service, tenure process)	▪ Offer networking opportunities
	▪ Stress peer mentoring

Mentoring Program Modifications

Each year, we consider feedback received on the program from a variety of sources (surveys, questionnaires, at-event feedback), and implement changes where and when feasible. Two significant changes include broadening the program to both tenured and non-tenure track faculty. Appendix C, *Faculty Mentoring @ RIT Program Timeline*, reflects the changes made over the past three years, which collectively have resulted in a stronger program and a broader awareness of the value of a faculty-to-faculty mentoring program at RIT, reflecting The Wallace Center's commitment to faculty success and mission of "ongoing support at all stages of their career continuum."

Recommendations

Recommendations for the Faculty Mentoring @ RIT program for Year 4 include:

▪ New Faculty Orientation 2014 will include a new faculty-led panel, *Hit the Ground Running,* to replace the former Faculty Mentoring @ RIT session.
▪ The *Faculty Success Series* will continue, including the Power Reception, guest speakers, panel discussions, and many opportunities for faculty in Intersession 2015.

- A fall 2014 survey will be conducted with MENTORS to get feedback on how to better support and recognize the work of faculty mentors.
- In fall 2014 a new online social networking opportunity for faculty to collaborate, network and share resources will be launched.
- Mentoring grants and award programs will continue.
- The website and other resources will continue to be refined and refreshed.
- 4th annual Mentoring Grants launches in October 2014.
- 4th annual Excellence in Mentoring Award announced in spring 2015.
- Continue collaboration with NSF AdvanceRIT to improve and refine mentoring practices and provide support to the team.

Appendix A: Faculty Mentoring @RIT Program
Academic Year 2013-2014 Events

Event	Details
New Faculty Orientation (NFO) *August 13, 2013*	Faculty introduced to the mentoring program and resources Opportunity to network with new colleagues and begin building network.
Power Reception: Get Your Network Started! *September 13, 2013*	New faculty cohort invited to a welcome reception hosted by President Destler offering faculty an opportunity to reconnect with peers met at NFO, meet deans, associate deans, and administration team.
Destination Intersession *January 6-24, 2014*	New in 2014; 20 different events for faculty to connect with their colleagues and continue building their mentoring network, including a Faculty Showcase.
Curious about the Mid-Tenure Review Process? Preparing for Mid-Tenure Review Panel Discussion *February 12, 2014*	4th annual panel; Provost provides an overview of the tenure process for pre-tenure faculty. Panel includes tenured faculty from each college.
Women's Leadership: How Good Managers become Great Leaders (webinar) *February 13, 2014*	Networking opportunity for women faculty and staff on balancing management and leadership skills, learning strategic ways to rejuvenate their careers, sharpen their competitive skills, and explore/define new career directions.
So You Want to be a Mentor Panel Discussion *March 10, 2014*	Panel discussion with senior faculty who have been successful as mentors geared toward tenured faculty who are interested in serving as mentors, facilitated by Dr. Pat Scanlon.
Powerful Communication Strategies for Faculty *March 21, 2014*	Presentation delivered by RIT alumna Terri Standish-Kuon '88 on how faculty can improve classroom delivery, ability to present at conferences, formal knowledge of presenting so they can do a better job in teaching students how to present as well as assess student presentations.
Why Use Peer Observation? *April 11, 2014*	FCDS funded a faculty request (Joe Henning-CLA) for a mentoring grant idea that was not approved. Dr. Billie Franchini (U-Albany) presented on the benefits of peer observation (Pt.1).
Maximizing the Benefits of Peer Observation *April 11 , 2014*	FCDS funded a faculty request (Joe Henning-CLA) for a mentoring grant idea that was not approved. Dr. Billie Franchini (U-Albany) presented on maximizing the benefits of peer observation (Pt.2).
Getting Ready for Summer Research *April 30, 2014*	FCDS funded a faculty request (Kelly Norris Martin-CLA)) for a mentoring grant idea that was not approved. FCDS hosted/coordinated a workshop/training on the qualitative software NVivo.
Celebration of Teaching Awards Ceremony *May 7, 2014*	Mentoring Award Recipients honored at annual Celebration of Teaching ceremony.
3rd Annual Provost's "Meet the Scholars" Launch *May 1, 2014*	Reception launching the 3rd annual report of RIT faculty scholarship-- a unique opportunity to network and develop relationships

Faculty Mentoring Program Assessment – AY 2013
Bennett Prosser, Carol Marchetti, Margaret Bailey, Laurie Clayton

Executive Summary
The Faculty Mentoring Program at RIT was launched in AY2010 with the objective of supporting tenure-track faculty at RIT. To assess the program, the faculty associates to the provost and the executive director of faculty recruitment and retention created a survey in the spring quarter of AY2011, with input from a number of deans and the provost. Survey questions were designed to gain a better understanding of how mentoring relationships *form* at RIT, the *quality and nature* of these relationships, and the mentee's *level of satisfaction* with these relationships. Results from the AY2011 survey are described in the document "Faculty Mentoring Program Assessment – AY 2011," while results from the AY2012 survey are described in the document "Faculty Mentoring Program Assessment – AY 2012." The AY2012 survey introduced gender demographic questions, while the AY2013 survey introduced questions asking for the respondents experience with mentors who sponsor involvement in professional activities and initiatives, as well as questions asking for the respondent's race/ethnicity and hearing status. In the AY2013 spring semester, the provost's office administered this survey to all 174 tenure-track faculty at RIT using Clipboard, a web-based survey resource. The survey response rate was 43% and the survey was open for approximately four weeks. The following chart outlines significant findings from the AY2013 survey.

Significant AY 2013 Survey Findings	AY2013	AY2012	AY2011
Response rate by Gender	42% female 43% male 15% declined	44% female 51% male 5% declined	Not asked in the survey
Slight increase in Percent Who Have an RIT Mentor	81% overall, varied by college (100% to 50%)	78%	72%
• Faculty respondents on the tenure-track for more than five years report the highest levels of agreement with having a mentor at RIT (as opposed to two to five years in previous surveys).			
Slight increase in Percent Who Know about the RIT Faculty Mentoring Program	89% overall, varied by college (100% to 60%)	86%	75%
• Faculty members of longer lengths on tenure-track reported higher awareness of the mentoring program, a change from similar levels of awareness being found in all groups in AY2012. • Females had generally higher awareness and activity in the mentoring program than males.			
Traditional one-on-one remains most common type of mentoring relationship	75%	74%	59%
Increase over 2012 in Percent Discussing Mentoring with Administrative Leadership	54%	49%	62%
Decrease from 2012 in Percent for Whom Mentoring Activities are Specifically Included in the Annual Plan of Work	18%	21%	20%
Increase in Percent for Whom Mentor Offers Advice/Encouragement	80%	75%	59%
Decrease in Approachability	82%	88%	59%
Decrease in Percent for Whom Mentor Discusses Work/Life Balance	14%	26%	20%
Decrease in Percent for Whom Mentor Makes Introductions with Others to Help Fill in The Gaps	21% 13% female 28% male	30% 29% female 31% male	15% N/A N/A

The AY2013 survey yielded the following comparisons to the AY2012 survey:
- Overall response rate decreased by 4% from 47% to 43%.
- Awareness in the RIT Mentoring Program increased by 3%.
  - Differences by type of mentor - RIT mentors and non-RIT mentors narrowed, as percentage of RIT mentors increased by 3% and non-RIT mentors increased by 18%.
- As with the results from the AY2012 survey, more experienced tenure-track faculty members are growing more aware of the mentoring program, although decreasing among new faculty.
- Most tenure-track faculty agree with the statement "mentoring relationship met expectations," though there was a slight decrease in agreement from AY2012.
- Relationship characteristics between mentors and mentees have remained approximately the same in most areas, though satisfaction with the mentoring program has slightly decreased.
- Mentoring Relationship Characteristics experienced decreases in advice on management of work life balance and connections with people to fill in gaps.

AY2013 Report
This report explores faculty responses for each survey question. Overall average response values are provided, as well as average responses by college, gender, race/ethnicity, and length on tenure-track, where relevant. In multiple colleges, the sample size of respondents was less than 5. This is found in GCCIS and NTID, as well as SCB in multiple questions. Results cannot be reported from colleges with less than five respondents. Similarly, less than 5 respondents identified as Deaf or Hard of Hearing, so there was insufficient data to conduct analyses based on hearing status.

Key
We compare the results of the AY2013 survey with the previous AY2012 and AY2011 surveys, highlighting changes based on increase or decrease from each survey's respective previous year.
If the percentage of respondents increased for a single question, the appropriate cell is highlighted in GREEN. For example, the percentage of respondents in CIAS increased from 22% in AY2012 to 50% in AY2013, so the corresponding 50% cell is highlighted in GREEN. Alternately, if a response decreased from the previous year, the cell is highlighted in RED.

For gender comparisons, the gender with the higher rate of positive response is noted in each question. This is shown by a **bolded** percentage. For example, 94% of female respondents are aware of the faculty mentoring program, opposed to 84% of males, so the corresponding 94% is **bolded**. Comparisons of Race/Ethnicity follow the same **bolding** guideline. Statistical significance is not shown through this notation, but basic difference in the responses of genders and races/ethnicities is presented. Because the AY2013 survey is the second year in which respondents were asked to indicate their gender, the responses based on gender can be compared with the AY2012 survey. This is shown using the same GREEN or RED highlighting as explained above, though can only be shown on the AY2013 results.

Survey Administration
In the spring semester of AY2013, the provost's office administered a survey to the tenure-track faculty at RIT using the RIT Clipboard on-line survey resource. **Appendix A** includes the results of the AY2013 survey, compiled into tables corresponding to those in this summary. **Appendix B** includes full responses to the open-ended questions, Questions 13 through 16, edited for privacy – access to this appendix is limited. **Appendices C** and **D** include copies of the survey instrument and the administration invitation plan, respectively. **Appendix E** includes the overall survey response results by count. **Appendix F**, also access-limited, contains responses by gender for all faculty and for AALANA faculty.

The overall survey participation rate was 43% (74/174) with the highest college-level participation from KGCOE faculty (64%) and the lowest level from CHST, GIS, NTID, and Provost (0%), excluding those colleges and departments with zero tenure track faculty. Most response rates decreased from the previous year, though CIAS and KGCOE increased. Overall response was down 4% from 47% in AY2012. **Table 1** lists the survey response rate breakdown by college and overall.

Table 1. Survey Response Rates by RIT College for AY2011, AY2012, and AY2013 Surveys

College	TT Faculty Count	Response Count Final	Response Rate by College (AY2013)	Response Rate by College (AY2012)	Response Rate by College (AY2011)
CAST	17	8	47%	47%	59%
CIAS	24	12	50%	22%	47%
COLA	32	15	47%	58%	64%
COS	30	12	40%	59%	51%
SCB	16	5	31%	44%	36%
KGCOE	22	14	64%	48%	45%
CHST	4	0	0%	25%	50%
GCCIS	13	4	31%	41%	59%
GIS	3	0	0%	0%	67%
Multi Studies	0	0	0%	0%	0%
NTID	12	3	25%	56%	76%
Provost	1	0	0%	0%	---
Unanswered	---	1	---	---	---
Total	**174**	**74**	**43%**	**47%**	**55%**

Program Awareness and Mentoring Activity

Questions on the survey were designed to gain an understanding of the awareness of mentoring programs on campus, the participation in those programs, how relationships were formed, and the types of relationships. **Table 2** includes summary data for these characteristics by college and overall. **Table 2a** includes AY2013 results, stratified by college, gender, and race/ethnicity, and **Table 2b** includes AY2012 results stratified by college and by gender. Respondents were asked to indicate any mentoring relationship that they encountered, so college totals for "Mentoring Relationship Type" may add to over 100%. Findings to note:

- Among the tenure-track faculty responding to the survey, 81% indicated having an RIT mentor (58/72 with two unanswered). However, this varied by college with high reported values of 100% within COLA and 92% in COS and a low of 50% in SCB.
- General awareness of the RIT Faculty Mentoring Program had similar results, with 89% of respondents indicating awareness (64/72 with two unanswered), with some variability among colleges (for example, 100% of COLA, COS, and CAST faculty respondents are aware compared to 60% in SCB).
- Over half of the faculty respondents (64%) indicate that their college/department assigned a mentor (again there is significant variability reported by college with a high of 100% in COLA and a low of 25% in SCB).
- The most common type of mentoring relationship, reported at 75%, is the traditional one-on-one mentee/mentor relationship with the remaining types (group, peer, multiple mentors) at similar representations of 13-22%.

- Females showed higher activity and awareness within the mentoring program in almost all areas, only falling below males in awareness of mentoring website.
- White respondents indicated highest rates of alternative types of mentoring, as well as a high percentage of mentors that were assigned by their department. Asian respondents showed the highest awareness of the mentoring website, and 100% had mentors at RIT. Awareness of the faculty mentoring program and mentors outside of RIT are similar across races/ethnicities.
- For the individual questions…
  - Faculty with mentor(s) outside of RIT increased by 18% (up from 37% in AY2012).
  - Mentor(s) assigned by College or Department increased by 8% (up from 56% in AY2012).
  - Awareness of the mentoring website increased by 7% (up from 27% in AY2012).
- Changes from the AY2012 survey results varied among the colleges.
  - COLA and CIAS increased in positive response in nearly every category.
- Changes from the AY2012 survey results varied between genders.
  - Females increased in positive response in most categories, excluding one-on-one mentoring, multiple mentors, and awareness of mentoring website.
  - Males decreased in positive response in almost all categories, excluding RIT mentors, external mentors, and awareness of mentoring website.

Table 2a. Mentoring Program Awareness and Mentoring Activity Among Respondents (AY2013)

COLLEGE	n	% w/mentor(s) at RIT	% w/mentor(s) outside RIT	% w/assigned mentor(s)	Mentoring Relationship Type				% aware of program	% aware of program website
					1 ON 1	GROUP	PEER	MULTI		
By College										
COLA	15	100%	67%	100%	93%	13%	20%	7%	100%	21%
COS	12	92%	50%	42%	75%	25%	33%	25%	100%	50%
GCCIS	4	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5
KGCOE	14	57%	50%	28%	42%	0%	17%	8%	71%	36%
NTID	3	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5
SCB	5	50%	25%	25%	75%	0%	0%	0%	60%	50%
CAST	8	88%	50%	75%	63%	50%	50%	38%	100%	50%
CIAS	12	64%	42%	83%	80%	0%	20%	10%	82%	9%
overall averages	74	**81%**	**55%**	**64%**	**75%**	**13%**	**22%**	**16%**	**89%**	**34%**
By Gender										
Female	32	**83%**	**58%**	**71%**	**77%**	**17%**	**31%**	**23%**	94%	28%
Male	31	81%	48%	52%	67%	10%	17%	10%	84%	**45%**
By Race/Ethnicity										
AALANA	10	78%	**56%**	44%	67%	0%	22%	11%	**90%**	22%
Asian	9	**100%**	**56%**	44%	**89%**	11%	0%	11%	88%	**44%**
White	40	85%	53%	**70%**	76%	**16%**	**29%**	16%	90%	33%

Table 2b. Mentoring Program Awareness and Mentoring Activity Among Respondents (AY2012)

COLLEGE	n	% w/mentor(s) at RIT	% w/mentor(s) outside RIT	% w/assigned mentor(s)	Mentoring Relationship Type				% aware of program	% aware of program website
By College										
					1 ON 1	GROUP	PEER	MULTI		
COLA	23	96%	33%	87%	91%	0%	9%	13%	91%	26%
COS	19	68%	32%	11%	53%	26%	53%	26%	74%	34%
GCCIS	7	86%	71%	86%	71%	14%	0%	0%	100%	43%
KGCOE	10	70%	20%	40%	50%	0%	0%	0%	80%	10%
NTID	9	89%	67%	56%	67%	0%	0%	33%	89%	22%
SCB	7	43%	29%	43%	43%	0%	0%	0%	71%	14%
CAST	9	89%	44%	78%	44%	67%	56%	44%	100%	44%
CIAS	5	40%	0%	40%	40%	0%	0%	0%	80%	0%
overall averages	**91**	**78%**	**37%**	**56%**	**74%**	**16%**	**22%**	**19%**	**86%**	**27%**
By Gender										
Female	40	**83%**	**38%**	**62%**	**82%**	9%	19%	**25%**	**90%**	**30%**
Male	46	76%	33%	54%	68%	**23%**	**28%**	18%	85%	24%

In filtering responses by length on the tenure-track, some interesting trends emerge. **Table 3a** lists these results by length in rank in AY2013.

Table 3a. Mentoring Program Awareness and Activity by Length on Tenure Track (AY2013)

Length on Tenure-Track	TT Faculty Count	Aware of Program	Have RIT Mentor	Assigned Mentor	One-on-one Mentor
0-1 year or less	13	77%	75%	58%	50%
2-3 years	27	93%	82%	69%	79%
4-5 years	29	89%	79%	69%	78%
Longer than 5 years	5	100%	100%	20%	100%

Table 3b. Mentoring Program Awareness and Activity by Length on Tenure Track (AY2012)

Length on Tenure-Track	TT Faculty Count	Aware of Program	Have RIT Mentor	Assigned Mentor	One-on-one Mentor
0-1 year or less	20	85%	65%	55%	45%
2-3 years	26	92%	81%	46%	73%
4-5 years	36	81%	83%	58%	67%
Longer than 5 years	9	89%	67%	67%	56%

- All hires report high levels of RIT mentorship and awareness of the mentoring program, with over 75% positive response in all length-in-rank levels.
- Faculty respondents on the tenure-track for longer than five years report the highest levels of agreement with awareness of the mentoring program, having a mentor at RIT, and participating in one-on-one mentoring. These respondents also report the lowest level of assigned mentorship.

This data generally corresponds with the timing of the roll-out of the university-level mentoring program which began in AY2010.
- Compared to the AY2012 survey, included in **Table 3b**, faculty on tenure-track for two to three years have increased in mentoring program awareness and activity.
- Compared to both the AY2012 survey and the AY2011 survey, only awareness of mentoring program in faculty on tenure-track less than two years has steadily decreased. All other areas have either steadily increased or both increased and decreased.
- Compared to only the AY2011 survey, all areas have increased except awareness of program and one-on-one mentorship in faculty on tenure-track less than two years.

Mentoring within Work Environment

Two questions illustrate the degree by which mentoring is incorporated into the working environment within colleges and departments. One asked whether conversations had occurred between the tenure-track faculty member and their college leadership regarding the importance of establishing mentoring relationships. The second focused on whether mentoring related activities were part of the faculty member's annual plan of work. **Tables 4a** and **4b** include summary response data for these questions.

Table 4a. Integration of Mentoring within Work Environment (AY2013)

COLLEGE	n	% who have discussed with dean and/or chair importance of acquiring and interacting with a mentor	% whose current POW reflects mentoring related activities
By College			
COLA	15	53%	20%
COS	12	83%	8%
GCCIS	4	n < 5	n < 5
KGCOE	14	36%	21%
NTID	3	n < 5	n < 5
SCB	5	40%	20%
CAST	8	75%	38%
CIAS	12	42%	17%
overall averages	**74**	54%	18%
By Gender			
Female	32	53%	9%
Male	31	**55%**	**32%**
By Race/Ethnicity			
AALANA	10	60%	10%
Asian	9	**88%**	**22%**
White	40	50%	20%

Table 4b. Integration of Mentoring within Work Environment (AY2012)

COLLEGE	n	% who have discussed with dean and/or chair importance of acquiring and interacting with a mentor	% whose current POW reflects mentoring related activities
By College			
COLA	23	48%	13%
COS	19	58%	32%
GCCIS	7	57%	14%
KGCOE	10	30%	20%
NTID	9	56%	33%
SCB	7	14%	14%
CAST	9	78%	33%
CIAS	5	20%	0%
overall averages	91	49%	21%
By Gender			
Female	40	**54%**	**25%**
Male	46	46%	20%

These tables include AY2013 data and AY2012 data shown by college, gender, and race/ethnicity.

- 54% of tenure-track faculty respondents indicate that they have had discussions with their administrative leadership regarding mentoring, an increase from 49% in AY2012.
- However, only 18% indicate that mentoring activities are specifically included within their annual plan of work (POW), a slight decrease from 21% in AY2012.
- A higher percentage of males (32%) responded positively to having dean discussions and POWs that include mentoring activities than their female peers (9%), a reversal of the female majorities in AY2012.
- Asian respondents reported highest integration of mentoring within their work environment.

Mentoring Relationship Characteristics

A multi-part question on this survey explored the characteristics within mentoring relationships at RIT. **Tables 5a** and **5b** include summary response data for this question by college and overall. **Tables 5a** and **5b** show results from AY2013 and AY2012, respectively, including college, gender, and race/ethnicity distinctions when available. For the AY2013 survey, two new characteristic questions were added, asking respondents to comment on their mentor's sponsorship of professional activities and initiatives. The results of these additional questions are included in their own table at the end of **Table 5a**.

- Most common characteristics:
  - Mentor is approachable and easy to talk to (82%, decreased from 88% in AY2012).
  - Mentor offers advice and encouragement (80%, increased from 75% in AY2012).
- Least common characteristics:
  - Mentor "offers advice regarding how to manage a balance between work/home life." Only 14% of respondents indicated this, a decrease from 26% in AY2012.
  - Mentor "has sponsored my participation in professional activities." 14% of respondents answered positively. This is a new question in the AY2013 survey.

Table 5a. Mentoring Relationship Characteristics (AY2013)

COLLEGE	% who describe current mentoring relationship(s) within RIT as "My mentor(s)....."								
	offers advice & encouragement wrt my goals	meets with me regularly	provides me with prompt feedback	offers constructive criticism to me	is approachable /easy to talk to	facilitates my participation in prof. act. w/in RIT	facilitates my participation in prof. act. outside of RIT	involves me in networking activities	acts as an advocate for me w/in my dept/unit
By College									
COLA	64%	57%	50%	57%	79%	29%	36%	36%	50%
COS	80%	50%	60%	40%	90%	30%	60%	50%	90%
GCCIS	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5
KGCOE	78%	22%	22%	33%	78%	22%	22%	22%	11%
NTID	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5
SCB	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5
CAST	83%	50%	67%	83%	100%	83%	33%	67%	67%
CIAS	100%	43%	71%	71%	100%	43%	29%	14%	71%
overall averages	**80%**	**46%**	**50%**	**50%**	**82%**	**36%**	**32%**	**34%**	**50%**
By Gender									
Female	**88%**	**46%**	**54%**	**58%**	83%	33%	33%	38%	**54%**
Male	80%	44%	48%	44%	**84%**	**40%**	**36%**	**40%**	44%
By Race/Ethnicity									
AALANA	85%	43%	**71%**	57%	86%	14%	**43%**	29%	**57%**
Asian	**100%**	33%	56%	33%	78%	22%	22%	22%	44%
White	77%	**44%**	44%	53%	79%	**38%**	29%	**38%**	53%

- The questions of whether a mentor "has sponsored my participation in professional activities" and "has sponsored my involvement in department, college, or institute initiatives" were added to the 2013 survey.
  - AALANA faculty had the highest response rate (29%) of RIT mentors who have sponsored their participation in professional activities
- Females identify significantly higher rates of receiving constructive criticism, encouragement to submit grant proposals and author publications, mentors who act as advocates within departments/units, teaching observation and feedback, and discussion about the tenure process.
- AALANA faculty reflect the highest response rates of having mentors who provide feedback, encouragement, and collaboration on scholarship, as well as teaching observation and feedback. White faculty discuss tenure and teaching strategies with their mentors, while making connections with other faculty through institute initiatives and other RIT activities.
- Females increased their positive responses in nine of the eighteen characteristics, compared to an increase in only five for male respondents.
- While all mentoring relationship characteristics improved between the AY2011 and AY2012 surveys, only six of the eighteen comparable questions improved from AY2012 to AY2013. Of these, the largest increase was in encouragement to submit grant proposals (by 7%).

- Other characteristics decreased in positive response, especially in discussions of teaching-related strategies (by 14%), collaboration on research, grant proposals, and/or publications (by 11%) and advice on management of work/life balance (by 12%).
- Among colleges, CAST and CIAS increased across almost all characteristics, while COLA and COS decreased in six.

Table 5a. Mentoring Relationship Characteristics (AY2013) (continued)

COLLEGE	% who describe current mentoring relationship(s) within RIT as "My mentor(s)....."								
	encourages me to submit grant proposals	encourages me to develop research ideas	encourages me to author publications	has observed me while teaching and offered feedback	discusses the tenure process with me	offers advice regarding how to balance between work/home life	discusses teaching related strategies w/me	connects me w/people who "fill in the gaps" in areas where I am less skilled	collaborates w/ me on research, grant proposals, and/or publications
By College									
COLA	50%	57%	64%	64%	64%	14%	43%	0%	21%
COS	70%	40%	80%	30%	70%	10%	30%	20%	40%
GCCIS	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5
KGCOE	33%	33%	33%	22%	56%	11%	11%	22%	22%
NTID	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5
SCB	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5
CAST	50%	83%	50%	50%	83%	33%	67%	50%	33%
CIAS	29%	43%	57%	14%	71%	14%	43%	29%	14%
overall averages	**46%**	**48%**	**57%**	**36%**	**64%**	**14%**	**32%**	**21%**	**25%**
By Gender									
Female	**54%**	**50%**	**71%**	**42%**	**71%**	13%	**38%**	13%	25%
Male	44%	48%	44%	28%	56%	**20%**	32%	**28%**	**32%**
By Race/Ethnicity									
AALANA	**57%**	**57%**	**86%**	**57%**	43%	14%	14%	14%	**43%**
Asian	44%	44%	33%	11%	56%	11%	11%	11%	11%
White	47%	47%	62%	38%	**68%**	18%	**41%**	**27%**	29%

Table 5a. Mentoring Relationship Characteristics (AY2013) (continued)

COLLEGE	% who describe current mentoring relationship(s) within RIT as "My mentor(s)....."	
	has sponsored my participation in professional activities	has sponsored my involvement in department, college, or institute initiatives
By College		
COLA	14%	21%
COS	30%	20%
GCCIS	n < 5	n < 5
KGCOE	11%	22%
NTID	n < 5	n < 5
SCB	n < 5	n < 5
CAST	17%	50%
CIAS	14%	43%
overall averages	**14%**	**23%**
By Gender		
Female	13%	17%
Male	**20%**	**28%**
By Race/Ethnicity		
AALANA	**29%**	14%
Asian	22%	11%
White	12%	**27%**

Table 5b. Mentoring Relationship Characteristics (AY2012)

COLLEGE	% who describe current mentoring relationship(s) within RIT as "My mentor(s)....."								
	offers advice & encouragement wrt my goals	meets with me regularly	provides me with prompt feedback	offers constructive criticism to me	is approachable and easy to talk to	facilitates my participation in professional activities w/in RIT	facilitates my participation in professional activities outside of RIT	involves me in networking activities	acts as an advocate for me w/in my dept/unit
By College									
COLA	65%	35%	44%	30%	83%	35%	17%	35%	48%
COS	68%	42%	53%	47%	74%	32%	37%	37%	53%
GCCIS	71%	43%	71%	43%	86%	43%	29%	43%	57%
KGCOE	20%	0%	20%	30%	50%	20%	20%	20%	30%
NTID	78%	44%	56%	44%	89%	33%	22%	44%	11%
SCB	43%	0%	0%	14%	14%	14%	0%	0%	29%
CAST	67%	44%	33%	33%	67%	33%	33%	33%	44%
CIAS	20%	20%	20%	0%	20%	20%	20%	0%	40%
overall averages	**75%**	**41%**	**52%**	**45%**	**88%**	**39%**	**32%**	**39%**	**54%**
By Gender									
Female	**82%**	38%	**56%**	44%	85%	38%	29%	**47%**	53%
Male	72%	**44%**	50%	44%	**94%**	**41%**	**38%**	31%	53%

Table 5b. Mentoring Relationship Characteristics (AY2012) (continued)

COLLEGE	% who describe current mentoring relationship(s) within RIT as "My mentor(s)....."								
	encourages me to submit grant proposals	encourages me to develop research ideas	encourages me to author publications	has observed me while teaching and offered feedback	discusses the tenure process with me	offers advice regarding how to manage a balance between work/home life	discusses teaching related strategies with me	connects me w/people who "fill in the gaps" in areas where I am less skilled	collaborates w/ me on research, grant proposals, and/or publications
By College									
COLA	26%	30%	39%	39%	61%	35%	39%	13%	26%
COS	37%	47%	53%	16%	63%	11%	47%	32%	26%
GCCIS	71%	57%	57%	14%	57%	29%	43%	29%	43%
KGCOE	40%	30%	40%	20%	40%	10%	30%	10%	10%
NTID	33%	56%	44%	56%	56%	22%	22%	44%	44%
SCB	0%	29%	14%	29%	14%	0%	29%	14%	29%
CAST	22%	22%	33%	22%	56%	22%	33%	33%	33%
CIAS	0%	20%	20%	0%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
overall averages	**39%**	**48%**	**54%**	**34%**	**67%**	**26%**	**46%**	**30%**	**36%**
By Gender									
Female	32%	**50%**	**56%**	**38%**	65%	24%	**47%**	29%	**47%**
Male	**41%**	44%	46%	31%	**66%**	**28%**	41%	**31%**	25%

Quality and Satisfaction of Mentoring Relationships

A multi-part, Likert-scale question explored the quality and the general satisfaction of mentoring relationships. Respondents indicated their level of agreement with a series of statements. **Tables 6a** and **6b** list average response data for each sub-question by college and overall for AY2013 and AY2012 respectively. The results show that

- As opposed to near-universal progress in the AY2012 survey, the AY2013 survey shows that some mentoring integration has decreased in the past year.
- For some aspects of the mentoring relationship faculty shows low agreement, especially those pertaining to evaluating the effectiveness of the relationship. Respondents say that
  - They did not evaluate the success of the mentoring relationship (with a value of 2.3 showing disagreement).
  - The meeting times and agendas did not have guidelines (2.6, showing disagreement).
  - A plan to meet specific goals was not developed (2.7, again disagreement).
- Overall averages were similar to those the AY2012 survey results, and all remained higher than the AY2011 survey results.
  - Average satisfaction in progress towards goals and frequency of meetings remained the same, while all other categories increased or decreased by an absolute value of 0.1 or 0.2.
  - COLA and KGCOE increased in five of the seven categories, only decreasing in one each.
  - COS decreased in six of the seven categories, while CIAS decreased in five.
  - COS posted the lowest score of 1.5 in success evaluation, while CIAS resulted in the high score of 4.1 in progress toward goals.

- Males indicated higher average levels of satisfaction than females in four of the categories, while the remaining three questions resulted in equal averages.
  - Females were notably less satisfied with plan development, success evaluation, and happiness with the mentoring relationship than males.
  - Females decreased in satisfaction in every category except for progress towards goals, where they remained constant, when compared to the AY2012 survey.
- Respondents identifying as Asian indicated the highest satisfaction in every category, with averages above 3.0 in all categories, signifying average agreement with every question.
- Respondents identifying as AALANA indicated the lowest satisfaction, 1.9, in success evaluation.

Table 6a. Integration of Mentoring within Work Environment and Quality/Satisfaction of Mentoring Relationship (AY2013)

COLLEGE	n	Average Level of Agreement (1 = Strongly disagree and 5 = Strongly agree)						
		I developed a plan including goals to be met under the direction/ guidance of my mentor(s).	I met or made satisfactory progress towards meeting my goals.	My mentor(s) and I discussed how we would evaluate the success of our mentoring relationship(s).	I am satisfied with the frequency of our meetings.	My mentor(s) and I established guidelines defining how often or when we would meet.	Overall, I am happy with the type of mentoring in our relationship(s).	This mentoring relationship(s) met my expectations.
By College								
COLA	15	2.6	4.0	2.2	3.2	2.6	3.3	3.4
GCCIS	4	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5
COS	12	2.3	4.0	1.5	3.1	2.1	3.7	3.4
KGCOE	14	2.7	3.4	2.5	3.2	2.7	3.2	3.3
NTID	3	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5
SCB	5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5	n < 5
CAST	8	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.6	2.5	3.6	3.4
CIAS	12	2.3	4.1	1.9	3.4	1.9	2.9	2.7
overall averages	74	2.7	3.9	2.3	3.4	2.6	3.4	3.3
By Gender								
Female	32	2.3	3.9	1.9	3.4	2.5	3.0	3.4
Male	31	**3.0**	3.9	**2.7**	3.4	**2.8**	**3.5**	3.4
By Race/Ethnicity								
AALANA	10	2.3	4.0	1.9	3.1	2.1	3.6	3.1
Asian	9	**3.7**	**4.4**	**3.6**	**4.0**	**3.1**	**4.1**	**4.3**
White	40	2.7	3.9	2.2	3.4	2.6	3.4	3.4

Table 6b. Integration of Mentoring within Work Environment and Quality/Satisfaction of Mentoring Relationship (AY2012)

COLLEGE	n	Average Level of Agreement (1 = Strongly disagree and 5 = Strongly agree)						
		I developed a plan including goals to be met under the direction/ guidance of my mentor(s).	I met or made satisfactory progress towards meeting my goals.	My mentor(s) and I discussed how we would evaluate the success of our mentoring relationship(s).	I am satisfied with the frequency of our meetings.	My mentor(s) and I established guidelines defining how often or when we would meet.	Overall, I am happy with the type of mentoring in our relationship(s).	This mentoring relationship(s) met my expectations.
By College								
COLA	23	2.5	4.0	1.6	3.1	2.3	3.6	3.3
COS	19	2.9	3.9	2.0	3.7	2.4	3.8	3.7
GCCIS	7	3.1	3.9	2.8	4.3	3.2	4.2	3.2
KGCOE	10	2.7	3.9	1.7	2.7	2.4	3.1	3.0
NTID	9	3.9	4.0	3.4	4.1	3.3	4.4	4.5
SCB	7	3.0	4.0	2.7	3.3	2.7	4.3	4.0
CAST	9	3.1	4.0	2.4	3.3	2.5	3.2	3.5
CIAS	5	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.5	3.5
overall averages	91	2.9	3.9	2.2	3.4	2.5	3.6	3.5
By Gender								
Female	40	**3.0**	3.9	2.1	3.3	**2.7**	**3.7**	3.5
Male	46	2.9	**4.1**	**2.2**	**3.6**	2.5	3.6	**3.6**

Responses to Open-ended Questions

The survey also included open-ended questions for respondents to provide comments (see **Appendix B** for full responses). In this sub-section responses to those questions are summarized.

Question (13): What were two of the most beneficial professional development activities you did with your RIT mentor(s) during this academic year? (29 respondents did not answer)

- **Professional Improvement** – Methods and techniques for instruction and scholarship were discussed, as well as work/life balance and campus resources. Class observations were conducted and discussed with feedback.
- **Grants** – Guidance in grant writing, funding, proposals, and potential programs. Some co-authored grants together.
- **Networking & Events** – Departmental politics were discussed, with some mentors acting as advocates within their college. Some attended workshops or campus fairs together, as well as serving on the same committees or seeing guest speakers together.
- **Publication** – Strategies for publication and peer-reviewed publications were beneficial.

- **Research** – Received encouragement and guidance about research and its proposals and agenda. Some performed research together.
- **Collaboration** – Papers and grant proposals were co-authored.
- **Tenure –** Guidance and advice for the tenure process and projects that relate to tenure.
- **None** – Many had not met with their mentors during the academic year.

Question (14): What is the most beneficial change you identified in yourself as a result of your RIT mentoring relationship(s)? (34 respondents did not answer)
- **Self-Improvement** – Encouragement in confidence, relaxation, and focus. Some noticed increased professional independence and productivity, such as planning and readiness to ask for help.
- **Classroom** – Learned new and improved teaching strategies, including evaluations of students' capabilities and feeling at ease in the classroom.
- **Writing** – Learned more about grant and paper writing and submissions, as well as the importance of publishing. Increased knowledge and applications for external funding.
- **Research** – Encouragement in research productivity and presenting outside of RIT. Received endorsements in research program, as well as help with research focus.
- **Tenure** – Grew comfortable with and more knowledgeable about tenure activities, expectations, and priorities.
- **None**

Question (15): What are three or more points of guidance from your RIT mentor(s) that you believe were the most helpful this academic year, and why? (38 respondents did not answer)
- **Personal Improvement** - Time management, focus, and preparation were important points made by mentors. Additional teaching skills and techniques such as lecture delivery and course planning were helpful, as were the mentor's encouragement, pride, and recognition of their mentees.
- **Networking** – Mentors provided and facilitated great networking opportunities, especially across colleges and with students. Peer mentoring was stressed to add variety in scholarship and teaching.
- **Student Help** - Mentors stressed the importance of expectations for students, and working with them jointly on research. Discussions were held about teaching Deaf or Hard of Hearing students, as well as techniques for handling difficult students.
- **Additional Help** - In publishing, grant writing, external funding sources, research, service, and the tenure process, mentors provided guidance and assistance to faculty members.

Question (16): If applicable, offer suggestions on how your RIT mentoring relationship(s) could be more effective. (41 respondents did not answer).
- **Fifteen (15)** out of thirty-three (33) mentees (45%) wish that there were more structured guidelines for the Faculty Mentoring Program. There does not appear to be a formal definition of the expectations of a mentor, and this inhibits the program from effectiveness. Multiple mentors across colleges or departments could be beneficial to meet the needs of a mentee.
- **Thirteen (13)** out of thirty-three (33) mentees (39%) indicted that they were unaware of the Faculty Mentoring Program, had never been assigned a mentor, or had very limited meetings or engagement with their assigned mentors. These mentees either were assigned their department head/chair as their mentor, or solely used non-RIT mentors. Some mentors were helpful only in certain professional areas, such as publishing, and were not necessary for other needs.

- **Five (5)** out of thirty-three (33) mentees feel that the Faculty Mentoring Program is too structured and/or too formal. They believe that mentors should not be assigned at all, and mentee should either be able to choose their own mentor or prefer peer mentoring. Mentoring can create tension between senior and junior faculty, as RIT's shifted focus on research causes misunderstandings between tenured and tenure-track faculty. If other networking opportunities were offered, or peer mentoring was stressed, the mentoring program may be more successful.

Appendix C: Faculty Mentoring @RIT Program Timeline

Mentoring Program Component	Year 1: Academic Year 2011-2012	Year 2: Academic Year 2012-2013	Year 3: Academic Year 2013-2014
Key Changes	Program launches for new faculty cohort – tenure track faculty.	- All tenure track / tenured faculty are included. - NSF Advance RIT partnership begins. - FCDS takes over coordination (formerly with TLS/Faculty Associates).	- Non-tenure track faculty included in all. - New survey conducted.
Communication/ Delivery	Mentoring program introduced at a special session at New Faculty Orientation (NFO).	Faculty feedback from NFO 2011 guides modifications to 2012 mentoring session.	- NFO mentoring session slightly revised. - *Protégé* eliminated; *Mentee* used.
Resources	New website and print/online mentoring guidebooks available for new faculty, mentors and department heads.	Website moved from Provost's site to live under Faculty Career Development Services.	- Printed resources moved online to FCDS mentoring website; replaced with new one-page brochure. - New faculty-authored articles added to site.
Mentoring Activities	Structured series of events (one per quarter) offered for the *new faculty cohort, tenure track faculty* only.	As a result of feedback, *all tenure-track (pre-tenure and tenured)* faculty are included, allowing this population to take advantage of mentoring, networking and potential ad hoc mentoring relationships.	- Campus COACHE and Climate surveys drive the team to broaden all mentoring program offerings to include non-tenure track faculty (in an effort to be responsive to their needs). - Panel event added for faculty *mentors*, targeting mid-career faculty; strategies and best practices on the mentor-mentee relationship - *FCDS Faculty Success Series* launched.
Mentoring Grants	Grants awarded: 6	Grants awarded: 5	Grants awarded: 10
Provost's Excellence in Faculty Mentoring Award	1st recipient, spring 2012	5 faculty receive award, spring 2013	5 faculty receive award, spring 2014
Surveys/Feedback	Faculty Associates conduct College Mentoring Survey (Year 1) to all tenure-track faculty.	NSF AdvanceRIT partners with FCDS for College Mentoring Survey (Year 2) dissemination and analysis to tenure-track faculty.	- FCDS conducts College Mentoring Questionnaire[1] to all deans, leading to increased awareness of what is occurring campus-wide in each college. - NSF AdvanceRIT completes College Mentoring Survey (tenure-track faculty).
Partners/Collaboration		Partnership begins with NSF AdvanceRIT team to refine the program, consistent with their "Human Resources Strategic Approach" (specifically, "HR1. Refine the RIT Faculty Mentoring Network").	FCDS provides support to NSF AdvanceRIT mentoring initiatives (events, publication, newsletter, etc.)

---

[1] Current Practices in Faculty Mentoring at RIT: A Summary of 2013 Questionnaire Results, November 2013