



Program Report
Faculty Mentoring @ RIT
Year 2 - Academic Year 2012-2013

Faculty Career Development Services
The Wallace Center

July 16, 2013

Anne Marie Canale
Cheryl Herdklotz
Lynn Wild

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
2012-2013 Faculty Survey on Mentoring at RIT	3
Current Status of Mentoring Resources and Support	4
Summary of Faculty Mentoring Events AY 2012-2013	5
Recommendations for Mentoring Programming, Academic Year 2013-2014	7
Conclusion	8

Appendix A: Mentoring Survey 2012-2013 - Executive Summary and Survey Results

Appendix B: Overall Feedback from Mentoring Events, AY 2012-2013

Appendix C: Feedback from Mentoring Awardee Focus Group, May 2013

Introduction

The **Faculty Mentoring @ RIT** program launched in 2011 with a structured series of events, resources, and recognition to support tenure-track faculty at RIT. Based on feedback and assessment from Year 1, significant changes came the second year that proved to boost attendance and build awareness of the program campus wide. For example in Year 1, only the new cohorts of faculty were invited to participate in programming (approximately 60). In Year 2, invitations were open to all faculty (pre-tenure and tenured) to allow for more informal networking and potential ad hoc mentoring relationships for faculty at all ranks. Faculty Career Development Services (FCDS) took the lead in creating and developing the mentoring opportunities for Academic Year 2012-2013 described in this report. In addition, FCDS began a partnership with the NSF ADVANCE Grant *Connect@RIT* team in 2012 to collaborate on refining the program, consistent with their Human Resources Strategic Approach for the NSF grant (specifically, “HR1. Refine the RIT Faculty Mentoring Network”).

2012-2013 Faculty Survey on Mentoring at RIT

For the second year, RIT faculty were surveyed on their mentoring experiences at RIT. All tenure-track faculty (194) were surveyed via the Provost’s office using an online instrument. Survey questions were designed to gain a better understanding of how mentoring relationships *form* at RIT, the *quality and nature* of these relationships, the protégé’s *level of satisfaction* with these relationships, and on their experience with the Mentoring Program. Feedback is being considered as the FCDS and ADVANCE teams collaborate to refine and build the **Faculty Mentoring @ RIT** program. The Executive Summary and survey results compiled by Margaret Bailey, Faculty Associate for Women and PI – NSF ADVANCE, and Carol Marchetti, co-PI NSF ADVANCE are available in Appendix A of this document.

In addition to the statistical results of the survey questions found in Appendix A, faculty responded to four open-ended questions revealing their thoughts on *changes identified in mentees, best guidance received, most beneficial activities with mentors, and suggestions for improving mentoring relationships*. Select excerpts from the survey are listed on the following page.

Changes Identified in Mentees

- *Better communication skills both in the classroom and professionally*
- *Capacity to better balance activities and comfort with the tenure process.*

Best Guidance Received

- *A clear plan of action for scholarship, networking and building relationships*
- *Guidance related to tenure and RITs governing structure.*

Most Beneficial Activities with Mentors

- *Advice on tenure and promotion*
- *General professional guidance*
- *Direction on scholarship and research*

Suggestions For Improving Mentoring Relationships

- *Assure selection of a mentor for each untenured faculty*
- *Need a more formal definition of the mentor's role*
- *Outline expectations for mentoring in plans of work for both mentor and mentee*
- *Consider mentors for teaching vs. Scholarship in different colleges or areas of expertise*
- *Build better awareness of the RIT mentoring program.*

Current Status of Mentoring Resources and Support

The **Faculty Mentoring @RIT** program includes resources, funding, awards, and events designed to support faculty in building and fostering mentoring relationships. The status of each area is listed below:

- **Faculty Mentoring @ RIT Website** – the site was redesigned in 2012 and migrated to the main FCDS site. , The website will be enhanced with testimonials and photos from the mentoring grant and award recipients, and references to the NSF ADVANCE grant collaboration. Another key resource, the *Faculty Mentoring Guidebooks*, are available online.
- **Mentoring Grants Funded by Provost** - For the second year, the Provost provided funds to support the efforts of formal and informal mentoring groups. Due to the outstanding caliber of project requests, the Provost approved additional one-time funds to award \$13,720 this year, compared to \$4,850 last year. The selection committee included Lynn Wild (chair), Margaret Bailey, Mary Lou Basile, Daniel Johnson, Tom Reichlmayr, and Patrick Scanlon who reviewed the 25 proposals. The grant recipients are required to submit a report on how funds were used which will be posted on the mentoring website in summer 2013. The

exceptional project proposals will continue to support the mentoring program and further develop awareness of the value of mentoring for all ranks of faculty.

- **Provost's Excellence in Faculty Mentoring Award** – this award was established to recognize an RIT faculty who demonstrates an outstanding commitment to mentoring by actively helping non-tenured, tenure-track faculty in developing their career(s) at RIT by offering advice, feedback and guidance that reflects a deep understanding of their department, college and university. Due to the exceptional and inspiring nomination packages submitted, five faculty received this prestigious award up from one award last year, selected by the same committee as the Mentoring Grants.

Summary of Faculty Mentoring Events AY 2012-2013

A main strategy to assist new faculty in building their mentoring networks was to provide at least one event per quarter, listed below. Seven mentoring-related events were held in 2012-2013. Feedback from faculty attending these events can be found in Appendix B.

Faculty Mentoring Events Held AY 2012-2013		
Event & Date	Attendees	Notes
New Faculty Orientation (NFO) <i>8/22/12</i>	65	New Faculty are first introduced to RIT's faculty mentoring program and resources at NFO. Faculty receive copies of the guidebook and a list of upcoming events.
Faculty "Mixer" <i>9/18/12, 3-4:30 pm</i>	36 (2012) 29 (2011)	Social reception to bring together new faculty with the previous year's cohort. New this year, cohorts from the previous 4 years were invited.
"Summon" Open House <i>11/1/12, 3-4:30 pm</i>	67	All RIT faculty were invited to this open house at The Wallace Center for a hands-on demonstration of this new tool, and to network with resource librarians and other TWC staff.
Preparing for Mid-Tenure Review <i>1/31/13, 3-4:30 pm</i>	40 (2013) 15 (2012)	The Provost welcomed the group with an overview of the tenure process. This was an opportunity for pre-tenure faculty to learn from tenured faculty. Topics: Goals of the third-year comprehensive review, Selection of tenure reviewers, Required documentation for the dossier. Panelists from COLA, CIAS, KGCOE, COS, and Saunders.

Faculty Mentoring Events Held AY 2012-2013		
Event & Date	Attendees	Notes
Celebration of Teaching Awards Ceremony 5/7/13	5 awards	Mentoring Award Recipients were honored at Celebration of Teaching annual event and received a \$1000 cash award and framed certificate: Bob Barbato, Chris Collison, Rob Garrick, Anne Haake, Todd Pagano
Focus Group with Mentoring Awardees and Nominees 5/23/13	5 faculty	FCDS and ADVANCE teams conducted a focus group to learn best practices from our Mentoring Award nominees and recipients. Results can be found in Appendix C. Attendees: Bob Barbato, Mary Lou Basile, Chris Collison, Rob Garrick, Anne Haake
3rd Annual Provost's "Meet the Scholars" Launch 5/14/13, 3:30-5:30 pm	56 registered	Reception to launch the faculty scholarship report, reflect on previous year's successes, and showcase our valued faculty members whose research efforts continue to promote innovation, collaboration and discovery; a unique opportunity to network and develop relationships

Recommendations for Mentoring Programming, Academic Year 2013-2014

Based on feedback from past events and the faculty survey referenced in Appendix A, the FCDS team proposes the following curriculum for AY 2013-2014. Additional events co-hosted with ADVANCE to be determined.

Recommendations for Mentoring Events, AY 2013-14	
Event/Resource	Comments
Faculty Mentoring @ RIT Session at New Faculty Orientation 8/14/13	Based on feedback from NFO participants, new faculty found this session valuable but wanted more time spent on the topic. <i>Therefore, the FCDS team has increased the time and depth of this session for NFO 2013.</i>
Deans Council Discussion TBD	Debrief on mentoring assessment and feedback.
Department Head/Chair Meeting TBD	Debrief on mentoring assessment and feedback
“Power” Reception 9/13/13	New Faculty will be have the opportunity to begin their networking by attending a Power Reception with key leadership at RIT – President Destler, Provost Haefner, Deans, Associate Deans, etc.
Publishing Support @ TWC 11/13/13	Open House to highlight publishing support in the Wallace Center for faculty.
Destination Intersession: Your Ticket to Paradise 1/ 2-24/14	Series of professional development events for all RIT faculty currently being designed in collaboration with ILI, SRS, ADVANCE, Office of Sustainability, etc.
Preparing for Mid-Tenure Review 2/13/14	Panelists will be invited to represent all colleges. Attendance by deans/chairs/department heads will be encouraged.
So, You Want to be a Mentor? 3/13/14	Panel discussion with senior faculty who have been successful as mentors geared toward tenured faculty who are interested in serving as mentors.
4th Annual “Meet the Scholars” Reception 5/14 (TBD)	Reception to launch the faculty scholarship report; a unique opportunity to network and develop relationships.

Conclusion

Faculty Career Development Services will continue to lead programming for the **Faculty Mentoring @ RIT** program following the original Implementation Plan with changes as noted in preceding paragraphs. In addition, the FCDS team will be working closely with NSF ADVANCE team to refine and improve the program going forward. Each mentoring program and event will be evaluated as to its usefulness and value for RIT faculty mentors/mentees, and to guide our future programs.

APPENDIX A Executive Summary AY 2012

Faculty Mentoring Program Assessment – AY 2012

Margaret Bailey, Renee Baker, Chance Glenn

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 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 protégé's *level of satisfaction* with these relationships. Results from the AY2011 survey are described in the document, "Faculty Mentoring Program Assessment – AY 2011". The AY2012 survey introduced a question asking for the respondent's gender, and in the AY2012 spring quarter, the provost's office administered this survey to all 194 tenure-track faculty at RIT using a web-based survey resource. The survey response rate was 47% and the survey was open for approximately four weeks.

Significant findings from the AY2012 survey include:

Finding	AY2012	AY2011
Gender	44% female 51% male 5% declined to answer	Not asked in the survey
Females had generally higher awareness and activity in the mentoring program than males.		
Increase in Percent Who Have an RIT Mentor	78% overall Varied by college (96% to 40%)	72%
Faculty respondents on the tenure-track for two to five years report the highest levels of agreement with having a mentor at RIT (same as AY2011 result).		
Increase in Percent Who Know about the RIT Faculty Mentoring Program	86% overall Varied by college (100% to 71%)	75%
Faculty members of all lengths on tenure-track reported similar awareness of the mentoring program, a change from highest levels of awareness being found in more recent hires in AY2011.		
Increase in Most Common Type of Mentoring Relationship	74% traditional one-on-one protégé/mentor relationship	59% traditional one-on-one protégé/mentor relationship
Decrease in Percent Who Have Discussed Mentoring with Administrative Leadership	49%	62%
Slight Increase in Percent for Whom Mentoring Activities are Specifically Included in the Annual Plan of Work	21%	20%
Increase in Percent for Whom Mentor Offers Advice and Encouragement AND Is Easy to Talk to	75% and 88%	59% and 59%
Increase in Percent for Whom Mentor Discusses Work/Life Balance	26%	20%
Increase in Percent for Whom Mentor Makes Introductions with Others to Help	30%	15%

Compared to the AY2011 survey, the AY2012 yielded the following comparisons:

- Most tenure-track faculty agree with the statement “mentoring relationship met expectations” compared to general disagreement in AY2011.
- Overall response rate decreased by 8% from 55% to 47%.
- Awareness of the RIT Mentoring program increased by 11%. The gap between RIT mentors and non-RIT mentors widened, as percentage of RIT mentors increased by 6% and non-RIT mentors decreased slightly.
- More experienced tenure-track faculty members are growing more aware of the mentoring program, though among new faculty awareness is decreasing.
- Relationship characteristics between mentors and mentees have strengthened in all areas, as has satisfaction with the mentoring program.

AY2012 Report

This report explores faculty responses for each survey question. Overall average response values are provided, as well as average responses by college, gender and length on tenure-track, where relevant.

Key

We compare the results of the AY2012 survey with the previous AY2011 survey, highlighting changes based on increase or decrease. If the percentage of respondents increased for a single question, the appropriate cell is highlighted in **GREEN**. For example, the percentage of respondents in COS increased from 51% to 59%, so the corresponding 59% cell is highlighted in **GREEN**. Alternately, if a response decreased from the AY2011 survey, the cell is highlighted in **RED**.

For gender comparisons, the gender with a higher rate of positive response is noted in each question. This is shown by a cell highlighted in **ORANGE**. For example, 83% of female respondents have RIT mentors, as opposed to 76% of male respondents. Therefore, the 83% cell in the “Female” row is highlighted in **ORANGE**. Statistical significance is not shown through this notation, but basic difference in the responses of genders is presented.

Survey Administration

In the spring quarter of AY2012, the provost’s office administered a survey to the tenure-track faculty at RIT using the RIT Clipboard on-line survey resource. **Appendices A and B** include copies of the survey instrument and the administration invitation plan, respectively. **Appendix C** includes the overall survey response results by count.

The overall survey participation rate was 47% (91/194) with the highest college-level participation from COS faculty (59%) and the lowest level from CIAS faculty (22%). Most response rates decreased from the previous year, though COS, SCOB, and KGCOE increased. Overall response was down 8% from 55% in AY2011. **Table 1** lists the survey response rate breakdown by college and overall.

Table 1. TT Faculty Mentoring Survey Response Rates by RIT College for AY2011 and AY2012 Surveys

College	TT Faculty Count	Response Count Final	Response Rate by College (AY2012)	Response Rate by College (AY2011)
CAST	19	9	47%	59%
CIAS	23	5	22%	47%
COLA	40	23	58%	64%
COS	32	19	59%	51%
SCOB	16	7	44%	36%
KGCOE	21	10	48%	45%
CHST	4	1	25%	50%
GCCIS	17	7	41%	59%
GIS	3	0	0%	67%
Multi Studies	0	0	0%	0%
NTID	16	9	56%	76%
Provost	2	0	0%	---
Unanswered	1	1	---%	---
Total	194	91	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 AY2012 results stratified by college and by gender, and **Table 2b** shows the AY2011 results. 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, 78% indicated having an RIT mentor (70/90 with one unanswered). However, this varied by college with high reported values of 96% within COLA and 89% in NTID and CAST and a low of 40% in CIAS.
- General awareness of the RIT Faculty Mentoring Program had similar results, with 86% of respondents indicating awareness, with some variability among colleges (for example, 100% of GCCIS and CAST faculty respondents are aware compared to 71% in SCOB.)
- Over half of the faculty respondents (56%) indicate that their college/department assigned a mentor (again there is significant variability reported by college with a high of 87% in COLA and a low of 11% in COS).
- The most common type of mentoring relationship reported at 74% is the traditional one-on-one protégé/mentor relationship with the remaining types (group, peer, multiple mentors) at similar representations of 16-22%.
- Females showed higher awareness and activity within the mentoring program in almost all areas, only falling below males in group- and peer-mentoring.
- For the individual questions...
 - Program awareness has increased by 11% (up from 75%).
 - One-on-one mentoring relationships have increased by 15% (from 59%).
 - Percentage of faculty with RIT mentors has increased by 6% (from 72%).
 - Most other changes were negligible.
- Changes from the AY2011 survey results varied among the colleges.
 - CIAS has decreased in positive response in nearly every category.
 - GCCIS has increased in nearly every category.

Table 2a. Mentoring Program Awareness and Mentoring Activity Among Respondents (AY2012)										
COLLEGE	n	% with mentor(s) at RIT	% with mentor(s) outside of RIT	% with mentor(s) assigned by College or Dept	Mentoring Relationship Type				% aware of the faculty mentoring program	% aware of mentoring 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%
SCOB	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%

Table 2b. Mentoring Program Awareness and Mentoring Activity Among Respondents (AY2011)										
COLLEGE	n	% with mentor(s) at RIT	% with mentor(s) outside of RIT	% with mentor(s) assigned by College or Dept	Mentoring Relationship Type				% aware of the faculty mentoring program	% aware of mentoring website
					1 ON 1	GROUP	PEER	MULTI		
COLA	23	96%	48%	83%	78%	13%	9%	13%	91%	35%
COS	18	67%	33%	28%	61%	33%	28%	28%	83%	50%
GCCIS	10	60%	50%	70%	60%	10%	10%	0%	90%	40%
KGCOE	10	80%	30%	60%	50%	20%	0%	10%	70%	20%
NTID	13	62%	31%	23%	54%	0%	23%	8%	62%	31%
SCOB	5	80%	40%	80%	60%	0%	0%	20%	80%	40%
CAST	10	90%	40%	90%	60%	40%	40%	30%	90%	10%
CIAS	9	44%	22%	44%	44%	11%	11%	22%	22%	0%
overall averages	102	72%	38%	56%	59%	17%	16%	16%	75%	30%

In filtering responses by length on the tenure-track, some interesting trends emerge. **Table 2c** lists these results by length in rank in AY2012.

- All hires report high levels of awareness of the mentoring program, with at over 80% awareness in all ranks.
- Faculty respondents on the tenure-track for two to five years report the highest levels of agreement with having a mentor at RIT and participating in one-on-one mentoring.
- Faculty on tenure-track longer than five years reported the highest level of agreement in being assigned a mentor.

This data generally corresponds with the timing of the roll-out of the university-level mentoring program which began in AY2010. Compared to the AY2011 survey, included in **Table 2d**, faculty on tenure-track four years or more have increased in all areas, while those with one year or less have decreased in all areas except mentor assignment.

Table 2c. 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%

Table 2d. Mentoring Program Awareness and Activity by Length on Tenure Track (AY2011)

Length on Tenure-Track	TT Faculty Count	Aware of Program	Have RIT Mentor	Assigned Mentor	One-on-one Mentor
0-1 year or less	16	94%	69%	50%	56%
2-3 years	26	76%	78%	63%	70%
4-5 years	28	75%	73%	54%	50%
Longer than 5 years	11	55%	55%	36%	36%

Mentoring within Working Environment

Two of the questions on the survey were added to illustrate the degree by which mentoring is incorporated into the working environment within colleges and departments. One question asked whether conversations had occurred between the tenure-track faculty member and their college leadership regarding the importance of establishing mentoring relationships. The second question focused on whether mentoring related activities were part of the faculty member's annual plan of work.

Table 3a and **Table 3b** include summary response data for these questions. **Table 3a** includes AY2012 data shown by college and by gender, while **Table 3b** shows AY2011 results by college.

- 49% of the tenure-track faculty respondents indicating that they have had discussions with their administrative leadership regarding mentoring, a decrease from 62% in AY2011
- However, only 21% indicate that mentoring activities are specifically included within their annual plan of work (POW), a slight increase from 20% in AY2011.
- A higher percentage of females responded positively to having dean discussions and POWs that include mentoring activities than their male peers.
- **Table 3a** includes AY2012 data shown by college and by gender, while **Table 3b** shows AY2011 results by college.

Table 3a. 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%
SCOB	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%

Table 3b. Integration of Mentoring within Work Environment (AY2011)

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	74%	17%
COS	18	78%	28%
GCCIS	10	50%	0%
KGCOE	10	60%	10%
NTID	13	38%	38%
SCOB	5	40%	20%
CAST	10	90%	30%
CIAS	9	44%	11%
overall averages	102	62%	20%

Mentoring Relationship Characteristics

A multi-part question on the survey explored the characteristics within mentoring relationships at RIT.

Tables 4a and **4b** include summary response data for this question by college and overall. **Table 4a** shows results from AY2012, including college and gender distinctions. **Table 4b** contains AY2011 results.

- Most common characteristics:
 - Mentors offer advice and encouragement (75%)
 - Mentor is approachable and easy to talk to (88%).
- Least common characteristics:
 - Mentor “discussed balance between work/home life”. Only 26% of respondents indicated this, increased from 20% in AY2011.

- Mentor who “makes introductions with others in order to help fill in the gaps”, with 30% indicating this characteristic, an increase from 15% in AY2011.
- The question of whether the mentor “collaborated with [the faculty member] on research, grants proposals, and/or publications” was added to the survey.
- Females identify significantly higher rates of receiving advice and encouragement, involvement in networking activities, publication encouragement, and collaboration with their mentors.
- All mentoring relationship characteristics have improved since the AY2011 survey, especially the categories of approachability (by 29%), advocacy within department (by 20%), and tenure process discussion (by 23%).
- Among the colleges, COLA has increased in almost every category, while SCOB, CAST, and CIAS decreased in most categories.

Table 4a. 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%
SCOB	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%
Table 4a. 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%
SCOB	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 4b. Mentoring Relationship Characteristics (AY2011)									
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	
By College									
COLA	70%	9%	9%	13%	22%	13%	9%	9%	
COS	67%	33%	39%	50%	67%	39%	28%	33%	
GCCIS	50%	30%	20%	30%	50%	50%	20%	50%	
KGCOE	50%	30%	40%	40%	60%	30%	20%	20%	
NTID	69%	23%	38%	38%	46%	15%	23%	15%	
SCOB	60%	20%	20%	20%	60%	20%	0%	0%	
CAST	70%	30%	40%	40%	70%	40%	30%	50%	
CIAS	33%	44%	33%	33%	44%	22%	11%	11%	
overall averages	59%	34%	35%	39%	59%	32%	22%	27%	
Table 4b. Mentoring Relationship Characteristics (AY2011) (continued)									
COLLEGE	% who describe current mentoring relationship(s) within RIT as "My mentor(s)....."								
	acts as an advocate for me w/in my dept/unit	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
By College									
COLA	9%	9%	13%	13%	13%	26%	9%	13%	0%
COS	44%	39%	39%	50%	22%	33%	17%	28%	17%
GCCIS	30%	40%	40%	40%	10%	30%	30%	50%	10%
KGCOE	20%	40%	30%	30%	20%	40%	50%	20%	20%
NTID	31%	15%	46%	46%	31%	31%	0%	31%	15%
SCOB	20%	20%	40%	40%	20%	40%	20%	60%	20%
CAST	50%	50%	60%	50%	30%	60%	20%	30%	20%
CIAS	22%	33%	33%	22%	22%	22%	0%	0%	11%
overall averages	34%	34%	42%	43%	25%	44%	20%	31%	15%

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 5a** and **5b** list average response data for each sub-question by college and overall for AY2012 and AY2011 respectively. The results show that

- There is near-universal agreement across the colleges that progress was made towards the faculty's goals under the direction/guidance of a mentor.
- For some aspects of the mentoring relationship faculty showed 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 2.2 showing disagreement).
 - The meeting times and agendas did not have guidelines (2.5, again disagreement).
- However, all averages increased from the AY2011 survey in which no averages were above 3.0.
 - Average satisfaction in progress towards goals increased by 1.2 points.
 - Most colleges increased in all areas of mentoring satisfaction, though COLA decreased in five of the seven categories.
 - COLA posted the lowest score of 1.6 in any one category, while NTID resulted in the high score of 4.5.
- Generally, males and females indicated similar average levels of satisfaction, though females were notably less satisfied with mentoring meeting frequency than males.

Table 5a. 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
SCOB	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
Table 5b. Integration of Mentoring within Work Environment and Quality/Satisfaction of Mentoring Relationship (AY2011)								
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	3.0	3.5	2.0	3.3	2.3	3.7	3.8
COS	18	2.7	3.1	1.6	2.8	1.8	2.9	2.8
GCCIS	10	1.9	2.6	1.3	2.1	1.3	2.6	2.5
KGCOE	10	2.4	2.9	1.6	3.1	3.0	3.4	3.5
NTID	13	2.2	2.9	1.8	2.4	1.5	2.7	2.5
SCOB	5	2.2	1.8	1.8	2.2	1.8	2.9	2.6
CAST	10	2.6	3.0	2.4	3.2	2.7	3.4	3.1
CIAS	9	1.3	2.3	1.3	2.1	1.1	1.9	2.1
overall averages	102	2.2	2.7	1.7	2.6	1.8	2.8	2.7

Responses to Open-ended Questions

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

Question (14): What were two of the most beneficial development activities you did with your RIT mentor(s) during this academic year? (39 respondents did not answer)

- Tenure - Guidance and advice for the tenure application, process, requirements, review, and importance.
- Grants - Guidance in grant writing, funding, proposals, and potential programs. Some coauthored grants together.
- Research - Received encouragement and guidance about research and its proposals and agenda. Some performed research together.
- Networking - Provided references and connections with other faculty. Departmental politics were discussed, as well as the semester conversion and RIT as a whole.
- Collaboration - Papers and grant proposals were co-authored.
- Professional Improvement - Teaching methods and techniques were discussed, as well as work/life balance and external opportunities. Class observations were conducted and discussed with feedback.
- Publication - Strategies for publication and peer-reviewed publications were beneficial.
- None - Many had not met with their mentors during the academic year.

Question (15): What is the most beneficial change you identified in yourself as a result of your RIT mentoring relationship(s)? (38 respondents did not answer)

- Self-Improvement - Increased confidence, concentration, and focus. Became more professionally outgoing and more structured. Some noticed increased professional independence and balance, such as planning and clarity of thinking.
- Networking - Faculty understood internal politics better, and met many people through their mentors. They felt supported by their peers and established better relationships.
- Tenure - Grew comfortable with and more knowledgeable about tenure activities, expectations, and organization.
- Classroom - Learned new and improved teaching strategies, and grew experimental in the classroom.
- Writing - Learned more about grant and paper writing, as well as the importance of publishing. Increased knowledge and applications to external funding.
- None

Question (16): 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? (49 respondents did not answer)

- Student Help - Mentors stressed the importance of student priority, and that the students should be challenged. Help was given about advising the students, as both professors and mentors.
- Personal Improvement - Time management, focus, and preparation were important points made by mentors. Additional teaching skills and techniques were helpful, as well as grant proposal writing.
- Collaboration and Support - Mentors provided great networking possibilities and offered support to faculty in their research and scholarship.
- Additional Help - In publishing, grant writing, external funding sources, research, and scholarship, mentors provided guidance and assistance to faculty members.

Question (17): If applicable, offer suggestions on how your RIT mentoring relationship(s) could be more effective. (47 respondents did not answer).

- Fifteen (15) out of forty-four (44) mentees 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. Mentors should also meet with their mentees more often, as the latter feels that the time spent together is brief.
- For mentor assignments, there appear to be two camps:
 1. When a mentor is assigned, they should be appropriate to the wants and needs of the mentee, especially the specialization of the mentees scholarship or research. They should also be actively interested in mentoring. These mentors may have to be sought from various departments and colleges, as some mentees feel their department lacks size and/or experience. Department heads or deans may have to become responsible for mentoring plans. Some faculty members have had poor experience with their mentor, if they were assigned one at all. They found the mentor passive, or inappropriately assigned.
 2. Mentors should not be assigned at all, and mentees should either be able to choose their own mentor or prefer peer mentoring. Information sharing between coworkers can be more effective than a single source, as assigned mentors may not have the breadth of knowledge required for a mentees scholarship or research. Departments that do not have a long history will benefit from peer mentoring, as they would be inexperienced in some instances. Because the tenure process has changed over time, experienced mentors may not be reliable in helping newer faculty through the altered tenure process.

- Nine (9) out of forty-four (44) faculty members implied that they were unaware of the Faculty Mentoring Program, or had never been assigned a mentor. Issues that were mentioned include being caught in a transition period or a fear that tenure will be affected if there is not a sufficient mentoring relationship. Five (5) respondents feel that there should be no mentoring program, as it may distract from scholarship and research. They may not have the time or funds to seek a mentor while completing other requirements.

Proposed Faculty Mentoring Program Refinement

1. Create a communication plan to disseminate annual mentoring program evaluation results and related action items.
2. Develop a plan to create action items for overall program refinement each year based on the annual evaluation process. Action items should be assembled in a manner to aid in buy-in and encourage adoption and participation. Leverage the ADVANCE grant to refine the overall program and specifically the areas that impact female faculty significantly.
3. Start the process for IRB approval early in the fall semester.
4. Administer the survey beginning in early APR 2014.
5. Involve the Wallace Center in the survey administration process.
6. Add options to question 12 to address sponsorship (defined as action taken by a mentor to provide opportunities for career advancement).
 12. Please describe your current mentoring relationship(s) within RIT by selecting the following statements (select all that apply) which accurately complete the following: "My mentor(s)....."
 - has sponsored my participation in professional activities.
 - has sponsored my involvement in department, college, or institute initiatives.
7. Move question 2 (What is your gender?) to the end of the survey instrument.
8. Add two demographic questions at the end of the survey.
 - X. What is your hearing status?
 - deaf
 - hard of hearing
 - hearing
 - decline to answer
 - Y. What is your ethnicity?
 - AALANA (African American, Latin American, or Native American)
 - Asian
 - White
 - Other: specify _____
 - decline to answer

Appendix B: Overall Mentoring Event Feedback

New Faculty Mixer Feedback, September 2012

Q: What did you like most about this event?

- Knowing about new services at RIT that I wasn't aware ...
- Be able to hear and share our experiences of teaching in a classroom environment for the first time. Also share tips, tricks and example of using RIT provided faculty tools.
- It was a few weeks after orientation. This gives me a chance to reconnect with people I had met at orientation who are not in my school.
- The event was a defined block of time to interact with other new faculty outside of my department/college.
- I really enjoyed seeing faculty that I met at orientation last year that I have not seen since.
- The opportunity to network with my peers.
- Strengthens the feeling of mutual support: you are not alone out there.
- It was nice to meet my new colleagues, but it would have been more productive, if more of the last year's cohort had attended the event and provided structured advice.
- Great work! I really enjoyed it... Thanks

Q: How could we improve this event in the future?

- Encourage more faculty to attend....
- There were quite a few schedule conflicts from other new faculty who are unable to make to the mixers. I would suggest creating a 2nd new faculty mixer for those who miss the first event.
- Encourage exchange of contact information
- I can't think of any suggestions.
- Have more structured activities. Maybe a panel of new and old faculty members. Q &A session.

SUMMON Open House, November 2012

Q: What did you like MOST about this event?

- The relaxed, social environment. Probably we can't have wine every time (but if we can, let's do it!), but coffee and cookies help a lot.
- While it was a classy social event, and social interactions are important, the technical material covered was exceedingly well done. It would have been worth it based on technical content alone.

- I enjoyed the casual setting of the event and the helpful nature of the Wallace Center staff.
- The casual atmosphere and still the ability to use the application and learn. It was intimate and created an environment that fostered learning.
- Enthusiasm of library staff
- I liked the refreshments and the social atmosphere.
- The information was great as was the staff. Lynn Wild is a gem and has done a fabulous job with the Wallace Center.
- One of the things I liked best was the venue. We have an amazing library, and having an event there highlighted hidden gems like the Cary Collection. I also liked that the research librarians, and the development team that worked on the project was there. Traub (one of the developers) was on hand to answer my technical questions, and Jen Freer did a fantastic job explaining the project from a high-level.
 1. Fellowship (the chance to see and talk to colleagues in other departments and colleges)
 2. The opportunity to gain information on "Summon;" from a Wallace Library Associate who happens to be our department/college Library Representative.
 3. Wine
 4. Munchies (Cheese and Crackers)
- The fact that it offered the presentation again and again, which was convenient for those whose schedules varied widely and enabled some social interaction concurrently.
- The opportunity to meet staff from the Wallace Center
- Good wine and cheese ... this really set the mood for interaction ... I would attend more of these

Q: How could we improve this event in the future?

- Name tags that indicate faculty or staff, college, and new or current faculty
- People generally spoke with those they already knew from what I saw. Some way of getting folks to mix [like] at the mixer are needed.
- I think the expectation of this being a Social mixer / networking event was not portrayed well in the announcements. My attention was well placed on the Summon tool and it's relevance to my work as a faculty member. I assumed everyone was in this mindset as well so I didn't seek out new connections in the way I would have with a clearer intent.
- I liked it very much - no suggestions at this time. Thanks for inviting me.
- I found the event had two purposes that were somewhat in conflict.
 1. Educate faculty about the summon system. This required demonstrations, presentations, groups with questions and staff with answers.
 2. Help new faculty network and get ideas for being successful. This required wine, cheese, and chatting one-on-one.

- Maybe have a sign-up sheet to meet with someone to talk about ideas one-on-one at the event (but still casual)
- You couldn't it was great.
- I thought it was well executed.
- Possibly more chairs were needed (too many people were forced to stand while receiving instruction).
- Offer bigger space and seats
- Chocolate

Q: Do you have any additional comments you would like to share regarding this event, OR are there other events you would like to see offered?

- I am already using Summon and it's working well. I will post information for my class later today. I am concerned that the IDS system will be swamped by requests--I have submitted a dozen or more in the past hour. The speed with which IDS processes requests is one of its great strengths. Will we lose that fast response as an unintended consequence of the ability of Summon to locate sources and the ease of placing IDS requests via Summon? That would be a substantial problem for both teaching and research. Have additional resources been provided to IDS?
- I think it was important to keep reminding the participants who signed up for this "private, by invitation only" event that the event date was rapidly approaching and reminding us of the date. It sent a message to us that you all considered this important and I think it "rubbed off" on us.
- No more comments about this event. In the future, some faculty may appreciate a session on where/how funding is available from RIT....how to apply and how these funding venues apply to specific purposes.....faculty development, research....course development, equipment/software etc.
- I'd like to see other events like this with technological tools. For instance, I wish I could talk with someone about the best citation system for me. I see ads for classes but I just need help deciding among all the various options. Same thing with a collaborative website like Wordpress or Moodle.
- Perhaps a similar format event for other tools/databases available within the RIT library system. Summon pulls from all of them, but it would be good to understand each individual collection/database too.
- A similar type session on tools for e-Learning.

Mid-Tenure Review Panel , January 2013

Mid-Tenure Review Panel Feedback Survey Results – in an effort to elicit more responses from our faculty, a “60-Second Survey” was sent out the same day with only 2 questions posed. With a 37% response rate, (15/40), feedback was positive overall.

Q: What did you like BEST about the panel session -- feel free to add anything such as venue, topic, time of day, format, content, etc. We want to hear from you!

- The details on how to plan for 3rd year tenure review was very valuable
- Faculty website (could we get the link to look at in more depth?) and snack.
- I enjoyed hearing the different perspectives on the topic of mid-tenure review across the campus. It was so nice to hear that RIT WANTS us to succeed and there are a lot of services on campus to do so.
- The frank discussions about what can go wrong and what we need to do.
- Great event! It was nice to hear from a variety of speakers on the tenure process that represented several colleges at RIT. I thought winter quarter was great timing as well since we have had time to be exposed to the process and be ready to ask questions. The room was comfortable and easy to hear everyone. The snacks were a pleasant surprise.
- I most appreciated the honesty and openness that the panelists brought. The format, time of day, and venue were all good. Personally, I feel that RIT has done a good job of communicating my tenure expectations to me. My chair, my dean, my colleagues, recent tenure committees, and panels like these - they are all surprisingly consistent in their answers about tenure.
- It was helpful to learn about the process and how the mid-tenure and tenure processes interact.
- I was a presenter and we had quite a range of people on the panel. This gave the attendees a chance to hear a variety of perspectives.
- The candid discussions by panelists and their approachability.
- I liked hearing about the mid-tenure review from people from different colleges who were also at different stages of their careers. It makes it clear that the tenure process is very college and department specific. The best advice given was to talk to many different people and ask questions until you get the right answers.
- The panelists were very helpful!
- It was very well put together.
- Input from diverse panel
- Panelists sharing their personal experiences.
- Free flowing format.

Q: What did you like LEAST about the panel session -- feel free to add anything such as venue, topic, time of day, format, content, etc. We welcome your candid responses!

- Cold weather!
- School specific handout
- Nothing really.
- I think this format would have been more effective: 1st have panel introduce themselves; 2nd they each share their best practices/advice/what not to do/etc; 3rd we break up by college into small groups to discuss with panelist. I found the discussions afterward the panel to be the most useful.
- It was generally a good event, well-organized and everyone was friendly.
- It may be nice to have this event over the lunch hour from 12-2pm. I had to leave a class I was teaching to be able to attend and generally more people have the lunch hour free. It would be nice to have a formal list of additional resources or people to contact for scholarship help, grant writing, etc. A lot of these opportunities come through different departments and it is easy to lose track when the time comes you need the help.
- Needed a panelist from GCCIS (my college). Rajendra Raj or Pengcheng Shi would have been great. Also, I came away from the meeting even more freaked out about tenure than I was when I came in. You have to remember that when panelists tell stories about how a 9-point font annoyed their committee, the message that I hear is: "You might lose tenure for such a petty mistake as 9-point font". Tenure, when implemented properly, seems like a fine and fair process to me - but most of these kinds of sessions that I've gone to tend to disintegrate into horror stories about when the process fails. Are those really that helpful? Only a little bit, I suppose.
- If there are enough participants, I think it would make more sense to have the group split by college. Because it was campus-wide, it was not possible to talk about scholarship expectations in reasonable detail. I do understand that this varies college by college, but perhaps there are certain colleges where the definition of scholarship is more closely defined.
- Most of the attendees did not ask any questions.
- Timing -- the panel overlapped with my class, and I could only attend the last half hour.
- I did not like the fact that some people had very specific questions that only pertained to their particular discipline or their personal situation. Perhaps 10 or 15 minute breakout sessions can be offered at the end for people who need more structured guidance from someone in their college.
- The handouts were specific to one college, it would be better to have handouts for each college so we have the correct information.
- Low representation from my college.
- Some questions from audience members cannot be heard.

Mentor Nominee Meeting – May 23, 2013

Kerry's Notes

Attendees:

Mentoring Award Nominees Present

Mary Lou Basile (NTID); Bob Barbato (SCOB); Chris Collison (COS); Rob Garrick (CAST); Ann Haake (GCCIS); Pat Scanlon (CLA); Wayne Walter (COE);

Wallace Center

Lynn Wild, Anne Marie Canale

NSF ADVANCE Connect Team

Margaret Bailey, Carol Marchetti, Maureen Valentine, Kerry Ivers

Overviews and Presentation

Lynn – Introductions and purpose/objective of meeting

Anne – Overview of the Faculty Mentoring @ RIT to date

Carol – Overview of how NSF ADVANCE *Connect* will partner with the Wallace Center and support existing and future faculty mentoring initiatives. Review of themes from the mentoring award applications.

Discussion

Collaboration (inter or cross discipline working relationships)

Challenges of collaboration

- Tenured/TT faculty may not seek collaboration if they can't lead it.
- No incentive for collaboration – scholarship and grants only count for the first author and/or lead PI (co authors and co-PIs don't get credit in most current systems)

Solutions to encourage collaboration

- Alternate lead PI and co-PI on grants and research
- Alternative lead authorship
- Change the system for what "counts"

Thoughts/Observations about mentoring

- Informal mentoring relationships usually work better than forced/ assigned.
- Formal mentoring process in Communications utilizes a combination of formal and informal activities to foster relationship between mentors and assigned mentees. Has been very successful.
 - Method of assignment is via request/invitation. No one is forced.
 - Mentoring plan counts as a big part of service in the POW.
- Informal mentoring needs to count in the plan of work and as part of reviews.

K. Ivers

pg. 1

APPENDIX C MENTOR AWARD NOMINEE FOCUS GROUP FEEDBACK

NSF ADVANCE *Connect@RIT*
Mentor Award Nominee Meeting / Meeting Notes

May 31, 2013

- What faculty want to do or think they should do DOES NOT always equal what is being measured or how they are evaluated.
- Faculty will do/be what is measured. How people are evaluated/measured impacts how/what faculty produce and their decisions about helping others or not.
- When thinking about mentoring, it's not just about career mentoring. Need to also provide psycho/social mentoring to help protégé avoid isolation, build relationships, know they are safe and allow them to be themselves.
 - This aspect of mentoring may not always be addressed/considered, but can be very critical to faculty success/failure.
- Finding a mentor requires the protégé to figure out what kind of protégé they are/want to be. Knowing that will help them make better decision about who to seek mentoring from.
- Protégé can initiate the mentoring relationship (sometimes those are the best kind of mentoring relationships)
- Work/Life Balance – mentoring relationship should include discussion of work life balance. Important for new faculty to know that their career is a marathon, not a sprint.

Masterminding technique (Chris Collison)

- Based on Jack Canfield's Success Principal book (chapter 46)
- Group of peers meet regularly
- Build trust, get to know people; share their goals and problems; brainstorm solutions as a group
- Comparisons made to weightwatchers and/or AA (Individuals come to the group with their own specific goals. Benefit of group gathering, support and encouragement. Share strategies and ideas about how to achieve individual goals.)

Peer Mentoring - UFAST (Rob Garrick)

- Group of non-tenured faculty; no department heads and/or dean's allowed
- Divide and conquer approach – share the work
- Strategic about what committees and activities they participate in
- Spent a lot of time up front establishing group ground rules.

Benefits of Mentoring

- Mentors can provide support and encouragement and build up the protégé's confidence; mentors can show faculty how to work the system
- They can act as buffers, say no on behalf of the new faculty member who may not feel confident turning down tasks or assignments that do not help them advance on their career paths.
- Advise on identifying and avoiding NPAs (non promotable activities)
- Mentors can serve as a filter of information

References

- Jack Canfield, The Success Principles (Chp 46 Masterminding)
- McKeachie's Teaching Tips

K. Ivers

pg. 2

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. 1209115. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

APPENDIX C MENTOR AWARD NOMINEE FOCUS GROUP FEEDBACK

NSF ADVANCE *Connect@RIT*
Mentor Award Nominee Meeting / Meeting Notes

May 31, 2013

- UFAST Ground Rules example (Rob Garrick can provide)