

Draft Faculty Council Notes

January 16, 2015; 12pm - 1:15pm

Submitted to Lee Napier

by Kay Brocato at the request of President, Adam Knight

Attending: Brocato, L. Morse, Megan Holmes, Stephanie King, Kun Huang, Cheryl Justice, Tony Kirkland, Tawny McCleon, Kelly Moser, Chien Yu

- Dean's Report-
 - COE Dean has been given additional authority of management of the education programs in Meridian. Additionally, many types of support of the academic units that occurs on the Starkville campus will be extended to the Meridian campus.
 - Faculty are to be reminded of the university policy requiring the reporting of absences of all freshmen (they are also encouraged to report absences of all students).
 - MSUCOE has a new Ph.D. Program approved for kinesiology.
 - Education Foundations area will join the Department of Counseling and Educational Psychology while the Student Affairs Area joins the Department of Leadership and Foundations.
- Making our service to the College of Education fall in line with our respective research agendas was discussed. The work of the Faculty Council creating a COE Mentoring plan was discussed as a service which would be a research opportunity for any faculty interested. The IRB for this research was shared and discussed. (See Attached Consent)
- The service work of creating the mentoring plan was then discussed. The Center for Teaching and Learning as an important resource for this plan was stressed. Plans contributed by members were shared in hard copy and electronically (See Attached). All left committing to spend at least an hour and a half critiquing the plans.

FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING PACKET

January 16, 2014

**College of Education
Mississippi State University**

Instructions Proposal

- **Mark the things you like in Green Yellow or Orange with a circle or a traditional “highlight over” kind of mark.**
- **Mark the things you do not like in Blue, Purple, Pink with an “X”**
- **Make notations in the margins if you are not sure how to use the colors above or we can not all agree on the difference between pink and orange or you have a color differentiation issue! Hah**

Subject: Study 14-354: College of Education Faculty Council Mentoring Study Series- Phase I

Date: Friday, December 19, 2014 2:57:52 PM Central Standard Time

From: nmorse@orc.msstate.edu

To: dkb3@ra.msstate.edu

CC: Morse, Nicole, Morse, Nicole

Protocol Title: College of Education Faculty Council Mentoring Study Series- Phase I

Protocol Number: 14-354

Principal Investigator: Dr. Kay Brocato

Date of Determination: 12/19/2014

Qualifying Exempt Category: 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2)

Attachments: Stamped informed consent in separate email

Dear Dr. Brocato:

The Human Research Protection Program has determined the above referenced project exempt from IRB review.

Please note the following:

- Retain a copy of this correspondence for your records.
- An approval stamp is required on all informed consents. You must use the stamped consent form for obtaining consent from participants.
- Only the MSU staff and students named on the application are approved as MSU investigators and/or key personnel for this study.
- You do not need to submit an application for annual continuing review; however, a new application must be submitted if the study is ongoing after 5 years from the date of approval. (SOP 01-03 Administrative Review of Applications)
- Any modifications to the project must be reviewed and approved by the HRPP prior to implementation. Any failure to adhere to the approved protocol could result in suspension or termination of your project.
- Per university requirement, all research-related records (e.g. application materials, letters of support, signed consent forms, etc.) must be retained and available for audit for a period of at least 3 years after the research has ended.
- It is the responsibility of the investigator to promptly report events that may represent unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects or others.

This determination is issued under the Mississippi State University's OHRP Federalwide Assurance #FWA00000203. All forms and procedures can be found on the HRPP website: www.orc.msstate.edu.

Thank you for your cooperation and good luck to you in conducting this research project. If you have questions or

concerns, please contact me at nmorse@orc.msstate.edu or call 662-325-5220.

Finally, we would greatly appreciate your feedback on the HRPP approval process. Please take a few minutes to complete our survey at <https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/PPM2FBP>.

Sincerely,

Nicole Morse, CIP
IRB Compliance Administrator

Project Title: College of Education Faculty Council Mentoring Study Series- Phase I

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR'S ASSURANCE

As Primary Investigator, I have ultimate responsibility for the performance of this study, the protection of the rights and welfare of the human subjects, and strict adherence by all co-investigators and research personnel to all Institutional Review Board (IRB) requirements, federal regulations, and state statutes for human subjects research. I hereby assure the following:

The information provided in this application is accurate to the best of my knowledge.

All named individuals on this project have been given a copy of the protocol and have acknowledged an understanding of the procedures outlined in the application.


All experiments and procedures involving human subjects will be performed under my supervision or that of another qualified professional listed on this protocol.

I understand that, should I use the project described in this application as a basis for a proposal for funding (either intramural or extramural), it is my responsibility to ensure that the description of human subjects use in the funding proposal(s) is identical in principle to that contained in this application. I will submit modifications and/or changes to the IRB as necessary to ensure concordance.

I and all the co-investigators and research personnel in this study agree to comply with all applicable requirements for the protection of human subjects in research including, but not limited to, the following:

- Obtaining the legally effective informed consent of all human subjects or their legally authorized representatives, and using only the currently approved, consent form with the IRB approval stamp (if applicable); and
- Obtaining written notification of approval from the IRB before implementation of any changes to the project (except when necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to the subject); and
- Reporting via the Problem Report any unanticipated problem; and
- Promptly providing the IRB with any information requested relative to the project; and
- Promptly and completely complying with an IRB decision to suspend or withdraw its approval for the project; and
- Obtaining continuing review prior to the date approval for this study expires; and
- Granting access to any project-associated records to the IRB to ensure compliance with the approved protocol.

Name of Principal Investigator / Researcher: Kay Broacto

Signature: 
com.apple.xdms.appleid.prd.44593
862397751563370596c33686b4352
654c542b413d3d

ADVISOR'S ASSURANCE (if applicable)

I assume responsibility for defining, explaining, exemplifying, and requiring adherence to the highest standards of conduct and ethical values. I believe the investigator(s) is/are fully competent to accomplish the goals and techniques stated in the attached proposal. Further, I certify that I have thoroughly reviewed this application for readability and accuracy and the study is clearly described herein.

I have reviewed the proposed research and concluded that the following apply:

- The research uses procedures consistent with sound research design.
- The research design is sufficiently sound to yield the expected knowledge.

Name of Advisor:

Signature:

I. Project Information

Type of submission:

☒ Original Submission

☐ Revisions pending approval under Study #

☐ Requesting Developmental Approval* only

Include a timeline for development of the project. Estimated date for submission of a revised IRB application:

☐ Revision to previous Developmental Approval

If you already have developmental approval, list the study number assigned to the first submission of the study:

**Also referred to as "118 designation" - see [Developmental Approval](#) or "118 Designation" for more details. No human subjects (including use of identifiable data) may be involved in the research prior to final IRB approval.*

Project Period: **From IRB Approval** **to** Sep 15, 2016

Includes both data collection and data analysis

Study Funding:

☐ External Funding

Agency:

SPA Proposal or Fund/Account Number:

PI of Award (if different than Principal Investigator/Researcher listed above):

☒ Internal Funding (Department, College, Personal, etc.)

Graduate Students:

- All graduate (thesis or dissertation) committee members should be listed on the application and must have IRB training.

II. Personnel & Qualifications

- In the table below, describe the role and responsibilities of all research personnel and describe their qualifications as they relate to their abilities to perform responsibilities associated with the study.
- As principal investigator, it is your responsibility to ensure that all individuals conducting procedures described in this application are adequately trained prior to involving human participants.
- All personnel listed on this application are required to successfully complete the MSU IRB & Human Subjects training course or an IRB-approved alternative. Training will be verified by IRB staff before approval is granted.

Principal Investigator's Name	NetID	Department and Phone #	Email
Kay Brocato	dkb3	Leadership & Foundations 325-7060	kbrocato@colled.msstate.edu

6	Institutional Affiliation (1) (Choose only one for each individual)	6	Does this person or an immediate family member have a financial interest related to the research? (2) 6
<input type="checkbox"/> MSU Student	<input type="radio"/> Thesis <input type="radio"/> Dissertation	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MSU Faculty			
<input type="checkbox"/> MSU Adjunct or Visiting Faculty*			
<input type="checkbox"/> MSU Staff			

Role, responsibilities and qualifications:

Brocato will assist in leading a committee in the creation of a draft mentoring plan for the College of Education faculty council. As a member of the council, she intends to document the process of creating this draft plan to be submitted to the leadership team in the college. As a parallel research effort, Brocato will lead author the the first research manuscript to document this process. The Faculty Council has a goal of producing additional research manuscripts on this work which will be authored by other faculty who take the lead on the next phase of documenting the research.

Investigator's Name and NetID		Institutional Affiliation (1) (Check all the apply)		Does this person or an immediate family member have a financial interest related to the research? (2)	
	Advisor (if applicable):	<input type="checkbox"/> MSU Faculty	<input type="checkbox"/> MSU Staff	Yes	No
Add		<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> MSU Adjunct or Visiting Faculty*	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Del		<input type="checkbox"/> MSU Student	<input type="checkbox"/> Committee member		
	Net ID:				

Role, responsibilities and qualifications:

Add	Name:	<input type="checkbox"/> MSU Faculty	<input type="checkbox"/> MSU Staff	Yes	No
Del		<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> MSU Adjunct or Visiting Faculty*	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Net ID:	<input type="checkbox"/> MSU Student	<input type="checkbox"/> Committee member		

Role, responsibilities and qualifications:

--	--	--	--	--	--

(1) Individuals not classified as regular MSU Faculty, Staff, or Students may only be covered by the MSU IRB under limited circumstances.

***MSU Adjunct or Visiting Faculty** may be covered by the MSU IRB for activities conducted in association with their MSU appointment. Confirmation of Adjunct or Visiting status must be conveyed to the IRB by the appropriate department head, the individual's MSU offer letter, or current listing in the MSU Employee Directory.

****Non-MSU affiliates** may only be covered at the discretion of the MSU IRB. The Individual Investigator Agreement (IIA) must be completed for each non-affiliate whose activities the MSU IRB is being petitioned to cover. The IIA is not necessary for individuals who will receive approval of their activities from an IRB at another institution.

(2) Financial interest

"Immediate Family" means spouse and dependent children.

"Financial Interest Related to the Research" means any of the following interests in the sponsor, product or

service being tested, or competitor of the sponsor held by the individual or the individual's immediate family:

- 7 • Ownership interest of any value including, but not limited to stocks and options exclusive of interests in publicly-traded, diversified mutual funds.
- Compensation of any amount including, but not limited to honoraria, consultant fees, royalties, or other income.
- Proprietary interest of any value including, but not limited to, patents, trademarks, copyrights, and licensing agreements.
- Board or executive relationship, regardless of compensation.
- The occurrence of any reimbursed or sponsored travel (i.e., that which is paid on behalf of the individual and not reimbursed to the individual so the exact monetary value may not be readily available) related to the institutional responsibilities. This does not apply to travel that is reimbursed or sponsored by a Federal, state, or local government agency, an institution of higher education as defined at 20 U.S.C. 1001 (a), an academic teaching hospital, or a research institute that is affiliated with an institution of higher education.

***If yes, submit a [Financial Interest Disclosure Form](#).

III. Site of Work and Study Population

1. Site of Work:

List each MSU site where the research procedures will be performed. Please be as descriptive as possible (e.g., building, room number, Drill Field).

Mississippi State University. 255 Allen Hall distance education classroom where monthly meetings are held. The meetings are scheduled to be held on the second Friday of each month. The committee will have a portion of each meeting committed to discussion of our mentoring plan creation process. During this discussion time, data will be collected using notes recorded during the meeting of the discussion. A protocol for discussion is attached.

For multi-site research in which MSU is the lead, applications must include information that is relevant to the protection of participants, such as: unanticipated problems involving risks to participants or others, interim results, and/or protocol modifications.

Please provide information below if any of the research activities will be conducted at a performance site that is geographically separate from MSU or at a site that does not fall under the MSU IRB's authority (e.g., school, prison, hospital).

Site		Has the site given permission for the research to be conducted?	Will the site receive federal funding passed through from your grant?	Will the site's IRB review the research?	Will the site rely on MSU's IRB to review the research?
<input type="button" value="Add"/> <input type="button" value="Del"/>	Site name: <input type="text"/> Address: <input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

*Not allowed for Veterans Affairs research.

2. Will your project include any of the following vulnerable populations?

<input type="checkbox"/> Pregnant women/Fetuses	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Students and/or employees of MSU
---	--

<input type="checkbox"/> Prisoners	<input type="checkbox"/> Minors (under age 18) - Note: Category 2 above is restricted to only observations of public behavior when the investigator(s) do not participate in the activities being observed. Research involving survey or interview procedures of minors is not eligible for administrative review under Category 2.
<input type="checkbox"/> Adults with cognitive impairments	
<input type="checkbox"/> Substance abusers	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other population(s) vulnerable to coercion or undue influence (specify):	
<input type="checkbox"/> None of the Above	<input type="checkbox"/> Non-english speaking people

In order to qualify for administrative review, all of the procedures of your study must fit into one or more of the categories below (for example, if you are doing a survey and using an existing data set, you might indicate both categories 2 and 4). If all procedure(s) in the research do not fall into at least one of these categories, the study does not qualify for administrative review and you must use the Protocol Submission Form by checking "No Categories Apply".

IV. Exempt Review Categories

<input type="checkbox"/> (1) Educational strategies, curricula, or classroom management methods [§46.101(b)(1)].
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (2) Educational tests, survey, interviews, or observation of public behavior [§46.101(b)(2)]. Restrictions: Category 2 does not apply if: (a) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly (or indirectly through identifiers <u>and</u> disclosure subjects' responses could reasonably place the subjects at risk, or if (b) the research allows for the inclusion of data on children <u>and</u> involves survey/interview procedures, <u>or</u> observation of public behavior where the investigator participates in the activities being observed.
<input type="checkbox"/> (3) Educational tests, surveys, interviews, or observation of public behavior <u>not approvable under Category 2 (if publicly elected/ appointed public officials/candidate or if federal statutes require confidentiality)</u> [§46.101(b)(3)].
<input type="checkbox"/> (4) Research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if these sources are publicly available <u>or</u> if the information is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects [§46.101(b)(4)].
<input type="checkbox"/> (5) Federal department or agency research and demonstration projects for evaluation of public benefit/service [§46.101(b)(5)].
<input type="checkbox"/> (6) Taste and food quality/consumer acceptance studies (without additives or safety questions) [§46.101(b)(6)].
<input type="checkbox"/> No Categories Apply

V. Research Protocol

1. Give details of the procedures that relate to the subjects' participation.

- ⁹
- *If the procedures are in an existing document (for example, a grant or dissertation proposal), you may attach the document or the pertinent parts of the document that further explain your project. However, the study must be fully described within the application. What is the research question or hypothesis to be addressed? Be sure to reference any attachment.*
 - *Append a copy of all questionnaires or test instruments. If the procedures involve observation, please include the type of behavior or action you expect to observe and record. If the procedures involve an interview, attach a sample of questions you plan to ask.*
 - *Describe all interactions (contacts, interventions, observations, etc.) between the researchers and participants.*
 - *Describe procedures being performed already for diagnostic or treatment purposes, if any.*

At this time, the research question to be addressed is broad, as follows: How will a neophyte faculty council bolster college and university assets to create a cross-college mentoring plan? Attached is a focus group interview protocol to be used. Creative procedures being performed already for the purpose of drafting out a mentoring plan are underway. The procedures include a monthly meeting to discuss the elements preferred by the members of the council. Also considered is the current descriptive details of faculty mentoring needs, current faculty status, and other demographics which describe the case.

2. Describe the recruitment and enrollment procedures. Include a final copy of any recruitment letter, advertisement, e-mail, transcript of verbal recruitment announcement, audio/video recording, etc., and state the mode of its communication.

There is a simple recruitment process. The College of Education faculty council consist of an elected body of 2 representatives per academic department, a Dean or Dean's appointee, and 1 representative from the Centers (research, development and service) which are part of the College. Members attend a monthly meeting and are providing a service to the college by creating a draft of a mentoring plan to support College faculty development. At the beginning of the 1st meeting after the research is approved, I will explain the research and then obtain consent from those in attendance using the consent script, consent log, and interview protocol.

3. Describe the process for obtaining consent from participants. Projects eligible for Administrative Review must include the following four disclosures to participants unless there is justification for not doing so: (1) a statement that the study involves research, (2) the procedures of the study, (3) contact information for the researcher (and advisor, if applicable), and (4) that participation is voluntary.

Please attach the consent form, script, or process to be used to provide these disclosures to participants. Describe how consent will be obtained or provide justification for why consent will not be obtained. While *documentation* of consent is not required, projects involving (but not limited to) interactions with participants must include a consent process.

Verbal consent will be sought. The script is attached.

4. a. Will the study involve recording identifiable information, including direct identifiers (such as name, student ID number, Net ID, etc.) or indirect identifiers (such as demographics sufficient to identify individuals considering the study population)? Yes ☐ No ☒
- b. If yes (the study will involve recording identifiable information), describe provisions to maintain the confidentiality of the data.

5. Describe provisions to protect the privacy of participants during the course of the study, including recruitment and data collection activities. For example, might participants be publicly identified or embarrassed (i.e., "outed"), or during the conduct of the study, might participants' responses be overheard or observed by individuals outside the research team (e.g., might participants see other participants' responses on a survey in a crowded classroom or overhear interview responses)?

No person's name or any other identifying information will be included with the data collection phase. Meeting minutes are recorded void of any individuals' name or identifiers. The Faculty counsel acts one body and does not record direct quotes. Any member of the committee who offers up comment which he/she desires not be included in the research data set may request that their particular ideas be excluded from the research documentation and that request will be granted without question. This request may be made before during or after the monthly meetings in public or private to Kay Brocato. Brocato will behave according to the member's request in terms of disclosure. Since no names are recorded with the data, Brocato will assume that a person asking for removal of particular details is only asking for removal of their own contribution. Brocato will remove research detail upon request and as a precaution.

6. Is there any additional information you would like to provide?

None noted.

Investigator's Checklist for Submission

Before submitting your protocol for IRB review, make sure you have included the following (if applicable):

- ☒ Survey, Questionnaire or Interview Questions
- ☐ Consent and Assent forms
- ☐ Recruiting materials
- ☐ Permission letters from participating institutions
- ☐ Signed Investigator Assurance form
- ☐ For non-student researchers - Completed Scientific or Scholarly Validity Review Form signed by the appropriate individual. Note this can be submitted separately from the Protocol Submission Form, but it is required prior to approval.
- ☒ Clear, concise description of procedures to be used (Feel free to also attach any proposals that may further explain your project. However, the study must be fully described within the application.)
- ☐ All personnel listed must have completed IRB/Human Subjects Training. If not, your application cannot be approved until the training has been completed. Information regarding training options can be found at <http://orc.msstate.edu/humansubjects/training/>. You can check your training records from the "Check your training records" link from [Training Page](#).

PLEASE NOTE:

The determination of the IRB will be communicated to you in writing. Submission of an application to the IRB does not equal IRB approval. You may not begin this research until you have received written notification of IRB approval.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact our office at 325-3294 or by e-mail at irb@research.msstate.edu

Mentoring Plans

**Jane Addams College of Social Work
Faculty Mentoring Policy and Guidelines
Effective November 1, 2012**

This document provides guiding principles for a formal faculty mentoring program for Jane Addams College of Social Work faculty. It expands the current mentoring program and incorporates principles outlined in the UIC February 2012 mentoring policy. The mentoring program applies primarily to junior, tenure-track faculty in their probationary years, but may also be used with beginning level faculty on the clinical track as appropriate.

Policy: A mentor will be assigned to each new tenure track faculty member at the beginning of his/her appointment in the College. The primary purpose of this policy is to enhance the professional success of junior faculty members. Mentors will work with mentees up to the point of third year review. Following third year review a new mentor may be appointed or the mentor may be reappointed.

1. **Mentor Selection:** This mentor will be assigned by the Dean after discussions with the newly hired faculty member and potential mentors. The mentor(s) will typically be from within the College but additional external mentors may also be appointed. The eventual linking of a mentor and mentee will be determined by mutual consent. Either individual may terminate the relationship at any time and so inform the Dean. If this occurs the Dean will work with the mentee to appoint a new mentor in a timely fashion.

2. **Responsibilities of the Mentor:** The mentor shall be tenured (or at the level of clinical associate professor for clinical track faculty) and offer professional guidance and assistance to the mentee with the purpose of aiding professional progress and success. The mentoring will focus on issues related to research, teaching and service as well as process-related concerns such as navigating the policies and procedures of the various offices of UIC. First time mentors are expected to attend a mentoring training session offered by the UIC Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs.

3. **Responsibilities of the Mentee:** The junior faculty member will prepare a statement outlining his/her annual career goals and include a plan with milestones for achieving these goals. In discussion with the mentor, this plan should be revised yearly or more often as needed. It is the responsibility of the mentee to seek counsel from the mentor as needed.

4. **Mentoring Plan and Activities:** The mentor and mentee should meet formally at least twice annually. It is expected, however, that other meetings and discussions will occur informally throughout the year. In addition to working with the mentee in the development of careers plans, the mentor will serve as an ongoing resource. Mentoring activities during the first year of the faculty member's appointment include orienting the mentee to the College and the larger UIC community. Mentoring activities offered to the mentee can be modified and tailored as necessary to meet the individual needs and objectives of the mentee. In general they include the following:

- A. The mentor will assist the mentee in accessing and understanding College and University policies including but not limited to workload, travel authorization and reimbursement procedures, human subjects review, proposal processing and the resources available to support faculty development.
 - B. In conjunction with the JACSW Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Student Services the mentor will serve as a resource to address questions and concerns related to teaching, instructional technology resources, etc.
 - C. The mentor will help the mentee identify potential campus- and community-based partners for collaborative research development.
 - D. The mentor will offer guidance related to appropriate prioritizing and dedication of time and energy to service opportunities that arise for the mentee.
 - E. The mentor will offer constructive criticism and encouragement, compliments on achievements, etc.
5. Evaluation: At the end of each academic year, the mentor and mentee will meet to review the mentee's plan and progress and to determine the adequacy of the mentoring process. As needed, a plan and strategy for addressing challenges will be developed to guide subsequent mentoring. The mentor and mentee will assess their mentoring relationship to determine if it is adequately meeting the mentee's needs. A summary of this evaluation along with individual assessments of the mentoring program will be submitted to the Dean by May 30th of each academic year. These assessments will be used by the Dean as one means of evaluating the adequacy and accomplishments of the College's mentoring program.

Effective mentoring responsibilities will be considered by the Dean in annual evaluations and in merit salary increases for the mentor.

10/29/2012

Proposal for a Carolina Faculty-Student Mentoring Program

Prepared by the Mentoring Subcommittee of the Academic Plan Steering Committee
Professors Linda Beeber, Chair; Regina Carelli; Marc Cohen; and Ronald Strauss, Executive Vice Provost
and Chief International Officer; Mary Cooper, UNC Student Body President; and Stephen Barber, Staff
Assistant to the Committee

Introduction

Mentoring, with its dimensions of teaching, guiding, advising and modeling, is an essential part of being an engaged faculty member at The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. The Academic Plan 2011: *Reach Carolina* recommended that as part of the larger objective entitled *Faculty: Prominence, Composition, Recruitment, Development, Retention and Scholarship (Theme 2)*, a pilot Faculty-Student mentoring program be created (Recommendation 10). This proposal, prepared by a subcommittee of the Academic Plan Steering Committee, integrates technology and the human capacity for connectivity into a mentoring program that is dedicated to supporting lasting bonds between students and faculty. The proposal provides essential background, a detailed plan and outlines the resources needed to implement the program.

Background

Future UNC-CH graduates will enter a competitive global economy requiring a highly educated, diverse workforce. With an eye on using precious resources wisely, one recommendation in The Academic Plan 2011 was to establish a pilot Faculty-Student Mentoring Program. Mentoring, a deliberate learning partnership between a more experienced and less experienced individual that provides instrumental and emotional support through a relationship that becomes more important over time (Garvey & Alred, 2003; Jacobi, 1991; Kram, 1985; Grossman and Rhodes, 2002), has been shown to be an effective investment of resources that provides rewards for faculty and crucial positive outcomes for students. Compared to academically similar students without mentors, undergraduate students who are mentored by university faculty for as little as one year have higher academic achievement, lower dropout rates (Crisp and Cruz 2009; Campbell and Campbell, 1997; Terenzini, Psacarella, and Blimling, 1996) and greater success in professional careers (Schlosser, Knox, Moskovitz, and Hill 2003). Mentored first year students are significantly more likely to return to college for a second year (Terenzini, Psacarella, and Blimling 1996; Campbell and Campbell, 1997). Even greater gains are seen in ethnic minority students. Compared to minority students who are not mentored, minority students who mentored have higher GPA's and are twice as likely to stay in college (Crisp and Cruz 2009). While the gains of mentoring have been well-established, the mechanics of ensuring that students have access to well-prepared faculty mentors requires systematic planning that is tailored to the needs of the students and the characteristics of the university setting.

To accomplish these elements, the Mentoring Subcommittee proceeded in three steps: a) assessment of model mentoring programs already in operation at UNC-CH and other institutions, b) securing input of key university stakeholders including students, and c) preparation of the final recommendations and a proposed budget.

Assessing Existing Mentoring Programs at UNC and Nationally

The committee identified model faculty-student mentoring programs already in place at Carolina and in other universities across the US. These became the models for the proposed program. Examples of these on-campus programs include:

- *The McNair Scholars Program*, which is a federally funded initiative that prepares first-generation and traditionally underrepresented undergraduate students for doctoral and other graduate level studies in their chosen academic discipline through a combination of scholarly research and other enrichment opportunities. Faculty mentorship of each individual student is a major component in the framework of this program.
- *The Carolina Covenant Scholarship Program*, which promises to ensure a debt-free undergraduate education to high-performing students from low income families. Students are assigned both a peer mentor and a faculty/professional mentor upon acceptance into the program, which they will have for the duration of their college career. Also, those students who display interest in a career in medicine have the opportunity to be mentored by a member of the UNC medical community.
- *Carolina Creates*, which aims to connect students, faculty, staff, and other community members through a combination of online and on-campus programming.
- *Carolina Leadership Development*, which is an initiative that helps to equip students with the training necessary to develop effective leadership ability. In addition to serving as an information hub for all leadership-related resources on campus, this program emphasizes interaction and collaboration on the part of students, faculty, and staff.

Several institutions with exemplary faculty-student mentoring programs also include:

- *University of Virginia*: The Faculty-Student Mentoring Program administered through the Office of African-American Affairs pairs students of color with faculty members on the basis of mutual interest and professional goals with the overall goal of enhancing the undergraduate experience for each individual in the program.
- *University of Michigan*: MentorNet, which is an internet-based matching system connects undergraduate, graduate, and doctoral students, as well as junior faculty members with professionals in academia, government, and industry in an eight-month-long, email-based mentor relationship. The target group for this system is women and groups that have been traditionally underrepresented in science and other technical fields.
- *University of Pennsylvania*: Two distinct mentoring programs exist: a College Alumni Mentoring Series which pairs undergraduate students and UPenn alumni in mentoring relationships to assist students in aligning their academic track with a possible career, and the Graduate-Undergraduate Mentoring Program helps prepare undergraduate students for success in post-graduate studies by matching them with graduate and professional students from the various schools across campus. An online resource hub for information about each program and related enrichment opportunities, much like the one we envision in this proposal, is also available.

In summary, UNC-CH has excellent specialized mentoring programs serving specific populations of students that could serve as models for the creation of a general, campus-wide program. We verified that, as noted in

the Academic plan, gaps exist for the broader range of students, particularly those who have not yet established their academic major/career direction (Academic Plan, p. 31).

Seeking Stakeholder and Student Input

Stakeholders. The Mentoring Committee met with key individuals who were already providing mentoring or who will be critical linkages to a new, university-wide mentoring program. These individuals represented a variety of units such as the Center for Faculty Excellence, Career Services and Office of Advising, as well as key faculty leaders from several of the exemplar campus mentoring programs mentioned earlier. The Committee had provided a draft of our initial plan to these individuals and the feedback was very positive. Participants verified that such a program would reach large numbers of students who currently do not have access to mentors. Of concern were students in the middle years (sophomore and junior years) who are often making and changing decisions about academic majors and future directions. While the current academic advising and career services provide excellent services, there is a need for more individualized mentoring of students who are attempting to create new or novel directions for themselves. The Committee received great support from the participants in the form of program advice, a training manual (from the Carolina Covenant) and other offers of ongoing support and linkage as the proposed program is implemented.

Students. The Committee conducted a focus group with students who validated the need for such a program and provided exquisite detail about their own journeys toward graduation and career. Of note were students who described being shy and overwhelmed about the large UNC campus and the critical role that faculty mentoring had played in their success. Some of these students spoke eloquently to the struggle to create new combinations of majors that ultimately will prepare them to be innovators and leaders. These student had clearly benefitted from faculty mentoring. A key finding from the student focus group was that students help other students connect to faculty mentors. Students described that they helped their peers meet faculty by encouraging them, providing introductions and helping peers clarify what they wanted to ask faculty. Students who attended the group were emphatic that we add the student element to the proposed mentoring plan. Two students contacted us after the group asking to be considered for volunteer positions if the program is implemented.

Creating the Plan

We acknowledge the energy and dedication of our informants and the Committee in creating this proposed program that meets the unique needs of UNC-CH.

We propose to create the Carolina Faculty-Student Mentoring Program which will consist of a permanent Website and key personnel (the Human Element). The website will be welcoming, continuously accessible and tailored to the different needs of students. A dedicated Human, “The Champion,” will promote the program and create linkages throughout the Carolina community. Dedicated faculty mentors and student navigators will complete the human element. Mary Cooper, our student representative, envisioned that the program will become a national model such that “anyone could type in *Faculty Student Mentor* and our Carolina website would pop up as the number one hit.”

The Technological Element

The website will be designed to have the following features:

- A motivational message encouraging students to seek mentoring.
- Descriptions of mentoring opportunities throughout the Carolina university community with linkages to those programs.
- A clear message that diversity is celebrated and a special welcome to students who have not decided on an academic major or career path.
- Connections with designated mentors in each academic unit including those that have not traditionally had dedicated connections to undergraduates (e.g., Medicine, Dentistry and Graduate Studies).
- Profiles of faculty mentors.
- Narratives about mentors and mentees that model the values, expectations and benefits of mentoring relationships.
- Events; we envision that the Champion will coordinate periodic events such as an icebreaker session (modeled on speed dating) where mentees are introduced to a number of mentors.
- Portals for students with defined characteristics; e.g., First-year students, Sophomores, Juniors, Students with interests in (XXX); students who are still imagining their future, etc.
- Portals for topics related to career development; e.g., issues related to women in science; where to go if you realize medical school is not in your future, etc.
- Resources; e.g., practical help sheets such as “How to Write an Email to a Potential Faculty Mentor,” etc.
- Additional portals and features that evolve as the program matures.
- An embedded system for collection of evaluation data.

The content and linkages on the website will be developed iteratively through meetings with established support units, academic programs and sponsored programs that have faculty-student mentoring components. These collaborations will serve both as a means to disseminate the idea of the website among different units of the university and will also prevent unnecessary replication and re-invention of programs. Ultimately, the goal will be to produce a website where students can easily connect with mentors who match their needs. The qualities for a successful match may not be obvious, especially for students who are seeking a direction. For these and other students, the personal characteristics of the mentor might be more important than the mentor’s established expertise or area of interest. Therefore, it is important that a diverse pool of mentors be available and prepared to welcome contacts from students.

Other technologies such as social networking will be explored as potentially useful supplements to the website. The use of these media expands rapidly. New devices will be in use even before the proposed plan is implemented. Thus, the Faculty-Student Mentoring Program will partner with educational programs (e.g., the “EE” [Experiential Education] initiatives; capstone projects) and welcome innovations that use emerging technologies to connect students to the website and students to mentors.

The Human Elements

- A Passionate Champion for the Program will link people with the Program technology.

We envision that the Champion will bring energy, direction and dedication to maintaining the viability and vibrancy of the program. The Champion will forge partnerships and supportive

linkages with other resources and mentoring programs across the university and will garner support from parents, alumni, community leaders and the public. The Champion will develop systems for evaluating the program, assessing its impact on students, and instituting improvements.

We envision that well-crafted public relations messages will spread the word about the benefits of the Program to Carolina families, communities and the state. These messages will help build the support that will be vital to the success of the program.

- A Staff Associate who will provide support to the program.
- Mentors who are prepared and supported in their roles.

We envision that the Faculty-Student Mentoring Program will be anchored in most or all of the academic units on the campus. To do this, we propose to enlist the support of Deans and Department Chairs to identify mentors within their units and promote their service as mentors. Forty mentors will be identified and trained, twenty in the first year and twenty in the second year of the project.

Mentors will be rewarded appropriately. We envision that the university will provide recognition for the Mentors' service; a modest honorarium and an annual "allowance" for small expenditures (lunch with a mentee) will be provided; preparation for the role will be provided formally by the Champion and extraordinary mentor-models; and finally, periodic events will be offered to nurture relationships among mentors that will support them in problem-solving difficulties that mentors and mentees encounter. Ultimately, the reward for mentoring will come directly to mentors through their work with students.

- Student Ambassadors who will function as essential links between students and faculty mentors.

Bringing the Faculty-Student Mentoring Program to Scale

By Year 2, we propose that there will be 40 trained Faculty Mentors. We envision that this will bring the program to scale. Forty Mentors, the Champion and Staff Associate, the Student Navigators and the linkages forged by the program to other campus resources should be adequate to serve undergraduates throughout the UNC-CH campus. The Champion and Staff Associate will be prepared to maintain the website; Faculty Mentors will evolve areas of expertise and become trainers of new Mentors who will fill vacancies; quality improvement measures will assure that the program becomes a national model.

Resources Needed (Budget)

PERSONNEL	YEAR ONE		Total
	Base Salary	Fringe	
Champion	\$35,000 (@ 30% effort)	\$9100. (@26%)	\$44,100.00
Staff Associate	\$30,000 @ 40% effort	\$7800 (@26%)	\$37,800.00
Faculty Mentors			
Honoraria	\$10,000.00 (20 @ \$500.)		\$10,000.00
Website Creation	\$8,400.00		\$8,400.00
+ design and programming			
+ site architecture			
+ hosting			
+ forms			
+ forum			
+ authentication			
+ interactive directory			
+ training with whoever will be in charge of uploading content and making edits			
+ project management			
OTHER EXPENSES			\$13,050.00
Faculty Lunch Monies	\$10,000 (20 @ \$500.)		
Training Manuals	\$350.00		
Food	\$500.00		
Conference Travel (each year for Champion & Associate)	\$2,000.00		
Miscellaneous Supplies	\$200.00		
			\$113,350.00

PERSONNEL	YEAR TWO (3% increase)		Total
	Base Salary	Fringe	
Champion	\$35,000 (@ 30% effort)	\$9100. (@26%)	\$45,423.00
Staff Associate	\$30,000 @ 40% effort	\$7800 (@26%)	\$38,934.00
Faculty Mentors			
Honoraria	\$10,000.00 (20 @ \$500.)		\$10,000.00
Website Creation	\$8,400.00		\$8,400.00
+ design and programming			
+ site architecture			
+ hosting			
+ forms			
+ forum			
+ authentication			
+ interactive directory			
+ training with whoever will be in charge of uploading content and making edits			
+ project management			
OTHER EXPENSES			\$23,050.00
Faculty Lunch Monies	\$20,000 (40 @ \$500.)		
Training Manuals	\$350.00		
Food	\$500.00		
Conference Travel (each year for Champion & Associate)	\$2,000.00		
Miscellaneous Supplies	\$200.00		
			\$127,407.00

References

- Campbell, T.A. and Campbell, E.D. 1997. "Faculty/Student Mentor Program: Effects on Academic Performance and Retentions." *Research in Higher Education*, 38, 727–742.
- Crisp, G. and Cruz, I. 2009. Mentoring College Students: A Critical Review of the Literature between 1990 and 2007. *Research in Higher Education*, 50: 525–545.
- Garvey, B. and Alred, G. 2003. "An Introduction to the Symposium on Mentoring: Issues and Prospects." *British Journal of Guidance and Counseling*, 31, 1–9.
- Grossman, J.B. and Rhodes, J.E. 2002 "The Test of Time: Predictors and Effects of Duration in Youth Mentoring." *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 30, 199–219.
- Jacobi, M. 1991. "Mentoring and Undergraduate Academic Success. A Literature Review." *Review of Educational Research*, 61, 5.
- Kram, K.E. 1985. *Mentoring at Work: Developmental Relationships in Organizational Life*. Glenville, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company. 05–532.
- Schlosser, L.Z. and Gelso, C.J. 2001. Measuring the Working Alliance in Advisor-Advisee Relationships in Graduate School. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 48, 157–167.
- Terenzini, P.T., Pascarella, E.T., and Blimling, G.S. 1996. Students Out-of-class Experiences and their Influence on Learning and Cognitive Development: A Literature Review. *Journal of College Student Development*, 37, 149–162.

This draft document begins the conversation of how to tailor a mentoring program for our college by offering two methods along a spectrum of possible vehicles for implementation of a program or programs in our college. Whether these possibilities are used as a model to develop more tailored plans for a particular unit, or units choose to formalize existing informal mentoring systems, each plan must be documented and published via the web and contain sections explaining the plan's definitions and purposes, processes, roles and responsibilities, and methods of assessment. The model mentoring programs outlined below have been adapted from best practices used by units both within the university and peer institutions.

Effective Faculty Mentoring Programs

important definitions:

who is responsible: dean, dept/unit head, mentor/mentoring committee, mentee

what are the activities of each responsible party

when are activities to take place

how will the program be assessed and improved

m

Draft **Preamble**

UIC Faculty Mentoring Policy

Each college/school is charged with developing, implementing, and periodically assessing a faculty mentoring program. Implementation should begin in the fall semester of 2013. The College of Architecture, Design, and the Arts faculty mentoring policy incorporates required elements from the campus mentoring policy which can be found at: <http://www.uic.edu/depts/oaa/faculty/facment.html>

Definition and Purposes

Mentorship is an ongoing process of providing guidance and counseling for faculty at all stages in their academic careers. Mentorship requires a commitment by the tenured faculty and administration to facilitate the establishment of mutually rewarding relationships between mentor and mentee, proactive participation in the different aspects of the mentee's academic and professional life, and continuous evaluation and reevaluation of goals and achievements of both the program and its participants. Effective mentorship is a process that blends role modeling, advising and nurturing. The mentorship program in CADA is designed to help the mentee to establish an agenda for working toward her/his professional development goals and providing the necessary support to achieve those goals and gain insight into the realities of building an academic career at UIC.

Effective mentoring is crucial for furthering academic and professional excellence, retaining a creative and diverse faculty, and developing and maintaining a respectful and positive work climate in which all members of the college community can succeed. It is expected that associate and full professor faculty members will accept mentoring as a responsibility and privilege of their rank.

The Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs is responsible for providing training workshops for mentors, at least once per year. All newly-assigned or first-time mentors are expected to attend the training during the first year of mentoring.

This policy is designed to provide support for tenure track and clinical track assistant professors in our College and aims to:

- Facilitate the successful entry of assistant professors into structures, processes, and climate of the university, college, and department.
- Provide support to assistant professors in teaching, research, service and other aspects of professional life as they seek productive paths to tenure and promotion.

The process includes identification and appointment of mentor or mentors, agreement with the recommended match, an official letter to the mentor/mentee from the department head/unit head copied to the Dean, and an orientation event for mentors/mentees. The mentor(s) will meet with the mentee *(at least once a semester,)* though it is expected that other informal discussions would take place throughout the year. A summary of the meeting shall be written by the mentee and distributed to all members.

In joint appointment situations where a faculty member holds other than a 100% appointment in one unit, a single mentoring plan needs to be developed for that faculty member through consultation between the mentee and the appropriate unit head.

Desired Outcomes

The desired outcomes for the mentorship program include: successful recruitment, reappointment, promotion, and retention of outstanding faculty; successful productivity of faculty; mentor and mentee satisfaction in keeping with the goal of achieving for a sustainable community of scholarship and learning. It is important that administration signal its support for the embrace a culture of mentorship will be valued and rewarded. Such rewards for mentoring might include Unit as well as Dean's Mentorship Awards, inclusion of mentoring in the criteria (norms) for promotion and merit increases, and showcasing mentors in college communications.

Assessment to document achievement of the desired outcomes will include the following:

- Annual mentor and mentee satisfaction survey
- Aggregate data from the surveys will be used to assess and enhance the overall mentoring program.
- Individual surveys may be used by mentor/mentee teams to enhance their relationship.

Draft **Model A**

Mentoring by Committee

A Mentoring Policy for Tenure and Clinical Track Assistant Professors

When an assistant professor begins work as a new hire, *(the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs) will provide an orientation to the university and college, and the (Department Chair/Unit Head)* will provide an orientation to the department. Orientation topics should include (a) the mission of the university, college and department, (b) identification of support services and personnel, (c) a discussion of operational rules and procedures (d) expectations and norms for faculty performance in teaching, research, and service, (e) annual review procedures, (f) the promotion and tenure process, (g) the mentoring policy, and (h) any other information that will allow the new appointee to get off to a successful start.

1. Before the end of the first semester of an assistant professor's employment the department chair/unit head will appoint two to three senior faculty members, at least one of whom should be in the home department, to serve as that faculty member's mentor committee. This appointment is to be made in consultation with the mentee, after the mentee has had an opportunity to meet department and college faculty and review their areas of expertise. The appointment of a mentorship committee from among the CADA faculty does not preclude the mentee from having one or more additional mentors either inside or outside the College or the University
2. The department chair/unit head shall not be on the mentoring committee, as the department chair/unit head has the responsibility of evaluating the progress of the assistant professor annually and for the third-year review, which is to remain a separate process.
3. Committee members should be selected based upon their ability to support the assistant professor in research, teaching, and service and to provide guidance on all matters relating to the professional life of college faculty.
4. One member of the committee shall be appointed chair. This individual will be responsible for convening meetings of the committee and the mentee to develop an overall mentoring plan, to discuss the mentee's status at least one time each semester and to monitor the effectiveness of mentoring and the tone of the mentor/mentee relationships.

5. The department chair/unit head should periodically monitor the mentoring process and can, at his or her discretion or by request of the mentee or committee chair, replace a mentor at any time.

Responsibilities of the Committee:

- Meets with the mentee at least once per semester during the academic year. At the first meeting, the mentors and mentee will develop a *(three-year)* Mentoring Plan, in accordance with the expectations of the department. This plan should be updated after each yearly performance review with the Unit Head, and revised based upon the mentee's progress.
- The committee chair will share the mentoring plan, the three-year trajectory, and a yearly progress update, in writing, with the department chair.

Responsibilities of the Mentors:

- Mentors will meet individually with their mentees as mutually determined. In addition, they will meet with the mentoring committee *at least once each semester*.
- Participates in mentorship activities, such as orientation, training programs and evaluation.
- Reaches out to mentees to insure the development and maintenance of relationships.
- Makes time for, initiates, and holds meetings with the mentee at least twice per semester.
- Provides opportunities for discussion and reflection on careers and the mentor/mentee relationship.
- Reviews specific short- and long-term goals with the mentee and monitors progress toward these goals.
- Provides guidance, information, and feedback relative to research productivity, clinical responsibilities, publication progress, teaching effectiveness, and the College's mission and strategic plan as well as significant policies and procedures, particularly those for reappointment and promotion. The mentor will help with developing professional and organizational leadership skills, goal setting, and access to resources, advising students and personal career issues.
- Helps mentee to set priorities, manage time, and make wise choices among options and opportunities.
- Offers guidance on when and how to say "no."
- Provides counsel and strategies for working within a team framework.
- Works with the collaborative mentorship team, meeting with them during the semester or as needed.
- Establishes the agendas for the mentorship collaborative team meetings together with the mentee.
- Reviews progress and in conjunction with the Department Head and Associate Deans helps facilitate the mentee's success in meeting the established and agreed upon goals.
- Maintains parameters of confidentiality jointly agreed upon by the mentor and mentee at the initiation of the relationship.

Responsibilities of the Mentee

- Takes full responsibility for her/his career.
- In discussion with the mentor committee, develops a *(three-year)* Mentoring Plan, outlining his/her annual career goals in accordance with the expectations of the department and milestones for achieving these goals. This plan should be updated after each yearly performance review with the Unit Head, and revised based upon the mentee's progress.
- Participates in mentorship activities, such as orientation, training programs and evaluation.
- Reaches out to the mentor and insures the development and maintenance of their relationship.
- Remains open to the need for mentorship in certain areas.
- The junior faculty member will prepare a statement outlining his/her annual career goals and include a plan with milestones for achieving these goals. In discussion with the mentor, this plan should be revised yearly or more often as needed. It is the responsibility of the mentee to seek counsel from the mentor as needed..
- Makes time for, initiates, and holds regular meetings with the mentor.
- Meets with the Department Head at least once per year to review progress and to resolve issues. This meeting may or may not be the same as the collaborative mentorship team meeting and it may also serve as the end of year for the performance appraisal meeting.
- Works with the mentor to establish the agendas for the collaborative mentorship team meetings.
- Identifies and discusses perceived conflicting career advice with Department Head and mentor.
- Takes full responsibility for documentation of mentorship meetings and distributes documentation to all attend-

ees.

- Makes her/him self familiar with CADA and University criteria, policies, and procedures regarding faculty reappointments, promotions, and tenure.
- Makes her/him self familiar with the College's mission and strategic plan.
- Strives for academic excellence in their respective field of expertise and gives documented evidence of productivity, particularly in the area of scholarship and teaching.
- Maintains parameters of confidentiality jointly agreed upon by the mentor and mentee at the initiation of the relationship.

Responsibilities of the Dept/Unit head

The Department Head will meet with new and junior faculty members upon their appointment to the CADA. In this meeting, the Department Head and the new faculty member will establish the new faculty member's teaching responsibilities and begin a discussion about setting goals for their research and practice/service activities during the year. This initial meeting may or may not be designated to include the mentor. At the end of each academic year during the junior faculty member's probationary period the Unit Head will meet with the candidate for their Annual Performance Review (http://www.uic.edu/depts/oaa/Docs/701-Annual%20Faculty%20Evaluations_4-2009.pdf) to assess progress towards achieving the benchmarks set in the Mentoring Plan. Along with assessing that progress, the written report of this meeting may identify additional resources and strategies that will enhance the potential for each mentee's success. This annual process of review is repeated in subsequent years until the faculty member is promoted or receives tenure as appropriate to the individual's initial appointment.

in addition:

- In collaboration with the mentor(s), the unit head has overall responsibility for the success of the mentoring program.
- Ensures that the mentorship program is implemented and, with the Dean, conducts periodic evaluation of the success of the program.
- Works with the other Department Heads to identify faculty to serve as mentors, identify faculty needing mentors, and match mentors and mentees.
- Convenes each mentorship committee meeting when necessary in order to evaluate the plan for mentees, review progress, and ensure that the mentor/mentee relationship is successful.
- Ensures that outstanding mentors are rewarded as part of their annual merit review.
- Reports on the progress of new and junior faculty to the Dean at the end of each academic year.
- Ensures that the names of the mentor and collaborative team members are kept in the faculty member's file.

Assessment of Mentoring Program success:

The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs will assess the success of each unit's program following the spring semester of every year. This assessment will consist of the following:

1. A survey completed by mentees annually that measures mentee satisfaction with the mentoring process relative to the objectives of the mentoring program.
2. A survey completed by mentors annually that measures mentor satisfaction with, and records suggestions for the mentoring process.
3. The surveys will be collected and aggregated by the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs at the college level. The results of these surveys will be kept confidential and will be used by the Associate Dean to provide evidence of mentoring program effectiveness to the UIC Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. If the survey results suggest problems with the mentoring process, those results will be used by the Associate Dean to initiate program improvements.

One on One Mentoring

College of Architecture, Design, and the Arts

A Mentoring Policy for Tenure and Clinical Track Assistant Professors

When an assistant professor begins work as a new hire, *(the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs) will provide an orientation to the university and college, and the (Department Chair/Unit Head)* will provide an orientation to the department. Orientation topics should include (a) the mission of the university, college and department, (b) identification of support services and personnel, (c) a discussion of operational rules and procedures (d) expectations and norms for faculty performance in teaching, research, and service, (e) annual review procedures, (f) the promotion and tenure process, (g) the mentoring policy, and (h) any other information that will allow the new appointee to get off to a successful start.

1. Before the end of the first semester of an assistant professor's employment the department chair/unit head will appoint a senior faculty member to serve as that faculty member's mentor committee. This appointment is to be made in consultation with the mentee, after the mentee has had an opportunity to meet department and college faculty and review their areas of expertise. The appointment of a mentor from among the CADA faculty does not preclude the mentee from having one or more additional mentors either inside or outside the College or the University
2. The department chair/unit head shall serve as a mentor, as the department chair/unit head has the responsibility of evaluating the progress of the assistant professor annually and for the third-year review, which is to remain a separate process.
3. Mentors should be selected based upon their ability to support the assistant professor in research, teaching, and service and to provide guidance on all matters relating to the professional life of college faculty.
4. The mentor will have joint responsibility with the mentee for convening meetings and aiding the mentee in developing an overall mentoring plan. Thus they should meet at least once a semester to discuss the mentee's plan and any other issues that may be pertinent.
5. The department chair/unit head should periodically monitor the mentoring process and can, at his or her discretion or by request of the mentee or committee chair, replace a mentor at any time.

Responsibilities of the Mentor:

- Meets with the mentee at least once per semester during the academic year. From the first meeting, the mentors and mentee will develop a *(three-year)* Mentoring Plan, in accordance with the expectations of the department. This plan should be updated after each Annual Performance Review with the Unit Head, and revised based upon the mentee's progress.
- Participates in mentorship activities, such as orientation, training programs and evaluation.
- Reaches out to mentees to insure the development and maintenance of relationships.
- Makes time for, initiates, and holds meetings with the mentee at least twice per semester.
- Provides opportunities for discussion and reflection on careers and the mentor/mentee relationship.
- Reviews specific short- and long-term goals with the mentee and monitors progress toward these goals.
- Provides guidance, information, and feedback relative to research productivity, clinical responsibilities, publication progress, teaching effectiveness, and the College's mission and strategic plan as well as significant policies and procedures, particularly those for reappointment and promotion. The mentor may help with developing professional and organizational leadership skills, goal setting, and access to resources, advising students and personal career issues.
- Helps mentee to set priorities, manage time, and make wise choices among options and opportunities.
- Offers guidance on when and how to say "no."
- Provides counsel and strategies for working within a team framework.
- Works with the collaborative mentorship team, meeting with them during the semester or as needed.
- Establishes the agendas for the mentorship collaborative team meetings together with the mentee.

- Reviews progress and in conjunction with the Department Head and Associate Deans helps facilitate the mentee's success in meeting the established and agreed upon goals.
- Maintains parameters of confidentiality jointly agreed upon by the mentor and mentee at the initiation of the relationship.

Responsibilities of the Mentee

- Takes full responsibility for her/his career.
- In discussion with the mentor committee, develops a *(three-year)* Mentoring Plan, outlining his/her annual career goals in accordance with the expectations of the department and milestones for achieving these goals. This plan should be updated after each Annual Performance Review with the Unit Head, and revised based upon the mentee's progress.
- Participates in mentorship activities, such as orientation, training programs and evaluation.
- Reaches out to the mentor and insures the development and maintenance of their relationship.
- Remains open to the need for mentorship in certain areas.
- The junior faculty member will prepare a statement outlining his/her annual career goals and include a plan with milestones for achieving these goals. In discussion with the mentor, this plan should be revised yearly or more often as needed. It is the responsibility of the mentee to seek counsel from the mentor as needed..
- Makes time for, initiates, and holds regular meetings with the mentor.
- Meets with the Department Head at least once per year to review progress and to resolve issues. This meeting may or may not be the same as the collaborative mentorship team meeting and it may also serve as the end of year for the performance appraisal meeting.
- Works with the mentor to establish the agendas for the collaborative mentorship team meetings.
- Identifies and discusses perceived conflicting career advice with Department Head and mentor.
- Takes full responsibility for documentation of mentorship meetings and distributes documentation to all attendees.
- Makes her/him self familiar with CADA and University criteria, policies, and procedures regarding faculty reappointments, promotions, and tenure.
- Makes her/him self familiar with the College's mission and strategic plan.
- Strives for academic excellence in their respective field of expertise and gives documented evidence of productivity, particularly in the area of scholarship and teaching.
- Maintains parameters of confidentiality jointly agreed upon by the mentor and mentee at the initiation of the relationship.

Responsibilities of the Dept/Unit head

The Department Head will meet with new and junior faculty members upon their appointment to the CADA. In this meeting, the Department Head and the new faculty member will establish the new faculty member's teaching responsibilities and begin a discussion about setting goals for their research and practice/service activities during the year. This initial meeting may or may not be designated to include the mentor. At the end of each academic year during the junior faculty member's probationary period the Unit Head will meet with the candidate for their Annual Performance Review (http://www.uic.edu/depts/oaa/Docs/701-Annual%20Faculty%20Evaluations_4-2009.pdf) to assess progress towards achieving the benchmarks set in the Mentoring Plan. Along with assessing that progress, the written report of this meeting may identify additional resources and strategies that will enhance the potential for each mentee's success. This annual process of review is repeated in subsequent years until the faculty member is promoted or receives tenure as appropriate to the individual's initial appointment.

in addition:

- In collaboration with the mentor, the unit head has overall responsibility for the success of the mentoring program.
- Ensures that the mentorship program is implemented and, with the Dean, conducts periodic evaluation of the success of the program.
- Works with the other Department Heads to identify faculty to serve as mentors, identify faculty needing mentors, and match mentors and mentees.
- Ensures that outstanding mentors are rewarded as part of their annual merit review.
- Reports on the progress of new and junior faculty to the Dean at the end of each academic year.
- Ensures that the names of the mentor and collaborative team members are kept in the faculty member's file.

Assessment of Mentoring Program success:

(The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs or the College Executive Committee) will assess the success of each unit's program on an annual basis for the first two years and on a periodic basis after that. At minimum this assessment will consist of the following:

1. A survey completed by mentees annually that measures mentee satisfaction with the mentoring process relative to the objectives of the mentoring program.
2. A survey completed by mentors annually that measures mentor satisfaction with, and records suggestions for the mentoring process.

The surveys will be collected and aggregated by *(The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs or the College Executive Committee)* at the college level. The results of these surveys will be kept confidential and will be used by the Associate Dean to provide evidence of mentoring program effectiveness to the UIC Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. If the survey results suggest problems with the mentoring process, those results will be used by the Associate Dean to initiate program improvements.

Draft **Survey of Mentees**

The results of these surveys will be kept confidential and will be aggregated at the college level and used by the Associate Dean to provide evidence of mentoring program effectiveness to the UIC Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. If the survey results suggest problems with the mentoring process, those results will be used by the Associate Dean to initiate mentoring program improvements.

For each item below, circle the number that best represents your experience with your mentoring committee.

Not at all 1 >>>>5 A great deal

My committee/mentor

1. Advised me on a professional plan of action. 1 2 3 4 5
2. Helped me to connect with individuals in the department and college. 1 2 3 4 5
3. Helped me to connect with individuals across the university. 1 2 3 4 5
4. Helped me develop external relationships 1 2 3 4 5
5. Provided useful advice about grants, teaching, service, and scholarship. 1 2 3 4 5
6. Helped me to understand faculty expectations and norms. 1 2 3 4 5
7. Helped me prepare for my third-year review (if applicable). 1 2 3 4 5
8. Helped me prepare for tenure and promotion (if applicable). 1 2 3 4 5
9. Helped me understand how the university, college, and department runs 1 2 3 4 5
10. I was comfortable with my mentors 1 2 3 4 5
11. I sought my mentors out for advice beyond the committee meetings. 1 2 3 4 5
12. My mentors were available. 1 2 3 4 5
13. My mentors knew a sufficient amount about my work for me to trust their advice. 1 2 3 4 5
14. I took advantage of all of the help that I was offered. 1 2 3 4 5
15. I met with the entire mentoring committee _____ times during the year.
16. I met individually with mentor 1 _____ times during the past year.
17. I met individually with mentor 2 _____ times during the past year.
18. I met individually with mentor 3 _____ times during the past year.

The most valuable part of the mentoring process was _____

The least valuable part of the mentoring process was _____

In the future, I would like to see these changes in the mentoring process. _____

Draft **Survey of Mentors**

The results of these surveys will be kept confidential and will be aggregated at the college level and used by the Associate Dean to provide evidence of mentoring program effectiveness to the UIC Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. If the survey results suggest problems with the mentoring process, those results will be used by the Associate Dean to initiate mentoring program improvements.

For each item below, circle the number that best represents your experience with your mentoring committee.

Not at all 1 >>>>5 A great deal

1. I provided advice on a professional plan of action. 1 2 3 4 5
 2. I helped my mentee to connect with individuals in the department and college. 1 2 3 4 5
 3. I helped my mentee to connect with individuals across the university. 1 2 3 4 5
 4. I helped my mentee develop external connections. 1 2 3 4 5
 5. I provided useful advice about grants, teaching service, and scholarship. 1 2 3 4 5
 6. I helped my mentee to understand faculty expectations and norms. 1 2 3 4 5
 7. I helped my mentee prepare for my third-year review (if applicable). 1 2 3 4 5
 8. I helped my mentee prepare for tenure and promotion (if applicable). 1 2 3 4 5
 9. I helped my mentee understand how the university, college, and department runs. 1 2 3 4 5
 10. I was comfortable with my mentee 1 2 3 4 5
 11. My mentee sought me out for advice beyond the committee meetings. 1 2 3 4 5
 12. I was available. 1 2 3 4 5
 13. I knew a sufficient amount about my mentee's work to provide useful advice. 1 2 3 4 5
 14. My mentee took advantage of all of the help I offered. 1 2 3 4 5
 15. My mentee took advantage of all of the help the committee offered 1 2 3 4 5
 16. I met individually with my mentee _____ times during the past year.
 17. The mentoring committee met with the mentee _____ times during the past year.
- The most valuable part of the mentoring process was _____
- The least valuable part of the mentoring process was _____
- In the future, I would like to see these changes in the mentoring process _____

- Benefits Orientation
- NESSIE New Hire Log-On ID and password
- Staff Directory Form Completed
- I-Card
- Parking application and sticker
- NETID ID (activate: <http://activatenetid.accc.uic.edu>)
- Email access
- Building access
- Voicemail enrollment
- Office key

Introduction to Resources

- Teaching resources
- Blackboard orientation and access
- Library
- Listservs enrollment (Dept. and College)
- Organizational Chart
- Mission and Strategic Plan Overview
- College Committees
- Appt./Tenure/Promotion Policies
- All College Faculty Meetings
- Copier ID
- Department Meetings
- Business Cards

College of Education
Mentoring Policy for Tenure and Clinical Track Assistant Professors

Effective mentoring is critical for enhancing academic excellence, building a strong and diverse faculty, and developing a respectful and positive work climate in which all members of the college community can thrive. Accordingly, this mentoring policy is created to provide support for tenure track and clinical track assistant professors in the College of Education. The specific objectives of this policy are to:

- Facilitate the successful entry of assistant professors into structures, processes, and climate of the university, college, and department.
- Provide support to assistant professors in teaching, research, service and other aspects of professional life as they seek productive paths to tenure and promotion.

A. Orientation

When an assistant professor begins work as a new hire, the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs will provide an orientation to the university and college, and the Department Chair will provide an orientation to the department. Orientation topics should include (a) operational rules and procedures, (b) support services and personnel, (c) the mission of the university, college and department, (d) expectations and norms for faculty performance in teaching, research, and service, (e) annual review procedures, (f) the promotion and tenure process, (g) the mentoring policy, and (h) any other information that will allow the new appointee to get off to a successful start.

B. Mentoring Committee

1. Two to three senior faculty members, at least one of whom should be in the home department, will be appointed by the department chair. This appointment shall be in consultation with the mentee, after the mentee has had an opportunity to meet department and college faculty and review their areas of expertise.
2. The department chair shall not be on the mentoring committee. The department chair has the responsibility of evaluating the progress of the assistant professor annually and for the third-year review, and this is considered a separate process.
3. Committee members are selected based upon their ability to support the assistant professor in research, teaching, and service and to provide guidance on all matters relating to the professional life of college faculty.
4. The department chair shall appoint one mentor as committee chair. This individual will be responsible for convening meetings of the committee and the mentee to develop an overall mentoring plan, to discuss the mentee's status at least one time each semester and to monitor the effectiveness of mentoring and the tone of the mentor/mentee relationships.

5. The department chair should periodically monitor the mentoring process and can, at his or her discretion or by request of the mentee or committee chair, replace a mentor at any time.

C. Responsibilities of the Committee:

1. The Mentoring Committee will meet with the mentee at least once per semester during the academic year. At the first meeting, the mentors and mentee will develop a three-year mentoring plan, in accordance with the expectations of the department. The plan will be reviewed at the final meeting of the committee each year, and revised based upon the mentee's progress.
2. The committee chair will share the mentoring plan, the three-year trajectory, and a yearly progress update, in writing, with the department chair.

D. Responsibilities of the Mentors:

1. Mentors will meet individually with their mentees as mutually determined. In addition, they will meet with the mentoring committee at least once each semester.
2. Mentors will provide guidance to the mentees to facilitate the mentee's work and to support them towards accomplishing tenure and promotion.

E. Responsibilities of the Department Chair

The Department Chair assigns the mentors and reviews the mentoring plans. The Department Chair will share plans, annual reports, third-year review documents, and feedback to the mentoring committee as appropriate.

F. Assessment of Mentoring Program success:

The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs will assess the success of each mentee's program in the spring semester of every year. This assessment will consist of the following:

1. A survey completed by mentees annually that measures mentee satisfaction with the mentoring process relative to the objectives of the mentoring program.
2. A survey completed by mentors annually that measures mentor satisfaction with the mentoring process.
3. The surveys will be collected and aggregated by the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs at the college level. The results of these surveys will be kept confidential and will be used by the Associate Dean to provide evidence of mentoring program effectiveness to the UIC Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. If the survey results suggest problems with the mentoring process, those results will be used by the Associate Dean to initiate program improvements.

Survey of Mentees

The results of these surveys will be kept confidential and will be aggregated at the college level and used by the Associate Dean to provide evidence of mentoring program effectiveness to the UIC Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. If the survey results suggest problems with the mentoring process, those results will be used by the Associate Dean to initiate mentoring program improvements.

For each item below, circle the number that best represents your experience with your mentoring committee.

		Not at all			A great deal
	My committee...	1	2	3	4
1.	Advised me on a professional plan of action.	1	2	3	4
2.	Helped me to connect with individuals in the department and college.	1	2	3	4
3.	Helped me to connect with individuals across the university.	1	2	3	4
4.	Helped me develop national/international colleagues.	1	2	3	4
5.	Provided useful advice about grants, teaching, service, and scholarship.	1	2	3	4
6.	Helped me to understand faculty expectations and norms.	1	2	3	4
7.	Helped me prepare for my third-year review (if applicable).	1	2	3	4
8.	Helped me prepare for tenure and promotion (if applicable).	1	2	3	4
9.	Helped me understand how the university, college, and department runs.	1	2	3	4

10.	I was comfortable with my mentors	1	2	3	4
11.	I sought my mentors out for advice beyond the committee meetings.	1	2	3	4
12.	My mentors were available.	1	2	3	4
13.	My mentors knew a sufficient amount about my work for me to trust their advice.	1	2	3	4

14. I took advantage of all of the help that I was offered. 1 2 3 4
15. I met with the entire mentoring committee _____times during the year.
16. I met individually with mentor 1 _____ times during the past year.
17. I met individually with mentor 2 _____ times during the past year.
18. I met individually with mentor 3 _____ times during the past year.

The most valuable part of the mentoring process was

The least valuable part of the mentoring process was

In the future, I would like to see these changes in the mentoring process.

Survey of Mentors

The results of these surveys will be kept confidential and will be aggregated at the college level and used by the Associate Dean to provide evidence of mentoring program effectiveness to the UIC Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. If the survey results suggest problems with the mentoring process, those results will be used by the Associate Dean to initiate mentoring program improvements.

For each item below, circle the number that best represents your experience with your mentoring committee.

		Not at all			A great Deal
		1	2	3	4
1.	I provided advice on a professional plan of action.	1	2	3	4
2.	I helped my mentee to connect with individuals in the department and college.	1	2	3	4
3.	I helped my mentee to connect with individuals across the university.	1	2	3	4
4.	I helped my mentee develop national/international colleagues.	1	2	3	4
5.	I provided useful advice about grants, teaching, service, and scholarship.	1	2	3	4
6.	I helped my mentee to understand faculty expectations and norms.	1	2	3	4
7.	I helped my mentee prepare for my third-year review (if applicable).	1	2	3	4
8.	I helped my mentee prepare for tenure and promotion (if applicable).	1	2	3	4
9.	I helped my mentee understand how the university, college, and department runs.	1	2	3	4
10.	I was comfortable with my mentee	1	2	3	4
11.	My mentee sought me out for advice beyond the committee meetings.	1	2	3	4
12.	I was available.	1	2	3	4
13.	I knew a sufficient amount about my mentee's work to provide useful advice.	1	2	3	4

14. My mentee took advantage of all of the help I offered. 1 2 3 4
15. My mentee took advantage of all of the help the committee offered. 1 2 3 4
16. I met individually with my mentee _____ times during the past year.
17. The mentoring committee met with the mentee _____ times during the past year.

The most valuable part of the mentoring process was

The least valuable part of the mentoring process was

In the future, I would like to see these changes in the mentoring process.



Guidelines for the School of Design Faculty Mentoring Program

Mission

The School of Design is committed to the development and retention of excellent faculty. The faculty mentoring in each department aims to help untenured junior faculty to develop their professional careers at Penn.

The School of Design strongly supports and encourages faculty mentoring, as follows:

- The department chairs oversee the mentoring within their academic unit;
- Tenured faculty, professors of practice, and emeritus professors may serve as mentors to untenured junior faculty;
- Procedures are developed to identify and address problems in the developing stages of the careers of untenured junior faculty;
- A system for documenting progress is established and maintained; and
- Information about the faculty mentoring program, policies, and procedures is provided to new faculty when they arrive at Penn. Each new faculty member reviews this information with his or her faculty mentor.

Definition of Faculty Mentoring

A faculty mentor is a senior faculty member, professor of practice, or emeritus professor who advises or guides a junior faculty member about how to achieve professional development and academic success. In the School of Design, the faculty mentor will help the mentee create an agenda for working toward his or her professional goals as well as offer insights into how to build an academic career. The mentor – mentee relationship must be built on a foundation of trust.

Role of the Department Chair or Program Head in Mentoring

The department chair has overall responsibility for the success of the faculty mentoring program. The department chair must implement the department faculty mentoring program and assign a faculty mentor to each untenured junior faculty member. The dean of the School of Design chair should explain the faculty mentor program in the junior faculty member's initial letter of appointment. The department chair assigns a faculty mentor to the junior faculty member when the junior faculty member arrives on campus.

The department chair will monitor the effectiveness of the faculty mentoring program, ensure that appropriate documentation exists, meet with mentors and mentees, and make changes as needed.

Reporting and Evaluation

The faculty mentoring program will have a uniform reporting and evaluation process throughout the School of Design:

- There will be a simple record of all meetings with the mentee;
- Mentor and mentee will meet at least twice a year; and
- The meetings will focus on developing an academic career, including research, teaching, publications, networking, and policies and procedures for reappointment and promotion.

By July 1 of each year, the department chair will submit to the Dean of the School of Design:

- A list of all untenured junior faculty and their mentors for the next academic year; and
- A report of the prior year's mentoring activities, including a listing of mentors, mentees, and meeting dates.

Each year, the Dean of the School of Design or the dean's designate will confer with both the mentor and mentee to evaluate the relationship. If the relationship, for whatever reason, is regarded as undesirable, a new mentor will be recruited for the junior faculty member.

Periodically, the School of Design will evaluate its mentoring program to ensure it is meeting its stated purpose.

Selecting a Faculty Mentor

- Each untenured junior faculty member may be assigned one or more mentors at the rank of associate professor with tenure or above (including professors of practice and emeritus professors). Usually, the faculty mentor will be in member of the mentee's department. But the mentor may be chosen from other departments or schools if more suited to the mentee's academic program;
- Department chairs should not appoint themselves as mentors because they will likely have to make decisions about reappointment and promotion concerning the untenured junior faculty;
- The mentee may change mentors if he or she chooses, with the department chair's approval; and
- The department chair identifies a mentor in the new faculty member's initial letter of appointment.

Responsibilities of the Mentor

The mentor should:

- be accessible to the mentee and meet with him or her at least twice a year.

- provide the mentee with constructive comments;
- advise the mentee about how to develop an academic career, including research or related scholarly activities, budgeting time, teaching, participating on committees, participating in external professional activities;
- assist the mentee in establishing short-term (3 years) and long term career goals.
- provide guidance and information about scholarship, publications in professional journals, exhibitions, supervising students, presenting at conferences, research support, consulting, and collaboration with colleagues;
- be familiar with resources for faculty development offered by the University, School of Design, and the department;
- advise the mentee about the importance of networking and networking strategies;
- be familiar with and explain the department, School of Design, and University criteria, policies and procedures regarding faculty tracks, reappointment, and promotion and tenure; advise mentee that recommendations for reappointment and promotion are the responsibility of the department chair and the mentee should address questions about his or her own situation to the department chair;
- advise the mentee about the importance of being a team player;
- maintain confidentiality;

Responsibilities of the Mentee

The mentee should:

- assume responsibility for his or her career;
- ask for and accept advice and constructive criticism;
- actively participate in the mentoring relationship;
- become familiar with the department, School of Design, and University criteria, policies, and procedures about faculty tracks, reappointment, and promotion and tenure;
- continue to add to the knowledge base in his or her area of expertise;
- develop a professional network which includes mentor's recommendations and those personally identified;
- maintain confidentiality in relationship with mentor; and
- strive for academic excellence in all areas of expertise and provide documented evidence of productivity, especially in teaching, publications, or other scholarly activities.

2006-1548: A THIRD YEAR REVIEW OF THE FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM AT MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY

Donna Reese, Mississippi State University

Dr. Donna Reese is Associate Dean for Academics and Administration in the James Worth Bagley College of Engineering at Mississippi State University

Kirk Schulz, Mississippi State University

Dr. Kirk Schulz is Dean of Engineering in the James Worth Bagley College of Engineering at Mississippi State University

Noel Schulz, Mississippi State University

Dr. Noel Schulz is an Associate Professor and holder of the TVA Professorship in Power Systems in the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering at Mississippi State University

Roger King, Mississippi State University

Dr. Roger King is Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Studies in the James Worth Bagley College of Engineering at Mississippi State University

A Third Year Review of the Faculty Development Program at Mississippi State University

Introduction

Over the past three years, we have replaced over 25% of the faculty members within the Bagley College of Engineering at Mississippi State University due to retirements or departure to other universities. Many of the new faculty hires are at the Assistant Professor level, with little or no academic experience. In an effort to assist these faculty members in successfully starting their academic careers, the Bagley College of Engineering implemented a comprehensive faculty development program that assists new faculty members in balancing teaching, scholarship, and service responsibilities [1,2]. This program is now in its third year, and this paper will report on the significant impact that this program has had on new faculty members in regards to teaching effectiveness, effective national service, and research productivity.

Current Faculty Development Program

The faculty development program at Mississippi State falls into three distinct phases: programs for first-year faculty members, programs for untenured faculty members, and programs for all faculty members regardless of rank and tenure status. Some details on each of these three interrelated aspects of the faculty development program are described below. Details on the current program can be found on the Bagley College of Engineering website at:
http://www.engr.msstate.edu/faculty_staff/faculty_development/index.php.

The faculty development program is administered out of the Dean of Engineering office, with shared responsibilities between the Dean of Engineering, the Associate Dean for Academics and Administration, and the Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Studies. Each year, the Deans will meet to discuss the faculty development program, including suggested topics, key speakers, and who to invite as speakers/workshop coordinators.

First-Year Faculty Members

All first year faculty members at Mississippi State University attend university level orientation sessions that include presentations made by the President, Provost, Vice President for research and other senior administration officers. Mississippi State also organizes a bus tour which takes the new faculty members around Mississippi to see various industries in the state, meet different constituent groups who interact with the university, and in general to allow the new faculty members to interact together on a social basis. Immediately prior to this event, the Bagley College of Engineering hosts a lunch for new faculty members to introduce them to the various Deans and to allow them to meet the other new faculty members.

During the first two weeks of class, we hold several key events, including a welcome reception at the Dean's house, a reception at a local restaurant with first and second year faculty members, and lunch with the new faculty members and their mentors.

Following the start of the semester, new faculty members have one activity per month that is expressly geared towards their needs as new faculty members. These include opportunities to meet with Office of Research Staff members, meetings with the Dean's office staff and learning their various responsibilities, and career tips from senior administrators. A summary of these activities is listed in Table 1.

MONTH	EVENT
August	New Faculty Lunch
August	New Faculty Appetizers at Deans House
August	New Faculty/Second Year Faculty Social
August	New Faculty meet with Mentor Group
September	New Faculty – Open Forum
October	Meet Sponsored Programs
November	Meet Dean's Office Staff
December	Tips for Getting Career Started – VP Research
January	Panel – Effective Service/Outreach
February	Preparing to Visit a Research Sponsor
March	Trip to National Science Foundation
April	NSF CAREER Award Development Panel
May	End of the Year Activity and Assessment

Table 1: Faculty Development Activities for New Faculty Members

One of the key aspects of the faculty development program is assignment of faculty mentors for each new faculty member. Each Department Head is asked to nominate a senior faculty member to serve as a mentor for each untenured faculty member. The Deans meet with the mentor group prior to our new faculty – mentor lunch, and discuss tips for effective peer mentoring. Mentors are provided with key resource materials on effective mentoring, and are asked to meet with their mentee on a monthly basis.

One of the highlights for the year is the visit to the National Science Foundation (NSF). Several group visits are arranged where the entire group of new faculty members will meet with the appropriate Division Director, and individual faculty members will have appointments with their own program managers. The faculty members are strongly encouraged to volunteer as proposal reviewers, giving them experience seeing the proposal process from another side.

One of the challenges with hiring so many new faculty members is that it can be challenging for department heads, deans office staff, research center directors and the upper administration to remember the faces and expertise of the new faculty members.

Each year, we compile a “new faculty” directory, with a picture of each new faculty member, as well as a short biographical sketch for each person. This is duplicated and widely circulated throughout the Bagley College of Engineering and the University.

Untenured Faculty Members

There are several events that are held each year for untenured faculty members. We hold a social event between the new faculty member and second-year faculty members to allow the new faculty members some idea of what to expect during the first year from other faculty members who were recently “in their shoes”. Additionally, we invite the untenured faculty members to several other events including a description of the federal relations initiatives and how to participate, and a general seminar on career advice from a senior administrator. A summary of these activities is listed in Table 2.

MONTH	EVENT
August	Second Year Faculty/New Faculty Social
September	Understanding Federal Relations at MSU
November	Tips for Getting Career Started – VP Research
April	NSF CAREER Award Development Panel

Table 2: Faculty Development Activities for Untenured Faculty Members

All Faculty Members

The College of Engineering also holds several events that are geared for an open faculty audience, regardless of rank, tenure status, or time at the university. We sponsor two “brown bag” lunches each semester with a focus on effective teaching. These seminars are led by faculty members who are among the most effective teaching faculty at Mississippi State. These lunches are done in a panel format, with two faculty members discussing a particular teaching topic, followed by open discussion with the audience. Additionally, at least one research related topic is also part of the faculty development program each semester, so that all faculty members have the opportunity to grow in their careers. A summary of these activities is listed in Table 3.

MONTH	EVENT
September	Brown Bag Lunch on Teaching and Learning – <i>Using Technology Effectively</i>
September	Understanding Federal Relations at MSU
November	Brown Bag Lunch on Teaching and Learning – <i>Teaching Introductory Courses</i>
February	Brown Bag Lunch on Teaching and Learning – <i>Teaching Senior Design</i>
April	Brown Bag Lunch on Teaching and Learning – <i>Incorporating ABET Assessment into Engineering Courses</i>

Table 3: Faculty Development Activities for All Faculty Members

Program Impact

The faculty development program has had a significant impact on Mississippi State University faculty members in starting their careers in several key areas, which are given below. By the end of this academic year, somewhere over 20 new faculty members will have passed through this program. While we are in the process of collecting quantitative assessment data on this program, we have observed several key impacts from a college administrative point of view, which may suggest the adoption of a similar type of program at other engineering schools.

The new faculty members develop a group of peers to socialize with across disciplinary boundaries. Many of the new faculty members will socialize off-hours, and often develop friendships outside of their department during their first couple of months on campus. This network also provides moral support during a very difficult adjustment period for many faculty members.

A group visit to the National Science Foundation is a friendly way to introduce faculty members to the peer review process. Many of the new faculty members are asked to participate in an NSF panel following their visit, and gain a much better understanding of the peer and panel review process. Several of the faculty members have commented on the importance of this experience when developing their own proposals by having the opportunity to read both high quality and poor quality proposals.

Opportunities to meet and ask questions of high-level administrators are beneficial to the newer faculty members and the administrators. Many high-level university administrators have a broad range of research and teaching experience, but are often too busy or involved in meetings to meet and mentor individual faculty members. By having these key administrators meet with the new faculty members in a smaller, more intimate setting, it gives both the administrators and the new faculty members an opportunity to get to know each other well. Many of the presentations made by key administrators have been very effective.

Any faculty development program must have opportunities for new faculty as well as more established faculty members. It is key to make sure to bring new ideas to senior faculty as well as junior faculty members. Additionally, as faculty members work progress in their careers, many will take on greater leadership roles, will teach more, and will lead large research teams. All of these require skills that may not be obtained during the first few years when initiating a research program as a junior faculty member.

Summary

The faculty development program at Mississippi State University is in its third year, and has had a significant impact on the faculty. A high quality faculty development program

can easily be put in place that will have a significant impact in any institution using expertise available at any university for a very reasonable cost.

Bibliography

[1] Noel N. Schulz and Kirk H. Schulz, "Faculty Development – The Future of Engineering Education", *Proceedings of the 2004 Annual ASEE Conference*, Salt Lake City, Utah, Session 1475, 2004.

[2] Noel N. Schulz and Kirk H. Schulz, "Investing in Faculty – A Comprehensive Faculty Development Program", *Proceedings of the 2005 ASEE Southeast Section Conference*, Chattanooga, TN, 2005.

College of Education Faculty Council Mentoring Study Series- Phase I

Consent Script:

As we have discussed each meeting beginning in May 2014, we (College of Education Faculty Council Members) intend to conduct research as a committee. All of us are aware that the creation of our College mentoring plan provides us an opportunity to mentor each other through a common research goal and process. Many of us would like to be a committee that not only discusses research but which also produces research. This means we intend to research our development process as a case study and seek publication. Each phase of the research will be unique.

In this first phase, I (Kay Brocato) will act as the PI and will serve as the contact for the research. This means that I (Kay Brocato) will be examining the mentoring plan drafting process as an act of designing in a studio based learning environment, since this is one of my (Kay Brocato's) primary research lines. In subsequent phases, another IRB application or modification will be completed by the next leader in the research and development of the faculty mentoring plan. That next PI may establish a new research paradigm and literature around which to frame the research. A separate consenting process will take place at that time.

Phase I is a case study describing our development process. During our monthly meetings we will reserve a portion of time to discuss issues related to our development of a mentoring process. During this section of the meeting, we will record the data for this case study by taking notes on the conversations we have. No persons' name will be recorded alongside or with his/her comments. After the notes are taken they will be shared with each member of the committee so that each person may approve or remove any data they wish not to include in the research. Each person on the committee who participates in the conversation and validates the data taken in the notes of the discussion will initial the notes. Once a manuscript draft is available, committee members will again be allowed opportunity to read, approve, and/or disapprove of any data which has been included. Copies of manuscript drafts will be provided to each member for review and member checking as a validity and reliability measure. Any research manuscript will be unique and separate from the actual mentoring plan draft we produce as a service to the college. Any data or idea recorded in the notes or any manuscript draft which is asked by any member of the committee to be removed, will be removed without question, judgment, or consequence. All members of the committee will be invited into review notes and manuscripts multiple times to ensure all material included is acceptable.

Participation in this research is voluntary. Those interested in participating by having their conversation and commentary recorded in meeting notes and then used to answer the research question, "How will a neophyte faculty council bolster college and university assets to create a cross-college mentoring plan?" will indicate their consent by signing their full name on the following consent log. A protocol list for focus group discussion is also included above the consent log so that participants can review the kinds of questions and conversations anticipated. Additionally, participant will provide ongoing consent by initialing notes and drafts of manuscripts. If electronic documents notes and manuscript drafts are exchanged, an e-mailed consent note will suffice as the initialing of notes and manuscript drafts.

For the Phase I consenting process, please sign below if you are willing to serve as a research participant and volunteer as we describe our own case of creating a college mentoring plan. All those who do not wish to participate, please do not sign the consent ledger. If anyone decides not to participate at a later date, that person may contact me (Kay Brocato) at kbrocato@colled.msstate.edu or 662-312-9703 or the office of regulatory compliance at irb@research.msstate.edu or 662-325-3294. We will remove the person from the ledger by marking through the name on the consent ledger and noting the date of removal of the participant. At that point we will review existing data and manuscripts to be certain that all existing research details are acceptable to the participant who is removing him/her self.

Each manuscript will likely contain a statement as follows to acknowledge all faculty counsel members' contribution to the research:

“The authors wish to acknowledge their appreciation for the College of Education Faculty Council members, [names listed here], at Mississippi State University for sharing ideas, data, and time to review drafts of this research.

Faculty Counsel members who do not wish to be listed in this statement of appreciation will not be listed and will not be penalized in any way for this preference.

Protocol for Focus Group Questions:

Overarching question- How will a neophyte faculty council bolster college and university assets to create a cross-college mentoring plan?

- What mentoring needs do we have?
- How many and what descriptors do we need to consider of junior-level faculty at the Assistant or Associate level who need mentoring?
- How many and what descriptors do we need to consider of faculty at the Assistant or Associate or Full professor level who would like to serve as a mentor for others?
- What other factors do we need to know to describe the existing variables which will influence our mentoring process planning?
- What are the ideas we could develop for the mentoring plan?
- What mentoring plans already in existence do we want to consider? What portions are important to keep and or discard of existing plans?
- Are there elements of a mentoring process we may be overlooking?

Consent Ledger: Please sign your name in an empty box to signify you agree with being a part of the faculty council research:
