

The International  
**JOURNAL**  
*of*  
**LEARNING**

Volume 16

A Ten-Year Faculty Mentoring Program:  
Administrator, Mentor, and Mentee Perspectives

Linda P. Thurston, Lori Navarrete and Teresa Miller

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LEARNING  
<http://www.Learning-Journal.com>

First published in 2009 in Melbourne, Australia by Common Ground Publishing Pty Ltd  
[www.CommonGroundPublishing.com](http://www.CommonGroundPublishing.com).

© 2009 (individual papers), the author(s)  
© 2009 (selection and editorial matter) Common Ground

Authors are responsible for the accuracy of citations, quotations, diagrams, tables and maps.

All rights reserved. Apart from fair use for the purposes of study, research, criticism or review as permitted under the Copyright Act (Australia), no part of this work may be reproduced without written permission from the publisher. For permissions and other inquiries, please contact  
<[cg-support@commongroundpublishing.com](mailto:cg-support@commongroundpublishing.com)>.

ISSN: 1447-9494  
Publisher Site: <http://www.Learning-Journal.com>

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LEARNING is peer-reviewed, supported by rigorous processes of criterion-referenced article ranking and qualitative commentary, ensuring that only intellectual work of the greatest substance and highest significance is published.

Typeset in Common Ground Markup Language using CGCreator multichannel typesetting system  
<http://www.commongroundpublishing.com/software/>

# A Ten-Year Faculty Mentoring Program: Administrator, Mentor, and Mentee Perspectives

Linda P. Thurston, Kansas State University, Kansas, USA

Lori Navarrete, Nevada State College, Nevada, USA

Teresa Miller, Kansas State University, Kansas, USA

*Abstract: Mentoring programs for new faculty in higher education have the potential to increase and enhance the success of new professors, to renew and inspire senior faculty, and to enhance recruitment and retention efforts of the administration. The College of Education at Kansas State University is the home of a New Faculty Mentoring program that has been in place for over 10 years. The program, designed by a committee of tenure-track professors of education, was created following a year of planning, adopted by faculty assembly, implemented, and then evaluated yearly. To date, the program has involved 28 new faculty and over 30 senior faculty mentors. A comprehensive summative evaluation that included stakeholder interviews and a longitudinal tracking of mentees indicated that the program has met the goals of the college administration, enhanced mentee success, and was beneficial to mentors. This presentation will provide the perspectives of administrators, mentors, and mentees regarding the development and the outcomes of the program.*

Keywords: Higher Education, Faculty Mentoring, Evaluation

## Introduction

“...we educate, and train, but we don't nurture”.

Wright and Wright (1987, p. 207)

**M**ENTORING PROGRAMS IN higher education are being developed to advance a diverse faculty, promote supportive academic environments, and recruit and retain outstanding faculty. Effective mentoring programs can assist new professors by coaching them in the formal and informal aspects the academic culture, helping them develop networks for collaboration, and helping them understand and meet the expectations for promotion and tenure. There are often added benefits for those who mentor, such as renewed interest in the field and the altruistic nature of mentoring. Thus, mentoring of junior faculty is vitally important to higher education institutions and impacts three stakeholder groups: new faculty mentees, senior faculty mentors, and administrators. As learned from mentoring programs in business and industry, mentoring is the catalyst for advancing and enhancing organization structure, developing and sustaining informal and formal networks of communication, and when structured effectively, it offers stimulation to both junior and senior faculty members (Luna and Cullen, 1995).

Research on mentoring in community colleges where faculty who reported they benefited from mentoring programs described their relationships as providing both psychosocial and career benefits (Hopkins and Grigoriu, 2005). Psychosocial benefits included role modeling,

counseling, friendship, acceptance, and confirmation. Career benefits involve such activities as coaching, protection, and support when taking on challenging assignments. Psychosocial support enhances a new faculty member's sense of competence and identity in the workplace. Career-related support enhances advancement through exposure and guidance in career development.

The results of a faculty mentoring study by Wilson, Pereira & Valentine (2002) also indicated that mentoring programs involve aspects of both career and psychosocial functions. The mentees evaluated the value of the mentor relationships, saying the relationships were helpful in the beginning for adjusting to a new environment, learning a new system, and connecting to the school. These mentees identified several factors they considered important in their mentor relationships, including empathic skills, enthusiasm, positive role modeling, accepting, flexibility, and a willingness to have a two-way learning process. They reported that the mentoring relationship provided a way to vent frustrations, cope with stress, and develop a balance between teaching and research. The university also experienced benefits senior faculty mentors found the process "stimulating".

A pilot mentoring program for new faculty at Massachusetts General Hospital was examined by Tracy, Jagsi, Starr and Tarbell (2004) who found that camaraderie and the needed support by other members of the department were benefits of the program. An unexpected result was the benefit to the mentors of working with their mentees, including increased opportunities for self-reflection and a sense of being more connected. Tracy and colleagues (2004) identified these psychosocial benefits to mentees: having a role model, having increased visibility, feeling more supported, and having an increase in self-confidence.

Sands, Parson and Duane (1991) concluded that mentoring is a complex, multidimensional activity. They described four important factors of the mentoring relationship: friendship (emotional support, advice, etc.); collaboration in research or publications, career development, etc.; information about policies and procedures, promotion and tenure hints; intellectual guidance, manuscript collaboration and constructive criticism. Further, these researchers concluded that it was important for mentees to know what type of mentor they needed and for mentors to acknowledge what kind of help they were willing to provide, in order to create a mutually agreeable mentoring relationship.

Goodwin, Stevens and Bellamy (1998) studied mentoring beliefs and efforts. Values expressed in their interviews were listed as mutual respect, caring, accessibility of the mentor, compatibility, and support. Junior professors also valued help in establishing partnerships with outside agencies and institutions.

Hartwick (2005) identified crucial characteristics for successful mentoring programs and the importance of training mentors in these skills: listening and drawing out, motivating and energizing, persuading, asserting, and supporting less experienced faculty. He says that a culture needs to be built that causes senior professors to want to be mentors, in order to nurture and sustain an overall culture of collaboration for the good of the profession.

These studies demonstrate that successful mentoring relationships have a potential transformative power in higher education. Further investigation is necessary to ascertain the specific perceptions of the three stakeholder groups involved in mentoring programs in higher education: mentees, mentors, and administration. This paper describes a study that focused on using qualitative and quantitative methodology to gain perspectives of these three stakeholder groups about a ten-year faculty-mentoring program in the College of Education at Kansas State University in the United States.

## Methodology

Twenty-nine mentors and 23 mentees who were or had been participants in a college-wide new faculty-mentoring program were surveyed and administrators in the college (Dean, Associate Dean, and Assistant Dean/founding Director of the college's mentoring program) were interviewed.

**Mentor and Mentee Surveys.** Mentor and mentee electronic surveys were designed using the Dillman method (Dillman, 2007) and based on the psychosocial and programmatic aspects of mentoring found by researchers cited above. The two instruments focused on perceptions, experiences, valuing of the mentor-mentee relationship, and the impact of the program. Questions were based on the stated purposes of the program and on impacts found in studies cited above. These surveys were based on a Likert-type four point scale; however, several open-ended items were also included.

The Dean of the College of Education sent formal letters to all faculty and former faculty who had been a part of the college's new faculty mentoring program in the nine years since it had started. These letters notified them that they would be receiving an email with a link to the mentor or mentee survey and requested that they participate. Several weeks later, each mentor and mentee was sent an email with a web link to the appropriate survey, using the university's web-based survey system. The survey remained open and available for invitees to respond for three weeks. Reminder emails were sent after one and two weeks.

Upon survey closing, data were downloaded from the survey system. Eleven mentees responded to the mentee survey, for a 48% response rate. Twenty-one mentors, 74%, responded to the mentor survey. The data were then examined for accuracy (i.e., coding implications or errors) and corrections were made. The data were then exported into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS, v. 15.0) for analysis. Means, standard deviations, frequencies, and percentages were computed.

In addition, responses to open-ended questions were compiled for both groups. These two sets of disaggregated narrative responses were then coded by categories of: perceptions of important mentor characteristics; perceptions of important attributes of a successful mentor-mentee relationship; and experienced benefits of a mentoring program.

**Interviews.** To gather information about the perceptions of the administrators of the college, the Dean, the Assistant Dean, and the first Director of the mentoring program, an Assistant Dean, were interviewed using oral history interview procedures. This aspect of the study followed a narrative research design using field texts, as identified by Creswell (2002) and Clandinin & Connelly (2000). Interview questions were based, in part, on the results of other mentoring studies, cited in the research earlier. Sample questions included: What was the expected impact of the program? What do you think have been the impacts of the mentoring program? Interviews were audiotaped and transcribed. These interviews were analyzed to identify core beliefs, and perceptions of program impact on various individuals, departments, and the college.

## Results

### **Administrators' Perspectives**

*Once you find somebody that you believe is good, the smart thing to do is spend your time and money on helping them succeed.*

Dean of the College of Education

The interviews with the administrators in the College of Education and the experiences of the authors, who are all currently working with new faculty mentoring as administrators, form the basis for this discussion of administrator perspectives. Administrators in higher education have multiple concerns. Included in those are finances, programs, student learning, morale, and staffing. Mentoring new faculty into successful and secure colleagues saves money, builds programs, promotes student learning, increases morale, and prevents many types of staffing problems faced in universities.

Related to these issues, one administrator said: *As an administrator in the college that implemented a very successful mentoring program... it is my firm belief, and the belief of my colleagues in administration at our college, that our mentoring program is valuable for our whole college. I believe that everybody benefits from mentoring – even when it's designed for women or underrepresented groups. Our program was designed for new tenure track faculty members, but we all benefit.*

Mentoring is a highly efficient mechanism to induct people into professions and it benefits all groups in the environment. Administrators who were interviewed believed their program would produce higher job satisfaction in faculty and that their program was “*very efficient for the organization because seeking out, hiring and preparing new employees is a very expensive and high risk proposition. Once you've found somebody who you have reason to believe can succeed, you should spend your time and money helping them succeed.*” New faculty mentoring is cost efficient and time efficient for the organization and time efficient for the individuals who are hired.

Administrators believed that matching mentors and mentees and the skills and attitudes mentors bring to the relationship are crucial issues. The administrators seemed to agree with Hardwick (2005) that a culture needs to be built that causes senior professors to want to be mentors, in order to nurture and sustain an overall culture of collaboration. Several administrators in this study believed their program could do a better job at promoting mentorship and “increasing the mentor pool”. One administrator noted that [It is]...*very hard to be a mentor – to function on their own with their own sets of responsibilities and still maintain some kind of feeling of responsibility for working with a junior colleague and trying to facilitate their careers.* An additional administrator comment was: *An important part of the mentoring program is to establish in people the disposition that mentoring is a good thing and that it can vary from instance to instance as to the type of mentoring and the type of person to do the mentoring and the willingness to seek that out. This can be a competitive environment – so seeking help doesn't come naturally to some people.*

The administrators interviewed noted that not everybody gets equal access to the kind of assistance they need to be successful in academia. There is reason to believe that gender, race and cultural differences may be an issue related to why people do not seek out assistance or are not part of a group that has needed information given to it. Also, sometimes new faculty

do not know what questions to ask. One interviewee gave this example: *I was visiting with a new faculty member and noted that the walls and bookshelves were empty. When I asked if the new faculty member needed help moving, the newcomer said that she just didn't have time during the week to move into her office and the buildings were locked on the weekends. So I told her how to request an outside door key.*

*I see far fewer of the 'silly mistakes' that new people make, commented the Dean of the College. When people got their advice in the hallways, the advice was not always correct. With the mentoring program, new faculty are seeking legitimate sources of information as opposed to informal channels. The mentoring program promotes understanding that there are 'legitimate' sources of information as opposed to unreliable sources of information.*

From these interviews, it was clear that the founding administrators were extremely pleased with the program. They were pleased that of the twelve faculty eligible for tenure in the most recent year of the program to date, nine (75%) were tenured. (One was not granted tenure, and the others went to another university or retired prematurely.) In addition, eight junior professors successfully completed the mid-tenure process. The higher education administrators agreed with one interviewee who said, *I think the mentoring program has really made a difference in people's lives and ... helped build a really good cadre of new colleagues in the College.*

A former mentee who is now an Associate Dean of Education at a different university said succinctly: *Why should academe be concerned with new faculty mentoring? The short answer is so we don't waste good talent.*

Mentors' Perspectives.

*To me, being a mentor is a gratifying way to contribute to the profession, to return the favor for the mentoring I received. I was fortunate enough to have several very strong mentors, who guided me in the process of promotion and tenure, joined me in writing projects that led to successful publications, and guided me create a research agenda that matched my passion and interests. As I work now with junior professors, I hope to share the lessons I learned from those who mentored me.*

A mentee who later became a mentor

Successful mentoring requires an open, honest, and collaborative relationship between mentor and mentee—a relationship that develops over time. Openness and honesty are needed to build trust, so that the mentee can feel free to share questions, concerns, and overall fears. Both the mentor and mentee need to be able to express divergent opinions as they work together. The collaborative skills are needed to introduce mentees to potential publishing partners, both within their own department and cross-college, with those who have similar interests. Mentees need assistance with developing productive networks of key professional organizations as well as research partners to help them move forward with their research agendas. Mentees may also need help in securing funds for research and travel. These funds are available in most institutions, but not always accessed by young professors. In addition, mentees will likely need assistance in ways to deal with the conflict and stressors that typically appear on the road to tenure.

A former participant of the mentoring program described in this study is currently an administrator at another university. She provided this feedback about the program: *There are a lot of benefits to being a mentor. I'm learning that I get great satisfaction in assisting in*

*the development of a colleague. I have received great ideas for my own teaching and scholarship by brainstorming with my mentees. My “circle of colleagues” who have advanced through the system has grown as well as have my own professional networks. There is research to show that faculty who have been mentored are retained longer than those who do not receive mentoring and many go on to take on leadership positions in academe. Erikson’s middle adulthood stage of development comes to mind when I think of effective mentors. In part, effective mentors may be acting on what Erikson described as generativity (40-60 years), a concern for establishing and guiding the next generation.*

Mentors in this study were surveyed about the mentoring relationship. Table 1 shows the percentage of responses to the survey question, How important to you are each of the following aspects of a mentee-mentor relationship? The responses could be Not At All Important, Minimally Important, Moderately Important, Very Important, and No Response.

Other important aspects that listed were: a good match, trust, reciprocal learning and sharing successes. Several mentors mentioned “needs of the mentee”: *The dynamics of being a mentor are strongly influenced by the needs to the mentee. I always tried to understand the mentee’s needs and then work to help fulfill those needs.* Another wrote: *There have been many differences in the way we mentors understand the needs of our mentees. And it’s very different from year to year, mentee to mentee.*

**Table 1: Mentors’ Ratings of Relationship Aspects**

<b>How important to you are each of the Following Aspects of a Mentee-Mentor Relationship?</b>	<b>Very Important</b>	<b>Moderately Important</b>	<b>Minimally Important</b>	<b>Not At All Important</b>	<b>No Response</b>	<b>Total</b>
General Support	13 (59.09%)	7 (31.82%)	1 (4.55%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (4.55%)	22 (100.0%)
Collaboration in Research, Publication, and Presentations	3 (13.64%)	6 (27.27%)	8 (36.36%)	4 (18.18%)	1 (4.55%)	22 (100.0%)
General Career Development	5 (22.73%)	9 (40.91%)	6 (27.27%)	1 (4.55%)	1 (4.55%)	22 (100.0%)
Information about Policies and Procedures	7 (31.82%)	9 (40.91%)	2 (9.09%)	3 (13.64%)	1 (4.55%)	22 (100.0%)
Intellectual Guidance (e.g., constructive criticism, editing manuscripts, etc.)	7 (31.82%)	8 (36.36%)	4 (18.18%)	2 (9.09%)	1 (4.55%)	22 (100.0%)
Professional Networking	2 (9.09%)	10 (45.45%)	5 (22.73%)	4 (18.18%)	1 (4.55%)	22 (100.0%)
Friendship	6 (27.27%)	10 (45.45%)	3 (13.64%)	1 (4.55%)	2 (9.09%)	22 (100.0%)
Information about Promotion & Tenure	16 (72.73%)	2 (9.09%)	2 (9.09%)	1 (4.55%)	1 (4.55%)	22 (100.0%)

In addition, mentors responded to the survey item, How important is it for mentors to possess each of the following characteristics? All mentors responded to the questions. The results of this survey item are seen in Table 2. When asked to list other important mentor characteristics, availability, accountability, and ability to manage multiple demands were mentioned.

**Table 2: Mentors' Ratings of Mentor Characteristics**

<b>How Important is it for Mentors to Possess each of the Following Characteristics?</b>	<b>Very Important</b>	<b>Moderately Important</b>	<b>Minimally Important</b>	<b>Not At All Important</b>	<b>No Response</b>	<b>Total</b>
Willingness to have a 2-way learning process	16 (72.73%)	4 (18.18%)	1 (4.55%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (4.55%)	22 (100.0%)
Flexibility	14 (63.64%)	6 (27.27%)	1 (4.55%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (4.55%)	22 (100.0%)
A Positive Role Model	17 (77.27%)	3 (13.64%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (4.55%)	1 (4.55%)	22 (100.0%)
Empathetic	15 (68.18%)	5 (22.73%)	1 (4.55%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (4.55%)	22 (100.0%)
Accepting	15 (68.18%)	6 (27.27%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (4.55%)	22 (100.0%)
Knowledgeable of the Department	14 (63.64%)	3 (13.64%)	3 (13.64%)	1 (4.55%)	1 (4.55%)	22 (100.0%)
Knowledgeable of Professional Content	4 (18.18%)	12 (54.55%)	4 (18.18%)	1 (4.55%)	1 (4.55%)	22 (100.0%)
Good Listening Skills	15 (68.18%)	5 (22.73%)	1 (4.55%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (4.55%)	22 (100.0%)
Good Problem Solving Skills	12 (54.55%)	7 (31.82%)	2 (9.09%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (4.55%)	22 (100.0%)
Knowledge of the College	18 (81.82%)	1 (4.55%)	1 (4.55%)	1 (4.55%)	1 (4.55%)	22 (100.0%)
Knowledge of the University	12 (54.55%)	6 (27.27%)	2 (9.09%)	1 (4.55%)	1 (4.55%)	22 (100.0%)
Confidentiality	19 (86.36%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (4.55%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (9.09%)	22 (100.0%)

When surveyed about the importance of various aspects of the mentoring program, informal mentor/mentee relationships (77.27%) and matching mentors with mentees (68.18%) were the items with the highest "very important" ratings. About 64% rated social events and informal get-togethers as moderately or very important. One mentor commented about the mentoring program's policy of reviewing mentor/mentee matches yearly: *I think it is important that both mentors and mentees can think about staying with the pair or moving on; in our*

program, usually the pair discusses this together and talks about changing professional needs and interests...and what to do when a mentor goes on sabbatical, etc. This is a plus with our program.

The mentor survey included this question: How influential has each of the following Faculty Mentoring Program aspects been to your own professional development? One mentor did not respond to this question. The percent of those responding who rated each aspect as No Influence, Minimal Influence, Moderate Influence, or Great Influence is found in Table 3.

**Table 3: Mentors' Ratings of Influence of Mentoring Program**

<b>How Influential has each of the following Faculty Mentoring Program Aspects been on your Own Professional Development?</b>	<b>Great Influence</b>	<b>Moderate Influence</b>	<b>Minimal Influence</b>	<b>No Influence</b>	<b>No Response</b>	<b>Total</b>
Networking	6 (27.27%)	5 (22.73)	10 (45.45%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (4.55%)	22 (100.0%)
Friendship	10 (45.45%)	8 (36.36%)	2 (9.09%)	1 (4.55%)	1 (4.55%)	22 (100.0%)
Getting to know other mentors/mentees	9 (40.91%)	5 (22.73%)	6 (27.27%)	1 (4.55%)	1 (4.55%)	22 (100.0%)
Learning new professional materials	5 (22.73%)	6 (27.27%)	9 (40.91%)	1 (4.55%)	1 (4.55%)	22 (100.0%)
More/better publications, grants, research, presentations (yourself)	1 (4.55%)	10 (45.45%)	7 (31.82%)	3 (13.64%)	1 (4.55%)	22 (100.0%)
Reflecting on own professional interests or practice	11 (50.0%)	4 (18.18%)	5 (22.73%)	1 (4.55%)	1 (4.55%)	22 (100.0%)
Personal satisfaction of collaboration/helping new faculty	10 (45.45%)	6 (27.27%)	5 (22.73%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (4.55%)	22 (100.0%)
Self Confidence	3 (13.64%)	7 (31.82%)	7 (31.82%)	4 (18.18%)	1 (4.55%)	22 (100.0%)

When asked to further comment on the impact of being a mentor on their professional development, responses mentioned opportunity for service, motivation, support, and leadership development.

*Service: The program has likely been as beneficial for me as for my mentees. I have enjoyed service as a person who has many of the answers to mentee questions. The wisdom gained from years at ...[name of university] seems to assist the mentees considerably.*

*Motivation: Any time I am able to dialog with other professionals about common interests and concerns, I feel I learn and develop better practices. I am motivated by my conversations with the new faculty; they have new ideas. Finally, I truly value knowing what other faculty (veterans and novices) are doing with teaching, research, and service. I develop a huge appreciation for them as colleagues and know more about how to tap into their strengths to help my students and myself grow professionally.*

*Support: I did get a lot of benefit from the mentoring luncheons. There is no other place in the College in which people share what they are working on and share their trials and successes. It felt like a place of comfort and support.*

*Leadership development: I believe the mentoring program at KSU has had a tremendous influence on my professional development. As a mentor in the program, I learned how to mentor others from watching my peer mentors. I learned about resources to help mentees. I learned how to network and to assist new faculty in networking. Mostly, I became more confident in myself as a professional woman in higher education. I continued to serve as a mentor after leaving KSU. I feel that some of the reasons my administrators and peers perceived me as a leader were because of my obvious support and mentoring of new faculty. The challenges I have faced in higher education, whether they are political or personal, have also made me a better mentor. I have been able to suggest ways to problem-solve difficult situations more effectively as well as provide resources. I plan to start a mentoring program at the college in which I currently work. I will model it after the KSU COE mentoring program.*

In response to a survey question about whether the mentoring program was worthwhile, 100% mentors agreed. One respondent added: *My colleagues at other universities are envious of the strong role this program plays. I also know I would have been much more successful (and more quickly) had I been mentored in the ways I now see our new faculty receiving. I'm so glad we don't have to repeat the mistakes of the past and let new faculty struggle just because it is "the way it has always been done" or "that's a part of the university culture".*

Mentees' Perspectives:

*Having been in higher education for 16 years and three different institutions, I have something to contribute to a discussion on new faculty mentoring program. My field of expertise is teacher education and I am female and a member from a traditionally underrepresented group. My initial higher education experience began in a state university where I assisted in the start-up of a new faculty-mentoring program at the college-level under the leadership of a very ambitious and keen assistant dean, someone who remains a mentor to me today. Currently, I am an associate dean in a school of education. Knowing how important new faculty mentoring is and how it impacted my professional growth in academia, it is my goal to work collaboratively with other senior faculty and administration to institute a new faculty mentoring program within the next two years.*

Former mentee

A mentor must be someone who is accessible. He or she must make time to be available to the new faculty member. New faculty will benefit from regular contacts such as dropping in, calling, sending an email, or invitations to lunch, especially in the first six months. New

faculty will need a mentor who is available to provide input into manuscripts, teaching, and faculty evaluation process, among others. An effective mentor helps the new faculty mentor establish professional networks. He or she is a good listener and is genuinely interested in the mentee’s independence and growth. Effective mentors set an example help mentees learn from their mistakes.

Table 4 shows the percentage of responses to the survey question, How important to you are each of the following aspects of a mentee-mentor relationship? The responses could be Not At All Important, Minimally Important, Moderately Important, Very Important, and No Response.

**Table 4: Mentees’ Ratings of Relationship Aspects**

<b>How Important to you are each of the following Aspects of a Mentee-Mentor Relationship?</b>	<b>Very Important</b>	<b>Moderately Important</b>	<b>Minimally Important</b>	<b>Not At All Important</b>	<b>No Response</b>	<b>Total</b>
General Support	7 (63.64%)	3 (27.27%)	1 (9.09%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	11 (100.0%)
Collaboration in Research, Publication, and Presentations	3 (27.27%)	4 (36.36%)	3 (27.27%)	1 (9.09%)	0 (0.0%)	11 (100.0%)
General Career Development	4 (36.36%)	5 (45.45%)	2 (18.18%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	11 (100.0%)
Information about Policies and Procedures	5 (45.45%)	5 (45.45%)	1 (9.09%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	11 (100.0%)
Intellectual Guidance (e.g., constructive criticism, editing manuscripts, etc.)	6 (54.55%)	3 (27.27%)	2 (18.18%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	11 (100.0%)
Professional Networking	2 (18.18%)	7 (63.64%)	1 (9.09%)	1 (9.09%)	0 (0.0%)	11 (100.0%)
Friendship	4 (36.36%)	4 (36.36%)	3 (27.27%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	11 (100.0%)
Information about Promotion & Tenure	7 (63.64%)	2 (18.18%)	2 (18.18%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	11 (100.0%)

Mentees responded to the survey item, How important is it for mentors to possess each of the following characteristics? All mentees responded to the questions. The results are seen in Table 5.

**Table 5: Mentees' Ratings of Mentor Characteristics**

<b>How important is it for Mentors to Possess each of the Following Characteristics?</b>	<b>Very Important</b>	<b>Moderately Important</b>	<b>Minimally Important</b>	<b>Not At All Important</b>	<b>No Response</b>	<b>Total</b>
Willingness to have a 2-way learning process	7 (63.64%)	2 (18.18%)	2 (18.18%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	11 (100.0%)
Flexibility	6 (54.55%)	4 (36.36%)	1 (9.09%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	11 (100.0%)
A Positive Role Model	8 (72.73%)	2 (18.18%)	1 (9.09%)	1 (4.55%)	0 (0.0%)	11 (100.0%)
Empathetic	4 (36.36%)	4 (36.36%)	3 (27.27%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	11 (100.0%)
Accepting	4 (36.36%)	5 (45.45%)	2 (18.18%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	11 (100.0%)
Knowledgeable of the Department	7 (63.64%)	2 (18.18%)	2 (18.18%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	11 (100.0%)
Knowledgeable of Professional Content	6 (54.55%)	2 (18.18%)	3 (27.27%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	11 (100.0%)
Good Listening Skills	5 (45.45%)	4 (36.36%)	2 (18.18%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	11 (100.0%)
Good Problem Solving Skills	6 (54.55%)	3 (27.27%)	2 (18.18%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	11 (100.0%)
Knowledge of the College	8 (72.73%)	2 (18.18%)	1 (9.09%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	11 (100.0%)
Knowledge of the University	7 (63.64%)	3 (27.27%)	1 (9.09%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	11 (100.0%)
Confidentiality	7 (63.64%)	3 (27.27%)	1 (9.09%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	11 (100.0%)

Mentees listed other mentor characteristics that they valued: respect, honesty, time to devote to being a mentor, encouraging attitude in concert with constructive criticism, high expectations, and knowledge of how to live a balanced life. *Good mentors are active in research and university endeavors*, wrote one mentee. Sense of humor was mentioned several times. Mentees also recognized the varying needs of new faculty: *Recent graduates in a tenure-track faculty position require different support than faculty members from other institutions. Having a mentor understand those needs provided appropriate support to help me develop as a positive contributor to the institution as well as develop professionally.*

The mentor survey included this question: How influential has each of the following Faculty Mentoring Program aspects been to your own professional development? One mentor did not respond to this question. The percent of those responding who rated each

aspect as no influence, minimal influence, moderate influence, or great influence is found in Table 6.

**Table 6: Mentees' Ratings of Influence of Mentoring Program**

<b>How Influential has each of the Following Faculty Mentoring Program Aspects been on Your Own Professional Development?</b>	<b>Great Influence</b>	<b>Moderate Influence</b>	<b>Minimal Influence</b>	<b>No Influence</b>	<b>No Response</b>	<b>Total</b>
Networking	4 (36.36%)	3 (27.27)	0 (0.0%)	4 (36.36%)	0 (0.0%)	11 (100.0%)
Friendship	3 (27.27%)	6 (54.55%)	1 (9.09%)	1 (9.09%)	0 (0.0%)	11 (100.0%)
Getting to know other mentors/mentees	5 (45.45%)	3 (27.27%)	2 (18.18%)	1 (9.09%)	0 (0.0%)	11 (100.0%)
Learning new professional materials	2 (18.18%)	2 (18.18%)	4 (36.36%)	3 (27.27%)	0 (0.0%)	11 (100.0%)
More/better publications, grants, research, presentations (yourself)	3 (27.27%)	3 (27.27%)	3 (27.27%)	2 (18.18%)	0 (0.0%)	11 (100.0%)
Reflecting on own professional interests or practice	3 (27.27%)	2 (18.18%)	3 (27.27%)	3 (27.27%)	0 (0.0%)	11 (100.0%)
Personal satisfaction of collaboration/helping new faculty	4 (36.36%)	5 (45.45%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (18.18%)	0 (0.0%)	11 (100.0%)
Self Confidence	5 (45.45%)	1 (9.09%)	2 (18.18%)	3 (27.27%)	0 (0.0%)	11 (100.0%)

In another question, the highest percent of any item listed for potential contribution to the general success of the mentoring program was mentor/mentee matching, with 81.82% rating matching as very important. One mentee summarized the comments of several: *A key factor (for me) was being paired with mentors who held similar professional dispositions (not necessarily similar content area backgrounds). I feel that careful consideration was taken to select my mentors. Effective pairing insures that the mentee-mentor relationship will benefit both individuals. I feel that I was able to communicate and share with my mentor at a deeper professional level.*

A total of 83% of mentees agreed that the mentoring program in which they participated was worthwhile. Responses to the comment part of the question included such quotes as these:

- *Often new faculty may not know the questions to ask or sources for information.*
- *The program provides major as well as incidental information that will help the mentee survive during her (or his) first three years.*

- *Having the mentoring program systematically provided me with a wonderful support. It was something that I could fall back on when I needed somebody to review my manuscripts or to talk about my frustrations. I think building up a personal relationship is key to the success of the mentoring program. What I like most about my mentors was that they were always available for me no matter how busy they were.*

## Conclusion

This study shows that administrators, senior faculty mentors, and new faculty mentees value new faculty mentoring programs. This program enhanced its impact by setting aside time in a university schedule to allow junior professors to meet formally or informally with senior professors to work collaboratively on research and scholarship, teaching, and service.

At the time of this writing, three junior professors are preparing mid-tenure documents and three have completed the promotion and tenure process. Results will be announced in several months, but all of these mentored faculty have been fully supported in the process by their departments and the Dean. Three new faculty who joined the college in the fall voluntarily chose to participate in the mentoring program. Senior professors continue to be involved in the program as mentors and/or service on the Advisory Committee.

The administrators interviewed for this study emphasized the importance of developing and maintaining a culture of collaboration to support mentoring programs. They all believed that the 10 years of the program had promoted a culture of collaboration. The Assistant Dean stated: *I feel like the culture of collaboration in our college has greatly improved; I have seen a huge difference in the attitude toward helping new colleagues since the program started. I also think it has been important in recruiting good new faculty to the college.* The mentor and mentee groups agreed. Both groups were asked the question, To what extent is the culture of collaboration supported in our college? Of the mentors, 61.9% said it was “very much supported”, and 72.7% of the mentees agreed.

Universities that invest in such programs will find numerous rewards: a stronger presence in research and funding and scholarship, a more dynamic teaching cadre, and an academic team interested in learning, contributing, and growing.

## References

- Clandinin, D. J. and Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. California: Jossey-Bass.
- Creswell, J. W. (2002). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. New Jersey: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Dillman, Don A. (2007). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, 2007 update*. Hoboken, NJ. Wiley and Sons.
- Goodwin, L. D., Stevens, E. A. & Bellamy, G. T. (1998). Mentoring among faculty in schools, colleges, and departments of education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(5) (Nov-Dec), 334.
- Hardwick, S. W. (2005). Mentoring early career faculty in geography: Issues and strategies. *The Professional Geographer*, 57 (1), 21-27.
- Hopkins, R.A. & Grigoriu, E. (2005). Mentoring community college faculty and staff: Balancing contradictions of informal program components and formal program structure. *Community College Review*, 32, 40 – 59.

- Luna, G. & Cullen, D.L. (1995). Empowering the faculty: Mentoring redirected and renewed. *ASHE: ERIC Higher Education Reports no. 3*. Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Services.
- Sands, R. G., Parson, L. A. & Duane, J. (1991). Faculty mentoring faculty in a public university. *Journal of Higher Education*, 62 (2), 174-193.
- Tracy, E. E., Jagsi, R., Starr, R. & Tarbell, N. U. (2004). Outcomes of a pilot faculty mentoring program. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology* 191, 1846-50.
- Wilson, P. P., Pereira, A. & Valentine, D. (2002). Perceptions of new social work faculty about mentoring experiences. *Journal of Social Work Education* 38 (2) (Spring-Summer), 317.
- Wright, C. A. & Wright, S. D. (1987). Young Professionals. *Family Relations* 36(2): 204-8.

## **About the Authors**

### *Dr. Linda P. Thurston*

Linda is a professor in the Department of Special Education, Counseling, and Student Affairs. She was instrumental in founding the faculty mentoring program in her college and, as Assistant Dean, was the first Director of the Program.

### *Dr. Lori Navarrete*

Lori is an Associate Professor at Nevada State College and Associate Dean in the School of Education. She is the director of a bi-lingual special education teacher training program. Her research interests are multi-cultural education, learning disabilities, and teacher preparation. Lori was one of the first mentors in the Faculty Mentoring Program at Kansas State University.

### *Dr. Teresa Miller*

Teresa is a former special educator and public school principal. She was a mentee in the New Faculty Mentoring Program at Kansas State University and is now the Director of the program.

## EDITORS

**Mary Kalantzis**, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, USA.

**Bill Cope**, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, USA.

## EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

**Michael Apple**, University of Wisconsin, Madison, USA.

**David Barton**, Lancaster University, Milton Keynes, UK.

**Mario Bello**, University of Science, Cuba.

**Manuela du Bois-Reymond**, Universiteit Leiden, Leiden, The Netherlands.

**Robert Devillar**, Kennesaw State University, Kennesaw, USA.

**Daniel Madrid Fernandez**, University of Granada, Spain.

**Ruth Finnegan**, Open University, Milton Keynes, UK.

**James Paul Gee**, University of Wisconsin, Madison, USA.

**Juana M. Sancho Gil**, University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain.

**Kris Gutierrez**, University of California, Los Angeles, USA.

**Anne Hickling-Hudson**, Queensland University of Technology, Kelvin Grove, Australia.

**Roz Ivanic**, Lancaster University, Lancaster, UK.

**Paul James**, RMIT University, Melbourne, Australia.

**Carey Jewitt**, Institute of Education, University of London, London, UK.

**Andeas Kazamias**, University of Wisconsin, Madison, USA.

**Peter Kell**, University of Wollongong, Wollongong, Australia.

**Michele Knobel**, Montclair State University, Montclair, USA.

**Gunther Kress**, Institute of Education, University of London, London, UK.

**Colin Lankshear**, James Cook University, Cairns, Australia.

**Kimberly Lawless**, University of Illinois, Chicago, USA.

**Sarah Michaels**, Clark University, Worcester, USA.

**Jeffrey Mok**, Miyazaki International College, Miyazaki, Japan.

**Denise Newfield**, University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa.

**Ernest O'Neil**, Ministry of Education, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

**José-Luis Ortega**, University of Granada, Granada, Spain.

**Francisco Fernandez Palomares**, University of Granada, Granada, Spain.

**Ambigapathy Pandian**, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Penang, Malaysia.

**Miguel A. Pereyra**, University of Granada, Granada, Spain.

**Scott Poynting**, Manchester Metropolitan University, Manchester, UK.

**Angela Samuels**, Montego Bay Community College, Montego Bay, Jamaica.

**Michel Singh**, University of Western Sydney, Sydney, Australia.

**Helen Smith**, RMIT University, Melbourne, Australia.

**Richard Sohmer**, Clark University, Worcester, USA.

**Brian Street**, University of London, London, UK.

**Giorgos Tsiakalos**, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki, Greece.

**Salim Vally**, University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa

**Gella Varnava-Skoura**, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece.

**Cecile Walden**, Sam Sharpe Teachers College, Montego Bay, Jamaica.

**Nicola Yelland**, Victoria University, Melbourne, Australia.

**Wang Yingjie**, Beijing Normal University, Beijing, China.

**Zhou Zuoyu**, Beijing Normal University, Beijing, China.

## THE UNIVERSITY PRESS JOURNALS



Creates a space for dialogue on innovative theories and practices in the arts, and their inter-relationships with society.

ISSN: 1833-1866

<http://www.Arts-Journal.com>



Explores the past, present and future of books, publishing, libraries, information, literacy and learning in the information society.

ISSN: 1447-9567

<http://www.Book-Journal.com>



Examines the meaning and purpose of 'design' while also speaking in grounded ways about the task of design and the use of designed artefacts and processes.

ISSN: 1833-1874

<http://www.Design-Journal.com>



Provides a forum for discussion and builds a body of knowledge on the forms and dynamics of difference and diversity.

ISSN: 1447-9583

<http://www.Diversity-Journal.com>



Maps and interprets new trends and patterns in globalisation.

ISSN 1835-4432

<http://www.GlobalStudiesJournal.com>



Discusses the role of the humanities in contemplating the future and the human, in an era otherwise dominated by scientific, technical and economic rationalisms.

ISSN: 1447-9559

<http://www.Humanities-Journal.com>



Sets out to foster inquiry, invite dialogue and build a body of knowledge on the nature and future of learning.

ISSN: 1447-9540

<http://www.Learning-Journal.com>



Creates a space for discussion of the nature and future of organisations, in all their forms and manifestations.

ISSN: 1447-9575

<http://www.Management-Journal.com>



Addresses the key question: How can the institution of the museum become more inclusive?

ISSN 1835-2014

<http://www.Museum-Journal.com>



Discusses disciplinary and interdisciplinary approaches to knowledge creation within and across the various social sciences and between the social, natural and applied sciences.

ISSN: 1833-1882

<http://www.Socialsciences-Journal.com>



Draws from the various fields and perspectives through which we can address fundamental questions of sustainability.

ISSN: 1832-2077

<http://www.Sustainability-Journal.com>



Focuses on a range of critically important themes in the various fields that address the complex and subtle relationships between technology, knowledge and society.

ISSN: 1832-3669

<http://www.Technology-Journal.com>



Investigates the affordances for learning in the digital media, in school and throughout everyday life.

ISSN 1835-2030

<http://www.UlJournal.com>



Explores the meaning and purpose of the academy in times of striking social transformation.

ISSN 1835-2030

<http://www.Universities-Journal.com>

**FOR SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION, PLEASE CONTACT**

[subscriptions@commonground.com.au](mailto:subscriptions@commonground.com.au)