

## **Mentoring Review Committee Report**

Revised: 4/29/13

*Members:* Lois Banta, Ed Epping, Steven Gerrard, Carmen Whalen (chair), Betty Zimmerberg

The Mentoring Review Committee (MRC) was constituted by the Faculty Steering Committee (FSC) in the spring of 2012 to work as an ad hoc committee through the 2012-2013 academic year. The MRC was charged with assessing the College's current practices in regards to mentoring pre-tenure faculty and with making recommendations for improvements. The MRC submitted its final draft report to the FSC on March 7, 2013, followed by these revisions.

### **Summary**

#### *Mentoring of Pre-Tenure Faculty:*

Mentoring is the on-going process of guiding and assisting pre-tenure faculty members' professional development. It has many components. At a bare minimum, Williams College has a responsibility to provide the clearest possible articulation of the expectations for tenure at this institution, but mentoring is also more than that. Effective mentoring provides guidance on how to meet those expectations in the areas of teaching, scholarship/creative endeavors, and service, as well as how to convey one's accomplishments, particularly for reappointment and promotion reviews. Addressing how to balance these competing expectations, while trying to maintain some sense of work-life balance, can also contribute to effective mentoring.

Mentoring can take many forms, including college-wide initiatives and those at the level of the department, program or evaluation committee. There are both formal and informal practices. Consistent with recent national trends in faculty mentoring, we treat mentoring not as a singular relationship between one senior and one pre-tenure faculty member, but rather as mentoring networks or mosaics, and as mutual or two-way mentoring. Hence, valuable and effective mentoring relationships can develop among peers, with colleagues at other institutions, and by sustaining relationships with previous advisors, as well as by developing crucial mentoring relationships with chairs and senior colleagues at Williams.

*Based on our assessment of current mentoring practices, the Mentoring Review Committee finds that the greatest immediate needs are:*

- Providing effective mentoring throughout *all* of the pre-tenure years
- Providing increased mentoring on scholarship/creative endeavors
- Increased clarity in evaluation and in reappointment and tenure review processes
- Providing formal mechanisms to promote effective informal mentoring
- Addressing disparities in the effectiveness of mentoring among academic units

*To meet the fluid, emerging, and diverse needs of pre-tenure faculty:*

We recommend the evolution of the Project for Effective Teaching into the Faculty Mentoring Program:

- \* Building on the existing strengths of PET in fostering networks among peer cohorts, the FNP expands its parameters to include mentoring and fostering networks in the realm of

scholarship/creative endeavors, and to reach beyond the first three years to the full pre-tenure period.

\* This is accomplished primarily through the better coordination of existing initiatives, including strengthening aspects of PET's current programming (such as lunches, orientation, individual meetings between co-directors and pre-tenure faculty, social gatherings, website, and classroom dynamics workshops) and by coordinating with the already existing Teaching Roundtable and the Faculty Mentoring Program.

\* We recommend the addition of one coordinator so that each division is represented, to facilitate the discussion of division specific teaching and the development of scholarship/creative endeavors mentoring networks.

\* We recommend the establishment of scholarship/creative endeavors roundtables as an additional, optional resource for faculty.

We recommend the continuation of the four optional discussions on evaluation processes being offered by the Dean of the Faculty and the Associate Dean for Institution Diversity, and the addition of two more.

We recommend more communication about mentoring college-wide, and within academic units.

### **Part I: Assessment of Current Mentoring**

The Mentoring Review Committee assessed the college's mentoring programs—the Project for Effective Teaching and the Faculty Mentor Program. The committee also explored other college programs that might be productively used as mentoring, as well as mandated evaluation procedures and other academic unit practices that could provide an opportunity for effective mentoring. The two college-wide mentoring initiatives, the Faculty Mentoring Program and PET, focus on pre-tenure faculty only in their first year or in their first three years, respectively. In addition, both programs focus on teaching—PET by design and the faculty mentoring program by default, as mentors are selected from fields distant to the pre-tenure faculty member thereby limiting the ability to mentor on scholarship/creative endeavors. Last year, the Associate Dean for Institutional Diversity added three workshops focused on scholarship and preparing tenure packets. Some departments, programs, and evaluation committees use the mandated communications around evaluation and evaluation procedures as an opportunity for some mentoring, particularly in terms of a clear articulation of the expectations for reappointment and tenure. Formal and informal mentoring varies greatly between academic units. (See Appendix I for a list of current mentoring practices and possibilities).

In fall 2012, we conducted a survey of all faculty members who started tenure-track positions between 2002 and 2011, asking them to assess the effectiveness of the mentoring they have received at Williams College. The survey went to 121 faculty members, 90 of whom are still at Williams and 31 of whom are no longer at the College. A total of 63 faculty responded, 54 of whom are still at the College of 9 of whom are no longer at the College. Although we analyzed the data after classifying by pre and post tenure, by division, by race/ethnicity, and by gender, the numbers were relatively small and no significant statistical variations were found among sub-groupings. In addition to quantitative data, the faculty members who responded were very generous in providing written comments and we thank you.

The survey used a scale of “very effective” to “very ineffective” to assess mentoring at the college-wide level and at the level of the academic unit. The survey indicated that in many categories, less than one third of faculty found mentoring to be “very effective.” Similarly, less than one third “strongly agreed” that they received effective mentoring in various areas. For example, 16 percent found PET lunches “very effective,” 26 percent found PET orientation “very effective,” and 32 percent found

the Faculty Mentor Program “very effective,” with more respondents finding these programs “somewhat effective.” At the level of the academic unit (department, program and/or evaluation committee), only 58 percent responded that their unit offered formal mentoring. Overall, 34 percent of respondents found formal mentoring in their unit “very effective.” More respondents, 84 percent, said that informal mentoring was happening in their unit, and 55 percent found it “very effective.” While 46 percent “strongly agreed” that they received “effective” pre-tenure mentoring on teaching, only 23 percent “strongly agreed” that they received “effective” pre-tenure mentoring on scholarship/creative endeavors. Significantly fewer responded that they received “effective” mentoring on setting up a lab or studio, grant writing, and publishing books or articles. Twenty-nine percent strongly agreed that they received effective mentoring on the expectations for tenure, 21 percent on how to reach the expectations for tenure, and 21 percent on preparing materials for reappointment and tenure reviews. (See Appendix II for a summary of survey results).

Based on our survey results and other data available to the MRC, we found room for improvement. We believe that Williams College should strive for very effective mentoring in all areas. Survey results suggested several areas where we could build on existing strengths, and indeed, some areas not currently coordinated as pre-tenure mentoring were deemed very effective. (See Appendix II).

Based on our assessment of current mentoring practices, the Mentoring Review Committee finds that the greatest immediate needs are:

- Providing effective mentoring throughout *all* of the pre-tenure years
- Providing increased mentoring on scholarship/creative endeavors
- Increased clarity in evaluation and in reappointment and tenure review processes
- Providing formal mechanisms to promote effective informal mentoring
- Addressing disparities in the effectiveness of mentoring among academic units

## **Part II: Recommendations**

### **College-wide Mentoring: Evolution of PET into the Faculty Network Program (FNP)**

The goals of the Faculty Network Program are to both provide mentoring networks and to help individual faculty members develop their own networks throughout their pre-tenure years. Building on the strengths of PET in fostering networks among peer cohorts, the FNP expands the parameters of PET in three important ways. First, the FNP mission includes mentoring and fostering networks in the realm of scholarship/creative endeavors, as well as teaching. Second, the FNP mission extends its reach beyond the first three years to the full pre-tenure period. Third, in addition to fostering networks among peer cohorts, the FNP will work pro-actively with pre-tenure faculty to develop additional networks to meet their mentoring and faculty development needs.

To accomplish these goals, the FNP strengthens and coordinates existing mentoring initiatives, including PET activities, the faculty mentor program, and teaching roundtables. The FNP would begin Scholarship/Creative Endeavors Roundtables, and continue a pilot program of discussions on classroom dynamics. Individual meetings with division coordinators would be more deliberate in supporting pre-tenure faculty members in determining their own mentoring needs and drawing on resources to meet them. All participation is completely voluntary. Indeed, the entire FNP program is based on meeting the fluid, emerging, and diverse needs of pre-tenure faculty. We imagine that pre-tenure faculty members might draw on different components of the program at different times in their pre-tenure careers. For example, a pre-tenure faculty member in her/his first year might find the lunches and division meetings the most helpful, while a faculty member in her/his third year might most benefit from a teaching

roundtable they design. Faculty members about to begin their junior sabbaticals might most benefit from an external expert in their field and/or a self-designed writing group. What follows is intended as a blueprint that is flexible enough to meet the diverse needs of pre-tenure faculty.

To achieve these goals, the FNP would be run by three tenured faculty members—one from each division (hereafter “division coordinators”). Each of these division coordinators would be able to assist pre-tenure faculty in the areas of teaching and scholarship/creative endeavors, as well as in the areas of service and work-life balance. Division coordinators would be appointed based on their interest and skills in mentoring pre-tenure faculty. We recommend that their three year terms become staggered. They would receive one month summer salary and a course release (or stipend) for each year they serve. During the summer month, the division coordinators would educate themselves on faculty mentoring and on resources available to faculty, develop and update the web site and other resources, and plan the year’s programming. Division coordinators would also contact new tenure-track faculty over the summer to begin to determine their mentoring needs, particularly regarding assignment of faculty mentors, as well as to address questions/concerns and to alert in-coming faculty to available resources, particularly on the web site. Either in the summer or early fall, the division coordinators would meet with the Dean of the Faculty and/or members of the CAP to better understand the process and criteria for evaluation for reappointment and tenure in order to most effectively mentor pre-tenure faculty. Division coordinators would also develop and offer orientation on effective mentoring to faculty mentors, chairs, and other interested faculty members.

### ***Components would include:***

#### **Building Faculty and Faculty/Staff Networks on campus:**

Faculty orientation for new, incoming faculty right before the beginning of the fall semester, coordinated in conjunction with the Dean of the Faculty’s office.

One weekly lunch meeting for first, second, and third year tenure track and visiting faculty: to develop social networks, to provide information and support on teaching, and to introduce new faculty to William’s institutional structure, resources, and staff.

A second meeting (lunch or at another time) for the division coordinator and faculty in that division in their first three years, perhaps weekly initially and then as most productive based on pre-tenure faculty members’ needs. For example, the division III coordinator and division III faculty might meet early in the year for discussions on setting up labs, working with students in labs, as well as addressing pursuing their own research agenda in tandem with their responsibilities for students in the lab or the complicated intersections between research and teaching.

At least three social gatherings per year for faculty in their first three years, visitors, and their families: at the beginning of the fall semester, during winter study and/or at the beginning of the spring semester, and at the end of the spring semester.

#### **Coordinating Mentoring Initiatives:**

*Faculty Mentor Program:* Division coordinators, working with the Associate Dean of the Faculty, would arrange for one faculty mentor for in-coming faculty for their first year, preferably a senior faculty member from outside their academic unit but from within their division, or with other shared content or methodological connections. (Note: The division coordinator would serve

as an additional mentor, and academic units are asked to consider the benefits of providing an additional mentor from within the academic unit, see below)

*Teaching Roundtables:* This program would be expanded. Working closely with the Associate Dean of the Faculty, the FNP would promote this program, and division coordinators would assist pre-tenure faculty in putting these together, if requested. Funding for lunches (or equivalent) would be provided. Although available to all faculty, priority would be given to pre-tenure faculty.

*Scholarship/Creative Endeavors Roundtables:* This new initiative would be modeled, obviously, on the Teaching Roundtables, as well as Oakley research seminars. Self-defining groups of 4-6 faculty members would meet several times during the semester to discuss and share scholarship/creative endeavors. These could be a pre-tenure writing group of people working to transform their dissertations into books; a group of pre- and post-tenure faculty working on finishing articles for publication; a group preparing for conference presentations; a group with shared thematic, content or methodological approaches across disciplines who would benefit from intellectual exchange. Funding for lunches (or equivalent) would be provided. Although available to all faculty, priority would go to pre-tenure faculty.

*Classroom Dynamics Group:* This should be offered as a pilot program for pre-tenure faculty, as an additional resource that pre-tenure faculty could choose to use. PET developed this program this year, to be led by an external facilitator with appropriate professional training. The goals are to explore how learning in the classroom and in other learning environments emerges from the relationship between professor and student; to help professors assess the interpersonal dynamics that might be impeding optimal learning; and to identify possible ‘blind spots’ in professors’ teaching and develop appropriate classroom/learning environment strategies.

### **Fostering Individual Mentoring Networks:**

Division coordinators would offer to meet with all pre-tenure faculty individually to assess whether their mentoring needs are being met. These individual check-ins would continue through all of the pre-tenure years.

Division coordinators would offer to assist pre-tenure faculty in determining if, how, and when they needed to extend their mentoring scholarship/creative endeavors or teaching networks beyond the college. This could include discussing strategies for making good use of professional conferences to develop networks, as well as travel for meetings with experts in their field. Small stipends would be made available to offset travel or other costs, as needed.

### **Developing Resources:**

The FNP would serve as a resource center, letting faculty know of other faculty development and mentoring possibilities, such as the Writing Program, Advising Matters, Oakley Seminars, Science lunches, the Center for Foreign Languages Colloquia, and how these might best be used.

The FNP would work to develop additional discussion and/or resources that would assist pre-tenure faculty in their scholarship/creative endeavors, such as addressing barriers to productivity and success, work-life balance and time management issues.

The FNP would develop and maintain an expanded web site with information and resources for faculty (see Appendix III)

The FNP would offer all-campus discussions on teaching, faculty development, faculty mentoring.

### **Department/Program/Evaluation Committee Mentoring**

- Departments/Programs/Evaluation Committees have a key responsibility for assuring that pre-tenure faculty members have a clear understanding of the expectations for reappointment and tenure, as well as for ways to meet those expectations.
- Departments/Programs/Evaluation Committees should meet to discuss how to best use mandated evaluation procedures—annual staffing reports (Fuqua letters), the unit’s specific Procedures for Evaluation, and the required annual meeting with the unit Chair—to communicate a clear understanding of the expectations for reappointment and tenure, as well as for ways to meet those expectations.
- Departments/Programs/Evaluation Committees should discuss what methods of teaching evaluation they are using in addition to SCS scores and how best to use those methods of evaluation and the mandated meetings between the pre-tenure faculty member and senior colleagues to discuss them, for faculty development in the realm of teaching.
- Departments/Programs/Evaluation Committees should discuss what else they are doing in the realm of mentoring and what might be improved. For example, are there opportunities for informal discussions of teaching? Are there opportunities to share scholarship/creative endeavors?
- Departments/Programs/Evaluation Committees should check to assure that informal mentoring is occurring within their units. Are faculty members checking in to see how pre-tenure colleagues are doing? Have faculty members offered to be available to talk and to assist? Has anyone offered to read the pre-tenure faculty member’s scholarship, to view their creative work, to help prepare for a conference? It is too easy to assume that informal mentoring is happening because we think someone else is doing it!
- Departments/Programs/Evaluation Committees should explore and discuss the possible benefits of providing a faculty mentor from within their academic unit, recently tenured if possible, to serve as a person, in addition to the chair, who would welcome the faculty member to the academic unit and be available to answer questions for the new faculty member’s first year.
- Departments/Programs/Evaluation Committee chairs should work with their senior colleagues to assure that following a positive reappointment review, a senior colleague meets at least once with the pre-tenure colleague to discuss strategies for scholarship/creative endeavors before they go on their sabbatical. Given that senior colleagues have just reviewed the entirety of the pre-tenure colleague’s work, this is a unique and critical moment for mentoring in the realm of scholarship/creative endeavors. During this meeting, the senior colleague should seek to determine if it would be helpful for the pre-tenure colleague to touch base during their sabbatical or to at least offer the opportunity.

### **Dean of the Faculty**

The Dean of the Faculty, along with departments/programs/evaluation committees, has a key responsibility for assuring that pre-tenure faculty members have a clear understanding of the expectations for reappointment and tenure. In addition to the on-going work of the Dean of the Faculty’s and the CAP’s role in evaluation and related procedures, the Dean of the Faculty supports faculty mentoring through:

Orientation and on-going mentoring for chairs that covers: proper evaluation procedures, communicating expectations for reappointment and tenure, and mentoring faculty.

Making documents that cover the timing and processes of evaluation, and of reappointment and tenure reviews available to pre-tenure faculty.

A series of group discussions for pre-tenure faculty, in collaboration with the Associate Dean of Institutional Diversity, on the processes of evaluation, and reappointment and tenure reviews (see Appendix IV).

Overseeing and supporting the Faculty Network Program and its components.

### **Part III: Budget Items and Other Considerations**

Physical space: Although we are not recommending the establishment of a formal Center for the FNP, we recommend that the Faculty House become a center for the FNP's activities.

This would include designating one of the upstairs rooms as the FNP office—this would be a place where resources could be gathered for the use of faculty and to ease the transitions between division coordinators over the years, as well as a place for the many individual and small group meetings that would take place.

The College should consider opening the Faculty House for lunch more than one day a week for networking, for roundtable meetings, and other discussions.

Coordinators compensation

Web development

Lunch stipends (and equivalent)

Funding for developing individual mentoring networks beyond the college (travel expenses)

Compensation for external facilitator for classroom dynamics groups

Social gatherings

## **Appendix I: Current Mentoring Practices and Possibilities**

### **I. College-wide Mentoring Programs**

#### *Project for Effective Teaching:*

- Focus is on mentoring faculty in the first three years, and on teaching
- One day orientation on teaching at Williams, for new faculty
- Lunch for faculty in first three years, twice a week fall, once a week spring
- Individual lunches for faculty in first three years with PET coordinators, winter study or spring
- All faculty lunches, twice a semester
- Website with teaching suggestion videos

#### *Faculty Mentor Program:*

- Assigns two senior colleagues to each new faculty member for first year
- Each mentor has two first year faculty
- Faculty assigned outside of new faculty's fields to separate mentoring from evaluation

### **II. Dean of Faculty and Associate Dean for Institutional Diversity**

#### *Dean of Faculty*

- Annual group meeting with first and second year faculty in January
- Annual individual meetings with first and second year faculty
- Document: Evaluation and Promotion of Tenure Track Faculty, distributed at January meeting and available on DOF website

#### *Associate Dean for Institutional Diversity, with Dean of Faculty*

- Annual group discussion for pre-tenure faculty on: Grants, Conferences, Publications, and Tenure
- Annual group discussion for pre-tenure faculty on: Books, Other Scholarship, Timing, and Tenure

#### *Associate Dean for Institutional Diversity*

- Annual group discussion on preparing tenure packets for faculty in fourth and fifth years, with former CAP representative(s)

### **III. Department, Program, and/or Evaluation Committee**

Most of the following are mandated forms of evaluation for the purposes of reappointment and tenure reviews. Yet some departments, programs, and evaluation committees may use them as an opportunity for mentoring.

- Annual staffing report/Fuqua letter
- Evaluation procedures specific to the department/program/evaluation committee (attached to Fuqua letter each year)
- Annual mandated conversation between chair and pre-tenure faculty member to discuss Fuqua Letter
- Mandated conversations between chair and pre-tenure faculty member about Reappointment and Tenure procedures
- Discussions with senior colleagues about student interviews, classroom visits, other forms of teaching evaluation
- Optional additional mentoring with great variation by unit



#### **IV. Other Possible Venues for Mentoring**

The following are not commonly discussed as faculty mentoring, nor are they well-integrated into college-wide mentoring initiatives. The Mentoring Review Committee identified these as potential venues for mentoring:

*Teaching Roundtable:* open to all faculty

Groups of four faculty members share conversations about teaching over lunch and visit each others' classes;

This program began in 2007 as a grant funded initiative. As funding ended, the program dwindled to just 2 groups in 2011-2012.

*Writing Program:* Stephanie Dunson, open to all faculty

Faculty Teaching Writing: "30 Minutes on Thursday" and individual consults

Faculty Writing: individual consults, private and confidential

*Oakley Center Seminars:* Mostly Div. I and II, pre and post-tenure

*Science Lunches:* Div. III and Psychology, pre and post-tenure

## Appendix II: Summary of Survey Results

### *Selected results on current college mentoring:*

#### *PET lunches*

- 15.5 % Very effective
- 46.6 % Somewhat effective
- 17.2 % Neither effective nor ineffective
- 12.1 % Somewhat ineffective
- 8.6 % Very ineffective

#### *PET orientation*

- 25.5 % Very effective
- 41.8 % Somewhat effective
- 12.7 % Neither effective nor ineffective
- 12.7 % Somewhat ineffective
- 7.3 % Very ineffective

#### *Faculty Mentoring Program*

- 32.1 % Very effective
- 35.7 % Somewhat effective
- 14.3 % Neither effective nor ineffective
- 3.6 % Somewhat ineffective
- 14.3 % Very ineffective

### *When asked, "Did your department and/or program offer this?"*

Formal mentoring: 57.8 % responded yes, and 42.2 % responded no

Informal mentoring: 84.0 % responded yes, and 16.0% responded no

### *When asked how effective overall formal mentoring was, the responses were:*

- 34.3 % Very effective
- 37.1 % Somewhat effective
- 11.4 % Neither effective nor ineffective
- 11.4 % Somewhat ineffective
- 5.7 % Very ineffective

### *When asked how effective overall informal mentoring was, the responses were:*

- 54.9 % Very effective
- 25.5 % Somewhat effective
- 3.9 % Neither effective nor ineffective
- 5.9 % Somewhat ineffective
- 9.8 % Very ineffective

### *When asked, "At Williams, I received effective pre-tenure mentoring on the topic of":*

#### *Teaching:*

- 46.0 % Strongly agree
- 34.9 % Agree
- 9.5 % Neither agree or disagree
- 6.3 % Disagree
- 3.2 % Strongly disagree

#### *Scholarship/creative endeavors*

22.6 % Strongly agree  
 32.3 % Agree  
 12.9 % Neither agree or disagree  
 17.7 % Disagree  
 14.5 % Strongly disagree

*Service*

15.9 % Strongly agree  
 38.1 % Agree  
 17.5 % Neither agree or disagree  
 23.8 % Disagree  
 4.8 % Strongly disagree

*Expectations for tenure*

28.6 % Strongly agree  
 46.0 % Agree  
 9.5 % Neither agree or disagree  
 11.1 % Disagree  
 4.8 % Strongly disagree

*How to reach expectations for tenure*

20.6 % Strongly agree  
 31.7 % Agree  
 22.2 % Neither agree or disagree  
 19.0 % Disagree  
 6.3 % Strongly disagree

*Setting up lab or studio*

10.5% Strongly agree  
 21.1 % Agree  
 15.8 % Neither agree or disagree  
 31.6 % Disagree  
 21.1 % Strongly disagree

*Grant-writing*

2.0 % Strongly agree  
 16.0 % Agree  
 14.0 % Neither agree or disagree  
 38.0 % Disagree  
 30.0 % Strongly disagree

*Publishing books/articles*

11.5 % Strongly agree  
 23.0 % Agree  
 21.3 % Neither agree or disagree  
 23.0 % Disagree  
 21.3 % Strongly disagree

As our mandate was to make recommendations for improvement, we give a sense here of what people found “very effective.” At the college-wide level, the highest proportion of respondents, 43 percent, found the Oakley Seminars very effective, and similarly, 36 percent found Science Lunches very effectively. The Teaching Roundtable was considered very effective by 41 percent of the

respondents who had participated. Those few who specified “other” mentoring at the college-wide level identified class visits and discussions, workshops organized by the Associate Dean for Institutional Diversity, and FSI/potlucks as effective.

At the level of the academic unit (department, program and/or evaluation committee), the most effective formal practices were more frequent meetings with the chair, which 41 percent found very effective, and meetings to discuss classroom observations, student interviews, or other teaching evaluation, which 38 percent found very effective. In contrast, only 29 percent of respondents found meetings to discuss their Fuqua letters “very effective.” Most effective in the realm of informal mentoring were “relationships with senior colleagues,” which 67 percent found very effective. Similarly, 65 percent pointed to impromptu conversations with colleagues as very effective. Those few who specified “other” mentoring in their unit identified the following as effective practices: senior colleagues “checking in,” conversations about service load, team teaching in which senior faculty attended classroom, class visits from senior colleagues outside the department, and syllabus sharing.

Pre-tenure faculty received mentoring from a wide-range of colleagues including pre-tenure and senior colleagues within and beyond their academic unit at Williams College, as well as colleagues beyond Williams, according to the survey. Notably, 32 of 48 respondents reported receiving effective mentoring from tenured members outside their department or program; the data do not allow us to discern what percentage of these 32 had formal assigned mentors versus informal mentoring. The written comments generally favor assigning mentors from within the division, and anecdotal reports also suggest that assigned mentors from another division, while appreciated for their welcoming support, are not seen as particularly valuable in terms of nuts-and-bolts mentoring sought by the incoming faculty member. Responses suggested that very few academic units currently assign a formal faculty mentor within the department or program, but of the 4 respondents who did have an intra-departmental assigned mentor, 3 found the practice somewhat effective. In addition to faculty within and beyond their academic units, responses also indicated that pre-tenure faculty received effective mentoring from “my dissertation or post-doctoral advisor and/or graduate school faculty” (31 percent strongly agreed and another 36 percent agreed) and from “experts in my field beyond Williams” (27 percent strongly agreed and another 54 percent agreed).

### Appendix III: Faculty Network Program Web Site

*The FNP would develop and maintain an expanded web site with information and resources for faculty.*

The success of mentoring pre-tenured faculty will primarily depend on the personal interactions that occur between mentees and mentors, but there is also a data-driven component of learning the Williams College culture. Good mentoring includes fluid and dynamic access to the governing threads of information. In a standard sense of discovery, it is the *who, what, when* and *where* that governs sequence, priority, action and outcome.

As Williams continues to hire faculty who are technically savvy and have high expectations of web-based media (data and social), it would not be surprising that they would examine the Williams search engine for many of their first level questions. What is expected from them and by what calendar, who might they best communicate with for answers to non-departmental questions, how to see who, in other academic units, they share intellectual work—pre-tenured and post-tenured? Even routine searches for details too many to ask a chair at any given conversation could be satisfied with a robust site developed for pre-tenure faculty. To be meaningful information—to give access—a web presence requires a quality that encourages further inquiry.

We are going to great effort (time and expense) to attract the best faculty to our community, but do not serve them well when they are presented with less than robust media that would and should deliver a great deal of access to the riches of this place. The FNP should be the foundation for building easier access to those complicated threads that link the work of administrative offices and personnel, curricular structures representing diverse but shared means of inquiry, social and health agencies available for the community's well-being, and intellectual/creative projects made real by dedicated individuals. If those riches are optimized then everyone has equal access and a core tenet of mentoring is satisfied.

#### Recommendations: The Layering or Rhizomic Model of Inquiry

The layering or rhizomic model of inquiry (more common on robust web sites) needs to be built into the Faculty Network Program web presence. Inquiry of a meaningful kind shares aspects of folding and unfolding; a small or large inquiry threads to answers that are threaded to other inquiry and from each fold the extending threads leads not only to stations where answers can be found but permits one to move to other stations (direct permalinks or indirect threads). The rhizomic model permits access through active participation rewarded by further discovery leading to other inquiry; a *private* conversation where nothing is judged by the question or its outcome measured by the sequence of the inquiry.

How might even a simple, basic thread operate?

**Q:** I need to know when syllabi are due? **A:** They are due at the following offices by *>date x, y, t<*. **Q:** is there a standard format used by the department/division or college? **A:** Here are sample PDF files of syllabi used in the following type courses from each of the divisions. Would you like to see sample designs used by faculty at other institutions? If so, here is a link. **Q:** How much overlap or contrast is permitted by the format of the printed syllabi and one I might post on GLOW? **A:** Do you imagine using media files as an essential component of your course? If you had not considered this, here is *>Name of person in OIT<* that would best assist you in putting those files together. **Q:** What intellectual property standards are required of me? **A:** *>Name/s of person/s in Stetson/Hopkins<* is someone that keeps current with these issues and could meet with you to answer your questions. **Q:** What is the simplest means of discovering what other faculty are teaching similar content in their classes; they need not be in my division? **A:** The Online Course Catalog has recently included a search engine that would allow an

entry-level search. >Name of person in Registrar's Office< is very familiar with this and could assist you in arriving at a broader share. *And so on....*

This simplest of threads, if expanded to the host of other inquiries many pre-tenured faculty would encounter, reveals that a robust web presence would develop answers to the common questions and permit that data field to expand in real time and, perhaps most importantly, offer consistent responses to the questions asked by most pre-tenure faculty. Software models do exist that would permit this to be a part of the FNP project.

### **Recommendation: Improve the Quality of Current Video Teaching Tips**

The current use of video “discussions” offers a variety of means to *discover* some responses to baseline questions many beginning faculty pose, but the lack of professional quality in most of these current video files undermines their usefulness. They run the risk of losing the interest of the audience for whom these are geared, and appear so dated, they appear irrelevant to the present.

### **Recommendations: Content Areas (examples)**

#### *I. Introducing the FNP*

- Importance of mentoring networks
- Programs/dimensions
- Division coordinators

#### *II. Being a Professor at Williams*

##### Teaching

- Developing a syllabus, Leading discussion, Preparing and delivering a lecture, Being an effective listener, Pacing a semester's expectations, etc.
- Teaching Tips from Williams Colleagues (videos)
- Teaching Students from Under-represented Groups
- Working with Students beyond the Classroom (labs, studios, independent studies, honors)
- Advising and Mentoring Students

##### Scholarship/Creative Endeavors

##### Service

##### Evaluation Procedures at Williams

##### Resources on Work-Life Balance

#### *III. Faculty Mentoring Relationships*

The mentoring threads and links on the Williams College web site should identify, articulate, coordinate and encourage the perpetual evolution of the goals of mentoring and faculty development. This will also ease the transitions between FNP division coordinators over the years.

The web site could include titles and dates of faculty lecture series/faculty presentations; professional documentation of any and all events that are remotely linked to learning or could be seen as a resource for mentoring; an indication that there are a great many people doing exciting things here. This would facilitate new faculty identifying a possible mentor and making connections based on shared interests.

Useful websites include:

<http://www.icre.pitt.edu/mentoring/overview.html>

<http://www.umass.edu/ctfd/mentoring/resources.shtml>

<http://www.brown.edu/Administration/Provost/Advance/mentor.html>

<http://www.faculty.harvard.edu/development-and-mentoring/faculty-mentoring-resources>

<http://academicaffairs.ucsd.edu/faculty/programs/faculty-mentoring-program.html>

<http://www.udel.edu/cubillos/622links.htm>

<http://www.cmu.edu/teaching/designteach/design/syllabus/index.html>

[http://sitemaker.umich.edu/advance/career\\_advising\\_mentoring\\_for\\_faculty](http://sitemaker.umich.edu/advance/career_advising_mentoring_for_faculty)

<http://www.uoguelph.ca/facultyjobs/images/pdfs/Best%20Practices%20and%20Recommendatio>

[ns.pdf](#)

<http://www.uri.edu/advance/10%20Best%20Mentor%20Practices%20NN.pdf>

[gumc.georgetown.edu/evp/facultyaffairs/mentoringprogram/](http://gumc.georgetown.edu/evp/facultyaffairs/mentoringprogram/)

## **Appendix IV: Dean of the Faculty and Associate Dean for Institutional Diversity Mentoring**

The Dean of the Faculty, along with departments/programs/evaluation committees, has a key responsibility for assuring that pre-tenure faculty members have a clear understanding of the expectations for reappointment and tenure. In addition to the on-going work of the Dean of the Faculty's and the CAP's role in evaluation and related procedures, the Dean of the Faculty supports faculty mentoring through: A series of group discussions, in collaboration with the Associate Dean of Institutional Diversity, on the processes of evaluation, and reappointment and tenure reviews

### **Group discussions for pre-tenure faculty**

*Introduction to Reappointment and Tenure Review Processes: A discussion for new faculty*

Each January, possibly lunchtime discussion

For first and second year faculty

Overview of evaluation criteria and procedures

Facilitated by Dean of Faculty, Associate Dean, and Associate Dean for Institutional Diversity

*Scholarship, Timing, and Tenure: Books and Other Publications (A discussion for pre-tenure faculty, primarily in Divisions I and II)*

Each spring, possibly lunchtime discussion

In conjunction with Book Publishing Day (editors from university presses, organized by John Gerry), if possible

Facilitated by Dean of Faculty and Associate Dean for Institutional Diversity with CAP member(s) if needed for disciplinary perspectives

*Scholarship, Timing, and Tenure: Grants, Conferences, and Publications (A discussion for pre-tenure faculty, primarily in Division III, Psychology, Environmental Studies)*

Each spring, possibly lunchtime discussion

In conjunction with Grant Day (panel on applying for and managing grants; representatives from NSF and NIH, Chris Winters, maybe Williams grant recipients or faculty who have served on selection committees), if possible

Facilitated by Dean of Faculty and Associate Dean for Institutional Diversity with CAP member(s) if needed for disciplinary perspectives

*Assembling Reappointment Packets: Questions you might want to ask*

Each spring, possibly lunchtime discussion

For third year faculty

Facilitated by Associate Dean for Institutional Diversity with *former* CAP member(s)

*Assembling Tenure Packets: Questions you might want to ask*

Each spring, possibly lunchtime discussion

For fourth and fifth year faculty

Facilitated by Associate Dean for Institutional Diversity with *former* CAP member(s)

### **Group discussion for post-tenure faculty**

*Paths after Tenure: Introduction to the Processes for Promotion to Full Professor*

Facilitated by Dean of Faculty and Associate Dean for Institutional Diversity