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Introduction

It is important for higher education institutions to strategically manage their faculty through recruitment, retention, human resources development, and professional development initiatives. Mentoring is a great way to satisfy all of these needs and build a quality faculty workforce. This, in turn, helps create a beneficial learning environment for students. Many times this is a non formal initiative by separate departments, but research has found that a unified, university-wide formal mentoring program would prove beneficial to the whole school community.

Definition

There are many different definitions of “mentorship” in academia. According to Janasz & Sullivan (2001), “Traditional definitions of mentoring suggest a dyadic relationship in which the more experienced mentor helped guide the career of a younger organizational member as this protégé learned to “navigate the world of work (Kram, 1985, p.2) and moved up the firm’s hierarchy (Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson, & McKee, 1978; Ragins, 1997)” (Janasz & Sullivan, 2001, p.264).

King, Parkhurst, Wizwer, Zdanowicz, & Zeind (2005) defined mentoring as “a relationship in which an individual who is senior in terms of experience (mentor) undertakes the following roles with a less experienced individual (protégé): advisor, teacher, protector, role model, advocate, counselor, and sponsor” (King, Parkhurst, Wizwer, Zdanowicz, & Zeind, 2005, p.1). The article also explained that transformation and reciprocity are main goals of this relationship and that mentoring is an important component in the development of faculty members. Mentors should help guide protégés through challenging experiences and help them to grow personally and professionally. The mentor is also affected by mentoring and will hopefully become rejuvenated in his/her work (King, Parkhurst, Wizwer, Zdanowicz, & Zeind, 2005).

The researchers in Duane, Parson, & Sands (1991) defined “mentor” as “a person who serves as a guide or sponsor, that is, a person who looks after, advises, protects, and takes a special interest in another’s development” (Duane, Parson, & Sands, 1991, p.175).

Benefits
Numerous studies in business organizations have shown that mentoring programs are beneficial to both the individual and organization; however, there is little empirical research on faculty mentoring (Janasz & Sullivan, 2001). The benefits of mentoring for faculty are plentiful. Janasz & Sullivan (2001) said research has found that individuals who have had mentors report higher job satisfaction, compensation, promotions, and less work conflicts. Organizations benefit as well, with lower employee turnover, higher organizational commitment, and higher morale (Janasz & Sullivan, 2001).

Both individuals participating, and the institution itself, can benefit from mentoring programs, as they promote the growth of faculty. Faculty development should be rooted in the values and norms of the organization. It should show through the institution’s mission statement and core principles.

Lyons (2007) expressed that mentoring programs enhance instructional abilities and ensure students are receiving top quality instruction. Mentoring increases team building and a sense of community among full time faculty and adjuncts. It also gives the mentor renewal and rejuvenation in their field, as well as professional pride that they are giving back and passing on their knowledge (Lyons, 2007). King, Parkhurst, Wizwer, Zdanowicz, & Zeind (2005) suggested that the potential benefits for mentors include increased self esteem, renewed approach to academic work, and increased job satisfaction. The protégé will hopefully be able to transition into the academic life more easily, acquire an advisor and confidant in the process (King, Parkhurst, Zdanowicz, & Zeind, 2005). LaLopa & Wasburn (2003) contended that faculty can benefit from the guidance, support, knowledge, friendship and opportunities that are present in mentoring relationships. Mentors serve as role models that help new faculty successfully transition into their new job (LaLopa & Wasburn, 2003).

Fields (2008) found that the payoff of a mentoring program would be the improved teaching and research skills of faculty who, in turn, can use these skills to move successfully through the tenure process. “Whatever steps we can take in the near future to reduce our need to go into the market for new faculty will be particularly valuable to our respective colleges” (Fields, 2008, p.7). Miami University of Ohio’s mentoring program has shown that junior faculty participating achieve tenure at a higher rate than those not participating (LaLopa & Wasburn, 2003). Gillespie & Thomas (2008) mentioned that “Bode (1999) found that new tenure-track faculty members consistently rank mentoring and collegiality as central to their
success, with collegiality rated more important than mentoring” (Gillespie & Thomas, 2008, p.31).

Mentoring has proved to be a valuable tool in supporting adjuncts as well. Lyons (2007) acknowledged, “Faculty mentoring programs are perhaps one of the best ways to create collegiality across disciplines and build community among instructors at post-secondary institutions” (Lyons, 2007, p.68).

*Reasons*

After reviewing the benefits of mentoring programs, one can understand the reasons why it is important to implement a program on a university campus. In the research, there is a call for universities to create more formal programs because informal, department-centered programs are harder to track and don’t provide the amount of diversity in perspective that university-wide programs offer.

According to Duane, Parson, & Sands’ (1991), results from their research “indicate that mentoring between faculty members in such universities is not prevalent. Where it occurs, it is mutually negotiated, primarily between persons of the same sex and between assistant and full professors” (Duane, Parson, & Sands, 1991, p.191). Seventy-two percent of the faculty in the study had at one time during their educational, academic, or professional career, had a mentor. However, only one third of study participants had a mentor at their current school. The authors argued; however, that it has been traditionally assumed that faculty members do not need support, and it is not standard practice to have a mentor during professorship (Duane, Parson, & Sands, 1991).

The author in Fields (2008) insisted that one of his highest concerns is seeing the age of his faculty because he realizes the problem of untrained new faculty will only escalate. The author thinks many schools don’t give new faculty proper orientation and just expect new faculty to dive in and start their research and feel confident in their activities. This is the typical “survival of the fittest” mentality. Department chairs and seasoned faculty need to understand it is in the new faculty members’ best interest to guide them through the process and help make them feel welcome. Otherwise, they will lose the faculty member, or risk the faculty member getting off the right track because of lack of direction. The author pointed out the importance of personal relationships and connections with new recruits, as well as proper marketing of their
programs. He believes a priority of departments should be to adopt a mentoring program (Fields, 2008). Gillespie & Thomas (2008) pointed out that “Boice (2000), Boyle and Boice (1998), and Sorcinelli and Austin (1992) have argued that new faculty need to be acculturated to the specific context of a campus if they are to be successful teachers and scholars” (Gillespie & Thomas, 2008, p.31). Successful acculturation strategies such as mentoring can help faculty feel involved and a part of the university.

At many research universities, professors focus on research and grants and leave little time to invest in improving their teaching activities (Lalopa & Wasburn, 2003). According to Janasz & Sullivan (2001), “Despite the advanced degree and beliefs to the contrary, new professors’ training for effective and successful performance (i.e., knowing how) in teaching, research, and service may be lacking. Many doctoral programs provide little if any training about the pedagogical and practical necessities or requirements of effective teaching” (Janasz & Sullivan, 2001, p.270). Mentoring can assist by providing faculty with a helpful resource for their teaching and research activities. Professional development of faculty can help improve teaching strategies as well as enrich students’ educational experiences.

Mentoring plays a critical role in the success of new faculty. It is important for departments to develop a mentoring program, if not just for the benefit of new faculty, for the pure economic advantages as well. LaLopa & Wasburn (2003) admitted that “With the criteria for promotion and tenure growing more stringent, mentoring can be key to faculty success” (LaLopa & Wasburn, 2003, p.262). Janasz & Sullivan (2001) mentioned that another main reason for developing mentoring programs would be the pure competitive advantage in the marketplace for quality faculty members.

Challenges

LaLopa & Wasburn (2003) found that mentoring can sometimes fail to be successful depending on the characteristics of each member and their relationship. Personality differences, failure to make clear goals, failure to allow sufficient time to spend together, and the mentor pushing an agenda are some possible downfalls to this relationship (LaLopa & Wasburn, 2003). Gillespie & Thomas (2008) stated that the ambiguous culture and the pressures on balancing demands on time also prove challenging in the academic realm. Fields (2008) contended that
ineffective mentoring can destroy the college’s reputation, so institutions need to spend time developing these programs that will help recruit and retain new faculty members.

**Formal mentoring programs**

LaLopa & Wasburn (2003) insisted that schools should not rely on mentoring relationships developing on their own, instead they need to be proactive and create a formal program. According to Janasz & Sullivan (2001), “60% of Fortune’s 100 best companies to work for in the U.S. have formal mentoring programs (Branch, 1999), a web and database search suggests that relatively few universities have such programs for their professors” (Janasz & Sullivan, 2001, p.275). The authors endorsed mentoring programs by saying, “Research on formal mentor programs in industry suggests that success is more likely when participants have input into the matching of proteges to mentor, when the pair establishes goals and meets regularly, when there is an exit mechanism, and when the mentoring program is integrated into other career development efforts” (Forret, Turban, & Dougherty, 1996; Gibb, 1999; Viator, 1999; Wilson & Elman, 1990; see Scandura & Williams, 2002 for a review) (Janasz & Sullivan, 2001, p.275).

Formal mentoring programs are starting to become popular, and rightly so. Janasz & Sullivan (2001) stated that the University of Hawaii (UH) implemented a formal mentoring program with workshops, seminars, and web information. Also, the Academy of Management (AOM) created an online mentoring program across different universities to provide opportunities for faculty to network with mentors at various schools (Janasz & Sullivan, 2001).

Allen, Poteat, & Shockley (2009) examined the affect of mentor and protégé commitment on relationship satisfaction. Researchers found that it was important to have committed protégés because this may help with the attraction and retention of mentors. Commitment levels from both sides have proven to affect relationship satisfaction. Evaluation is an essential component to a formal mentoring program. This allows administrators to see if the program is beneficial to all parties and where improvements can be made. “The evaluation of the success of mentoring programs in organizational and academic institutions should include assessments of both mentor and protégé commitment. Career counselors may also want to emphasize to those seeking mentoring relationships the importance of demonstrating commitment to their mentoring partner” (Allen, Poteat, & Shockley, 2009, p.337).
Interdisciplinary/various models

Research has shown that most mentoring relationships occur within departments rather than interdepartmentally (LaLopez & Wasburn, 2003). LaLopez & Wasburn (2003) found that when mentors and protégés are matched outside of their own departments, there is the benefit of diversity in the relationship and the likelihood that politics will not be involved.

Organizations are changing and academia is not exempt. Janasz & Sullivan (2001) stated that institutions are facing greater public scrutiny of spending, legislative pressures and a growing expectation of accountability. Faculty’s jobs are changing as well, with increased workloads, decreased resources, more diverse classrooms, and the demands from changing technology and globalization. With these increased pressures that institutions are being faced with from all angles, it is important for them to enhance their reputation and marketability by retaining and enhancing their faculty’s professional development. This article suggests, “we break with the traditional apprenticeship model and demonstrate that it would be unlikely that one mentor could fulfill all the needs of the faculty protégé, necessitating the creation of a developmental network. It is through the interaction with multiple ‘mentors of the moment’ that faculty protégés will expand their competencies and their beliefs about future career possibilities” (Baugh & Scandura, 1999) (Janasz & Sullivan, 2001, p.269).

Research has found that students may benefit more from a variety of mentors rather than the traditional one mentor, one protégé mentoring mode. These would prove to be beneficial learning experiences for both the mentor and the protégé. Janasz & Sullivan (2001) suggested that with the changes in higher education and our environment, professors may be better served by having a variety of mentors rather than just one. The challenges that the new contemporary environment presents warrants the need of a multiple mentor model, rather than the popular single mentor model. “Having a network of mentors can provide a protégé with a variety of developers with different perspectives, knowledge, and skills and who can serve different mentoring functions such as being a role model or providing career-related or emotional support” (Baugh & Scandura, 1999; Burt, 1992; Eby, 1997; Higgins, 2000; Kram & Isabella, 1985) (Janasz & Sullivan, 2001, p.264).

Human Resources
The responsibility for initiating programs usually lies in the human resources department of the university. Human capital is important to every organization. The people who work at a university create value for the organization. Julius (2000) expressed that human resources personnel must make sure to address faculty and staff’s concerns through policy and procedure manuals and have a strategy to keep faculty and staff informed and satisfied. Human resources departments need to be managed efficiently and effectively (Julius, 2000). Julius (2000) stated that “human resources professionals are often the primary advocates for and sponsors of professional development that enhances individual growth and upward mobility in colleges and universities” (Julius, 2000, p.47). This area may involve supervisor training, career counseling, discipline, and performance reviews. The human resources department may also sponsor seminars or workshops to update faculty and staff on new laws or institutional policies in effect (Julius, 2000).

**Best Practices**

Many universities have implemented various versions of formal mentoring programs. Mentoring can also be easily integrated professional development programs. The following best practice examples are just a few of the ways mentoring programs could be executed.

Lyons (2007) found that at MacEwan College in Alberta, Canada, a formal mentoring program was initiated because of the growing age and retirement of faculty members, as well as for the success of faculty and ultimately, the students. A faculty mentoring program committee was formed and a program coordinator was appointed. The first goal was to set a mission, principles, process, and learning outcomes. Their central theme was to promote lifelong learning among faculty. Cross-disciplinary pairings proved positive for all participants. The adjuncts expressed their satisfaction with the program as it connected them to other instructor and established a long-term relationship with someone they may have never met. Mentors and protégés applied to the voluntary program and were matched up by their profiles and needs. An orientation session for each pair introduced them to the program and they were given a complete assessment of their current skills. Each pair was presented with a template with goals and schedules for their relationship. They were required to meet at least once a week and visit each other’s classrooms. Journals were also given for reflection of their experiences. This mentoring experience provided the participants with a collegial bond that helps build awareness of issues
and benefits to their career. Ninety five percent of participants rated the program as extremely worthwhile (Lyons, 2007).

Mentoring programs must adapt to the changing environment with the increase in technology as well. According to Lyons (2007), Indian River Community College in Florida implemented a comprehensive professional development program for adjunct that included a systematic orientation, a course called Instructor Effectiveness Training, a mentoring program, a series of meal meetings to close the gap on isolation, and a resource center with materials on topics of interest. At the orientation, part-timers received the Adjunct Faculty Handbook and a college catalog. Question and answer time was followed by a checklist of information relayed to the participants. Eighty-six percent of participants said the orientation was well managed. The training course included four sessions focusing on course planning, managing classes, strategies for instruction, and evaluating students. The course was adapted into an online version to reach those who couldn’t make the face-to-face meetings. Mentoring is an important part to this comprehensive program by providing support and fostering collegial relationships. Two social activities were also vital to this program’s success. A brown bag luncheon and an annual spring reception were implemented to help adjuncts network. There is a growing collection of books in the library and a wealth of information on the IRCC website. The book stated, “In a 2003 comprehensive survey of IRCC’s adjunct faculty members, the initiative to support their teaching demonstrated its effectiveness when nearly 70% reported feeling ‘like a true member of the IRCC faculty’” (Lyons, 2007, p.195).

According to LaLopa & Wasburn (2003), in 1997, Purdue University created the Faculty Mentoring Network (FMN) to help create better teachers, meet the demands of research, promotion, and tenure, and serve as an advocate for faculty members. The FMN involves a ‘meet and greet’ networking event where mentors and protégés have the opportunity to meet many different contacts and rank their choices in mentors/protégés that they will later be matched up with. They are encouraged to meet monthly and develop a mutually beneficial mentoring relationship. The results have been extremely positive. The majority of mentors and protégés both said the program improved their teaching. The most successful relationships were the ones that met frequently and found common ground. Those that performed poorly had infrequent contact and weren’t able to establish rapport. The authors suggested the participants
discuss “best practices” on teaching that could help engage them in scholarly dialogue and be beneficial for both sides (LaLopa & Wasburn, 2003).

King, Parkhurst, Wizwer, Zdanowicz, & Zeind (2005) found that clinical educators often face high demands from the health care system and are often difficult to recruit and retain. Because of the overwhelming responsibilities of these faculty positions, faculty development is crucial in transitioning these educators. This article reviewed the development of a formal mentoring program at the Massachusetts College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences. The College implemented a formal mentoring program that consisted of “a mentoring subcommittee; faculty mentoring guidelines; pairing a new faculty member (protégé) with a senior faculty member (mentor) and individual meetings between protégés and mentors; an orientation program at the start of the academic year; monthly seminars/workshops throughout the academic year; and an end of the year workshop” (King, Parkhurst, Wizwer, Zdanowicz, & Zeind, 2005, p.3). After mentors and protégés’ are assigned, they attend an orientation where academic leaders give a brief overview of the program, and information about the program is discussed. Faculty documents are shared, as well as a questionnaire to assess abilities. After the orientation, mentors and protégés participate in approximately ten live and interactive workshops/seminars offered throughout the year. Examples of workshop topics include cultural diversity, classroom management, promotion, leadership, service learning, and communication skills. After the school year ends, mentors and protégés are invited to a luncheon to wrap up the year. Mentors and protégés share their experiences and the same evaluation from orientation is used to see how the perceived abilities have changed. The article stated that the mentoring program has seen an increase in participation since its inception, and feedback is largely positive. The authors contended that the support of academic and administrative leaders, financial commitment from the college, and the willingness of senior faculty members all contributed to the success of this program. This mentoring program has proved to be a great recruitment tool as well, since it allows the new faculty to easily transition into the culture of the institution and benefit from the past experiences of their mentors. Mentors are able to earn service credits and participate in activities to add to their promotion and activity reports. This program brought together faculty members of different ranks as well as other campuses to exchange ideas and enhance the experiences of the faculty (King, Parkhurst, Wizwer, Zdanowicz, & Zeind, 2005).
According to Alberg & Raines (2003), for a new chair to be successful, it is important for them to learn to be an effective leader, which involves planning, adaptation, and communication. The article suggested new chairs be in the company of other leaders to learn from them and see them in action. A new chair may seek out these leaders or join committees to see how they function. They serve as good examples and mentors. Mentorship was also suggested for these new leaders in order to benefit from those administrators with more experience. The advice and counsel of these leaders can help new leaders transition into their new role by learning from their mistakes and taking heed of their advice (Alberg & Raines, 2003).

Recommendations

LaLopa & Wasburn (2003) made a few recommendations for colleges and universities looking to start a formal mentoring program of their own. These included conducting an orientation session, using personality and outside interests in addition to others to match mentors and protégés, encouraging a contract of expectations, and using group sessions to create a network to connect faculty (LaLopa & Wasburn, 2003). Duane, Parson, & Sands (1991) suggested that those who are in charge of matching mentors and protégés be aware of the four types of mentors and take them into account matching participants. These styles, Friend, Career Guide, Information Source, and Intellectual Guide, were developed after researchers reviewed the data from their study and found common generalizations among subjects (Duane, Parson, & Sands, 1991).

Conclusion

Research has shown the benefits of mentoring programs, therefore giving reasons why higher education institutions should utilize this professional development tool. Even though many informal programs exist, the numerous benefits of mentoring need to be measured and evaluated to make sure they are making an impact on faculty. Formal mentoring programs should be implemented, as they are a great resource for schools. University-wide, interdisciplinary formal mentoring programs would be a great start for universities to take control of this opportunity. Another strategy that could be utilized would be switching up the pairings of mentors and protégés every year to have the participants benefit from more than one
perspective, personality, and advice. No matter how the school implements the mentoring program, research has shown that formalizing the process will provide an organized, evaluated and redesigned program that fits the needs of the participants by providing a learning environment that fosters collaboration and diversity across campus. This would be beneficial for the school, faculty, and ultimately, the student.
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