# The Advocate

12-1-2016

# Benefits of a University Faculty-to-Faculty Mentoring Program

Anh Tran
*Wichita State University*

Kay Gibson
*Wichita State University*

Follow this and additional works at: https://newprairiepress.org/advocate

Part of the Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons

## Recommended Citation

Tran, Anh and Gibson, Kay (2016) "Benefits of a University Faculty-to-Faculty Mentoring Program," *The Advocate*: Vol. 23: No. 3. https://doi.org/10.4148/2637-4552.1027

# Benefits of a University Faculty-to-Faculty Mentoring Program

## Abstract

A faculty-to-faculty mentoring program is considered a useful way to help faculty be successful in teaching, research and service that lead to tenure attainment. Mentoring programs can be structured in a variety of ways, but usually the outcomes are focused on the benefits for mentees. This article presents a research study on a mentoring program in the College of Education at Wichita State University, in which mentors were tenured faculty and mentees were tenure–eligible. Through a written survey and an interview, participants identified perceived individual individual benefits of the mentoring program, and provided recommendations for future development. The traditional model of a mentoring program involves one mentor meeting with one mentee allowing for more individualized attention and greater rapport building (Reimers, 2014). According to researchers (Duranczyk, Madyun, Jehangir, & Higbee, 2011; Reimers, 2014), institutions should provide multiple types of mentoring. Types of mentoring include one-to-one, group, team, peer, and e-mentoring (Kwiatkowski, 2003; Reimers, 2014). Within each type, the program should allow for both informal and formal opportunities for mentoring to take place (America Psychological Association [APA], 2006; Ramani, Gruppen, & Krajic Kachur, 2006).

# Benefits of a University Faculty-to-Faculty Mentoring Program

**Anh Tran**
**Kay Gibson**
**Wichita State University**

## Abstract

A faculty-to-faculty mentoring program is considered a useful way to help faculty be successful in teaching, research and service that lead to tenure attainment. Mentoring programs can be structured in a variety of ways, but usually the outcomes are focused on the benefits for mentees. This article presents a research study on a mentoring program in the College of Education at Wichita State University, in which mentors were tenured faculty and mentees were tenure – eligible. Through a written survey and an interview, participants identified perceived individual individual benefits of the mentoring program, and provided recommendations for future development.

The traditional model of a mentoring program involves one mentor meeting with one mentee allowing for more individualized attention and greater rapport building (Reimers, 2014). According to researchers (Duranczyk, Madyun, Jehangir, & Higbee, 2011; Reimers, 2014), institutions should provide multiple types of mentoring. Types of mentoring include one-to-one, group, team, peer, and e-mentoring (Kwiatkowski, 2003; Reimers, 2014). Within each type, the program should allow for both informal and formal opportunities for mentoring to take place (America Psychological Association [APA], 2006; Ramani, Gruppen, & Krajic Kachur, 2006).

In higher education, mentoring is considered to be a process in which a mentor coaches a mentee to develop and enhance the mentee's professional performance (APA, 2006; Schunk & Mullen, 2013). The mentoring relationship is dynamic and developmental in nature, and can be formal, informal, or both, including professional as well as social activities (Goodwin, Stevens, Bellamy, 1998; Mertz, 2004; Schunk & Mullen, 2013).

First and foremost, an effective mentoring program needs knowledgeable mentors who have communication skills and are willing to take on the task of mentoring (Evans, Homer, & Rayner, 2013; Hill, Bahniuk & Dobos, 1989; Ramani, et al., 2006). Formal mentoring programs are generally more effective when mentors voluntarily participate and are intrinsically motivated to help mentees (Baugh & Fagenson-Eland, 2007). Additionally, Duranczyk, Madyun, Jehangir, and Higbee (2011) emphasize that the responsibilities of a mentor are "being a resource that identifie[s] relevant publication

venues, reviewing manuscript drafts, providing feedback on tenure statements, offering strategic service option, and adapting to departmental concerns regarding the mentee's tenure case" (p. 25).

The literature review revealed a number of benefits for mentees related to a quality mentoring program. Probably the most commonly identified benefit was obtaining tenure and promotion (Brinson & Kottler, 1993; Goodwin, Stevens, & Bellamy, 1998; Savage, Karp, & Logue, 2004). Related benefits were career advancement, publications, and academic success (Angelique, Kyle, & Taylor, 2002; Benson, Morahan, Sachdeva, & Richman, 2002; Local Government Professionals (2016); Mertz, 2004; Pololi, Knight, Dennis, & Frankel, 2002; Reimers, 2014) through informal feedback and constructive criticism (Office of Faculty Development, 2015). Also, mentee emotional support was discussed in the literature as a benefit of university mentoring programs.  The benefit was described with phrases such as "feelings of being supported and belonging" (Goodwin, Stevens, & Bellamy, 1998), "feeling of support" (Beans, 1999), "reduction of stress", and "feeling welcomed and valued" (Office of Faculty Development, 2015).

Benefits for mentors identified in the literature included an opportunity to reflect on one's own practice, and satisfaction in helping junior faculty to grow (Benson, et al., 2002; Local Government Professionals, 2016). Other benefits found were that mentors often expand their networks of colleagues (Thomas, 2005), and increase opportunities for further collaboration in research projects (Loyola University Maryland, n.d.), as a result of their participation in the role of a mentor.

<center>Starting the COEd Mentoring Program Initiative</center>

Mentoring program objectives

At Wichita State University, the College of Education (COEd) began a mentoring program in the fall semester of 2012.  The main purpose of the COEd Mentoring Program was to help mentees, who are tenure-eligible, to be successful in their teaching, scholarship and service as they work toward mandated tenure; thus, increasing the retention rate of COEd faculty and avoiding the waste of valuable talent (Reimers, 2014).

Selection of mentors and mentees

Tenured faculty within the COEd and tenured faculty from related disciplines in other WSU colleges were considered to be potential mentors in the COEd mentoring program.  Department chairs nominated mentors outside the college and COEd faculty self-nominated to the Associate Dean.  All tenure-eligible faculty in the COEd were invited to participate in the mentoring program.  Each mentee was provided a list of three possible mentors from which they chose one of the three to serve as their mentor.

The Associate Dean contacted the mentor to notify of the selection. Mentors and mentees were asked to meet informally to introduce themselves to each other. All mentors attended an orientation meeting at which the Dean's address provided an overview of COEd initiatives and programs as well as the "roles and responsibilities of the mentor and mentee". The Associate Dean provided further information on how to serve as a mentor (College of Education Dean's Office, Wichita State University, 2012).

Two meetings including all participants and program administrators were held each semester, one at the beginning and one at the end. During the first semester, the Associate Dean provided online resources, and topics and activities related to mentoring (see Appendix A).

## Introduction to the Study

As two tenured and one non-tenured faculty members, we began a research study to investigate the benefits for mentees and mentors who had participated in the WSU College of Education mentoring program, in spring 2014 (Author, 2015). We conducted this study to investigate the benefits for all participants from fall 2013 to spring 2015.  We hoped to discover in what ways the program has helped mentees, who are tenure-eligible, to be successful in their teaching, scholarship and service as they work towards their mandated tenure. Further, we sought to learn what benefits, if any, the program has had for the mentors.
The research questions were:
- What are the benefits for the mentors and mentees who were participants in the College of Education's mentoring program?
- What suggestions do participants have that might improve the effectiveness of the College of Education mentoring program?
- 

## Methods

Participants

Approval of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) was secured. Then, during a mentoring meeting, the three researchers explained the study and invited mentors and mentees to participate. Those who accepted the invitation were asked to sign a consent form for the project and complete an online Qualtrics survey.

A total of 21 faculty signed a consent form for the study, 10 mentors and 11 mentees. Three mentors are from Fairmount College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, one mentor is from the College of Health Professions, and the remaining six mentors are from the College of Education (Author, 2015). It should be noted that even though we are faculty members who have been participating in the mentorship program, we did not take part in the online survey or the interviews.

To ensure confidentiality, mentors and mentees were assigned a number based on the order in which they were interviewed. For example, the first interviewed mentor was identified as Mentor 1, and the first mentee was identified as Mentee 1.
Instruments and procedures

We used a mixed method research design for the study using both quantitative and qualitative methods.

Online survey. An online survey (see Appendix B) was considered to be an appropriate way to immediately engage each participant in the study while interview times were scheduled.  The online survey was used to obtain data concerned with the participants' experiences in the mentoring program.  This type of survey was chosen because it provided data instantly for researchers, and was readily available to participants to respond to at any time (SmartSurvey, 2015).

The first four questions on the survey were designed to collect demographic information.  The respondents were asked their age, gender, racial identity, and years at WSU.  The fifth question was a series of 6 statements to which the respondents were to indicate their level of agreement.  Questions 6 through 9 asked the participants about how effective the mentoring program was, and their recommendations for future development of the program (see Figure 1).

Interviews.  Interviews were chosen as a data collection tool because as a qualitative method, researchers can establish an understanding of a participant's perspective (Mendaglio, 2003).  We constructed five questions to be used to gather data that would answer the research questions (see Figure 2).
Administration of interviews

Researchers for the study sent an email request to schedule an interview with each mentor and mentee who had signed the consent form. Interviews were scheduled in a place designated by the interviewee, most often in her/his office. After the audiotaped interviews were transcribed, researchers analyzed transcript data with a constant comparative method to determine response categories for each question, and finalized categories by means of inter-rater reliability.

# Results

As stated above, we conducted this study to investigate the benefits of the mentoring program in the College of Education for mentees and mentors who participated. We also hoped to discover in what ways the program had helped mentees, who are tenure-eligible, to be successful in their three areas of work at the university—teaching, scholarship and service—as they work to gain tenure. Further, we

sought to learn what benefits the program has had for the mentors.
The research questions were:

- What are the benefits for the mentors and mentees who were participants in the College of Education's mentoring program?
- What suggestions do participants have that might improve the effectiveness of the College of Education mentoring program?

An online survey and interviews with mentees and mentors were used to collect data to answer the research questions.

Online survey

Upon signing the consent form, participants were emailed a link to the Qualtrics survey. The online survey (see Appendix B) consisted of nine questions of which four were designed to gather demographic information. Not all participants answered all nine questions. Two participants were male, six female, and all identified as White or Caucasian. Four had been at WSU four or less years, and four of the participants had been at WSU thirteen or more years. More than half (6 out of 8) of the participants were 41 years old or more.

Participants were asked to describe their experience in the mentoring program for item #5, by rating six statements on a seven-point scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree (see Figure 1).

Due to the small number of the respondents, the results recorded as "Strongly Agree", "Agree", and "Somewhat Agree" were combined. Similarly, results recorded as "Somewhat Disagree", "Disagree", and "Strongly Disagree" were combined. Findings are reported in Table 1 for each statement.

Participants' responses to two questions produced an overall positive rating of the program. For instance, responses to question seven, designed only for mentees, "In which of the areas … (teaching, research, service) has the mentoring program significantly helped you?" revealed that three out of seven indicated that the mentoring program significantly helped them in all three areas. One participant felt that significant help was given in the area of Research. Three participants indicated they had been helped significantly in Service.

In addition, responses to question eight, "Overall, what is your rating of the current COEd mentoring program", revealed that five participants rated the program as "Very Good" or "Excellent" while four of the participants rated it as "Fair" to "Good". No participants rated the program as "Poor".

Finally, questions six and nine were text response questions. Question 6 was "If you have participated in another mentoring program, are there components from that program that you would like to see incorporated into the COEd mentoring program?"

38

Two responses were recorded. One idea was to allow mentees to choose their mentors and the other was to increase the number of "collective 'problem solving' workshops with multiple participants discussing different perspectives and brainstorming...with more than just the single mentoring pair."

The other text response question was "Are there any other concerns or comments you want to add?" There were six responses with one participant noting no comments or concerns. Comments from the other five identified them as three mentors and two mentees.

One of the mentors considered tenure and promotion to be "a major priority" for mentees. This mentor also thought that overall the program was strong, but added that the program still had room for "growth and improvement." Another mentor agreed that the program worked well, but had some concern about scheduling conflicts with college meetings. The third mentor suggested a program orientation at the beginning when mentors and mentees are first paired "to discuss mentoring, models, processes, and the outcomes."

One mentee "enjoyed" the mentor but felt that it would be better to be paired with someone "who is closer in proximity" and "who has more knowledge about my area." Another mentee wanted to be able to choose whether or not to participate in the program, and if participating, to be able to select the mentor.

Interviews

A total of 21 faculty agreed to be interviewed for the study; 10 mentors and 11 mentees. Three mentors were from Fairmount College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, one mentor was from the College of Health Professions, and the remaining six mentors were from the College of Education.

Due to schedules and time constraints two faculty were not able to participate in an interview. Therefore, of the 21 faculty who returned consent forms, 19 faculty participated in an audio-taped interview. As the interviews were transcribed, the constant comparative method (Fram, 2013) was used to analyze and categorize the data by two of the researchers. Then inter-rater reliability was established (Tinsley & Weiss, 2000). The resulting data is reported below for each question.

Question1: What first interested you in joining the mentoring partnership?
Mentees were interested in participating in the program because they viewed it as a "great" opportunity for them as new faculty coming into the university (Mentees 2, 4, 7, and 9). Mentee 8 voiced the belief that a mentoring program, in general, creates a positive impact on the participants. Mentor 7 reported that she experienced "a lot of benefits" in a mentoring program at another university while Mentor 8 thought it was valuable to him when he, as a mentee, was "kind of (shown) the ropes." Mentees and Mentors, alike, appeared to agree that a mentoring program provided another means by

39

which new faculty can acquire important knowledge and procedures necessary to be successful in a university environment (Mentee 2, 5, and 6; Mentors 6, 7, 8, and 9).

Question 2: Describe your relationship with your mentor/mentee.

Four participants described the mentee-mentor relationship using words such as informal, cordial, relaxed, more social, and casual (Mentees 2, 4, and 5; Mentor 2). Mentee 9 described her relationship with her mentor by saying "I could always go talk to her", and Mentee 8 called her relationship with her mentor "phenomenal."

Although part of the responses did not directly answer question two, they did reveal information regarding the content of the mentee-mentor meetings and the means of communication used by the participants. Therefore, we felt this data worthy of reporting here.

Within the mentee-mentor relationship, mentees felt free to ask about many professional issues including tenure reaching, grant writing (Mentees 2 and 6), research and review of draft articles (Mentees 4 and 9), policies and university operations (Mentee 4), clarification of the Faculty Activity Record (FAR) categories (Mentee 5), and student teaching (Mentee 5).

Mentors reported similar current issues that were discussed with the mentees. While Mentor 3 stated that he and his mentee talked more "about instruction than research", most mentors described discussion topics related to tenure and promotion, such as publications (Mentor 1 and 9), research (Mentor 6 and 8), conferences (Mentor 5), and existing projects (Mentor 4). Mentor 4 also observed that if the mentor-mentee relationship is in the same department, there would be more opportunity for "collaborative projects" (Mentor 4).

Mentees and mentors communicated largely through face-to-face meetings during a lunch or a dinner usually held once a month. In addition, two mentors mentioned the use of email.

Question 3: What would you say is the biggest benefit of the mentoring program?

"Camaraderie" (Mentee 4) was an often-reported benefit of the mentoring program.  Four mentees agreed using description such as "getting the chance to know someone else on campus to help me feel like more a part of the campus community" (Mentee 3), "having a designated person who can direct you where you need to go" (Mentee 9), and "helped to develop a relationship" (Mentee 3). Mentor 10 liked "that there's quite a bit of leeway and autonomy for each relationship to develop."

When asked about the benefits of the mentoring program, Mentee 6 who had a mentor outside his department first said a benefit was, "[j]ust an outlet for someone to talk to"; then added that he could gain "a fresh perspective from someone outside [his] department". Further, Mentee 6 said the mentoring program allowed him to learn "from

40

a more experienced faculty member." Similarly, Mentee 7 appreciated the benefit of leadership and experience that mentors could provide.

Another benefit identified by two mentees was the ability to gain insight into processes such as annual reviews (Mentee 9), and tenure and promotion (Mentees 3 and 9). One mentee believed a benefit of the program was that his mentor could assist him "with any struggles a mentee may have" (Mentee 8). Likewise Mentee 9 observed that a mentoring program may provide "a chance to collaborate" with experienced faculty.

Mentors identified similar benefits. Mentor 2, an outside college participant, claimed that having a mentee in the COEd allowed him to know about the COEd faculty and their research projects. Mentor 3 thought one benefit of the program was having "some common discussions with the other mentors and mentees." From the common discussions, Mentor 4 recognized a benefit of the program was to "begin discussions of specific topics rather than just checking on the operation [of the program] itself."

Three mentors identified the establishment of research partnerships as a benefit of the program. Mentor 6 saw the mentoring program as an opportunity to "build relationship[s]." Mentor 8 was aware of "connections and groups that … [the mentee] should be involved in." Mentor 8 pointed out that his mentee-mentor relationship enabled his mentee to assume the leadership role in some research projects. Mentor 10 found that he and his mentee were able to "discuss some unique partnerships" between two departments for research.

Additionally, two mentors, saw the mentoring program as an opportunity to assist mentees in tenure and promotion process. Mentor 10 saw a benefit for mentees to be coached in the process of tenure and promotion including research activities, and Mentor 7 drew attention to the fact that several mentee/mentor relationships had resulted in publications.

As a long-time faculty member in another college, Mentor 5 felt she could offer "a sympathetic [and informed] ear", which she saw as a benefit to her mentee. Similarly, Mentor 7 believed that "the biggest benefit is just having a safe place where they [mentees] can ask some questions", and Mentor 9 supported that belief by describing the mentoring program as "a place that you can talk about whatever."

Question 4: What needs to be improved in the mentoring program?

The vast majority of comments fell within the category of program planning and structure. Two mentees' comments as well as two mentors' were related to "more structure" for the mentoring program (Mentees 8 and 9; Mentors 1 and 3). Mentee 9 and Mentor 1 both suggested that "objectives" should be "written out." Mentee 8's comment concerned "the content of the meetings", while Mentee 9's comment was about more structure being given to mentors outside the COEd.

Mentor 3 agreed with Mentee 5 who thought that each year of the program could take on a different purpose. "During first year mentor and mentee get to know each other and their research interests and what they teach.  In the second year, it might then be possible to collaborate in the two areas" (Mentee 5).

One mentee suggested that activities should be planned by "creating a list of things that the mentor and mentee could do together", and that one possible activity could include "visiting each other's classrooms" (Mentee 3).

Two mentees made comments related to choices concerning the mentoring program.  Mentee 1 noted the program should be an "elective", and Mentee 5 believed "it would be nice to have a choice of the mentor."

Two mentors commented about stipends; Mentor 1 thought the mentoring program should be "done without money", and Mentor 4 thought, "maybe [we should] think about a stipend for mentees too."

Suggestions for future additions to the program included "providing training [for mentors] at the beginning" (Mentor 2), and the COEd sending mentors to conferences … [to increase their] mentoring skills" (Mentor 7).

Other suggestions associated with the recruitment of mentors were identified through phrases such as "who you are aligning people with" (Mentors 9 and 10), "finding more mentors from outside the college" (Mentor 2), and "having a large list of potential mentors to match up with incoming faculty" (Mentor 10).

Mentor 4 concentrated his comments on ideas about topical discussions for the group meetings.  Along with Mentee 7, Mentor 4 recommended "having a speaker or perhaps a round table discussion", and discussing "a set of questions" between three "sets of mentors and mentees…maybe twice a semester", [s]o in a way all mentees would benefit from all mentors' perspectives…."  Implementation of these ideas would alleviate Mentor 6's situation where she found it "a little hard" to mentor two people and may increase the benefit of the program for mentors as well as mentees (Mentee 8).

Question 5: Are there any other issues you want to discuss?

Responses to question five were overwhelmingly positive as evidenced by statements such as "I hope that it continues" (Mentee 9); and "I think it has given my mentee ways to connect to others in the field" (Mentor 9). "I think it was positive that you don't have to feel obliged to keep with this person and it's not going to be forever" (Mentor 6).  However, Mentee 1 "thought it was such a waste of time …. I could not rationalize spending any more hours doing it."

Mentor 5 expressed an appreciation for the remarkable College support in supplying "a lot of resources regarding how to be a good mentor." Another encouraging aspect of the College support is providing stipends for mentors work in the program. The stipends "add … accountability in terms of the mentor" initiating and maintaining the

42

relationship with the mentee (Mentor 7).

## Limitations

One limitation of the study was that not all participants responded to the online survey. Due to the issue of confidentiality, we had no way to determine who had or had not responded to the survey, and thus, could not conduct a follow up to increase participation. Another limitation was the high mobility of COEd faculty during the time of the mentoring program that was magnified when the study gained approval late in the spring semester and faculty who had signed consent forms left the university in the summer.

## Conclusion

This research sought to answer the questions:
- What are the benefits for the mentors and mentees who were participants in the College of Education's mentoring program?
- What suggestions do participants have that might improve the effectiveness of the College of Education mentoring program?

Through an online survey and interviews with participants in a COEd mentoring program, data were collected to answer the two questions.

### Benefits

Online survey. Numerous benefits of the mentoring program were recognized by mentees and mentors survey respondents. Eight out of nine participants who took the online survey agreed with the statement "The COEd mentoring program is a benefit to me", and six of those nine agreed that they planned to continue their "participation in the program next year" (see Table 1).

For question seven, respondents were asked if the program "significantly helped" them in the areas of teaching, research, and service.  Three out of seven mentees indicated an affirmative response to that question for all three areas, while the other four mentees indicated that they had been significantly helped in at least one area. Therefore, it can be said that the seven mentees who responded to the online survey felt they had benefited from the mentoring program in respect to the three professional areas.

Interviews. Participants identified the following as benefits of the mentoring program in their interviews. One benefit of the mentoring program was that it provided opportunities for mentees to develop relationships with peers within the COEd and across campus—a benefit also identified in research by Beans (1999).

In our study, we found that the mentoring program created a sense of belonging both academically and personally. These findings agreed with those of Goodwin, Stevens, and Bellamy (1998), who identified one benefit of mentoring as encouraging a

43

sense of support and belonging.

Wichita State mentees believed that the program provided a venue to safely discuss concerns that they had. Earlier research showed similar benefits for mentees in university settings (Benson et al., 2002; Tähtinen, Mainela, Nätti, & Saraniemi 2012; Wake Forest School of Medicine, 2015).

Mentees paired with colleagues outside their departments thought the mentoring program gave them "a fresh perspective" of the university setting, different from their own department.  In addition, all mentees believed the mentoring program made available insight into college and university processes (Savage et al., 2004).

The mentees acknowledged that the mentoring program allowed them to learn "from a more experienced faculty member" which was comparable to benefits found in studies by Brinson and Kottler (1993), and Savage et al. (2004). The mentoring program also offered an opportunity to collaborate with the more experienced faculty serving as mentors (Benson, Morahan, Sachdeva, & Richman, 2002; Kwiatkowski, 2003; Pololi, Knight, Dennis, & Frankel, 2002; Savage, et al., 2004).

Mentors identified a number of benefits for themselves from the mentoring program. They recognized that the program increased the mentors' knowledge about the COEd faculty and their research projects (Loyola University Maryland, n.d.) particularly with mentors outside the COEd. Mentors believed the program helped establish research partnerships with mentees (Angelique, Kyle, & Taylor, 2002; Benson, Morahan, Sachdeva, & Richman, 2002; Local Government Professionals (2016); Mertz, 2004; Pololi, Knight, Dennis, & Frankel, 2002; Reimers, 2014). Also, the mentors saw another benefit of the program as an opportunity to assist mentees in tenure and promotion, including research activities which resulted in publications (Benson, Morahan, Sachdeva, & Richman, 2002; Brinson & Kottler, 1993; Goodwin, Stevens, & Bellamy, 1998; Savage, Karp, & Logue, 2004).

The mentors also recognized that the mentoring program allowed them to provide a sympathetic ear to mentees, which one mentor considered was a "responsibility" of senior faculty (Local Government Professionals, 2016). Further, mentors viewed the common discussions held as part of the mentoring program as beneficial and relevant to mentors as well as mentees (Goodwin, Stevens, Bellamy, 1998; Mertz, 2004; Schunk & Mullen, 2013).

Recommendations for future development

The cited benefits listed above give evidence to the WSU COEd Mentoring Program's positive impact on both mentees and mentors. These strengths provide the framework into which the participants' recommendations can be integrated for a more effective and responsive program. The research participants gave a number of viable ideas from which the following recommendations have been written to be taken into consideration for future iterations of the program.

Recommendation 1:  Goals and objectives should be written to provide more structure, and to articulate the roles and responsibilities of both mentors and mentees.

Recommendation 2: Mentors should receive training and attend relevant conference(s).

Recommendation 3: Program participation should remain a requirement for mentees but should be voluntary for mentors.

Recommendation 4: Mentees should continue to select mentors with the ability to change when needed.

Recommendation 5: Effort should be given to finding more mentors from outside the college and compiling an extensive list of possible mentors from which mentees can choose.

Recommendation 6: Group meetings of mentees and mentors should be held at least once a semester with agendas of topics identified by participants.

Recommendation 7: Stipends should be maintained to recognize the work of the mentors.

In conclusion the research findings confirmed that the College of Education Mentoring Program at Wichita State University provided substantial benefits for participating faculty mentees and mentors. Online survey results produced an overall positive rating of the program. As well, individual interviews with mentees and mentors indicated the program provided opportunities to develop relationships that allowed for both positive professional and social interactions; contributed to the mentees' future success in teaching, research, and service leading to tenure and promotion; and provided occasions for discussions relevant to the operations of the department, the college, and the university. Mentor 6 provided the paramount reason to continue the COEd mentoring program when she said, "…we [mentors] get that big picture that she [the mentee] won't get for 10 or 15 years." Learning from experienced faculty can be of tremendous benefit to the new mentee in the university setting.

45

References

American Psychological Association. (2006). Introduction to mentoring: A guide for mentors and mentees. Retrieved from http://www.apa.org/education/grad/mentor-task-force.aspx

Angelique, H., Kyle K., & Taylor, E. (2002). Mentors and muses: New strategies for academic success. Innovative Higher Education, 26(3), 199.

Author (2015). Research study: "Benefits of a university faculty-to-faculty mentoring program" - Update one: May 1st, 2015. Unpublished.

Baugh, S. G., & Fagenson-Eland, E. A. (2007). Formal mentoring programs: A "poor cousin" to informal relationships? In B. R. Ragins, & K. E. Kram (Eds.), Handbook of mentoring: Theory, research, and practice. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Beans, B.E. (1999, March). Mentoring program helps young faculty feel at home. APA Monitor on Psychology [On-line], 30(3). Retrieved from http://www.apa.org/monitor/mar99/mentor.html

Benson, C., Morahan, P., Sachdeva, A., & Richman, R. (2002). Effective faculty preceptoring and mentoring during reorganization of an academic medical center. Medical Teacher, 24(5), 550-557.

Brinson, J.A., & Kottler, J. (1993). Cross-cultural mentoring in counselor education: A strategy for retaining minority faculty. Counselor Education & Supervision, 32(4), 241-253.

College of Education Dean's Office, Wichita State University. (2012). COEd Faculty Mentoring Program. Unpublished.

Duranczyk, I. M., Madyun, N., Jehangir, R. R., & Higbee, J. L. (2011). Toward a mentoring model for promotion and tenure: Progress and pitfalls. Journal of Diversity Management- Second Quarter 2011, 6(2), 21-30.

Evan, L., Homer, M., & Rayner, S. (2013). Professors as academic leaders: The perspectives of 'the Led'. Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 41, 674-689.

Fayetteville State University Office of Faculty Development. (2015). Principles, goals, and benefits of FSU's faculty mentoring program. Retrieved from https://www.uncfsu.edu/facultydevelopment/faculty-mentoring/goals

Fram, S. M. (2013). The constant comparative analysis method outside of grounded theory. The Qualitative Report, 18, 1-25.

Goodwin, L.D., Stevens, E.A., & Bellamy, G.T. (1998). Mentoring among faculty in schools, colleges and departments of education. Journal of Teacher Education, 49(5), 334-343.

Hill, S.K., Bahniuk, M.H., & Dobos, J. (1989). The impact of mentoring and collegial

46

support on faculty success: An analysis of support behavior, information adequacy, and communication apprehension. Communication Education, 38(1), 15-33.

Kwiatkowski, M. (2003). Faculty mentoring paper summary. Retrieved from http://cet.usc.edu/resources/teaching_learning/docs/facultypaper.pdf

Local Government Professionals. (2016). Benefits of mentoring. Retrieved from http://www.lgpromentoring.com.au/benefits-of-mentoring

Loyola University Maryland. (n.d.) Faculty mentoring program. Retrieved from http://loyola.edu/department/fdd/mentoring

Luna, G., & Cullen, D. L. (1995). Empowering the Faculty Mentoring Redirected and Renewed. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report 3. Retrieved http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED399889

Mendaglio, S. (2003). Qualitative case study in gifted education. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, (26)3, 163-183.

Mertz, N. (2004). What's a mentor anyway? Educational Administration Quarterly, 40(4), 541-560.

Pololi, L. H., Knight, S. M., Dennis, K., & Frankel, R.M. (2002). Helping medical school faculty realize their dreams: An innovative, collaborative mentoring program. Academic Medicine, 77(5), 377-384.

Ramani, S., Gruppen, L., & Krajic Kachur, E. (2006). Twelve tips for developing effective mentors. Medical Teacher, 28(5), 404-408.

Reimers, T. (2014). Starting a mentoring initiative. In T. Reimers (Ed.), Mentoring best practices: A handbook. Albany, NY: University at Albany State University of New York. Retrieved from www.albany.edu/academics/mentoring.best.practices.toc.shtml

Savage, H. E., Karp, R. S., & Logue, R. (2004). Faculty mentorship at colleges and universities. College Teaching, 52(1), 21-24.

Schunk, D. H., & Mullen, C. A. (2013). Toward a conceptual model of mentoring research: Integration with self-regulated learning. Educational Psychology Review, 25, 361-389.

SmartSurvey. (2015). 10 Advantages of online surveys. Retrieved from https://www.smartsurvey.co.uk/articles/10-advantages-of-online-surveys

Tähtinen, J., Mainela, T., Nätti, S., & Saraniemi, S. (2012). Intradepartmental faculty mentoring in teaching marketing. Journal of Marketing Education, 34(1), 5-18.

The University of Iowa Graduate College. (2012). Principles and good practices concerning research mentoring. Retrieved from http://facstaff.grad.uiowa.edu/dgs/handbook/mentoring/principles-and-good-practices-concerning-research-mentoring

Thomas, R. (March, 2005). Exemplary junior faculty mentoring programs. Retrieved

from
http://www.advance.cornell.edu/documents/Exemplary-Junior-Faculty-Mentoring-
Programs.pdf

Tinsley, H. E. A. & Weiss, D. J. (2000). Interrater reliability and agreement. In Tinsley,
H. E. A. & Brown, S. D. (Eds.). Handbook of Applied Multivariate Statistics and
Mathematical Modeling (pp. 94-124). New York: Academic Press.

Wake Forest School of Medicine. (2015). Positive benefits of being a mentee. Retrieved
from www.wakehealth.edu/School/OWIMS/Benefits-for-Mentees.htm

## APPENDIX A
## Mentoring Activities and Topics

The following list represents a compilation of activities, topics and mutual interests that are possible for exploration within a mentoring partnership. These are merely *examples* of the kinds of things from which new faculty members can benefit.  No single relationship can engage in all of these activities. Mentoring pairs or teams must decide for themselves, which of these activities or topics will be a part of their discussions.

<u>Mentoring Topics/Activities</u>

Research
- Read and respond to grant proposals
- Advice on establishing a publication record
- Conference involvement and selection
- Recruitment of undergraduate and graduate students
- Research group organization

Teaching
- Preparing for excellence in teaching
- Creating a teaching portfolio
- Review and design of syllabi
- Publication of education-related papers
- Work on strategies for advising students
- Classroom management

Professional Service
- Committee involvement
- Professional organization involvement

Community Service
- Community involvement, organizations, charities
- Neighborhood organizations

Tenure and Promotion Issues
- Prepare CVs and renewals
- Create a professional file
- Communicate and explore Tenure and Promotion expectations

UAlbany/College/Departmental Environment and Acculturation
- Departmental funding
- Development of collegial relationships
- Associations, teams, interest groups, etc. in department or college
- Resources available for faculty

<u>Mutual interests and experiences</u>

Family and Balance Issues

49

- Single and childless
- Faculty spouse
- Single parent
- Childcare responsibilities and options
- Eldercare responsibilities and options

Culture and Religion

- Local arts and music
- Churches, church groups and related activities
- Ethnic events, festivals, resources

Personal Interests

- Hiking
- Camping
- Bicycling
- Handicrafts
- Antiques
- Other?

APPENDIX B

Qualtrics Survey Software

Default Question Block
- What is your age?

- What is your gender?
      Male
      Female

- How do you describe your racial identity?

- How many years have you been at WSU?

- Please choose the answer that best describes your experience.

|  | Strongly Agree | Agree | Somewhat Agree | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Disa gree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.The COEd Mentoring Program is a benefit to me |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. I plan on continuing my participation in the program next year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. The structure of the COEd Mentoring Program is convenient for my schedule |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. Before entering the mentoring program, I was concerned about tenure and promotion | | | | | | |
| 5. The mentoring program helps to promote a sense of community within the College of Education | | | | | | |
| 6. I feel comfortable with my mentor/mentee | | | | | | |

- If you have participated in another mentoring program, are there components from that program that you would like to see incorporated into the COEd mentoring program?

- In which of the areas below has the mentoring program significantly helped you?
  - Teaching
  - Research
  - Service
  - All of the above
- Overall, what is your rating of the current COEd mentoring program?
  - Excellent
  - Very good
  - Good
  - Fair
  - Poor
- Are there any other concerns or comments you want to add?

FIGURE 1

Figure 1.   Survey Questions #5 through #9

Q5. Please choose the answer that best describes your experience.
    Statement 1.  The COE mentoring program is a benefit to me.
    Statement 2.  I plan on continuing my participation in the program next year.
    Statement 3.  The structure of the COE mentoring program is convenient for my schedule.
    Statement 4.  Before entering the mentoring program, I was concerned about tenure and promotion.
    Statement 5.  The mentoring program helps to promote a sense of community within the College of Education.
    Statement 6.  I feel comfortable with my mentor/mentee.
Q6. If you have participated in another mentoring program, are there components from that program that you would like to see incorporated into the COE mentoring program?
Q7. In which of the areas below has the mentoring program significantly helped you?
    A. Teaching     B. Research     C. Service     D. All
Q8. Overall, what is your rating of the current COE mentoring program?
    A.  Excellent    B. Very Good    C. Good    D. Fair    E. Poor

Q9. Are there any other concerns or comments you want to add?

FIGURE 2

Figure 2. Interview Questions

1. What first interested you in joining the mentoring partnership?
2. Describe your relationship with your mentor/mentee.
3. What would you say is the biggest benefit of the mentoring program?
4. What needs to be improved in the mentoring program?
5. Are there any other issues you want to discuss?

TABLE 1

Table 1

Online Survey Statement and Ratings for Item #5

| Online survey statements | Mentor and Mentee ratings |
|---|---|
| 1.  The COEd mentoring program is a benefit to me. | Eight of nine participants agreed. One did not respond. |
| 2.  I plan on continuing my participation in the program next year. | Six of the nine agreed, while two neither agreed nor disagreed.  One did not respond. |
| 3.  The structure of the COEd mentoring program is convenient for my schedule. | All nine participants agreed. |
| 4.  Before entering the mentoring program, I was concerned about tenure and promotion. | Only three participants indicated some degree of concern, three disagreed and two neither agreed nor disagreed. |
| 5.  The mentoring program helps to promote a sense of community within the College of Education. | Four participants agreed while four others neither agreed nor disagreed. One did not respond. |
| 6. I feel comfortable with my mentor/ mentee. | Eight of the nine participants agreed. Only one participant disagreed. |