

2015-2016

[Name of Institution]

**Faculty Mentoring
Program Evaluation Report**

Noelle A. Paufler

David Brackett

Soo Jeong Kim

ABSTRACT:

Given increasing expectations for scholarly productivity and teaching effectiveness, universities are more readily recognizing the importance of high-quality mentoring for early career faculty. In this study, researchers applied the Context-Input-Process-Product (CIPP) model to evaluate and inform efforts to improve the faculty mentoring program at a research-intensive university. Using an explorative approach, researchers administered an online survey to mentees and mentors to better understand their experiences in the program. Results warranted three major themes including the: (a) importance of building mutual relationships; (b) personal and professional benefits of mentoring; and (c) value of networking and collaboration. This exploratory study will contribute to the literature as an application of the CIPP framework and a prospective model for mentoring program evaluation.

PURPOSE:

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the [name of institution] Faculty Mentoring Program. The evaluation of this program will investigate and report the components of the program, including resources, personnel, and events; participation of mentees, mentors, and program facilitators in program events; and implementation, including integrity and fidelity of program in an effort to evaluate proposed, expected, and actual outcomes.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

- What is the structure of the [name of institution] Faculty Mentoring Program using the Context-Input-Process-Product (CIPP) Evaluation Model as a framework (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007)?
- What are the participation rates of mentees and mentors in the Faculty Mentoring Program?
- What are the perceptions of the participants related to the Faculty Mentoring Program? Specifically,
 1. What are the perceptions of participants (mentees and mentors) regarding frequency of interaction, mode of communication, personal and professional benefits, and additional needs?
 2. What is the awareness and participation rates of participants in different mentoring program events and groups?
 3. What are the barriers to participation in faculty mentoring program activities?
 4. What are the impacts of the Faculty Mentoring Program?

STAKEHOLDERS:

The stakeholders consist of [name of institution] junior faculty, the Office of Faculty Success, the Vice Provost's Office for Academic Affairs and the Associate Vice Provost for Faculty, faculty mentors, The Office of the President, as well as the [name of institution] community at-large.

RESEARCH DESIGN:

This study has a sequential, iterative mixed methods design. In an effort to better understand program context and input(s), researchers conducted a preliminary investigation and reported the components of the program, including resources, personnel, and events; participation of mentors, mentees, and program facilitators in program events; and initial steps of implementation. Continuing research is examining the integrity and fidelity of the program in an effort to evaluate proposed, expected, and actual outcomes.

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSES:

Surveys

Two surveys were administered online via Qualtrics to all mentees and mentors in the Faculty Mentoring Program over a four week period in June-July 2016. Mentors included all faculty assigned an individual or small group of mentee(s). Each potential respondent received an introductory letter and link to the appropriate survey via email. The mentee and mentor surveys were parallel in terms of structure although wording varied slightly to reflect positions and mentee/mentor roles. Each survey included a series of 12 open- and close-ended questions as well as five demographic questions (see the survey instrument in the appendix). The surveys included the following five sections:

- Part 1: Your Role
- Part 2: Individual Mentoring
- Part 3: Faculty Mentoring Events and Groups
- Part 4: Overall Experience
- Part 5: Demographics

Table 1

Mentee and Mentor Survey Summary: Response Rate by Position

Role	# of Survey		Response
	Recipients	Respondents	Rate
Mentee	71	28	39.4%
Mentor	70	29	41.4%
Total	141	57	40.4%

Representativeness of Survey Respondents

Chi-square tests of independence were conducted to compare the equivalence of respective mentee and mentor populations and survey respondents across several demographic variables including: 1) current position (i.e., job description/title); 2) gender; 3) race/ethnicity; and 4) total years of experience at [name of institution]. (See results in Tables 2 – 9 below.) Test results indicate that there was no statistically significant difference between the mentee and mentor populations and survey respondents, respectively, for all variables except mentor gender (see Table 7). Note that Tables 2, 4, 5, 6, and 9 include demographic variables with a count of less than five. Test results for these variables are for informational purposes only, and the statistical accuracy cannot be guaranteed.

Survey Data Analyses

Researchers calculated descriptive statistics for quantitative survey data by question (see Tables 10 – 18). Coding methods were used to analyze qualitative survey data, and findings and conclusions were formulated based on the themes generated (see the Overview of Survey Findings and Conclusions section).

Table 2

Results of Chi-square Test of Independence for Mentee Survey Respondents (Sample) and the Population by Current Position

Characteristic	Sample	Population
	<i>n</i> = 27	<i>n</i> = 70
Current Position (2015-2016) [†]		
Tenured Faculty ^{††}	1 (3.7%)	3 (4.3%)
Tenure-track Faculty	10 (37.0%)	28 (40.0%)
Clinical Faculty ^{††}	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Lecturer	10 (37.0%)	30 (42.9%)
Librarian	6 (22.2%)	9 (12.9%)
Other ^{††}	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Total	27 (100.0%)	70 (100.0%)

Note. $\chi^2 = 1.33$, *df* = 3. Numbers in parentheses indicate column percentages. **p* < .05

[†]The following positions include: tenured (full or associate professors), tenure-track (assistant professor), and lecturer (principal, senior, or lecturer). ^{††}*n* count less than 5 for Tenured Faculty, Clinical Faculty, and Other. Categories with less than 5 should be considered for informational purposes only, and the statistical accuracy cannot be guaranteed.

Table 3

Results of Chi-square Test of Independence for Mentee Survey Respondents (Sample) and the Population by Gender

Characteristic	Sample	Population
	<i>n</i> = 27	<i>n</i> = 70
Gender		
Male	7 (25.9%)	26 (37.1%)
Female	20 (74.1%)	44 (62.9%)
Total	27 (100.0%)	70 (100.0%)

Note. $\chi^2 = 1.09$, *df* = 1. Numbers in parentheses indicate column percentages. **p* < .05

Table 4

*Results of Chi-square Test of Independence for Mentee Survey
Respondents (Sample) and the Population by Race/Ethnicity*

Characteristic	Sample	Population
	<i>n</i> = 25	<i>n</i> = 69
Race/Ethnicity		
White	21 (84.0%)	54 (78.3%)
Not White [†]	4 (16.0%)	15 (21.7%)
Total	25 (100.0%)	69 (100.0%)

Note. $\chi^2 = 0.38$, *df* = 1. Numbers in parentheses indicate column percentages. **p* < .05

[†]*n* count less than 5 for Not White Faculty. Categories with less than 5 should be considered for informational purposes only, and the statistical accuracy cannot be guaranteed.

Table 5

*Results of Chi-square Test of Independence for Mentee Survey
Respondents (Sample) and the Population by Total Years at [name of
institution]*

Characteristic	Sample	Population
	<i>n</i> = 27	<i>n</i> = 70
Total Years		
1-6	26 (96.3%)	67 (95.7%)
7 or More [†]	1 (3.7%)	3 (4.3%)
Total	27 (100.0%)	70 (100.0%)

Note. $\chi^2 = 0.02$, *df* = 1. Numbers in parentheses indicate column percentages. **p* < .05

[†]*n* count less than 5 for 7 or More Years. Categories with less than 5 should be considered for informational purposes only, and the statistical accuracy cannot be guaranteed.

Table 6

Results of Chi-square Test of Independence for Mentor Survey Respondents (Sample) and the Population by Current Position

Characteristic	Sample	Population
	<i>n</i> = 23	<i>n</i> = 70
Current Position (2015-2016) [†]		
Tenured Faculty	10 (43.5%)	42 (60.0%)
Tenure-track Faculty ^{††}	1 (4.3%)	2 (2.9%)
Clinical Faculty ^{††}	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.4%)
Lecturer	9 (39.1%)	17 (24.3%)
Librarian ^{††}	2 (8.7%)	7 (10.0%)
Other ^{††}	1 (4.3%)	1 (1.4%)
Total	23 (100.0%)	70 (100.0%)

Note. $\chi^2 = 3.38$, *df* = 5. Numbers in parentheses indicate column percentages. **p* < .05

[†]The following positions include: tenured (full or associate professors), tenure-track (assistant professor), and lecturer (principal, senior, or lecturer). ^{††}*n* count less than 5 for Tenure-track Faculty, Clinical Faculty, Librarian, and Other. Categories with less than 5 should be considered for informational purposes only, and the statistical accuracy cannot be guaranteed.

Table 7

Results of Chi-square Test of Independence for Mentor Survey Respondents (Sample) and the Population by Gender

Characteristic	Sample	Population
	<i>n</i> = 22	<i>n</i> = 70
Gender		
Male	5 (22.7%)	33 (47.1%)
Female	17 (77.3%)	37 (52.9%)
Total	22 (100.0%)	70 (100.0%)

Note. $\chi^2 = 4.12^*$, *df* = 1. Numbers in parentheses indicate column percentages. **p* < .05

Table 8

*Results of Chi-square Test of Independence for Mentor Survey
Respondents (Sample) and the Population by Race/Ethnicity*

Characteristic	Sample	Population
	<i>n</i> = 20	<i>n</i> = 70
Race/Ethnicity		
White	14 (70.0%)	56 (80.0%)
Not White [†]	6 (30.0%)	14 (20.0%)
Total	20 (100.0%)	70 (100.0%)

Note. $\chi^2 = 0.90$, *df* = 1. Numbers in parentheses indicate column percentages. **p* < .05

Table 9

*Results of Chi-square Test of Independence for Mentor Survey
Respondents (Sample) and the Population by Total Years at [name of
institution]*

Characteristic	Sample	Population
	<i>n</i> = 23	<i>n</i> = 70
Total Years		
1-6 [†]	4 (17.4%)	15 (21.4%)
7 or More	19 (82.6%)	55 (78.6%)
Total	23 (100.0%)	70 (100.0%)

Note. $\chi^2 = 0.17$, *df* = 1. Numbers in parentheses indicate column percentages. **p* < .05

[†]*n* count less than 5 for 1-6 Years. Categories with less than 5 should be considered for informational purposes only, and the statistical accuracy cannot be guaranteed.

OVERVIEW OF SURVEY FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

Individual Mentoring – Pairing of Mentors/Mentees and Frequency of Interactions

Findings:

Within Program, Department, or College

- Nearly all mentees (96.3%) and the vast majority of mentors (87.0%) indicated that they had been paired with a mentor/mentee within their program, department, or college.
- Of these, three out of four mentees (76.9%) and mentors (75.0%) reported interacting (e.g., in person or via phone, email, Skype, etc.) with this mentor/mentee 1-3 times per month. Some mentees (34.6%) and mentors (35.0%) interacted with the other more often (at least 1 time per week).

Outside of College at [name of institution]

- Fewer mentees (48.1%) and mentors (39.1%) indicated that they had been paired with a mentor/mentee outside of their college at [name of institution].
- Approximately half of these mentees (46.0%) and one-third of mentors (33.3%) reported interacting with this mentor/mentee at least once per month.

Individual Mentoring – Benefits

Findings: (cont.)

- Mentees frequently cited their relationship with their mentor as helpful to their success at [name of institution]. Positive impacts include but are not limited to:
 - a better understanding of the promotion/tenure process
 - increased opportunities for research/scholarly activities
 - increased teaching effectiveness
 - greater ease in acclimating to the culture/climate of their program/department/college and/or the university
 - increased opportunities to network with other faculty
 - reduced anxiety in a safe space to ask questions and/or share concerns
- Several mentors noted that they enjoyed the mentoring experience. They reportedly value opportunities to support junior colleagues and interact with other faculty across disciplines.

Mentoring Events and Groups – Awareness, Participation, and Needs

Findings:

Formal Mentoring Events (Sponsored by the Office of Faculty Success)

- At least three out of four mentees indicated that they were aware of each of several small group events (e.g., New Faculty Orientation, Faculty CONNECT) organized by the Office of Faculty Success throughout the 2015-2016 academic year. Participation rates among respondents ranged from 19.2% (Holiday Concert and Reception) to 70.4% (New Faculty Orientation).
- Of those mentees who were reportedly unaware of one or more mentoring events, patterns across mentees were not evident. For example, no individual mentee reported that he/she was unaware of all of the events.
- Mentees generally expressed interest in attending events more often in the future. More than three out of four mentees (77.8%) cited scheduling conflicts (e.g., events regularly held during class) as a factor that prevented or discouraged participation. Some mentees (37.0%) also cited a lack of time due to other personal and/or professional responsibilities. Relatively few mentees cited a lack of utility (18.5%) or misalignment of events/groups to their interests or goals (14.8%). None cited a lack of need for mentoring as a factor.

Small Group Mentoring (Assigned Group of Mentees and 1-3 Mentors)

- A few mentees indicated that they were assigned to a small group at the beginning of the 2015-2016 academic year, but they were unaware of any subsequent meetings held for their small group.
- Several mentees expressed interest in attending (more) meetings/events with their small group in the future. These mentees cited realized or perceived benefits of regularly scheduled meetings/events with their small group such as the value of interacting with new and experienced faculty in other disciplines.

Mentoring Events and Groups – Awareness, Participation, and Needs

Findings: (cont.)

Mentoring Grant Groups

- In general, mentee awareness of the various mentoring grant groups is reportedly low. Less than one-fifth of mentees indicated that they are aware of each of the various mentoring grant groups with three exceptions: Faculty Writing Group (44.4%), Collaborating with Strangers (48.1%), and the Women’s Faculty Network (55.5%).
- Less than half of mentors indicated that they are aware of each of the mentoring grant groups with the exception of the Women’s Faculty Network (87.0%). Accordingly, mentors who are not aware of the various mentoring grant groups cannot share this information with their mentees.

Needs and Requests

- Mentees and mentors expressed interest in and suggested a variety of events or groups that they would like to see held/offered in the future based on, for example, interest/expertise/position (e.g., for librarians and lecturers), skill building (e.g., time management, student advising), personal circumstance (e.g., for those who are parents), and demographics/background (e.g., for Latinos/males of color or foreign-born faculty).

Overall Satisfaction

Findings:

- Overall, mentees and mentors reported satisfaction with their individual and small group mentoring experiences. In total, eight out of 10 mentees indicated that their overall experience was good (n=14/27, 51.9%) or excellent (n=8/27, 29.6%). Additionally, almost nine out of 10 mentors reported that their overall experience was good (n=8/23, 34.8%) or excellent (n=12/23, 52.2%).

Recommendations

- Continue to ensure that all mentees have at least one mentor both within their program, department, or college as well outside of their college at [name of institution].
- Encourage frequent communication between small group mentors and their mentees. Promote regularly scheduled meetings/events for small groups that provide opportunities for collaboration and social interaction.
- To the extent possible, vary the day of the week and time of day mentoring events are scheduled to accommodate faculty, especially those with greater teaching responsibilities.
- Raise awareness among mentees and mentors regarding the wide variety of mentoring grant groups currently available. Encourage interested faculty to apply for mentoring grants based on interest/expertise, skill building, etc., pending the availability of funding.

SURVEY RESULTS BY QUESTION:

PART 1: YOUR ROLE AND PART 5: DEMOGRAPHICS

Table 10

Role, Position, and Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Characteristic	Mentees	Mentors
	<i>n</i> = 28	<i>n</i> = 29
Role		
Mentee/Mentor	27 (96.4%)	23 (79.3%)
Other	1 (3.6%)	6 (20.7%)
Total	28 (100.0%)	29 (100.0%)
Current Position (2015-2016)*		
Tenured Faculty	1 (3.7%)	10 (43.5%)
Tenure-track Faculty	10 (37.0%)	1 (4.3%)
Clinical Faculty	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Lecturer	10 (37.0%)	9 (39.1%)
Librarian	6 (22.2%)	2 (8.7%)
Other	0 (0.0%)	1 (4.3%)
Total	27 (100.0%)	23 (100.0%)
Gender		
Male	7 (25.9%)	5 (21.7%)
Female	20 (74.1%)	17 (73.9%)
I prefer not to answer	0 (0.0%)	1 (4.3%)
Total	27 (100.0%)	23 (100.0%)
Ethnicity		
Hispanic or Latino	1 (3.7%)	4 (17.4%)
Not Hispanic or Latino	26 (96.3%)	16 (69.6%)
I prefer not to answer	0 (0.0%)	3 (13.0%)
Total	27 (100.0%)	23 (100.0%)
Race		
Amer. Indian/Alaska Native	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Asian	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Black or African American	2 (7.7%)	1 (4.3%)
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
White	21 (80.8%)	17 (73.9%)
Two or more	2 (7.7%)	1 (4.3%)
I prefer not to answer	1 (3.8%)	4 (17.4%)
Total	26 (100.0%)	23 (100.0%)

Note. Counts are presented as raw numbers with respective valid proportions of the total participants in parentheses. *The following positions include: tenured (full or associate professors), tenure-track (assistant professor), and lecturer (principal, senior, or lecturer).

Table 11

Discipline and Experience Levels of Respondents

Characteristic	Mentees	Mentors
	<i>n</i> = 28	<i>n</i> = 29
Discipline		
Social Sciences	13 (54.2%)	12 (54.5%)
STEM*	3 (12.5%)	1 (4.5%)
Arts	8 (33.3%)	9 (40.9%)
Total	26 (100.0%)	22 (100.0%)
Total Years		
1-3	26 (96.3%)	2 (8.7%)
4-6	0 (0.0%)	2 (8.7%)
7-9	1 (3.7%)	3 (13.0%)
10-12	0 (0.0%)	3 (13.0%)
13-15	0 (0.0%)	2 (8.7%)
16 or More	0 (0.0%)	11 (47.8%)
I prefer not to answer	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Total	27 (100.0%)	23 (100.0%)

Note. Counts are presented as raw numbers with respective valid proportions of the total participants or population in parentheses.

*STEM refers to Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math

PART 2: INDIVIDUAL MENTORING

Table 12

Individual Mentoring Within the Program, Department, or College at [name of institution]: 2015-2016 Academic Year

	Mentees <i>n</i> = 28	Mentors <i>n</i> = 29
Has a Formal Mentee/Mentor <i>Within</i> Program, Department, or College		
Yes	26 (96.3%)	20 (87.0%)
No	1 (3.7%)	3 (13.0%)
Total	27 (100.0%)	23 (100.0%)
Frequency of Interaction*		
Frequently (At least 1 time per week)	9 (34.6%)	7 (35.0%)
Often (1-3 times per month)	11 (42.3%)	8 (40.0%)
Sometimes (1-3 times per semester)	3 (11.5%)	5 (25.0%)
Rarely (Less than 1 time per semester)	3 (11.5%)	0 (0.0%)
Total	26 (100.0%)	20 (100.0%)

*Interactions may have occurred in person or via phone, email, Skype, etc.

Table 13

Individual Mentoring Outside of the College at [name of institution]: 2015-2016 Academic Year

	Mentees <i>n</i> = 28	Mentors <i>n</i> = 29
Has a Formal Mentee/Mentor <i>Outside of</i> College		
Yes	13 (48.1%)	9 (39.1%)
No	14 (51.9%)	14 (60.9%)
Total	27 (100.0%)	23 (100.0%)
Frequency of Interaction*		
Frequently (At least 1 time per week)	1 (7.7%)	0 (0.0%)
Often (1-3 times per month)	5 (38.5%)	3 (33.3%)
Sometimes (1-3 times per semester)	3 (23.1%)	6 (66.7%)
Rarely (Less than 1 time per semester)	4 (30.8%)	0 (0.0%)
Total	13 (100.0%)	9 (100.0%)

*Interactions may have occurred in person or via phone, email, Skype, etc.

Qualitative Data: Benefits of Faculty Mentoring	
Themes	Understanding Processes and Procedures, Opportunities for Scholarship/Publications, Acclimating to the University/Department Culture/Climate, Mentor/Mentee Relationship, Teaching/Advising Students, Service Responsibilities, Work-Life Balance
Role	Sample of Raw Data
Mentees <i>Frequency = 21</i>	<p>“We discussed the tenure process, which scholarly activities would be most beneficial for me to pursue, and advice about navigating the relationships with other faculty in the College.”</p> <p>“Advice on duties, department social interactions, accountability, and getting to know the campus and [name of city]. They also help me think about next steps and career goals.”</p> <p>“My mentor’s advice has been invaluable in helping me to balance the demands of research, teaching, and advising. She has also connected me with other professionals in the field.”</p> <p>“My department mentor has been very helpful by providing me with teaching materials, observing my classes, allowing me to observe his classes, and reviewing my SPOT evaluations. I have not interacted with my extra-departmental mentors much since New Faculty Orientation.”</p> <p>“My formal mentors have been beneficial from learning about the culture of my division and college, to discussing publications.”</p>
Mentors <i>Frequency = 20</i>	<p>“My mentee has a better understanding of (1) the annual review process, (2) the requirements for promotion, (3) how to get a conference presentation accepted and (4) how to get published.”</p> <p>“I see new faculty as the future of our program – and that’s important/a benefit to me as a mentor. For my mentee, I’ve shared opportunities through the Women’s Faculty Network, possible research collaborations, ideas for her future research, conferences she might consider, and help with teaching ideas for her classes.”</p> <p>“It helps the mentee to keep on track for the tenure window. It also acts as a safe space to share anxieties about being on tenure track with someone who already has tenure.”</p> <p>“I benefit from the enjoyment of helping early-career faculty, and of getting to know cutting-edge scholars from many different disciplines. / I think my mentees have benefited from learning about resources available to them, and from being ‘plugged in’ to other new faculty.”</p> <p>“Yes, both - formal mentoring helps me to keep in touch with other faculty (across disciplines) and learn from them and their experiences. I hope that my mentees are reassured that they have someone who will assist and support them.”</p>

Qualitative Data: Need for Additional Mentoring Supports	
Themes	Mentor Accessibility/Approachability, Lack of Opportunity for Collaboration, Building the Mentor/Mentee Relationship, Alignment to Interests/Expertise, Purpose of Mentoring for Lecturers, Time Management, Research/Travel Funding
Role	Sample of Raw Data
Mentees <i>Frequency = 16</i>	<p>“For the outside-the-department mentor, I barely had any contact with them and wasn't sure the best way to approach them. When I know everyone is so busy, there is always some hesitancy to contact them.”</p> <p>“I think it would be helpful for extra-departmental mentoring groups to meet in person at least once per semester to discuss the challenges we face as new faculty and to celebrate our successes. Although it can difficult for faculty in different department to relate to one another, in some cases it may be valuable to discuss issues with faculty outside one’s home department.”</p> <p>“More opportunity to connect with faculty and staff outside my area. I'm doing this on my own as well, but it's always nice to have a formal introduction... sometimes ‘cold calling’ doesn't open doors in the same way.”</p> <p>“Not sure my dept. really understands the purpose of the mentoring program for the lecturers since this is a new addition to our program.”</p> <p>“I would like to have mentorship in my specific area of interest and expertise; I would like guidance on how to connect with faculty members outside of my department for collaboration and mentorship.”</p> <p>“I think much of the success is what I brought to the situation. Others in my department have not had as much success with their formal mentor because they did not seek to build the relationship. Additional opportunities to build the relationship would have been more beneficial even though we have a good relationship as it is.”</p>
Mentors <i>Frequency = 18</i>	<p>“I think junior faculty should have additional support though the university to be able to attend at least two conferences a year. When I was a junior faculty, I only had funding for one conference. If the university expects junior faculty to attend and present at conferences as part of their growth as researchers and academics, they should receive the additional financial support.”</p> <p>“In order of importance: 1) more funding for research/creative work, 2) more funding for travel, and 3) summer support for research.”</p> <p>“I think continued mentorship would be a good thing, whether it's formal or informal. I think a time management class could be helpful. One thing I wish I had was some training on how to chair dissertations. I had to chair in my first year on the tenure track and I was so lost. I think if junior faculty continue being mentored past their first year, this could be a helpful seminar to host.”</p> <p>“Stronger accountability checks and balances so the mentee establishes patterns in the first year that will carry on throughout her/his career. Additionally their department chairs and deans need to be more aware of how to support and encourage them. / Troubleshooting personnel issues and preventing or reducing institutional issues of power over, rank and privilege, and racism or sexism.”</p>

PART 3: FACULTY MENTORING EVENTS AND GROUPS

Table 14

Awareness of and/or Attendance at [name of institution] Faculty Mentoring Events: 2015-2016 Academic Year

Event	I attended this event	I was aware of this event but did not attend	I was not aware of this event	<i>n</i>
New Faculty Orientation (August 13, 2015)				
Mentees	19 (70.4%)	6 (22.2%)	2 (7.4%)	27 (100.0%)
Mentors	4 (19.0%)	14 (66.7%)	3 (14.3%)	21 (100.0%)
Faculty CONNECT Mentoring Network Luncheon (September 29, 2015)				
Mentees	7 (26.9%)	14 (53.8%)	2 (7.4%)	26 (100.0%)
Mentors	7 (31.8%)	6 (27.3%)	9 (40.9%)	22 (100.0%)
Faculty CONNECT – Holiday Concert and Reception (December 3, 2015)				
Mentees	5 (19.2%)	15 (57.7%)	6 (23.1%)	26 (100.0%)
Mentors	5 (21.7%)	8 (34.8%)	10 (43.5%)	23 (100.0%)
Faculty CONNECT Mentoring Network Luncheon (March 4, 2016)				
Mentees	9 (34.6%)	13 (50.0%)	4 (15.4%)	26 (100.0%)
Mentors	7 (33.3%)	6 (28.6%)	8 (38.1%)	21 (100.0%)
Spring Mentoring Lunch (April 22, 2016)				
Mentees	8 (30.8%)	14 (53.8%)	4 (15.4%)	26 (100.0%)
Mentors	5 (22.7%)	8 (36.4%)	9 (40.9%)	22 (100.0%)
Faculty CONNECT – “Merry Wives of Windsor” Performance (April 22, 2016)				
Mentees	6 (23.1%)	15 (57.7%)	5 (19.2%)	26 (100.0%)
Mentors	3 (14.3%)	9 (42.9%)	9 (42.9%)	21 (100.0%)
Promotion/Tenure Workshop (any one of multiple events)				
Mentees	10 (40.0%)	12 (48.0%)	3 (12.0%)	25 (100.0%)
Mentors	6 (31.6%)	12 (63.2%)	1 (5.3%)	19 (100.0%)

Note. Counts are presented as raw numbers with respective valid proportions of the total participants in parentheses. For events that were held more than once throughout the school year, respondents indicated whether they were aware of and attended at least one of those events (i.e., promotion/tenure workshop).

Table 15

Awareness of [name of institution] Faculty Mentoring Groups

Group	Mentees <i>n</i> = 27	Mentors <i>n</i> = 23
18 th and 19 th Century Studies Group	3 (11.1%)	1 (4.3%)
Asian Faculty/Instructors Mentoring Network	0 (0.0%)	2 (8.7%)
BIOFUELS: Biology Forum on Undergraduate Education in Life Sciences	1 (3.7%)	1 (4.3%)
Black Women's Initiative	4 (14.8%)	6 (26.1%)
Collaborating with Strangers	13 (48.1%)	4 (17.4%)
Community of Sharing	1 (3.7%)	2 (8.7%)
Coordinating Across Languages	2 (7.4%)	3 (13.0%)
Faculty Writing Group	12 (44.4%)	8 (34.8%)
Gender Equity Matters	0 (0.0%)	3 (13.0%)
La Colectiva	3 (11.1%)	4 (17.4%)
LGBT Faculty Mentoring Network	5 (18.5%)	8 (34.8%)
[name of institution] Digital Fabrication Group	3 (11.1%)	2 (8.7%)
Peer Support and Improving Faculty Research and Productivity	3 (11.1%)	4 (17.4%)
Postwar Faculty Colloquium	2 (7.4%)	1 (4.3%)
Poverty Working Group	0 (0.0%)	1 (4.3%)
Revving Up for Research: Methods Mentoring for Assistant Librarians	3 (11.1%)	2 (8.7%)
Women's Faculty Network	15 (55.5%)	20 (87.0%)

Note. Counts are presented as raw numbers with respective valid proportions of the total participants in parentheses.

Table 16

Factors that Prevented or Discouraged Participation in [name of institution] Faculty Mentoring Events or Groups: 2015-2016 Academic Year

Factor	Mentees <i>n</i> = 27
Scheduling Conflicts (not usually available at the date(s)/time(s) offered)	21 (77.8%)
Lack of Time (due to other personal and/or professional responsibilities)	10 (37.0%)
Misalignment to Interests/Goals (personal and/or professional)	4 (14.8%)
Lack of Utility (not helpful in supporting teaching, research, and/or service)	5 (18.5%)
Lack of Need (faculty mentors is/would not be beneficial)	0 (0.0%)
Other	4 (14.8%)

Note. Counts are presented as raw numbers with respective valid proportions of the total participants in parentheses. Respondents who selected "Other" factors subsequently explained their responses (see below).

Qualitative Data: Other Factors for Prevented or Discouraged Participation in Faculty Mentoring Events or Groups	
Themes	Relevance for Librarians, Location (Out-of-State or Off-Campus), Time Commitment/Scheduling
Role	Sample of Raw Data
Mentees <i>Frequency = 4</i>	<p>“I’m a librarian. So much is aimed at teaching faculty and does not apply to me.”</p> <p>“I tried to participate in as many as I could time wise. None of the ones mentioned above was an issue that prevented me from participating.”</p> <p>“My role requires me to be off campus and sometimes this conflicted with the mentoring schedule.”</p>
Mentors	<i>Item Not Included in Survey</i>

Table 17

Need for Other Types of Faculty Mentoring Events or Groups in the Future

	Mentees	Mentors
	<i>n = 28</i>	<i>n = 29</i>
Need for Other Types of Events/Groups		
Yes	9 (33.3%)	5 (21.7%)
No	18 (66.7%)	18 (78.3%)
Total	27 (100.0%)	23 (100.0%)

Note. Respondents who selected "Yes" subsequently explained their responses (see below).

Qualitative Data: Other Requested Mentoring Events or Groups	
Themes	Interests/Needs of Librarians/Lecturers/Full Professors, Campus Orientation, Social Events, Opportunities for Inter-disciplinary Research/Collaboration, Parenthood, Foreign-born Faculty, Latinos/Males of Color, Training for Mentoring Graduate Students
Role	Sample of Raw Data
Mentees <i>Frequency = 9</i>	<p>“I would like to see events that have more training components such as publishing, presenting, time management, etc.”</p> <p>“I was assigned to a mentoring group at New Faculty Orientation, but I don't think we have met as a group since.”</p> <p>“More social gatherings”</p> <p>“I'm not sure if these exist already, but it would be nice to have events that connect people with other departments and colleges for collaboration. Maybe some kind of speed-dating research type event.”</p> <p>“An interdisciplinary writing group that brings faculty from different areas to research and write about complex issues (i.e. education, public policy, public health, etc.)”</p> <p>“foreign-born faculty mentoring”</p> <p>“Parenthood and academia would be very useful.”</p> <p>“I think events that orient faculty to the functionality of the entire campus would be great. Faculty tend to focus in their own department and specialty, but we all work for [name of institution] and I think should be a more integral part to the community.”</p> <p>“Groups relevant to the interest and needs of librarian faculty. We don't get tenure and most of us don't teach. We need groups that will address our issues and not those of teaching faculty.”</p>
Mentors <i>Frequency = 5</i>	<p>“Lecturers networking events”</p> <p>“A group specifically for full professors designed to help full professors remained engaged/ interested in teaching and scholarship and not resigned to feel that [name of institution] is a dead end street.”</p> <p>“Perhaps a workshop advising faculty of best practices in mentoring graduate students.”</p> <p>“The tenure and productivity and post-tenure workshops are all geared to people whose output is largely written. This excludes those of us whose research is creative, object-based and performative. I'd like to see those practices represented more at such workshops or perhaps a non-writing productivity, work-life balance event.”</p> <p>“Latino (men) and other male faculty of color”</p>

PART 4: OVERALL EXPERIENCE

Table 18

*Overall Experience in the [name of institution] Faculty Mentoring Program: 2015-2016
Academic Year*

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	<i>n</i>
Mentees	8 (29.6%)	14 (51.9%)	4 (14.8%)	1 (3.7%)	27 (100.0%)
Mentors	12 (52.2%)	8 (34.8%)	3 (13.0%)	0 (0.0%)	23 (100.0%)

Note. Counts are presented as raw numbers with respective valid proportions of the total participants in parentheses.

Qualitative Data: Additional Comments	
Themes	Scheduling Conflicts (During Class), Value of Mentoring Experience for Mentees and Mentors, Needs Disparities by Discipline, Lack of Opportunity for Collaboration, Need for Research Funding, Need for Resources/Guidance for Mentors
Role	Sample of Raw Data
Mentees <i>Frequency = 8</i>	<p>“The only obstacle that prevented me from participating more was that I taught during the times events were held.”</p> <p>“My biggest suggestion is to vary the dates and times of events because I missed many events that were always scheduled on Tuesday or Thursday early afternoon when I taught.”</p> <p>“Great job to those organizing these events!”</p> <p>“I made great friends within the formal mentoring group. It was good to share with them. The mentors were excellent resources. I made it a priority to attend the events because I understand the value of networking. Other colleagues did not attend very many of the events and they have not thrived as well this year. In addition to the formal mentor at the university level and the one in my department, I adopted several other mentors who have been most helpful. One suggested to the journal editors for me to write an invited book review, sent me an invitation to publish in a special edition that he had received, and recently recommended me to the editor to review an article.”</p> <p>“My faculty mentoring group couldn't address some of my issues because of the disparities among our disciplines. For instance, I teach writing, and grading is a challenge, grading large assignments from almost 30 students in each class. Most in my mentor group taught classes that used computer-gradable assignments. One in my group taught music composition, and we discussed our approaches, but even then, the differences overshadowed the likenesses.”</p> <p>“I feel that my experience with the mentor program has been successful primarily because of my personal relationship with my mentor who I saw frequently in my department. The fact that our research and teaching interests align well made it a natural fit. The mentoring program could do a better job at fostering networking within colleges or around research synergy areas across departments--perhaps synergies that [name of institution] would like to develop a reputation for. I work in an interdisciplinary field, and I would be interested in meeting other researchers with overlapping interests. My sense is that currently, there are few opportunities to reach out and meet other faculty and staff beyond my department. (I am not sure if this is due to a lack of events, a lack of advertising the benefits of mentoring event participation, or perhaps an all-inclusive umbrella that makes it seem unlikely that I would meet someone with similar research interests).”</p>
Mentors <i>Frequency = 10</i>	<p>“Again, more research support. It would be great for both junior and tenured faculty, especially as we strive to retain Tier 1 status. This is especially important for those of us you are in programs that have few grant possibilities.”</p> <p>“Another aspect that could potentially have a big impact at low cost is informal gatherings, over food, at the Union, for tenure track faculty on a consistent basis, even every few weeks.”</p> <p>“Lecturers tend to carry a heavy load. It is difficult to find the time to get involved with mentees as there are always conflicts</p>

with meetings and teaching. For us that are in the [campus location], away from everything, it takes more time to make it to events in the main campus.”

“I am very proud to have been chosen to be part of this program that helps strengthen our infrastructure and supports our most important asset - our faculty members.”

“Please continue the excellent leadership from the Provost's office. The Mentoring Program has been a wonderful way for our new faculty to meet people, learn the expectations of [name of institution], and feel supported to be successful.”

“I would like for mentees to attend gatherings and events. Few do because of class scheduling conflicts.”

References

Stufflebeam, D. L., & Shinkfield, A. J. (2007). *Evaluation theory, models, and applications*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Appendix

Survey Instrument for Mentees and Mentors

[name of institution] Institutional Review Board

Informed Consent Notice

Before agreeing to participate in this research study, it is important that you read and understand the following explanation of the purpose, benefits and risks of the study and how it will be conducted.

Title of Study: [name of institution] Faculty Mentoring Program Evaluation

Co-Investigators: Drs. Noelle Paufler and David Brackett, [name of institution] Department of Teacher Education and Administration.

Purpose of the Study: You are being asked to participate in an evaluation of the [name of institution] Faculty Mentoring Program. This study will investigate and report the components of the program, including resources, personnel, and events; participation of mentors, mentees, and program facilitators in program events; and implementation, including integrity and fidelity of program in an effort to evaluate proposed, expected, and actual outcomes.

Study Procedures: You will be asked to participate in a survey that will take approximately 5 minutes of your time.

Foreseeable Risks: No foreseeable risks are involved in this study.

Benefits to the Subjects or Others: We expect the project to benefit you as information from this study will be used to improve program design and/or implementation to reach the goals of recruiting, retaining, and promoting high quality faculty. Effective faculty mentoring is of benefit to the entire [name of institution] Community.

Compensation for Participants: None

Procedures for Maintaining Confidentiality of Research Records: All data collected in this study will be de-identified and reported in aggregated and disaggregated forms that inhibit tracing responses back to individual participants. The co-investigators will be the only individuals who see any participant-identifying information, which may be necessary to track responses and participation rates. The confidentiality of your individual information will be maintained in any publications or presentations regarding this study.

Questions about the Study: If you have any questions about the study, you may contact Dr. Noelle Paufler at [email address] or Dr. David Brackett at [email address].

Review for the Protection of Participants: This research study has been reviewed and approved by the [name of institution] Institutional Review Board (IRB). The [name of institution] IRB can be contacted at [phone number] with any questions regarding the rights of research subjects.

PART 1: YOUR ROLE

1) What is your role in the [name of institution] Faculty Mentoring Program?

- Mentee
- Mentor
- Other, please specify: _____

2) What is your current position at [name of institution]? Please respond based on your position during the 2015-2016 academic year.

- Tenured Faculty (i.e., Professor or Associate Professor)
- Tenure-track Faculty (i.e., Assistant Professor)
- Clinical Faculty
- Lecturer (i.e., Principal, Senior, Lecturer)
- Librarian
- Other, please specify: _____

PART 2: INDIVIDUAL MENTORING *(The red text in this section will vary for mentor and mentee surveys.)*

Please answer each question below based on your interactions with one or more formal *mentors/mentees* at [name of institution] during the 2015-2016 academic year. For the purpose of this survey, a formal *mentor/mentee* is defined as a *new/more experienced* [name of institution] faculty member whom you chose or was assigned to you as a *mentor/mentee* as part of the [name of institution] Faculty Mentoring Program.

3) Have you had at least one formal **mentor/mentee** within your program, department, or college at [name of institution]?

- Yes
- No

Survey respondents to answer “No” to Question #3 will be redirected to Question #4.

3a) If yes, how often did you interact with this/these **mentor(s)/mentee(s)** on average (e.g., in person, phone, email, Skype or any other means)?

- Frequently (At least 1 time per week)
- Often (1-3 times per month)
- Sometimes (1-3 times per semester)
- Rarely (Less than 1 time per semester)

4) Have you had at least one formal **mentor/mentee** outside of your college at [name of institution] (e.g., in another college or at the university level)?

- Yes
- No

Survey respondents to answer “No” to Question #4 will be redirected to Question #5.

4a) If yes, how often did you interact with this/these **mentor(s)/mentee(s)** on average (e.g., in person, phone, email, Skype or any other means)?

- Frequently (At least 1 time per week)
- Often (1-3 times per month)
- Sometimes (1-3 times per semester)
- Rarely (Less than 1 time per semester)

5) MENTEE SURVEY: In what ways, if any, have interactions with your formal mentor(s) been personally or professionally beneficial for you?

5) MENTOR SURVEY: In what ways, if any, do you believe that individual formal mentoring has been personally or professionally beneficial for you and/or your mentee(s)?

6) MENTEE SURVEY: What additional supports from your formal mentor(s), if any, would have been or would be personally or professionally beneficial to you?

6) MENTOR SURVEY: What additional supports, if any, do you think your mentee(s) need to be personally or professionally successful?

PART 3: FACULTY MENTORING EVENTS AND GROUPS

Please also each question below based on your experiences at [name of institution] Faculty Mentoring Program events during the 2015-2016 academic year.

7) Please indicate whether you were aware of and attended the following events sponsored by the [name of institution] Office of Faculty Success.

If one of the events below was held more than once throughout the school year, please respond “Yes” if you attended at least one of those events.

	I attended this event	I was aware of this event but did not attend	I was not aware of this event
New Faculty Orientation (August 13, 2015)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Faculty CONNECT Mentoring Network Luncheon (September 29, 2015)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Faculty CONNECT – Holiday Concert and Reception (December 3, 2015)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Faculty CONNECT Mentoring Network Luncheon (March 4, 2016)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Spring Mentoring Lunch (April 22, 2016)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Faculty CONNECT – “Merry Wives of Windsor” Performance and Reception (April 22, 2016)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Promotion/Tenure Workshop (any one of multiple events)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

8) Please indicate whether you are aware of the following mentoring groups. (select all that apply) Note that these groups received [name of institution] Team Mentoring Grants for the 2015-2016 academic year.

- 18th and 19th Century Studies Group
- Asian Faculty/Instructors Mentoring Network
- BIOFUELS: Biology Forum on Undergraduate Education in Life Sciences
- Black Women’s Initiative
- Collaborating with Strangers
- Community of Sharing
- Coordinating Across Languages
- Faculty Writing Group
- Gender Equity Matters
- La Colectiva
- LGBT Faculty Mentoring Network
- [name of institution] Digital Fabrication Group
- Peer Support and Improving Faculty Research and Productivity
- Postwar Faculty Colloquium
- Poverty Working Group
- Revving Up for Research: Methods Mentoring for Assistant Librarians
- Women’s Faculty Network

9) **MENTEE SURVEY: Which of the following factors, if any, prevented or discouraged you from participating in one or more mentoring events or groups? (select all that apply)**

- SCHEDULING:** I was not usually available at the date(s)/time(s) that events/groups were scheduled.
- TIME COMMITMENT:** I did not have time to participate in events/groups with all of my other personal and/or professional responsibilities.
- ALIGNMENT TO INTERESTS/GOALS:** I do not feel that the events or groups offered align with my personal or professional interests/goals.
- UTILITY:** I do not feel that the events or groups offered were/are helpful in supporting my teaching, research, and/or service.
- NEED FOR MENTORING:** I do not feel that faculty mentoring in general is/would be beneficial to me.
- Other, please explain: _____

10) **MENTEE SURVEY: Are there other faculty mentoring events or groups that you would like to see offered in the future?**

- Yes
- No

If yes, please describe the types of events or groups that you would like to see offered.

PART 4: OVERALL EXPERIENCE

11) **How would you rate your overall experience in the [name of institution] Faculty Mentoring Program during the 2015-2016 academic year?**

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

12) **If you have any other comments you would like to add about your experience in the [name of institution] Faculty Mentoring Program, please do so here:**

PART 5: DEMOGRAPHICS

This section includes questions related to demographics. Data collected will be used to confirm that respondents are representative of the faculty.

13) What is your gender?

- Male
- Female
- Other
- I prefer not to answer

14) What is your ethnicity?

- Hispanic or Latino
- Not Hispanic or Latino
- I prefer not to answer

15) With which of the following race/ethnicity demographics do you most identify?

- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- Black or African American
- Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
- White
- Two or more
- I prefer not to answer

16) In which discipline do you primary teach and/or conduct research?

- Social Sciences
- Science, Engineering, Technology, and Math (STEM)
- Arts

17) Including the 2015-2016 academic year, how many total years have you been a faculty member at [name of institution]? Please include years at [name of institution] as a faculty member in any position.

- 1-3
- 4-6
- 7-9
- 10-12
- 13-15
- 16 or more
- I prefer not to answer

Thank you for your participation!