Survey of Cohort Mentees
August 2014

Sample
Twenty-two mentees completed the survey from an overall population sample of 75 potential mentees. Thus, this survey had a response rate of 29.3%.

Of the mentees who provided responses, 10 (45.5%) identified as women, 11 (50.0%) as men, and one (4.5%) did not respond. Seventeen (77.3%) of the mentees identified as White and five (22.7%) identified as Asian.

Twenty (90.9%) mentees identified as assistant professors, one (4.5%) as an assistant professor of practice, and one (4.5%) as a visiting associate professor. Additionally, 15 (68.2%) mentees identified as being from STEM colleges, and seven (31.8%) identified as being from non-STEM colleges.

Finally, in the sample for this evaluation, six (27.3%) of the mentees had been in the FORWARD cohort mentoring group for two years, and 16 (72.7%) stated that they had been in a cohort mentoring group for one year. It is also interesting to note that only seven (31.8%) mentees reported that they were informed about the cohort mentoring program when they interviewed for their position.

Participation in the Cohort Mentoring Program
Two (9.1%) mentees responded that they had not participated in a cohort mentoring group during the 2013-2014 academic year. When asked what reason best explains why the mentees did not participate, both mentees responded that they chose not to participate this year.

Previous Mentoring Experiences
Of this sample of 22 mentees, eight (36.4%) reported that they had been in a mentoring relationship prior to the FORWARD cohort mentoring program. Mentees who had been in a previous mentoring relationship were also asked to compare their experience in the cohort mentoring process with their previous experiences. They provided the following responses:
- This is less all encompassing, though there is far less routine contact as meetings required arrangements. I am located in an isolated building on campus, so there were rare opportunities for chance encounters or 'drop in' opportunities.
- In the current experience, except for the faculty member in my department, I did not know the others very well. I am not sure I could look upon the group as a resource when I had problems.
- Department expectations seem to vary wildly, advice given outside the department is very vague - i.e. time management, grant writing.
- Someone in my department can relate closer to my position and faculty expectations.
- My other mentoring relationship engages in conversation on a greater frequency.
- The informal mentoring was a stronger relationship and was not forced or did not feel forced.
- The FORWARD program is subpar and hypocritical.

Functioning of the Cohort Mentoring Groups
The functioning of the cohort mentoring groups was examined by exploring how often groups met, what topics were discussed, and feedback from the mentees on the composition of the mentoring groups.

Mentees were asked how often their cohort group met:
- 2 (9.1%) mentees responded once a month.
- 3 (13.6%) mentee responded two times a semester.
- 7 (31.8%) mentees responded once a semester.
- 6 (27.6%) mentees responded once per year.

Mentees were asked about their satisfaction with the frequency of their meetings using a six-point Likert scale (ranging from 1 = Strongly Dissatisfied to 6 = Strongly Satisfied):

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very Dissatisfied	1	4.5	5.3
Dissatisfied	4	18.2	26.3
Somewhat Dissatisfied	2	9.1	36.8
Somewhat Satisfied	4	18.2	57.9
Satisfied	7	31.8	94.7
Very Satisfied	1	4.5	100.0
Missing Data	3	13.6	
Total	22	100.0	

*** Mean= 3.79, SD= 1.44

Mentees were also asked their thoughts on the composition (e.g., same gender, STEM faculty with other STEM faculty) of the cohort mentoring groups and provided the following answers:

- I think the composition as it has played out has been fine. I suppose it would be useful to have some in which many different disciplines and colleges are put together and some in which the focus is more on my own discipline or college, but both are useful.
- I think each program/department is different so being with someone who knows the ins and outs of the department is helpful.
- I consider diversity an asset in mentoring.
- My group does not consist of STEM faculty with STEM faculty, and I like that. It is useful to see others' perspectives outside your own field.
- Having STEM faculty is useful because they are able to relate to others experiences within the group. Similar disciplines were somewhat helpful - meetings were sparsely attended.
- I think that having faculty mentors in a similar discipline as myself is essential. Different fields have different requirements and expectations, so assigning a mentor that is in a field completely unrelated to mine would not be beneficial to either of us. As far as gender, I have no preference as long as the person has qualities that suite him or her to mentoring a young faculty member. I come from a field where gender equity is commonly accepted and appreciated, therefore being mentored by a male or female senior faculty does not influence me. My primary interest is that the person can provide insight and advice when needed that is useful and relevant to my situation.
- I don't have an opinion on same vs. mixed gender groups. I think both have their merits. I do strongly think that STEM faculty should be mentored by STEM faculty simply because the nature of the work is so different from what non-STEM folks do.
- As a male colleague, I would have found it advantageous to hear about the challenges that some of my female colleagues are facing. When one is a position of privilege, it is often difficult to even recognize advantages. Hearing about what they are experiencing and how it is impacting them could help me recognize if I am making any of the same missteps myself or somehow contributing to an atmosphere that places me at an unseen advantage.
- I thought the same gender groups at first seemed sort of offensive, almost drawing lines, urging women to think of themselves as the disadvantaged group on campus. I do not think of myself this way, I think of myself as a faculty member and would have preferred meeting all types of other faculty members.
- Our college did same gender groups, and frankly I thought it was a little silly to separate the boys and the girls out. We are all adults. I realize there is research on male dominance in group interactions, but a good moderator can help mitigate those problems (e.g., by setting ground rules, or policing interrupters) and let the women have a voice. Other research on mentoring suggests that diversity is a good thing--that matching people up with others who are different from them can help them grow more than similar matches, despite some discomfort with those diverse interactions.
- I thought a bigger cohort with more mentors would be good. Something like 8-10 mentees, mixed group, with 2-3 mentors seemed desirable after my experience.

- Assistant Professors of Practice with other Assistant/Associate/Professors of Practice.
- It is hypocritical. It engenders that which it claims to prevent. It hinders my ability to gather perspectives necessary for me to provide the best mentorship to my female advisees and that necessary for me to be the best colleague that I can be.
- I honestly don't think it is necessary to match gender with mentoring groups. I like to have more diversity among my mentoring groups so that I can see how different individuals perceive situations and work through problems at hand. Having more in common intellectually and interested in more similar research areas is more important to me then gender matched composition.

Mentees were also asked whether or not they discussed certain topics and how helpful those discussions were:

Topic	Have you discussed this topic?	How helpful was this topic to you? 1= completely unhelpful 6 = very helpful
The PTE process at NDSU	17 (77.3%) = yes	Mean = 4.71, SD = 0.99 Responses Ranged from 3 to 6
Starting a research program	7 (31.8%) = yes	Mean = 4.00, SD = 1.41 Responses Ranged from 1 to 6
Networking within your department	9 (40.9%) = yes	Mean = 4.50, SD = 1.51 Responses Ranged from 1 to 6
Issues related to work life balance	17 (77.3%) = yes	Mean = 4.16, SD = 1.26 Responses Ranged from 2 to 6
Formal and written policy/rules	10 (45.5%) = yes	Mean = 4.62, SD = 0.96 Responses Ranged from 3 to 6
Unwritten or informal rules of the institution	13 (59.1%) = yes	Mean = 4.60, SD = 1.40 Responses Ranged from 1 to 6
Teaching effectiveness	6 (27.3%) = yes	Mean = 4.44, SD = 1.51 Responses Ranged from 1 to 6

Mentees were also asked what topics they think still need to be discussed in their cohort mentoring group:
- We need time to meet so questions can be periodically asked as they arise.
- Some of the programs on campus like campus connection are really not user friendly. It would be great to discuss how to use some of these things.
- Teaching.
- Research connections and navigating the University administrators.

Satisfaction with the Cohort Mentoring Process
The survey included a number of different qualitative and quantitative measures of satisfaction with the cohort mentoring process.

In terms of overall satisfaction with the quality of the cohort mentoring experience, mentees were asked to rate their satisfaction using a six-point Likert scale (ranging from 1 = Strongly Dissatisfied to 6 = Strongly Satisfied).

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very Dissatisfied	1	4.5	5.3
Dissatisfied	1	4.5	10.5
Somewhat Dissatisfied	6	27.3	42.1
Somewhat Satisfied	5	22.7	68.4
Satisfied	4	18.2	89.5
Very Satisfied	2	9.1	100.0
Missing Data	3	13.6	
Total	22	100.0	

*** Mean= 3.84, SD= 1.30

Mentees were also asked if being a part of the cohort mentoring process was a good use of their time and responded using a six-point Likert scale (ranging from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree).

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	3	13.6	15.8
Disagree	1	4.5	21.1
Somewhat Disagree	2	9.1	31.6
Somewhat Agree	6	27.3	63.2
Agree	6	27.3	94.7
Strongly Agree	1	4.5	100.0
Missing Data	3	13.6	
Total	22	100.0	

*** Mean= 3.74, SD= 1.52

Mentees were further asked if they wished to continue participating in the cohort mentoring program for the next year and again responded using a six-point Likert scale (ranging from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree).

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	1	4.5	5.3
Disagree	1	4.5	10.5
Somewhat Disagree	3	13.6	26.3
Somewhat Agree	4	18.2	47.4
Agree	9	40.9	94.7
Strongly Agree	1	4.5	100.0
Missing Data	3	13.6	
Total	22	100.0	

*** Mean= 4.16, SD= 1.26

Another measure of satisfaction was the degree to which the mentees felt connected to the members of their cohort mentoring group and their mentors. Mentees responded to the statement "I feel connected to the other new faculty members in my cohort mentoring group" using the same six-point Likert scale.

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	3	13.6	15.8
Disagree	1	4.5	21.1
Somewhat Disagree	3	13.6	36.8
Somewhat Agree	6	27.3	68.4
Agree	5	22.7	94.7
Strongly Agree	1	4.5	100.0
Missing Data	3	13.6	
Total	22	100.0	

*** Mean= 3.63, SD= 1.50

Mentees also responded to the statement "I feel connected to the mentor(s) from my cohort mentoring group" using the same six-point Likert scale.

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	3	13.6	15.8
Disagree	2	9.1	26.3
Somewhat Disagree	2	9.1	36.8
Somewhat Agree	6	27.3	68.4
Agree	4	18.2	89.5
Strongly Agree	2	9.1	100.0
Missing Data	3	13.6	
Total	22	100.0	

*** Mean= 3.63, SD= 1.61

In addition to reporting a feeling of connection, 14 (58.3%) mentees reported that their mentors were helpful. When asked to explain how their mentors were helpful, mentees provided the following responses:

- I think it works well when a mentor has been around for a considerable [amount of] time and is willing to openly share and give advice.
- Giving advice, answering questions when I have them, informing me of things that I should know about but was not aware of.
- Some of them are more helpful than others but one was great at answering questions. Even questions related to looking for a physician and personal life questions.
- Provided guidance on the general issues that are part of any adjustment to an academic position.
- They have provided their insights and opinions on how they were able to be successful at this institution.
- Great advice and expertise regarding time management and workload management.
- They provided a specific, constructive, and positive approach to dealing with an issue that was the source of a great deal of anxiety. Their recommendations proved quite successful (at least in the short term).
- So far, I think there is really only one person who has worked out as a mentor, but I was matched with this person through a college-level mentoring program (I am pretty sure--although the FORWARD mentoring stuff hasn't been completely clear in terms of knowing which activities are FORWARD mentoring ones.). Anyway, she has been helpful in terms of all the stuff I mentioned before-- basic advice about getting things done on a new campus and how to fit in to my new department and college.
- Have taken the time to talk me through issues and point out resources.
- Teaching assessment strategies were the best, other meetings were not focused enough and wasted my time on things I already knew.
- Suggestion, attending the class.
- They are willing to engage in conversation and share experiences.

Mentees were also asked to explain in what ways their mentors were not helpful and provided the following responses:

- It is not their fault, the mentors assigned do not know anything about my departments functioning. It is hard to help with tasks or processes that they know nothing about.
- We met once as a cohort group. That part was helpful but once is not enough.
- Ideally, I would have checked a "no basis for judgment" option. I have only met my mentor once during a group meeting and had little one-on-one interaction. I did attend some of the seminars meant for new faculty, but my mentor was never at the presentation I attended. The one time I did meet my mentor during the group lunch, I could see how she may be helpful on a research/topics idea basis, but also realized that our departments and the expectations of those departments were very different, so I'm not sure how helpful my mentor really could have been if we would have met more than once. My mentor did not send any form of communication to meet following that lunch and I honestly forgot about the option due to how busy the Spring semester was.
- Was treated as odd-man out in the group. Advice was targeted at helping me, personally, access state commodity and extension groups. Others had extension appointments and did not need this advice. I do not have an extension appointment and did not want his advice.
- This is hard question because some were more helpful than others. The small group mentor I had was not helpful at all. She rarely scheduled meetings, didn't have any kind of agenda or topic for the meeting. Having a mentor declare at the beginning of a meeting that "I just hate writing grants" is hardly helpful, given that we are all expected to write grants. She seems like a really nice person, and I think she meant well, but support and idea generation would have been more constructive than complaining. Also, having a mentor from my own college or at least a related discipline would have been helpful. As a scientist, the challenges I face are very different from those faced by faculty in humanities and social sciences.

- I have a unique position where I am only on campus half time and I have a clinic site the other half of the time. The best mentor for me would be someone who also has this sort of position.
- Meeting times were usually during my class times making it difficult to meet with the group.

Mentees were asked about how helpful the workshops geared at participants in the cohort mentoring program were for them and responded using a six-point Likert scale (ranging from 1 = Not Helpful At All to 6 = Very Helpful).

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Somewhat Helpful	6	27.3	28.6
Helpful	8	36.4	66.7
Very Helpful	5	22.7	90.5
Did Not Attend	2	9.1	100.0
Missing Data	1	4.5	
Total	22	100.0	

*** Mean= 4.95, SD= 0.78

Mentees were asked if they would like to see the workshops continue in the next academic year and responded using a six-point Likert scale (ranging from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree).

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Disagree	1	4.5	4.8
Somewhat Disagree	1	4.5	9.5
Somewhat Agree	5	22.7	33.3
Agree	7	31.8	66.7
Strongly Agree	7	31.8	100.0
Missing Data	1	4.5	
Total	22	100.0	

*** Mean= 4.86, SD= 1.11

Additionally, nine (40.9%) mentees stated that the cohort mentoring program met their expectations. When asked to explain their answers, the mentees provided the following responses:
- I did not really have any expectations or know what to expect from it, but I enjoyed it and learned things while there.
- I think some of the speakers were not as useful for a first year faculty member. I think some of the topics would have been better geared for graduate students (i.e., time management).
- It is always good to get multiple perspectives from both mentors and mentees.
- As a group, we were able to engage in conversation and share experiences.
- I met other junior faculty and was able to establish some connections outside of my department.
- Expectations were exceeded because I learned a great deal about time management, promotion, etc.
- I thought it would be great. I was really impressed with the idea of it when I heard about it on my job interview here. I don't think a group really materialized through FORWARD. We did a lot of speed mentoring meetings, which didn't really end up hooking me up with people in a more permanent way. I am not sure they assigned me to a group either--or if it was supposed to happen organically out of the speed mentoring stuff... Or maybe the group that I thought was assigned through my college was the FORWARD group. If that was the case, then it was just assigned so late in the year (a month into the spring semester) that it wasn't as helpful for me as a new NDSU employee as it could have been.
- Too broad too many meetings.
- Again, here, I would select a "in some aspects, but not all" option. The cohort lunch was useful because I did get to interact and meet other new faculty and the mentors leading the group, but that only occurred once. I would expect this needed to happen more than once for the group to be effective. The seminars/workshops I attended did allow me to network, but not with my assigned "cohort". I suppose I am also confused somewhat with this program. What is meant by "cohort"? Is it the entire group of new faulty or the group we were assigned as a subset? The phrasing and conveying of this program is not always clear in my opinion.

- There was no sense of common purpose among the three members of my cohort group.
- By separating according to gender, the program continues what it is meant to prevent.
- I thought we would meet periodically through the year to answer questions about promotion and tenure. I didn't realize this was a one-shot deal.
- The group only actually met once and it was hard to see the benefit, it just seemed like one more required meeting.
- We didn't meet often enough to really get to know each other.
- The cohort could not meet more than once due to scheduling difficulties.
- I was unable to attend the session due to my off campus clinic schedule.
- Again, times of meetings were during my scheduled classes.

Mentees were also asked to identify the advantages of the cohort mentoring program and provided the following responses:
- We met once and were able to ask questions.
- Meeting other new professors, learning things that I did not know about NDSU, discovering problems that may arise that I was previously unaware of and learning how to deal with some of those problems.
- With multiple mentees in a session I was able to hear questions and answers that broaden my understanding of the NDSU academic life.
- Learning while networking within the university.
- Advantages are that it eliminates the awkwardness of being paired with a person as a mentor with whom you do not get along well. It gives you the opportunity to see who you "click" with and continue relating with that person (or people).
- Having similar issues to deal with as the other mentees progress through tenure.
- Great to understand different interpretations and approaches to teaching and the tenure process, but it did not make my own understanding any more clear.
- Getting to know more people, understanding how things work across the university.
- Discussing things that I have not thought of myself.
- Insight from experienced individuals.
- Limited, to be honest. I did appreciate some of the workshops put on, but the cohort mentoring group has not added much to my experience as a new faculty at NDSU. I have gained more from my departmental interactions. I do think it is necessary to branch out and network with other faculty at the University, but have not experienced that as part of this group.
- None immediately popped into mind.
- Have not really seen any yet.
- Bouncing ideas off of other faculty would be an expected advantage. Built in support network. However, personally this did not happen. I have established support from faculty colleagues that I've complete research with. That seems to be more beneficial personally for me.

Mentees were further asked to identify the disadvantages of the cohort mentoring program and provided the following feedback:
- None.
- None, at this point!
- None.
- None that immediately popped into mind.
- None.
- Again, unsure because of how the program was administered.
- My department doesn't see the need to mentor new faculty because it assumes that FORWARD is mentoring new faculty.
- Time.

- Scheduling.
- Takes up time.
- Some aspects of things discussed did not apply to my college.
- It's easy to get lost in the shuffle if you don't take initiative. However, in this case, I don't think any initial actual groups existed such that you could either meet people and continue relating, or get lost in the shuffle.
- Sometimes mentors take on their own agenda and personal feelings or experience can bring in their bias and negatively affect the work environment. Think the mentoring purpose needs to be clearer.

Impacts on the Mentees

To begin to assess the impact of the cohort mentoring program on the mentees, they were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with a series of statements using a six-point Likert scale (ranging from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree).

Being in the cohort mentoring program has increased my sense of connection with other faculty on campus.

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Disagree	2	9.1	10.0
Somewhat Disagree	3	13.6	25.0
Somewhat Agree	10	45.5	75.0
Agree	2	9.1	85.0
Strongly Agree	3	13.6	100.0
Missing Data	2	9.1	
Total	22	100.0	

*** Mean= 4.05, SD= 1.15

Being in the cohort mentoring program had decreased my sense of isolation on the NDSU campus.

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	2	9.1	10.0
Disagree	2	9.1	20.0
Somewhat Disagree	3	13.6	35.0
Somewhat Agree	7	31.8	70.0
Agree	2	9.1	80.0
Strongly Agree	2	9.1	90.0
NA	2	9.1	100.0
Missing Data	2	9.1	
Total	22	100.0	

*** Mean= 3.95, SD= 1.73

Being in the cohort mentoring program has decreased my sense of isolation within the Fargo-Moorhead community.

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	3	13.6	15.0
Disagree	2	9.1	25.0
Somewhat Disagree	4	18.2	45.0
Somewhat Agree	4	18.2	65.0
Agree	1	4.5	70.0
Strongly Agree	1	4.5	75.0
NA	5	22.7	100.0
Missing Data	2	9.1	
Total	22	100.0	

*** Mean= 4.05, SD= 2.16

Being in the cohort mentoring program provides me with helpful social opportunities.

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	1	4.5	5.3
Disagree	3	13.6	21.1
Somewhat Disagree	2	9.1	31.6
Somewhat Agree	8	36.4	73.7
Agree	4	18.2	94.7
Strongly Agree	1	4.5	100.0
Missing Data	3	13.6	
Total	22	100.0	

*** Mean= 3.74, SD= 1.28

I feel I have a support system I can trust in my mentoring cohort group.

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	2	9.1	10.5
Somewhat Disagree	5	22.7	36.8
Somewhat Agree	5	22.7	63.2
Agree	6	27.3	94.7
Strongly Agree	1	4.5	100.0
Missing Data	3	13.6	
Total	22	100.0	

*** Mean= 3.84, SD= 1.34

Due to my participation in the cohort mentoring program, I have developed relationships that I expect will continue throughout my career at NDSU.

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	2	9.1	10.5
Disagree	2	9.1	21.1
Somewhat Disagree	1	4.5	26.3
Somewhat Agree	9	40.9	73.7
Agree	4	18.2	94.7
Strongly Agree	1	4.5	100.0
Missing Data	3	13.6	
Total	22	100.0	

*** Mean= 3.74, SD= 1.37

Being in the cohort mentoring program has increased my comfort level with the promotion and/or tenure process here at NDSU.

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	1	4.5	5.6
Disagree	1	4.5	11.1
Somewhat Agree	9	40.9	61.1
Agree	6	27.3	94.4
Strongly Agree	1	4.5	100.0
Missing Data	4	18.2	
Total	22	100.0	

*** Mean= 4.17, SD= 1.15

If I was having a problem in my job, I would seek out one of the mentors from my cohort mentoring group for help.

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	3	13.6	15.8
Disagree	2	9.1	26.3
Somewhat Disagree	3	13.6	42.1
Somewhat Agree	2	9.1	52.6
Agree	9	40.9	100.0
Missing Data	3	13.6	
Total	22	100.0	

*** Mean= 3.63, SD= 1.57

Fourteen (63.6%) mentees identified that participating in the cohort mentoring program had a positive impact on their own experience of the climate here at NDSU. Ten (45.5%) mentees felt that participating in the cohort mentoring program had an impact on their decision to remain at NDSU.

Moreover, five (22.7%) mentees felt that participating in the cohort mentoring program gave them greater access to academic administrators. When asked to elaborate, mentees responded:
- Yes, but they are in unrelated disciplines.
- Met some people I otherwise wouldn't have met.
- I have met no administrator through the cohort program that I had not met another way.
- I would not say that was something I was looking to get out of it.
- I already had the needed access to my academic administrators.
- Had a good relationship with my college chair and dean prior to the mentoring program.
- Chair is not connected to mentoring - would prefer if I spent my time doing research.
- The mentoring group only met once. The seminars introduced me to some administrative personnel, but not on a one-on-one basis, so if I emailed them in the future I would not be on a more personal basis than if I had not met them before.
- I didn't meet any of them through cohort mentoring, except those I already knew.
- As a faculty member I have not felt intimidated to talk with the two different department chairs nor the Dean of my college. I am new faculty member to NDSU but I was at another university before taking the position at NDSU.

Finally, six (27.3%) mentees felt it increased their comfort with academic administrators. When asked to elaborate, mentees responded:
- Somewhat.
- I do not feel uncomfortable with these individuals.
- Was already comfortable.
- Quite comfortable with my current academic administrators outside the mentoring program.
- I was already fairly comfortable with my head and dean before staring the program.
- I did not have an issue beforehand. My primary concern is knowing who to go to with certain questions. For the most part, I've had to figure that out on my own with assistance from colleagues in my department.
- See previous answer [I didn't meet any of them through cohort mentoring, except those I already knew.].
- Again, I have felt comfortable approaching and talking with both the Dean of my college as well as the Chairs in the department in which I'm in.

Improvements to the Cohort Mentoring Process
Mentees were asked what changes they would recommend to the cohort mentoring program to improve its effectiveness. Their responses are below:
- Better information up front, present it as a resource, not as a required randomly assigned group you are forced to attend.
- Cohorts need to meet regularly--not once during an academic year.
- Multiple meetings per semester is my biggest recommendation. This, however, starts with mentors that are dedicated to ensuring that the group meets and the conversation held is beneficial. I personally did not experience that, but other groups may have.
- Less meetings with more useful information. I didn't go most of the time because I'm confident in workshops that were offered.
- Assign groups earlier in the year--if one of the advantages is that you can meet different people and then decide who to continue a relationship with, then, there isn't the problem of figuring out how to match people up at the beginning of the year.

- More than one mentor, so that there is a check on the point of view and the focus of the discussion.
- Ensure that all of the mentors have information that is relevant to their mentees. For example, just because one department does spousal hiring smoothly does not mean that all do, so having a mentor who blithely says "Spousal hiring just works! It's great!" is not helpful if your department is uncooperative regarding spousal hires.
- Allow for more faculty to select their mentor and maybe that would engage faculty who were not already a part of the mentoring to get the mentoring information and work more with the new faculty.
- Erase gender barriers (this goes for most FORWARD programs).
- More information about administration at NDSU and how to use that knowledge for our and our students' success.