Survey of Cohort Mentors: *Gender-Based Analyses*
August 2014

Sample
Fifteen mentors completed the survey from an overall population sample of 27 mentors. Thus, this survey had a response rate of 55.5%. Of the mentors who provided responses, five (33.3%) identified as women, nine (60.0%) as men, and one (6.7%) did not respond to the question about gender.

Description of Sample of Women Mentors
The five women mentors each identified as White (100.0%). Moreover, one (20.0%) woman mentor identified as a full professor and four (80.0%) as associate professors. Additionally, two (40.0%) woman mentors identified as being in STEM colleges and three (60.0%) from non-STEM colleges. Finally, one (20.0%) of the women mentors reported that this was her fifth year being a mentor for the FORWARD cohort mentoring program, three (60.0%) reported that this was their second year, and one (20.0%) reported that this was her first year participating.

Description of Sample of Men Mentors
Of the nine men mentors, eight (88.9%) identified as White and one (11.1%) identified as Asian. Moreover, three (33.3%) men mentors identified as full professors and six (66.7%) as associate professors. Additionally, five (55.6%) men mentors identified as being in STEM colleges and three (44.4%) from non-STEM colleges. Finally, six (66.7%) of the men mentors reported that this was their second year being a mentor for the FORWARD cohort mentoring program and three (33.3%) reported that this was their first year participating.

Participation in the Cohort Mentoring Program of Women Mentors
In the sample of five woman mentors, three (60.0%) reported that they participated in the FORWARD cohort mentoring group during the 2013-2014 academic year, while two (40.0%) reported that they did not participate.

Of the two participants who did not participate, one (20.0%) reported that she was not assigned to a mentoring group and one (20.0%) reported that she chose not to participate this year.

Participation in the Cohort Mentoring Program of Men Mentors
In the sample of nine men mentors, all mentors (100.0%) reported that they participated in the FORWARD cohort mentoring group during the 2013-2014 academic year.

While the overall sample for this survey was 15 mentors, one mentor did not report her/his gender. Thus, for the remainder of this report, the sample will be 14 and all percentages reported will be based on a revised sample of 14 participants.

Previous Mentoring Experiences of Women Mentors
Of this sample of five women mentors, all (100%) reported that they had been a mentor prior to the FORWARD cohort mentoring program. In particular, three (60.0%) reported they had been a mentor to a faculty member within their own department and three (60.0%) also reported being a mentor as part of a campus-wide mentoring experience.

Previous Mentoring Experience of Men Mentors
Of this sample of nine male mentors, seven (77.8%) reported that they had been a mentor prior to the FORWARD cohort mentoring program. In particular, four (44.4%) reported they had been a mentor to a faculty member within their own department and three (33.3%) reported being a mentor as part of a campus-wide mentoring experience.

Mentors were also asked what they see as the differences, if any, between the cohort group mentoring process and one-on-one mentoring experiences. They provided the following responses:

Women Mentors

- One-on-one experiences are easier compared to group gatherings.
- I kind of like the one on one better, because it is more informal and can happen at any time, whenever it is that the mentee has a problem or a question.
- The ease of scheduling meetings. It was pretty most impossible to find a time that 10+ people could all meet.
- Cohort more organized, provides peer support and seems to involve more discussion.
- Positive = multiple perspectives; Negative = often felt like a meeting or obligation rather than something beneficial.

Men Mentors

- One-on-one programs are more effective but require more resources.
- The group meetings seem somewhat more formal, which I'm not sure is a good thing. It is also possible for one person to dominate much of the conversation (though I suppose this can happen one-on-one as well).
- I informally acted as a mentor for a few junior faculty members not at NDSU but they are in the disciplines related to mine. I felt I was able to help them more. I feel that for academic mentoring, it doesn't matter with cohort or one-on-one mentoring, the shared experience is more important.
- Group benefits from shared experiences.
- Mentees feel less isolated and alone in their drowning when they meet was a cohort group. "Misery loves company" can be beneficial in this regard.
- Better discussion among the various persons and more questions and ideas.
- One-on-one is much more job description related.
- Not a great deal - just more questions being asked.

Mentors were further asked to reflect on how the time commitment for the cohort mentoring process compared to previous mentoring experiences and shared the following responses:

Women Mentors

- Similar.
- Comparable. I didn't feel like the mentoring program was a large time commitment.
- The actual time spent in mentoring was the same, but the scheduling was a bit of a nightmare.
- Probably rather less, because we were able to meet only once.

Men Mentors

- Similar.
- About the same.
- About the same.
- About the same.
- It's much easier to mentor one on one than in a group. My other duties, particularly chairing a college-level search committee, simply obliterated the time that I had hoped to spend mentoring.
- Arrangements for last time made it easier but all program lectures were during my teaching times.

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 mentors on the composition of the mentoring group.

Mentors were asked how often their cohort group met:
  Women Mentors
- 2 (40.0%) women mentors responded once a semester.
- 1 (20.0%) woman mentor responded once during the academic year.
- 1 (20.0%) woman mentor responded once during the academic year but that she met with individual mentees more frequently as requested.

  Men Mentors
- 4 (44.4%) men mentors responded once a semester.
- 2 (22.2%) men mentors responded twice a semester.
- 3 (33.3%) men mentors responded once during the academic year.

Mentors 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	7.1	7.7
Dissatisfied	4	28.6	38.5
Somewhat Dissatisfied	3	21.4	61.5
Somewhat Satisfied	2	14.3	76.9
Satisfied	3	21.4	100.0
Missing Data	1	7.1	
Total	14	100.0	

*** Overall Mean= 3.15 (SD= 1.35), for women = 3.50, for men = 3.00; no significant gender difference.

Mentors were asked whether or not they discussed certain topics and how helpful they felt those discussions were to their mentees.

Topic	Have you discussed this topic? Women Mentors	Have you discussed this topic? Men Mentors	In your opinion, how helpful was this topic for your mentees? *** 1= completely unhelpful 6 = very helpful
The PTE process at NDSU	3 (60.0%) = yes	8 (88.9%) = yes	Mean = 5.09, SD = 0.94 Responses Ranged from 4 to 6
Starting a research program	2 (40.0%) = yes	3 (33.3%) = yes	Mean = 4.20, SD = 1.64 Responses Ranged from 2 to 6
Networking within your department	1 (20.0%) = yes	4 (44.4%) = yes	Mean = 4.50, SD = 0.71 Responses Ranged from 3 to 5
Issues related to work life balance	3 (60.0%) = yes	7 (77.8%) = yes	Mean = 4.30, SD = 1.06 Responses Ranged from 2 to 6
Formal and written policy/rules of institution	0 (0%) = yes	4 (44.4%) = yes	Mean = 4.20, SD = 0.84 Responses Ranged from 3 to 5
Unwritten or informal rules of the institution	3 (60.0%) = yes	5 (55.6%) = yes	Mean = 5.00, SD = 0.82 Responses Ranged from 4 to 6
Teaching effectiveness	1 (20.0%) = yes	5 (55.6%) = yes	Mean = 4.71, SD = 0.76 Responses Ranged from 4 to 6

*** No significant gender differences existed for any of the mean scores on helpfulness, data provided are overall means.

Other topics discussed by Female Mentors
- Difficult department.

Other topics discussed by Male Mentors
- How to avoid being overburdened with service.

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

Women Mentors
- Same gender is good as men may not understand the challenges women face in an academic position.
- I would prefer mixed gender mentoring, even if it switched back to a one-on-one format. Same gender setup sometimes felt like we were saying that women don't have anything valuable to offer junior male faculty. That said, I think it's a good idea to pair TEM faculty with STEM faculty.
- I think that it's useful, but there was some confusion to the mentees about the gendered division of the groups. I think what is more important is actually teaching people HOW to be mentors and not assuming people with experience will be good mentors.
- Believe within college teams are good as faculty evaluated by same unit.
- Groups should be diverse and believe they are.

Men Mentors
- I would have been fine with mentoring women faculty as well, but I suspect the value of having women mentor other women is pretty high. I'm STEM and my mentees are not; there's probably value in that as well, but I think I would have had more practical advice to offer new STEM faculty, since I know more about expectations within those programs.
- Should try to maintain gender mix and stem/non-stem mix.
- That is helpful.
- Based on my experience, I feel that the discipline match-up is the number one priority. The gender match up can be secondary.
- Neutral on all levels.
- There are pros and cons to any configuration.

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, mentors 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	7.1	7.7
Dissatisfied	1	7.1	15.4
Somewhat Dissatisfied	1	7.1	23.1
Somewhat Satisfied	3	21.4	46.2
Satisfied	7	50.0	100.0
Missing Data	1	7.1	
Total	14	100.0	

*** Overall Mean= 4.08 (SD= 1.32), for women = 4.50, for men = 3.89; no significant gender difference.

Mentors 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
Somewhat Agree	5	35.7	41.7
Agree	4	28.6	75.0
Strongly Agree	3	21.4	100.0
Missing Data	2	14.3	
Total	14	100.0	

*** Overall Mean= 4.83 (SD= 0.84), for women = 4.75, for men = 4.88; no significant gender difference.

Mentors 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
Disagree	2	14.3	15.4
Somewhat Disagree	2	14.3	30.8
Somewhat Agree	3	21.4	53.8
Agree	3	21.4	76.9
Strongly Agree	3	21.4	100.0
Missing Data	1	7.1	
Total	14	100.0	

*** Overall Mean= 4.23 (SD= 1.42), for women = 3.50, for men = 4.56; no significant gender difference.

Another measure of satisfaction was the degree to which the mentors felt connected to the members of their cohort mentoring group. Mentors responded to the statement "I feel connected to the members of my cohort mentoring group" using the same six-point Likert scale.

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	2	14.3	15.4
Disagree	1	7.1	23.1
Somewhat Disagree	1	7.1	30.8
Somewhat Agree	7	50.0	84.6
Agree	1	7.1	92.3
Strongly Agree	1	7.1	100.0
Missing Data	1	7.1	
Total	14	100.0	

*** Overall Mean= 3.54 (SD= 1.45), for women = 3.50, for men = 3.56; no significant gender difference.

Mentors were also asked to identify the advantages of the cohort mentoring program. Their responses are below:

Women Mentors
- It provided an opportunity to connect with other women on campus.
- The group is an advantage because the mentees get input from more than one faculty. It is also a disadvantage because it is just about impossible to meet with 5 people.
- Opportunity to meet new(ish) faculty from other departments. Opportunity to hear how other departments approach the evaluation of teaching, research, and service. Opportunity to reflect on my own experiences as a junior faculty member.
- I got to meet people outside of my college.

Men Mentors
- It is helpful to meet colleagues from other programs who will be part of your cohort as you advance at NDSU; these are people you'll be serving on committees with in the future.
- Very good program to help new faculty knowing about what is expected from them.
- Shared experiences.

- The main advantage was that four faculty members from different departments now know each other.
- Last year, I felt the group mentoring worked really well. The advantages were that everyone could learn from everyone else, there wasn't any pressure on any one mentor to know all the answers, and mentees could learn from each other.
- Just an opportunity for new faculty to talk with senior faculty about any issue they are interested in.
- Mentees are overwhelmed by the demands on their time. Mentors can help them stay sane.
- The advantage is getting a few new faculty together to talk to a senior faculty about their experience and suggestions for them. I think it is a good idea- but the question really needs to be answered by the new faculty.
- At this point, I feel the advantages are somewhat random. If the mentor and the mentee are matched up well, then the advantages can be realized to a far greater extent. If the match-up is somewhat random (or constrained by the availability of the mentors from relevant disciplines), the true advantages are less likely to be realized.

Mentors were further asked to identify the disadvantages of the cohort mentoring program and provided the following feedback:

Women Mentors

- The women in my group are from departments outside of my college; thus, it was sometimes difficult to understand what expectations (tenure-wise) they had compared to expectations in my department/college.
- Feeling like my limited knowledge of other fields (particularly science) affected my ability to give good advice. I found myself listening a lot more than I talked, and I'm not sure if that's a good thing.
- Lack of time to meet more often; coordinating four schedules across extension, teaching, and research is difficult.
- The experiences of the last two years have strengthened my belief that a university-wide mentoring program may not work. It's not a one-size-fits-all relationship. Perhaps the Provost's Office could support individual colleges in their mentoring efforts(or perhaps pair similar colleges together: ie- AHSS and HDE). Where there were mentees in colleges with their own mentoring programs there was a lot of confusion about the difference between the two programs.

Men Mentors

- Harder to schedule meetings that include several mentors and mentees at once.
- It is very difficult to find time to do this- schedules are very tight and hard to find time to get together.
- The above mentioned difficulty in scheduling a meeting is for me the largest disadvantage.
- Very hard to schedule time to meet.
- Need more senior faculty to participate.
- While NDSU is still short 175 faculty members, the time demands on mentors all too often forces time for mentoring to the side. The irony of mentors not having sufficient time to mentor mentees, who uniformly feel themselves to be drowning in demands on their time, should not be lost on those running the mentoring program. The problem is systemic. Until the cause of the problem is addressed, the mentoring program will remain more of a placebo than a treatment.
- I don't know if it is a disadvantage of the cohort group design, or just in how it was implemented this year, but there seemed to be little or no structure or obligation to get us together this year. Diffusion of responsibility?
- Need more organization.
- Not much disadvantage really. It's a matter of the return on efforts.

Mentors were further asked how the role they expected to play matched the role they actually played and provided the following feedback:

Women Mentors
- The role I am playing matches my expected role.
- I think it pretty much worked out the way I had expected it.
- Working with individual. Listening rather than mentoring.
- Sharing experiences - both positive and negative - from my time on the tenure track. Serving as a "sounding board" for my mentees.
- The role felt a little forced with some of my mentees and it was a natural fit with others.

Men Mentors
- Good match.
- About the same.
- Very similar.
- I thought that I would meet more regularly with my mentees. The fact that I haven't met with them often is partly my fault -- it's been difficult to find time -- and partly a result of getting started kind of late.
- Although I managed to arrange for myself and the other two mentors of my large group to meet with the 12 mentees initially in a large group, I ran out of time to meet with my subgroup of 3 mentees.
- This year, the role I actually played was very minimal, much less that I expected. I was not put into a group until late in the year, and then just met my mentees once, at a luncheon.
- We had general discussions about being a faculty member, none very specific with respect to females.
- It has panned out less involved as I initially expected. In part, this could be because the mentees are not directly in the same discipline. The one from the same college although still from a different discipline, actually worked out better for me. Based on this experience, I feel that the match-up between mentor's and mentee's disciplines may be a critical factor. After all, they have more common experience to share.
- Unsure since there was little feedback.

When asked what outcomes the mentors anticipated their mentees had received from participating in the cohort mentoring program, the following responses were provided:

Women Mentors
- Better decision making in how to deal with problems.
- Networking, value of external perspectives, sense of solidarity.
- For some of my mentees: honestly, nothing. For one of my mentees: we have established a relationship that gives her a space to be able to process her experiences with her colleagues and in her college in a confidential way.

Men Mentors
- I do think they've gotten some very useful practical advice for dealing with specific situations in their careers. I also think they've benefitted from the opportunity to meet others across the university who are at their level of career.
- Better understanding of tenure processes.
- Better understanding of job responsibilities and what it means to be a faculty member at NDSU.
- Hopefully they learned something- just being able to ask questions with someone non-judgmental.
- Perhaps a few tips for survival.

- I hope they received some good advice from senior faculty and had a chance to see what other junior faculty are thinking.
- Learn how to improve teaching and research and to prepare for faculty evaluation and tenure process.
- I was hoping to help the mentees a lot more, but realized that beside general suggestions, which the mentees probably would receive elsewhere, I could not offer much value to the mentees from outside my college. I was able to help the one from my college ore although from different disciplines as we have more common experiences.

Impacts on the Mentor

Another goal of the cohort mentoring program was to have a positive impact on mentors' careers. To begin to assess the impact of being a mentor on these faculty members, 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 allowed me to form significant relationships with other faculty.

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Somewhat Disagree	1	7.1	8.3
Somewhat Agree	8	57.1	75.0
Agree	2	14.3	91.7
Strongly Agree	1	7.1	100.0
Missing Data	2	14.3	
Total	14	100.0	

*** Overall Mean= 4.25 (SD= 0.75), for women = 4.75, for men = 4.00; no significant gender difference.

Being in the cohort mentoring program provides me with a good opportunity to network with other faculty at NDSU.

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	1	7.1	8.3
Somewhat Disagree	2	14.3	25.0
Somewhat Agree	4	28.6	58.3
Agree	2	14.3	75.0
Strongly Agree	3	21.4	100.0
Missing Data	2	14.3	
Total	14	100.0	

*** Overall Mean= 4.25 (SD= 1.49), for women = 5.00, for men = 3.88; no significant gender difference.

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

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Disagree	2	14.3	16.7
Somewhat Agree	6	42.9	66.7
Agree	1	7.1	75.0
N/A	3	21.4	100.0
Missing Data	2	14.3	
Total	14	100.0	

*** Overall Mean= 3.67 (SD= 1.00), for women = 3.50, for men = 3.80; no significant gender difference.

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

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Disagree	2	14.3	16.7
Somewhat Disagree	1	7.1	25.0
Somewhat Agree	2	14.3	41.7
N/A	7	50.0	100.0
Missing Data	2	14.3	
Total	14	100.0	

*** Overall Mean= 3.00 (SD= 1.00), for women = 3.00, for men = 3.00; no significant gender difference.

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

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	2	14.3	15.4
Disagree	3	21.4	38.5
Somewhat Agree	5	35.7	76.9
Agree	3	21.4	100.0
Missing Data	1	7.1	
Total	14	100.0	

*** Overall Mean= 3.31 (SD= 1.49), for women = 4.25, for men = 2.89; *significant gender difference at p < .05.

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

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	2	14.3	15.4
Disagree	2	14.3	30.8
Somewhat Disagree	1	7.1	38.5
Somewhat Agree	6	42.9	84.6
Agree	2	14.3	100.0
Missing Data	1	7.1	
Total	14	100.0	

*** Overall Mean= 3.31 (SD= 1.38), for women = 4.50, for men = 2.78; *significant gender difference at p < .05.

If applicable, being in the cohort mentoring program has had a positive impact on my own promotion process.

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	1	7.1	7.7
Somewhat Disagree	3	21.4	30.8
Somewhat Agree	4	28.6	61.5
Agree	1	7.1	69.2
NA	4	28.6	100.0
Missing Data	1	7.1	
Total	14	100.0	

*** Overall Mean= 3.44 (SD= 1.13), for women = 3.67, for men = 3.33; no significant gender difference.

Additionally, two (40.0%) female mentors and all nine (100.0%) male mentors identified that participating in the cohort mentoring program had a positive impact on their own experience of the climate here at NDSU. Furthermore, one (11.1%) male mentor felt that he was mentored during the cohort mentoring process.

Mentors were also asked about what impact being a mentor had on their own leadership skills. They provided the following answers:

Women Mentors
- I think it made me think more clearly about the fact that many young faculty see me as a role model, which is something I did not have when I was younger.
- It has shown me that I know more than I thought I knew (confidence). Also prompted me to work on my meeting facilitation skills.
- I've been allowed to reflect on my experience and remember that I have a lot of varied experiences here.

Men Mentors
- Good experience mentoring.
- Some benefit, mostly CV related though.
- Dealing with issues facing new faculty and listening to them.
- Very little.
- None.

One (20.0%) female mentor reported that being involved in the cohort mentoring program had provided her with greater access to academic administrators (e.g., chairs, heads, and deans). Other mentors provided the following responses:

Women Mentors
- Got the opportunity to network with some administrators at the workshops.
- I always had good access to administrators.

Men Mentors
- Nothing has come up that has required those sorts of interaction.
- My contacts are already good.
- No reason for administrators to be involved.
- How could it?
- I have been able to access my department chair and college dean in general. Participating in the mentoring program doesn't change that for better or worse.

When asked if being involved in the cohort mentoring program had increased their comfort with academic administrators (e.g., chairs, heads, and deans), the mentors provided the following responses:

Women Mentors
- I have always felt comfortable with administrators.
- They had nothing to do with the program that I am aware of.
- It has certainly given me more of an administrator's perspective.

Men Mentors
- Not really relevant to my experience.
- My comfort level is already good.
- I have been comfortable with my department chair and college dean in general. Participating in the mentoring program doesn't change that for better or worse.

Improvements to the Cohort Mentoring Process
Mentors were asked what changes they would recommend to the cohort mentoring program to improve its effectiveness. Their responses are below:

Women Mentors
- I don't know whether there is a solution to the scheduling problem. Maybe one could make sure that mentors don't go on sabbatical, which they should know before. Likewise, mentors/mentees that are absent for a whole semester for some other reason may consider to participate some other time.
- Smaller groups (to make meeting easier). Or greater emphasis on meeting just with your mentees (rather than the whole group). I know it's mostly an issue of getting enough mentors. I wish that type of service was more valued at NDSU!
- Support the colleges in providing their own programs.

Men Mentors
- It would have been really helpful to get started very early in the fall, rather than in the spring – I think the mentees might have felt more invested in the mentoring relationship in that case.
- More senior faculty participation.
- Both mentors and mentees need sufficient time to meet. I don't foresee improvements unless the faculty:student ratio improves to its pre-2000 ratio and the faculty workload can be spread out. Ironically, until this happens, the new faculty hired to improve the ratio won't receive sufficient mentoring.
- As I mentioned above, please try the mentee's bottom-up nomination approach next time. I feel it may be the best approach theoretically, but we will never know that until we test it in reality.

> Using marriage as an analogy, it's hard to make it work if the match-up is not right from the start. The current system is not working to my observations.

Mentors were also asked what additional information related to being a mentor they would like to receive and provided the following responses:

<u>Women Mentors</u>
- Most effective ways to help people navigate (or avoid getting involved in) department politics.
- I believe anyone engaging in this program should be educated on and agree to learn basics of mentoring. The process this year was quite confusing, for both mentors and mentees.

<u>Men Mentors</u>
- It would be helpful to know at the start the amount of time that mentors are expected to spend on mentoring.
- Promoting research and teaching techniques.
- I'd like to hear more about how other mentors are approaching the experience. I'd also like to hear more about mentees' goals for the program.
- Mentoring faculty in my own department.
- Did the structure or process change this year from last year? There seemed to be much less support or information this year. Also, we were invited to luncheons, but there were usually 2 dates offered for each one, so you may not even be there at the same luncheon as other members of your mentoring group.