The FORWARD Evaluation
Promotion to Professor Panel: Mentoring
November 14th, 2012

Attendance

- Twenty-nine individuals attended and 19 completed evaluations.
  - Eight were administrators, two were full professors, nine were associate professors, and two were assistant professors. Two attendees identified two roles (both professor and administrator).
  - Thirteen attendees reported that they currently had a mentor or someone they considered to be a mentor. Five reported that they did not currently have a mentor or someone they consider to be a mentor.
  - Fifteen attendees reported they had the opportunity to be a mentor to another faculty member. Three reported they had not had the opportunity to be a mentor to another faculty member.
  - Ten attendees reported that they felt there should be rewards for being a mentor. Six reported that they did not feel there should be rewards for being a mentor.

Quantitative Results from the Evaluation Form

My understanding of different mentoring opportunities through the FORWARD program improved after today's panel.

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Disagree	1	5.3	5.3
Agree	12	63.2	68.4
Strongly Agree	6	31.6	100.0
Total	19	100.0	

I feel I have acquired new skills and/or information about both being a mentor and different types of mentoring.

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Disagree	1	5.3	5.3
Agree	11	57.9	63.2
Strongly Agree	7	36.8	100.0
Total	19	100.0	

As a result of my participation in this session, I will be able to implement new strategies in my own process of becoming a full professor.

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Disagree	2	10.5	12.5
Agree	7	36.8	56.3
Strongly Agree	7	36.8	100.0
Missing Data	3	15.8	
Total	19	100.0	

I would recommend this panel discussion to others.

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Disagree	1	5.3	5.3
Agree	7	36.8	42.1
Strongly Agree	11	57.9	100.0
Total	19	100.0	

Rate the overall quality.

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Average	6	31.6	31.6
Above Average	7	36.8	68.4
Excellent	6	31.6	100.0
Total	19	100.0	

Qualitative Results from the Evaluation Form

1. Who do you think should be responsible for finding or identifying a mentor for you?
   - Fundamentally, the process is driven by the department chair, but others at all levels should be involved too. Multiple mentors make a lot of sense.
   - Me.
   - Yourself, with help from chair.
   - Myself with assistance from chair/other faculty.
   - Me.
   - I think I'm responsible but I would certainly take help if someone wanted to help me.
   - Joint between individual and department chair/head.
   - Self.
   - Department chair/head; full professors and self.
   - Dean or chair.
   - I think everybody should do it himself/herself.
   - I see it as primarily my own responsibility, although the dean could provide related opportunities.
   - Myself.
   - Me.
   - Unit administration; me.
   - Individual with assistance of others.

2. Do you feel there should be rewards for being a mentor? (10 said yes, 6 said no) If yes, what rewards would you recommend?
   - Not applicable. I see this as a 'each one, teach one' where benefits of being mentored are returned later via mentoring.
   - Yes. Part of T & P (tenure and promotion) portfolio.
   - No.
   - Yes. Continue Advance FORWARD.
   - Yes. If the university could provide small amounts of travel funds or recognition that has real meaning—lunch with provost or president (face time with administrators).
   - Yes. Vacation day not charged to annual leave.
   - Yes. The rewards are internal mentoring should be considered in T&P and salary.
   - No. I would hope people do it because they have a sense that it is the right thing to do.
   - No.
   - No. Isn't advancement a reward in itself? This is not about senior faculty. Respect must be earned.
   - No. As mentioned, mentoring should be about giving and receiving if you're doing it correctly!
   - Yes.
   - Yes. Recognition as an important aspect of service and thus eligible for merit pay.
   - It's difficult to quantify.
   - Reward is primarily intrinsic
   - Yes. Time.
   - Yes
   - Yes

3. What questions do you still have after attending this panel? Please list any topics related to the promotion process from associate to full professor that you would like to receive additional information about or items that need further clarification. Your suggestions will be used to structure future sessions on the promotion process to full professor.
   - 'How do NDSU policies pertaining to PTP change over time'? (or do they?)
   - Clear expectation/evaluation criteria from provost. How does he interpret the PTE document?
   - Inconsistent expectations not part of job description. Lack of communication.
   - In a functional department, senior faculty take on significant administrative work so that junior faculty have more time. Where does time for development for senior faculty come from?

4. What do you think were the most helpful or valuable aspects of the panel you attended today?
- Communicating their enthusiasm on the topic of mentoring.
- Open discussion –great!
- Different panelists with different experiences
- Differing points of view
- Multiple mentors/outside mentors
- The comment from Dean Clark-Johnson.
- Success seems to be the result of unselfish faculty.
- Hearing about the process and what makes a good mentor.
- How should we seek for mentoring advice outside the department or college. Use of multiple mentors at the same time.
- Offering useful ideas and strategies for improving mentoring opportunities and experiences.
- General information; to be a good mentee.

5. What is one tip that you got today that will be useful as you prepare to apply for promotion to full professor?
- The NIH URL.
- Go for it—use, find mentors.
- Ask people if they are willing to mentor me.
- Mark is right—we all don't have the same opportunities. Resources?! Wow!
- Knowing that everyone's path can be different.
- It is a long way to go for me but I learned I should go through PTE description very well and be a good mentee and find good mentors
- Multiple mentors
- Everything was useful –mentoring doesn't get talked about enough!

6. How could the panel be improved to be more beneficial to you?
- No improvement needed
- In the past, avoided answering submitted questions.
- More perspectives from different levels.

7. Please provide any additional comments you have about today's panel discussion and/or the FORWARD program in general below or on the back of this page.
- It was great.
- So FORWARD grant applies to women? Academics has become 'competitive' not 'complementing.' (Back page) It's not helpful when PTE committee decline promotion with no suggestions to improve or willingness to mentor. Most successful faculty don't get there alone, yet they are overtly selective and biased. Recent changes in requirements have eliminated or set me back. If you aspire to a position similar to your mentors aspiration doesn't usually work in my experience. Senior faculty only mentor their choices that support their desires. There is a select standard? Our accomplishments don't—look at the same, but judgment is more unilateral.
- I thought the panel was excellent.
- Was good

Questions from the Audience for Panelists
- What do you think about external mentoring versus internal mentoring? Advantages? Disadvantages?
- Betsy—what was your source of funding for the $500.00 for the peer mentor group you formed?
- Does a chair of a department make a good mentor? Why/why not?
- How do you deal with a situation where the junior faculty does not accept guidance? Or take a suggestion into consideration? Junior faculty considers the suggestion as an attack on themselves.
- Is there a typical or average timeframe from associate professor to full professor? How many peer-reviewed publications per year are recommended?
- Usually the most successful faculty in the department will be asked for mentoring lots of people. What will encourage those people to do so and put lots of time and efforts in that direction?
- If the leadership is not fair, are you going to continue to talk with them, or give up or do other alternative options?