

## **Mentoring Committee Report**

February 18, 2011

The University Mentoring Committee met on Tuesday, August 18, 2010, and discussed the need to formally assess the mentoring partnerships formed during academic year 2009-2010. After seeking approval from the Institution Review Board to conduct this assessment, the committee developed a Survey Monkey instrument, which was emailed during the month of October 2010 to the individuals listed below (with the exception of Anne Perkins, who retired from CNU in May 2010):

<b>New Faculty</b>	<b>Mentors</b>
Darren Good (Management & Marketing)	Anne Perkins (LAMS)
Matthew Hettche (Management & Marketing)	Nathan Busch (GOVT)
Michael Clayton (Management & Marketing)	Michaela Meyer (COMM)
Jessica Lent (THEA)	John Nichols (ENGL)
Mary Wilson (ENGL)	Phil Hamilton (HIST)
Kevin Shortsleeve (ENGL)	Jana Adamitis (MCLL)
Michael Mulyran (MCLL)	Graham Schweig (PHIL)
Lauren Ruane(BCES)	Kelly Cartwright (PSYC)
Jeffrey Carney (BCES)	Toni Reidl (PCSE)
Timothy Smith (BCES)	David Heddle (PCSE)
Noah Schwartz (PSYC)	Rob Atkinson (BCES)

Following the collection of the data, the committee met on Tuesday, November 16, 2010, to discuss the finding and make the recommendations highlighted in this report.

### **Findings from Survey**

The data collected from the above 11 partnerships represents a small database. For that reason the committee report includes numbers as well as percentages for clarity. Of the faculty surveyed, the Committee received 7 responses (a 64% response rate) from the new faculty surveyed, and a 6 responses (a 60% response rate) from the faculty mentors. Highlighted below are significant findings from the survey:

- Although 6 (out of 7) faculty new faculty reported meeting with their assigned faculty

mentors at least once during the academic year, one faculty member indicated that he or she had no meeting with the assigned mentor

- For those partnerships in which meetings did occur, both mentors and mentees reported that they discussed to some degree the following topics: teaching, research/scholarship/creative activities, service, general information (policies and procedures), and personal matters (such as work and life outside CNU).
- None of the mentees reported that the mentoring had a negative impact on their teaching, research/scholarship/creative activities, or service, with the largest percentage of positive impact being on research/scholarship/creative activities.
- The mentees' satisfaction with the mentoring partnerships indicates some level of both satisfaction and dissatisfaction as evidenced below:

## **Recommendations**

The committee makes the following recommendations for academic year 2010-2011:

- The formation of the partnerships should be changed so that mentors are self-nominated. The committee recommends that chairs should submit a list of senior faculty who are interested in serving as faculty mentors to the deans, who will then have a pool of candidates from which to select.
- Partnerships should be formed during the summer months (if possible), so that mentors have the opportunity to contact new faculty members with a welcoming letter and to provide assistance immediately at the start of the academic year.
- A function (breakfast, luncheon, early evening wine and cheese reception) should be positioned during "Getting Started Week" so that the new faculty can meet their faculty mentors. The Committee recommends that the Deans or Faculty Senate, along with the University Mentoring Committee, host this event.
- A survey of this year's 29 partnerships should be conducted in the spring of 2011 and future assessments should be positioned in the spring semester to gather helpful information to improve the mentoring process for future cohorts.
- The Faculty Senate should recommend to the Provost, for inclusion in the University Eval-4, how this mentoring should be valued and where this commitment counts (teaching or service) this commitment counts.
- A central place (the Committee discussed the possibility of a link on HR's Website) should be developed that would house information helpful to new and/or prospective faculty hires.



## **Appendix A: Christopher Newport University Faculty Mentoring Program Survey**

Take a few moments to respond to the following questions in the space provided. No identifying information is necessary as your responses are confidential. The Faculty Mentoring Committee will be writing a report highlighting the overall trends that emerge from this survey data. The goal at this time is to obtain feedback regarding your mentoring relationship as well as the mentoring program.

1. Approximately how many times did you meet with your faculty mentor during academic year 2009-2010?
  - ☐ None
  - ☐ One to five
  - ☐ More than five
2. What topics or concerns constituted the focus of your meetings? Check all that apply.
  - ☐ Teaching (course management, pedagogy, textbooks)
  - ☐ Research/Scholarship/Creative Activities (writing, funding, conferences)
  - ☐ Service (committee participation, civic engagement)
  - ☐ General information (policies, procedures)
  - ☐ Personal matters (work and life outside CNU)
3. How satisfied are you with the mentoring relationship?
  - ☐ Very satisfied
  - ☐ Satisfied
  - ☐ Neutral
  - ☐ Dissatisfied
  - ☐ Very dissatisfied
4. How has the mentoring relationship supported your teaching?
  - ☐ Had a positive influence on my teaching
  - ☐ Had no influence on my teaching
  - ☐ Had a negative influence on my teaching
  - ☐ Not applicable
5. How has the mentoring relationship supported your research/scholarship/creative activities?
  - ☐ Had a positive influence on my research/scholarship/creative activities
  - ☐ Had no influence on my research/scholarship/creative activities
  - ☐ Had a negative influence on my research/scholarship/creative activities
  - ☐ Not applicable

6. How has the mentoring relationship supported your service commitments?
- Had a positive influence on my service commitments
  - Had no influence on my service commitments
  - Had a negative influence on my service commitments
  - Not applicable
7. What actions have influenced the development of your mentoring relationships? Check all that apply.
- Email correspondence
  - Casual face-to-face meetings
  - Formally scheduled face-to-face meetings
  - Phone conversations
8. What support would you like to receive beyond what has already been provided?
9. How might the mentoring program be improved?