Mullen, C. A., Feyten, C. M., Holcomb, C., Kealy, W. A., & Keller, H. R. (2008). Launching a new faculty mentoring program in a university research culture. In C. A. Mullen (Ed.), *The handbook of formal mentoring in higher education: A case study approach* (pp. 25-53). Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers.

Chapter 1

Launching a New Faculty Mentoring Program in a University Research Culture

Carol A. Mullen, Carine M. Feyten, Cenira Holcomb,
William A. Kealy, & Harold R. Keller

This case study features a faculty mentoring program in its early stages of development in a university research culture. The story is about breaking new ground in a changing organizational culture through collective support and growth that allowed for the program's successful launch. The program's first year of life is described, with highlights included of its transition into the second year. Newcomers experiencing socialization within organizations find that the most dramatic changes occur within the first year (Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1993), which makes studies like this necessary.

Mentoring and collegiality stand out as two ways in which new faculty members—situated herein as *learning partners* engaged in two-way learning with mentors—are socialized to understand complex environments and undergo career development (Bode; 1999; Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1993). In fact, based on results gathered via a recent survey conducted by the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (and sponsored by the Ford Foundation) that questioned 4,500 tenure-earning faculty at 51 higher education institutions, junior faculty "care more about departmental climate, culture, and collegiality than they do about workload, tenure clarity, and compensation" (Fogg, 2006, p. A1). Researchers who study faculty mentoring are arguing that it is essential to better

understand mentoring processes, not just outcomes (e.g., Baugh, Lankau, & Scandura, 1996). This dual goal informs our writing. Universities that report successful outcomes associated with formal mentoring programs, such as the University of Manitoba (2006) in Canada, recognize the need for them to be built around promising practices predicated upon new faculty's professional and academic needs.

The aim of this writing, though, is not to simply document the processes and outcomes of a mentoring program but to address four related questions. First, what aspects of the formal mentoring arrangements at the departmental level worked and did not work? Second, what aspects of the formal mentoring arrangements at the college level worked and did not work? Third, what aspects of the formal mentoring program itself worked and did not work? And, fourth, how might the program be improved to increase its effectiveness and potential to make faculty-to-faculty mentoring not only widespread in the college but also entrenched in its culture? Although formal mentoring programs have increased in popularity nationwide, much more critical analysis is needed, which is a problem that we recognize and address (see Gibb, 1999).

The College of Education (COEDU) at the University of South Florida (USF) has eight departments and, as of the 2007–2008 academic year, over 180 continuing faculty. The purpose of the COEDU's New Faculty Mentoring Program (NFMP) at the USF, a large public doctoral/research-extensive university located in Tampa, Florida, is twofold. Its primary aim is to support the scholarly professional development of its new faculty. A second purpose of almost equal importance is to provide established faculty with opportunities to make a difference in the professional lives of new colleagues by sharing their expertise. Hence, the leaders of this initiative envision that both mentors and their learning partners will benefit from the communication and contribution that ensues in the mentoring process. Finally, we expect that the college as a whole will greatly benefit from this initiative. Ideally, the NFMP will serve as another means of forwarding the college's mission of offering challenging learning opportunities to faculty; supporting educational research and scholarship; and preparing the next generation of educators, scholars, and leaders for the professoriate. In highly functioning mentoring relationships, it is expected that minority and majority tenure-earning faculty alike will receive guidance and direction, countering the global complaint that American higher education institutions have only vague performance expectations regarding research and teaching (e.g., Alexander-Snow & Johnson, 1999).

The NFMP leaders strongly encourage the new faculty in the university's education college to foster their mentoring relationships and reach out for assistance. Without the commitment of faculty mentors, the program simply would not exist. Their willingness to devote time to mentor another, however, is not the

only criterion used to build a roster of faculty mentors. Those participating in the NFMP are selected from a pool of faculty identified for outstanding scholarship and success at mentoring and advising COEDU students and faculty.

This 9-month program has the support of several parties that work with the Faculty Mentoring Director: the College Dean, the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, department chairs, and faculty mentors. The faculty and administrators in the COEDU have committed, across units and ranks, to help all new faculty realize their full potential as researchers and scholars.

Practicality and empowerment are key to high-quality mentoring relationships. New faculty are placed in the driver's seat of their formal academic relationships to decide the professional areas of focus in which they need support. Importantly, the faculty mentors are committed to the relationship and responsibility of mentoring and prepared to work within the parameters of the mentee's agenda.

Figure 1.1   Faculty Mentors as Intellectual Guides and Collegial Friends

What Is the NFMP?

Program Vision and Leadership

The vision undergirding USF's New Faculty Mentoring Program is to support the scholarly development of new faculty and help them to succeed through a structured teaching/learning process and formalized collegial relationships.

The NFMP encapsulates two-way decision making (Fullan, 1999) and faculty leadership (Luna & Cullen, 1995). The implementation of this program was

made possible by two interdependent events, the self-initiative of a tenured faculty member and several deans' enthusiastic support of a college-wide mentoring opportunity. Just 1 month later (May 2005), the program was endorsed; it rapidly formed through two forces: (1) joint decision making between the faculty leader and the administrative leaders, and (2) proactive consultation of promising practices involving faculty-to-faculty mentoring in higher education. Although scarce, some information on this topic was made available through Internet reports (e.g., University of Manitoba, 2006) and published material (e.g., Johnson, 2002; Johnson & Ridley, 2004).

Immediate and Future Goals

Because the COEDU aims to support a culture of collaboration, as well as the development and retention of new faculty through formal mentoring, the NFMP functions as an "incubator" for satisfying these objectives. We use the metaphor of an incubator to reflect the desire for the NFMP to increase the climate of faculty mentoring within the college, as part of a broader aim of spreading the mentoring role and responsibilities to informal networks of support. Informal networks of support can be linked conceptually to social capital (e.g., Burt, 2000) whereby the role of social networks in organizational emergence is recognized as actual social capital; toward this end, *social capital* provides a catalytic role in generating "the norms and networks that enable collective action" (PovertyNet, 2004, para. 1) for mentoring network structures, whether formal or informal.

Reduced faculty turnover is a documented organizational benefit of mentoring organizations that are well defined and evidence-based (Morin & Ashton, 2004; Scandura, 1998). New faculty who receive ongoing mentoring support from senior faculty better meet the requirements of tenure. All tenure-earning professors who so desire should be supported and receive feedback on a regular basis. It takes a minimum of 3 years to become acculturated to the academy (Morin & Ashton, 2004). Only about half of the assistant professors employed at major American research universities are awarded tenure, with fewer women not only employed as full-time faculty (Trautvetter, 1999) but also less succeeding, proportionately, than men (Wilson, 2006), and, additionally, with many faculty of color being denied tenure and promotion within predominantly white institutions (Alexander-Snow & Johnson, 1999).

The primary goals of this formal tenure-earning faculty mentoring program are:

- Assisting faculties and departments in taking an active role in mentoring new faculty.

- Enabling the scholarly development of newcomers through diverse arrangements.

- Supporting the retention and advancement of all new faculty.
- Sustaining college-wide mentoring through ongoing, sustained practice.

NFMP Structure and Expectations

Within the NFMP, each new faculty member functions as the center of a mentoring triad (i.e., three-person relationship), assigned to a mentor in the department and in the college. Because rising faculty and academic newcomers benefit from more than one mentoring relationship, the goal is for them to receive assistance from multiple, coexisting sources (Higgins, 2000) specifically configured as a dynamic mentoring triad (Mullen & Kennedy, 2007). Department chairs identify department mentors, and the mentoring coordinator compiles the list of potential college mentors and creates the college matches, with input from the dean's office. New faculty needs typically range from entry-level concerns (e.g., learning the functions of key personnel), to academic agendas (e.g., securing resources), to performance reviews (e.g., clarifying requirements).

Figure 1.2 Program Faculty Participation in Structured Mentoring Events

Faculty Mentor Descriptions and Profile

The *department mentor* in this program, a seasoned professor, is likely to have more contact with the new academic than the college mentor. This person serves as an invaluable local resource and sounding board. The *college mentor*, also a senior faculty member, is a colleague with whom the new professor can freely discuss any concerns in confidence. An outsider to the mentee's department, this mentor can provide additional perspectives.

Relative to the diversity of USF's College of Education, the 30 faculty participating were somewhat heterogeneous, particularly the new faculty group. It

consisted of 3 white females, 2 white males, 2 African American females, 1 African American male, and 2 Indians, one female and one male, ranging from their early 30s to late 50s. Nine white females, 9 white males, and 2 African American males served as mentors to the 10 incoming faculty members. Demographically speaking, membership in this program reflected the increasing faculty diversity of the college.

Responsibilities and Characteristics of Key Parties

The responsibilities of key parties have been formalized in all of the NFMP materials (see Mullen, 2006), as exhibited in Table 1.1.

Table 1.1   Responsibilities and Characteristics of Key Parties (C. A. Mullen, 2006)

Mentoring Coordinator	New Faculty	Faculty Mentors
Solicit necessary information from all organizational and mentoring parties.	Participate in as many program functions as possible, and submit a description of research interests to provide the mentoring coordinator with information for matching.	Ensure that contact (preferably through meetings) between mentors and mentees is maintained on a regular basis.
Pair new faculty with college mentors.		Help mentees transition to the college and Tampa Bay area.
Monitor any difficulties or obstacles in the mentoring relationships.	Maintain contacts (preferably through meetings) on a regular basis (e.g., once a week with department mentor and once a month with college mentor).	Introduce the mentee to the larger academic community and its culture.
Organize events with mentors and mentees.		Advise the mentee on how to deal with the pressures of professional life.
Maintain and update the COEDU's NFMP web page, mentoring booklet, and program directory.	Ask for guidance and assistance from the two mentors as needed.	Focus on mentee-driven agendas in research, teaching, and service.
Assess the program and generate anonymous feedback and official reports.	Request any desired changes in mentor arrangements from the coordinator.	Share knowledge of the institution and support professional development.
	Assess the program by, for example, completing a survey at the outset and end of the year.	
	Seek consultation about tenure and promotion policies and procedures.	

Source: CAS Mentoring Program (2005) [College of Arts and Sciences] leaflet, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida.

Program Information Disseminated

At the outset of the program's first year, key information was reported on the NFMP web site and handouts distributed to new faculty at meetings. At the closure of the first year, a research-based mentoring booklet was created to summarize the program highlights (see Mullen, 2006; available as a pdf file at the NFMP web site).

Mentoring Functions

The two major functions of academic mentoring relationships, career and psychosocial, proved relevant to the reported growth of the program for new faculty in particular, but also for mentors (these functions are derived from Kram's [1985/1988] well-established workplace model). The NFMP college mentoring partners emphasized career functions, whereas departmental counterparts gave more attention to psychosocial elements. From this perspective, the tenure-earning faculty potentially had access to well-rounded mentoring. A description follows of both types of functions, with long-term validation in the mentoring literature (see Table 1.2).

Table 1.2   Career and Psychosocial Functions of Formal Academic Mentoring (C. A. Mullen, 2006)

Career Functions	Psychosocial Functions
Sponsorship—Mentor recommends the new faculty member for opportunities and roles inside and outside the academy.	*Role modeling*—Mentor provides a positive example in organizing and managing workload, including stresses, and in relating to people in the institution.
Exposure and visibility—Mentor encourages the mentee to serve on committees and network.	*Acceptance and confirmation*—Mentor provides support and trust as the mentee adjusts. Mistakes are recognized as part of learning and growth. Mentor is non-judgmental and respects the person, despite demographic or personality differences.
Coaching—Mentor shares knowledge of the field and how to successfully navigate requirements, such as state and federal guidelines. Mentor might share teaching ideas or suggest ways to accomplish a task.	
Protection—Mentor shields tenure-earning faculty member from making untimely or inappropriate requests. Mentor might assist with difficult assignments or tasks (and deadlines), such as grant proposals and manuscript improvement.	*Counseling*—Mentor acts as a sounding board for the mentee to discuss anxieties and ambivalences that might affect performance. Disclosures are kept in confidence.
Challenging assignments—Mentor encourages mentee to research or teach using new strategies or techniques and possibly provides feedback on the performance.	*Friendship*—Mentor and mentee engage in social interaction outside the immediate domain that results in mutual affection.

Sources: Kram, 1985/1988; adapted by Luna & Cullen, 1995; Ragins & McFarlin, 1990.

Areas of Mentoring Activity

For the mentoring program's inaugural year, a series of program activities and specialized events were developed and implemented:

- Fall orientation, which included discussion of the program highlights for all attending new faculty (part of a more comprehensive, college-wide orientation).

- "Meet and greet" luncheon for new faculty that covered program overview and specifics, effective faculty mentoring, new faculty mentoring needs, and assessment based on initiating experiences (late September).

- End-of-the-year luncheon, program overview, and assessment for new faculty (spring semester).

- Research and scholarship panel with tenure-earning faculty: Program mentors dialogued with new faculty about doctoral advisement, grant development, and research publication—areas predetermined by the new faculty.

Faculty Appraisal Surveyed

The new faculty, department mentors, and college mentors appraised the effectiveness of their own mentoring experiences, in addition to that of the program itself. Assessments were carried out through surveys (created by Carol Mullen, the Mentoring Program Founder and, from 2005 to 2007, Faculty Mentoring Director) and achieved reliability through two means: overlap with studies in faculty mentoring (e.g., Morin & Ashton, 2004) and feedback from survey specialist Dr. Kristine Hogarty on the instrument's design. Included here is the fall 2005 survey entitled "Touching Base" (Table 1.3) that was designed for the new faculty participants.

Separate surveys were constructed for the department mentors and the college mentors that incorporated modifications reflective of their specific mentoring roles. The end-of-the-year survey (spring 2006) was similarly launched as a three-part design that targeted the same participant groups. Questions mirroring the fall 2005 survey were asked (and in the same sequence) but in the past tense, as in "Assuming you have you had the opportunity to meet with your departmental (inside) mentor this academic year, please indicate how many times this occurred" (question 1a), and "What topics or concerns constituted the focus of your mentoring?" (question 1b). We prompted the new faculty to assess their departmental and college mentoring relationships, as well as the mentoring program itself. The department mentors assessed their mentoring relationship with their

Table 1.3   COEDU New Faculty Mentoring Program Assessment: Touching Base (C. A. Mullen, 2006)

Dear New Faculty Member:

Using this survey, please comment on the program and offer suggestions for improvement. We realize that it is still early in the semester (October 1, 2005) but many of you have already had the opportunity to at least consult with your faculty mentors.

Take a few moments to respond to the following questions in the spaces provided. No identifying information is necessary as your responses are strictly confidential. I will be drafting a report highlighting the overall trends that emerge from the baseline data. The goal at this time is to obtain feedback regarding your department mentoring relationship (part 1), college mentoring relationship (part 2), and the COE New Faculty Mentoring Program (part 3). This is an IRB-approved program for which data will be collected, generalized, and anonymously reported.

Give as much detail as possible.

1.   DEPARTMENTAL MENTORING RELATIONSHIP

     A.   Have you had the opportunity to meet with your departmental (inside) mentor yet?
          ___ No ___Yes
          If yes, approximately how many times to date? ___

     B.   What topics or concerns have constituted the focus of your mentoring thus far?

     > Here are some basic categories, just to get you thinking:
     >
     > Teaching—courses, etc.
     >
     > Research/scholarship/creative activities—conferences, etc.
     >
     > Service—committees, etc.
     >
     > Mission, policies, procedures, norms—handbooks, etc.

RESPOND HERE:

     C.   Is this mentoring relationship going well so far? Why or why not?

     D.   What dynamics (e.g., initiating emails, events) have been influencing its development?

     E.   What benefits have you derived so far?

     F.   What strengths, if any, do you perceive this mentoring relationship (or the matching process) to have?

     G.   What weaknesses, if any, do you perceive this mentoring relationship (or the matching process) to have?

2.   COLLEGE MENTORING RELATIONSHIP

     A.   Have you had the opportunity to meet with your college (outside) mentor yet?
          ___ No ___Yes
          If yes, approximately how many times to date? __

Table 1.3   COEDU New Faculty Mentoring Program Assessment: Touching Base (C. A. Mullen, 2006) *(Continued)*

B.   What topics or concerns have constituted the focus of your mentoring thus far?

> Here are some basic categories, just to get you thinking:
>
> Teaching—courses, etc.
>
> Research/scholarship/creative activities—conferences, etc.
>
> Service—committees, etc.
>
> Mission, policies, procedures, norms—handbooks, etc.

PLEASE RESPOND HERE:

C.   Is this mentoring relationship going well so far? Why or why not?

D.   What dynamics (e.g., initiating emails) have been influencing its development?

E.   What benefits have you derived so far?

F.   What strengths, if any, do you perceive this mentoring relationship (or the matching process) to have?

G.   What weaknesses, if any, do you perceive this mentoring relationship (or the matching process) to have?

3.   NEW FACULTY MENTORING PROGRAM (NFMP)

A.   What do you like about the NFMP program so far (e.g., program structure, philosophy)?

B.   How might the program be improved for the spring 2006 semester to help ensure additional benefits?

C.   How might this pilot program be improved for the next crop of incoming faculty and/or for the faculty mentors who help them? (fall 2006)

4.   ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Do you have any additional suggestions for improving upon the program or the experiences of the mentoring parties involved?

5.   CONTACT INFORMATION

Has your contact information changed? If so, please indicate.

---

protégé and the mentoring program itself, and the college mentors also assessed their assigned mentoring partnership, as well as the program.

Besides providing the NFMP with a means for continuous improvement, the assessment structure enabled mentees and mentors alike to identify concerns. The new faculty also acknowledged the efforts of their mentors, as in the example that follows.

> Thank you so much for obtaining [Jack] as a mentor for me. This week, I sat with him for nearly 2 hours. His vision for the children's research center is awesome, and he helped me see my research from a larger perspective. What a personable and professional scholar! It was a privilege to share with him, and I left our meeting feeling truly energized about my work. (fall 2005 survey)

Testimonial Data

For the thematic discussion that follows, we synthesized the faculty mentoring survey results and meeting notes generated over 1 year (2005–2006).[1]

Analysis of Data Sets

Striving to establish interrater agreement, the Faculty Mentoring Director, a coauthor, and a doctoral student each separately analyzed the data and compared results, applying Miles and Huberman's (1994) qualitative scheme for data management and analysis. The data were coded relative to anonymously completed surveys that had been circulated in hard copy so that identifying information would not be revealed, complying with the USF Institutional Review Board's requirement. After gaining familiarity with the two data sets (fall and spring), we individually generated codes, tables, and themes, comparing them for authentication. The survey data for the new faculty, college mentor, and department faculty were entered into three separate charts, one per group. The tables resulted in 26 typed, single-spaced pages for the new faculty group, 13 for the department mentor group, and 12 for the college mentor group (total of 51 pages, not included due to space restrictions). Organizing the survey data, we labeled the college faculty mentors' responses "CFM," the department mentors' responses "DFM," and new faculty's responses "NFM."

All responses from the open-ended survey section were entered into the tables and categorized accordingly: Fall and spring survey items were placed in the left-hand column, with responses from each group in the right-hand column. This strategy readily enabled comparison of survey responses for all three groups, not only within semesters, but also between them and over the 9 months. All data were numerically coded, and recurring ideas and salient quotes were identified. Relevant comments from meetings held with new faculty were analyzed separately.

With slight variations, the surveys for all three mentoring parties were identical in format and questions. The spring version differed in three ways: As previously intimated, questions were converted into past tense, reflection was prompted on the entire year with respect to the development and quality of

mentoring relationships, and assessment of the program itself was cued, along with necessary improvements. Because the spring data covered the 9-month mentoring cycle, these provided salient information.

For this preliminary study, the 30 faculty were surveyed twice (fall and spring), 10 participants per group (new faculty, department mentor, college mentor). The overall return rate of survey responses was 63% for the fall semester and 57% for the spring semester. The new faculty response rate was 80% in both the fall and spring. Department mentors had a 60% return rate in the fall, with 80% the following semester. Relatively speaking, the college mentor response rate was modest—50% (fall) and 30% (spring).

Thematic Results of Survey Responses

Meeting opportunities. The initial question on the survey (fall and spring) asked the three faculty groups to indicate whether they had had the opportunity to meet with their assigned mentor or mentee and, if so, with what frequency. For example, the new faculty reported having met with their college mentor anywhere from not at all to one time (that is, by the end of September[2]), and two to nine times for the entire year. College mentors disclosed having met with their mentee up to three times during the fall, and three to five times during the spring.

This modest activity is not surprising. The college mentors, external to the new professors' units, neither had the physical proximity that the department mentors had to their assigned mentee nor, in some cases, close correspondence with the new faculty's scholarly interests and goals. Further, the newcomers appeared to have had a lesser need for their external mentors, thereby placing fewer demands on their time and energy and more on those within reach who shared day-to-day challenges and interests.

By late September, department mentors reported meeting with their mentee anywhere from 1 to 12 times. During the spring semester, these internal mentors similarly indicated that they had met with their learning partners anywhere from one to numerous times (unspecified) during the mentoring process. Meanwhile, new faculty confirmed that in-person meetings with their department mentor had occurred up to eight times during the fall semester and much more frequently over the academic year, as much as dozens of times. The new faculty obviously met their department mentors with greater regularity than their college mentors. Relationship catalysts were office proximity, similarity of interests, teaching issues, and program overlaps.

New professor–mentor meetings ranged from the formal to the informal, specifically "formal lunches, but also informal chats in the office" and "meeting a couple of times a week in snatched moments." Participants initially arranged formal meetings that allow themselves to become acclimated to each other and

develop familiarity across scholarly agendas, interests, and goals. Informal meetings occurred intermittently as the synergy grew, and as issues surfaced.

Topics of concern. Concerns related to the mentoring process were solicited: What topics or concerns constituted the focus of your mentoring? In what areas did you receive or provide help? What did you talk about or work on together?

The new faculty–college mentor meetings within the first month primarily focused on social adjustment, research, and teaching, whereas the new faculty–department mentor meetings included discussions about tenure and annual review requirements, as well as teaching concerns that highlighted assignments, schedules, responsibilities, and management issues. In Boice's (1991) study of new faculty teaching, he found that recently hired faculty need help moving from a cautious stance toward teaching (reflected in their focus on the mundane) to a risk-taking attitude toward change and improvement. This issue was not discussed in the NFMP data, nor was there much evidence that mentors identified superficiality and control on the part of their mentees as an issue or that they presented challenges to what may have been a tendency toward the mundane. With their department mentors, new faculty also explored concerns related to research and writing, departmental politics and policies, and committee service. The mentors identified the same topics of discussion.

Similarly but in greater detail, overall concerns expressed by new faculty throughout the mentoring experience included "development of research ideas," grant writing and time management pertaining to "writing productivity," proposal development and expert feedback, "networking and locating resources," and "finding opportunities for collaborative work," whereas research issues "focused on pace, projects versus presentations, and the relative value of coauthored versus single-authored publications." Importantly, new faculty's spring responses also identified as areas of concern "collegiality and relationships," "interpersonal relationships with other faculty," and "peer review processes." The focus on relationships and building collegiality within the department might have become a safe topic for some faculty and their internal mentors as time passed, once they developed comfort and trust. Performance review was mentioned far less frequently by the new faculty than by both mentor groups. It is as though matters involving immediate survival—such as research productivity, grant writing, and teaching concerns—overshadowed comparably distant ones.

The spring data reveal that although college mentors also covered discussions of tenure and annual review with their mentee, department mentors highlighted research productivity (a reversal of the fall scenario). It appears that the new faculty received help with performance review, research, and teaching from both mentors, albeit at different times. The fact that the newcomers sought the advice of their college mentor early on with regard to sensitive social issues may be indicative of the safety and comfort they associated with the physically remote

party. At least some new faculty felt more inclined to discuss unit-based concerns with this individual.

However, new faculty also sought the counsel of their department mentors regarding sensitive topics. Teaching effectiveness surfaced as an issue. This contrasts with the "inattention to teaching" that burdened a different group of new faculty at the research campus that Boice (1991) studied (p. 155). In one situation, NFMP participants, who were part of a mentoring pair, separately reported the same incident. This dilemma involved the new professor's first-semester teaching evaluations, which signaled some problems with the instruction. The mentor attempted to be reassuring and practical, writing, "Because I understand the struggle with good teaching, I urged him to stick with the learning process, work at implementing the suggested changes, and take comfort in knowing that his transitional year would not be judged harshly." Only one newcomer felt that the assigned department mentor was not receptive to collegiality or disclosure. On the spring survey, this individual elaborated, "I found myself in need of increased guidance as to how to maintain proper relationships with my mentor and all of my department colleagues, and under some very difficult circumstances." After consulting with this mentee, the program coordinator assigned a second college mentor and validated her spontaneously formed relationship with another department mentor.

Based on conversational data collected during the workshop meetings with the new faculty, no other major concerns were reported within the context of the assigned mentoring relationships. The new faculty and their mentors developed a support system and collegiality where face-to-face contact occurred with some regularity.

Mentoring relationships. Participants were asked to reflect on the mentoring relationship within the first month and, later, during the entire cycle: Is the mentoring relationship (with your assigned party) going well so far? (fall); Did the mentoring relationship go well? Why or why not? (spring).

Overall, all parties reported that the mentoring process turned out to be a positive experience and hence a success. Throughout the year, college mentors made such evaluative comments as: "[My assigned faculty partner and myself] seem very compatible," "We share a lot of common interests," and "As chair of the search committee for my mentee, I felt bonded and got to know her well." College mentors as a group reported that the overall mentoring process had gone well.

Similar feelings were echoed by the new faculty about their college mentoring experience, who deemed it worthwhile from the outset. However, several assessed it in less enthusiastic terms: "It's just fair [meaning "okay"]," and "My mentor is very kind, but busy." Taken as a whole, responses during the spring semester reinforced the viability of the new faculty–college mentor relationship. The mentees made such typical remarks as, "We got along well, and I was encouraged

to set meetings," "We share a similar outlook and complementary interests," "The relationship went very well because of my mentor's willingness to be available when needed," and "It went smoothly—my outside mentor was diligent about the work at hand and so was I."

Department mentors, too, reported in the early fall that the mentoring arrangement was already working well. They commented, "We are already working closely," "Much of my assigned protégé's interest is relevant to my program," "We really enjoy our luncheons," "We have a lot in common," and "I think my mentee is a wonderful addition to the department."

Conversely, on the spring surveys, three mentors expressed discontent. One college mentor was frustrated with the relationship and program: "I don't know. We had lunch once. I have received no guidance about what I am supposed to do." Two department mentors reported that the mentoring did not go as intended. One disclosed, "We are not as close as I would like. My mentee is a seasoned educator, and therefore she figured out issues for herself," the other explained, "Because my department chair is mentoring this nontenured faculty who is in a different teaching area from me, I don't feel he needs another mentor right now." This individual continued, "I am available should he need additional help, but so far he's not requested any." In these two unit-based instances, there may have been a reluctance on the part of the mentor to connect with the faculty newcomer, or for the faculty mentor and mentee to connect; alternatively, what appears to be failure may be quite the opposite, with one newcomer's independence and experience resulting in minimal need for mentoring and the other receiving the necessary guidance—it just happened to evolve more naturally from a chair than the internal mentor. The role of chairs as mentors has also been depicted as a promising, emergent trend (see Bensimon, Ward, & Sanders, 2000).

Several new faculty members understandably felt that it was "too early to tell," given that it was only the end of September; once again, one observed that the department mentor who was assigned to help her did not "value the program." On the whole, the new faculty recounted positive dynamics with their internal mentors. By the spring, the newcomers' positive reports about the mentoring that they received had the backing of experience.

Most mentors were committed to imbuing the new faculty with integrity and establishing worthwhile mentoring. As a result, the mentoring accounts often suggested optimism—these dynamics affirmed the need for the continuance of a formal mentoring program in the college and for collaborative, structured learning between new and seasoned faculty.

Multiple dynamics. One survey item prompted reflection on the dynamics (e.g., initiating emails) that influenced the mentoring relationships and personal development. For all three groups, over the course of the year, formal and informal communications took such forms as email exchanges, telephone conversations,

classroom observations (with mentors observing mentees), and especially face-to-face meetings. College mentors highlighted these same dynamics, narrating such specifics as, "We saw each other in the elevator and made another lunch date."

The new faculty responded similarly about what helped foster the relationships with their college mentors, reporting that they initially "sent emails back and forth to find times to meet" and "engaged in conversation," both scheduled and impromptu. College mentors even "exhibited initiating behavior." Spring comments from the new faculty group solidified these directions—they "made appointments for lunch," "emailed about questions and concerns," and responded to mentors "who were good about following up." Most of the mentees "established regularly scheduled times to be in our offices," as well as "dates for phone conversations." Electronic exchanges and meetings, including lunches, informed the actions taken.

The majority of department mentors, like the college mentors, also encouraged the development of the mentoring relationship from the outset. During the fall semester, they participated in "regular meetings and lunches on issues both of us considered important," emailed their mentees, talked with them after department meetings, "expressed congeniality, genuine interest, and concern," and "took advantage of close proximity of offices and similar teaching schedules." One unit mentor invited a new professor to "participate in a collaborative research group." The internal mentors responded similarly in the spring. Face-to-face meetings and emails enabled them to foster their mentoring relationships, as did proximity of offices: "We see each other almost every day because our offices are so close. This arrangement facilitated the mentoring. Additionally, the concurrence of my colleagues was that I was his department mentor helped cement the relationship."

On the other hand, two department mentors indicated that their mentoring relationship suffered because of physical distance. A few of the mentors were, out of necessity, located at the Tampa campus, away from their mentees' affiliated regional campus: "When was [my mentee] ever at this campus? I would have met at the regional campus while visiting on other business, but never had any other business!" Another pointed to absence as a problem: "[My mentee] has not been at this campus very much, which has been the problem from the get-go. To be honest, I do not believe she desired mentoring from someone she didn't know." Given that participation in this program was voluntary and that interest was confirmed, apathy would have been difficult to gauge.

The big picture here is that most of the new faculty and their department mentors made themselves readily available to the other via email and "especially face-to-face contact." Even when physical proximity was an issue, connections were often made: "When my department mentor came to my campus for a meeting, we had lunch together in the cafeteria." Most new faculty and department

mentors were in close proximity, though, which prompted communications rang-
ing from electronic communications to spontaneous chats. New professors
shared: "We use our common office hours to meet," "My mentor allows me to sit
in on College Council and other meetings," "Short conversations occur between
us on the fly," and "Ongoing chats are already the norm."

An emerging force influencing the positive synergy of the mentoring relation-
ship revolved around the dynamics of gender, race, and even rank. By the time
spring rolled around, several new female faculty who had been matched with at
least one female mentor commented on the benefits of same-gender matching for
them: "I think the fact that my college mentor is a female helps. [Her department
was predominantly male.] It is helpful to hear a minority perspective." In the
single instance cited regarding race, the professor (presumably white) also gained
from the mentor's minority status. At the unit level, a department mentor shared,
"We're both strong women in a very male-dominated department; my mentee
had already picked up on politics in her program." A single same-status comment
that came from a college mentor was, "The match was a good one—we're both
senior colleagues."

Benefits. Survey questions also focused on benefits derived from the mentoring
process. Mentors believed that the new faculty particularly benefited in the areas
of guidance and support, collegiality and networking, understanding of tenure-
related concerns and university politics, and faculty development and connec-
tions. During the fall semester, college mentors pinpointed general assistance,
guidance, and direction as gains, including "guidance on grant development and
understanding performance expectations," "having a friendly and recognizable
face out of the department," "increased knowledge of what's available here," and
"introduction to key folks."

College mentors' responses differed somewhat in the spring, with greater em-
phasis on performance review, contrasting with the fall responses that priori-
tized gaining a sense of familiarity within the college. This progression seems
logical. College mentors specifically noted as mentee-derived benefits "guidance
and advice related to tenure and promotion, as well as annual review," and "a
better understanding of the university's bureaucracy."

Department mentors felt that their mentees moved forward by developing a
"more in-depth understanding of the unit's particular programs," as in gifted
education, "reduction of ambiguity regarding policies," and "clarification of ap-
propriate duties and responsibilities, and of potential research." Other internal
mentors noted "getting a running start instead of floundering or muddling
through" as advantages that they experienced. Unlike college mentors who fo-
cused on tenure-related issues during the spring semester, department mentors
attended to other matters, primarily involving collegiality and programs (e.g.,
"getting to know me and my working style, essential in a faculty program, and

our academic programs and how they function were all priorities"); problem solving, socialization, and productivity (e.g., "awareness of issues faced by new faculty and problem-solving," "faster socialization and fewer mistakes," "information about resources and advice about proposals)," and timeliness of developmental learning (e.g., "She found what we talked about helpful only after she had confirmed that she could 'survive' and be successful"). Meanwhile, only a few department mentors reported in the spring that they had broached the subject of policies and evaluation: "I focused on the information in promotional policies that's really important" and "For promotion and tenure, I stressed that the bottom line is someone who's a good role model in the college." In both instances, new faculty were offered help with the demystification of spoken and, importantly, unspoken rules associated with tenure.

New faculty reported numerous benefits from the department- and college-level mentoring: grant and research development, connections with faculty and the community, and a growing awareness of potential resources. After just 1 month on the job, they had already "developed some awareness of university resources and personnel" and "made contact with faculty outside the department." Their spring responses regarding the college mentoring confirmed more than these outcomes, reinforcing the benefits of guidance and feedback: "I was guided on the annual review process," "My mentor sat in on a class and did a critique," and "I learned about available resources and got feedback on ideas." Unlike college mentors, who specified tenure-related issues as a mentoring benefit, the new faculty underscored the value of collegiality.

As revealed, the new professors acknowledged having received extensive support and guidance from their department mentors. As early as September, they cited such specifics as "My research interests have been narrowed from four areas to one," "I have gained better control of my time, in effect limiting my time on campus," and "My mentor has passed on some very useful tips." Comments from the spring data that support a sense of collegiality among faculty include "I got a new research grant! My mentor had suggested applying, plus he provided feedback on an early draft of the proposal," "I developed connections with other faculty and with the community—faster than I could have on my own," and "I was protected from teaching a graduate and undergraduate course simultaneously this summer. Without this intervention, I would have been teaching two separate courses while being paid for one." Interestingly, the last mentor was described as a "nonbeliever in formal mentoring." The benefit of having established a collaborative process that requires individuals to be supportive and respectful of one another might have occurred even in the most unlikely cases.

The college and department mentors provided similar feedback on the topic of collegiality. Feedback from college mentors throughout the year highlighted that they "got to know a new colleague," "enjoyed conversations, hoping that I'm

helping," "benefited from working with a new faculty member and from listening to this individual's research goals and interests, which makes me think about my own more," "fulfilled the role of having served as a mentor to someone new," and "planned the team-teaching of a course with the new colleague." Department mentors noted that they received similar benefits from their mentoring relationships, with nuances sometimes befitting a unit-level context: "I received validation for the assessment procedures in my particular program and the inherent challenges of being a one-person program faculty worker," "Companionship! collegiality! proved invigorating," "I experienced the joy of sharing and helping," and "I gained a colleague with talent and insight." Several internal mentors gave credence to discussion of tenure-related issues, describing such specifics as having "together reviewed the university's policies regarding promotion and tenure."

Overall and importantly, mentors at the department and college levels reported a sense of fulfillment, enjoyment, and satisfaction from mentoring new faculty. One internal mentor reminisced, "It reminds me of the struggle of the early years, lest I forget, and helps develop my understanding of 'young' colleagues."

Discernible strengths. All parties were invited to reflect on possible strengths attributed to the mentoring program, including the matching process. The strengths identified were numerous, highlighting the NFMP's existence, philosophy, and flexibility, in addition to the coordinator's willingness to help, strong communication, collegiality, and respect.

New faculty shed light on their college mentoring relationships: "We are both willing for the process to occur," "We have mutual respect for each other's work," "We were matched across levels of appointment," and, notably, "Integrity and honesty were strengths, as my mentor really listened and responded to my concerns but was also willing to make good suggestions." About their departmental mentorships, new faculty detailed as strengths "similar research interests," "being assisted with protecting my time," and "having an expert on the lookout to help me."

College and department faculty, during both the fall and spring, observed, "This program formalizes the mentoring process and adds some accountability to the college for assisting in the development of its new members." They added, "I think this program will prove vital to our college's retention of new faculty," "It provides an advocate for someone learning the ropes," "Good collegial interaction was promoted," and "It hooked us up and offered the newcomer an outlet. My sense is that this faculty member is developing several key relationships, which is great!"

Noticeable weaknesses. Weaknesses acknowledged by department and college mentors in the spring included inadequate funding for the faculty mentors, insufficient informal gatherings, and a lack of training concerning the mentoring role: "There was no structure to this, no introduction. It might have been fun to

have a few gatherings for mentor and mentees during the year," and "I volunteered in my unit to be a mentor—a good idea might be to list mentors and their areas of expertise." It was certainly not the case that the program lacked structure; however, experienced faculty vary with respect to the degree of structure they require in order to feel comfortable in the formal role of mentor. Even where scaffolds are established and expectations clarified for faculty mentors, some may inevitably feel uncertain about their own role and contributions to an endeavor (Eliasson, Berggren, & Bondestam, 2000).

Several new faculty also viewed proximity to their mentors as an obstacle, observing that "weaknesses are derived from the logistics of *not* being centrally located at the regional campus" and "My mentor is very busy, and we are on different campuses." To clarify, because affiliated regional faculty are not situated at the Tampa (main) campus, physical distance proved a challenge for them. Regarding the perception of newcomers that they may be imposing on their new colleagues when seeking help, two new faculty were reluctant to make requests of their already overloaded college mentors. Overall, however, the new faculty members expressed few concerns about their college mentoring arrangements.

With regard to their departmental arrangement, several new faculty members cited mentor disinterest and lack of readiness ("lack of interest on the part of my mentor," "not sure my mentor believes in the process and is committed to meeting"); scheduling and proximity ("time and distance"); and program politics ("Because my department mentor was within my immediate program, it sometimes felt a little too close for comfort. I felt hesitant to discuss problems"). New faculty who work in close proximity to effective mentors do not always feel that it is politically astute to express all of their concerns, despite the assumed confidentiality. This cautionary note suggests the potential need for a network of supports or trusted colleagues beyond the formal two-mentor arrangement. Again, the larger goal might be for the program and college to foster a broader, more natural network of supports, confidants, and mentors.

Program highlights and suggested improvements. Participants were also asked to briefly state what they liked about the program and to identify areas of improvement for the spring semester and the upcoming 2006–2007 cycle. College and department faculty endorsed the existence, philosophy, and goals of the program and acknowledged the need for it: "The college recognized the importance of creating a support foundation for new faculty," "The fact that this program is formalized and systemized is important," "The very establishment of this program shows care for new faculty development," "Pairing new faculty with a mentor as soon as they join this university has got to help foster new faculty retention and satisfaction," and "I am completely sold on the role of mentoring and Cognitive Coaching; I see mentoring as a 'two-way street.' Kudos for doing this!" New faculty endorsed the program's philosophy, specifically its "triangular

structure" and support for incoming professors, and the attention paid to their "endless needs."

Improvements suggested by mentors for both the spring semester and year two revolved around obtaining "funding for mentor training and mentee support," "recognizing and providing incentives beyond intrinsic rewards," "creating a web site to facilitate communication," and, most importantly, "establishing faculty-wide commitment to support new faculty." Also in the spring, half of the department mentors and several new faculty requested program-led social activities where all mentoring parties could interact: "Have some social activity once or twice with all the new faculty and their mentors" and "Possibly offer a mid-semester meeting where all mentors and mentees can mingle." The call for socializing understandably came mostly from the mentors, as the newcomers were engaged in organized social activities throughout the year.

Discussion: Insights and Lessons

No college-wide, tenure-earning faculty mentoring program is free of concerns, especially in the embryonic state. Human dynamics within mentoring situations are complicated and somewhat unpredictable, and so new mentoring programs in particular will have blemishes. As Fullan (1999) wisely advised, dynamics can be "designed and stimulated in the right direction but can never be controlled" (p. 3). Furthermore, although practitioners might want to formalize mentoring programs, emphasizing such aspects as responsibility and accountability, researchers have clearly established that academic mentors and their learning partners prefer that mentoring processes be as informal (unstaged) as possible (Mullen, 2007; Noe, 1988; Scandura, 1998); however, spontaneous mentoring involves greater commitment and risk, as the promised assistance does not always occur (Blake-Beard, 2001; Mullen, 2005), which leaves some new faculty feeling abandoned or at least less-than-competent. Formal mentoring, then, not only potentially compensates for situations bereft of faculty bonding but also better positions college leaders to meet their goals of retention and success while generating widespread cultural change.

Toward this end, attention on mutual commitment and interest, scholarly overlap, diversity, and other variables that inform (but do not mandate) the making of good faculty matches within USF's COEDU are of utmost importance. Another goal we have is to continue soliciting recommendations for improvement and, when advisable, acting on these.

Faculty Mentor Support

Most faculty mentors were willing to provide the new professors with much-needed guidance and support that, in effect, supported the classic functions of formal mentoring: career (e.g., protection, visibility) and psychosocial (e.g., role modeling, counseling). Additionally, they supported the junior faculty members' expressed interests in such areas as teaching, grants development, and manuscript preparation. The quality and regularity of mentoring varied across the college and department assigned relationships. Meetings with internal mentors were, as could be expected, less formal and more frequent and departmentally focused. Office and campus proximity was identified by all three groups as crucial to the regularity and success of mentoring.

It is important not to overreact, viewing as somehow "less than" the off-campus mentorship or college mentor role. Instead, it is advisable to have realistic expectations for this type of mentoring relationship, as it embodies a different purpose than the department mentor role. Although the college and department mentoring arrangements functioned somewhat differently in this mentoring program, they were nonetheless complementary. Consistent with strengths inherent in the particular role, as confidants, college mentors mostly offered a safe haven, providing objective viewpoints on issues involving promotion and personalities, whereas department mentors focused on relationship-building and problem solving. Over the course of the year, then, the college mentors might have served more of a careerist, preparatory function embodying a long-term view, whereas department mentors seemed more local in their emphasis, educating about the survivalist aspects of the work; however, these mentoring functions and efforts naturally overlapped, with all supportive mentors, regardless of physical location, offering career and psychosocial benefits that ranged from help with adjustment to a new place to assistance with scholarly development.

Triangular mentoring. With regard to the NFMP, the results that we obtained suggest that both mentoring groups nurtured the career and psychosocial needs of the mentees to whom they were assigned. Perhaps because a mentoring mindset and climate were established in the college, nonappointed faculty and chairs also rose to the occasion when necessary and, in at least two cases, unofficially assumed mentoring responsibilities. Validation of the program and its centerpiece—the triangular mentoring relationship—was confirmed through data analysis. It appears from the results obtained that a mentoring culture supportive of new faculty members was beginning to take shape, and at a level not previously experienced in this education college. The importance of "growing" a mentoring culture cannot be underestimated, as this can have the effect of contributing significantly to the development of a robust social network.

Obstacles to Faculty Mentoring

Physical distance. Importantly, both college and department mentors reported that a growing sense of collegiality with their mentees influenced the development of the relationship. Mentoring parties located at a distance, then, could feel genuine concern for one another, which in turn fostered collegiality, ensuring support. On the other hand, physical distance and time stood out as barriers to effective mentoring for some parties. Distance had less to do with whether the mentor was situated outside the new professor's unit, and more to do with whether he or she was located at a different campus. The new professors who were situated at the regional campuses were inevitably challenged. As one solution, most of the newly hired regional faculty agreed to have three mentors, with at least one from their own site and another from the main campus.

Reluctant mentoring. Another barrier was the perceived reluctance of several mentors to fulfill the expected functions of mentoring. To a far lesser extent, the willingness of mentees to reach out for support was questioned—those who "lapsed" did so with college mentors, who were typically external to their campus. The recommendation that matching be made more carefully is tricky. The matches were all made cautiously; however, personality and circumstances defy stasis. For example, part way through the year, two college mentors were promoted into administration, which strained the arrangements. Ironically, the new faculty who had been matched with them requested that the pairings remain intact for year two.

Program intervention. As a fiercely independent lot, academics tend to march to the beat of their own drummers. Not all seasoned faculty value mentoring others, and not all neophyte faculty can benefit from mentoring and networking. There is no shame in this if the latter is able to make the expected progress as tenure-earning faculty by receiving acceptances from publishers, good teaching evaluations from students, and so forth (Johnson = Mullen, 2007). It is a major professional concern, however, when new faculty seek mentoring and experience frustration and discouragement. Thus, there is a need for program leaders to frequently monitor the experience, enabling early "intervention," if necessary. An end-of-year evaluation is too late to discover that someone may have had a frustrating or disappointing experience. Hence, we incorporated new faculty-only gatherings in the early fall, along with survey assessment; additionally, the program director held private communications with the faculty participants who were protected by a policy of confidentiality she had developed.

Program Improvements for Year Two

For the transitional period at the end of the first year and for the second-year cycle of this program, all of the participants' recommendations were satisfied. The 2005 spring data were analyzed in time to satisfy the request for recognition, information, and other program changes; some were made at the tail-end of the inaugural year, with changes implemented for the second year. Recognition occurred through certificates of recognition (signed by the college dean and president) and custom-designed thank you cards, as well as hard-copy distribution of the director's newly created research-based booklet (Mullen, 2006) that included a listing of the faculty mentors for both years. Also generated was a NFMP directory of all participants, complete with contact information for faculty (and program leaders), including their areas of research interest and expertise. Institutional recognition for mentoring is essential; otherwise, mentors may regard themselves "solely as facilitators, not expecting any gains for themselves" (Eliasson et al., p. 177).

Regarding a mentor's request for the establishment of a program web site, one had, in fact, been posted prior to the onset of the inaugural year; participants were notified. The site contained a welcome statement, NFMP principles and program goals, mentoring matches and relationships, yearly meeting dates, a new faculty list, a learning goals form for new faculty, survey forms for all participant groups, workshops, and resources. The web site was updated for year two, with the posting of the NFMP booklet, social events, responsibilities of key parties, the program directory, and more. We are currently considering whether participants would like to engage in a private discussion board, however, the challenge remains to avoid inundating participating mentees and mentors with program expectations that are not collectively shared.

In addition, the suggestion that mentor training be financially supported was acted upon. The program director obtained resources from Dean Colleen Kennedy for a luncheon that included all mentoring parties as well as the printing of all materials. Mentors did not request or receive extra pay for their time.

"Faculty-wide commitment to support new faculty" is also expected to evolve, with combined efforts on the part of the NFMP leaders and faculty more generally. Recognition that formal mentoring is essential to college-wide buy-in was prompted, for example; the program director asked the first-year faculty whether they wanted to continue in the program. Ninety percent agreed to extend their formal arrangements for a second year. One test of formal mentoring success in any organization is for new faculty to want to continue to receive mentoring from senior faculty. These protracted arrangements will be examined at the conclusion of the second year, along with the new mentoring relationships that are formed. Based on this program modification that extends the opportunity for

mentoring for first-year faculty, it will be possible to learn more about formal mentoring within research cultures and its evolutionary process. It is, therefore, desirable to gather data concerning the development or emergence of informal mentoring support networks.

As another strategy for soliciting college-wide involvement, although some of the same mentors continued into the second year, new ones were also welcomed. For year three of the NFMP program, it is anticipated that almost all of the assigned mentors will be new; however, some of the mentors will be retained to maintain continuity and support. A vision guiding this program is to involve as many willing and capable senior faculty as possible.

Additional improvements introduced in year two of the NFMP were: (1) a mentoring training session (identified as "meet and greet," complete with other inclusive social events), (2) a mentoring agreement for parties wanting to clarify what is expected (see University of Manitoba, 2006), (3) a new survey item with best-match variables, and (4) the conversion of the fall/spring survey into a user-friendly, online instrument.

Understanding Best-Match Variables of Mentor and Mentee

Dynamics of race, gender, and status surfaced sporadically in the data. The female–female arrangement was applauded by those involved, aiding its success. The gender configuration of these relationships sometimes stood in contrast with home departments that were completely male. It is a reality that professional women tend to identify with other women when men have dominant status (Ely, 1994).

Two compounding decision variables in the NFMP involve diversity in the matches and matched scholarly interests. The goal was to satisfy the criteria of diversity and overlapping scholarly interests in the three-way relationships for all matches, a strategy for enhancing each tenure-earning member's social capital (e.g., networks of support). The program was conceived as a resource for matching new faculty's scholarly interests with senior faculty who could identify with these interests and thereby be even more effective in their assistance.

For the second year, the scholarly interest of participants also remained the foremost criterion of matching; however, the Faculty Mentoring Director and department chairs continued to attend to the configuration of race and gender. The literature is mixed about the value of same-gender and cross-gender and race matching; on the one hand, we know that "women face more barriers to obtaining a mentor than men" (Ragins & Cotton, 1991, p. 939), and that women and minorities alike benefit from being mentored by capable women and minorities (Ely, 1994); on the other hand, gains can also come from being mentored by accomplished white males in cross-race relationships (Dreher & Chargois, 1998).

Consequently, matches were formed for both years along these multiple diversity lines. Because each new faculty member is assigned two mentors, diversity and balance have been upheld in the three-way arrangements. The new faculty members or their department chairs provide input on the mentoring variables that best suit each potential match (e.g., in year one, a minority female was matched with a male and a female, one minority, the other white). Consequently, the three-way matches are heterogeneous, with the expectation that greater learning will be afforded by the scope this gives.

Diversity in relationships strengthens faculty mentoring programs, promotes appreciation of group differences, and improves communications spanning cultural differences. Participants also learn about barriers that minority academics experience, as well as effective strategies for overcoming them (Ragins, 1997).

Advocacy for faculty. The role of advocacy is described in the literature as an important mentoring component, particularly for faculty of color and women. By explicitly framing advocacy as one function of mentoring (e.g., see Ragins & McFarlin, 1990), mentees and mentors may feel better situated to explore challenges, which include reducing real and perceived barriers for newcomers. We have provided examples of advocacy herein, as in the case where a new faculty member was protected from teaching a graduate and undergraduate course simultaneously and, thus, from having to do two different course preparations within a short time. In that instance, the chair (potentially a faculty mentor) supported the faculty mentor by reaching a shared understanding with a regional administrator. Also, consideration of best-match variables when creating mentoring relationships, as in the case of the NFMP, is a good example of advocacy. Finally, effective mentors go above and beyond the call of duty to assist new faculty, and their efforts are often focused on advocating for them.

Last Push: The Hope, the Dream

The New Faculty Mentoring Program is obviously evolving. Modifications continue to be made based on faculty participants' input and assessment, and on the brainstorming and "tinkering" of the leaders involved. As recounted, the administrative leaders in the education college that houses this program have a strong interest in seeing that tenure-track faculty members realize their full potential as tenured scholars who are productive and well-adjusted. New faculty who have the help of a mentor fare better both as teachers and researchers, and they experience higher confidence and morale (Allen & Eby, 2007).

The NFMP supports the development and retention of new faculty who, through ongoing mentoring from senior faculty, make progress toward tenure and promotion. They also gain by being guided and advised about various facets

of their discipline, college, and university, all in order to help them succeed as a scholar, teacher, and colleague. All incoming junior faculty are given two faculty mentors who focus on their agenda in the areas in which they feel a need for support and emphasis. Faculty mentors help them with making a successful transition to the USF community. Some new developments of year one of this mentoring program are that faculty will participate in annual "meet and greet" luncheons, conversational gatherings for new faculty, library, and other information sessions, panel talks around scholarly themes, and more. Such opportunities enable new faculty to "hit the ground running" while launching their academic careers in ways that are not only productive, but also collaborative and personally fulfilling.

Universities that function as mentoring organizations by encouraging and facilitating mentor–protégé relationships are offering something relatively new (Forret, Turban, & Dougherty, 1996), yet this is "the future, coming on 'like a freight-train'" (Loeb, as cited in Gibb, 1999). A few recent hires in USF's College of Education have actually requested, as part of the negotiating process, that they be allowed to participate in the college-wide mentoring program for tenure-earning faculty, only to learn the good news that they will automatically become part of it. Not every mentoring relationship works, but everything humanly possible should be done to ensure that new faculty members succeed. No matter how much is done to create excellent mentoring relationships, each "birth" will unfold in its own way. We hope that this mentoring program will reach what Gladwell (2002) referred to as the "tipping point." Applied to the COEDU context, this will become obvious when, through synergy and reinforcement, faculty mentoring becomes contagious. What is currently modest with respect to being a movement can be expected to grow once faculty–faculty mentoring within the research culture studied "sticks." Relatively minor changes have been known to dramatically affect how faculty behave and who they are. The story we have told is about efforts to make a program, and its message about the importance of mentoring budding scholars, permanent by creating scaffolds that enable critical parties to think and act differently.

Finally, formal mentoring programs that are successful make a difference to new academics and even seasoned faculty. Support networks like USF's NFMP encourage the exchange of experience and promising practice, as well as cultural change. In hindsight, mentoring not only involves a birth from without, with respect to changing ideas and behaviors, it also facilitates a rebirth from within.

List of Steps to Take

As an aid for assisting with the development of new faculty mentoring programs at other institutions, ideas and strategies intrinsic to the creation of USF's New Faculty Mentoring Program are listed below. Additional ideas and tips for fostering formal faculty mentoring programs are also available (see Mullen, Kennedy, & Keller, 2006). Keep in mind that every context is unique, which means that program adaptations are inevitable (Fullan, 1999).

- Solicit the endorsement and involvement of key faculty and university leaders in creating a mentoring program, and develop a shared understanding among the parties of the purposes and goals, and processes and procedures, of the program.

- Stipulate through a negotiation process the resources needed to support and finance the mentoring program (e.g., staff assistance, course release, financial stipend, refreshments for meetings, paperwork).

- Consider the dynamics of race, gender, status, and anything else when matching mentors with mentees.

- Identify criteria to be followed for carefully selecting faculty mentors (e.g., proven expertise in faculty mentoring) and use these as a guide.

- Sponsor various mentoring activities throughout the academic year that help nurture the development of new faculty and their mentoring relationships.

- Create formal assessments and continually introduce program modifications (from one semester and year to the next) based on faculty input and personal reflection.

- Develop assessments and analyze data using such proven empirical methods as team-based approaches to interrater reliability, data triangulation, and consultation of the literature (e.g., best practices); also, consult specialists (e.g., survey analysts).

- Publicly share outcomes of the mentoring initiative to benefit other institutions and leaders, and to help fill gaps in the educational literature.

Key Definitions

Learning partner. *Protégé* and *mentee* are the typical descriptors used in the mentoring literature to designate new faculty in mentoring relationships, whereas *mentee* is most frequently used herein. The NFMP leaders see the mentee's role as

a *learning partner*. *Protégé* is not used in this chapter; even though it means "to protect," this term could signal just the opposite to some readers for whom *protégé* cònnotes institutionally embedded, hierarchically situated, and, importantly, patronizing, if not potentially oppressive, relations.

Department mentor. A seasoned faculty member who has daily or consistent contact with the new academic and who serves as a significant source of support.

College mentor. A senior faculty member who is physically located outside the new faculty member's unit and who serves as a sounding board and confidant.

Social network. Informal networks of mentoring support function as a type of social capital that contributes to building capital in the organization.

Triangular mentoring. Department mentors and college mentors join new faculty to form a triad in which the newcomer is mentored, most typically through one-to-one, albeit intersecting, arrangements.

Tipping point. Synergy and reinforcement among faculty makes effective mentoring possible and, in turn, builds capacity within responsive learning organizations.

End Notes

[1]This study received USF's Institutional Review Board approval in 2005.

[2]The motivation behind collecting data from all participants just 1 month into the fall term was to set the pace for mentoring early on, when new faculty clearly need guidance.