8   Facilitating Faculty Success

People are not born knowing how to be successful in their work. They learn how to be successful through access to information and opportunities, and especially challenges and opportunities to learn from low-stakes failures. People also learn through the examples of others whom they would like to emulate and think they could emulate. It is to a department's advantage to provide the conditions in which faculty can do their best work. Although departments hire faculty who have survived an elaborate process of selection in graduate school for their intellectual skills, some areas of professional development may have been relatively neglected or may not have been addressed because they were not appropriate for the individual's position as a graduate student or postdoctoral fellow. Because of those lacunae, most faculty benefit from opportunities to learn a wide range of skills not included in their disciplinary education or apprenticeship. Moreover, retention of all faculty is enhanced when institutions have communicated the value of the faculty and expressed support for them by providing professional development opportunities.

The Job Demands of Being a Faculty Member

Being a high-functioning faculty member is a very complex job. The job includes managing time and responsibilities; deciding where to focus one's energies; making intellectual progress in answering the questions one has posed; applying for funding; teaching effectively and efficiently; gaining value and pleasure from attending conferences; presenting good papers; balancing research, teaching, and service responsibilities; balancing work and a personal life; finding collaborators; operating within a diverse community of faculty and students; working with staff; mentoring graduate

students and junior colleagues; choosing meaningful ways to contribute to the institution and discipline; continuing to develop intellectually in a variety of roles; and supporting leaders whose vision one values.

Responsibilities and opportunities change as a professional career progresses. We devote most of this chapter to strategies that apply to junior faculty in particular or apply across the board to all faculty, regardless of rank.

Evaluating One's Progress

One of the main features of academic work that makes it appealing—the independence and autonomy it offers—is also what makes it challenging. The job is challenging for everyone, and part of the challenge is realistically evaluating one's pluses and minuses. White women and underrepresented minorities are less likely than White men to receive opportunities to excel in new research areas and less likely to receive recognition for their research achievements (as we have discussed). The feedback that White women and underrepresented minorities receive, if they take it as reasonably informative about their value, will result in their feeling less entitled than is appropriate. White men, who receive more positive feedback and recognition, will also tend to interpret the feedback they receive as informative and will thus feel more entitled than is appropriate, given their performance (Hogue, Yoder, & Singleton, 2007; Pelham & Hetts, 2001). Women tend to boast less than equivalently accomplished men do (Reuben, Sapienza, & Zingales, 2014). It is difficult for people to appraise their own contributions realistically since part of realism requires taking others' reactions into account, and people's reactions are skewed.

Universal Design

In our view, men and women should be treated similarly, as should Whites and people of color. However, that does not mean treating women like men or treating men like women; similarly, it does not mean treating people of color like Whites nor Whites like people of color. Rather, it means that one finds a way to convey the information that will be the same for everyone *and* will take into account the differences in how people are likely to react. It means applying principles of universal design,

as described in the preface: that is, the solution should take into account the range of possible human responses and be tailored to include as many people as possible.

Overview of the Chapter

This chapter reviews what everyone needs to know to be successful and presents examples of programs that help ensure that everyone has access to that information. The chapter describes five kinds of faculty development programs that can be successful: classical one-on-one mentoring, circles of advisors, peer mentoring, workshops, and launch committees for new faculty. It is possible for an institution to offer all or only some of them. These programs should be assessed in terms of their success in reducing race and gender gaps in outcomes, including success in obtaining tenure, retention, time in rank before promotion, access to leadership opportunities in rank-appropriate ways, and representation in leadership positions.

Organized faculty development programs and opportunities make it more likely that all faculty will be successful both inside and outside of the institution. Yet few institutions pay more than lip service to faculty development. For example, some institutions claim to have a mentoring program, and they do, but what they mean by mentoring is that a senior faculty member meets with the junior faculty member once or twice a year. Moreover, we have found—and we have heard this from other colleagues too—that the higher the administrative source on how mentoring works in an institution, the more likely it is portrayed positively and as very successful. To know how mentoring is going, it is crucial to gather information from the presumptive "mentees."

We assume that most people have the twin goals of wanting to be as effective as possible in their work and of wanting to enjoy their work and their life as a whole. There are sometimes limitations on how effective a person can be or how enjoyable their work and life can be, due to external life circumstances. For example, someone may have unusual caretaking responsibilities or may have a chair or head who is a tyrant. Time and chance happen to us all.

Nevertheless, there are skills people can acquire that will allow them to work effectively, efficiently, and enjoyably. Those skills require information and practice. We address here the steps faculty can take to acquire the

skills to be a successful and fulfilled academic. In the ideal case, the college or university has tested programs in place that will facilitate faculty development, and a faculty member's chair or dean will ensure that all faculty have the opportunity to participate in those programs. Even if institutional support is lacking, faculty themselves can take the lead in obtaining the information and skills they need.

Faculty Development

The Classical Conception of Mentoring

Perhaps the most widely adopted and popular kind of program to increase the success of individual junior faculty is mentoring.

Defining Mentoring   Different people mean different things by mentoring—so different that there is no way of determining, just from the term "mentoring," what such a program might include. Some departments assign every new faculty member a "mentor." What that can mean in practice is that the faculty member meets with the mentor once a semester or year, during which time the mentor asks how things are going and the faculty member says that they are going pretty well. This is like the server who stops by your table in a restaurant and says, "Are you enjoying your meal?" Or it can mean that the mentor meets frequently with the faculty member, gives advice on professional and personal matters, advocates for the faculty member, and serves as a professional model. Or it can mean something in between.

The inadequate end of the distribution of possible ways to mentor is exemplified by a department chair who told us that his department had a mentoring program: "Every year I have an annual evaluation session with junior faculty." That yearly evaluation took about 15 minutes. During the meeting he filled out a form, assigning ratings of "satisfactory," "needs improvement," "unsatisfactory," or "not applicable" in three areas, research, teaching, and service. That seems to nail down a procedure that is not actually mentoring at all.

At the other end of the distribution is the idea of the mentor as sage, advocate, career planner and manager, issuer of challenges to do better, emotional supporter, and tireless giver of advice for all aspects of life until such time as the mentee or protégé no longer needs mentoring. We know of

mentors like this, but the number of people who can be or want to be that sort of mentor is tiny. Mentoring that requires that much knowledge, dedication, and time is going to be mentoring for the few by the very few. And mentoring, like any interpersonal relationship, includes negative as well as positive aspects (Eby, Butts, Durley, & Ragins, 2010). Any relationship is more likely to endure when people feel positively valued by the other person. In academia, where critical analysis is part of everyday professional practice, that may be hard to achieve.

Formal Mentoring Programs   Most colleges and universities do not have a consistent mentoring program that operates across all departments, and most do not have any training of people who supervise graduate students or postdoctoral fellows. Even fewer have training programs for senior faculty to mentor junior faculty. Colleges and universities train graduate students and postdocs in how to do research. After that, academics are on their own.

Does Mentoring "Work"?   Despite the large literature on mentoring, it is very difficult to determine whether it "works." Mentoring effects can be measured in terms of objective and subjective benefits and costs to the mentee or protégé(e) (Kram, 1985; Kram & Ragins, 2007; see Allen & Eby, 2011, for a suite of articles). Objective benefits or costs might include various measures of career progress, such as number of publications, number of grants, invitations to speak at scholarly events, progress through the ranks, and so on. Those benefits are occasionally measured, but the length of studies does not always allow extended measurements. Subjective benefits or costs might include various measures of attitudes and motivations, and those subjective benefits or costs might in turn lead to objective benefits or costs.

Some people argue for the value of only creating mentoring relationships between people who are of the same gender and/or race. In our view this is both impossible and unwise. First, wherever there are increasing numbers of a group, the small number of senior people in that group will be overburdened by mentoring. Second, this assumes that sharing group membership is always a basis for a relationship of trust and that not sharing group membership is always a basis for a relationship of mistrust. Neither is true. (For a description of mentoring written by a White mentor and

an American Indian mentee, see Fryberg & Gerken, 2012.) That said, it is always helpful for young faculty who belong to an outnumbered group (by race, gender, sexuality, disability, etc.) to have access to senior faculty who are like them, not only as mentors but as role models and sources of community. Those people do not need to be their official mentors. They can be members of a network or a circle of advisors they seek out if they are so inclined, and their mentors and department chair can facilitate their meeting such people.

A major difficulty in establishing the effects of mentoring is that there is seldom an adequate control group (for reviews, see Allen, Eby, Poteet, Lentz, & Lima, 2004; Eby, Allen, Evans, Ng, & DuBois, 2008; Kammeyer-Mueller & Judge, 2008; Underhill, 2006). Informal, or spontaneous, mentoring relationships are common among successful individuals (e.g., Blickle, Witzki, & Schneider, 2009), but in such cases the mentees are self-selected and have selected or been selected by their mentor. Such individuals may simultaneously be engaging in a variety of other behaviors that will help their career. In formal mentoring relationships, where individuals are paired through a formal system of some sort—for example, the departmental chair assigns a mentor to a faculty member—there is again no control group. The documented positive effects are usually modest, and the underlying mechanism for their success remains unclear (Baranik, Roling, & Eby, 2010; Egan & Song, 2008). Mentoring may help mentees in part because the mentor becomes more invested in the mentee's success (Dobbin, Schrage, & Kalev, 2015).

Can Mentoring Harm?   Although negligence on a mentor's part is harmful, the worst way to be a bad mentor is to have a destructive and negative style (Eby et al., 2010; for a qualitative assessment, see, e.g., Straus, Johnson, Marquez, & Feldaman, 2013). From the mentee's perspective, a bad mentor is worse than a mentor who is absent and unresponsive because a bad mentor poisons the mentee's aspirations and goals. Negative terms, even though used less often than positive terms, have a disproportionate effect on the listener, creating a general negativity bias (Ito, Larsen, Smith, & Cacioppo, 1998; Rozin & Royzman, 2001).

One of us heard a male colleague mention an early experience as a faculty member: he had spoken to a senior faculty member about the difficulties of managing his research, applying for funding, being a good teacher, and performing service. The senior person said, in effect, if you can't stand the

heat, get out of the kitchen. Thirty years later, this man still remembered that comment and its negative effect on him.

Mentoring and Evaluation   Both senior and junior faculty worry that the same people will play two roles in the lives of junior faculty: mentors or advisors and evaluators at critical career reviews. It is inevitable that some individuals will play both roles, but we believe that senior faculty can learn how to separate them, and junior faculty can be sensible about their own actions.

Senior faculty, when they are providing advice to a younger colleague, need to remember that they are providing *advice*, not instruction. Colleagues must make their own decisions. Whether a junior colleague did or did not follow the senior colleague's advice is not an appropriate issue to bring up when evaluating the junior person's success at career assessments. Similarly, it is inappropriate to bring up information that a junior colleague may have disclosed, such as a teaching problem or a difficulty with a collaborator. The focus of evaluations is the individual's career outcomes, not the particulars of the individual's path.

It is helpful for both mentors and mentees to know from the beginning whether they will be expected to play a major role in evaluation (e.g., because their expertise is pertinent). Mentees must discuss some problems in their work lives with their advisors if they are to get relevant assistance, but they can exercise discretion as to when and with whom to discuss those problems. They may choose to discuss some problems only with those colleagues who will not participate in assessment of their professional competence for institutional reviews.

Passive or Active Mentees?   Even if perfect mentors were plentiful, we see other problems with the classical conception of a mentor. For one thing, it implicitly puts the wrong person in the driver's seat. Each individual should be in charge of his or her own professional life, deciding where he or she wants to go next, figuring out which people to ask for advice, information, advocacy, support, and challenges to excel. A study with undergraduates taught them how to find a range of people, so that they had a "composite mentor." The students became more proactive in their education as a result and changed their pretraining idea of a mentor as a single person to a posttraining idea that many people could be usefully consulted in developing their undergraduate trajectory (Packard, 2003).

Mentoring across Academic Careers   The traditional conception suggests that there will come a time when someone no longer needs advice, advocacy, support, challenge, and information. Thus, this conception suggests that it is the weak who need a mentor. One woman we know told her chair that she wanted a mentor, and he said, "Oh, you're too good for that; you don't need a mentor." This illustrates an unfortunate connotation that many people have of "mentor": a mentor is needed by people who don't know what they are doing.

We reject that conception. Everyone can benefit from good advice, support, challenge, and information throughout their professional lives, no matter who they are. Everyone can learn more and develop. We also reject a model that suggests that everyone should have a stable, clear idea about his or her goals because that model forecloses growth. Sometimes goals change. People change their research direction or area. They turn to service to the institution or the profession. Even when goals remain stable—to do one's research, teaching, and service well—one's changing status within the institution and the discipline may add new dimensions to those goals. Associate and full professors may find that junior colleagues now ask them for advice. Most faculty are informal mentors, whether or not they want to be, to students. Senior faculty similarly become informal mentors to junior faculty. Yet there are few formal occasions on which faculty can learn how to excel at giving advice, help, and support (i.e., in a way that will actually benefit the person who has asked for advice, help, or support). Who will mentor the mentors, so that they can mentor well?

A Model Mentor Training Program   Medical schools have increasingly risen to the challenge of providing training for mentors of medical students, postdoctoral fellows, and junior faculty. A 26-item Mentoring Competency Assessment (MCA) can be used by would-be or current mentors in medical schools to evaluate their mentoring in six areas: maintaining effective communication, aligning expectations, assessing understanding, addressing diversity, promoting professional development, and fostering independence (Fleming, House, Shewakramani, Yu, Garbutt, McGee, et al., 2013). This assessment tool was developed initially through the Research Mentor Training group (http://www.researchmentortraining.org/index.aspx) and subsequently through the Center for Improvement of Mentored Experiences

in Research (CIMER, http://cimerproject.org) within the University of Wisconsin. It can be adapted for broader purposes.

One value of the assessment is to show mentors important areas that they may not be thinking about. The category of aligning expectations, for example, includes "setting clear relationship expectations" and "considering mentor-mentee differences." Many supervisors, in our experience, do not consider the possibility that a student may have different goals than they have. We have provided the full set of 26 MCA items in box 8.1, which is also available at the University of Wisconsin website. Their research suggests that people who are highly motivated to be good mentors can develop their skills through training.[1]

On balance, we think that mentoring can be successful, especially if mentors are highly motivated and receive training or support in how to mentor. Many institutions provide handbooks to faculty that can be used by both mentors and mentees and help them identify their joint goals and how they will work together (for one example, see the resources available under career advising at the University of Michigan's ADVANCE website).

Box 8.1
Mentoring Competency Assessment (MCA)

> **Please rate how skilled you feel you are in each of the following areas:**
> [Think about your skill generally, with all your mentees. Please only choose "not applicable" (N/A) when a skill cannot be applied to any of your mentees.]
>
> 1 = not at all skilled
> 4 = moderately skilled
> 7 = extremely skilled
> n/a = not applicable
>
> 1. Active listening
> 2. Providing constructive feedback
> 3. Establishing a relationship based on trust
> 4. Identifying and accommodating different communication styles
> 5. Employing strategies to improve communication with mentees
> 6. Coordinating effectively with your mentees' other mentors

(continued)

Box 8.1 (continued)

7. Working with mentees to set clear expectations of the mentoring relationship

8. Aligning your expectations with your mentees'

9. Considering how personal and professional differences may impact expectations

10. Working with mentees to set research goals

11. Helping mentees develop strategies to meet goals

12. Accurately estimating your mentees' level of scientific knowledge

13. Accurately estimating your mentees' ability to conduct research

14. Employing strategies to enhance your mentees' knowledge and abilities

15. Motivating your mentees

16. Building mentees' confidence

17. Stimulating your mentees' creativity

18. Acknowledging your mentees' professional contributions

19. Negotiating a path to professional independence with your mentees

20. Taking into account the biases and prejudices you bring to the mentor/ mentee relationship

21. Working effectively with mentees whose personal background is different from your own (age, race, gender, class, region, culture, religion, family composition etc.)

22. Helping your mentees network effectively

23. Helping your mentees set career goals

24. Helping your mentees balance work with their personal life

25. Understanding your impact as a role mode

26. Helping your mentees acquire resources (e.g., grants, etc.)

https://uwmadison.co1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_5jMT4fhemifK01n &Q_JFE=0

But the notion of a single mentor, and the notion that mentees are limited to students, postdocs, and junior faculty, is too limiting. For people whose needs and desires for new skills continue, the time at which they no longer need advice, advocacy, support, challenge, and information is—never. If we try to apply the classical notion of a mentor, midlevel and senior people are usually out of luck. They're supposed to already know what they want to do, or they're supposed to figure it out for themselves, or they're supposed to wait for something to drop into their laps. That is an inefficient way to arrange one's next steps. While it's wonderful to already know what one wants to do next, or to be able to figure it out oneself, or for luck to smile, it seems smarter to increase one's methods for acquiring the skills one needs.

In addition to knowing the topics that one can address if one is providing professional or personal information and advice, one can learn how best to provide that information. In box 8.2 we offer suggestions for how to give constructive advice.

Box 8.2
How to Give Advice and Offer Help

Most of us have seen or heard about extraordinary mentors (e.g., Lee, Dennis, & Campbell, 2007), just as most of us have seen or heard about extraordinary teachers. By definition, "extraordinary" is not the norm. Our goal is to widen the group of people who provide advice, information, advocacy, and other mentoring activities. We do so by suggesting that people concentrate on providing the activities and opportunities where they can be most helpful. We offer here some suggestions about how to give advice and other help, based in part on our own experience and on tips from the Internet (e.g., http://www.wikihow.com/Give-People-Advice/).

Preliminaries

1. Decide what you're good at and concentrate on offering advice or help in those areas. Some people, for example, are very good at writing grants and talking to funding agencies. They can provide excellent help in that arena. Other people might be especially good at talking warmly and helping a student or colleague feel part of things. Let your junior colleagues—all of them, not just the ones you have the most rapport with—know what kind of advice or help you are prepared to offer. Be ready to say that you are not the best person to ask about X, and suggest another person who might be better on that topic.

(continued)

Box 8.2 (continued)

2. There are two broad kinds of help one can offer people: help that is directly related to the progress of their career and help that is psychologically tinged and supportive (Kram, 1985). Think carefully ahead of time about which type of help you are competent and comfortable giving. Again, be ready to say that you are not the best person to ask about X, and suggest another person who might be better on that topic.

3. Decide how much time you're willing to spend. You might not be willing to read someone's entire grant proposal because that would be too time-consuming, but you might be willing to spend 15–30 minutes discussing overall strategy, or you might be willing to read their first few introductory paragraphs. As another example, you might invite junior colleagues to have coffee with you—with no agenda other than getting to know the other person and make them feel welcome.

4. Be prepared to look at things from the point of view of the person you're talking to, even if that is not your point of view or approach. There's no value in telling someone to pull up their socks, or suck it up, or get on with it. They would have done that on their own if they could have. Think about what seems possible for that person, given what they have told you about themselves. Then query them about whether they think it would help to try X.

Giving the Advice or Help

1. Listen carefully and attentively to what people say. Paraphrase what they say to make sure you understand what they are asking for.

2. Concentrate on how you can help people reach their own goals. Their own goals may be different from the goals you would like them to have.

3. Don't promise more than you can deliver. Think about the long-term consequences of your willingness to provide advice or help. You don't want to renege on an implied promise. It's better to offer less and deliver reliably than to offer more and be inconsistent.

4. Be constructive. Don't even think about making negative personal remarks. If you don't think you can be constructive, don't do or say anything. One of us heard someone give a talk in a way that started out unnecessarily badly. We knew just what they should have done. But we had only just met the person and there was no approach that would not have made the person feel like an idiot for starting as they had. Some people make people feel bad. Don't be one of those people.

5. Let people know that there are other people whom they can query and that people can differ in their judgments about what the best course of action in a given case is.

Circle of Advisors

Not everyone is cut out to be a classical mentor, as we have already discussed. Ensuring that mentoring actually works, and that it is considerably more positive than negative, requires a consistent investment of time and resources. A different model is increasingly described in the literature in terms like "composite mentor" (Packard, 2003), "mosaic of advisors" (Rosen, Katz, & Morahan, 2009), "mosaic of mentors" (McCauley & Martineau, 1998), "personal leadership board" (Katz, Rosen, & Morahan, 2009), "developmental network" (Higgins & Kram, 2001), and "mentor network" (de Janasz & Sullivan, 2004; de Janasz, Sullivan, & Whiting, 2003). We use the term "circle of advisors," coined by the Hunter College Gender Equity Project (GEP), in order to eliminate the confusion entailed by the differing connotations that accompany "mentor" in its various guises. The circle is a virtual circle; it is possible that none of the people in the circle know one another.

In our workshops on developing a circle of advisors we discuss the various roles and kinds of help that others can offer. One feature of the workshop is having attendees identify people who could play a given role for them and the ways that they might approach the person to provide the advice, information, or help that is needed. For every role that one wants someone to fill, part of the challenge is to find someone who will be constructive rather than destructive. One of the beauties of the circle-of-advisors model is that a destructive person is easily jettisoned. One simply doesn't ask that person for advice or information again. Since one never took up much of the person's time to begin with, there is no unspoken obligation to keep seeing the person. On the classical mentor model, it is difficult to stop contact with someone who is not helpful.

Pursuing "Advisors" Do faculty announce to someone, "I want you to be in my circle of advisors?" No. They simply approach the person and ask, for example, "I wonder if you could give me some advice about applying for X. I know that you have been successful at X and I think you would have insights that would help me." Although not everyone will say yes, most people will, because most people enjoy talking about the components of their success.

The people in one's circle of advisors will change as one's needs change. Some may be consulted once a month or more often, and some may be consulted once a year or less often. (See box 8.3 for an example of an advisor who is consulted less often than once a year.)

Box 8.3
An Infrequently Consulted Advisor

> A woman tells us, I have a two-hour lunch with Ed about once a year or once every two years. This is purely a one-way relationship, which is one reason I don't talk to him more often. I would feel guilty taking up more of his time. We've known each other, though not well, for 40 years. We started out in the same field. I continued in academia, and he eventually became president of a foundation. He understands how every aspect of academia works. He also has an appreciation for unusual ideas and unconventional ways of doing things. He liked an unconventional article that I wrote a long time ago, so I think of him as someone who will be helpful when I want to do something that doesn't fit an established genre. And that's exactly what he is. I have sometimes had an idea that he's supported and sometimes had an idea that he hasn't supported. In each case, what he does—and I don't know how he does it—is ask questions and listen to what I say until *I* think, okay, I don't really want to do X, or, okay, I really do want to do X. He's not a friend, he's not someone whose professional life is similar to mine, but he's been a wonderful advisor.

Identifying Issues to Discuss   Box 8.4 has a sample list of issues that individuals can ask for help with. We developed this list from published material (McCauley & Martineau, 1998)[2] and from suggestions by workshop participants. Although individuals can do this alone, it is helpful to do it within a group so that people can make a variety of suggestions. It is helpful for people to see that they are not alone, whether it be in navigating how to order chemicals, dealing with finding a book publisher, handling the process of finding experimental participants, dealing with rejection, managing one's time efficiently, or attending conferences. Not everyone will want every kind of information or support. In the act of choosing what to concentrate on, each faculty member defines what needs attention for himself or herself.

The list in box 8.4 is not exhaustive, nor is it a list that everyone might want every item from. A given person can fill more than one role, and some roles might be filled by multiple people; the key idea is that no single person can fill every role (McCauley & Martineau, 1998). It's often a good idea to get more than one take on an issue because different people have different kinds of knowledge. We recall one woman who was told that she should not approach multiple book publishers simultaneously, that

Box 8.4
What Members of a Circle of Advisors Might Provide

General and Not Specific to Any Field; Advisor Need
Not Always Be in One's Field or Profession

1. Challenges to do better
2. Encouragement to succeed
3. Sympathetic critiques of one's self-presentational style
4. Sounding board when new opportunities or dilemmas arise
5. Help with time management and procrastination problems
6. Requirements for accountability (holding one's feet to the fire)
7. Service as devil's advocate

Specific and Work Related

1. Names of other people who might provide useful information or help
2. Advocacy on one's behalf
3. Advice on how to handle conflict within one's group
4. Experience with role-playing negotiation scenarios
5. Suggestions of items to negotiate for
6. Strategies for success, tailored to one's circumstances
7. Constructive criticism of written material
8. Knowledgeable critiques of funding proposals
9. Interpretation of negative reviews; analysis of rejection letters
10. Discussion of how to assign credit when multiple contributors are involved
11. Suggestions for how to handle an underperforming assistant
12. Suggestions of places to apply to for funding
13. Suggestions about writing the diplomatic cover letter when resubmitting a manuscript
14. Information about prizes and awards one might be eligible for
15. Information about how to advance into academic leadership positions
16. Information about book publishers

The listed items are starting points. Not all of them may be relevant to a given person, and someone might want to add others for a large group. No issue is too big or too small. If help with it would allow one to become more effective, it's worth including.

(adapted from McCauley and Martineau, 1998)

publishing a book was like publishing at article in a journal. Had she asked more people about this very important decision, she would have learned that it is permissible to approach more than one publisher (of course, letting them know that one is doing so).

In the GEP's first workshop on the topic of a circle of advisors, we included "someone to hold my feet to the fire" among the roles one might want someone to fill (our thanks to Page Morahan). One of the attendees pounced on it: "That's exactly what I need!" Because it was written down as a possibility, it was validated as a problem that people—not just that woman—might have. Even if people think they should not need such help, acknowledging that they do need it frees them to get the help and solve the problem. That particular woman went on to publish an important book. Another role that faculty might think they should be able to play for themselves is "someone to read my letters of rejection with me." In our view, everyone has areas in which he or she can do better. It shows strength to acknowledge and deal constructively with a weakness. It's more of a weakness to put a rejection letter in a drawer for several months than it is to review it with the right person.

Advisors about Life   For what psychologists call "psychosocial support," another academic is not necessary and may not even be desirable. Managing the demands of a personal and professional life is a process many people can be consulted on, and few are likely to have "the" answer. Assembling different strategies is the task for the person seeking advice. Moreover, not all issues are equally appropriate to discuss with academic advisors. For example, we advise people not to freely disclose their self-doubts to individuals who will be writing letters of recommendation for them or evaluating them for tenure and promotion. One's own doubts tend to engender other people's doubts, especially if one is a member of a group that is underrepresented. Some recipients of such information will be unaffected, but others will be negatively affected. One needs to have a great deal of trust in the person to whom one discloses a weakness or needs to be in such a position of strength that disclosure will only make one seem pleasantly human.

Peer Mentoring

In a recent workshop that one of us led for junior faculty, one person described a problem with a senior person that she didn't know how to solve; she didn't know whom she could approach for advice. Another

faculty member in the group had had a similar problem and described how she had solved it. She said she would be happy to discuss it further with the first faculty member. (Although the workshop was open to everyone, it was attended by one man and about 15 women.) That sort of positive communication happens frequently in such workshops and reveals the power of groups with diverse experiences. It also demonstrates to faculty that problems they may have thought were unique to them are not uncommon, and that their peers can be a source of information and support. Examples of peer mentoring range from small informal groups who might meet for years (e.g., Daniell, 2006) to large formal groups convened for a shorter period of time (e.g., Pololi & Evans, 2015).

Increasingly, institutions are providing small incentives (e.g., lunch money, funds to purchase books to read together) for groups of faculty in the same career stage to meet and talk about professional issues together and give each other the benefit of their shared experience. This can be expanded to include activities like invitations to senior faculty leaders in the department and outside, who can be invited to meet with the group of junior faculty and answer their questions about a particular topic relevant to the leader's role. This is an efficient use of senior faculty members' time and also ensures that all of the junior faculty hear the same information and advice.

Workshops

The circle-of-advisors workshop is one of a suite of workshops that the Hunter College GEP developed through support from NSF. Workshops are a natural extension of the circle-of-advisors model. They are a form of collective mentoring. The workshops we describe began at Hunter College and, with further NSF funding, were later extended to all the senior colleges of the City University of New York (CUNY). Some of the workshops are currently offered by the CUNY central administration. By providing such workshops to faculty, administrations demonstrate their commitment to faculty success. Many institutions offer orientation sessions to new faculty, covering the mechanics of arranging life in one's institution, and those are valuable for faculty. However, topics like how to negotiate, how to run a meeting, and so on are seldom covered.

Box 8.5 lists most of the topics that the GEP workshops have addressed. Workshops are typically offered in two or three all-day sessions spread across a semester, generally on a Friday. Notice of the workshops is sent to

Box 8.5

Suite of Workshops, Based on Hunter College Gender Equity Workshops

Career Development

1. CVs and cover letters

2. Balancing responsibilities: Research, teaching, and service; learning to say "no"

3. Teaching effectively and efficiently

4. Self-presentation

5. Public speaking and presentations; the first three minutes of a talk

6. Attending conferences

7. Entitlement and negotiation

8. Tenure and promotion

9. Nominating oneself for prizes, awards, and other forms of recognition

Writing and Publishing

1. Time management and procrastination

2. Publishing and handling rejection

3. Maximizing research and writing during the summer

4. Grant writing

5. The ally system

6. Professional influences on productivity

"Mentoring"

1. Building and maintaining a circle of advisors

2. Student and assistant management

3. Giving advice to junior colleagues

Balancing Work and a Personal Life

1. Equality and negotiation in personal relationships

2. Balancing work and a personal life

3. The influence of family on productivity

Leadership

1. Lateral leadership

2. Power and politics within one's department and institution

3. Leadership within one's discipline

departments. The number of participants is capped at 25–30, depending on the room that is available. Participants submit their CVs and make a number of commitments: attend all sessions, complete the (minimal) reading and exercises for each day ahead of time, evaluate each workshop day, and be available for follow-up questions. In some versions, participants are asked to complete logs about their productivity.

Although most workshops were led by Hunter College-internal or CUNY-internal speakers, some were led by external speakers who were judged by the GEP staff to be particularly likely to add a valuable perspective, either because they studied the topic (such as division of responsibilities in the household) or because they had personally had extensive or unusual experience (such as running an extremely large laboratory). One advantage of having internal speakers, other than cost, is that people learn how much valuable information is available within their institution.

A workshop series does entail a cost to the institution. There needs to be a central core of people who set up the workshops, find and distribute the reading material, line up speakers, arrange for food, and so on. Those people's time is compensated, and there is a food budget.

An analysis of the productivity of faculty who had attended the GEP workshops showed that they published more papers and submitted more grant proposals after attending the workshops. This is not a controlled experiment since the faculty who participated were motivated to be successful or they would not have attended three all-day workshops and completed the various activities that were required. One could argue that such individuals might have found other ways to get the information they needed to be more successful. Our response is that even if the attendees were already highly motivated, the workshops did add value, or participants would not have increased their productivity over their baseline rate. A somewhat similar program, restricted to women in economics, where participants were randomly assigned to workshops or to a control group, showed similar improvements in outcomes (Blau, Currie, Croson, & Ginther, 2010). Increasingly, professional associations—perhaps especially those where White men predominate—are offering mentoring workshops before, at, or after annual professional conferences. These provide individuals with both advice and feedback and with a broader network of colleagues nationally at their own and other career stages.

Workshops are an efficient way for individuals to learn about their job. Participants' comments in Hunter College's program evaluations, as well as their high ratings, indicated the value of the workshops. One participant commented,

I really appreciate all your guidance, and I think it was particularly useful for me as an instructor who is at the beginning of the process to get all this necessary information up front and be able to form a long view of my goals and strategies. I would love to participate in future workshops if any are held as a follow-up to this one.

Although individuals can provide such information one-on-one, a workshop is not only efficient but, through the questions from the group, allows for greater clarity on points that might be misunderstood.

Another wrote, "For a junior academic, this workshop is the best thing I could be lucky enough to have encountered." When asked about the structure and format of the seminar, participants expressed satisfaction; one responded, "It was *very very* effective! I wouldn't change the format." Another said, "There was great integration of practice and presentation." In one intermediate report, a participant wrote, "I've been more productive in the last two weeks than I have been in last 6 months. I've reached out to peers for support and advisement and have been able to revise and resubmit one grant application." The value of the workshops for junior faculty—the intended audience—was evident: "These workshops are wonderful. It would be very important for new faculty to take them in the first year to avoid making mistakes and gaining all the information from the very beginning," "The GEP was very effective. I believe that my participation has increased my chances of achieving tenure as a professor."

The Hunter College workshops, which both men and women attended, attempted to integrate information about gender and diversity into each workshop and included male and female presenters from different ethnic groups. The negotiation workshop, for example, presented data on differences in reactions to men and women who negotiate, gave tips on how to negotiate so as to reduce possible negative reactions, and had participants act out negotiation scenarios. At some workshops, a department chair would take the role of a department chair that the faculty member wanted to approach about, say, a course reduction, bridging funds, or an increase in salary. In one workshop, an experienced faculty member coached the person trying to negotiate and the group saw how the chair responded.

At a workshop on attending conferences, the presenter was a woman of color. One of the attendees, also a woman of color but a different ethnicity, asked a question about how she could approach a group of White men at a conference. We doubt whether that woman would have felt as free to ask her question if the presenter had been White. Not every workshop needs to be led by a White woman or a person of color, as long as there is a mix that allows everyone to see that being a "different" gender, color, or ethnicity does not reduce someone's knowledge or authority.

Launch Committees

Another form of collective mentoring is "launch committees." When new faculty are hired, whether they are male or female, they have to figure out how things work at their new institution. We recall one productive scientist's estimation that she would lose one to two years when she moved from her current institution to a new one—and that was for a well-funded senior person! The point of launch committees is to smooth junior faculty members' introduction to their new institution and thus speed up how quickly a new faculty member can become a productive contributor. It is in the institution's best interest to help new faculty hit the ground running. Launch committees are a short-term—typically one-year—form of a circle of advisors with a particular mission.

Case Western Reserve University pioneered a pilot version of the launch committee concept for the school of engineering at Case, funded by a grant from the NSF ADVANCE program. A description of the pilot, written by Erin Lavik, Elmer Lindseth, and G. Q. Zhang, can be found on Case's webpage for the program for Institutions Developing Excellence In Academic Leadership (or IDEAL; http://case.edu/provost/ideal/) in their second-year annual report, p. 65. The University of Michigan has adapted and developed the idea in several schools and colleges for humanists, natural scientists, social scientists, and faculty in music, theater, and dance. What follows is an outline of how a launch committee works (http://advance.umich.edu/launch.php). Other institutions (at the moment Florida International University, Michigan Technological University and The Ohio State University) are experimenting with pilot versions of the launch committee program. We describe the University of Michigan's program, but it can be tailored to particular fields and institutions.

Structure of the Committee   A committee is formed that includes the individual's department chair or delegate, a senior colleague in the department with related interests, a senior colleague in a different department with related interests, and a specially trained "convener," who is a senior faculty member from outside the department who does not necessarily share any interests or expertise with the launchee. The convener's role is to ensure that key issues are addressed at each meeting even if the launchee or other participants do not raise them. In addition, the convener can press for clarification of departmental and school practices that are unclear or ambiguous (e.g., how to get a graduate student) or how to address or resolve a problem. Because the conveners have specific preparation and follow-up responsibilities that no other committee member has, they are offered an honorarium of $1,000 at the University of Michigan. All other committee participation is voluntary. There is, in addition, some labor required to orient conveners to their role and to track the committees. This labor can be shared with smaller schools and colleges in large universities, but it is helpful to have a centralized office (in Michigan's case, ADVANCE) that monitors the committees and is prepared to orient conveners and troubleshoot difficulties that may arise.

Committee Process   The committee works to identify, with all new faculty members, what space and assistance they will need, what funding and collaboration opportunities are available both inside and outside the institution, and who the most important people are for the new faculty member to meet, focusing on teaching, research, community participation, and service. The tension and balance of personal and professional life is always addressed. The committee and the candidate meet formally either in person or electronically on a monthly basis for the first year, sometimes beginning in the summer before the launchee arrives on campus; committee members are available for informal meetings as well. At each meeting the committee follows up on issues raised at previous meetings and tries to address lingering issues. The committee convener provides brief accounts of the discussion of key topics and sends the reports to the committee members and to whoever is overseeing the launch program.

Evidence of Launch Committees' Value   In its initial pilot year at the University of Michigan (2011–2012), there were launches in four science departments. A survey for that year collected data from the eight launchees

from those four departments and from four comparable departments that did not have launch committees. Launchees overall were more likely than new faculty in comparable departments to have their research space fully functional and were more satisfied with their research equipment than those in comparable departments. Launchees were also more likely to report knowing senior faculty outside their department and expressed greater ease in identifying a senior colleague to help answer a question. In addition, women launchees (but not men) reported significantly higher satisfaction with service and were more likely to agree that their colleagues created a respectful work environment compared to women in comparable departments who were not part of launch programs.

In subsequent years, the launch committee experience has been assessed for all of the committee members, including the launchee and the department chair(s). The 2015 report (covering 2012–2013 through 2014–2015) from the University of Michigan (available at http://advance.umich.edu /resources/LaunchreportFinal.pdf) summarizes evaluations of 79 committees, involving 267 faculty in nine schools and colleges. That report contains evaluation data without comparisons since all new faculty in science and engineering fields received launch committees.

Launchees report very positive experiences in being welcomed, having a good orientation to the campus, and being integrated into their department (all means above 3.4 on a 4-point scale). Launchees were enthusiastic in their satisfaction with their teaching load, the courses they were asked to teach, the mentoring they received, and the department as a place to work: on a 5-point rating scale, the mean was 5.0. On open-ended questions about the best things they experienced, seven mentioned that the networking opportunities were amazing, and seven mentioned their access to chairs. Six expressed appreciation for the time to ask questions, discuss issues of concern, and gain viewpoints from different faculty members, while five mentioned the advocacy, support, and advice they received.

All of the committee members were similarly positive, citing the value to the launchee, the relative ease of the "work" of launching a talented young colleague, and the pleasure of contributing to the next generation. One committee convener noted, "It's very systematic advising, not catch-as-catch-can advising like we so often have here." Another noted that the launch committee "integrates the new faculty member into the University. They meet people, they make friends, they learn about administrative hurdles. They

also learn about many opportunities available, but not necessarily easily apparent." Committee members liked the opportunity for a time-limited relationship that could be continued if it was of interest to the two people but which was not mandated beyond the first year.

Department chairs commented that they intended to be available to new faculty, but this program ensured that those intentions were expressed in actual time spent with them. One said, "Even with the best intentioned chair, there can be things that fall through the cracks, and the junior faculty don't always know that they can be asking for help about certain things." Another commented that it enabled "finding out about problems quickly and fixing those problems with minimal delay." One noted that "I think what I like about them is that the committees come up with some ideas that are not necessarily the way that I would do them, but they're good suggestions."

The multiplication of ideas about how to do things both is liberating to the junior faculty members and underscores the fact that, although they need advice and information, they are in charge of making the decisions about their own career. It also demonstrates to senior faculty that there are multiple strategies for solving problems.

New faculty members' careers start well or badly, depending on how quickly they can adjust to a new institution, create a functional laboratory or develop a group of colleagues to talk to, and learn what facilities are available to ease their transition both professionally and personally. It is hard, without a good introduction, to make up for lost time, hard to overcome needless frustrations, and hard to recover from unwitting mistakes. Some people are lucky. But the institution's job is to reduce the importance of luck. Moreover, receiving assistance and attention in this early stage creates a sense that the institution values the new faculty member—an impression that is likely to have long-term consequences for the faculty member's success, retention, and morale. Finally, serving on launch committees has the unintended benefit of offering senior faculty a concrete model of what mentoring involves—a model that can change the way they mentor all of their younger colleagues.

Institutional Support for Launch Committees   Widespread adoption of a launch committee requires institutional support. We note the irony that although faculty at Case Western Reserve University originated this excellent idea, the experiment ended in 2012 with the end of the grant that funded the original experiment (personal communication, Diana Bilimoria, January 7, 2016). Had the University of Michigan not learned of it,

the idea might have died. Instead, launch committees have flourished at Michigan and are being tried now in all liberal arts fields as well as some of the professional schools within the university.

This is one example of many we have seen where new programs are developed but are not maintained over time. Sometimes the lack of support is due to a change of leadership; sometimes it is due to the difficulty of convincing ongoing administrative leadership that the program should be continued. We believe that institutions are well-served by maintaining proven programs, rather than continually developing new ones.

Developing a Mentoring Program

Many schools, especially those that have been funded by the National Science Foundation's ADVANCE program to improve the advancement of women in the sciences, have developed different types of mentoring programs for faculty (see, e.g., Bilimoria & Liang, 2012; Stewart, Malley, & LaVaque-Manty, 2007). There are too many to list. We advise searching the web with terms like "faculty development," "career advising," and "faculty mentoring."

Schools can and should take a more active role in faculty development, including via formal mentoring programs like the two models outlined here. What we suggest is that schools start small, with a committee that examines different models and considers what will work well in their context. Of course, committee members should be compensated for their time, either by release time, the provision of a research assistant, or some other means. Since mentoring—or its equivalent—is an important faculty benefit, it makes sense to do it right. A committee of faculty members from a range of departments will be able to evaluate workable models. Independent evidence suggests that committees consisting of faculty, who take on responsibilities additional to their direct faculty roles, help propagate values throughout a community (e.g., Dobbin & Kalev, 2007). Faculty are accepted as credible when staff members are not, faculty have a sense of their colleagues (though it may not always be correct), and faculty can monitor the success of programs.

Midcareer and Senior Faculty

The strategies for faculty development that we have discussed thus far are applicable to faculty at any level, though many of them have been developed most intensively for new faculty. Faculty at different ranks share many of the same concerns but also have their own particular concerns.

Associate professors with tenure (about 34% of full-time faculty at research-intensive schools), especially those who have been at that rank for more than six years, are less satisfied with their position than are assistant or full professors (Mathews, 2014). Such long-term associate professors report being undermentored, underappreciated, and underrecognized at higher rates than any other group (Mathews, 2014). At research-intensive institutions, the normative career pattern is to move from associate professor to full professor status in seven or fewer years, but at some institutions, associate professor status can be an end point. Women and faculty in the humanities are likely to spend more time at associate professor rank than men do (see chapter 4 and, for a range of models, Committee on Gender Differences in Careers of Science, Engineering, and Mathematics Faculty, 2010). Workshops aimed at helping faculty move from associate professor to full professor are offered by the CUNY central office.

Once faculty have achieved tenure, faculty may ask themselves questions about their goals, both at work and in their personal lives, and reassess their aspirations (Bickel, 2016; Neumann, 2009). In some cases it is difficult for faculty to abandon a line of research that they are no longer interested in and that has provided mixed results at best; they feel a commitment to finish what they started. Having a sympathetic senior person point out that it could be better to start something new that one is excited about, rather than continue not making progress in an area that has lost its appeal, might be all someone needs to begin a fresh direction. The opposite pressure is also problematic: sometimes institutions insist on evidence that an individual has developed a wholly new line of work since the last review, when the individual is deeply interested in pursuing the original program of work and pushing it further. In our view institutions would benefit by being less focused on directing faculty scholarly energy in either direction and more focused on supporting faculty members' best ideas about how to deploy their own energy.

Sometimes midcareer faculty want to play more of a role in the institution but are unsure of how to go about it. They may also find themselves the recipient of multiple requests to serve on committees. Now that they are members of the permanent faculty, other faculty and administrators feel free to ask them for more service. Negotiating those requests is tricky.

A survey of 39 institutions found that very few specified support that was directly aimed at midcareer faculty (Canale, Herdklotz, & Wild, 2013), even though such faculty are numerous, and even though it is costly to

their institutions if those faculty are not productive. Examples of support are pamphlets detailing requirements for promotion to full professor, coaching sessions to help faculty advance to full professor, internal grants or fellowships for advancing a faculty member's research program, and academic leadership programs designed to help faculty change roles. Except for the last, most programs are intended to help faculty move to the next step—promotion to full professor.

Faculty who have adopted a circle-of-advisors model are in a better position to consider their next steps than faculty who have progressed under a classical mentor model. Those who have adopted the circle-of-advisors model are accustomed to finding people who can provide information, advice, and encouragement about thinking through the opportunities their change in status offers. Institutions can be helpful here in creating a network of individuals that faculty can call on to discuss their next steps. Schools can also undertake a series of workshops along the lines of those for junior faculty but adapted to the needs of midcareer faculty.

Another model is an internal "sabbatical," where a faculty member might choose to develop a new line of research. A scientist, for example, might work in a colleague's laboratory. An historian interested in political science might sit in on advanced courses, have structured discussions with a senior faculty member, and be provided an office in the political science department for a specified period, enabling them to participate in the department community.

Administrative Leadership Programs

Chairs, deans, and provosts are committed to permanent employment of faculty with tenure. It is in the institution's interest to provide faculty with opportunities for leadership, via programs that we list below as well as through internal programs, such as workshops by faculty who have taken on positions of academic leadership or who have participated in leadership programs. Knowledgeable faculty can provide information about whether a program requires that faculty members be nominated by their institutions and about whether a program provides funding.

We have provided a partial list of some programs in appendix 8.1. Administrators or faculty can search the web with terms like "academic leadership training," "academic leadership professional development," and department chair training." As one example, women in academic medicine, if supported by the dean of their medical school, can apply for the year-long program Executive Leadership in Academic Medicine (ELAM), at Drexel

Medical College (McDade, Richman, Jackson, & Morahan, 2004). The Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC) has several programs that are designed to help medical schools improve faculty effectiveness. Similarly, the American Council on Education (ACE) sponsors a variety of programs for individuals interested in, or already finding themselves in, academic administration. For example, it sponsors two-day workshops for chairs, supplemented by five webinars throughout the year.

Retiring and Retired Faculty

In 1994, mandatory retirement for faculty ended. This boon for those faculty who saw age 70 as an arbitrary stopping point was a problem for universities, concerned as they were that there would not be room for younger faculty if older faculty continued to work into their seventies. That remains a concern for colleges and universities, and there is evidence, based on data from over 1,000 faculty at a large private university in the metropolitan northeast, that faculty indeed have retired later since mandatory retirement ended: 25% continued past age 78 and 15% were estimated not to be retired until age 80 or older, but there was substantial variation from school to school within the university (Weinberg & Scott, 2013). Faculty in professional schools retired at similar ages to those who had been faculty during the mandatory retirement period, possibly because they could earn significant amounts of money outside the university. It was faculty in the humanities, sciences, arts, and education who stayed on, perhaps partly for financial reasons but perhaps also because of the freedom they had in arranging their teaching responsibilities and their research in satisfactory ways (June, 2012; Weinberg & Scott, 2013).

The main effort universities and colleges have made in considering the needs of retiring and retired faculty is to offer faculty financial incentives for retiring. Some also offer financial planning and continued medical benefits. Very few have considered how to make it possible for faculty to continue to contribute to their field or the institution, should they want to, in retirement. (And some schools make it difficult for faculty, by not allowing them to sponsor students in research.) The result is that there are fewer resources for retiring and retired faculty than there are for those at any other point in their careers.

Several institutions have, however, developed programs that are responsive to some faculty needs, many funded by the Mellon Foundation or the

Sloan Foundation (McLaughlin, Duranleau, & Van Ummersen, 2014; Van Ummersen, Duranleau, & McLaughlin, 2013). One category of needs is projects that faculty want to finish but require institutional resources in order to complete. Another category is access to workshops or counselors that explore options for a productive and satisfying retirement. A third category is maintaining a satisfying relationship with the institution. As with institutional benefits for giving faculty what they need at earlier stages in their careers, here, too, institutions will benefit by doing more than providing monetary incentives and benefits, important though those are.

Retired faculty are a potential and greatly underused asset for the college or university. Retiring and retired faculty have a great deal of knowledge about how their institution works and how their field works. Such faculty can be a resource for leading workshops and organizing mentoring programs. With minimal funding, interested retiring faculty could contribute to the professional development of their junior colleagues.

Measuring Progress or Lack Thereof

How can a school or department determine whether its faculty development programs are successful? In the ideal case, a given program will have both an experimental group that receives the benefits of the program and a control group of individuals who were interested in the program but were not enrolled to it. Measures such as faculty productivity and satisfaction will then determine whether to continue the program. Once the program is open to everyone, the quasi-experimental comparison is no longer feasible, but ongoing benchmark data—of two main types—will be informative. The first type is the data that institutions collect on faculty: retention; success at tenure; time in rank before promotion from associate to full professor; salary; grant funding; and climate survey information. The second type is a faculty member's CV, which includes number of publications and awards. Keeping track of and interpreting such data requires institutional resources.

Institutional Benefits of Faculty Development

We have outlined a variety of ways that institutions can promote faculty productivity and well-being. All the methods require an outlay of resources, but we believe that the increases in outside funding and the renown that

faculty bring to the institution make the investment worthwhile. We also note that faculty who are actively and happily involved in research are likely to incorporate students into their research projects, thus also providing benefits to undergraduates, who now have the opportunity to get hands-on experience with research.

Summary

In this chapter we have provided an overview of five kinds of programs that can help faculty succeed. In our view, all of them provide some value. It is not necessary for an institution to offer all of them, but it is important that the institution provide access to some of them. Moreover, it is crucial for the institution to provide avenues for experienced faculty to develop skill at providing constructive and appropriate advice in their areas of expertise (via workshops or participation in launch committees where they may learn about their role), and for faculty who are new to a role to develop their ability to seek advice proactively. We encourage institutions to recognize the importance of establishing a culture in which faculty at all career stages recognize the need for career advice and have ways to obtain it. Finally, we note that programs to help faculty succeed, valuable though they are, cannot substitute for the institutional changes we recommend in the other chapters of this book.

Recommendations for Helping Faculty Succeed

Institutional Policies

1. Routinize provision of information to faculty about key milestones in faculty progress (e.g., third-year review, tenure and promotion to full professor). Make the criteria associated with these milestones transparent.

2. Where possible, provide faculty with support to attend national leadership development programs.

Senior Administrators

1. Explicitly articulate the value of faculty development, and contributions to faculty development, to the institution.

2. If no faculty development programs currently exist, set up a faculty committee to evaluate alternatives and create a pilot program in a few departments.

3. Provide financial and time resources to faculty to develop and implement formal programs:

• or new assistant professors (launch committees)

• for all junior faculty (classical mentoring or circles or advisors or peer advising networks)

• for other faculty at key transitions in their careers

• via workshops on faculty professional development and skill-building that are open to all faculty

4. Ensure that there is an oversight process for programs and that data are collected to assess their value.

5. Consider setting up mentoring relationships or encouraging circles of advisors among faculty seeking and holding administrative positions.

Department Chairs

1. Explicitly articulate the value of faculty mentoring and faculty development to the department.

2. Proactively ensure that all untenured faculty receive information, advice, and assistance via classical mentoring, launch committees, a circle of advisors, or peer mentoring.

All Faculty Members

1. Take full advantage of institutional resources supporting faculty development—whether as a provider or beneficiary. Improve your skills in both roles.

2. Take seriously the value of supporting the faculty development of your colleagues. Provide colleagues with information and constructive advice.

Notes

1. The MCA was tested in 16 medical schools, where 283 mentors rated themselves on the 26 items on a 1–7 scale (Fleming et al., 2013). Their scores on individual items ranged from an average low of 4.41 ("Helping your mentee balance work with their personal life") to a high of 6.05 ("Acknowledging your mentee's professional contributions"). The mentees of those mentors were even more positive about their mentors than the mentors were about themselves. Some caution should be used in considering these results, all of which show performance above the midpoint. The people who took the assessment were probably already interested in trying to be a good mentor. They were a convenience sample of about 22% of those initially

contacted. They had apparently been willing not just to be assessed, but to participate in an eight-hour training program to improve their mentoring skills. All of that said, it's clear that those who participated left feeling armed with useful knowledge.

This training program trained facilitators at the 16 sites where they had tested mentoring competency (Pfund, House, Asquith, Fleming, Buhr, Burnham, et al., 2014). The same 283 participants previously tested were divided into an intervention and control group. The control group received no training and no interaction with trainers. In posttests three months after training, the two groups again rated themselves in the six areas. The intervention group showed a greater positive change overall compared to the control group, driven by a greater positive change in three of the six areas, showing at a minimum that individuals who are motivated to change, and who enroll in an intervention designed to improve changes in six specific areas, are likely to perceive themselves as having changed positively. The data from the mentees was equivocal.

2. Our thanks to Page Morahan for initially introducing us to this material.

Appendix 8.1

Partial List of Faculty Development Programs

Workshop Series for Faculty—Gender Equity Project, Hunter College
  http://www.hunter.cuny.edu/genderequity/resources/workshopmaterials

Faculty Career Advising Resources—University of Michigan ADVANCE
  http://advance.umich.edu/careeradvising.php

Launch Committees—University of Michigan ADVANCE
  http://advance.umich.edu/launch.php

ADVANCE Faculty Development Office—Mentoring for New and Pre-Tenure Faculty, Northeastern University
  http://www.northeastern.edu/advance/new-pre-tenure-faculty/faculty
  -mentoring/

ADVANCE Faculty Professional Development—Center for Institutional Change, University of Washington
  https://advance.washington.edu/additionalresources/facdevelopment.html

Faculty Professional Development—Northern Arizona University
  https://nau.edu/faculty-development/welcome/

Institutional Faculty Development Plan—University of Wisconsin–Madison
  https://www.ohr.wisc.edu/grants/InstitutionalFacultyDevelopmentPlan.html

Leadership workshops (all levels, including presidents)—American Council on Education
  http://www.acenet.edu/leadership/Pages/default.aspx

Executive Leadership in Academic Medicine—Drexel
  http://drexel.edu/medicine/academics/womens-health-and-leadership/ELAM/

Faculty Forward—Association of American Medical Colleges
  https://www.staging.aamc.org/services/facultyforward/survey/

Group on Women in Medicine and Science—Association of American Medical Colleges
  https://www.aamc.org/members/gwims/

Northwestern University Clinical and Translational Sciences Institute Education and Career Development
  https://nucats.northwestern.edu/education-career-development/early-career
  -faculty-development-programs/navigating-translational-research-enterprise
  /schedule-materials

References

Allen, T. D., & Eby, L. T. (Eds.). (2011). *The Blackwell handbook of mentoring: A multiple perspectives approach*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Allen, T. D., Eby, L. T., Poteet, M. L., Lentz, E., & Lima, L. (2004). Career benefits associated with mentoring for proteges: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*(1), 127–136.

Baranik, L. E., Roling, E. A., & Eby, L. T. (2010). Why does mentoring work? The role of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *76*(3), 366–373.

Bickel, J. (2016). Not too late to reinvigorate: How midcareer faculty can continue growing. *Academic Medicine*, *91*(12), 1601–1605.

Bilimoria, D., & Liang, X. (2012). *Gender equity in science and engineering: Advancing change in higher education*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Blau, F. D., Currie, J. M., Croson, R. T. A., & Ginther, D. K. (2010). *Can mentoring help female assistant professors? Interim results from a randomized trial* (NBER Working Paper 15707). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Blickle, G., Witzki, A., & Schneider, P. B. (2009). Self-initiated mentoring and career success: A predictive field study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *74*(1), 94–101.

Canale, A. M., Herdklotz, C., & Wild, L. (2013). *Mid-career faculty support: The middle years of the academic profession*. Rochester, NY: Faculty Career Development Services, the Wallace Center, Rochester Institute of Technology.

Committee on Gender Differences in Careers of Science, Engineering, and Mathematics Faculty; Committee on Women in Science, Engineering, and Medicine; Policy and Global Affairs; Committee on National Statistics, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education, the National Research Council of the National Academies.

(2010). *Gender differences at critical transitions in the careers of science, engineering, and mathematics faculty*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Daniell, E. (2006). *Every other Thursday: Stories and strategies from successful women scientists*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

de Janasz, S. C., & Sullivan, S. E. (2004). Multiple mentoring in academe: Developing the professorial network. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *64*(2), 263–283.

de Janasz, S. C., Sullivan, S. E., & Whiting, V. (2003). Mentor networks and career success: Lessons for turbulent times. *Academy of Management Executive*, *17*(4), 78–91.

Dobbin, F., & Kalev, A. (2007). The architecture of inclusion: Evidence from corporate diversity programs. *Harvard Journal of Law & Gender*, *30*(2), 279–301.

Dobbin, F., Schrage, D., & Kalev, A. (2015). Rage against the iron cage: The varied effects of bureaucratic personnel reforms on diversity. *American Sociological Review*, *80*, 1014–1044.

Eby, L. T., Allen, T. D., Evans, S. C., Ng, T., & DuBois, D. L. (2008). Does mentoring matter? A multidisciplinary meta-analysis comparing mentored and non-mentored individuals. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *72*(2), 254–267.

Eby, L. T., Butts, M. M., Durley, J., & Ragins, B. R. (2010). Are bad experiences stronger than good ones in mentoring relationships? Evidence from the protégé and mentor perspective. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *77*(1), 81–92.

Egan, T. M., & Song, Z. (2008). Are facilitated mentoring programs beneficial? A randomized experimental field study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *72*(3), 351–362.

Fleming, M., House, M. S., Shewakramani, M. V., Yu, L., Garbutt, J., McGee, R., et al. (2013). The Mentoring Competency Assessment: Validation of a new instrument to evaluate skills of research mentors. *Academic Medicine: Journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges*, *88*(7), 1002–1008.

Fryberg, S. A., & Gerken, L. A. (2012). Twins separated at birth? Critical moments in cross-race mentoring relationships. In K. L. Dace (Ed.), *Unlikely allies in the academy: Women of color and white women in conversation* (pp. 149–159). New York, NY: Routledge.

Higgins, M. C., & Kram, K. E. (2001). Reconceptualizing mentoring at work: A developmental network perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, *26*(2), 264–288.

Hogue, M., Yoder, J. D., & Singleton, S. G. (2007). The gender wage gap: An explanation of men's elevated wage entitlement. *Sex Roles*, *56*, 573–579.

Ito, T. A., Larsen, J. T., Smith, N. K., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1998). Negative information weighs more heavily in the brain: The negativity bias in evaluative categorizations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *75*, 887–900.

June, A. W. (2012, March 18). Aging professors create a faculty bottleneck. *The Chronicle for Higher Education.* http://www.chronicle.com/article/Professors-Are-Graying-and/131226/

Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D., & Judge, T. A. (2008). A quantitative review of mentoring research: Test of a model. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 72*(3), 269–283.

Katz, J. K., Rosen, S., & Morahan, P. (2009). What is team coaching, and why use co-coaches? *Academic Physician & Scientist, 5*, 2–6.

Kram, K. E. (1985). *Mentoring at work.* Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Kram, K. E., & Ragins, B. R. (2007). The landscape of mentoring in the 21st century. In K. E. Kram & B. R. Ragins (Eds.), *Handbook of mentoring at work* (pp. 659–692). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lee, A., Dennis, C., & Campbell, P. (2007). Nature's guide for mentors. *Nature, 447*(7146), 791–797.

Mathews, K. R. (2014). *Perspectives on midcareer faculty and advice for supporting them.* Cambridge, MA: The Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education.

McCauley, C. D., & Martineau, J. W. (1998). *Becoming your own best mentor: Selecting a mosaic of mentors. Reaching your developmental goals: Ideas into action guidebooks.* Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

McDade, S. A., Richman, R. C., Jackson, G. B., & Morahan, P. S. (2004). Effects of participation in the Executive Leadership in Academic Medicine (ELAM) program on women faculty's perceived leadership capabilities. *Academic Medicine, 79*(4), 302–309.

McLaughlin, J., Duranleau, L., & Van Ummersen, C. (Eds.). (2014). *Faculty retirement: Best practices for navigating the transition.* Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Neumann, A. (2009). *Professing to learn: Creating tenured lives and careers in the American research university.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Packard, B. W. L. (2003). Student training promotes mentoring awareness and action. *Career Development Quarterly, 51*(4), 335–345.

Pelham, B. W., & Hetts, J. J. (2001). Underworked and overpaid: Elevated entitlement in men's self-pay. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 37*(2), 93–103.

Pfund, C., House, S. C., Asquith, P., Fleming, M. F., Buhr, K. A., Burnham, E. L., et al. (2014). Training mentors of clinical and translational research scholars: A randomized controlled trial. *Academic Medicine: Journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges, 89*(5), 774–781.

Pololi, L. H., & Evans, A. T. (2015). Group peer mentoring: An answer to the faculty mentoring problem? A successful program at a large academic department of medicine. *Journal of Continuing Education in the Health Professions, 35*(3), 192–200.

Reuben, E., Sapienza, P., & Zingales, L. (2014). How stereotypes impair women's careers in science. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *111*(12), 4403–4408.

Rosen, S., Katz, J. K., & Morahan, P. (2009). Making "Personal Leadership Boards" and team- and co-coaching work for you. *Oncology Times*, *31*(7), 21–23.

Rozin, P., & Royzman, E. B. (2001). Negativity bias, negativity dominance, and contagion. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *5*(4), 296–320.

Stewart, A. J., Malley, J. E., & LaVaque-Manty, D. (2007). *Transforming science and engineering: Advancing academic women*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Straus, S. E., Johnson, M. O., Marquez, C., & Feldaman, M. D. (2013). Characteristics of successful and failed mentoring relationships: Qualitative study across two academic health centers. *Academic Medicine: Journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges*, *88*(1), 82–89.

Underhill, C. M. (2006). The effectiveness of mentoring programs in corporate settings: A meta-analytical review of the literature. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *68*(2), 292–307.

Van Ummersen, C., Duranleau, L., & McLaughlin, J. (2013). Faculty retirement transitions revitalized. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, *45*(2), 16–24.

Weinberg, S. L., & Scott, M. A. (2013). The impact of uncapping of mandatory retirement on postsecondary institutions. *Educational Researcher*, *42*, 338–348.