Present: K. Browne, S. Calkins (Administration Liaison), W. Crossland (Chair), A. Goodman (AAUP/AFT Liaison), P. Jarosz, K. Padmanabhan (Non-Senate), E. Puscheck, M. Sengstock.
Absent with notice: L. Keashly, P. Kernsmith, C. McNath (Student Council Liaison), A. Popadic, R. Parnell, L. Romano (Policy Committee Liaison), J. Wang.
Absent: S. Putatunda,
Guests: Freda Giblin, Ph.D., Office of the Vice President for Research; Linda Roth, Ph.D., Director of Professional Development, School of Medicine.
[Information added after the meeting.]

1. *Call to order.*

    The meeting was called to order at 10:05 am.

2. *Approval of minutes of December 10, 2008.*

    Approved without additional corrections.

3. *Mentoring.*

    A. **Freda Giblin - Office of the Vice President for Research**

        (Dr. Giblin's dissertation area included mentoring.) There is a need for educating new faculty and chairs regarding a number of areas, such as procedures for assembling materials for grant review and preparing scholarly work for publication that would help research/scholarly activity. Mentoring can fine tune and help individualize this information. The push for more training grants also requires that trainees (postdocs, grad students) have access to a range of mentoring experiences such as preparing grant applications, dealing with internal review boards, setting up labs, and writing papers. The Office of the Vice President for Research (OVPR) office needed to do something tangible. In order to develop and carry out a mentoring program, Dr. Giblin talked to Stephen Calkins (Associate Vice President for Personnel) because some needs related to Promotion and Tenure (P&T) and also to Steven Salley (Interim Dean of the Graduate School) for other academic considerations. During the 2007-2008 academic year the OVPR's office started with the *Faculty Development Seminar Series* held every three weeks with P&T as their first seminar. They invited deans, chairs, recently tenured faculty to speak. This year the series, scheduled twice a month, is called the *Professional and Academic Development Series* for faculty, postdoc, grad students. Access is available through the OVPR�s web site to streaming video of the sessions for 2008-2009 (www.research.wayne.edu). Some topics (P&T, research compliance and grant review) will need to be presented annually. The OVPR might use a 2-3 year cycle for other topics. Feedback and evaluations of the series by audience members were quite positive. Comments

derived from feedback will be used to focus topics related to audience suggestions. Further discussion of program development is ongoing. One goal is to create a sense among faculty that WSU cares about faculty development and wants faculty to succeed. A limitation of the series is not being able to give discipline-specific tips. Dr. Giblin believes that Schools, Colleges and Departments need to provide this finer level of education.

B.   **Linda Roth - Director of Professional Development, Office of Dean of Faculty Affairs, Human Resources and Professional Development - School of Medicine (SOM)**

Mentoring is supported by the SOM both as a mechanism of faculty development and by requirements of funding agencies (e.g., Clinical and Translational Science Award grant application). The SOM Faculty Senate Executive Committee supports mentoring and sometimes includes mentoring requirements/requests in faculty letters of offer. There are programs on faculty development and new faculty orientation offered through the medical school in addition to those offered through the OVPR. Furthermore, some SOM departments use private agencies (e.g, Health Research Associates) to carry out specialized mentoring for grant writing. One of the faculty development efforts created by the SOM was how to put together academic documentation. At this event a dean, a Clinician Educator Track faculty member and a Research Educator Track faculty member gave concrete examples for the attendees. This session, offered twice annually, has attracted much interest. The SOM also does new faculty orientation twice a year and encourages attendees to attend the OVPR's new faculty orientation as well. In order to make mentoring a more uniform effort among the SOM's heterogeneous departments, the SOM relies on yearly merit and/or P&T review - especially from feedback from the chair or division chief who is �instructed and expected to provide mentoring.� But do the faculty actually get the mentoring they need? Many clinical specialties rely on national meetings for preconference workshop for development of young faculty.

C.   **Open Discussion on Mentoring**

One committee member felt that there is little enthusiasm at the department level for mentoring and that mentoring is not dealt with seriously in many departments. Some senior faculty do not understand why others need mentoring if they never got any. To some mentoring looks like cronyism - trying to curry favor with senior faculty. A departmental mentoring committee (or some formalized structure) would be helpful in reducing the cronyism concerns.

Dr. Giblin pointed out that there are a variety of ways to mentor: Informal, formal, distance, in department, outside department. The mentor needs to be caring regardless of format.

Furthermore, new faculty should find as many mentors as possible and not limit mentoring to one person.

Professor Puscheck (also a member of the SOM Faculty Senate Executive Committee) related that there was a campus-wide mentoring panel discussion two years ago that was effective. A variety of people spoke on different topics. Their discussion revealed several issues: Some people thought that their PhD advisor should be their mentor or that they should have only one mentor. But faculty may need a variety of mentors for different issues and at different stages of their career. People don�t know how to mentor, how to find mentors, do not understand what mentoring is all about, they don't realize that assigned mentors may not be adequate for all issues. They need to understand that mentors can be from their own department, another department in the same university or at another university. Dean Kenneth Palmer (Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs, Human Resources and Professional Development - SOM) said over 60% of faculty don�t use mentors. When P&T packets are evaluated by the SOM Executive Committee, the need for mentors is evident. In spite of this need, not everyone understands what mentoring is, how to identify a mentor, how to make mentoring work, how to be a mentor, how to be a mentee, what are appropriate and inappropriate expectations of mentoring.

Professor Sengstock amplified the need for a multiplicity of mentors. People often choose badly: someone slightly ahead of them, often a collaborator rather than mentor. People need to be told that they should have many mentors, perhaps one for each facet of academic life. Junior faculty need to understand that sometimes chairs or senior faculty are not always the best choices for mentors because the mentee has so much at stake if they make an error.

Dr. Giblin commented on two things that mentoring provides: Information and social support. One reason that people choose a specific mentor is that they like them or are similar to them. But the potential mentor may not have the information needed when it is sought. It is important that mentors have good advice to give. It might be best to screen potential mentors first so that mentees can choose a person they feel comfortable with from a knowledgeable pool. Following up on Dean Palmer's point, a special problem is with those (majority) who seek no mentoring. They may see mentoring as a sign of weakness or they do not need a mentor. Even if assigned a mentor and they may ignore them. A mentor has to work into a position of trust over time with such a person.

Professor Browne noted another reason for using multiple mentors is that existing disputes among the P&T committee members over what constitutes tenurable record. Some may have non-mainstream opinions. If the mentee gets matched up with such an individual, they may

get bad advice.

Professor Goodman suggested that some sort of uniform expectation was made for all departments to ensure that they all encourage mentoring. A small departmental committee to oversee mentoring would be helpful. At least that way it seems less likely that the entire committee will be unhelpful rather than assigning an individual who might be unhelpful.

Dr. Giblin studied how social support and mentoring overlap. Social support can be informational. One-on-one relationship and opportunity to gravitate toward people you like is very important. We need to look at how to pair people. It is important that personal element makes mentee comfortable with mentor.

Dr. Roth suggested limiting the time of a mentoring assignment so someone can move on. For example, there is a WSU program to financially reward a mentor who helps a junior faculty member successfully submit a first grant (mentorship of limited duration). As to individuals reluctant to have mentors: They might rely on feedback from yearly P&T review. However, that feedback may not be useful in some cases because comments at the meeting are said in confidence and therefore the written document may lack important details. The junior faculty need to follow up by conferring with the dean, the department chair or P&T committee members for clarification. To insure that junior faculty have a dispassionate reading of their P&T performance to date, faculty without mentors might use a mock P&T committee. This group could assess their record and give junior faculty member frank feedback on their strengths and weaknesses. In any case Departmental level feedback is most important because the department is first hurdle and the place where colleagues can best estimate the person's progress with respect to tenure.

The Chair asked if interdepartmental variability in mentoring should be addressed by some sort of standardization within departments or within colleges?

Dr. Giblin said the OVPR's office is planning a series of presentations for chairs and directors (especially new and interim chairs). The chairs and directors must know that it is their responsibility to have some sort of mentoring for their junior faculty and there is a range of things that might be done.

Committee members commented that there has been little emphasis in the past for chairs to think about mentoring other than it was seen as a group responsibility rather than an individual responsibility. The Deans should be more aware of the need for mentoring and influence the department chairs to at least establish a minimum set of efforts toward

mentoring by the chair.

Professor Puscheck pointed out that SOM Clinician Educators Track faculty *are not tenured and not eligible to be voting members of the P&T committee (contract between Wayne State and the AAUP/AFT). This rule makes it unlikely that Clinical Educator faculty get feedback on their progress from the P&T committee and less likely to have adequate representation.* Regarding mentorship Professor Puscheck suggested a university-wide program be established to promote mentoring. It would be valuable to have a resource center as a site to direct people to solve problems. There may be information from national academic organizations or from deans. We have a great need but we also have some resources already, including volunteers with some experience with mentoring issues.

In response to the question, "what can our committee suggest that would be helpful," Prof. Puscheck replied that deans and chairs need information on mentoring and need to buy in to the effort. Perhaps a handbook for chairs or deans would be helpful. People need information on what it means to be a mentor and mentee that could be distributed through informational sessions. Resources need to be available: a database of potential mentors and their expertise, whether they would be willing to mentor outside of their department. Do not use anyone who is not willing. A multipronged approach to mentoring would be best: Introductory informational sessions (formal panels, informal meet and greet parties), handouts, flyers (paper and electronic), have information available on the web but also send it out periodically. It might be useful to simply send out a survey to each new faculty member: what are your mentoring needs?

Dr. Roth added that it is important to push this material to junior faculty. Perhaps even a check list of things you want to accomplish with your mentor.

A committee member noted that faculty have personal responsibility for their own careers. They must try to solve their own problems by working with willing colleagues in their own departments.

Professor Calkins noted that the university has already put on many programs, making it surprising that people were unaware of WSU and SOM efforts. He pointed out that 2008-2009 sessions of the *Professional and Academic Development* seminar series are available via link at the OVPR web site (www.research.wayne.edu). He asked, what are new faculty told when they come in? What advice is available? It would be easy to promulgate mentoring advice when people are joining WSU (e.g., what to expect of mentor, have different mentors for different issues). Precisely what they should be told is another issue

because ideas may change and early advice might be seen as bad at a later time. The need to give newly hired faculty information on mentoring could to be addressed at the Dean's and Chair's level.

When Professor Goodman asked if administrators were being evaluated regarding mentoring, Dr. Roth responded that this began last summer in the SOM. An evaluation is being developed.

Professor Puscheck reiterated that a resource center would be valuable - a place where information is always available, where faculty, chairs or deans could find out more about resources for mentoring.

Participants commented that in order to minimize the variability in mentoring across campus, it might be best to generate a set of resources and have the Provost make some baseline requirements of the deans and chairs for mentoring all new faculty, possibly as an element of the dean's/chair's job performance. However, concern was expressed regarding how such a performance might be judged. If deans and chairs were rewarded for getting people through the tenure process, might it encourage them to be less critical of tenure candidates?

(Drs. Giblin and Roth left the meeting.)

4. *Center for Academic Excellence in National Security Intelligence Studies (CAE).*
Joint committee meeting was cancelled in December and has not yet been rescheduled. The chair reported that there is no word yet but it seems unlikely that the meeting will be rescheduled. [Rescheduled Joint Meeting **is scheduled** for **Thursday, February 12, 2009, 2:00-4:00 pm, 4339 FAB**.]

5. *Forum on Retirement -* �*Financing Your Retirement in Turbulent Times*�
   A. *Participants*
      1. Three retirees:
         a. Jim Low, WSU Business Administration
         b. Al Glover, (nonWSU) former VP, Raymond James, Inc.
         c. Another WSU retiree [Sheldon Alexander, Psychology, agreed shortly after this meeting]
            Professor Padmanabhan suggested that Jerry Dunnifer (Physics) might be willing if Sheldon has a conflict.
      2. TIAA/CREF - Robert Bittner, Preretirement considerations
      3. Fidelity - Dan Thornton, finances in retirement,

        4.   Health care - Susan Cancelosi (Law School)

    B.   *Volunteers needed!*

        1.   Mobile microphone assistants (Padu, Liz):

        2.   Help set up auditorium & hand out programs (Pat, Kingsley)

        3.   Help clean up auditorium (Padu, Liz):

    C.   *Advertising*

    We will have announcements via email (2) to faculty and staff and current retirees, medical school e-mail/web announcements (via Phillip Van Hulle), Pipeline ad, print up flyers for next meeting.

6.   **Next Meeting: February 18, 2009; 10:00 am, 1270 FAB**.

7.   *Adjourn*.

    Meeting adjourned at 11:20 am.

_____

As approved at the Faculty Affairs Committee meeting of February 18, 2009