

Disclaimer: This is a machine generated PDF of selected content from our databases. This functionality is provided solely for your convenience and is in no way intended to replace original scanned PDF. Neither Cengage Learning nor its licensors make any representations or warranties with respect to the machine generated PDF. The PDF is automatically generated "AS IS" and "AS AVAILABLE" and are not retained in our systems. CENGAGE LEARNING AND ITS LICENSORS SPECIFICALLY DISCLAIM ANY AND ALL EXPRESS OR IMPLIED WARRANTIES, INCLUDING WITHOUT LIMITATION, ANY WARRANTIES FOR AVAILABILITY, ACCURACY, TIMELINESS, COMPLETENESS, NON-INFRINGEMENT, MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE. Your use of the machine generated PDF is subject to all use restrictions contained in The Cengage Learning Subscription and License Agreement and/or the Gale Virtual Reference Library Terms and Conditions and by using the machine generated PDF functionality you agree to forgo any and all claims against Cengage Learning or its licensors for your use of the machine generated PDF functionality and any output derived therefrom.

Title: Mentoring promotion/tenure-seeking faculty: principles of good practice within a counselor education program

Author(s): L. DiAnne Borders , Todd F. Lewis , A. Keith Mobley , Christine E. Murray , Jose A. Villalba and Kelly L. Wester

Source: *Counselor Education and Supervision*. 50.3 (Mar. 2011): p171.

Document Type: Report

Copyright : COPYRIGHT 2011 American Counseling Association

<http://www.counseling.org>

Full Text:

Approaches to mentoring junior faculty in counselor education departments have received minimal attention in the counseling literature. In this article, the authors describe a successful program based on the 10 principles for good mentoring recommended by Sorcinelli (2000). Application of the principles within a combined formal and informal mentoring approach is described, as are the experiences of junior faculty whose careers have been shaped within this system.

You can't just say to someone; Go be successful. You have to help them move toward their innate potential for success, which results in a happy, loyal and trusting colleague.

--Promotion/Tenure-Seeking Faculty member

The importance of mentoring junior faculty is quite clear. Indeed, junior faculty members' experiences in the first year are critical to establishing a pattern of productivity (Boice, 1992), and having a faculty mentor is vital through at least the first 3 years (Lucas & Murry, 2002). Junior faculty who are mentored become more productive scholars and more confident teachers, feel less isolated and have more collegial relationships with other departmental faculty, report higher career and job satisfaction, and experience greater career advancement (de Janasz & Sullivan, 2004; Lucas & Murry, 2002). Magnuson and colleagues (Magnuson, 2002; Magnuson, Black, & Lahman, 2006; Magnuson, Shaw, Tubin, & Norem, 2004) found similar results in a longitudinal study of a cohort of counselor education assistant professors in their first 3 years. They reported that more satisfied and more successful assistant professors described ongoing support of program faculty, consistent mentoring, and collegiality.

Nevertheless, there is some evidence that significant numbers of counselor education junior faculty, especially women (N. R. Hill, Leinbaugh, Bradley, & Hazier, 2005) and African Americans (Bradley & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004), lack mentoring for at least some aspects of their work. In addition, both descriptions of mentoring assistance (e.g., Briggs & Pehrsson, 2008) and recommendations for enhancing mentoring practices (e.g., N. R. Hill, 2004) are quite general (e.g., provide resources to conduct research, assist with career decisions, make tenure guidelines clear). As a result, Briggs and Pehrsson (2008) called for senior mentors to provide more specific descriptions of their activities. They suggested that a more in-depth understanding of the mentoring process could help mentors and mentees create healthier and more productive relationships.

In response, we describe concrete examples of successful mentoring strategies used in one Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) accredited counselor education department. First, to provide a context for the descriptions, we summarize key conclusions from the literature on academic mentoring and introduce the evidence-based principles of good practice for supporting junior faculty (Sorcinelli, 2000). Then we provide concrete examples of mentoring activities under each principle, including perspectives of both senior and junior faculty members.

Mentoring Domains and Functions

There is consensus regarding domains of mentoring and the relevant functions needed across academic disciplines (e.g., Johnson, 2002; Mullen & Hutinger, 2008) as well as for academic women (e.g., Rheineck & Roland, 2008) and faculty of color (e.g., Evans & Cokley, 2008). Most writers refer to Kram's (1985) delineation of two primary domains: career and psychosocial. Career mentoring involves instrumental functions that support career advancement, including coaching (e.g., offering tips on effective teaching; navigating the promotion and tenure process; allocating time to teaching, research, and service), protection (e.g., helping the mentee prioritize opportunities and giving permission to say no), sponsorship and visibility (e.g., helping with networking and recommending the mentee for professional service or leadership positions, inviting the mentee to copresent at a professional conference), and challenging work assignments (e.g., observing and providing feedback on the mentee's teaching, encouraging the mentee to take additional research and statistics courses).

Psychosocial mentoring refers to helping junior faculty members with the cultural, environmental, and personal adjustments relevant to their new positions and involves role modeling (e.g., being a positive model of personal and professional life balance, suggesting appropriate ways to interact with various members of the academy), acceptance and confirmation (e.g., providing support, being nonjudgmental, viewing missteps as part of the learning and adjustment process), counseling (e.g., being a confidential sounding board regarding the mentee's anxieties and worries), and friendship (e.g., interacting in informal or social situations such as lunches, celebrating life events such as the birth of a child). Effective mentors blend these functions in ways that enhance the personal and professional development of the mentee (Johnson, 2002; Kram, 1985). In this article, examples of both career and psychosocial mentoring activities are described.

Although there seems to be considerable consensus on the importance of mentoring for junior faculty members, the outcomes of effective mentoring, functions of mentoring, and the specific needs of junior faculty members, there is continued debate about the preferred approach to

mentoring, for example, formal versus informal mentoring or one versus multiple mentors. Some argue for a more formalized, structured approach (e.g., Boice, 1992; Mullen & Hutinger, 2008) in which a new faculty member is assigned to a more senior faculty member. The mentoring program often involves training for the mentor and/or mentee, instructions regarding topics to be covered, and requirements for number and frequency of meetings. Some believe that more structured and systematic mentoring programs are preferable for women and minority faculty members and are likely to involve a greater number of junior faculty members than less structured approaches do (Lucas & Murry, 2002).

Faculty members, however, tend to prefer more informal, spontaneous approaches to mentoring (Mullen & Hutinger, 2008), and these pairings are seen by some as more effective, meaningful, comfortable, relational, and enduring (Johnson, 2002). When individuals choose each other, they form a more successful relationship and can create an individualized approach tailored to the needs of the junior faculty member (de Janasz & Sullivan, 2004; Goodyear, 2006). Informal pairings are achieved through the actions of both senior and junior faculty members. Prospective mentors offer their support to prospective mentees, and junior faculty approach senior faculty who appear to be good matches for their needs, personality, and interests. There are, however, potential downsides to this approach. The promised help may not materialize (Lucas & Murry, 2002; Mullen & Hutinger, 2008) and/or the mentee may find that the mentor is really more interested in how the relationship can further the mentor's career rather than that of the mentee (Johnson, 2002).

Others have suggested that a combination of formal and informal mentoring approaches may be the preferred option, allowing for flexibility that takes into account the individual needs of junior faculty members (Mullen & Forbes, 2000; Olmstead, 1993). In addition, there are numerous suggestions that the traditional dyadic model (one mentor matched with one protege) of mentoring is not realistic in many work settings, including the academic setting (de Janasz & Sullivan, 2004; Magnuson, 2002). Instead, junior faculty members need multiple mentors for various aspects of Kram's (1985) career and psychosocial mentoring domains (Higgins, 2000; Johnson, 2002). This may be particularly true for female (Brown, Daly, & Leong, 2009; Chandler & Kram, 2007; Essic, 1999) and African American faculty members (Bradley & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004; Evans & Cokley, 2008). Junior faculty may benefit from working not only with a primary longterm mentor but also with secondary and tertiary mentors (Johnson, 2002), who provide less intense support over shorter periods of time for specific functions (e.g., guidance in learning a new statistical procedure, modeling life-career balance as a female faculty member, providing networking for the only ethnic minority faculty member in a department). Such a developmental network (de Janasz & Sullivan, 2004; Higgins & Kram, 2001; Kram & Higgins, 2008) can evolve over time as faculty needs and goals change.

Although most faculty apparently rely on more than one mentor (de Janasz & Sullivan, 2004; S. E. K. Hill, Bahniuk, & Dobos, 1989), descriptions of multiple mentor approaches in academe are scarce. In this article, a multiple mentoring approach that involves both formal mechanisms and informal agreements is described.

Principles of Good Practice

In the late 1990s, the American Association for Higher Education sponsored the "New Pathways: Faculty Careers and Employment for the 21st Century" project, which highlighted changes in the American professoriate and increasing expectations of new faculty. As part of this project, Rice, Sorcinelli, and Austin (2000) interviewed over 350 junior faculty members and graduate students who aspired to be faculty members from across the United States in a wide range of disciplines. They identified three core and consistent concerns: lack of a comprehensible tenure system; lack of community; and lack of a balanced, integrated life. In addition, they noted that female respondents and faculty members of color had difficulty finding mentors, felt lonely and isolated, and experienced subtle and overt discrimination.

On the basis of the three core concerns reported by junior and aspiring faculty members (Rice et al., 2000), Sorcinelli (2000) identified 10 principles of good practice in supporting junior faculty and provided brief examples from various universities illustrating each. Principles 1 through 4 involve suggestions for improving the review and tenure process, Principles 5 through 7 offer ideas for encouraging positive relations with colleagues and students, and Principles 8 through 10 provide suggestions for easing the stresses of time and balance. It is of importance that Sorcinelli noted the "essential role played by the department" (p. 27) in enacting these principles. The principles seemed to reflect an updated view of Kram's (1985) career and psychosocial mentoring functions and were quite relevant to the junior faculty in the department, who began their careers during the time Rice et al. (2000) conducted their study. Thus, the 10 principles were used as the organizational framework for describing the mentoring approach.

Procedure

The two lead authors, the previous and current department chairs at their university, proposed the idea and procedures for this article to the five promotion/tenure-seeking faculty members (PTSFs) employed in the department at that time. [The acronym PTSF was chosen because the junior faculty members included both tenure-track and clinical faculty members. At the time the article was being written, four of the PTSFs had recently been promoted to the associate level and one was an assistant professor.] All five PTSFs, the third through seventh authors, expressed interest in participating. The final order of authorship was determined by the extent of participation (e.g., providing examples, identifying and reviewing relevant literature, editing the manuscript).

First, the two lead authors independently reviewed the 10 principles of good practice (Sorcinelli, 2000) and listed relevant examples of the department's mentoring activities for each. After reading Sorcinelli's work, the PTSFs were asked to review the chairs' lists and then independently provide written feedback, including whether they agreed a principle was a departmental practice, examples of the activity from their own experiences, and observations about what worked well and what needed improvement. Responses indicated some variation in activities the PTSFs said they had experienced and how helpful they were. Three reported a negative experience related to at least one mentoring strategy, and all offered suggestions for enhancing mentoring activities.

On the basis of collective feedback and follow-up discussions, we selected the most salient mentoring activities under each principle for inclusion in this article. These are described, along with the PTSFs' observations and quotes from their written feedback (included with their permission).

Principle 1. Good Practice Communicates Expectations for Performance

Junior faculty members in Rice et al.'s (2000) study described expectations for promotion and tenure as "vague, unclear, shifting, and conflicting" (p. 9). Thus, first and foremost, Sorcinelli (2000) emphasized that good practice necessitates performance expectations that are explicit, stated openly, and reviewed often. To that end, within the department, expectations for promotion and promotion and tenure, including number and

quality of publications, teaching requirements, and service commitments, are presented in several formats and at various times. In other words, numerous efforts are made to demystify what is needed to be successful.

Expectations for promotion and tenure (P&T) are first discussed during the on-campus interview between the faculty candidate and the department chair. Upon the arrival of each new faculty member, the chair provides them with a copy of the Handbook for New Faculty Members, which outlines various departmental policies, including departmental and School of Education P&T policies and procedures. These policies describe what materials are to be presented at each stage of the review process, evaluation criteria, and a timeline outlining tasks to complete at each step along the P&T process. During the first fall semester of employment, each PTSF has a series of meetings with the chair to review and discuss these written policies. PTSFs noted that these meetings were helpful in getting oriented to the department and helped establish an "open door" environment that encouraged them to ask questions. Each fall, PTSFs present written goals for the year to the chair and receive feedback about setting priorities relevant to P&T expectations. One PTSF noted that the goals meetings were helpful "in understanding where to put my energy and what was expected of me by the time I went up for reappointment or promotion and tenure." Another stated that "the suggestions to strengthen certain areas were always helpful."

PTSFs typically have a target number of publications in mind for P&T. Although scholarly expectations cannot be quantified in absolute numbers, the department specifies that PTSFs provide a minimum target number of 10 to 12 publications, half of which are to be empirical studies (qualitative and/or quantitative), with a substantive percentage as first author. Having such a tangible number seems to be helpful, although scholarly impact is repeatedly emphasized. Impact is defined as furthering the science of the counselor education field (e.g., improved clinical practice, more effective teaching and supervision approaches, more sound measures of relevant constructs).

The Handbook for New Faculty Members also includes more specific expectations and recommendations related to departmental culture, such as norms and tips for teaching, service, and research. For example, PTSFs are cautioned to take on no more than two doctoral committee memberships per year, encouraged to publish in American Counseling Association (ACA) journals, and given the department's view of which publications carry more weight in the promotion and tenure decision-making process (e.g., national refereed journal articles vs. invited book chapters). Expectations related to departmental, school, and university culture also are included (e.g., which meetings to attend and why). One PTSF stated that the handbook "was very useful overall and something that I referenced several times throughout the first year and beyond."

It is of importance that a developmental perspective is emphasized in the handbook as well as in conversations with the chair and other senior faculty members. Suggestions are provided regarding how to use one's time and energy the first year (e.g., focus on teaching, departmental committees vs. university committees, and internal vs. external grants) and how this likely will evolve over time. PTSFs are strongly encouraged to ask questions of the chair and other faculty for clarification "early and often." One PTSF noted, "We were encouraged to stop in anytime with questions." The goal is to be very clear without overwhelming the new faculty member, giving an overview up front before employment and then providing more detailed information as needed to complete various steps in the process.

Principle 2. Good Practice Gives Feedback on Performance

Junior faculty members in Rice et al.'s (2000) study described feedback as "insufficient, unfocused, and unclear" (p. 10). In contrast, good practice involves "clear, honest and constructive feedback" (Sorcinelli, 2000, p. 29), both verbal and written, that is more developmental than evaluative. As suggested by Sorcinelli (2000), a variety of approaches are used to give PTSFs ongoing feedback relevant to expectations for teaching, scholarship, and service and to encourage self-reflection.

For teaching, one peer review of a class session is required each year. PTSFs are encouraged, in consultation with the chair, to choose an observer with experience or expertise related to their goals (e.g., improve facilitation of classroom discussion), to have a variety of observers over time, and, as appropriate, have the same observer for the same course at different times. After having the identical observer in year 1 and year 3, one PTSF stated that the observer "was able to comment on developmental changes he observed, which helped me to reflect further upon that growth myself."

In a preobservation meeting, the PTSF's syllabus is reviewed, goals for the upcoming class are described, and goals for the observation are stated. Following the observation, the observer meets with the PTSF to share observations and get clarifications as needed. A written formal evaluation, which becomes part of the P&T materials, includes both observations and suggestions for improvement. It is expected that the emphasis will be on helping the PTSF develop his or her own style of teaching.

All departmental faculty members complete a comprehensive annual report of teaching (including student evaluations), scholarship, and service each year. In addition, PTSFs construct a portfolio for peer review during their first 2 years. The portfolios include self-assessments of their teaching, research, and service relevant to their goals for the year, as well as plans for building on their accomplishments the following year. Copies of that year's peer teaching evaluation, published articles, manuscripts under review, grant proposals, and other relevant materials are included. These portfolios are reviewed by all other faculty members in the department, who then provide written, anonymous feedback. The chair compiles the narrative feedback into one evaluation statement, summarizing feedback and specific suggestions.

One PTSF noted that the narrative feedback during the first 2 years was helpful in "understanding the perspectives of multiple faculty" who would be voting on reappointment and P&T and made expectations clear. Another stated,

This was very important for me coming in with all tenured faculty. The narrative feedback allowed me to reflect on my performance, and at the same time saved me some anxiety because I wasn't ranked against the senior faculty. Had that happened, I would probably have been a bit discouraged to say the least.

Several PTSFs found the feedback helpful in constructing a meaningful and realistic research focus, such as whittling back on "my 13 research agendas." Another PTSF found the narrative feedback to be less helpful because of different expectations voiced by various faculty members, some of which seemed inconsistent with agreement regarding goals and expectations with the chair. In this case, the chair was made aware of the conflicting perspectives early on and was able to meet with senior faculty to clarify certain misunderstandings and reach a consensus on expectations for the new faculty member. Sorcinelli's (2000) suggestions include "ongoing discussions in the department of the tenure process and the values that inform it" (p. 30), as well as clear statements of P&T criteria and expectations. Some of the previously described activities (e.g., specific expectations stated in the department's P&T document, annual evaluations) address Sorcinelli's suggestions. The narrative feedback

provided by all faculty members in the first 2 years for the PTSFs' portfolios were cited by one PTSF as particularly collegial; the PTSF added,

I felt like faculty really provided some good perspectives and direction, really telling me what I was doing well and suggesting some next steps, which got pulled into my goals meeting the next year. The feedback for those 2 years led right into creating my reappointment materials during the 3rd year. It was a lengthy and purposeful process.

There are also ongoing discussions in departmental meetings regarding the department's identity, mission, and goals and how these inform expectations of faculty members.

As Sorcinelli (2000) suggested, the School of Education typically hosts a meeting for all nontenured faculty members to discuss P&T guidelines and procedures and answer questions. These meetings are facilitated by school P&T committee members and previous department chairs. The PTSFs reported that these meetings were somewhat helpful but, due to different expectations across departments, meetings within the department were more informative.

Junior faculty members in Rice et al.'s (2000) study expressed frustration and fear regarding turnover of department chairs and tenure committee members. The school-level meetings described previously are one way these concerns are addressed. In addition, the chair's annual evaluation provides insurance for the PTSF if there is turnover in personnel. As one PTSF noted, "There was something in writing suggesting what I should be doing and backing up my decisions and behaviors."

Principle 4. Good Practice Creates Flexible Timelines for Tenure

A number of circumstances may affect progress along the tenure timeline. Faculty of color may find it takes more time to build professional networks, and female faculty members may need to have accommodations made for family responsibilities (Rice et al., 2000). Sorcinelli (2000) encouraged flexibility and attention to these particular needs.

The university's family leave policy allows for flexible timelines due to a variety of family events (e.g., birth of a child, extended illness of a loved one). Following the birth of a child, faculty parents (mother or father) have 8 weeks of paid leave and they may request an extension of 1 year on their tenure clock. The application of the family leave policy, however, happens at the department level. With a cadre of young PTSFs over the last few years, the department has had ample opportunity to be creative. One female PTSF had a teaching reduction to one course during the spring semester when her baby was due. She met her class twice weekly so that the course was completed by midsemester. Another female PTSF, who also had the reduction to one course, took her leave in the middle of the semester. A doctoral student cotaught the course with her and covered the classes she missed while on leave. Male faculty members have not asked for the official 8 weeks' leave, but have negotiated ("much appreciated") unofficial time off following the births of their children, coming to campus only for teaching and a few office hours per week and spending the rest of their time at home with their families. In these ways, departmental faculty members and the chair have sought to demonstrate their intent to be "family friendly" and supportive (see also Principle 10).

For a Latino faculty member, the chair connected him with a research center and faculty on campus with similar interests. He reported these introductions "actually proved much more beneficial than, say, getting to meet a professor in the Spanish department who happened to be Latino." These connections helped him start to build a network that has led to significant external funding and interdisciplinary publications.

Principle 5. Good Practice Encourages Mentoring by Senior Faculty

Junior faculty members in Rice et al.'s (2000) study reported a desire for more effective and enriching connections with senior faculty. In line with Sorcinelli's (2000) suggestions for good practice, the department has invested much energy into mentoring PTSFs, both recently and historically. Mentoring PTSFs is a highly valued activity and is seen as an important professional responsibility within the departmental culture. This attitude reflects deliberate mentoring practices established some years ago by former faculty members, who modeled many of the activities and beliefs practiced today. One PTSF wrote,

Mentoring from senior faculty seems to be a mind-set as well as a goal. It is the culture of the Department to usher (new) faculty into the role of counselor educator. How has this been indoctrinated? I don't know if it's in the senior faculty rule book or an area of evaluation, but I can tell that at minimum discussions on this topic occur.

Beyond the formal policies and procedures described previously, the approach has followed a more informal, "spontaneous," multiple-mentor approach rather than a formal, structured approach with an assigned mentor. This approach encourages meaningful connections and has seemed to work well for several reasons. First, senior faculty members truly enjoy mentoring PTSFs, so all are available and often initiate contacts that they believe would be mutually beneficial. Second, each senior faculty member has different strengths and thus is a more natural mentor for some areas of the PTSF's development than others. Third, each PTSF arrives with different strengths and areas for growth, and therefore needs a somewhat individualized approach. Fourth, faculty offices are, for the most part, across from each other along the same hall, making informal, almost immediate consultations easy (e.g., "I just had this experience with a student and I'm not sure how to handle it"). Such spatial proximity greatly facilitates the development of mentoring relationships (Chandler & Kram, 2007; Higgins & Kram, 2001). Finally, personalities vary, and needs and goals necessarily change across time, which are more easily accommodated by a more fluid approach. Thus, in consultation with the chair, PTSFs identify senior colleagues who may be helpful to them in a variety of ways: observing teaching, designing a study, writing an internal grant, editing or reviewing a manuscript, choosing a publication outlet for a written project, dealing with conflicting feedback from journal reviewers, or seeking a particular service opportunity. At the same time, senior faculty also initiate contacts and offer to help, collaborate, and be supportive.

Perhaps the most common mentoring suggestion involves inviting a new faculty member to coauthor a manuscript or study. This happens in the department on a regular basis, although varied by faculty member. Coauthoring can be quite instructive in terms of how to structure a particular type of manuscript and can provide an opportunity to receive feedback on writing style. Offers to edit a PTSF's work may be just as helpful. One PTSF reported, "I have learned a lot by reading through the detailed feedback on my manuscripts."

Ideally, and usually over some time, projects of complementary and/or mutual interest develop, drawing on the expertise of both faculty members. For example, a PTSF contributed her expertise in family interventions to a case study being written by a senior faculty member. Senior faculty and PTSFs involved in a new advanced practicum course collaboratively designed a study of its effectiveness. Another PTSF-senior faculty pair

combined their two interests in a study of the wellness of new faculty members.

Senior faculty members are involved in other indirect mentoring activities in line with Sorcinelli's (2000) suggestions for collaborating. Most departmental committees (e.g., search committees, program revision committees) include both PTSF and senior faculty members so that the perspectives, experiences, and input of PTSFs are heard. Departmental meetings also provide opportunities for indirect mentoring. For example, the department holds a student review and retention meeting at the end of each semester. One PTSF wrote that "for me, participating on student retention committees with senior faculty has assisted me in articulating issues with students, understanding the gatekeeping nature of our role, and interpreting policies related to ethical codes, due process guidelines, and University procedures." The size of the faculty (11 members) and the informality of departmental meetings also encourage participation by PTSFs.

One PTSF provided this final comment about departmental practices under this principle: "The mentoring by faculty was not about molding me to fit one model, but instead allowing me to be who I was while also meeting the expectations."

Principle 6. Good Practice Extends Mentoring and Feedback to Graduate Students Who Aspire to Be Faculty Members

Sorcinelli (2000) suggested that graduate students need many of the same supportive activities offered to junior faculty as good practice. Thus, most of her suggestions under this principle were specific to working with graduate students. Of more relevance to this article are the ways PTSFs are involved in mentoring students.

PTSFs are almost immediately involved with doctoral students preparing to be counselor educators, although in low-demand ways. Typically, several doctoral students will be assigned to assist a PTSF with course-related practicum activities (e.g., observing role play of master's students and providing feedback). The PTSF trains the doctoral students regarding requirements for the practicum and provides feedback about their work. Such interactions often lead to other relevant discussions, such as what it is like to be a female faculty member, how the student decided to accept the offer of a position in our department, or how to handle a challenging student in the practicum activity. PTSFs also attend and participate in dissertation proposal seminars for all students, involve some students in their own research, and copresent with students at conferences. At the same time, PTSFs are encouraged to avoid overextending in these rewarding yet time-consuming activities.

PTSFs noted that they learned how to mentor students by watching tenured faculty members interact and encourage students. One stated, "My 'manner' of interacting with students has been largely shaped by simply observing senior faculty interact with students. And my style is still evolving!" Another PTSF reported, "I enjoy being forwarded emails or citations by senior faculty and have oftentimes found myself doing the same with students. In 'paying forward' the encouragement I have received, I emulate the model I've been provided."

Principle 7. Good Practice Recognizes the Department Chair as a Career Sponsor

Sorcinelli (2000) highlighted the critical role of the department chair in encouraging a collegial environment that supports and protects junior faculty members. As indicated previously, the chair is the central spoke of the mentoring wheel in the department through ongoing formal meetings (e.g., goals meetings) as well as oversight of all reappointment and P&T documents. The chair also purposefully initiates informal brief contacts at least weekly with PTSFs, and more frequently during the first year, to get a sense of the PTSFs' transition and needs.

Consultation with the chair is expected so that discussions of new opportunities and decisions can be considered in light of both short-term and long-term goals (e.g., Is this the best time to run for president of a national organization?). Consultation also is encouraged as protection for the PTSF, who may not be aware of the time commitment involved in a university committee, know which commitments "count" more, or be aware of the political nature of some alignments on campus.

PTSFs are encouraged to say, "I have to talk with my department chair first to see how this fits into my other responsibilities" before saying yes. It may be a flattering and exciting invitation--and it may be the wrong time. One PTSF wrote, "This was one of the greatest things. Several times when I was asked to be on a University committee, my department chair adamantly said 'no.'" Another stated, "I think this was essential for me. I always check out opportunities to get the chair's thoughts and insights. It was a relief to hear 'you don't need to do that right now' and that saved me a lot of stress."

PTSFs also are encouraged to share their accomplishments (e.g., manuscript accepted for publication) with the chair. Female faculty and faculty of color can be especially reluctant to "brag" to the chair. This reluctance is addressed directly in the Handbook for New Faculty Members, along with the following advice:

Keep the Chair informed of your activities and accomplishments. Your needs. Your goals. Your concerns. The Chair is your guide and also your advocate with the School and the University. The Chair can only help, advise, and advocate for you if the Chair knows what you are doing! (p. 13).

Principle 8. Good Practice Supports Teaching, Particularly at the Undergraduate Level

The department does not have an undergraduate major, but several of Sorcinelli's (2000) suggestions do apply, such as access to previous course syllabi. In addition, to the extent possible, PTSFs are assigned courses that match their interests and/or speak to their strengths and avoid a teaching load that overruns time for research. One PTSF noted, "I had a good 'build up' in my teaching load in that I never had to do two new preps in the same semester." Structured programs and workshops regarding teaching are available on campus. Ongoing support and feedback from senior faculty about teaching has been described previously. In addition, PTSFs are encouraged to observe other faculty in the classroom or in supervision. At times, the chair may suggest a particular pairing based on the new faculty member's teaching goals (e.g., observe a more process-oriented teacher if the goal is to improve facilitation of group discussion).

PTSFs are made aware of several resources on campus that support teaching, including grant funds. Some have received funds to attend conferences relevant to their teaching assignments; several received funding for supplies to use in course and supervision activities.

Principle 9. Good Practice Supports Scholarly Development

Sorcinelli's (2000) good practice suggestions under this principle primarily involve resources (e.g., research assistants, travel funds, grant support offices) that are needed to develop one's scholarly agenda. Many involve offices beyond a department. The task, then, is to make sure PTSFs know about these opportunities and offices, including sources of additional funding. At the school level, PTSFs are eligible for a dean-supported small research grant and additional travel funds. Other opportunities for funding (e.g., special fund for international travel) are described in the Handbook for New Faculty Members, including support to obtain additional research training. PTSFs have been given priority by the department in years when resources were short, such as limited funding for research assistants and travel. One PTSF noted, "I think this support is essential, and it was certainly evident when I was junior rank." Given the minimal start-up funds that are offered, this priority continues to be important. In addition, during their 1st year, PTSFs are assisted in writing a proposal for the New Faculty Grants awarded by the research office on campus and are guided in their proposals for other internal grants in subsequent years. In line with Sorcinelli's (2000) suggestions, the department supports PTSFs' use of a range of research methods across a wide variety of research projects, including applied research and work with secondary data sets. Quality and impact are emphasized, rather than type of study (see Principle 1). Given the increasing emphasis on interdisciplinary work, the chair has connected PTSFs with on-campus researchers with similar interests, including health disparities and motivational interviewing projects in the School of Nursing with extensive external funding. Encouraging these connections is in line with a current emphasis on mentoring that allows proteges to establish broad and diverse networks that meet their varied and changing needs (Chandler & Kram, 2007; Goodyear, 2006; Higgins & Kram, 2001).

Principle 10. Good Practice Fosters a Balance Between Professional and Personal Life

Junior faculty members need advice on managing their varied responsibilities (Sorcinelli, 2000), including encouragement (if not permission) to have a life outside work. In goals meetings and annual reviews, PTSFs receive suggestions for prioritizing their time among teaching, research, and service to provide time away from work. Although faculty members in the department are motivated for success and work hard, life outside of work is honored. It is expected that faculty members will make time to attend their children's activities, take care of ailing family members, and be involved in religious and civic activities of their choosing. The department strives to create a culture of healthy balance. There certainly are ongoing conversations about "how much more can we take on," and various times of the semester can be more than hectic, but faculty members are not asked to do more than they believe they can do. Instead, the focus is on a synergy of effort, so that the teaching, research, and service activities complement and develop one another.

Summers, in particular, are viewed as guarded time for regeneration, planning, reflection, focused scholarly work, and quantity and quality time with family and friends. Faculty members are not expected to teach, although some choose to do so. Some have responsibilities that spill over into the summer (e.g., internship, admissions), and work with doctoral students does not stop. By departmental policy, however, dissertation proposal meetings and comprehensive exams are not scheduled during the summer months.

An additional cultural element of the department is that the chair works to protect faculty from unnecessary bureaucratic responsibilities by taking on some committee work and report writing that could be passed along to faculty. Finally, PTSFs are not expected to have an open door policy with respect to advising. Rather, they are asked to accommodate students' need for time in a reasonable fashion, but to protect their own time for research, quality teaching, and carefully selected service.

Discussion

In this article, we have described one counselor education program's approach to mentoring PTSFs, based on the 10 principles of good practice outlined by Sorcinelli (2000). We are aware that our approach may not be a perfect match for other programs, which necessarily will differ in size, culture, personality, and the larger university context of expectations, as Sorcinelli noted that "good practices are campus- and content-specific" (p. 28). In addition, not all senior faculty members want to mentor and not all are good mentors (Johnson, 2002), so that our "everyone participates" approach should not be imposed where it would not fit.

Indeed, the approach described here is not perfect, and clearly some aspects worked better for some PTSFs than for others (e.g., see responses to narrative feedback under Principle 2). Several PTSFs noted times when they had difficulty saying no to a mentoring opportunity offered by senior faculty members. Since multiple faculty members may approach them at the same time, PTSFs can be overwhelmed, so that the directive to "consult the chair" is relevant to opportunities both within and outside the department. Similar limitations have been identified by others (e.g., Chandler & Kram, 2007; de Janasz & Sullivan, 2004; Higgins, 2000; Olmstead, 1993), who noted that managing multiple mentors may be confusing, conflicting, and draining.

We also are aware that the more informal aspects of the approach may seem somewhat nebulous to some readers. Such an informal, fluid, and individualized approach has its drawbacks for readers interested in designing a similar approach. As one PTSF stated, "Even though we like the informal nature of mentoring here, its lack of structure makes it difficult for others to replicate. Is there some way to 'formalize the informal?'" Similarly, Mullen and Forbes (2000) noted that it is difficult to "write into the rules" a mentoring process that responds to the personal needs of individuals" (p. 44).

In addition, the success of more informal approaches is dependent on both senior and junior faculty taking the initiative to explore potential collaborations, and several PTSFs noted that new faculty members need to be willing to reach out, ask questions, and discuss concerns. Similarly, Chandler and Kram (2007) emphasized the "very active role" that individuals need to take "in shaping their own development" (p. 259). One PTSF said,

We are mentored in all areas, but really the majority of the time we are mentored if we ask for help. I am not sure that someone who was not willing to ask for mentoring informally would receive the same benefits that I did.

Peer Mentoring

In seeking to meet the needs of new faculty members, it is easy to overlook the ways they can help each other (Chandler & Kram, 2007; de Janasz & Sullivan, 2004). Indeed, all the PTSFs have collaborated with at least one other PTSF on at least one project, combining their complementary strengths in conducting research, writing articles, and developing grant proposals. Some years ago, Boice (1992) found that junior faculty members were successful at mentoring other junior faculty. Higgins (2000) found that peer mentors were significantly related to work satisfaction of early career lawyers in large corporate law firms, an organizational structure she likened to universities. In particular, she reported that higher amounts

of work satisfaction were most significantly related to receiving high amounts of psychosocial mentoring and support (see Kram, 1985) from one person, not necessarily a more senior person. Higgins noted that "peers may provide help such as information and friendship that enable an individual to feel competent and confident in his or her role in an organization" (p. 280). Indeed, the experience of one PTSF, who was the only assistant professor in the department for several years, clearly was different from those who arrived at the department at the same time or joined an existing group of PTSFs. Senior faculty members simply could not provide the same type of psychosocial support for the "loner" that subsequent hires provided for him and each other. One PTSF expanded on this concept by coestablishing a national interest network for new faculty members in counselor education, which has been highly successful. Despite the positive aspects of peer mentoring, however, career mentoring functions (Kram, 1985) are best supported by more senior faculty members who understand the written and unwritten rules of the departmental and university culture.

Benefits of Mentoring

In line with the findings in the literature (e.g., Boice, 1992; de Janasz & Sullivan, 2004; Johnson, 2002), senior faculty members in the department have noted benefits from mentoring experiences. Although time-consuming, mentoring PTSFs clearly speaks to many aspects of generativity for more senior faculty members as well as enhanced energy and productivity through collaborations (Johnson, 2002). PTSFs' professional accomplishments reflect well on the department and their mentors (Johnson, 2002). PTSFs also have brought new perspectives and insights to curriculum development and revisions. Over time, PTSFs have begun to return the favor, initiating collaborative research, writing, and service projects based on mutual interests. PTSFs have had the most successful record of grant funding in the department in recent years, enhancing the on-campus status of the program as well as funding students. In short, their needs for mentoring have evolved to new challenges (e.g., directing dissertation studies), and their abilities to provide mentoring for others have become evident.

Mentoring approaches such as the one outlined here inherently present obstacles for those seeking to evaluate their success and research their impact (e.g., de Janasz & Sullivan, 2004). How does one determine which mentor made what contribution to which mentee outcome? To date, we have not attempted to collect systematic outcome data regarding our approach. At this point, we offer only our PTSF statements, as summarized in this article, and our record: To date, every PTSF who has applied for promotion (clinical) or promotion with tenure to the associate level has received a unanimous vote of approval at the School of Education level. More research is needed to understand what makes our approach work and how it could be improved, in general and for specific individuals, as well as provide guidelines for other counselor education programs that seek to foster a "developmental culture" (Chandler & Kram, 2007) that enhances mentoring of their PTSFs. Nevertheless, we believe many of our practices are well grounded in current research on mentoring, as reported throughout this article, and reflect recommendations recently highlighted in the final phase of Magnuson's (Magnuson, Norem, & Lonneman-Doroff, 2009) 6-year longitudinal study of new counselor educators.

Given that many junior faculty in counselor education programs lack the mentoring they need (e.g., Bradley & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004; N. R. Hill et al., 2005), a broader conversation about establishing effective mentoring programs could be initiated within the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES). The recently completed ACES guidelines for research mentoring (Wester et al., 2009) is a vital first step, but these guidelines do not address many of the functions of career and psychosocial mentoring outlined by Kram (1985). Systematic professional development for ACES members who want to enhance their mentoring abilities may be needed.

Our goal has been to provide some tangible examples of mentoring activities, formal and informal, that may benefit other programs. For readers who wish to develop or revitalize mentoring within their departments, we encourage the following:

1. Have frequent conversations among senior faculty members regarding how they might best be involved in the mentoring of PTSFs.
2. Develop a clear and concrete departmental plan for mentoring PTSFs.
3. Implement a structure for providing developmentally appropriate feedback to PTSFs.
4. Be flexible in terms of how mentoring is conducted with individual PTSFs.
5. Emphasize open communication.

Conclusion

The purposes and goals of the current mentoring approach might best be summarized by Olmstead (1993), as she reflected on her experiences as an assistant professor of physics at two different universities:

From the point of view of an assistant professor: tell us what we are supposed to do, give us enough information and resources to get the job done, tell us how we are doing in time to fix any problems, and do a reasonable job as a "blocker" so we can make it across the finish line without getting too badly hurt along the way. The rewards will include both a valued colleague and an improved reputation for your department. (p. 1)

Olmstead's (1993) words also make clear some of the payoffs for investing time, energy, and resources in PTSFs. In addition, PTSFs who experience good mentoring likely will become good mentors of graduate students as well as future junior colleagues. Indeed, with the promotions of several PTSFs, "mentoring of mentoring" has become a more deliberate focus in interactions between them and more senior faculty members. In this way, we hope our tradition of mentoring will continue for many more generations of PTSFs.

References

- Boice, R. (1992). *The new faculty member: Supporting and fostering professional development*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bradley, C., & Holcomb-McCoy, C. (2004). African American counselor educators: Their experiences, challenges, and recommendations. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 43*, 258-273.
- Briggs, C. A., & Pehrsson, D.-E. (2008). Research mentorship in counselor education. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 48*, 101-113.

- Brown, R. T., Daly, B. P., & Leong, F. T. L. (2009). Mentoring in research: A developmental approach. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 40, 306-313.
- Chandler, D. E., & Kram, K. E. (2007). Mentoring and developmental networks in the new career context. In H. P. Gunz & M. A. Peiperl (Eds.), *Handbook of career studies* (pp. 241-267). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- de Janasz, S. C., & Sullivan, S. E. (2004). Multiple mentoring in academe: Developing the professional network. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 64, 263-283.
- Essic, E. J. (1999). The multiple mentor model: Getting the mentors you need. An investigation of the effects of a skills-based program for women on perceptions of mentor relationships and self-efficacy (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.
- Evans, G. L., & Cokley, K. O. (2008). African American women and the academy: Using career mentoring to increase research productivity. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, 2, 50-57.
- Goodyear, M. (2006). Mentoring: A learning collaboration. *EDUCAUSE Quarterly*, 29, 51-53.
- Higgins, M. C. (2000). The more, the merrier? Multiple developmental relationships and work satisfaction. *Journal of Management Development*, 19, 277-296.
- Higgins, M. C., & Kram, K. E. (2001). Reconceptualizing mentoring at work: A developmental network perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 26, 264-288.
- Hill, N. R. (2004). The challenges experienced by pretenured faculty members in counselor education: A wellness perspective. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 44, 135-146.
- Hill, N. R., Leinbaugh, T., Bradley, C., & Hazier, R. (2005). Female counselor educators: Encouraging and discouraging factors in academia. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 83, 374-380.
- Hill, S. E. K., Bahniuk, M. H., & Dobos, J. (1989). The impact of mentoring and collegial support on faculty success: An analysis of support behavior, information adequacy, and communication apprehension. *Communication Education*, 38, 15-32.
- Johnson, W. B. (2002). The intentional mentor: Strategies and guidelines for the practice of mentoring. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 33, 88-96.
- Kram, K. E. (1985). *Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- Kram, K. E., & Higgins, M. C. (2008, September 22). A new approach to mentoring. *Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from <http://online.wsj.com/public/article/SB122160063875344843.html>
- Lucas, C. J., & Murry, J. W., Jr. (2002). *New faculty: A practical guide for academic beginners*. New York, NY: Palgrave.
- Magnuson, S. (2002). New assistant professors of counselor education: Their 1st year. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 41, 306-320.
- Magnuson, S., Black, L. L., & Lahman, M. K. E. (2006). The 2000 cohort of new assistant professors of counselor education: Year 3. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 45, 162-179.
- Magnuson, S., Norem, K., & Lonneman-Doroff, T. (2009). The 2000 cohort of new assistant professors of counselor education: Reflecting at the culmination of six years. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 49, 54-71.
- Magnuson, S., Shaw, H., Tubin, B., & Norem, K. (2004). Assistant professors of counselor education: First and second year experiences. *Journal of Professional Counseling: Practice, Theory, and Research*, 32, 3-18.
- Mullen, C. A., & Forbes, S. A. (2000). Untenured faculty: Issues of transition, adjustment and mentorship. *Mentoring and Tutoring*, 8, 31-46.
- Mullen, C. A., & Hutinger, J. L. (2008). At the tipping point: Role of formal faculty mentoring in changing university research cultures. *Journal of In-service Education*. 34, 181-204.
- Olmstead, M. A. (1993, August). Mentoring new faculty: Advice to department chairs. *CSWP Gazette*, 13, 1. Retrieved from <http://faculty.washington.edu/olmstd/research/Mentoring.html>
- Rheineck, J. E., & Roland, C. B. (2008). The developmental mentoring relationship between academic women. *Adultspan Journal*, 7, 80-93.
- Rice, R. E., Sorcinelli, M. D., & Austin, A. E. (2000). *Heeding new voices: Academic careers for a new generation*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Sorcinelli, M. D. (2000). Principles of good practice: Supporting early-career faculty. In R. E. Rice, M. D. Sorcinelli, & A. E. Austin (Eds.). *Heeding new voices: Academic careers for a new generation* (pp. 26-38). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Wester, K. L., Borders, L. D., Briggs, C., Chang, C., Haag-Granello, D., Hays, D., Pepperell, J., & Spurgeon, S. (2009). Guidelines for research mentorship in counselor education. Retrieved from Association for Counselor Education and Supervision website: <http://www.acesonline.net/features.asp?feature-id=601595437>

L. DiAnne Borders, J. Scott Young, Kelly L. Wester, Christine E. Murray, Jose A. Villalba, Todd F. Lewis, and A. Keith Mobley, Department of Counseling and Educational Development, University of North Carolina at Greensboro. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to L. DiAnne Borders, Department of Counseling and Educational Development, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, PO Box 26170, Greensboro, NC 27402 (e-mail: borders@uncg.edu).

Borders, L. DiAnne^Young, J. Scott^Wester, Kelly L.^Murray, Christine E.^Villalba, Jose A.^Lewis, Todd F.^Mobley, A. Keith

Source Citation (MLA 7th Edition)

Borders, L. DiAnne, et al. "Mentoring promotion/tenure-seeking faculty: principles of good practice within a counselor education program." *Counselor Education and Supervision* Mar. 2011: 171+. *Academic OneFile*. Web. 14 Mar. 2014.

Document URL

http://go.galegroup.com/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CA252191078&v=2.1&u=lincclin_vcc&it=r&p=AONE&sw=w&asid=48563a6c77cf00dc7d9fc6c2114fedb2

Gale Document Number: GALE|A252191078
