

COMMITTEE ON CAREER ADVISING

Annual Report, 2005-06

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The Committee on Career Advising (CCA) began its year by studying a report on women faculty in the physical and biological sciences on our campus. The report indicated many areas of job satisfaction—excellent and congenial departments, committed graduate students, and intellectual freedom, among several others. The areas of job dissatisfaction mentioned include lack of on-campus childcare, lack of affordable housing, challenge of getting research funds for labs and graduate students, and personnel processes that were unclear, conservative, and/or inconsistently employed. The faculty interviewed identified mentoring as valuable to their career development. With this understanding of the concerns of one segment of the campus, CCA wanted to assess the need for mentoring for a wider range of faculty. To that end, we devised a survey on mentoring that we submitted to a sample of junior faculty and to department chairs and managers.

Faculty Mentoring Survey

A report of the results of the survey on faculty mentoring is attached to our annual report and will be disseminated to departments. Junior faculty who responded to the survey indicated the need for help with administrative procedures, personnel actions, and partner hires. Responses of department Chairs and department managers show a variety of mentoring and orientation methods used on campus and generally reveal that the departments considered their methods to be successful. But our survey shows that where departments believed that they were offering effective services, junior faculty respondents felt they received few or no services. To improve mentoring on campus, CCA recommends that all departments check their mentoring and orientation methods against the CCA survey items and that junior faculty use the same list to familiarize themselves with what they can and should receive.

Career Equity Review

After consulting with the Chair of the Senate, CCA agreed to take over the job of advising faculty interested in applying for a Career Equity Review, which assess whether their current rank and step are appropriate for their accomplishments. This job will typically be done individually by the Chair. In advising potential applicants about a Career Equity Review, the Chair will 1) describe the process and options, 2) discuss whether or how career advancement was thrown off track, and 3) apprise the faculty of his/her right to a grievance procedure if discrimination or an infraction of procedure might have occurred in earlier personnel reviews.

Childcare

The cost of housing and the availability of convenient, affordable childcare are factors affecting recruitment and retention of faculty. CCA was happy to see some progress made on increasing childcare facilities for the children of faculty members, but we find that the plans are too little and, for many of us, too late.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON CAREER ADVISING

Olof Einarsdottir

Gabriel Elkaim

Patty Gallagher (F, S)

Paul Roth

Carolyn Martin-Shaw, Chair

August 31, 2006

Survey of Faculty Mentoring Activities in Academic Departments

The Academic Senate Committee on Career Advising (CCA) is charged with developing, implementing, and evaluating mentoring activities to enhance the likelihood of faculty promotion and retention. To better understand mentoring activities and needs throughout the university, we sent out two surveys: one to Chairs and academic department managers, and one to Assistant Professors Step II and III. The first survey sought to identify mentoring practices currently in use on campus and the second survey aimed to assess the effectiveness of those practices.

We received responses from 16 of the 41 departments and programs (about 40%): 3 in the Arts, 1 in Engineering, 5 in Humanities, 2 in Physical and Biological Sciences, and 5 in Social Sciences. Out of 77 faculty members contacted, 30 responded (about 40%): 7 in Arts, 6 in Engineering, 1 in Humanities, 2 in Physical and Biological Sciences, and 14 in Social Sciences. This report contains a summary of the results of the survey, a selection of respondents' comments, and the committee's recommendations for the future.

I. Summary of Findings

The survey covered questions regarding mentoring of junior faculty as well as orienting new faculty to their departments, to the campus, and to the UC system. Both departmental and junior faculty respondents point to a range of people who provide orientation for new faculty, including staff members, department Chair, other faculty, and Academic Human Resources (AHR).

Overwhelmingly junior faculty respondents report that AHR was important in providing their orientation to the campus and the UC system. A number of junior faculty respondents identified a broad spectrum of issues on which they needed additional help. Among these were advice on Senate and campus service, help with personnel actions and partner hires, and assistance with administrative procedures. Some junior faculty respondents wanted to see more web-based materials and to have more inclusive printed materials.

A goal of faculty mentoring is to enhance the retention and promotion of faculty. We gauged the extent of the problem of retention and promotion by examining a study of promotion to tenure during the last ten years. We found that most people who came up for tenure within all the

divisions were granted tenure. Of a total of 227 Assistant Professors hired between 7/1/1995 and 7/1/2006, thirty-four have separated from the university. Seventy percent (70%) of those who left UCSC were untenured at the time of separation. Except for a few cases, we were unable to assess the reasons for the departure. A systemwide 2005 Faculty Recruitment and Retention Report (Ellen Switkes to the Council of Vice Chancellors) gives some indication of the kinds of general issues that might cause untenured faculty to leave: resignations were because of “low salary,” “family reasons,” and “spousal employment.”

What are we doing for faculty **mentoring** was our next question. After consulting widely, CCA developed the following list of best practices.

Best Practices for Faculty Mentoring include mentoring in the following areas:

- 1. Research:** identify funding sources, seed money, start-up, creative off-site research, help with grant writing, and intellectual property rights
- 2. Publication:** review of manuscripts, where to publish, when to publish, relative importance of chapters, journal articles, and book reviews
- 3. Expectations for Tenure:** preparation of file, personnel review, rules, and procedures
- 4. Teaching:** grading, course development, writing a syllabus, academic integrity policies, and classroom expectations and management
- 5. Service:** participating on department, campus, and senate committees; service to the profession and the public
- 6. Lab and Office Space:** what is appropriate, negotiation, and contraction and expansion of research space
- 7. Supervision of Students and Post Docs:** expectations, hiring, training, and management
- 8. Other Personnel Issues:** sexual harassment, diversity awareness, and hiring procedures
- 9. Administrative Rules:** voting rights, purchasing, and reimbursements
- 10. Consulting, Conflicts of Interest, and Extra-Curricular Activities:** writing textbooks, teaching summer session, and consulting—when and what to do
- 11. Managing Workload:** day-to-day, long term, office hours, email, writing, grad students, committees, teaching, research, and publishing
- 12. Life Balancing:** family, work, health, and community

What we found at UCSC surprised us. The most striking result of our survey was the “serious disconnect” between what departments reported that they offered and what junior faculty reported that they received. For instance,

- All departments responding to the survey reported that they mentor on expectations for tenure, but 65% of junior faculty respondents (19/29) answered that they were not mentored in this area.
- All responding departments reported that they mentor junior faculty on teaching: course development, grading, and classroom expectations; but two-thirds of responding junior faculty (67%, 18/27) reported that they received no such mentoring.
- Most departments, 14-15 out of 16 reported that they mentored faculty on research, publications, and service, but 60-80% of junior faculty respondents report not being mentored in those areas (research 68% [19/28], publications 78% [22/28], and service 60% [17/28]).
- Fewer than one-fifth of the junior faculty reported that they received mentoring on supervision of students (0/30), consultation (4/30), lab and office space (3/30), and management of workload (5/30). Yet responding departments felt that they had done good jobs in those areas.

How mentoring is dispensed on campus varied across and within the academic divisions and the School of Engineering, from junior faculty being assigned a single mentor, to Chair as mentor, to general openness and availability of senior faculty. On the whole, junior faculty respondents sought mentoring that engaged senior faculty in one-on-one conversations. Departments addressed one-on-one mentoring, but also included workshops and presentations as aspects of mentoring. As might be expected, the committee found that some responding junior faculty were happy with casual mentoring, but others wanted a formal system of assigned mentors. A couple of responding junior faculty expressed interest in working with mentors outside their departments.

We will address suggestions for improving **mentoring** in the final section of this report. The next four sections of this report summarize specific questions of the survey.

II. Campus and Department Orientation Practices

Most departments do not have formal orientation programs for faculty, partly because so few faculty are hired each year in a single department and partly because the Chair of the department often takes responsibility for orienting the new faculty member to the campus. Most junior faculty respondents (17/30) identified AHR as providing orientation to the university, and a few department Chairs and managers also indicated that in addition to meeting with faculty one-on-one, they rely on AHR for campus orientation. One new faculty member mentioned that AHR was extremely helpful, while another suggested that “some information provided could have been effectively compiled in a packet to hand out to new faculty. This would have left room for other issues to be covered: including, but not limited to, the academic promotion system, benefits overview, e-mail orientation, how to order textbooks, how to navigate the narrative evaluation system and so on.”

III. Current Faculty and Peer Mentorship Practices

Half of the responding departments reported that they assign a senior mentor to assist a new junior faculty member. One department assigned a senior faculty member to work with a cluster of junior faculty and two departments indicated that the Chair serves as mentor to new junior faculty. Junior faculty noted that their interaction with mentors included lunch once a year with the chair, monthly meetings with the chair, meetings with assigned senior mentor, and peer mentoring. Regarding peer mentoring, one respondent wrote: “It’s very much the blind leading the blind...it’s more a support network than mentoring.” Some responding junior faculty reported satisfaction with being able to consult a range of individuals including junior and senior faculty, the Chair, and staff and with having web-based material available. A clear trend in the comments of junior faculty is that they have been left to initiate contact with senior mentors rather than their senior colleagues reaching out to them. Two responding junior faculty summed up the range of effective mentoring on campus. One wrote, “Mentored” is too strong a word. “My fellow faculty always have an open door when I have a question though. Thus I just go ask when I’m particularly confused about something.” The other reported, “My mentor has done a great job of answering questions as they come up.”

Under additional mentoring activities, responding departments listed grant writing workshops, faculty exhibition space, advice on applications and nominations for career awards, and meetings before personnel reviews. Responding junior faculty mentioned informal check-in by the Chair and senior faculty, collaboration with senior faculty on organizing a panel for a professional

conference, aid in contacting professional colleagues, and the availability and geniality of the Chair and senior colleagues.

Underscoring the range in diversity of effective mentoring, two junior faculty reported very similar experiences but one called for more formal mentoring and the other did not. The first reported, "The Chair and one other senior member of the Department checked in informally a few times, particularly in my first year here, to see how things were going. Certainly they were very much available and open to answering questions that I had, large and small. However, I believe strongly that a more formal mentoring system would be very beneficial." The second wrote, "Mentoring has been done informally and seems effective, though there is not solid data for this other than a lack of complaints and a seemingly happy community in the department." Finally, one poignant response gave us pause. The respondent, a Chair or senior manager, asked how senior faculty can mentor in workload management and life balancing when they have not mastered these themselves.

IV. Credit for Mentoring

Three comments on the question of whether or not mentors gained credit in their personnel reviews for service as mentors netted responses that suggest that some departments recognize mentoring as a service responsibility, although it is not consistently mentioned in personnel reviews. Where the Chair is the primary mentor, mentoring is considered part of the Chair's regular duties, and was not commented on in personnel reviews.

V. What Should the Senate Do?

Responding faculty and department Chairs and managers alike felt that circulating our template of mentoring activities and sharing the results of the survey would be beneficial in engaging members of the campus in thinking about and assessing their mentoring activities. In addition, department respondents thought the Senate could aid in providing advice on senate service, familiarizing junior faculty with campus procedures, such as IT, AIS, and CruzBuy, helping out with the problems of partner hires and faculty personnel reviews, and improving mentoring activities, such as peer support and consultation with senior faculty. Junior faculty respondents suggested that the Senate help in establishing and funding a formal mentoring system, understanding Senate and campus service, making contacts with potential mentors from outside their departments, working with multiple faculty mentors, and setting and managing research agendas.

VI. Conclusions and Recommendations

- Given that retention and promotion of our outstanding junior faculty is a shared goal of the campus, mentoring and orientation should be shared responsibilities at every level of the campus--central administration, the School of Engineering, Academic divisions, departments, and the Academic Senate.
- In addition to activities already undertaken in orientation, department Chairs and managers should pay attention to administrative procedures and provide orientation to the departmental grading systems. Recent changes in centralization of business processes and information technologies have prompted special orientation programs on CruzBuy and AIS. Such programs should be repeated on a regular basis and new faculty should be encouraged to attend.

- At the level of the division or the school, joint orientations could be undertaken for departments with few hires in any given year. Divisional orientations which highlight the personnel process and introduce junior faculty to senior colleagues in other departments would be most useful.
- The Senate's Committee on Career Advising will undertake a posting of web-based materials on mentoring that will be available to all faculty. The committee will also continue its efforts to provide services that will enhance the likelihood of retention and promotion of faculty.
- Because responding junior faculty seem to value one-on-one conversations with senior colleagues, we recommend that junior faculty be encouraged to work with a senior faculty mentor who has been chosen in consultation between the Chair and the junior faculty member. Chairs may serve as mentors.
- Junior faculty should be made aware of the list of best practices and encouraged to seek help in their department, division, school, the Academic Senate, and Academic Human Resources.