

University of Dayton

eCommons

Reports from the Gender Equity Research
Fellowship

Women's and Gender Studies Program

10-20-2020

The Role of Mentoring in Tenuring and Promoting Women at the University of Dayton

Laura Vorachek

University of Dayton, lvorachek1@udayton.edu

Sarah Critchfield

University of Dayton, critchfields1@udayton.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/wgs_equity



Part of the [Women's Studies Commons](#)

eCommons Citation

Vorachek, Laura and Critchfield, Sarah, "The Role of Mentoring in Tenuring and Promoting Women at the University of Dayton" (2020). *Reports from the Gender Equity Research Fellowship*. 3.

https://ecommons.udayton.edu/wgs_equity/3

This Conference Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Women's and Gender Studies Program at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Reports from the Gender Equity Research Fellowship by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu, mschlengen1@udayton.edu.

The Role of Mentoring in Tenuring and Promoting Women at the University of Dayton

Gender Equity Research Fellowship Report

Laura Vorachek

Sarah Critchfield

June 15, 2020

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	3
Introduction.....	3
Literature Review.....	4
Methodology.....	5
Findings.....	6
Recommendations.....	15
References.....	17
Appendices	
Appendix A: Department chair interview questions.....	19
Appendix B: Pre-tenure and Recently Tenured Faculty Survey Questions.....	20
Appendix C: Early Career Faculty Interview Questions.....	22

Abstract

Retention of women and underrepresented minority faculty is an important consideration for the University of Dayton. This study critically examines current practices for supporting women faculty through the tenure and promotion process at UD, focusing in particular on the mentoring of pre-tenure faculty. A survey and interviews with early career faculty found gender discrepancies in mentoring experiences. Despite lower retention of female faculty, women report more receiving more mentoring and more satisfaction with mentoring than men. The study also found that the type of mentoring received (formal or informal) had a significant impact on faculty satisfaction with mentoring and with faculty experience of the tenure and promotion process. The report concludes with recommendations based on this research for implementing new mentoring programs and improving existing programs at the university, including ways to ensure equal access to mentoring.

Introduction

Faculty retention is an important consideration for the University of Dayton because of the university's commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion and the expense of hiring new faculty. During the nine-year period from 2011-12 to 2019-20, seventy-one female faculty and seventy-four male faculty were awarded tenure at UD. Women and men were tenured at similarly high rates, although men were tenured slightly more often than women with 97% of male applicants compared to 91.5% of female applicants receiving tenure and promotion. Between 2010-11 and 2019-20, fourteen women and ten men separated from the university without earning tenure. Currently women make up 38.8 % of ranked faculty at the university, so it is cause for concern that they leave the university without tenure at a higher rate than men. Of the twenty-four faculty who resigned or were denied tenure, 54% were white, 29% were persons of color, and 17% were nonresident international faculty. Given that persons of color and nonresident international faculty make up 23.8% and 5.1% of the total faculty respectively, they are leaving the university in disproportionate numbers. More than half (62.5%) of the women and men who separated from the university left after years two through four of their employment, suggesting that these are crucial years for interventions to improve faculty retention.¹

This study critically examines current practices for supporting women faculty through the tenure and promotion process at the University of Dayton, focusing in particular on the mentoring of pre-tenure faculty. A survey of early career faculty and interviews with department chairs and early career faculty were conducted with attention to quality, consistency, and equal access to mentoring. The study maps the formal and informal mentoring of pre-tenure faculty that is currently taking place on campus and evaluates the role mentoring plays in the tenuring and promotion of women faculty. The report concludes with recommendations based on this research for implementing new mentoring programs and improving existing programs at the university, including ways to ensure equal access to mentoring.

¹ Data was provided by the University of Dayton's Office of Institutional Reporting.

Literature Review

Mentoring can be an important tool for the retention of female faculty and faculty of color. Research on mentoring of early career faculty indicates it affords benefits for the faculty member, the mentor, and the institution. Typically, mentoring programs pair an advanced faculty member with a pre-tenure faculty member to provide guidance related to career development and professional and institutional norms. This provides many benefits for the mentee, including improved teaching skills, increased research productivity and grant funding, and enhanced career satisfaction. Mentors familiarize mentees with department, unit, and university tenure and promotion expectations, convey information on campus-wide resources, provide networking opportunities, and prepare faculty for leadership roles. Mentoring has also been shown to reduce the social isolation many new faculty report and to promote relationship building across campus. Mentoring can help new faculty integrate into department culture and university mission and promote inclusion of underrepresented members of the academy.²

Mentoring also has been shown to benefit mentors, who gain a sense of accomplishment and personal satisfaction from mentoring new faculty, have opportunities to hear new ideas and perspectives, and even experience greater productivity in their own research.³

Finally, mentoring programs confer many benefits on universities. Mentoring has been shown to aid in the recruitment and retention of new faculty. In particular, mentoring can increase representation of women and members of other underrepresented groups and contribute to a more inclusive campus environment. Mentoring also has considerable financial implications for universities, as the costs of hiring a new faculty member, from the search process to startup costs, can range from \$20,000 in the Humanities to \$1 million in STEM fields. In addition to monetary costs, losing pre-tenure faculty results in the loss of expertise, loss of mentors to students, and damage to the morale of departments and programs.⁴

Despite research indicating mentoring's benefits, according to JoAnn Moody, faculty development and diversity specialist, there is a "clear *lack* of systemic informal and formal mentoring for early stage faculty" (159). Reasons for this include assumptions that informal mentoring is taking place, limited senior faculty within a department, resistance to mentoring because it is seen as hand-holding, and mentoring falling to overburdened chairs who also evaluate pre-tenure faculty. Moreover, women and members of underrepresented groups have historically had less access to informal mentoring (such as "good ol' boy" networks), resulting in less help navigating department policies or tenure and promotion procedures. This is especially a problem for women in the fields of science and engineering. Additionally, women are more likely to experience isolation and marginalization than their male counterparts, which has been

² For information in this paragraph, see Phillips and Dennison, 2015; Otieno, Lutz, and Schoolmaster, 2010; Moody, 2012; Johnson, 2016; Webber and Rogers, 2018; and Bland, et. al., 2009.

³ See Phillips and Dennison, 2015; Otieno, Lutz, and Schoolmaster, 2010; Johnson, 2016; and Bland, et. al., 2009.

⁴ See Masterson, 2018; Phillips and Dennison, 2015.

linked to greater job dissatisfaction. And women are less likely to receive effective mentoring due to lack of awareness or lack of attention to the particular stressors and biases that women, and women of color in particular, face.⁵ This study uncovers assumptions about mentoring at the University of Dayton by interviewing department chairs and gauges the effectiveness of current mentoring practices by surveying and interviewing early career faculty about their experiences.

Methods

In order to create a current picture of mentoring programs and faculty experiences with mentoring at the University of Dayton, we engaged in three research methods: 1) conducting an online survey of pre-tenure and recently tenured faculty, 2) interviewing department chairs, and 3) interviewing pre-tenure and recently tenured faculty.

Pre-tenure and Recently Tenured Faculty Survey

The goal in surveying early career faculty was to gauge faculty experiences with mentoring at the University of Dayton. In the fall of 2019, we created an online survey approved by the institutional review board to reach as many pre-tenure and recently tenured faculty as possible while collecting data in a way that could be easily analyzed. The Associate Provost for Faculty and Administrative Affairs supplied us with a list of faculty that met our parameters. We then invited our target population, a total of 177 faculty members, to complete the survey. After the initial invitation to take part in the survey was distributed, a follow-up email was sent to the recipients of the initial email that had not completed the survey.

Survey inclusion criteria included 1) being pre-tenure or tenured within the last three years and 2) currently being employed at the University of Dayton. The survey was created in Qualtrics, an online survey generator and data collector. After an initial draft of the survey was created, we consulted with another faculty member for advice on the style and construction of the questions. The final survey included twenty-five questions.

After four weeks, the survey was closed, having collected responses from a total of ninety-four faculty for a participation rate of 53%. Eighty-eight respondents completed the survey for a completion rate of 94%. Respondents came from a reported twenty-eight departments across all six units of the university (College of Arts and Sciences, School of Engineering, School of Law, School of Education and Health Sciences, School of Business, and the Libraries). Reports were created to separate the results based on the variable of gender identity. The results were analyzed to identify gender differences in experiences of mentoring.

Department Chair Interviews

Department Chairs were interviewed with the goal of mapping existing formal mentoring programs at the university and identifying resources needed for mentoring. We identified the department chairs from the University of Dayton's website and asked the Deans of the School of Law and Libraries to identify the chair equivalents in their units. We then emailed each chair

⁵ See Laursen, Austin, Soto, and Matinez, 2015; Moody, 2012; Turner and Gonzalez, 2015; Glenn, 2007; Diggs, Garrison-Wade, Estrada, and Galindo, 2009.

requesting an interview. We interviewed twenty-nine of the thirty-nine chairs or division heads for a 74% participation rate. The interviews contained eleven questions that were approved by the institutional review board. The chair interviews took place over the course of seven weeks in the fall of 2019.

Early Career Faculty Interviews

Pre-tenure and recently tenured faculty were interviewed with the goal of identifying the strengths and weaknesses of mentoring at the University of Dayton. Thirty-two respondents to the survey of pre-tenure and recently tenured faculty indicated that they were willing to participate in an interview about their mentoring experiences. We emailed all thirty-two faculty to request an interview. Twenty-five faculty members agreed to be interviewed, fourteen women and eleven men, for a participation rate of 14% of all pre-tenure and recently tenured faculty at the university. The interview contained eleven questions approved by the institutional review board. The interviews took place over the course of eleven weeks in the spring of 2020.

Findings: Mentoring at the University of Dayton

Department Chairs' Views of Mentoring

Interviews with department chairs reveal that there are few departments at the University of Dayton with formal mentoring programs. Six of the university's thirty-nine departments or divisions have formal mentoring programs. Four are within the College of Arts and Sciences (Biology, English, Music, and Psychology), and two are within the School of Education and Health Sciences (Physician Assistant Education and Teacher Education). The Department of Engineering Management, Systems and Technology in the School of Engineering is in the process of developing a formal mentoring program.

The structure of these formal mentoring programs varies from department to department (Department Chair Interview Q2, Q4, Q5, Q7). For the most part, chairs assign new faculty a mentor based on common research interests, and the Physicians Assistant Education Department additionally uses a behavioral analysis tool to match mentors with mentees. The Music Department assigns new faculty a mentor from outside as well as inside the department. Teacher Education has a single faculty member who serves as the principle mentor to new faculty, and the Department of Engineering Management, Systems and Technology is developing a team approach, with mentors for specific areas like teaching, research and writing, and tenure and promotion. The English Department's program is the most structured; mentors are encouraged to meet with their mentees two hours a month and receive monthly emails suggesting topics for discussion. Currently, none of these programs evaluates mentors.

Chairs gave a range of reasons why their departments do not have a formal mentoring program (Q3). These include:

- a small and/or collegial department
- it would create a service burden for senior faculty
- "we've never had one"

- mentoring is the chair's responsibility
- informal mentoring is sufficient
- faculty find their own mentors
- too few new faculty for a formal program
- new faculty not interested
- recent new hires have been at the associate level
- past attempts at mentoring programs were unsuccessful
- dissatisfaction with the traditional pairing approach to mentoring

Indeed, the majority of departments rely on informal mentoring or the department chair to mentor pre-tenure faculty.

Chair's conceptions of what makes a good mentor (Q9) are fairly consistent across units. The ideal mentor is empathetic and available, knowledgeable about the institution, teaching, research, and the tenure and promotion process, and will guide their mentee through that process. Good mentors are proactive, but also empower their mentee by helping them problem solve, strategize, and navigate difficult situations. Good mentors advocate for their mentee, but are also frank about their concerns. And, they will listen—actively and nonjudgmentally—but also be comfortable with their advice being disregarded.

When asked what resources they need for mentoring (Q10), chairs overwhelmingly responded that they would like more money, time, and training for mentors. It is worth noting that chairs desire funding largely for modest expenditures. Most often, they said they would like funds to pay for mentor/mentee coffee and lunch meetings.⁶ A few suggested a course release or a stipend to compensate mentors for their time. Chairs felt that time was an important resource as it is necessary for developing relationships between mentors and mentees. Currently only one department (English) has provided training for its mentors. Other resources that chairs requested include recognition for the work of mentoring; models of mentoring programs in other departments and information on mentoring best practices; a university director of mentoring to facilitate mentoring programs; and a university wide database of mentors for those faculty who would like to seek mentoring outside their department.

Chairs indicated that mentoring predominantly occurs in the areas of teaching, research, service, and the tenure and promotion process (Q6). Relatively few departments reported attending to other areas of interest for a new faculty members, such as understanding the student body and acclimating to the culture of the university, department, or Dayton area.

When asked about the impact of mentoring on retention of pre-tenure faculty (Q8), chairs provided examples of positive mentoring primarily in the areas of research, teaching, and service. They described mentors advancing pre-tenure faculty research by collaborating on research with their mentees, co-authoring articles, writing grants together, and setting publication

⁶ The English Department spent approximately \$100 on coffee at Heritage Coffeehouse for eleven mentor/mentee pairs in 2018-2019.

schedule goals. In the area of teaching, mentors supported pre-tenure faculty experimentation with course design and delivery, provided advice about the University of Dayton's student body, and taught the same section of a course as the mentee. In this instance, the chair explained that the mentor and mentee met regularly to plan the course sessions, with the pre-tenure faculty member updating course material and the tenured faculty member providing guidance on how to run a class. Mentors also provided advice about service opportunities and helped mentees negotiate competing demands on their time.

Survey Results

Of the eighty-eight pre-tenure and recently tenured faculty who completed the survey, forty-eight indicated they were female and thirty-one indicated they were male. One person chose the "non-binary" option, three chose "prefer not to say," and five participants did not respond to the question about gender. Because the sample size for those who did not identify as female or male was so small, their responses were not analyzed.

Types of mentoring

Respondents were asked what kinds of mentoring they have experienced (Survey Q1). They were asked to check all that applied from a list that included: formal mentoring (senior faculty paired with junior faculty in structured program) in department; informal mentoring (senior faculty mentoring junior faculty in an unofficial capacity) in department; peer mentoring (junior faculty mentoring other junior faculty) in department; formal mentoring external to department; informal mentoring external to department; peer mentoring external to department; formal mentoring external to University of Dayton (e.g. through a professional organization); informal mentoring external to UD (e.g. dissertation advisor); peer mentoring external to UD; and no mentor or mentoring experience while on the tenure track. Early-career female faculty at UD received mentoring from all sources at a higher rate than early-career male faculty, as the chart below demonstrates.

Source of Mentoring	Women	Men
Formal in department	18.75%	9.68%
Informal in department	85.42%	77.42%
Peer in department	64.58%	48.39%
Formal external to department	10.42%	9.68%
Informal external to department	35.42%	22.58%
Peer external to department	25.00%	16.13%
Formal external to UD	16.67%	6.45%
Informal external to UD	60.42%	51.61%
Peer external to UD	41.67%	35.48%
No mentor or mentoring experience on tenure track	4.17%	12.90%

The numbers of participants who reported receiving formal mentoring from a designated senior faculty member was low for both women and men, reflecting the fact that only six departments at the University of Dayton have formal mentoring programs. Almost twice as many women as men reported participating in a formal mentoring program. This discrepancy is likely due to the fact that some of departments with formal mentoring programs are female-dominated fields such as Teacher Education and Physician Assistant Education. The most common sources of mentoring for both women and men were informal mentoring and peer mentoring within their own department and informal mentoring and peer mentoring external to the University of Dayton. Interviews with faculty indicate that informal mentoring external to University of Dayton most often takes the form of dissertation advisors or other faculty who continue to mentor their former students now that they are faculty. Respondents were asked to indicate all types of mentoring that they had experienced, so some respondents are receiving mentoring from multiple sources while others may be receiving mentoring from a single source. Interviews confirm that many early career faculty have networks of mentors that include senior faculty and peers at UD as well as former graduate advisors and members of professional organizations external to UD. However, a small number of faculty have received no mentoring at all while on the tenure track at UD. Three times as many men as women lack mentoring while on the tenure track.

Areas of mentoring

Respondents were asked to indicate in which areas they had received mentoring (Q2). They were asked to check all that applied from a list that included: teaching, research, service, work/life balance, tenure and promotion expectations, acclimating to the department/university, acclimating to the city/area, and other. Early-career female faculty at UD receive mentoring in all areas at higher rates than early-career male faculty, as the chart below demonstrates.

Area of mentoring	Women	Men
Teaching	75.00%	67.74%
Research	87.50%	77.42%
Service	54.17%	51.61%
Work/life balance	47.92%	25.81%
Tenure and promotion expectations	85.42%	64.52%
Acclimating to the department/university	58.33%	48.39%
Acclimating to the city/area	18.75%	22.58%
Other	6.25%	0.00%

Most early-career faculty at UD are receiving mentoring in the areas of teaching, research, and tenure and promotion expectations. Only about half of faculty are mentored in service or acclimating to the department/university. Department chairs stated in interviews that pre-tenure faculty receive mentoring in these four areas, but survey results indicate that not all faculty are in fact receiving mentoring in these areas, especially service. Less than a quarter of new faculty are mentored in acclimating to the city/area. Gender differences in areas of mentoring are starkest

when it comes to mentoring regarding work/life balance, with almost 50% more women than men receiving mentoring in this area. Studies have shown that family formation negatively affects women's academic careers but not men's, which may account for this discrepancy.⁷ Also cause for concern is that 20% fewer men report receiving mentoring in tenure and promotion expectations than women.

Survey questions 3 through 13 asked respondents to indicate to what extent they agreed or disagreed with statements that their mentoring experiences have helped in a particular area. For ease of comparison, I have compressed "strongly agree," "agree," and "somewhat agree" as well as "somewhat disagree," "disagree," and "strongly disagree" into the single categories "agree" or "disagree." "Neither agree nor disagree" is represented at "neither." As the chart below demonstrates, in every area more women than men agreed that their mentoring experiences had been useful.

Area of Mentoring	Women	Men
Prepare for T&P (Q3)	Agree 85.41% Neither 6.25% Disagree 8.34%	Agree 70.96% Neither 3.23% Disagree 25.81%
Teaching (Q5)	Agree 70.84% Neither 12.50% Disagree 16.67%	Agree 56.66% Neither 13.33% Disagree 30.00%
Scholarship (Q6)	Agree 72.92% Neither 10.42% Disagree 16.67%	Agree 56.67% Neither 20.00% Disagree 23.33%
Funding Opportunities (Q7)	Agree 46.81% Neither 21.28% Disagree 31.92%	Agree 26.67% Neither 23.33% Disagree 50.00%
Service (Q8)	Agree 56.25% Neither 14.58% Disagree 29.17%	Agree 35.48% Neither 19.35% Disagree 45.16%
Professional Orgs (Q9)	Agree 39.59% Neither 18.75% Disagree 41.66%	Agree 25.81% Neither 32.26% Disagree 41.93%
Difficult Situation (Q10)	Agree 76.60% Neither 12.77% Disagree 10.64%	Agree 54.84% Neither 16.13% Disagree 29.03%
Resolve Conflict (Q11)	Agree 52.18% Neither 34.78% Disagree 13.04%	Agree 29.03% Neither 38.71% Disagree 32.25%
Acclimate to dept./university (Q12)	Agree 85.41% Neither 4.17% Disagree 10.42%	Agree 67.74% Neither 6.45% Disagree 25.80%
Acclimate to	Agree 36.71%	Agree 19.36%

⁷ Mason, Wolfinger, and Golden, 2013.

city/area (Q13)	Neither 34.04%	Neither 45.16%
	Disagree 29.79%	Disagree 35.49%

Three-quarters of early-career female faculty rated their mentoring experiences helpful in the areas of preparing for tenure and promotion, navigating a difficult situation, and acclimating to the department/university, and more than half found their mentoring experiences helpful in the areas of teaching, scholarship, service, and resolving a conflict. More than half of early-career male faculty rated their mentoring experiences helpful in the areas of preparing for tenure and promotion, teaching, scholarship, navigating a difficult situation, and acclimating to the department/university. Only about 30% of men found their mentoring experiences helpful in the areas of service and resolving conflict.

Early-career male faculty reported their experiences with mentoring were significantly less helpful than women's experiences in significant areas. One-quarter of men disagreed that mentoring helped them prepare for tenure and promotion or acclimate to their department/university. Approximately 30% disagreed that their mentoring experiences helped with teaching, navigating a difficult situation, or resolving a conflict. And 45% disagreed that mentoring helped them strategically choose service opportunities. In these areas, women's only comparable dissatisfaction was in the area of service, with almost 30% disagreeing that their mentoring experiences helped them strategically choose service opportunities.

Less than half of respondents of either gender reported that their mentoring experiences helped them seek funding opportunities for research. This may be due in part to the fact that many disciplines have few opportunities for external funding for research. Less than 40% of respondents found their mentoring experiences helped them participate in professional organizations or acclimate to the city or area, indicating that these areas of professional development and adjusting to a new position are not currently receiving attention.

Overall Satisfaction

Respondents were asked how satisfied they were with their mentoring experience overall (Q14). For ease of comparison, I have compressed "extremely satisfied," "moderately satisfied," and "slightly satisfied" as well as "slightly dissatisfied," "moderately dissatisfied," and "extremely dissatisfied" into the single categories "satisfied" or "dissatisfied." Women reported higher rates of satisfaction with their mentoring experiences than men, as the chart below indicates.

Overall Satisfaction (Q14)	Women	Men
Satisfied	79.17%	45.15%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	6.25%	16.13%
Dissatisfied	14.58%	38.71%

While nearly 80% of early-career female faculty are satisfied with their mentoring experiences, less than half of early-career male faculty report satisfaction. Men report dissatisfaction with their mentoring experiences at two and half times the rate that women do.

Early Career Faculty Experience of Mentoring

Early career faculty responses to interview questions varied by type of mentoring rather than by gender throughout. When asked to describe their experience of the tenure and promotion process at UD (Early Career Faculty Interview Q4) those who had a formal mentor expressed the most satisfaction with the tenure and promotion process regardless of gender. For example, a recently tenured female interviewee stated that the process was “very clear from the beginning.” A pre-tenure male faculty member commented that “I’ve been getting good feedback and things appear to be well on track.”

The experiences of early career faculty with informal mentors was mixed. Many female and male faculty with informal mentors had positive experiences, finding the tenure and promotion process clear, the guidelines straight forward, and their questions readily addressed. A female pre-tenure faculty member reported that the department requirements have “only been communicated in a supportive manner.” One recently tenured male faculty member stated that “I knew where I stood at pretty much every time.”

But women and men with informal mentors also described negative experiences with the tenure and promotion process. Many found department guidelines to be unclear and information and clarification lacking. A recently tenured female faculty member commented that “I spent a lot of time asking my chair and then the department [tenure and promotion committee] to meet for some clarification. And what I often got in terms of clarification or response was, ‘You’re doing fine, read the document.’” A pre-tenure male faculty member felt that “they’re constantly changing the rules on us. And the rules are different depending on what level is evaluating you.”

Those faculty without mentors had uniformly negative experiences with the tenure and promotion process. One recently tenured female faculty member found the process “very stressful.” “I felt very unsupported and with no directions” and “sometimes receiv[ed] wrong information.” Another pre-tenure female faculty member described the process as “chaotic.... No one tells you anything.” Similarly, male faculty members without mentors found the process “confusing.” As one pre-tenure male faculty member said, “Our T&P document is open ended.... [There is] no guide, no goalpost, and no one willing to say that out loud.”

When asked in what ways their mentoring experiences helped prepare them for tenure and promotion (Q5), differences again depended on type of mentor rather than gender. Those with formal mentors reported that mentors were helpful in reviewing materials, constructing binders, answering questions, and clarifying the tenure and promotion process. One recently tenured male faculty member noted, “my mentor was 100% in my corner always going to bat for me.”

Early career faculty with informal mentors reported varying levels of help in preparing for tenure and promotion. Informal mentors, like formal mentors, were helpful in reviewing material, constructing binders, and answering questions. Faculty also mentioned informal mentors sharing templates and documents, offering advice (about research, department politics, tenure narratives), helping faculty prioritize their work, and providing reassurance and perspective. One pre-tenure faculty member appreciated her informal mentor for “telling me things that aren’t necessarily explicit all the time.” A pre-tenure male faculty member noted “you kind of find out [about the tenure and promotion process] through a lot of lunch conversations.”

However, some female faculty members with informal mentors also indicated that their mentors had not been helpful with the tenure and promotion process. Responses such as “I wasn’t really mentored about what needs to go into my [binder]” and “we don’t really provide the kind of mentorship that could have been useful to me,” indicate that informal mentoring does not address all pre-tenure faculty needs for tenure and promotion.

Faculty of both genders without mentors turned to peers for help with the tenure and promotion process, including informal peer support organizations like F3USE (Female Faculty Forum to Uplift, Strengthen, and Engage), a group created by and for female STEM faculty. A pre-tenure male faculty member without a mentor said, “I feel so confused by some of the processes. I really don’t know what to do.”

When asked if their mentoring experiences had been useful in other ways (Q6), participants’ responses again differed according to the type of mentoring received rather than gender. Those with formal or informal mentors found mentoring to be helpful in the areas of teaching, research, work/life balance, building networks across campus, and negotiating department politics. A recently tenured female faculty member with a formal mentor remarked that “having this mentorship helped me see that there are different pathways to be successful at UD.” However, faculty with no mentor commented on the lack of advice. A pre-tenure female faculty member detailed not learning important information about the department curriculum until her fifth year of teaching a particular course. Similarly, a pre-tenure male faculty member described talking to his peers and thinking, “Oh man, I wish somebody had told me that” about publishing.

Participants were also asked how mentoring has impacted their career development (Q7). In responding to this question, women tended to focus on mentoring before coming to UD. Several women discussed how mentors had prepared them to be successful with advice on research and publishing and had co-authored papers with them. Women mentioned mentors encouraging them to negotiate when offered a tenure track position. One commented, “it was important to have a female role model in academia.” Another credited mentor support for her involvement in faculty governance and administration at UD.

Men spoke of external mentors’ influence on their career development in relation to the direction of their research, invitations to speak, and shifts in the focus of their career. A pre-tenure male faculty member described the absence of mentoring on his career

development: “it would be nice if someone was more invested in you” instead of waiting to see if you get tenure.

Participants were asked how mentoring has been effective for them (Q8). There were no differences between what women and men find effective, whether they had received formal or informal mentoring. In the area of teaching, faculty cited as effective mentoring strategies co-teaching with the mentor, sharing syllabi and other teaching materials, writing exams together, working together to develop classroom activities, providing advice about teaching methods, and sharing information about UD’s student body. For research, faculty found mentoring effective when mentors shared strategies for finding time to write, co-authored publications with mentees, and provided advice and feedback on grant applications and articles. Effective mentors also discussed service opportunities with their mentees. Early career faculty and department chairs alike find these to be high impact mentoring practices.⁸

Early-career faculty also found it effective when their mentors revealed the unwritten rules of being a faculty member. As one pre-tenure female faculty member put it, “there’s a hidden curriculum of how to be a member of the UD community.” Effective mentors discussed how to navigate meetings and other situations, “modeled diplomatic conventions,” and shared information about the culture of the institution. Several participants valued their mentor introducing them to people outside their department.

More generally, early-career faculty stressed how important it was to feel that their mentor’s door was always open for questions or “just listening.” Faculty appreciated mentors who acted as a sounding board, acknowledged their concerns, provided validation, and were interested in their success. Several faculty mentioned how much they valued a mentor’s support for their research and their choices. Although faculty appreciated the advice and guidance of mentors, they also wanted a mentor who was “fully supportive of me making my own decisions.”

A pre-tenure male faculty member with a mentor outside UD found the structure of a formal mentoring relationship effective. In particular, he appreciated that he and his mentor set goals for their time working together and met on a regular basis to discuss preset topics as well as any concerns that had recently arisen.

When asked about barriers to mentoring participants have encountered at UD (Q10), not surprisingly those with formal mentors found no obstacles to mentoring. By contrast, early career faculty without mentors experienced significant barriers to mentoring. Women without mentors felt an impediment to mentoring at UD was a lack of interest in mentoring early career faculty. One said, “I don’t think they feel the importance of it” which “results in a terrible work climate.” Men without mentors felt that social and power dynamics within departments presented barriers to mentoring.

⁸ These practices reflect the qualities of outstanding mentors identified by Cho, Ramanan and Feldman (2011).

Early career faculty with informal mentors also described barriers to mentoring at UD. For both women and men the most common obstacles were a lack of formal mentoring programs, time constraints on both mentors and mentees, and the burden of finding a mentor falling to the pre-tenure faculty member. As one pre-tenure female faculty member said, “the requirement for developing mentorship is put on the people who are seeking mentorship... the people who are the least likely to know how to locate mentorship in the institution.” Women were particularly sensitive to the fact that female faculty tend to be overburdened with service work and therefore do not have time to mentor others. Other impediments to mentoring raised by those with informal mentors included lack of support for mentors, the “assumption that you already know things,” senior faculty who rarely spend time in their offices, “people who hold asking questions against you,” and the loss of faculty dining room because it provided an “opportunity for faculty to develop informal relationships and mentoring relationships.”

Finally, participants were asked for their recommendations for mentoring programs at the department or university level (Q11). Both women and men with formal mentors recommended more clarity in the tenure and promotion policies and processes, despite describing their experience with the tenure and promotion process positively.

Most early career faculty with informal mentors and all faculty without mentors recommended the establishment of formal mentoring programs at UD. A recently tenured female faculty member without a mentor recommended “a strong message from higher administration to encourage mentoring and to try to create the culture” of mentoring. There was not a clear consensus on whether the mentor should come from within a faculty member’s home department or within their unit, and some felt that faculty should have the option to opt out of a formal mentoring program. Participants suggested a variety of ways mentors and mentees might be paired, including similar research or teaching interests, gender and racial/ethnic identifications, and even a speed-dating type event to make the match.⁹ Early career faculty also called for training for mentors and recognition for the work of mentoring. One participant said, “I would recommend course releases for people who excel in mentoring.”

Other recommendations included a drop-in support group at the unit level that would meet periodically to discuss specific topics; a regular “coffee with friends” event to combat isolation; and restoring the faculty dining room or providing other university-wide networking opportunities.

Recommendations

Survey responses and interviews with early career faculty indicate a strong need to attend to mentoring at the University of Dayton. The culture of departments at UD varies widely. Some

⁹ Cook, Bahn, and Menaker (2010) describe and evaluate this approach to identifying mentors.

strongly support mentoring of pre-tenure faculty through either formal programs or a robust culture of informal mentoring. By contrast, in departments without such mentoring pre-tenure faculty feel like they must sink or swim without the support of their colleagues. Many early-career faculty are proactive about seeking mentorship, and described networks of mentors that include senior faculty and peers at UD as well as former graduate advisors and members of professional organizations external to UD. However, some early career faculty reported receiving no mentoring at all while on the tenure track. Those without mentors were more likely to describe their experience with the tenure and promotion process at UD as confusing and even antagonistic. Even those with informal mentors recommended more formal mentoring at UD. As one pre-tenure male faculty member said, “I have been officially trained for maybe 25% of this job.” While graduate programs prepare their graduates to be researchers, they do not always train them to be teachers or contributing members of departments and universities. Early career faculty must navigate tenure and promotion processes, new departments, new students, a new university culture and a new city when they join the faculty at UD.

While research indicates that female faculty are often disadvantaged when institutions rely on informal mentoring, this study reveals that at the University of Dayton women receive mentoring in all areas at a higher rate than men. Women find their mentoring experiences are helpful at a higher rate and express higher overall satisfaction with mentoring than men. Despite this, women are tenured at a lower slightly lower rate than men and separate from the university at a higher rate than men. Gender discrepancies in both mentoring experiences and faculty retention could be addressed with formal mentoring programs that include training, guidance, and support for mentors.

Based on the results of the survey and interviews with early career faculty and department chairs, this study makes the following recommendations:

- **Establish formal mentoring programs at the University of Dayton.** While department chairs feel that mentoring is their responsibility, informal mentoring is sufficient, or that faculty will find their own mentors, interviews with early career faculty indicate that they would prefer a mentor who is not in an evaluative position, find informal mentoring to be insufficient, and see the onus of finding their own mentor as a barrier to mentoring. Moreover, early career faculty without mentors find the lack of mentoring detrimental to their progress toward tenure and promotion and to the climate of the department. Research shows that lack of formal mentoring is especially injurious for underrepresented minority faculty.¹⁰ Mentoring programs support President Spina’s Strategic Vision of empowering faculty and staff for the future by developing effective teachers, productive scholars, and future university leaders. Furthermore, as noted in the Hiring and Advancement for Diversity, Inclusion, and Mission Working Group report, the University of Dayton’s commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion grows out of its Catholic and Marianist mission. Promoting the career development and retention of women and underrepresented faculty through mentoring is one way to achieve this mission.

¹⁰ Espino and Zambrana, 2019.

- **Provide training for mentors.** Both early career faculty and chairs recommended training senior faculty to mentor effectively. Survey results indicate that not all pre-tenure faculty are receiving mentoring in areas key to their success, that they do not always find their mentoring experiences helpful, and that a significant number of male faculty are dissatisfied with their mentoring experiences. Mentor training could address these concerns as well as cross-race/ethnicity or cross-gender mentoring.
- **Provide mentors with ongoing guidance.** Survey results indicate that current mentoring is helpful in some areas but not in others. Moreover, men received less mentoring in all areas than women. Ongoing guidance for mentors could address these topic and gender imbalances and gaps.
- **Recognize the work of mentors.** Effective mentoring is time consuming and should be recognized as important service to the university. Some chairs and early career faculty recommended mentors be recognized with stipends or course releases.
- **Fund mentoring programs.** Given the expense of hiring new faculty, funding mentoring activities such as coffee or lunch meetings is likely to be cost effective since it promotes faculty retention.
- **Create a clearinghouse of mentoring information** for chairs, including models or approaches to mentoring and best practices for effective mentoring.
- **Create a University Director of Mentoring position** to help department chairs or units create mentoring programs, provide mentoring training and guidance, and otherwise support mentoring initiatives.

References

- Bland, Carole J. et. al. *Faculty Success Through Mentoring: A Guide for Mentors, Mentees, and Leaders*. Rowman & Littlefield, 2009.
- Cho, Christine S., Radhika A. Ramanan, and Mitchell D. Feldman. "Defining the Ideal Qualities of Mentorship: A Qualitative Analysis of the Characteristics of Outstanding Mentors." *American Journal of Medicine*, vol. 124, no. 5, 2011, pp. 453-458.
- Cook, David A., Rebecca S. Bahn, and Ronald Menaker. "Speed Mentoring: An Innovative Method to Facilitate Mentoring Relationships." *Medical Teacher*, vol. 32, no. 8, 2010, pp. 692-694.
- Diggs, Gregory A., Dorothy F. Garrison-Wade, Diane Estrada and Rene Galindo "Smiling Faces and Colored Spaces: The Experiences of Faculty of Color Pursuing Tenure in the Academy." *Urban Review*, vol. 41, no. 4, 2009, pp. 312-333.
- Espino, Michelle M. and Ruth E. Zambrana. "'How Do You Advance Here? How Do You Survive?' An Exploration of Under-Represented Minority Faculty Perceptions of mentoring Modalities." *Review of Higher Education*, vol. 42, no. 2, 2019, pp. 457-484.
- Glenn, David. "Alienation Fuels Female Professors' Dissatisfaction with Their Jobs, Study

- Suggests.” *Chronicle of Higher Education*, April 12, 2007. www.chronicle.com.
- “Hiring and Advancement for Diversity, Inclusion, and Mission.” University of Dayton, June 2018. <https://udayton.edu/diversity/initiatives/hiring-diversity-inclusion-mission.php>
- Johnson, W. Brad. *On Being a Mentor: A Guide for Higher Education Faculty*. Routledge, 2016.
- Laursen, Sandra L., Ann E. Austin, Melissa Soto, and Dalinda Martinez. “ADVANCing the Agenda for Gender Equity.” *Change*, vol. 47, no. 4, 2015, pp. 16-24.
- Mason, Mary Ann, Nicholas H. Wolfinger and Marc Golden. *Do Babies Matter? Gender and Family in the Ivory Tower*. Rutgers UP, 2013.
- Masterson, Kathryn. “Want to Keep Your Talented Professors? Sponsor Their Professional Development.” *Chronicle of Higher Education*, October 28, 2018. www.chronicle.com.
- Moody, JoAnn. *Faculty Diversity: Removing the Barriers*. 2nd edition, Routledge, 2012.
- Otieno, Tom, Paula M. Lutz and F. Andrew Schoolmaster. “Enhancing Recruitment, Professional Development, and Socialization of Junior Faculty through Formal Mentoring programs.” *Metropolitan Universities*, vol. 21, no. 2, 2010, pp. 77-91.
- Phillips, Susan L. and Susan T. Dennison. *Faculty Mentoring: A Practical Manual for Mentors, Mentees, Administrators, and Faculty Developers*. Stylus, 2015.
- “Strategic Vision.” University of Dayton. <https://udayton.edu/vision/>
- Turner, Caroline and Juan Carlos Gonzalez, eds. *Modeling Mentoring across Race/Ethnicity and Gender: Practices to Cultivate the Next Generation of Diverse Faculty*.
- Webber, Karen L. and Samantha M. Rogers. “Gender Differences in Faculty Member Job Satisfaction: Equity Forestalled?” *Research in Higher Education*, vol. 59, no. 8, 2018, pp. 1105-1132.

Appendix A: Department Chair Interview Questions

- 1) What formal mentoring programs are in place in your department?
- 2) How are mentors chosen for pre-tenure faculty (assigned by the chair, volunteers, etc.)?
- 3) If there are no mentoring programs, why is this the case? (informal mentoring, limited senior faculty, no need, etc.)
- 4) If there are programs in place, how are they structured?
- 5) What training or guidance is provided for mentors?
- 6) Are there expectations for the kind of guidance mentors will provide their mentees?
- 7) Are mentors evaluated? How so?
- 8) What stories can you share that can help me understand the impact mentoring has had on the retention of pre-tenure faculty?
- 9) What makes a good mentor for pre-tenure faculty?
- 10) What resources for mentoring do you need or wish you had?
- 11) May I have copies of documents pertaining to your department's mentoring program(s), if any?

Appendix B: Pre-Tenure and Recently Tenured Faculty Survey Questions

1. What kinds of mentoring have you experienced (check all that apply)
 - a) Formal mentoring (senior faculty paired with junior faculty in structured program) in department
 - b) Informal mentoring (senior faculty mentoring to junior faculty in an unofficial capacity) in department
 - c) Peer mentoring (junior faculty mentoring other junior faculty) in department
 - d) Formal mentoring external to department
 - e) Informal mentoring external to department
 - f) Peer mentoring external to department
 - g) Formal mentoring external to University of Dayton (e.g. through a professional organization)
 - h) Informal mentoring external to UD (e.g. dissertation advisor)
 - i) Peer mentoring external to UD
 - j) No mentor or mentoring experience while on the tenure track

2. In what areas have you received mentoring? (check all that apply)
 - a) Teaching
 - b) Research
 - c) Service
 - d) Work/life balance
 - e) Tenure and promotion expectations
 - f) Acclimating to the department/university
 - g) Acclimating to the city/area
 - h) Other

For the following questions, please indicate the degree to which you agree with the statement: Strongly disagree/disagree/neither agree nor disagree/agree/strongly agree

3. My mentoring experiences have helped prepare me for tenure and promotion.
4. My mentoring experiences have helped me develop as a teacher.
5. My mentoring experiences have helped me be a productive scholar.
6. My mentoring experiences have helped me seek funding opportunities for research.
7. My mentoring experiences have helped me participate in service in meaningful ways.
8. My mentoring experiences have helped me participate in professional organizations.
9. My mentoring experiences have helped me navigate a difficult situation.
10. My mentoring experiences have helped me resolve a conflict.
11. My mentoring experiences have helped me acclimate to the department and/or university.
12. My mentoring experiences have helped me acclimate to the city/area.
13. How satisfied are you with your mentoring experience overall.
Very dissatisfied/dissatisfied/neutral/satisfied/very satisfied

14. Would you be willing to meet with the researcher to discuss mentoring further? Yes/No If yes, please provide email address to researcher may contact you.

Demographic information (Optional, not for reporting purposes)

15. Gender?
16. Race/ethnicity?
17. Age (give ranges to choose from?)
18. (dis)ability
19. Marital status?
20. Number of children
21. Department?
22. Pre-tenure or recently tenured?

Appendix C: Early Career Faculty Interview Questions

- 1) Do you have a mentor? (formal, informal, peer, etc.)
- 2) Can you tell me about your mentor?
- 3) Where are you in the tenure process?
- 4) Can you tell me the story of your experience with the tenure and promotion process at UD?
- 5) In what ways did your mentoring experiences help prepare you for tenure and promotion?
- 6) Have your mentoring experiences been useful in other ways? How so?
- 7) How has mentoring impacted your career development?
- 8) What stories can you share with me that would help me understand how mentoring has been effective for you?
- 9) Have you sought a new mentor or needed to limit your relationship with your mentor?
- 10) What barriers to mentoring have you encountered at the University of Dayton?
- 11) What recommendations would you make for mentoring programs at the department or university level at UD?