

USA Faculty Senate Academic Development & Mentoring Committee

"This Committee will coordinate the Senate mentoring program for new faculty. It will recommend policies for the mentoring program, identify and recruit faculty mentors, and establish operating procedures. The Committee will also represent faculty in matters related to academic development at the university level." (Chapter 2, page 39 [Faculty Handbook](#), 2007)

2010-2011 Members

Chair: Phil Carr, A&S
pcarr@jaguar1.usouthal.edu
Phone: 460-6347
Campus Address: ARCM 107

Members:

- | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| 1. Kelly Byrd (EDUC) | 6. Husam Omar (ENG) |
| 2. Laura Moore (A&S) | 7. Amy Kingman (SCESP) |
| 3. Coral Gubler-Hanna (AHP) | 8. Andrea Kahn (COM) |
| 4. Harry Roddy (A&S) | 9. Alan Hillman (A&S) |
| 5. Tom Martinko (COM) | |

Goals 2010-2011

Academic Development

- 1) Identify and assess the adequacy of existing programs that support and enhance the skills and careers of our faculty and that promote faculty growth.
- 2) Suggest new programs to address needs with a special focus across the career course (from new faculty orientation to retirement) and that address all aspects of faculty work (teaching, research, service). Possible new programs include:

Navigating the Tenure Process for 1st-3rd Year Faculty

Navigating the Tenure Process for 4th-6th Year Faculty

Making the Most of your Sabbatical

Moving from Associate to Full Professor

3) Examine issue of inadequate time and resources for research or creative work. As reported in the 2010 Faculty Survey, the majority of faculty selected “Inadequate” (33.2%) regarding time and resources to conduct research or creative work at USA and an additional 16.6% selected “Very Inadequate.” Less than one quarter choose “Adequate” and “More than adequate” combined.

4) Examine issue of inadequate resources to travel to meetings to present work and to partake in professional development activities. As reported in the 2010 Faculty Survey, the majority of faculty selected “Inadequate” (35.1%) regarding time and resources to conduct research or creative work at USA and an additional 25.5% selected “Very Inadequate.” Less than one fifth choose “Adequate” and “More than adequate” combined. Additionally, less than one fifth of the faculty responded that “>95%” of their travel expenses are reimbursed with the majority (24.3%) indicating that 50-79% of their travel expenses are reimbursed.

5) Promote a career-building focus that helps faculty to shape productive and satisfying careers within the institutional context, while identifying ways in which they can, in turn, contribute to long-term institutional development.

Mentoring

Three questions related to mentoring at USA were placed on the 2010 Faculty Survey. The results demonstrate this as an area of concern for faculty. The vast majority of faculty choose “Agree” (37.6%) or Strongly agree (47.0) when asked “Mentoring new faculty is important and should be a priority for USA.” Yet, the highest percentage (25.1%) “Disagree” that “There is an adequate mentoring program for new faculty in my college” with an additional 14.6% that strongly disagree. An even greater percentage (31.9%) disagree with the statement “There are adequate rewards for acting as a mentor in my college and an additional 18.6% strongly disagree.

A request to Deans regarding mentoring in their college resulted in only two responses and these suggest that mentoring is relatively informal in those colleges.

1) Gather additional data from administrators and faculty regarding mentoring programs in each college.

2) Suggest new programs to promote the quality of mentoring such as “Mentor-Mentee” workshops.

3) Make recommendations regarding guidelines (best practices, roles and responsibilities, relationships, career development) concerning mentoring at USA.

4) Promote recognition of the importance of acting as a mentor.

Report (2010-2011)

Many of the goals for the 2010-11 academic year remain in progress and there is much left to accomplish. This report outlines progress made and accomplishments, as well as suggestions for the future.

At our first committee meeting, it was recognized that many faculty were unaware of development opportunities at USA. It was decided that the posting a list of such opportunities would be beneficial and this was made a priority. Efforts were made to produce a list, but it has not been completed at the time of this report submission. We see this as an important undertaking and a future goal.

Discussions regarding mentoring at USA resulted in a committee consensus that general guidelines for mentoring practices need to come from Academic Affairs. Each College should have specific guidelines. Several potential models were identified and one of the best of these is from UC San Diego (<http://academicaffairs.ucsd.edu/faculty/programs/fmp/default.htm>).

Dr. P. Carr, as Chair of the FS ADMC, was a voting member of the USA Faculty Development Council for 2010-11. At the fall meeting, he proposed that the Faculty Development Council should expand its scope of faculty development beyond research and presented a handout model from James Madison University (<http://www.jmu.edu/cfi/>). Unfortunately, the vote was to maintain a narrow mission. At the spring meeting, the council voted to fund thirteen proposals at \$50,590. During the proposal review a motion was made by Dr. P. Carr and seconded by Dr. B. Johnson that the \$1,350 university travel limit should not include USA Faculty Development Research Travel.

A positive aspect for faculty development is the upcoming Teaching and Learning Conference, scheduled for May 16, 2011. This promises to be a constructive event with two off-campus speakers and over 50 presentations from USA faculty.

The University created the Innovation in Learning Center (ILC) announced in the Midweek Memo on March 23, 2011. The ILC was established “to better integrate and focus faculty development...” among other things. The creation of the ILC without input from the FS ADMC indicates a lack of communication.

Recommendations:

- 1) Establish a University Committee whose primary mission is faculty development and mentoring. The Chair of the Faculty Senate - Academic Development and Mentoring Committee should be a member of this new committee.
- 2) The current University “Faculty Development Council” should change its name to better represent its mission focus on research. Additionally, the Council should consider broadening their efforts in development of faculty research.

- 3) The new University Faculty Development and Mentoring Committee should work to establish lists of university-wide and college specific faculty development opportunities. These lists should be published on appropriate web-pages with links from the faculty senate webpage.
- 4) This new committee should work to establish general university-wide guidelines for faculty mentoring and specific guidelines appropriate to each college. The current ADAMC considered Marquette University (<http://www.marquette.edu/fmp/>) to represent a model program.
- 5) The new committee should assess faculty development opportunities at USA in comparison to those available at other institutions and make recommendations where appropriate.