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Abstract

A Case Study of the Perceptions of Faculty in a Formalized Mentoring Program at a Private 4-Year College. Sheri E. Kelleher, 2015: Applied Dissertation, Nova Southeastern University, Abraham S. Fischler School of Education. ERIC Descriptors: Mentoring, Higher Education, Formal Mentoring Program, Professional Development

This qualitative case study was designed to investigate mentors and mentees and their relationships in a formal group-mentoring program. Results and findings were expected to contribute to the literature on how to best support future new faculty and senior faculty careers by providing data on the opinions of those who participated in the mentoring program. The study may also add to the limited literature on the successes and challenges of using a group mentoring model.

The researcher interviewed 20 faculty members who participated in a formal mentoring program. The interviews examined how and in what ways faculty mentors and mentees describe what they understand, integrate, and implement in their relationship after going through this program; the mentors’ and mentees’ perceptions of the materials and activities in the program in supporting their efforts in developing a mentoring relationship; and after completing the mentorship program, the success and challenges in sustaining an effective mentoring relationship. In addition to interviews, a focus group was conducted and archival documentation was reviewed.

The study site was a private 4-year college in the eastern region of the United States. Data collection included interviews, a focus group, and documents. Interpretation analysis was used to identify themes. An analysis of the data revealed the importance that experiences, resources, knowledge, trust, support, and feelings of connection to the institution have on a successful mentoring relationship in a group mentoring model.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Statement of the Problem

Research on effective mentoring in higher education is often overgeneralized by experiences in corporate cultures (Zellers, Howard, & Barcic, 2008). Effective mentoring for faculty that can meet the growing needs of an academic in higher education is an ongoing problem nationwide because of changing technologies, a diverse student body, expanding expectations, and growing workloads (Adcroft, 2010). Higher education institutions of the 21st century are changing, and mentoring new faculty is critical to the ongoing health and vitality of the profession as a whole. New faculty are found to experience the most dramatic changes and adjustments within the first year at an institution and will progress more rapidly when expectations are clear and intellectual interests and career development are supported (Mullen & Hutinger, 2008). In addition, mentoring new faculty has become essential as the number of senior professors grows larger and administrators look for ways to balance the junior and senior faculty members to counter this trend (Miller & Thurston, 2009). Senior faculty can also benefit from the relationship with a new faculty member. Yet, much of the research on mentoring focuses on new faculty members, as it is assumed senior faculty do not need renewal experiences (Russell & Russell, 2011). A growing number of studies suggested that the relationship between the mentor and mentee has been shown to enhance a mentor’s professional development and offer a renewal experience to their careers (Howey, 1998; Iancu-Haddad & Oplatka, 2009; Miller & Thurston, 2009).

Mentoring relationships have existed for centuries. The idea of mentoring can be traced back to Greek mythology. Mentor, who was a wise and trusted friend of Odysseus, served as a tutor, caretaker, and role model to Odysseus’s only son, Telemachus, when
Odysseus went away to fight in the Trojan War (Allen & Eby, 2007). Examples of basic forms of mentoring can also be found in literary works written years ago such as Shakespeare’s *Much Ado About Nothing* and F. Scott Fitzgerald’s *The Great Gatsby* (Allen & Eby, 2007).

However, the concept of formal mentoring has been around only for several decades. In business, formal organizational mentoring started in the 1970s and quickly grew among elite, high-performance leaders looking for a vehicle for the development and retention of employees (Zachary, 2005). Since then, American businesses have used formal mentoring practices as tools for professional development and for sustaining a competitive advantage in light of the changing demands of the diverse needs of contemporary organizations (Zellers et al., 2008).

In the academic community, informal mentoring relationships have been historically dependent on the current generation of faculty to cultivate the development of the next generation. Mentoring has long been viewed as an effective means of enhancing faculty development and retention. In fact, mentoring is often cited in the literature of higher education as one of the most successful aspects that make up a faculty member’s career (Johnson, 2007). Boice (2000) cited a study showing that without effective mentoring, 15% of faculty resigned from the institution early or were terminated; however, this was not true of those who had effective mentoring. Another study assessed by Boice (1992a) showed that 56% of student evaluations were above average by the second semester for faculty who had mentors versus 18% for faculty without mentors. Some higher education administrators feel that “the best mentoring occurs spontaneously” (Boice, 2000, p. 237). The reality, however, is that spontaneous mentoring does not happen often, and it does not occur for faculty who need it.
Demonstrated benefits to mentees in a formal mentoring program include rapid induction to the culture of the institution; increased probability for success and career satisfaction; and access to advisement, encouragement and feedback (Zellers et al., 2008). Mentees, however, are not the only beneficiaries of mentoring relationships. Faculty members serving as mentors are able to take advantage of developing new networks, exposure to fresh ideas and new perspectives, access to opportunities to influence the future of the institution, and the opportunity to gain an overall renewal experience for their own careers (Iancu-Haddad & Oplatka, 2009).

The faculty renewal experience has significant benefits. Mentors are most often faculty who are in the middle years of their career, a time period that spans 15-25 years of their professional lives. Boice (1992a) pointed out that several programs and orientations are in place at institutions across the country for newly hired faculty. These programs help them ease into academic life and have better success in the early years of their careers. At present, there are no comparable programs that solely support faculty in the middle of their academic career, which is the longest time period spent at an institution for a faculty member (Baldwin, Lunceford & Vanderlinden, 2005).

In most cases, for faculty members in the midcareer phase of their lives, this is where they are the most productive and produce most of their scholarship and publications, teach the majority of their students, and service their institutions in both mentor and leadership roles. According to Baldwin et al. (2005), “Midlife typically falls between ages 30 and 70, with 40 to 60 as its core” (p. 3) and includes seasoned professionals who have been granted tenure but are not yet nearing retirement. In addition, a renewal experience brought by a mentoring program can help a faculty member through a period of unprecedented changes in higher education. With growing changes to the
student population, educational applications of technology, and the increased amount of adjuncts teaching on college campuses, midcareer faculty are not only constantly adapting to these developments but they are also serving critical leadership and mentoring roles within their programs and institutions. Midcareer faculty members make up the largest segment of the academic profession and should be given closer consideration by higher education administrators and policymakers.

The study site, a private 4-year college in the eastern region of the United States, hired 85 tenure-track faculty members across six academic schools within the institution since Fall 2007. A total of 26 tenure-track faculty members resigned from the institution since 2007; only a few left because they were not granted tenure. Zellers et al. (2008) suggested that effective mentoring can enhance faculty members’ teaching effectiveness, enable them to have a more productive research career, ease their adjustment to the academic environment, and relieve feelings of isolation and alienation. Effective mentoring has also been found to revitalize a senior mentor’s interest in his or her work and provide a career renewal experience.

There are 222 full-time faculty members at the study site, 163 of whom are tenured. Tenure-track faculty members have 6 years to build their portfolio before being considered for tenure at the institution. Faculty attrition is a growing concern because of the high cost of recruitment. The cost of recruitment varies throughout the year, but is estimated at the study site to cost between $3,000 and $5,000 per candidate to fill an open position. Additionally, the faculty who left the institution have expressed concerns over the lack of departmental support during their first year of service. Consequently, both junior and senior faculty approached the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) to start a mentoring program to address these problems. More institutional challenges include
future retirements, as 43% of the full-time faculty population are over the age of 60. It was important to understand the participants’ perceptions of how they described their mentoring relationship, the successes and challenges in sustaining a mentoring relationship after going through this program, and their perceptions of the materials in the program in regard to supporting their efforts in developing a mentoring relationship.

**Phenomenon of interest.** The need for effective mentoring programs in higher education is arguably greater now than ever before. This is not only because of the large number of retirements by faculty but also because of the changing demands during the faculty members’ careers. With retirements increasing, Miller and Thurston (2009) stated, “higher education administrators face an urgent need to find ways to maintain a balance of junior and senior faculty to counter this trend” (p. 35). Mentoring programs need to be able to address not only the differing needs of newly hired faculty but also the demands and challenges senior faculty encounter serving as mentors. Currently, there is a wide range of areas in which newly hired faculty members would seek support from their mentors. Traditional models of mentoring have been defined by a top-down, one-on-one relationship in which a senior member of the faculty would support and guide a junior member of the faculty in the development of his or her career. Because of the broad range of career competencies needed to survive and be successful in today’s workplace, the traditional model of mentoring may no longer be realistic (Miller & Thurston, 2009; Mullen & Hutinger, 2008).

Mentoring has evolved, and the expertise of more than one mentor has been a trending approach to mentoring programs over the last decade (Mullen & Hutinger, 2008). Group mentoring is being used today to address a variety of career competencies in higher education. According to Lumpkin (2011), “The formation of a mentoring dyad
or groups among faculty members from different departments, or interdepartments or multidisciplinary mentoring, at times can be more successful than mentoring dyads within departments” (p. 7).

Boice (1992a) suggested that pairing new faculty in groups outside of their own department made the mentees feel more comfortable in expressing weaknesses and concerns. In addition, mentors outside of a mentee’s department will not be involved in contract renewals and tenure decisions. Nondepartmental mentors are also able to provide advice and perspectives that are not influenced by departmental politics (Lumpkin, 2011).

**The topic.** Mentoring programs for new faculty have become an important part of higher education (Miller & Thurston, 2009) and have been recognized as a significant component of faculty integration and overall workplace satisfaction (Allen & Eby, 2007). Developing a sustainable, effective mentoring program at higher education institutions with the support of the administration has shown to increase the success and retention of junior professors. It has also shown to improve practice, offer a renewal experience for senior faculty, and provide them the opportunity to positively influence their institution (Allen & Eby, 2007; Iancu-Haddad & Oplatka, 2009). Lumpkin (2011) stated that effective mentoring programs “are characterized by the clarity of the mission for the program and ongoing assessment of the program effectiveness” (p. 9). It is essential to understand the perceptions of the participants in a mentoring program and how they perceived its success. The study site implemented a formal mentoring program for the first time using a group model format. Zafar, Roberts, and Behar-Horenstein (2012) indicated that it is important to understand how effective a mentoring program is based on the perceptions of the mentors and mentees of the program and the relationship that was fostered because of it.
The research problem. The problem under study was that effective mentoring was not occurring at higher educational institutions as illustrated by the literature (Miller & Thurston, 2009; Zellers et al., 2008). Miller and Thurston (2009) stated that effective mentoring is needed to assist new faculty and maintain a balance between the new faculty and senior faculty but does not exist despite its pressing need. Zellers et al. (2008) asserted that many mentoring programs are currently in practice but research on effective mentoring in higher education is limited. In the fall of 2013, a formal group mentoring program began at the study site; participation in the program was voluntary. This study was intended to help determine the mentors' and mentees' perceptions of the mentoring efforts and whether they believed the mentoring program was effective. In addition, newly hired faculty mentees were asked if the program assisted with their transition into the culture of the institution along with learning the policies and procedures needed to achieve tenure. Senior faculty mentors were asked whether the program provided a renewal experience in their teaching careers at the institution.

Without effective mentoring, there is faculty attrition as well as lack of motivation and guidance for junior faculty. These issues were researched for this study. The information gathered from the study will be used to help strengthen the mentoring program's missions and goals as well as justify the need for such a program and for continuation of the program. The gathered information provided insight on how to best support future new faculty and senior faculty by acquiring data on the opinions of those who participated in the mentoring program. The study was intended to determine, based on the participants' perceptions, whether the mentors felt a sense of renewal, whether both the mentors and mentees liked the group mentoring format, and what they perceived to be the successes and challenges of the mentoring relationship.
**Background and justification.** Mentoring in 21st century higher education is no longer framed by a one-on-one mentoring model but, rather, multiple mentoring relationships because of the growing needs of faculty (Zellars et al., 2008). Faculty need career guidance from a variety of sources. Mullen and Hutinger (2009) agreed that multiple mentoring relationships or a group mentoring model lead to better success of an advancing faculty member as they are receiving assistance from several coexisting sources. Mentoring programs at colleges and universities in the United States do not exist in high numbers. Mentoring programs that do exist are facing the urgent need to adjust their format and structure to meet the ever-changing needs of faculty. Zellars et al. (2008) suggested that richer data should be obtained on existing faculty mentoring programs that have successfully reenvisioned mentoring to meet their institutions’ needs and sustain their mission and core values. They suggested examining actual experiences of mentoring from both the mentors’ and the mentees’ perspectives. The study site recently introduced its first mentoring program because faculty attrition was a growing concern among the administrators, as was the issue of the aging faculty population. The institution sought to address this problem by establishing a mentoring program and by using a group model format for its faculty.

The benefits of effective mentoring programs can have a profound impact not only on the mentee but also on the mentors (Zachary, 2005). Mentoring programs are typically geared towards introducing new faculty to the culture of the institution, fostering success in the classroom, developing networks for collaboration and service contributions, getting them started in publishing, and achievement of academic and institutional goals (Miller & Thurston, 2009). Effective mentoring can provide support and assistance for the development of relationships between mentors and mentees and
across disciplines (Bell & Treleaven, 2011). In addition, first-year faculty who participate in mentoring programs are more likely to stay at the institution and have success in publications and receiving external grants.

Studies have shown that mentors indicated that being involved in mentoring programs was a way for them to contribute to the institution and was also a learning and self-reflection experience. Iancu-Haddad and Oplatka (2009) recognized, “The senior professional may view this request to mentor as validation of his or her status as an expert with knowledge and wisdom to share” (p. 48). The goal of this study was to examine the perceptions of newly hired faculty as well as senior faculty in a formal group-mentoring program.

The institution’s website indicates that it serves 14,000 students each year on campuses in North America, China, the Middle East, and online. It offers 90 degree programs including undergraduate, graduate, and professional degrees in more than 50 fields of study including architecture and design, arts and sciences, education, engineering and computing sciences, health professions, management, and osteopathic medicine.

The study site lost 33% of its tenure-track faculty over the last 6 years, and 43% of the full-time faculty population is over the age of 60 and nearing retirement. Faculty expressed concern to the administrators and the CTL that more guidance was needed during a faculty member’s pretenure years. There was a lack of support from the departments during critical years of a faculty member’s employment at the institution. Succession planning and professional development for faculty has also become part of the provost’s 5-year strategic plan. Given that the institution was facing changes in the faculty population and with growing concerns of attrition, conducting a study and
understanding the perceptions of a mentoring program was expected to help bridge some of these gaps and address the needs of both the faculty and administrators.

**Deficiencies in the evidence.** Formal mentoring programs do not exist in high numbers, and research on them is “rare and fraught with methodological pitfalls” (Zellers et al., 2008, p. 2). Mentoring programs and effective mentoring relationships have evolved over time in both business and education. Boyle and Boice (1998) asserted that higher education’s “laissez-faire approach to mentoring” (p. 159) no longer fits how faculty members need to be supported and that finding spontaneous support is obsolete and unrealistic. Zeller et al. (2008) stated that because of the vast technical, professional, and personal needs of new faculty, one mentor is no longer adequate; multiple mentoring or group mentoring will complement their complex needs in the context of modern society. Boyle and Boice (1998) indicated that group mentoring that was made up of cross-departmental faculty made the interactions less political because of the nature of tenure and promotion. Further investigation is needed on effective mentoring and how group-mentoring models are favored in 21st century higher education (Zellers et al., 2008).

After a nationwide study on how many mentoring programs existed in the United States, Zeind et al. (2005) estimated that 18% of universities have a formal mentoring program and 53% indicated an informal mentoring program at their academic institution. Studies suggested that mentoring relationships can have an increased success rate and result in better retention for junior faculty (Miller & Thurston, 2009). The study site had not previously had a formal group-mentoring program for faculty. Data collected were expected to be helpful in developing such a program, perhaps even replicating characteristics of other strong mentoring programs.
Trends indicated that mentoring models are steering away from the one-on-one method of mentoring and moving towards a group-oriented method of mentoring for broader exposure for the new faculty (Allen & Eby, 2007). In addition, in one-on-one mentoring models, faculty are not given the opportunity to learn from their peers. Reder and Gallagher (2007) suggested that the most effective mentoring models are those that allow new faculty the opportunities to interact within a group of several individuals as well as their peers. Consequently, there was a clear need to explore historical data and current best practices for mentoring models for future implementation at higher education institutions.

Moreover, evidence was needed to understand how senior faculty mentors in the midcareer phase perceived effective mentoring programs. Seldin (2008) stressed that institutions establish mentoring programs so that senior faculty can pass on decades of experience in higher education and, in turn, reenergize their careers. These midcareer faculty have been largely ignored in higher education policy and practice.

There has been little acknowledgment of this long and important phase of academic life and the distinctive challenges it presents. “We know even less about what colleges and universities do specifically to support mid-career faculty” (Baldwin, 2006, p. 28).

The gap this study was intended to fill was to provide much-needed data on group mentoring models and how the program effectiveness was perceived by the mentor and mentee participants. The researcher intended that information gathered on group mentoring models would add to the literature of effective ways to structure mentoring programs in 21st-century higher education. In addition, it was hoped that by obtaining data on the perceptions of senior faculty in a mentoring program as a means to enhance
their careers at their institution, this too would add to the limited research published on faculty vitality and midcareer faculty development.

**Audience.** Institutions of higher education, corporations, businesses, and school districts should benefit from the research and assessment of the mentoring program at the study site. Administrators, superintendents, principals, and human resources directors looking to implement, improve, or transform a mentoring program should also benefit from the data and findings that emerged from this study. By exploring the perceptions of what encompasses effective mentoring relationships as well as the participants’ perceptions of the group mentoring model, the researcher was able to measure its effectiveness. Other institutions of higher education can also benefit from the data collected on the program and model implemented.

**Definition of Terms**

The following terms are defined for the purpose of this study.

*Formal mentoring program* refers to programs that are structured and supported by the organization and that are time limited with assigned mentors sending the message that mentoring is an accepted part of academic life for the growth and development of faculty (Lumpkin, 2011).

*Mentee* refers to a newly hired faculty member who will work with a senior faculty member within the first year of service at an institution of higher education (Mullen & Hutinger, 2008).

*Mentor* refers to a senior tenured faculty member who is expected to serve as a role model, provide guidance, and satisfy the career and psychosocial functions of mentoring relative to the mentee’s work in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service (Mullen & Hutinger, 2008).
Renewal refers to the benefits a mentoring program brings to a mentor’s career by revitalizing his or her interests in the work through exposure to fresh ideas and professional development opportunities (Zellers et al., 2008).

Midcareer faculty are those faculty members who have advanced beyond novice status and fall between the ages of 30 and 70, with 40 to 60 as its core (Baldwin et al., 2005).

Effective mentoring is reported by new faculty who have expressed higher career satisfaction at their institution in the areas of teaching scholarship and service as well as feeling less isolated and alienated from their colleagues. The term also refers to faculty mentors achieving personal satisfaction and revitalizing in their careers (Zellers et al., 2008).

First-year experience refers to newly hired faculty members who participate in a mentoring program during their first year of service at an institution of higher education (Iancu-Haddad & Oplatka, 2009).

Group mentoring is small groups of mentors and mentees from different departments (Lumpkin, 2011).

Relationship refers to the collaboration between a mentee and a mentor in a mentoring program where both exchange ideas and mutually benefit from each other’s experiences (Zeind et al., 2005).

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this case study was to explore and analyze the perceptions of the faculty in their first year of service and senior faculty in a mentoring program at a private 4-year college in the eastern region of the United States to see how they viewed its effectiveness and its challenges. Miller and Thurston (2009) asserted, “Mentoring
programs must be flexible enough to address the different needs of new professors and can only exist in an overall growth-orientated culture that values contributions to both levels of professors—those new to the system and those who serve as mentors” (p. 35). Despite the pressing need for effective mentoring programs, not many are supported and funded in higher education institutions, yet they are critical to the overall success of new faculty (Zellers et al., 2008).

The goal of this case study was to explore how a group mentoring program influenced faculty at the study site. Exploring the perceptions of junior faculty mentees and senior faculty mentors was expected to help administrators plan future activities for newcomers and stronger programs for senior midcareer faculty. In addition, determining the effectiveness of a group mentoring model will add to the literature on mentoring programs and professional development activities for faculty at higher education institutions.

The mentoring relationship between the mentor and mentee was expected to have a positive influence on the careers of the participants in the program. In addition, the relationship was intended to foster collaborations across disciplines and schools and strengthen new faculty commitments to teaching, scholarship, and service. This experience addressed attrition and concerns of large numbers of future retirements of senior faculty at the institution. It should be noted that all relationships involved both positive and negative experiences (Allen & Eby, 2007; Zellers et al., 2008). Allen and Eby (2007) asserted that the literature almost always focused on the positive aspects of mentoring relationships and often oversimplified how complex and challenging they can be.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

The literature review is presented in six major sections. These include (a) theoretical framework; (b) mentoring in higher education; (c) developing sustainable mentoring programs; (d) the mentor and mentee relationship; (e) trends in mentoring programs; and (f) mentoring and midcareer faculty.

Theoretical Framework

The theory that guided this study is grounded in the social learning theory. This theory was originally developed by Bandura in 1977 and was primarily used to study behavior modification and aggression. The social learning theory has been applied to many studies that look at human behavior and the effects of role modeling (Warhurst, 2011). This theory has also largely been used in education (Sanderse, 2013). The basis of this theory suggested that people learn new concepts most effectively from the observation, imitation, and modeling of others (Bandura, 1977):

Learning would be exceedingly laborious, not to mention hazardous, if people had to rely solely on the effects of their own actions to inform them what to do. Fortunately, most human behavior is learned observationally through modeling: from observing others one forms an idea of how new behaviors are performed, and on later occasions this coded information serves as a guide for action. (p. 22)

The theory of social learning emphasizes human behavior in terms of continuous reciprocal interaction among environmental, behavioral, and cognitive influences.

Building self-efficacy is also rooted in the social learning theory (Bandura, 1977). Bandura’s social learning theory guides the new mentoring program by preparing mentors to act as role models for the newly hired faculty members and to provide them with personal and career guidance. Zellers et al. (2008) reported that the best mentors they studied “served as sponsors or coaches to guide, protect, teach, challenge, open doors, and provide feedback. They also became role models who demonstrated
appropriate behaviors, attitude, and values, as well as counselors who provided support and advise” (p. 4).

According to Allen and Eby (2007), the social learning theory is “highly relevant for mentoring because it explicitly addresses the observation of a model as an important mode of learning” (p. 39). A seasoned role model or mentor can demonstrate successes and share experiences in difficult or challenging situations. Allen and Eby added that “learning through structured guidance and observation is proposed to operate across multiple domains of functioning, including academic, vocational and recreational pursuits. In addition, a mentor or role model may demonstrate how to interact with others in various social situations” (p. 39).

This study was designed to understand the participants’ perceptions of a formal mentoring program and to explore their opinions on the group modeling format and whether the senior faculty mentors felt a sense of renewal. The researcher explored and analyzed how new faculty and senior mentors in the program perceived the program’s effectiveness and challenges in sustaining a mentoring relationship.

**Mentoring in Higher Education**

A focus group of senior university faculty who had been awarded and recognized for excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service were asked to share their thoughts and experiences on how they developed as faculty members over time. Carter and Brockerhoff-Macdonald (2011) asked a focus group of nine faculty members, five female and four male in their mid- to late careers from different disciplines, how they first came to learn about teaching. They were asked about their process for professional development in their careers; whether any person or resource helped them in the early stages of their teaching careers; and whether they could offer any advice about teaching
to new faculty, midcareer faculty, and faculty nearing retirement. A majority of the faculty provided insight regarding the benefit of continual learning in their careers with the help and guidance from a mentor. Many expressed the importance of having a mentor, as many faculty had little to no experience reflecting on themselves as learners with to teaching.

Many activities are available for junior faculty; however, the most successful activities are involvement in peer consultation programs or mentoring programs at a college or university. This study pointed out that (a) the changing professoriate, (b) the changing student population, and (c) the changing nature of teaching, scholarship, and learning are three main challenges college and universities face today. Steps should be taken in the development and implementation of strategies such as mentoring programs. “Ideally, when such supports and strategies are in place, there will be increased value on teaching at universities and a more synergistic relationship between teaching and research” (Carter & Brockerhoff-Macdonald, 2011, p. 10). This study addressed several issues facing leaders in higher education and indicated the need for further research on mentoring programs and how they can assist in the transition of the professoriate into the 21st century.

Literature on the expectations of new faculty concluded that they are not fully aware of the demands of academic work. Adcroft (2010) explained that the demands of teaching for the first time can be daunting and that specific support is needed for new faculty entering the profession. Adcroft conducted a qualitative study that encompassed a series of semistructured interviews with new academics and senior managers in two research-intensive business schools. The four essential elements that were found to be critical to the success of a career for new faculty were career management, managing
expectations, professional development, and mentoring. Findings also indicated that each element is important in its own right; however it is the combination of all four that will determine the quality of a new faculty member’s career. Adcroft made reference to the works of Boyle and Boice (1998), who argued that any approach made to help the early career stages of a new faculty member needs to take place between a more experienced member and an inexperienced member of an academic department. Consequently, this raised the issue of mentoring and the need for research to continue to explore different methods of effective mentoring.

Mentoring is seen as a way of intervention and can help newcomers out of isolation and can create collaboration and collegiality among their faculty colleagues (Boyle & Boice, 1998). Mentoring has many advantages; however the advantages only occur when a program is well organized and well managed. Adcroft (2010) also suggested that faculty teaching in different disciplines will need different types of mentoring especially in terms of academic practice. Finally, Adcroft suggested that “formal mentoring and informal relationships with senior members of faculty were crucial in finding strategies to reconcile teaching and research commitments, which fits in neatly with much of the literature in this area, especially Boyle and Boice (1998)” (Adcroft, 2010, p. 295).

Research conducted at the study site was intended to extend the literature by exploring the perceptions of mentors and mentees who participated in the mentoring program.

Ortlieb, Biddix, and Doepker (2010) suggested that faculty members, hired to teach, are often well prepared in the content area but lack the apprenticeship or transition time to discover the policies and procedures of the institution. Ortlieb et al. postulated that novice teachers often lack basic educational theory and are confused about the expectations or plan of action toward achieving tenure. Faculty find themselves spending
countless hours preparing lecture notes and lesson plans and not enough time on their scholarship and service. “Without publications, there is no promotion, no tenure, no security, no more teaching and untimely no more job” (Ortlieb et al., 2010, p. 112). Zafar, Roberts, and Behar-Horenstein (2012) explored the mentoring perceptions of tenure-accruing foreign faculty and their experiences as they transitioned into a research-intensive university. With the use of semistructured interviews and grounded theory, the researchers found that not all new faculty had the same level of support and that the college lacked basic policy and procedures to guide mentoring. The authors suggested that in lieu of the confusion, a mentor could help assist new faculty during the early years of their careers and provide direction and guidance along their journey. Further research at the study site was expected to extend the literature as to how mentors assist new faculty during the first year of their careers.

Minorities and women in higher education respond more positively in collaborative learning experiences, including working with mentors (Gorman, Durnowicz, Roskes, & Slattery, 2010). By sharing strategies and results in a case study format, Gorman et al. (2010) constructed a model for female faculty advancement and professional growth in academia. The authors agreed that taking initiative, acquiring additional responsibilities, assertiveness, excellence, and drive were especially necessary for women seeking career advancement. The authors found that there was a profound perception that women’s performance expectations were greater than for men, which increases the need for women to participate in strategic professional development such as one-on-one and group mentoring on a regular basis. Gorman et al. also found that when effective mentoring occurred, an increased sense of community and collegiality were found. In addition, the authors emphasized that mentoring relationships in formal mentoring programs are
essential to the professional growth and development of both men and women. "While informal mentoring relationships may be more powerful, the element of chance inherent in this type of interaction may leave gaps, thus necessitating the creation of more formal mentoring programs" (p. 4).

Appropriate opportunities for mentoring must exist in higher education; therefore, it is critical that institutions provide these types of developmental interactions and programs. This study reflects the importance of formal mentoring programs as a means to support college and university faculty. The data collected from the study site was expected to add to the existing literature on effective mentoring relationships being used to enhance professional growth and increase collegially in an institution of higher education.

Santo, Engstrom, Reetz, Schweinle, and Reed (2009) asserted that mentoring at institutions of higher education requires the continued support of the administration, staff, and faculty. Institutions that assign mentors to new faculty can ease anxiety and stress for the newcomers and promote productivity, motivation, and confidence in their pursuit of tenure. Santo et al. (2009) agreed that institutions that offer "sufficient time, intrinsic motivation, formal mentorship, culture that values research, and a network of external colleges" (p. 120) have an increase in research productivity. Santo et al.'s work reinforced the fact that formal mentoring programs can have a positive effective on faculty participants and that higher education institutions could benefit from further research conducted on faculty perceptions of the success and challenges during their participants' mentoring program. The mentoring program at the study site was implemented and supported by the administration. The research conducted at the study site was intended to add to the current literature on formal mentoring programs when supported by the institution and determined whether this support enhanced the mentoring
experience for the participants.

Mullen, Murthy, and Teague (2008) suggested that if institutions of higher education want to support faculty and enhance their research output, providing scholarly resources such as the availability of mentors is essential for this effort. The researchers set out to understand faculty perceptions on the factors that influence their scholarship and research. Faculty teaching at top-tier institutions were asked what specific resources they felt most were important to facilitate their research activities. They were also asked what financial and nonfinancial resources were essential. The researchers analyzed the differences between junior and senior faculty responses and their views on the importance of various resources. Faculty from 12 colleges responded to the survey, which was completed by 305 of 1,474 full-time tenured, tenure-track, and nontenure-track faculty. One of the main areas of concern identified from this study was the lack of collegial and intellectual collaboration and support. Overall, faculty rated collaboration across departments, culture, and the structure very low at the institution. Faculty stated that their institution was not conducive to participation in research-oriented collaboration or mentoring. Moreover, faculty admitted that because research skills were not their strongest attribute, they desired and wanted the help and support of mentors in this area. The faculty responses all pointed to wanting more collaboration and to be actively supported in their research by a mentor.

Mullen et al. (2008) stressed that collaborative, productive research and scholarly activities are desired among the faculty who want support in these pursuits, so having a conversation with the faculty is a crucial starting place for organizational change. The study site also identified a lack of collegial and departmental support among new faculty members. The institution sought effective mentoring to guide and support its new faculty
members during their first year at the institution. Further research is needed on the outcomes of effective mentoring programs and how mentoring relationships help to strengthen new faculty development and output in areas of scholarship and research.

Mentoring should be fostered through a training program that promotes goal setting, metacognitive strategies, encouragement, and feedback. Proper training along with set expectations for the mentoring processes and outcomes will improve mentor-mentee interactions. Mentees may acquire self-regulation skills that are useful for advancement, and mentors can apply these skills to their own careers. “Self regulation includes such activities as setting goals, applying and adjusting strategies to attain them, cognitively monitoring performance and progress, maintaining motivation and positive effects about learning, and utilizing social and environmental resources to help attain goals” (Schunk & Mullen, 2013, p. 363). Schunk and Mullen (2013) recommended these important activities during the interactions between mentees and mentors. Mentors can also learn from mentees who bring in new ideas and research topics as well as experience higher self-efficacy. Mentoring programs allow senior faculty the opportunity to explore new research interests and cultivate motivation for pursing them. Mentoring is a beneficial experience for both the mentor and mentee and can enhance both professional and career development. Research should, therefore, continue to examine ways in which mentors and mentees interact and develop a relationship that may help them to fulfill their personal development. The data collected at the study site was expected to add to the literature on senior mentors in a mentoring program and how the relationship with a new faculty mentee influenced their careers and enhanced their professional development.

In order to understand how mentoring training should occur, Stanulis and Ames (2009) explored the experience of one teacher as she worked with first- and second-year
faculty and attended ongoing professional development as part of a university and district pilot induction partnership program. Throughout the course of the year, the mentor would learn how and where to gather relevant information that would help new faculty. The mentor learned the value of organizing evidence from the new faculty’s practice to guide them through continued learning. In addition, the mentor learned how to conduct proper observations and evaluations. Stanulis and Ames agreed that preparing mentors can differ based on the program purposes and context. The researchers also determined that mentors needed their own time to reflect, learn, try out, discuss, and have conversations about methods for mentoring that should or should not be put into practice. “Our goal was to support experienced teachers in constructing mentoring practices that were educative. Educative mentoring involved a shared vision of good teaching that guides the work of the mentor, an image of how beginning teachers learn to teach, a repertoire of mentoring strategies and skills, and adopting a stance of a learner” (p. 3). Stanulis and Ames concluded that more research is needed to enhance findings about specific contexts that should be included in new faculty mentoring programs as well as to explore the changing needs of a faculty member. Research should continue on the development of strategies to support the needs of faculty by analyzing their perceptions of the materials in a mentoring program. The study site provided further data on how mentors reflected on the program materials and activities and how it influenced their relationship with mentees.

**Developing Sustainable Mentoring Programs**

Zeind et al. (2005) established that there was a need for professional development and a formalized plan for a mentoring program because the retention of junior faculty was problematic. The authors developed a formal, sustainable mentoring program for the Massachusetts College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences to address this issue. The
designed mentor program would provide each junior faculty member with two mentors over the course of 4 years. The program would include an orientation, mentorship subcommittees, faculty mentoring guidelines, mentor-mentee pairing, seminars and workshops, and meetings between the mentor and mentee. The authors used pre- and postsurveys that were distributed to assess changes in the perceived level of abilities of mentors and mentees in the three main areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Questionnaires and data were also collected from feedback by the mentorship subcommittee. Over a span of 5 years, 93 mentees and 73 mentors had participated in the mentoring program. Overall, the program evaluations were very positive. Also noted were the self-perceived abilities of mentees that had increased in every area of teaching, scholarship, and service. The perceived abilities of mentors showed some increases following the mentoring program. It was concluded that both the mentor and mentee benefitted from the program and the relationships they built.

It could also be said and that faculty mentoring programs are essential for retention, professional development and academic and institutional goals. Research should therefore continue to examine the relationship between the mentee and mentor and how they perceive a mentoring programs success and effectiveness. Although this program showed that both the mentor and mentee benefitted, more focus and data are needed on how mentors perceived the program in relation to their own careers and professional development. Research conducted at the study site was intended to contribute to the literature on mentoring in higher education, as a means of implementation to counter faculty attrition, and for succession planning.

Miller and Thurston (2009) also saw the value in mentoring programs; however, their intent was not to develop a new program but to evaluate the 9-year model to justify
its importance and assess how it remained sustainable over the years. The program was initially created by a taskforce who spent a year designing protocols and the policies and procedures of the new faculty mentoring program. The program was then piloted for one year with three new faculty members and was evaluated using interviews and surveys. Following this, the program was adopted by the faculty assembly and placed into the faculty handbook. This program used three types of mentoring: individual, triad, and group. In only a few instances was someone assigned to more than one mentor; however, some individuals found it helpful to have two mentors as they moved through the tenure process. Group mentoring took place monthly at luncheons where the topics of teaching, research, and service were discussed and cross-department networking could take place. There were 23 new faculty and 29 senior faculty who were involved in the mentoring program.

Both formative and summative evaluations took place over the course of 9 years to assess the impact and success of the program. Miller and Thurston (2009) distributed online surveys to all the former mentors and mentees. All 23 mentees and 29 mentors completed the survey. The comprehensive 9-year evaluation concluded successful programming and promotion of faculty with 38% of mentees reaching tenure. The study also acknowledged that another 38% of newly hired faculty were successfully moving along in their tenure-track positions. Effective mentoring was shown not only to foster faculty success in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service for reaching tenure, but also to acclimate new faculty to the culture, policies, and procedures of the institution as well as cultivate faculty conversations and collaborations across disciplines.

Future research should be conducted to provide specific data on other areas that may be beneficial to the mentee and mentor. Research at the study site addressed the
perceptions of both mentors and mentees in the context of a formal mentoring program. The perceptions of the faculty participants at the study site could be used to extend the literature on effective mentoring and how a group mentoring model was perceived by both mentors and mentees.

Thorndyke, Gusic, and Milner (2008) also asserted that faculty mentoring programs are important, so much so that they believed it is the main aspect of professional development for faculty. These authors expressed that in today’s environment, faculty mentoring programs need to be measured for their success and should be able to produce tangible outcomes. The authors’ main goal was to do an evaluation of a successful program through the use of their functional mentoring framework. They contended that the key outcome of functional mentoring is the project of the faculty member, which is aligned with professional responsibilities and with the college’s mission and core values. Therefore, the project would not only add to the faculty members’ experience but would also add to the value of the institution.

Functional mentoring is a way to measure results at various levels (Thorndike et al., 2008). There were 165 faculty in the continuing medical education accredited faculty development program who were surveyed at the beginning, midpoint, and end of the mentoring program, which lasted 4 years. The study showed that the mentoring program was highly effective and that participants were very satisfied. Junior faculty results indicated that 85% felt that their mentors had a large impact on their projects, 92% said that the project would impact their careers, and 86% said that the mentoring program would impact the department and college. The authors pointed out that there were many levels of success, but that the main outcome of a functional mentoring program is the faculty project and how it impacts them in their careers and the institution’s mission.
When measuring the program’s success at many levels, functional mentoring was found to be a favorable approach and future programs could be modeled after this program. Although functional mentoring fit the format and needs of the medical education faculty in this study, a group model format was used at the study site.

Sustainable mentoring programs also need to ensure that they were enhancing their content and format to fit the needs of changing faculty demographics and the needs of the academic institution. Hixon, Barczyk, Buckenmeyer, and Feldman (2011) conducted a program evaluation of the Distance Education Mentoring Program at Purdue University-Calumet in Indiana. This program was designed to enhance the development of online courses taught by faculty and was evaluated over a 4-year period through surveys and questionnaires that were sent to 47 mentees.

The questionnaires consisted of two major themes. The first was the participation and overall satisfaction and impact the program had, and the second was the program changes necessary for the changing faculty body. The results showed that 30% of faculty at the university had participated in the mentoring program and were teaching 44% of the courses offered online. The authors stated that these numbers suggested that the program was having a positive impact on faculty teaching online courses. The results showed that overall, the participants were satisfied with the mentoring program and its effectiveness.

Suggestions for further improvement from later cohorts indicated that more structure and accountability were needed in the program. Therefore, research should be conducted to understand what makes effective and sustainable mentoring programs. The authors concluded that mentoring programs like these aid in an academic institution’s development of a competitive advantage in the fast-paced, growing market of higher education (Hixon et al., 2011).
The Mentor and Mentee Relationship

It is important to develop a deep understanding of how vital the relationship between a mentor and mentee is for effective mentoring to occur. Russell and Russell (2011) conducted a qualitative research study by exploring the perceptions of nine teachers mentoring student interns in a formal mentoring program. Data were received from a demographic survey and from an open-ended questionnaire geared towards eliciting the participants' lived experiences. In addition, the researchers made observations during the mentoring program workshop, a 2-day, 6-hours a day workshop designed to prepare mentors for their roles in the program. The findings in this study suggested that the relationship between the teacher and intern greatly impacts how the intern learns to teach and that the help and guidance from the teacher mentor is directly related to the effectiveness of the student interns. The mentor participants discussed the emphasis and importance of role modeling for the student interns to facilitate and promote their growth and success.

Russell and Russell (2011) also looked at the participants' motivations for mentoring. Through the open-ended questionnaire responses, the participants expressed that they not only wanted to share their knowledge but also gain knowledge on new teaching and effective ways in which to collaborate with beginning teachers. Russell and Russell asserted that “learning during the mentoring relationship is a two-way street, where both mentee and mentor learn from the collaborative relationship” (p. 12). The study revealed that it is imperative to develop strategies for effective mentoring and to build positive relationships. The study outcomes also suggested that mentors must understand how significant their role is to the mentees’ experiences and that this information should be noted when developing and implementing future formal mentoring
programs. Research at the study site replicated and extended certain aspects of this study by gathering the perceptions of the participants in a formal group mentoring program and analyzing their roles and expectations of the mentoring relationship.

Meyer and Warren-Gordon (2013) conducted a study to explore the diversified mentoring relationships at a midsized Midwestern state university. Both researchers conducted 21 semistructured interviews with faculty who were members of underrepresented minority groups. The first author conducted qualitative interviewing, and the second author conducted an autoethnography, which is a form of self-reflection that allows the researcher to write in a highly personalized style and use personal experience to extend social meanings and understandings. They determined that there were a number of issues that were uncovered in the formal mentoring program and within the culture of the institution. Moreover, the findings indicated that the overall quality of the mentoring relationships had a profound effect on the mentees’ diversity practices and how they interacted with other cultures at the institution. This study took a deeper look at the racial dynamics of mentoring relationships and how they affect the outcomes for new faculty. The advice given by the participants could stimulate social change by improving the diversified mentoring experiences of minority faculty members. The researchers suggested that if institutions invest in positive diversified mentoring relationships, improvements can be made to the state of the intergroup relations and the institution overall. Institutions today are composed of a diverse set of faculty, and future research should extend to explore not just the relationship between a senior and junior faculty but also to diversified mentoring relationships at colleges and universities in the United States and around the world. Further research should be explored on mentoring models, specifically, group mentoring models, as this method of mentoring diversifies the
mentoring relationship and promotes cross-disciplinary interactions.

Erdem and Aytemur (2008) sought to determine the trust mentees felt for their mentors. The authors expressed the importance of trust in building a strong mentoring program. The authors also suggested that the attitudes and behaviors of the senior faculty mentors provide role modeling for the junior faculty, which makes it imperative for there to be a basis of trust and collegiality in these relationships. With the need for mentoring programs on the rise, the authors stressed that both the mentor and mentee need to establish a sense of trust and commitment for the program in order to achieve positive outcomes on both sides and to build a lasting program with a good track record. For this study, 32 mentees were interviewed. The total time spent on all the interviews was 35 hours. The study showed that the sharing of control and fair behavior were the areas that most mentees identified as being a positive experience.

Erdem and Aytemur (2008) revealed that mentors failed to provide guidance to the mentees in new areas of study. The negative areas of perception were not with the mentor but, rather, in other areas of the university such as legal matters, culture, and rigid university policies and procedures. These researchers found that the mentor and mentee relationship can be successful if they are both ready to share control, trust one another, and be responsible for the relationship's overall success. These researchers made further suggestions to universities with mentoring programs to consistently evaluate mentees on their satisfaction level with their mentors.

This is the first year a mentoring program has been implemented at the study site. Therefore, suggestions made by the participants in the program may be considered for future improvements of the mentoring program in the following years. The study may determine mentees' perceptions of their mentors. This determination may impact the
effectiveness of the mentoring program.

Having a mentoring program comes with many benefits to an academic institution, but with that comes the need to continue to investigate what makes a sustainable, high-quality mentoring program. Iancu-Haddad and Oplatka (2009) examined the importance of a good mentor in a new faculty mentoring program as well as the motives leading them to participate. They examined the various career stages of a mentor to determine what kind of support they could give, either psychosocial, career mentoring or both, which also could lead to why and to what motivates them. This study looked at 12 (10 females, 2 males) mentors who supported novice faculty in their first year of teaching to determine the need for mentoring during their first years of service. In order to break down the types of mentors, three groups were established by career stage. The first group was professors in the establishment stage with 5-10 years of teaching experience. The second group was the midcareer stage in which professors had 11-20 years of experience. The last group was the late career stage, which included teachers with 25 years of experience or more.

All groups were interviewed and the data was collected and analyzed. Iancu-Haddad and Oplatka (2009) found that many mentors had already worked with novice faculty, and the official appointment of the role only formalized the relationship. Other findings included mentors not wanting novice faculty to experience the same struggles they did when entering the profession without a mentor. Others wanted to return the favor of the good experience they had as a novice faculty member, and many felt it was a way for them to help improve the school system. There were also some negative results for the mentors. The outcomes showed that expectations of mentors were not met in the program and they became overextended and too emotionally involved.
Overall, based on the data and research collected, Ianu-Haddad and Oplatka (2009) determined that mentoring programs like this one is valuable to academic institutions; however, there is a need to understand better what motivates and benefits all those involved. Stakeholders need to understand that there is an emotional impact on mentors and that they need support, too. During the one-on-one interviews with the mentors at the study site, mentors were asked how the program impacted their careers and what types of support and training they received.

Mentoring programs are valuable to an institution, but making sure they are developed and set up correctly is critical. Once a program is established with the support of the administration and objectives and outcomes are specified, making thoughtful pairings of a mentor and mentee is the next essential step to a successful mentoring program (Bell & Treleaven, 2011). There are many ways to choose the right mentor and to support the pairing process. Bell and Treleaven (2011) explored the experiences of participants in a mentoring program that took place over 5 years. The study revealed that the pairing process can be uncomfortable and intimidating when mentees first meet mentors in a group and have to select someone. Out of 23 potential mentees, nine did not pick a mentor or form any mentoring relationship because of this process. The researchers further determined that mentees being able to select their own mentors and make personal connections was important to the participants and individuals' success in the program. Although this study was conducted on a formal mentoring program, mentees were able to select their own mentors, which are usually a characteristic of informal mentoring programs. Bell and Treleaven pointed out that their conclusions were different from those of Boice (1992b), who he found that pairing by a program director and mentors who formed their own pairs fared the same.
In addition, Bell and Treleaven (2011) stated that the pairing of faculty outside of their own discipline was successful, despite great hesitation at the onset of the program. Boice (1992b) attested that “protégés paired with strangers from different departments began by reporting that they did not like their mentors and that they were sure that a mentor from a different discipline would be of minimal help” (p. 111). Both the mentors and mentees in this program expressed that their experience was remarkable, the pairings were successful, and that were each able to contribute and learn from each other throughout their meetings and the entirety of the mentoring program. The study concluded by suggesting further research on the pairing process and what shapes successful pairing of mentees and mentors in higher education. Consequently, data collected from this study were intended to show how faculty perceived the effectiveness of the pairing process in a group mentoring model.

Mullen and Hutinger (2008) examined how a high-quality program can effect an institution. The authors described how a formal mentoring program can improve practice and the impact that mentors and mentees make on the culture of a university. The researchers investigated the development of a mentoring program in its second year at a university in Florida. The authors looked at factors that led to the tipping point in a mentoring program, or where mentoring becomes contagious among the faculty. A survey called Looking Back was distributed to new faculty who had gone through the mentoring program in the first year. The survey asked the new faculty to assess not only their relationship with the mentor but the overall mentoring program itself. Moreover, the mentors were surveyed to assess their relationship with the mentees and the overall program. Each mentee had one mentor in their department and one mentor outside their department to promote cross-disciplinary conversations among new faculty. Data were
collected from both mentor and mentee in addition to the notes taken over the first year of the mentoring program. The information was analyzed by both the mentoring director and a doctoral student through a mixed-methods design. From the new faculty responses, the study determined that participation in the faculty mentoring program was beneficial. The feedback from the mentors suggested that they benefitted from their role in the new faculty mentoring program as well. Overall, having mentors inside and outside the department was effective and innovative. The study results suggested that formal mentoring programs can be used to transform academic institutions in mentoring cultures that deepened reflection and improved practice in higher education. This study indicated a need for future research on formal mentoring programs and group mentoring models in which faculty are placed in groups from members outside of their departments and disciplines. At the study site, each participant was placed in a mentoring group with someone outside of his or her department.

Trends in Effective Mentoring Programs

Schechner and Posluny (2010) developed and evaluated a 3-year cohort-based series of faculty development workshops. The program was established because faculty and the administration recognized the need for ongoing faculty development during the strategic planning process. The program was designed to provide consistent policies and procedures to new faculty, mentoring faculty in the areas of teaching, research, and service, assisting faculty in finding the work-life balance, cross-disciplinary networking, and introduction to the culture of the institution to retain excellent faculty-scholars. When the program started, it was designed to last only one year with two or three workshops per semester.

After the first year, the participants asked for the program to continue as they felt
there was more information they needed and that this program was the venue for them to be successful. The first year of the program consisted of information and activities such as campus tours, course design workshops and lunches, which gave new faculty the opportunity to meet and collaborate with third-year faculty. The second year of the program included workshops that would help faculty take on new responsibilities and become more involved in university governance. The third year of the program was designed to give the faculty member a broader perspective of the university and offer sessions on strategic planning, student engagement, and guidance toward tenure. After surveys were distributed and interviews were conducted, Schechner and Poslunsy (2010) found that overall, faculty were very satisfied with the ongoing support and mentoring they were receiving through the first few years of their employment at the college. In addition, they pointed out that their biggest piece of evidence that the program was successful was the ongoing requests to offer more workshops each year and requests from midcareer tenured faculty also looking for similar stimulating workshops.

Schechner and Poslunsy (2010) noted that the one-day orientations and a handful of workshops for faculty today is inadequate and will not fully prepare new faculty for all of the issues they will face in their first few years of employment. They recommended that mentoring programs and workshops be continued throughout a faculty member’s tenure years and beyond. Data collected at the study site was over a one-year period and was intended to be used to understand faculty perceptions of the program’s success and effectiveness. It was expected to provide evidence that such support is needed at the institution and should be continued in the next academic year.

Moss, Teshima, and Leszcz (2008) evaluated the implementation of a peer-mentoring model versus that of a traditional dyadic model. Senior faculty identified the
need for mentoring and sent an email inviting all junior faculty to an information session to explore the possibility of starting the program. After the group's decision to meet was finalized, they developed specific learning objectives and overall goals as well as set the agenda of meeting dates and times throughout the year. From 2004-2005, 10 faculty members participated in the program that involved evening meetings every other month. After a year, a focus group was formed to provide a qualitative evaluation and to report the findings. The focus-group leader took notes and observations to write the final report. Based on the notes, several themes were evident: emotional gains, knowledge gains, and interpersonal gains. Overall, the faculty felt supported by each other and the institution and were reenergized in their teaching practices. It was decided to keep the program as the response from the participants was favorable and that a peer-mentoring program was an effective model of mentoring for the institution. Similarly, the study site has also incorporated the use of peer mentoring into its new mentoring program. In the group-model format being used, two peer mentees who were new faculty members at the institution were paired with a mentor who was a senior tenured faculty member. Research conducted at the study site was expected to add to the existing literature on the effectiveness of group mentoring models and the relationships created between the mentor and mentee in that format. The study determined effective mentoring by asking participants their opinions.

Reder and Gallagher (2007) created a mentoring program at a small liberal arts college that was not like traditional models. This mentoring program designed for newly hired first-year faculty at Connecticut College was done in a way that it was run by second- and third-year faculty. Most mentoring program models have their programs facilitated by a director with tenured faculty members as the mentors. Like most
academic institutions that have mentoring programs, Connecticut College felt the program was needed and that the Center for Teaching Learning would be the best place to implement this support for new faculty to help them with the challenges they may face working in a new environment. The idea around incorporating second- and third-year faculty into the mentoring program was that these mentors may have had a closer connection to a newly hired faculty member with more empathy and willingness to help them through the first year.

The mentoring program at Connecticut College was called the Johnson Seminar. Reder and Gallagher's (2007) main objective of the study was to show how the Johnson Seminar was transforming the overall culture through a peer-mentoring program. The authors found that the second- and third-year faculty benefitted from staying involved in the seminar in the areas of course design and classroom management. Before the program, there was no mechanism in place for tracking the progress of faculty scholarship or attention paid to their teaching and learning. The authors were able to show several indicators that the program was a success. Since the start of program in 2000, over 90% of first-year faculty participated in the Johnson Seminar in Year 2 to help the next incoming faculty members, and 25% of them returned for a third year. The number of faculty who attended workshops and gave presentations had been on a steady rise, and faculty who participated in the program had been offering more and more workshops on campus over the years.

Reder and Gallagher (2007) also found a steady increase in faculty publications. The authors showed several more examples of success such as faculty collaboration leading to new courses, faculty being granted tenure, and culture changes in various departments and among the faculty on campus. The authors looked very closely at each
aspect of the program, each faculty member's progress over the years at the college and the impact this program was making at Connecticut College overall. This peer-mentoring model was designed for a small liberal arts college in terms of scale but could be used for other academic institutions to make multiple faculty connections across several disciplines to bring a change to the culture of their institution. The study site used a group-model format and encompassed the same basic principles of this study. The study indicated the need for further research to evaluate different models of effective mentoring; therefore, the research explored and analyzed at the study site was expected to contribute to needed data on mentoring models for 21st-century higher education institutions.

Mentoring models are evolving as the faculty population grows older and more diverse. In 2009, at the University in Minnesota, a group of faculty members were charged with developing a new mentoring model that would better fit the institution. A new pretenure model was developed that would expand the program to include mentoring for promotion of faculty from assistant professors to associate professors and from associate professors to full professors. After the researchers surveyed 25 faculty who had participated in the program, they determined that both assistant and associate professors found the program beneficial for their careers and advancement. In addition, they believed that the mentoring experience gave them greater control over how they would present their portfolios to receive positive feedback and how they would be represented at review meetings. Almost all assistant professors said that they valued the opportunity to work with tenured faculty members. The researchers noted that a good mentoring program cannot always guarantee success, but it should be designed to support and facilitate faculty through the tenure process.
Challenges in any program can include finding a good mentor-mentee fit and faculty members being comfortable expressing weaknesses to their mentors. It is difficult to ask for help when the process expects excellence. A mentoring system will not resolve the inherent conflicts in the tenure system, but through dialogue and periodic systematic evaluations involving all the stakeholders, progress can be made (Duranczyk, Madyu, Jehangir, & Higbee, 2011, p. 29).

The study site's program highlighted the importance of mentoring during the tenure process and for career success. It is important for institutions to continuously find ways to support faculty. Data from the study site may be used to understand effective mentoring practices.

The traditional dyadic model of mentoring is no longer realistic in an academic setting; nontraditional formats such as group mentoring are becoming a much better fit for institutions of higher education (Miller & Thurston, 2009; Mullen & Hutinger, 2008). Van der Merwe (2011) conducted a qualitative intrinsic case study to explore a formal mentoring program at the College of Human Sciences to determine if research output had increased after a year of implementation. Van der Merwe asserted that a formal mentoring program promotes the recognition of mentoring activities and has a clear structure with understood outcomes and objectives by the mentors, mentees and program director. In general, most formal mentoring programs entail a one-on-one model and are directed by the program's coordinator.

Currently, more models are combining a variety of mentoring relationships at several levels and across departments to promote cross-disciplinary conversations and scholarly activity. Van der Merwe (2011) found that a formal mentoring program that allowed flexibility with choosing mentors and meeting times was an overall successful
effort at the College of Human Sciences. Van der Merwe also pointed out that combining faculty from different departments in mentoring groups increased research productivity and other cross-disciplinary projects. The findings showed that the mentoring program was well received by the faculty because they felt it was well designed, developed, and implemented in their departments. Research at the study site was similar to Van der Merwe’s, combining faculty from various departments in mentoring groups to promote further investigation of group mentoring models across disciplines.

The study site used a group mentoring model and encompassed elements of several mentoring models previously discussed. Moss et al. (2008) described a successful peer mentoring model, and Reder and Gallagher (2007) also described a mentoring model in which second- and third-year faculty were used as mentors rather than more senior, tenured faculty. The peer element is important as new faculty have greater success when they can share experiences with someone of the same status who is experiencing similar challenges and accomplishments (Moss et al., 2008; Reder & Gallagher, 2007).

The study site incorporated the peer element, as two newly hired faculty were paired with one senior tenured faculty member in the group mentoring model. Moss et al. (2008) and Reder and Gallagher (2007) designed small mentoring programs at small colleges. However, Reder and Gallagher suggested that their model could be used for academic institutions of any size looking to make multiple faculty connections across differing disciplines. Duranczyk et al.’s (2011) study on a pretenure mentoring model confirmed that faculty intending to advance in their academic careers valued the opportunity to work with a more senior, tenured faculty member. Further, formal mentoring programs promoted the positive recognition of mentoring and are successful when they are supported by the administration (van der Merwe, 2011; Pastore, 2013).
Combining multiple mentoring relationships across departments and disciplines is a better suited approach to support faculty in higher education (Miller & Thurston, 2009; Mullen & Hutinger, 2008; van der Merwe, 2011). For this study at a private 4-year college in the eastern region of the United States, the institution implemented a mentoring program for the first time. The mentoring program was supported and funded by the administration and was recognized as an important element of overall faculty success and professional development for both new and senior faculty.

The mentoring program at the study site was structured by a group mentoring model in which two newly hired faculty were paired with one senior faculty in a program that took place over the course of one academic year during the fall and spring semesters. In this group mentoring model, each of the new faculty mentees along with the senior faculty mentor were from different departments and disciplines. Conducting a qualitative case study on the perceptions of mentors and mentees and the successes and challenges in a group mentoring program is essential to determine effective mentoring practices for faculty at the study site and other institutions of higher education.

**Mentoring and Midcareer Faculty**

Mentoring is recognized as being mutually beneficial for both the new faculty mentee and the senior faculty mentor, yet literature on faculty in the midphase of their careers who are typically asked to serve as mentors is limited. Midcareer faculty make up the largest component of the academic workforce and are called upon most to take on leadership roles and to become mentors, department heads, and department chairs (Baldwin & Chang, 2006). There is a clear lack of neglect that many midcareer faculty experience in higher education.

Researchers at Michigan State University conducted a study of midcareer faculty
experiences at the institution to find out what was expected of them. Baldwin and Chang (2006) found that many midcareer faculty were expected to maintain and even enhance their performance after receiving tenure. One faculty member said, “The increased workload is almost bewildering” (p. 30). At the same time, faculty expressed concerns about keeping up with their rapidly evolving disciplines, staying engaged, and staying relevant. The researchers found that faculty expressed interest in the benefits their involvement in a mentoring program would bring to their careers and the knowledge they could share with junior faculty. Baldwin and Chang agreed that “higher-education institutions must look at their mid-career faculty in context in order to understand them fully and serve their professional development needs effectively” (p. 35). The importance of professional development for midcareer faculty is highlighted, and using mentoring as a means to enhance a midcareer faculty’s performance needed to be further explored.

The professoriate as a whole is growing older, and the professional development needs for senior faculty are different from those of their junior faculty colleagues. Institutional leaders today are faced with large numbers of experienced faculty, and it is becoming critical to provide continuing education to enhance their careers (Huston & Weaver, 2008). Huston and Weaver (2008) suggested that mentoring among peers and across disciplines has the potential to broaden conversations about pedagogy and foster partnerships among faculty. Rather than the traditional one-on-one mentoring, peer mentoring or multiple mentoring relationships offer opportunities for midcareer faculty to renew thinking about their teaching and service to the institution. Peer or multiple mentoring can also provide avenues for experienced faculty to become engaged in the academic community and provide a service to new members. The authors suggested that “if campuses are dedicated to providing faculty opportunities for experienced faculty
development throughout the career-span of the faculty they support, providing additional opportunities for experienced faculty members is a must” (p. 18). Colleges and universities must make an investment in the ongoing development of this important group essential. This study reflects how important faculty renewal initiatives are for midcareer faculty at colleges and universities. The study site was expected to gain insight and provide needed data on senior faculty perceptions on the group mentoring program as a means of renewal for their careers. This research added to the literature on faculty vitality and offered further information on mentoring programs as an effective way to providing support and opportunities to enhance a faculty member’s career.

List and Sorcinelli (2007) also looked at ways in which senior faculty could stay engaged and sustain long-term teaching vitality and success. The authors agreed that 21st-century teaching is a particular challenge. While students on a whole remain ages 18-22, the professors do not. Two thirds of the nation’s full-time faculty members are over the age of 50. As the age gap widens, the leadership at higher education institutions are exploring ways to keep their professors engaged and committed to their students. In addition, finding avenues to avoid burnout after so many years of teaching is becoming critical. List and Sorcinelli (2007) asked a dozen faculty members, all of whom had taught an average of 27 years in the classroom, which aspects and strategies they used in terms of long-term teaching success that worked for them and that could work for others. The researchers found that senior faculty expressed the same or more interest in being a quality teacher than did junior faculty and that senior faculty derived pleasure and satisfaction from the involvement in nurturing, influencing the lives of others, and mentoring students and faculty colleagues. Faculty vitality is about intellectual connections and continuing to support faculty throughout their careers, not just until
tenure is achieved. The research at the study site explored the relationships between senior faculty mentors and junior faculty mentees and how the relationship influenced their professional and personal careers.

Smith, Hecker-Fernandes, Zorn, and Duffy (2012) examined faculty perceptions of mentoring at the early, mid-, and late career phases. The study was conducted in a 48-member department at a college of nursing and health sciences at a public university. The department had recently implemented a promotional structure for clinical instructors that led researchers to explore and analyze the perceptions of mentoring within the department. The findings were that clinical instructors in the early phases of their careers experienced greater satisfaction in the mentoring program than did other faculty. Many clinical instructors were pursuing their doctorate degree and perceived mentoring as helpful with advancing their professional goals and developing leadership skills.

Other faculty in the early career phases put the most value on areas of mentoring such as feeling welcomed into the community, which in turn meant that the department was adequately supporting new members’ needs. The most individuals who were dissatisfied with mentoring were the faculty in the late phases of their careers. The researchers pointed out that further research was needed to understand why faculty in the late phases of their careers were not satisfied with the mentoring program so that improvements could be made to support this population, as it is critical to the success of an institution. The study site examined the profiles of the mentors to determine if age or career phase played a role in their overall satisfaction level. Smith et al. (2012) noted that “Mentoring facilitates the development of more advanced expertise, fosters entry into mature professional communities, assists with access to career opportunities and nurtures the growth of future leaders” (p. 499). Mentoring can promote organizational change by
empowering movement through personal and professional advancement.

Because midcareer faculty are often overlooked, Pastore (2013) conducted a study that looked at the value of a mentoring model that was designed for the development of midcareer faculty. Pastore (2013) explained that midcareer faculty make up the largest percentage of academic professors at colleges and universities, so it is imperative that their professional development needs are examined. Ten professors took part in the study and in semistructured interviews at a large university in the Midwest. The questions asked in the interviews were based on the interview guide from Baldwin and Chang’s (2006) Mid-Career Faculty Development Model. This model was based on a national web-based investigation that was constructed to develop strategies that could meet the needs of midcareer faculty. The model emphasized active faculty reflection and promoted various support activities for renewal experiences. Mentoring, collaborating and networking were among the first areas of support identified in this model. The study revealed that these areas of support, with an emphasis on effective mentoring are recommended measures for midcareer faculty professional development and satisfaction. Pastore (2013) concluded by stressing the backing and buy-in of higher education administrators and faculty in order for midcareer faculty to be recognized and supported at their institution. Further research is needed to explore mentoring programs as a renewal activity for midcareer faculty serving as mentors. The study site will conduct one-on-one interviews with both the mentors and mentees in the formal group mentoring program. During the interviews, the mentors will be asked how they benefited from the program. It is hoped that the mentoring program will offer a renewal experience, in which case the data will add to the literature on mentoring programs as an effective means of supporting senior faculty members.
Banks (2010) examined the reflections of 25 mentors who took part in a National Science Foundation program that was designed to encourage young women to engage in math and science. Although this study was not done in a higher education setting, Banks stressed that mentoring has many benefits, especially for the mentor. Banks pointed out that being a mentor in general promotes skill development and enhances teaching and service experiences. Being a mentor means that someone may serve in different roles at any given time; they may act as a teacher, coach, role model, and confidant. Therefore, “a strong mentorship program can strike a balance between serving as a source of inspiration and as a uni-directional force for instruction” (p. 69). Analyses of the data revealed several themes from the mentors. Mentors experienced affirmation of abilities, negotiating group dynamics, awareness of culture, greater knowledge of institutional policies and procedures, and career guidance. The researcher pointed out that mentors’ confidence did increase throughout the program. It was suggested at the conclusion of this study that future research should include intentionally measuring perceived mentor benefits and gains. The mentors themselves are worthy of their own investigation and further research. Therefore, it is hoped that research conducted at the study site will contribute to the literature on mentoring programs as an effective practice of professional development and promoting the development of new skills and enhancing teaching in the classroom for senior faculty serving as mentors.

Summary

Mentoring programs are critical to the induction of newly hired faculty and can positively affect senior mentors involved. The literature set the premise for a new faculty mentoring program to be developed and implemented. However, there was also a need to assess the mentoring programs’ effectiveness to mentors and mentees.
A group mentoring model is becoming a realistic approach in higher education as responsibilities and expectations grow among junior and senior faculty members. The study should be implemented to examine mentoring relationships and to analyze the perceptions of the mentors and mentees to determine the success and challenges of the program. This study also examined the perceptions of a group mentoring model in which faculty were grouped with a peer and a senior faculty mentor outside of his or her department and discipline. The researcher also examined the formal mentoring program as a means to support senior faculty mentors, who are often faculty in the midcareer phase of their professional lives.

**Research Questions**

1. How and in what ways do faculty mentors and mentees describe what they understood, integrated, and implemented in their relationship after going through this program?

2. What are the mentor’s and mentees’ perceptions of the materials and activities of the program in supporting their efforts in developing a mentoring relationship?

3. After completing the mentorship program, what were the successes and challenges of sustaining an effective mentoring relationship?
Chapter 3: Methodology

Introduction

This chapter addresses the reasons and benefits of using a case-study research method to explore the relationships developed between mentors and mentees in a formal group mentoring program. The instrument chosen to elicit data as well as the selection of participants are discussed. Data collection and procedures on how the study was conducted as well as the issues of trustworthiness, ethical considerations, and potential bias are discussed before limitations of the study are presented.

Design

The rationale for using a case study design was that it allowed the researcher to understand perceptions of individuals related to the phenomenon. A case study encompassed extensive data collection and analysis that provided a robust exploration of a bounded system (Creswell, 2013; Glense, 2011). The participants in this study were bound by their involvement in a mentoring program.

Yin (2014) explained that case studies are used to understand a complex social event within a real-life context. Case studies investigate how or why something happened regarding the phenomenon within a setting and are used when the researcher cannot manipulate events or behaviors. This study met those requirements, as it investigated mentors and mentees and their relationships in a formal group mentoring program at a private 4-year college in the eastern region of the United States. This project was based on the perspectives of 21 faculty members who participated in a formal mentoring program; therefore, a case study was used as the research method.

Participants

A purposeful sampling strategy was used to identify the participants for the study.
According to Miles and Huberman (1994), purposeful sampling strategies should be evaluated in terms of the following attributes: (a) the relevancy to the conceptual framework and the research questions, (b) the likeliness to generate rich data on the phenomenon that is being studied, (c) the descriptions and explanations produced should be believable, (d) the strategies should be ethical, and (e) the purposeful sampling plan should be feasible. Purposeful sampling was chosen as it allowed the researcher to select participants best suited to develop a detailed and useful understanding about the phenomenon being studied.

Participants were both the mentees and mentors in a mentoring program at the study site. To provide enough opportunities to determine themes of a case, Creswell (2013) asserted that at least 10-12 people would be needed. There were 21 total participants, male and female, in the mentoring program. Fourteen of the participants were mentees, and seven of the participants were mentors. The mentoring groups were made up of two mentees and one mentor, all from differing academic disciplines. The mentors were senior tenured faculty who had been at the institution between 10 and 25 years and were recommended by the dean and provost at the institution to be a mentor in the program. The mentees were junior faculty in their first year of service at the institution who had not yet achieved tenure. All 21 participants in the mentoring program were either a senior faculty member serving as a mentor or a new faculty mentee in the first year of service at the institution and had completed the one-year mentoring program; therefore, they met the criteria and were asked to participate in the study.

**Instruments**

The researcher was granted permission to use and adapt a protocol to guide individual interviews and focus groups (see Appendices A, B, and C). The actual
questions used in the interview protocol and focus groups were adapted by changing words such as “teacher” and “school year” to “new faculty” and “academic year.” In addition, “Teaching Mentoring Program” was changed to “Mentoring Program.” The protocol was developed by a student researcher and used in a study that evaluated the effectiveness of a teacher mentoring program (Benson-Jaja, 2010). The dissertation was designed to determine what aspects of a mentoring program were beneficial to the mentors and mentees and to what extent it impacted teacher retention. The population that was used by Benson-Jaja (2010) included 17 mentors and 35 mentees who participated in a teacher mentoring program in an elementary school in southeast Georgia during the 2006-2007, 2007-2008, and 2008-2009 school years. The protocol was used in a mixed-methods study to help answer questions about the needs of the new teachers, support received, support strategies, and mentoring relationships.

Benson-Jaja (2010) established validity by using triangulation, which, according to Glesne (2011), is the practice of using several methods of data collection. Data were collected from beginning teachers, mentors, and teachers new to the district using questionnaires, face-to-face interviews, and a focus-group interview (Benson-Jaja, 2010). Using more than one method while studying the same phenomenon helps to strengthen validity of the results (Frechtling, 2010).

Validity was also established by piloting the mentor survey and the new-teacher survey by an educator who was familiar with the district mentoring program. It was also established by making sure that during the interviews, “the questions were asked within the experience of the respondents” (Benson-Jaja, 2010, p. 55). In other words, the objectives of the Teaching Mentoring Program matched the questions being asked. Similarly, the protocol helped generate answers to the research questions proposed in this
study.

In order to establish triangulation, the researcher conducted individual interviews, a focus group, and a review of archival documentation from the mentoring program, including the results of the mentor self-assessment of mentoring knowledge and skills and the mentoring program agenda. The researcher analyzed the self-assessment documents as part of her job and looked at the results for archival evidence of effective mentoring for the study. Documents can provide valuable information on the participants or site in a study and can help researchers understand the phenomenon in a qualitative study (Creswell, 2012).

Procedures

The researcher sought approval from the study site and the researcher’s university. Following the guidelines, the researcher compiled the necessary documents and information for submission prior to starting the research. In addition, the researcher sought permission from the study site before submitting documentation. The submission included the protocol submission, the data-collection instruments, a copy of an informed consent form and the recruitment flyer. After appropriate approvals were obtained from both sites, the researcher forwarded all information and then began the study.

The researcher contacted the director of the CTL who started the new mentoring program at the study site and informed the director of the approvals obtained to conduct the study. The researcher attended midyear luncheons for both the mentors and mentees and explained the benefits of the study. All were advised that the information provided would be confidential if they would like to participate. Each participant was sent a recruitment letter by email (see Appendix D), and those who agreed to participate were given an informed consent form to complete. The consent process allowed each
participant to gain information on the length of the interview, how the results of the study would be used, the purpose of the study, and any risks or benefits involved of which they would need to be aware. The researcher also allowed time for questions during this process.

Once all participants were established, the researcher arranged to meet with each of them individually to conduct face-to-face interviews. The participants were seen at their offices. The selected interview protocol guided the interviews. Each interview was completed within an hour. Questions for the mentees included how they described their relationship with their mentor, what qualities the mentor exhibited that helped the mentee to be successful in the mentoring program, and what strategies the mentor used to help the mentee develop and implement curriculum in the classroom. Questions for the mentors included how they would describe their relationship with the mentee, how the mentor program impacted their career, and what were the benefits of mentoring. Open-ended questions were used during the interviews. According to Yin (2014), open-ended questions allow the researcher to probe the respondent to increase the quality of the response. They also allow the respondents to create their own ideas without constraints. The one-on-one interviews were recorded using an audiotape device in order to obtain an accurate account of the session (Creswell, 2012). The researcher then transcribed the audio recordings.

A focus group was conducted to collect a shared understanding of several participants as well as to obtain views from specific groups (Creswell, 2012). As in interviews, the focus groups were face to face but built on a group process. The researcher asked general questions to a group of mentors and mentees at the end of the yearlong program. Three mentors and three mentees were invited to participate in the
focus group, which took place at one of two campus locations. Creswell (2012) asserted that four to six people should provide ample opportunity to collect data. Questions asked included how they would describe the mentoring program, what improvements can be made, and whether the mentors benefitted from the program. According to Fitzpatrick, Sanders, and Worthen (2004), a focus group is “an increasingly popular method for obtaining qualitative information from a group of individuals” (p. 350). The researcher used a moderator to facilitate the focus-group discussion so she could take field notes for an hour and a half. The results were analyzed after transcribing the notes, and the focus-group participants had the opportunity to read through the analysis to check for consistency and accuracy.

A valuable source of data in qualitative research studies can be documents (Creswell, 2012). Documentation can “provide the advantage of being in the language and words of the participants, who have usually given thoughtful attention to them” (Creswell, 2012, p. 223). As part of the existing program at the study site, mentors are asked to fill out a self-assessment prior to the start of the program. The results of this archival documentation was obtained from the director of the mentoring program, and the researcher reviewed and analyzed this documentation as a part of the data collection.

**Data collection.** During each interview and focus group, the researcher took handwritten field notes (see Appendices E and F). The field notes included the researcher’s personal reactions and descriptions of the place, date, time, activities, body language, and conversations (Glesne, 2011). Field notes “should be both descriptive and analytic” (Glesne, 2011, p. 73). Field notes taken during the focus group also included detailed descriptions of the topics discussed, the types of
participants (mentors, mentees, or a combination of both), and the interactions between the participants (Creswell, 2012).

Yin (2014) suggested that once all sources of data were collected, the one-on-one interviews have been transcribed, and the focus group field notes are organized, sharing the collective data with the participants may provide clarity and establish a broader sense of trust and between the participants and the researcher. Glesne (2011) asserted that “by sharing working drafts, both researcher and researched may grow in their interpretations of the phenomena around them” (p. 212). Member checking occurred during the last 15 minutes of the 1-hour interviews and during the 15 minutes of the 1½-hour focus group session. Member checking helped to determine whether the information was an accurate account of the findings and of the researcher’s interpretations of the data (Creswell, 2012). Sharing the findings was also intended to help fill any gaps in information or field notes taken during each interview, focus group, or archival document collection.

**Data analysis.** Once the data were collected and reviewed by the participants, the researcher read the transcripts several times, and meaningful text was coded. Categories started to form, and the researcher began to create “detailed descriptions, develop themes or dimensions, and provide an interpretation in light of [participants’] views” (Creswell, 2013, p. 184). The researcher wrote notes in the margins consisting of the various key concepts and ideas that occurred throughout the review process (Creswell, 2013). Each transcript was reviewed in the same way so that the researcher could develop the data into the various themes (Yin, 2014). After themes were established for each transcript, cross analysis of the documents was done to determine common themes. A matrix grid was created to visually display the data.
**Reporting findings.** The researcher compiled findings in a report and matrix grid and distributed to selected audiences who could benefit from the information (Creswell, 2012). Specifically, the researcher shared the findings with the program director and the institution’s administrators. This was the first time the mentoring program was implemented at the institution; therefore, the administrators may have found the study data useful for continuation of the program in subsequent years. The report included the researcher’s perspectives and findings from the one-on-one interviews and focus groups and a detailed analysis of the archival review of the mentoring program documents.

**Trustworthiness.** According to Lincoln and Guba (1984), triangulation in naturalistic studies is important. The authors explained that measures should be taken to validate all data and information against a second method. In order to be given serious consideration, each item should be triangulated. Triangulation involved the use of several types of data including interviews, a focus group, and archival document collection (Creswell, 2012). The technique of triangulation is important because it will increase “the probability that findings and interpretations will be found credible” (Lincoln & Guba, 1984, p. 305). Validity was established by having the participants review and confirm themes that were established by the researcher. In addition, the researcher asked the director of the mentoring program to review the protocol and any conclusions made from the data before the final report was written.

**Ethical considerations.** Ethical issues arise in qualitative studies, so a researcher should be prepared for them (Creswell, 2012). To establish trust with the participants, the researcher explained the purpose of the study and how the findings might impact them. The researcher also made sure there was appropriate and accurate information on the
informed consent form for the participants willing to participate voluntarily in the study. Participants were informed that they could withdraw from the study at any time.

The individuals in the study were not identified by name during the collection and data analysis. They were protected by using a number coding system for anonymity, and the researcher assured participants that the findings would not be associated with them when the study was published (Creswell, 2012). The coding system was kept separate from all data-collection instruments. The audiotapes and field notes used during the one-on-one interviews and focus group were kept in a secure, locked file cabinet in the researcher’s office. Once the study was completed, all tapes, transcripts, and field notes were shredded by the researcher.

**Potential researcher bias.** This study on a mentoring program had potential bias because of the researcher’s employment and connection with the individuals in the mentoring program at the study site (Yin, 2014). The researcher was an employee at the site during the study period and aided the director of the CTL in the development of the mentoring program. This was the first time a mentoring program was in place at the institution, and part of the researcher’s job was to support the program and the participants’ needs throughout the year. The researcher hopes that the mentoring program is a successful one along with its potential to positively influence the first-year faculty mentees and enhance the careers of the senior faculty mentors. Therefore, the researcher may be heavily vested in its success based on working with the program.

To manage bias, the researcher abided by the code of ethics at her place of employment as well as the regulations of the university she attends as a doctoral candidate (Glesne, 2011). Maintaining the integrity of the program and of the researcher’s position at the institution was of the utmost importance. “Participants have
the right to expect that when they give you permission to observe and interview, you will protect their confidences” (Glesne, 2011, p. 172). The privacy of the participants, the interviews, the focus group, and documentation were kept in secured files by the researcher.
Chapter 4: Findings

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to explore and analyze the perceptions of faculty in their first year of service and senior faculty in a mentoring program to see how they viewed its effectiveness and its challenges. The participants in this qualitative case study were faculty members at a private 4-year college located in the eastern region of the United States. The case study design was used to document participants’ experiences in the mentoring program; then their responses were analyzed.

This chapter provides the results of the research. Three questions guided this study:

1. How and in what ways do faculty mentors and mentees describe what they understand, integrate and implement in their relationship after going through this program?

2. What are the mentor and mentees perceptions of the materials and activities of the program in supporting their efforts in developing a mentoring relationship?

3. After completing the mentorship program, what were the success and challenges in sustaining an effective mentoring relationship?

This chapter presents the themes that emerged from an analysis of the individual interviews and focus group. The findings from the pre- and postintervention self-assessment surveys that were completed by the mentors in the mentoring program are examined and discussed. Participants’ body language and facial expressions were observed as well during the interviews and focus groups, which helped give the researcher a sense and perception of their level of comfort. Information obtained from the pre- and postintervention self-assessment for mentors as well as the topics discussed by
mentors and mentees during the program were used in triangulation to gain a deeper understanding of the relationship between the mentor and mentee as well as to understand the challenges and successes of the program. Triangulation was described by Creswell and Miller (2000) as “a validity procedure where researchers look for convergence among multiple and different sources of information to form themes or categories in a study” (p. 126). After data from the interviews and focus group were collected and self-assessment documentation analyzed, a summary was created to exhibit the findings.

Themes

In this qualitative study, the findings suggested that two overall themes (see Appendix G) emerged from both the focus group and the interview transcripts: professional and personal. After examining the interview and focus-group transcripts, word patterns emerged and themes were developed. Many of the participants mentioned that they felt a sense of community within their mentoring groups and that the relationship could be used as a sounding board for both mentors and mentees in the program. Several participants also commented that they felt a sense of friendship, belonging, and reliability in their relationships.

*Professional* was defined as experiences, resources, and knowledge. *Personal* was defined as trust, support, and connection. The quotes from the participants are used to help answer the research questions. The findings from the participants are reported from transcripts and exhibit conversational speech. Participants were numbered in order to maintain confidentiality (e.g., P1, P2, and so forth).

**Theme 1: Professional**

Responses from the participants’ interview transcripts indicated that faculty mentors and mentees understand and describe their relationship as professional. For the
purposes of this study, shared experiences, resources, and knowledge between the faculty mentors and their mentees are categories that define the theme of professional.

**Experiences.** Experiences are defined in this study as being shareable, and they integrate stories in the mentoring groups that guide the mentoring relationships through advice from similar situations in a professional setting. The ability to interact with other faculty in a mentoring group and discuss experiences helped build a successful, professional relationship between the faculty mentor and mentees.

P11 greeted the researcher at the door and was warm and welcoming when the researcher entered his office. He appeared comfortable and relaxed and answered many of the questions eagerly and with little hesitation. He discussed some of his frustrations as a first-year faculty member, many of which related to situations encountered from the students he was teaching in his classroom. He related that he and his co-mentee shared similar frustrations and that even though the subject matter being taught was entirely different because the co-mentee was a faculty member in another discipline, the behaviors of the students were the same. He said they were able to discuss various scenarios openly when he and his co-mentee met as a group and that the mentor added valuable input to them as new faculty:

We talked about problems and our mentor had a lot of suggestions from her experience with all the years of teaching. And even a little bit we kind of went back and forth, and I actually thought it was good that it was a group program in the sense that sometimes one of us or one of the two mentees would have suggestions for the other one just based on, “Well I’m having this problem.” And then the other one said, “Well here’s what I’ve been doing,” and so we’ve kind of compared notes.

P16 also mentioned how important it was to her to be able to share experiences that supported the development of her mentoring relationship with her co-mentee and mentor. This participant was a middle-aged woman who smiled a lot when speaking
about her experiences as a first-year faculty member at the institution. She spoke very calmly and slowly. She answered each question with a lot of thought and seemed grateful and appreciative to be a part of the mentoring program. She told the researcher that she was much more relaxed now in her second semester of teaching and that she has started to get more comfortable with her teaching schedule and prepping for her courses. This participant explained that her mentor’s confidence and experience was a valued quality in the relationship and that she felt assured that her mentor was able to guide her correctly. She told the researcher that her mentor had “the kind of experience you get from doing it yourself and having been there yourself,” and that was important to her because it added depth to the mentor’s advice and guidance.

P20 also felt that experiences shared and discussed in the mentoring relationship were important. This particular participant had a slight accent and spoke softly at first, then became more passionate in her answers and when speaking of her two mentees. She told the researcher how she integrated her experiences into the conversations when meeting as a group with her two mentees. She expressed to the researcher that the benefits of meeting with people outside of her discipline was that it was a different point of view and

a nonbiased point of view, so the advice is more through experience and through personal opinion, and you just basically share what worked for you in the past and what didn’t, which is also important to say that sometimes things didn’t work out, and it’s okay to make mistakes.

**Resources.** Resources were noted in some of the participants’ conversations with the researcher. They mentioned how they were able to gain information and utilize the relationships that were developed in the mentoring program in ways that helped them learn more about each other and about other disciplines at the institution. Resources are
defined in this study as helping each other and guiding each other.

P3 was one of the oldest and most seasoned faculty members in the study. He was friendly and spoke with confidence. He was in his late 60s. Based on the stories he shared with the researcher, he spent most of his time traveling and spending time with his family and had knowledge of various aspects of higher education. His manner was that of someone who was comfortable speaking in front of crowds. He told the researcher about how he believed he was "a resource to the faculty because everybody encounters some sort of bumps along the road in terms of adjustment or issues." He also stated that he witnessed the interactions between his two mentees and that they were each able to provide perspectives on situations to each other and they came out of the conversation with more understanding of potential ways of addressing a particular issue. He also noted the following:

One of the things I encouraged them to do is to recognize that their colleagues in other departments do have phones and e-mail. And I encouraged them to reach out to colleagues who could be useful to them, because I think that's important in building an academic community and in building your own career.

P17 entered the room and immediately sat down and began chatting with the researcher about her experiences as a first-year faculty member. She shared stories about her teaching prior to coming to her current position and how her mentor helped and guided her throughout her first year in a tenure-track position. She spoke very graciously about her mentor and stated, "I think something helpful to me was that she had a lot of resources, so she was always able to point me in a direction." P17 described her relationship with her mentor as one that will be ongoing even after the formal program ends. She added, "I don't think that if I ever emailed my mentor in future, she would be like 'sorry, it's over.' I don't feel that at all."
P16 paused often to make sure her points were clear and thought out. She appeared to be concerned about her answers in that she wanted the researcher to understand the impact the mentoring program made on her. In addition to feeling as if the mentoring relationship was an avenue to share experiences, she also spoke in depth about how it helped her transition into her role as a faculty member. She told the researcher about the positive assurance she received from her mentor:

She helped us to adapt to the college culture, to the tenure process, answering questions, general questions, and then she would also ask us specific questions about our teaching; about where we are in terms of putting our portfolio together; resources that if we weren’t sure of what to do or how to do something, who would be the best person to ask. So I would say the role is like an advisor, a counselor, a helper, a colleague, somebody who is more seasoned in their role as a faculty member or professor, sharing their experiences and guiding us in the right direction, in that sense.

**Knowledge.** Some participants who were involved in the mentoring program felt as if they gained a sense of knowledge of the institution. Knowledge is described in this study as developing an understanding that similar situations happened elsewhere in other disciplines on campus. Other participants pointed out that the information obtained in the mentoring program and the relationships they developed expedited their adjustment to the institution.

Knowledge was important to P8, also. This participant was fully engaged in the protocol questions and took his time to answer them thoughtfully. He smiled often when describing his mentor and their interactions and when telling stories of other encounters with colleagues in his department with whom he grew close. He was in his late 30s and his voice was not loud, but he spoke fluently throughout the interview and without hesitation. He gained perspective from his mentor and co-mentee about the institution and career plans:
It’s good to hear that some of the problems that happen within my school also happen in her school and that it’s not just my school that’s crazy; everyone’s kind of crazy. So having a second mentee was useful too because she would come up with ideas and bounce them off of the group and it would lead to a different conversation—her tenure track is going to be slightly different because she has different obligations and things like that. So we had some productive five-year planning or six-year planning discussions where I had one approach and she had another approach, and we both helped each other out, and our mentor helped guide us.

P11 pointed out that they understood their relationship to be a way in which they could be more involved in and aware of the institution. P11 expressed that he felt it was important to understand things outside of his discipline. He told the researcher that “in terms of learning things about teaching and then talking about sort of the machinations of how things work around here was important because it was kind of like a sanity check.”

The researcher also interviewed P10, who spoke very softly and seemed comfortable throughout the entire interview. She paused a moment to think over the questions before answering. A few times, this participant would ask for clarity of the protocol questions. She was one of the youngest female participants in the study; she was in her early 30s. P10 described her mentoring relationship as comfortable and mutually communicative. She felt as if she could approach her mentor with any issue, because he was always able to provide valuable information, which in turn helped develop the relationship. “He has knowledge of the institution, probably more than anyone else who could be doing the mentoring. He had a desire to help, and it truly felt like he was interested in helping and your success.”

**Theme 2: Personal**

Responses from the participants’ interview transcripts indicated that faculty mentors and mentees understood and described certain aspects of their relationship as personal. For the purposes of this study, personal is defined as trust, support, and
connection that developed during the mentoring relationships.

**Trust.** With regard to how and in what ways faculty mentors and mentees described what they understood, integrated, and implemented in their relationships after going through this program, a few of them responded that they felt they developed a sense of trust in the mentoring relationship. The participants said they were able to discuss a variety of issues because they were dissociated from any of the other day-to-day activities in each other’s role and department.

Participants felt that it was important to develop trust in the mentoring relationship so everyone could speak freely and without fear of reprisal. P15 was open about how she felt on the topic of mentoring in general and the group mentoring structure of the program at her institution. She told the researcher about her experiences mentoring faculty in her own discipline for both full-time and part-time faculty in years past. She mentioned that even if she was not in an official role as a mentor in her department, new faculty would come to her for advice and guidance on a number of personal and professional topics. She spoke very confidently when describing her past and current mentoring relationships. In terms of mentoring new faculty outside of her department, she seemed satisfied when describing her meetings and experiences with her mentees throughout the duration of the program:

> I think it was a source of information that was totally unbiased and that they didn’t have to worry that I was going to tell on them or do anything like that. There was nothing but a pleasant exchange. It couldn’t be a punitive environment.

P7 also described trust as an important aspect of the mentoring relationship. This particular participant had a slight accent and was one of youngest male participants in this study in his early 30s. The researcher noticed she had to probe him for information as the
protocol questions were asked. The participant spoke about the relationship with his mentor and co-mentee and described their interactions as collegial but with a relaxed attitude since neither of them had any real bearing on his reappointment because they were not in his department. He seemed pleased that his mentor had a lot of experience in the institution and that she knew a lot about the administration and the faculty union. He mentioned that his mentor reminded him and his co-mentee often that “If you want to know more about the administration and the faculty union, ask me and I can provide an independent view from anybody in your department.” He added that because she has no real interaction with his department, she was able to give him an independent voice or mind on various topics.

P20 shared with the researcher that as a mentor, she also believed it was important that her mentees felt comfortable enough to trust her and her advice and that she felt the same trust with them when sharing her experiences. She added:

I think it was a relief, because in the discussion I would also share things that happen in my department with the same confidence that, things will stay there, and because they see that all the departments have issues they feel a little better that they’re not an exception that, “Oh my God, we have this, and he’s fighting with me and him, and he’s fighting with her.” That’s normal.

Support. Another topic of discussion between the researcher and a few of the participants was the feeling of support they gained from the mentoring relationship. For purposes of this study, support is defined as providing a sounding board to each other, learning from each other and feeling understood.

Being there and helping young faculty was also important to P13. She entered the room out of breath but still smiling, ready for the interview to start. She explained to the researcher that she had just come from class and hoped she was not too late. Right away,
P13 began telling stories and describing scenarios between her and her mentees. She felt that mentoring was very rewarding and she liked that the program was made up of people from differing disciplines because she liked getting to know different people. She also told the researcher that she had invited the mentees to dinner at her home, which seemed to give the relationship a more of a personal tone. When she described her relationship with her mentees, she showed passion as she spoke about how she made sure their experience at the institution was a good one. A few times, her voice became animated and her arms moved around to emphasize the points that she made. She explained to the researcher that when she would meet with her mentees, they seemed relieved to be able to talk to someone. “They felt it was good because sometimes just voicing their feelings and concerns and knowing someone was listening to them was good.”

Other participants pointed out that the mentoring relationships helped to reinforce what they were doing. P15 told the researcher, “I think knowing that they had a sounding board also was huge for them and that there was no fear of reprisals.” P16 added that being with another faculty member who was from a different department—and it didn’t really matter what department... But just also seeing and supporting each other in that sense. After we met with our mentor today, we were standing in the hall, and there’s a form that I have that he doesn’t have, and I was able to share that.

**Connection.** For purposes of this study, connection is defined as learning about disciplines outside of one’s own department and relating and linking similar situations to help foster the mentoring relationships in the group. Many of the interview participants discussed the subject of cross-disciplinary connections that were developed. With regard to mentors’ and mentees’ perceptions of the materials and activities in the mentoring program in support of their efforts in developing a mentoring relationship, a few of them informed the researcher that because they were required to meet as a group and were
paired with one peer mentee and one senior mentor faculty member outside of their department, they found more benefits to getting advice from more than one person rather than just one person several times. Based on the responses, the writer believes that this dynamic made the conversations and relationships among the mentors and mentees more robust.

P2 is about 40 years old. She would often lean forward in her chair when she seemed to be more enthusiastic about particular questions on the protocol. She shared with the researcher some of the challenges she faced as a first-year faculty member and how she takes pride in making sure her lectures and content are current for today’s 21st-century higher education students. She explained that because of her field of study, some students have a hard time relating to the subject matter. If she is able to find visual representations of good quality that relate to the content of her lectures, she finds that students are able to make the connection to what she is talking about and become more engaged. When she spoke about her meetings in the mentoring program, she expressed the instant bond she felt with her co-mentee and mentor:

The first meeting was really enjoyable, because we met as a group; I’m grouped with another new professor . . . It was very congenial. It was welcoming. It was very lighthearted. . . . And I just remember that first meeting thinking that I felt very much like this would be a very nice, close knit community, that it would be—that I would be able to foster a good relationship with the mentor and with the colleague.

When discussing the topic of connection to the institution during the interview, P13 told the researcher that her days as a student and new faculty member at the institution made being a mentor now very fulfilling and gave her particular insight to what new faculty needed. She concluded the interview by telling the researcher about her overall understanding of the mentoring program and how she was able to connect her past
experiences to help aid her advice to her mentees:

I found it very rewarding because also I wish I had had something similar. I
definitely would have loved that. . . . It was lovely getting to know people, just
being there to help them through some of the hurdles. For me especially, of
course, coming in as a I was student, I knew some of the hurdles, but certainly not
on the administrative level, and all the wheels that are in motion. So you really
didn’t get the big picture, especially from someone outside the department. I
thought that was excellent; I totally enjoyed it. I think it’s very important.

Focus Group

The focus group was made up of three mentors and three mentees, all from
different departments and mentoring groups. The focus group was conducted by a
facilitator who was the mentoring program director while the researcher took field notes.
All members entered the room one after another, as they had just come from an event
they had all attended. Some of the participants seemed calm and composed as they sat
down around the tables, while others seemed eager for the focus-group interview to start.
The participants all smiled as they looked around at one another and at the facilitator and
the researcher. The facilitator made the suggestion at the beginning of the session that a
letter should be assigned to each participant. She asked each person to say the letter
before they spoke. This would make the data analysis process more streamlined for the
researcher. The participants appeared comfortable and all took turns answering questions
regarding the goals of the program, the benefits of mentoring, the qualities of an effective
mentor, and a description of the characteristics of the program.

These participants were all continuously engaging with each other’s thoughts and
answers as the facilitator made her way through the protocol. The same themes from the
individual interviews emerged from the focus group. Several other questions asked were,
(a) What did the mentors do to facilitate the process for struggling mentees, (b) what
were the mentors responsibilities, (c) if a mentor or mentee had a problem, how was it
resolved, and (d) how did the mentors benefit from the mentoring program? A few of the participants felt that they gained professional aspects such as learning about the culture of the institution and advice regarding teaching, scholarship, and service required at the institution; they found the relationship to be a valuable resource. Several participants felt as if they also acquired a personal relationship in the mentoring program. Because of the structure of the program, many expressed the sense of trust they experienced as well as the support they received from their mentors and co-mentees. A few participants explained that the affirmation they received from their mentoring group made them see that success and survival were possible. Many participants discussed the topic of connection to the institution and support they received.

One question asked if a mentor or mentee had a problem, how was it resolved. One participant indicated that if a problem or issue arose inside or outside the classroom, the mentoring program could be used to help find alternate solutions and open up discussions to avoid feeling as if she was harboring any resentment toward the institution. She also mentioned that if something came up, she felt as if being involved in the program provided her the path and appropriate channels to find answers and ultimately bring out the best in her as a teacher and scholar. This participant added that, ultimately, the students benefit, as everyone wants a passionate professor. Several participants in the focus group indicated that the cross-disciplinary conversations in the mentoring groups not only gave the participants insights into other departments but also provided new roads to possible research and teaching collaborations.

The participants were asked to describe the benefits of the mentoring program. One participant expressed how it fostered interdisciplinary relationships and helped to achieve a breakdown of perceived boundaries among the various academic departments.
Another participant mentioned how he was able to connect with his mentor by discussing daily life events and that he felt he made a friend in addition to just being mentored professionally. He added that having participants from several departments in the program helped to keep the conversation going and developing, as what they all had in common tended to be more that they were all human beings with lives outside of school.

**Documentation**

As part of the mentoring program, a self-assessment survey with de-identified data was sent to the mentors before the program began and again when it concluded after 1 year to examine their pre- and postassessments and understanding of themselves as mentors. All seven mentors in the program completed the self-assessments. Mentors were asked to rate themselves on a scale of 1 to 5 on various topics, which included knowledge of adult development, knowledge of assessing mentees’ learning styles and development needs, knowledge of resources available, and knowledge of a wide variety of mentoring strategies and techniques. An examination and comparison were done of all the results of the pre- and postassessments by the mentors. Of the 41 questions on the survey, 40 showed an improved rating from the mentors after they completed their postassessment. When mentors answered the question regarding preassessing their knowledge of the resources available for working with the mentee, the average rating of all seven mentors was 2.6 out of 5. When examining the postassessment, the average rating of all seven mentors rose to 4.1 out of 5. In addition, when preassessing their knowledge of a wide variety of mentoring strategies and techniques, the average rating of all seven mentors was 2.4 out of 5. After the postassessment was completed, all seven mentors’ average had risen to 4.0 out of 5. These data provided support for ways to sustain effective mentoring relationships.
Summary

The purpose of this study was to explore and analyze the perceptions of the faculty in their first year of service and senior faculty in a mentoring program to see how they viewed its effectiveness and its challenges. A case study design was used to elicit mentor and mentee experiences and to describe what they understood, integrated, and implemented in their relationship; the perceptions of the materials and activities of the program in supporting their efforts in developing a mentoring relationship; and a description of the successes and challenges in sustaining an effective mentoring relationship.

Two overall themes emerged from the data. Themes were evident from the analysis of individual interview transcripts and the focus-group transcript and by cross analysis of all transcripts. Researcher observations and the review of pre- and postintervention self-assessment surveys were also utilized to extract data from the participants. The data also provided clarity that supported the mentoring program’s effectiveness in sustaining a mentoring relationship.

The theoretical framework that was chosen to guide this study was the social learning theory that was developed by Bandura in 1977. The theory suggested that people learn effectively from the observation and modeling of others, and it has been used extensively in the education field. This theory was chosen in order to explore how mentors and mentees perceived the successes and challenges in sustaining an effective mentoring relationship in the mentoring program at the study site.

The results from the individual interviews, focus group, and document review were utilized to help the researcher present the themes that emerged from the collected data. The data also showed evidence that provided support in sustaining effective
mentoring relationships. The researcher’s understanding of the data, implications of the study, and relevance of the study pertaining to the research questions are presented in chapter 5. Recommendations and conclusions are also addressed.
Chapter 5: Discussion

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this case study was to explore and analyze the perceptions of the faculty in their first year of service and senior faculty in a mentoring program at a private 4-year college in the eastern region of the United States to see how they viewed its effectiveness and its challenges. By exploring the perceptions of faculty mentees and mentors, administrators can strategize future activities. Determining the effectiveness of a group mentoring model also adds to the literature on mentoring programs and professional development activities for faculty at higher education institutions.

The researcher interviewed seven mentors and 13 mentees on their perceptions of a mentoring program for this qualitative case study. Each interview, along with the focus group, was digitally recorded and transcribed for analysis. Interpretational analysis was utilized to examine participants’ perceptions of the mentoring program and their successes and challenges in sustaining an effective mentoring relationship in the program. The researcher also observed the participants during the individual interviews and focus group. Two themes emerged from the analysis, professional and personal. Professional was defined as experiences, resources, and knowledge. Personal was defined as trust, support, and connection. The quotes from the participants are used to help answer the research questions. The three questions that guided this study were as follows:

1. How and in what ways do faculty mentors and mentees describe what they understood, integrated, and implemented in their relationship after going through this program?

2. What are the mentor’s and mentees’ perceptions of the materials and activities of the program in supporting their efforts in developing a mentoring relationship?
3. After completing the mentorship program, what were the successes and challenges of sustaining an effective mentoring relationship?

The theoretical framework that was chosen to guide this study was Bandura’s Social Learning Theory developed in 1977. This theory was that people learn effectively from the observation and modeling of others.

The researcher became interested in the topic of mentoring because of the demanding nature of the professorate in 21st-century higher education. The study site provided a mentoring program for the very first time, so the researcher also wanted to understand how people viewed its effectiveness as well as the challenges and overall success they found with it. The findings of this study addressed the research questions and supported the effectiveness of a group mentoring model.

The data that emerged from the interviews added meaning to the participants’ experiences in the mentoring program. The two themes that materialized from the interviews, professional and personal, helped to capture the mentors’ and mentees’ perceptions of the program. The interpretation of the interviews is based on the researcher’s understanding of the responses and data from the self-assessments. During the interviews and focus group, many of the participants mentioned the professional insights they received as well as having gained a sense of belonging and trust within their mentoring groups. The researcher noticed that when the mentors and mentees spoke about their experiences, they seemed appreciative and had a sense of satisfaction for having participated.

**Theme 1: Professional.** Most of the participants discussed feeling that they were able to share regarding teaching, internal politics, and work in higher education. They also believed they could use each other as resources in terms of where to find information
and what strategies worked and did not work in the classroom. Last, they felt they had gained a sense of overall knowledge of the institution regarding polices and procedures and whom to talk to about them and also in terms of tenure, promotion, and reappointment during their participation in the mentoring program. A few of the participants shared that they felt they were able to relate to each other and had learned from each other after sharing their experiences in the mentoring program. One participant indicated that he had tried a few strategies in the classroom after meeting with his mentor and co-mentee and hearing about their challenges and strategies with students when trying to get them more involved in the content of the course and participation.

Bandura’s (1977) social learning theory emphasized that human behavior is learned observationally through modeling. Some of the mentee participants acknowledged that they felt that they gained a better understanding of the university culture and overall structure after having interacted and met several times with their mentors. One participant described her mentoring experience:

She moved us forward, helped us to adapt to the college culture, to the tenure process, answering questions, general questions, and then she would also ask us specific questions about our teaching; about where we are in terms of putting our portfolio together; resources that if we weren’t sure of what to do or how to do something, who would be the best person to ask. So I would say the role is like an advisor, a counselor, a helper, a colleague, somebody who is more seasoned in their role as a faculty member or professor, sharing their experiences and guiding us in the right direction.

As a result of comments made by the participants during the interviews, the researcher noticed how much they valued the professional interactions, knowledge, and advice they received from participating in the mentoring program. Moreover, the study site had just implemented this program for the first time, and many of the participants had never participated in a formal mentoring program yet expressed that they felt a sense of
gain in their professional careers and personal relationships after having met in their mentoring groups.

The facilitators of the mentoring program also helped to cultivate the sense of professionalism that the participants experienced during the program. A few of the participants commented that one of the elements that attracted them to the program and to their overall experience was the facilitators of the mentoring program. The facilitators have a reputation for preparing high-quality faculty development sessions. One of the facilitators had over 20 years of experience in faculty development, mentoring, and delivery of best practices in teaching and learning. Another facilitator had over 10 years of experience in academic administration and faculty affairs. One participant, a mentor, pointed out that the facilitators laid down the groundwork that was useful and relevant to the needs of the new faculty and that she always felt she could reach out to either of the facilitators with any questions, concerns, or advice. A mentee remarked, “She [the facilitator] has honestly been there for me when I was having the toughest time; she was the person that I always went to when I felt like I didn’t know who else I could talk to. . . . She was there and always professional.” A third participant offered this comment:

I think the faculty who were involved . . . to their [facilitators’] credit, expressed real interest in the program and had interesting things to say about their own participation. I think that meeting [mentors’ orientation] was very helpful. It’s important to know what you can do and what you can’t do. You are not a psychological counselor . . . and there are other assets that you can rely on from other officers at the college. Knowing who those resources are is something you really have to know about before you begin to meet with people and mentor. So I thought that opening session, even though I was familiar with most of the issues, it was nice to put them all in one place, particularly in the context of talking to the other mentors within the program. So I thought that was set up very nicely.

Some of the participants told the researcher during the interview that the facilitators’ demeanor and helpful attributes enhanced their experience and contributed to
the overall sense of professionalism they encountered during the program. The facilitators assisted in directing the outline of program format, the goals and objectives, and the assessments and expected outcomes of the program. The facilitators designed and monitored the program not only for effectiveness but also so that both the mentors and mentees felt comfortable and felt a sense of confidentiality when sharing their knowledge and resources with each other.

When the focus group was held, chairs and small tables were set up to accommodate all 6 participants and 2 facilitators. Everyone was facing each other around the tables. This type of room arrangement allowed the researcher to see all the participants while making field notes.

The researcher was not surprised that participants commented that they shared their experiences and acted as resources to each other throughout the program. This interaction in the relationship can be interpreted as a positive experience that helped make the mentoring relationship successful and sustainable and influence their professional careers. Although the participants did not say that they hoped to gain anything from sharing experiences with one another within their mentoring groups, their comments regarding the knowledge and resources they shared can be interpreted as such.

**Theme 2: Personal.** Many of the participants mentioned in the interviews that their mentor-mentee relationship felt safe; that they had developed a sense of trust with one another; and due to the structure of the program, many felt a broader sense of linkage to and understanding of departments outside of their own discipline at the institution. Bandura's (1977) social learning theory suggested that people form new ideas and concepts by imitating others. This notion of forming new ideas and concepts is how some of the participants described their experiences when learning through interacting with
faculty members in their mentoring groups from other disciplines.

The social learning theory also focused on human behavior in terms of continuous reciprocal interaction between environmental, behavioral, and cognitive influences. Many of the participants mentioned that each time they met in their mentoring groups; they felt they could discuss any professional or personal problem they had been encountering and that the relationship provided a trustworthy sounding board.

Based on the data from the interviews, the personal aspects of the relationship that developed were trust, support, and connection to the institution. A few participants discussed the support and connection the program provided, especially for the mentees during their first year of teaching. One participant remarked that

having this program for me this year just made me feel like the institution cared about my staying here and about me doing well here....This is by far and away the biggest deal for me is just that the institution created a program to support me. So honestly even if we had only met once I would’ve felt like that because I think that for me that is honestly the biggest benefit of the whole thing is feeling like I’m in a place that cares rather than someplace that is just like, “Deal with it. Good luck.”

A mentor participant commented that “my role was to provide a broader view of the institution and to connect them (the mentees) to the opportunities and people who can help them.” Another mentor participant remarked that she felt it was important that her mentees felt supported by her and that they could reach out to someone else. She said role was important, “especially if they didn’t feel comfortable asking certain questions from their share of colleagues, because sometimes it can be read or taken a certain way.”

Several participants discussed the sense of trust they felt in their mentoring relationships. One participant said that the relationship was “a sounding board that isn’t going to place judgment.” Another participant indicated having the option to go next door to the department chair to get advice, but having a mentoring group and mentor who was
unbiased was a place to do emotional venting and seek support. A third participant talked about receiving a lot of helpful suggestions about how to run the classes and general moral support in terms of the way things operate at the institution.

The focus group findings were similar to those of the individual interviews. Several of the participants in the focus group mentioned how the program brought them a greater sense of connection to the institution. A few participants said that it did not matter whether someone was a new faculty mentee or a senior faculty mentor—a lot was gained in terms of knowledge of the institutional culture. One focus group participant, a mentor, said, “The program was to transition them into and become familiar with the culture of the institution, where to go if they had questions, needed to find out anything, and to be a support system.”

One of the findings from the individual interviews and the focus group, was that the group mentoring model not only allowed participants to share experiences with those from other programs and disciplines, but allowed them to meet others in different programs and disciplines as well. One focus group participant remarked, “perhaps one of the goals...especially with my mentor was that he was able to introduce me to people in other departments outside of my department. So I’ve been able to establish some relationships and meet some new people that I might not have otherwise.”

The researcher was not surprised by comments of some participants made during the interviews. A few participants mentioned that they were initially reluctant about the group mentoring model that consisted of two mentees and one mentor from different disciplines. A few mentors mentioned that they were not confident until starting the program that they would be able to offer the mentees much guidance because they were not in the same department or program. It made sense that these feelings would arise at
the beginning until the facilitators were able to hold the first orientation and explained the structure and outcomes of the program. Many of the participants expressed their gratitude for being asked to be a part of the program and conveyed that they gained a sense of support and connection to the institution because of their involvement.

**Self-assessment survey.** The self-assessment survey was given to mentors to examine their understanding of themselves as mentors. There were findings of significance when comparing the results of the surveys taken at the beginning of the program to those taken when the program had ended. In terms of resources available for working with the mentee, when first asked, all seven mentors averaged a rating of 2.6 out of 5. This rating improved to 4.1 out of 5 after the program had concluded. One participant related during the interview that the resources that were made available provided a chance to refamiliarize with institutional policies and procedures, and not being a part of the program, he or she would have not taken the time to find the updated information. Another who was a mentor mentioned not only becoming educated as to where the information and resources were for the new faculty, but also realizing becoming one of the most valuable resources to the mentee. A third participant added to that notion, "I was important as a resource to be there, to be available, and I tried to get that across. I think I did, that they could really contact me all the time, not necessarily just at the meeting times . . . so I was a constant resource."

**Meanings and Understanding**

**Research Question 1.** The first research question asked how and in what ways faculty mentors and mentees described what they understood, integrated, and implemented in their relationship after going through this program. The question was answered through the participant interviews. The participants commented that they felt a
sense of being able to share experiences through advice from similar situations, use each other as resources, and that they gained a sense of overall knowledge of the institution from their relationships. The participants also commented on the trust, support, and connection to the institution they felt from developing the relationship. During the interviews, some of the participants indicated that they had gained valuable classroom advice and teaching strategies from their mentoring relationships and planned to collaborate more with these faculty even after the program ended.

**Research Question 2.** This question asked about the mentors' and mentees' perceptions of the materials and activities of the program in supporting their efforts in developing a mentoring relationship. This was answered during the participant interviews and by comments about the self-assessment survey. Many participants commented that they felt the materials and resources provided were sufficient and aligned with the structure of the program. One participant commented that because he was an adjunct at the institution prior to becoming a full-time faculty member, the materials and activities did not add value to his first year of teaching. Most of the mentors commented that the self-assessment survey administered at the beginning of the program made them aware of the areas they needed advisement on prior to being assigned their mentees.

**Research Question 3.** The third research question asked about the successes and challenges of sustaining an effective mentoring relationship after the completion of the mentorship program. This question was answered through the participant interviews and focus group. Many participants commented that they felt the structure of the program, the pairings, and the required number of meetings were sufficient. A few participants indicated during the interviews that they felt the institution cared about their success. During the focus group, several participants commented that the program helped break
down perceived disciplinary boundaries. One participant commented during an interview that the required number of meetings of the mentoring groups was too frequent during the semester for her schedule. This particular participant felt that her workload was too heavy to have required meetings during the first year of teaching while she was trying to sort out the demands of her courses and balancing home life, too. A mentor participant commented that she felt she could have had a better connection and offered more advice on work-life balance if her mentees were two women rather than two men.

**Bandura's Social Learning Theory.** Bandura’s (1977) social learning theory, which has been used throughout all levels of education, primarily focuses on human behavior and role modeling. The social learning theory suggests that people learn from one another and replicate behavior if there are motivation, attention, and memory. The researcher observed a variety aspects of role modeling during the interviews. Some of the participants acknowledged that they admired their mentors and respected their ranking as senior tenured professors at the institution. A few participants remarked that their mentor was a good example of what success looked like and it was good to see that it is possible to achieve tenure. The fact that participants mentioned this implied that people like to see what success looks like and corroborated Bandura's theory that people will model success and seek out opportunities with those who can help them grow personally and professionally.

A few of the participants felt a sense of trust and support when sharing experiences in their mentoring groups. Eller, Lev, and Feurer (2014) asserted that mutual respect, trust, exchange of knowledge, a caring personal relationship, and role modeling behaviors in mentoring result in positive outcomes and are key components of effective mentoring relationships. Warren et al. (2014) remarked that integrity and trust are two of
the most important elements of the role of teachers. Warren added that role modeling was the most common way of informally teaching overall professionalism. The participant’s remarks supported Bandura’s theory and suggested that the feelings of trust and support, which was reciprocated in the mentoring relationships contributed to the participant’s positive experience in their relationships and in the program.

**Implications of the Study**

The findings of this research study were consistent with the theoretical framework in terms of participants learning from each other by sharing resources, knowledge, and experiences. The findings also confirmed that many of the participants established effective mentoring relationships through trust and supporting each other. Additional findings concluded that participants felt the group mentoring structure was beneficial in terms of connections it brought to other disciplines and the institution at large. This research strengthened the understanding that key personal and professional components enhance effective mentoring relationships.

The information gathered in this study will provide insight and additional strategies that will enrich the mentoring program at the study site in meetings its goals and objectives. Bodin and Leifman (2011) stated that assessing mentoring programs and reviewing best practices on effective mentoring relationships is important for the quality and sustainability of a program. Analysis of the interview data indicated that a sense of personal connection was important to the participants. A relationship that was supportive and in which experiences could be shared in a safe, trusting, and professional environment was also important to the participants. The participants seemed to feel they had an unbiased sounding board because of the group mentoring model structure of the program. These components may be used as tools to effectively plan upcoming
mentoring programs at the study site and at other educational institutions.

This study is relevant because of the growing needs of the professoriate in 21st century higher education. Technology, diverse student populations and growing workloads have created a greater need for institutional support of their academics. As shown in chapter 1, the study site is an example of an institution that is facing challenges with faculty retention. Thus, it is necessary for the study site to find ways to cultivate faculty and enhance their experiences at the institution. The study site is already attempting to do so with the mentoring program. The findings from this study provided data to the planning of future mentoring programs in order to enhance them.

Limitations

There were limitations in this study. All faculty members have a direct reporting line to the researcher’s office and supervisor; therefore, both the mentee and mentors in the mentoring program have been hired at one point by the researcher’s office at the institution. The researcher’s position and office are closely tied to the participants’ employment, which may have made them feel obligated to participate in the study. There was one new faculty member who decided not to participate in the mentoring program. He was a more seasoned faculty member and therefore may have felt he did not require mentoring. It would have been interesting to talk with him after his first year of teaching at the institution to see how his experience was in comparison to others who participated in the mentoring program.

Conclusions and Recommendations

As the researcher examined the interview transcripts and saw the emergent themes, it became apparent how important a feeling of trust, support, shared experiences and making personal connections to the institution were to the participants in the
mentoring program. It was apparent by how animated the participants were when responding to interview questions that the intimacy that they shared in the mentoring program was significant to their enjoyment and overall experience at the institution. What appeared to be very powerful about the sense of professionalism that the participants said they felt was the fact that many of them said that they are still going to continue the relationships with their mentoring group colleagues after the 1-year program was over.

The biggest surprise, however, was the way the participants elaborated on the group mentoring structure of the program and the different perspectives it brought. The participants talked about the benefits of having cross-disciplinary conversations, as many of the topics are generic to higher education and some of them are school specific. The participants also mentioned that even though the mentoring group members were from different departments, the communication was fluid, and they worked through it to better understand what is school specific and what is institute wide.

As a result of this study, a specific recommendation would be for further research on effective mentoring relationships and best practices in higher education mentoring models. As stated in chapter 1, there is a greater need today for supporting faculty needs and development in higher education. Furthermore, there will be a continual increase in changes in the student demographic, faculty workload, and technology advancements each year. In order to stay relevant, it is important for an institution to remain conscious of how these programs can benefit the success and productivity of the professorate that influences and prepares today’s students with a global 21st-century education.
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Appendix A

Interview Protocol for Mentors
INTERVIEW PROTOCOL FOR MENTORS

1. Describe your experiences with the Mentoring Program
2. What training did you receive to help you fulfill your role as a mentor?
3. What criteria were used to select you to become a mentor?
4. What did you think your role would be before you became a mentor?
5. What are the components of the mentoring program at this institution?
6. Describe your relationship with the teacher or teachers that you mentored.
7. How often did you meet with the new faculty that you mentored?
8. What were your responsibilities in the Mentoring Program?
9. How did the mentor program impact your career?
10. What type of problems did your mentee face?
11. How many new faculty did you mentor?
12. Describe the type of support you received before becoming a mentor and throughout the academic year.
13. In what ways was the Mentoring Program beneficial to the mentees?
14. In what areas did the program benefit the mentees the most?
15. What are the benefits of mentoring?
16. What changes would you like to see in the Mentoring Program?
Appendix B

Interview Protocol for Mentees
INTERVIEW PROTOCOL FOR MENTEES

1. How long have you been teaching in this institution?
2. How did you become a part of the Mentoring Program?
3. Describe the relationship you had with your mentor.
4. How often did you meet with your mentor during the academic year?
5. What strategies did your mentor use to help you develop and implement the curriculum?
6. Describe your mentor’s role.
7. What qualities did your mentor exhibit that helped you in to be successful in the Mentoring Program?
8. What qualities should a mentor have in order to mentor effectively?
9. What were the major problems you faced with the Mentoring Program?
10. Described the frustrations you had with the Mentoring Program.
11. What aspects of the program were beneficial to you?
12. What support did you receive from your mentor?
13. What other support did you receive other than the support you received from your mentor?
14. In what ways did the Mentoring Program impact your decision to remain in teaching?
15. What improvement should be made to the Mentoring Program?
Appendix C

Focus-Group Protocol
FOCUS-GROUP PROTOCOL

1. Discuss the goals of the Mentoring Program.
2. How were the goals and objectives communicated to mentors and mentees?
3. What did the mentors do to facilitate the process for struggling mentees?
4. What were the mentors' responsibilities?
5. How did the role of the mentor impact mentees' decision to remain in the school?
6. What aspect of the Mentoring Program needs improvement?
7. Describe the benefits of the Mentoring Program.
8. Describe the qualities of an effective mentor.
9. If a mentor or a mentee had a problem, how were they solved?
10. How did the mentors benefit from the Mentoring Program?
11. What were the characteristics of the Mentoring Program?
12. What improvement should be made to the Mentoring Program?
Appendix D

Recruitment Letter
Dear Friend,

My name is Sheri Kelleher and I am an employee at the institution. I am conducting a research study in partial fulfillment of my doctoral degree. You have participated in the mentoring program at the institution and I am interested in getting input from you regarding your experience in the program.

As mentioned at the luncheon with the Provost, I would like stop by your office to meet with you so that I can elaborate on the study and answer any questions you may have. The study is strictly voluntary but I hope will have an interest in participating in it. The purpose of this study is to explore your perceptions as a mentor or mentee and your relationships made in a formal, group mentoring program. The goal of this study is to effective identify strategies and plan future activities for participants in the mentoring program. In addition, determining the effectiveness of a group mentoring model will add to the literature on mentoring programs and professional development activities for faculty at higher educational institutions.

Thank you,

Sheri Kelleher
Appendix E

Focus-Group Field Notes Outline
Description of the physical setting, date, time, number of mentors and mentees:

Topics of group discussion:

1. Discuss the goals of the Mentoring Program.
2. How were the goals and objectives communicated to mentors and mentees?
3. What did the mentors do to facilitate the process for struggling mentees?
4. What were the mentors' responsibilities?
5. How did the role of the mentor impact mentees' decision to remain in the school?
6. What aspect of the Mentoring Program needs improvement?
7. Describe the benefits of the Mentoring Program.
8. Describe the qualities of an effective mentor.
9. If a mentor or a mentee had a problem, how were they solved?
10. How did the mentors benefit from the Mentoring Program?
11. What were the characteristics of the Mentoring Program?
12. What improvement should be made to the Mentoring Program?

Interaction of the research subjects with other group members:

Personal reactions:
  Agreements on:
  Not voicing an opinion (but nodding of their heads):

Reflective notes:
  Personal thoughts:
  Insights:
  Themes:
Appendix F

Interview Field Notes Outline
Description of the physical setting:

Date and time:

Notes on topics of discussion:

Body Language:

Reflective notes:

Personal thoughts:

Insights:

Themes:
Appendix G

Matrix Grid
# Theme 1

## Professional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Experiences</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td></td>
<td>A resource to the faculty because everybody encounters some sort of bumps along the road in terms of adjustment or issues. One of the things I encouraged them to do is to recognize that their colleagues in other departments do have phones and e-mail. And I encouraged them to reach out to colleagues who could be useful to them, because I think that's important in building an academic community, and in building your own career.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td></td>
<td>It's good to hear that some of the problems that happen within my school also happen in her school and that it's not just my school who's crazy; everyone's kind of crazy. So having a second mentee was useful too because she would come up with ideas and bounce them off of the group and it would lead to a different conversation — her tenure track is going to be slightly different because she has different obligations and things like that. So we had some productive five-year planning or six-year planning discussions where I had one approach and she had another approach, and we both helped each other out, and our mentor helped sort of guide us.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10</td>
<td>He has knowledge of the institution, probably more than anyone else that could be doing the mentoring. He had a desire to help and you and it truly felt like he was interested in helping and your success.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11</td>
<td>We talked about problems and our mentor had a lot of suggestions from her experience with all the years of teaching. And even a little bit we kind of went back and forth and I actually thought it was good that it was a group program in the sense that sometimes one of us or one of the two mentees would have suggestions for the other one just based on, ‘Well I’m having this problem.’ And then the other one says, ‘Well here’s what I’ve been doing,’ and so we’ve kind of compare notes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P16</td>
<td>The kind of the type of experience you get from doing yourself and having been there yourself.</td>
<td>In terms of learning things about teaching and then talking about sort of the machinations of how things work around here was important because it was kind of like a sanity check.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
seasoned in their role as a faculty member or professor, sharing their experiences and guiding us in the right direction, in that sense.

| P17 | I think something helpful to me was that she had a lot of resources. So she was always able to point me in a direction.
I don’t think that if I ever emailed my mentor in future, she would be like sorry it’s over. I don’t feel that at all. |
<p>| P18 | |
| P19 | |
| P20 | A non-biased point of view, so the advice is more through experience, and through personal opinion, and you just basically share what worked for you in the past and what didn’t, which is also important to say that sometimes things didn’t work out, and it’s okay to make mistakes. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Trust</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Connection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The first meeting was really enjoyable, because we met as a group. So I'm grouped with another new professor. And so it was very congenial. It was welcoming. It was very lighthearted... And I just remember that first meeting thinking that I felt very much like this would be a very nice, close-knit community, that it would be – that I would be able to foster a good relationship with the mentor and with the colleague.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I think she has lots of experience here, so she knows how different the administration and the union is working, so she says, “If you want to know more about that, ask me and I can provide an independent view from anybody in your department.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| P13         |       |         | I found it very rewarding because also I wish I had had something similar. I definitely would have loved that. You know, it was lovely getting to know people. Just being there to help them through some of the hurdles. For me especially, of course, coming in as a student I knew some of the hurdles, but certainly not on the administrative level, and all the wheels that are in
I think it was a source of information that was totally unbiased, and they didn't have to worry that I was going to tell on them or do anything like that. There could not be nothing but a pleasant exchange. There couldn't be a punitive environment.

I think knowing that they had a sounding board also was huge for them and that there was no fear of reprisals.

Being with another faculty member, who was from a different department and it didn't really matter what department... But just also seeing and supporting each other in that sense. Like, after we met with our mentor today, we were standing in the hall, and there's a form that I have that he doesn't have, and I was able to share that.

I think it was a relief because in the discussion I would also share things that happen in my department with the same confidence that, things will stay there, and because they see that all the departments have issues they feel a little better that they're not an exception that, "Oh my God, we have this, and he's fighting with me and him, and he's fighting with her." That's normal.