

The Carnegie Mellon Mentoring Series

FOSTERING A MENTORING CULTURE

A GUIDE FOR DEPARTMENT HEADS

| A COMPANION PIECE TO "MENTORS & COLLEAGUES:
| A GUIDE FOR JUNIOR FACULTY AND THEIR MENTORS"

CONTENTS

MENTORING AND THE ROLE OF THE DEPARTMENT HEAD ...	1
IDENTIFYING AND RESPONDING TO THE MENTORING NEEDS OF JUNIOR FACULTY	4
THE CONTINUING NEEDS OF ESTABLISHED FACULTY	9
UNDERSTANDING AND SHAPING DEPARTMENT CULTURE	12
COLLEGIALITY: THE ULTIMATE GOAL OF THE MENTORING PROCESS	17
BIBLIOGRAPHY	19
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	21

Dear Colleagues,

The decentralized nature of Carnegie Mellon allows our colleges and departments to enjoy both intellectual and administrative freedom. However, with such freedom comes the responsibility of colleges and departments to oversee activities that help maintain their viability. A fundamental component of a department's success is ensuring that new faculty quickly acclimate professionally, intellectually, culturally/politically and personally within their new jobs. Certainly, achieving this multidimensional adjustment is a challenge, given the substantial research and teaching responsibilities that are expected of Carnegie Mellon faculty. But this is a crucial step in cultivating the careers of junior faculty.

There is a substantial body of literature that points to the importance of mentoring. Furthermore, a 2001-2003 study of 123 former and current faculty, "Links Between Experience and Career Development at Carnegie Mellon University," definitively identified mentoring as a major factor in faculty satisfaction here.

In order to disseminate and build upon the findings from that study, we have created a series of mentoring guides for the campus community. This guide for department heads* is a companion piece to the booklet "Mentors & Colleagues: A Guide for Junior Faculty and Their Mentors," and the two should be referred to concurrently. This booklet addresses many issues related to the importance of mentoring, including the specific needs reported by junior and senior Carnegie Mellon faculty, recommendations and reflections from both current and former department heads, a discussion of organizational culture, how to implement change, and the value of collegiality. We hope this booklet provides some insight into the important role mentoring and collegiality have within our university.

Both the central administration and the faculty look to department heads to provide leadership in ensuring the acclimation of new faculty into the department. Mentoring—across several dimensions—is of primary importance in assisting newcomers as they begin their careers at Carnegie Mellon. Furthermore, building and maintaining a nurturing and collegial departmental culture ensures a productive and diverse campus community where, in the words of our mission statement, "discovery, creativity, and personal and professional development can flourish."

Sincerely,



Mark Kamlet
Provost

*We use the term *department head* generically throughout the booklet. This term encompasses the similar title *department chair* and, as in the Heinz and Tepper schools, *dean*.

MENTORING AND THE ROLE OF THE DEPARTMENT HEAD

The successful colleague retained by the institution is a manifestation of wise stewardship of institutional resources and of service to ourselves as persons.” (Herr, 1994)

A CALL FOR MENTORS:

RESULTS OF THE CARNEGIE MELLON STUDY

Responding to a 2001 Diversity Advisory Council finding (Amon & Majetich, 2001) that women and minority faculty at Carnegie Mellon reported a lack of communication and mentoring, we conducted a more extensive study to better understand the collective career development experiences of Carnegie Mellon faculty. Although the initial intent was to focus on women and minority faculty, the study (“Links Between Experience and Career Development at Carnegie Mellon,” 2001-03) was broadened to include all faculty and the full range of their experiences at the university (Ambrose et al., in press).

Interviewed in the study were 62 current and 61 former faculty members, representing all academic departments but one. The study’s open-ended interview protocol allowed the faculty to freely describe their experience at Carnegie Mellon, including what had initially attracted them and any significant factors or critical incidents that had shaped their experience. Two independent researchers coded the interviews to identify major patterns and themes across years, departments and individuals.

The data gathered clearly establish that effective mentoring is a key source of satisfaction among Carnegie Mellon faculty, while lack of mentoring is a potent source

of dissatisfaction. These findings corroborated national studies while also pointing to issues distinctive to Carnegie Mellon. The interviews highlighted not only the importance of mentoring to faculty, but also identified specific types of mentoring that had helped individual faculty succeed. In addition, faculty brought up areas in which they either expressly stated that mentoring was lacking or reported circumstances in which they had needed but had not received help or advice. Mentoring, moreover, was closely linked to collegiality—an even more encompassing issue affecting faculty satisfaction that will be discussed in the last section of this booklet. Finally, both junior and senior faculty pointed to the importance of department heads in facilitating effective mentoring. While colleagues and peers served as valuable sources of advice and encouragement, *individuals overwhelmingly looked to department heads to create and sustain an environment in which mentoring is valued and supported.*

It falls to department heads, in other words, to provide oversight to ensure the establishment and sustainability of a mentoring culture. Department heads have a critical leadership responsibility—and a unique perspective—to identify matches between those faculty members who would benefit from the knowledge and collegiality that mentoring provides, and the faculty

MY FIRST 10 YEARS HERE WERE ROUGH.

I RECEIVED VERY LITTLE FEEDBACK AND NO MENTORING, SO I NEVER FELT LIKE I WAS DOING ENOUGH, OR THAT WHAT I WAS DOING WAS ACKNOWLEDGED. NOW THAT I’M TENURED, I SEE THAT MY PRE-TENURE ANXIETY WAS UNWARRANTED. MY PERFORMANCE WAS GOOD; I JUST HAD NO WAY OF KNOWING IT.

—A TENURED PROFESSOR, CURRENTLY AT CMU

INVESTING TIME AND INSIGHT IN MENTORING NEW FACULTY IS THE WISEST POSSIBLE INVESTMENT IN THE FUTURE OF A SCHOOL OR DEPARTMENT. THE GOODWILL AND CONCOMITANT COMMITMENT WITH WHICH FACULTY RESPOND TO CONSTRUCTIVE GUIDANCE FAR EXCEED THE EFFORT EXPENDED IN HELPING THEM TO FEEL SUPPORTED AND CONNECTED TO THEIR PROFESSIONAL ENVIRONMENT. AND, ON A PRACTICAL BASIS, RETAINING TALENTED FACULTY AVOIDS EXPENSIVE AND TIME-CONSUMING ONGOING RECRUITING, ALONG WITH THE LOSS OF INVALUABLE ORGANIZATIONAL MEMORY.

—ELIZABETH BRADLEY, DEPARTMENT HEAD, DRAMA (2005)

I SPENT MY TIME AS A JUNIOR FACULTY MEMBER FEELING VERY ANXIOUS, AND ALWAYS EXPECTING SOMEONE TO TRIP ME UP. I REALIZED ONLY AFTER I WAS TENURED THAT MY COLLEAGUES HAD WANTED ME TO SUCCEED ALL ALONG, AND WEREN'T, IN FACT, LOOKING FOR EVIDENCE OF FAILURE. UNFORTUNATELY, THERE WAS SO MUCH SILENCE, I DIDN'T KNOW IT. I THINK THAT REGULAR MENTORING IS REALLY CRITICAL SO THAT JUNIOR FACULTY GET THE MESSAGE THAT WE WANT THEM TO SUCCEED AND WILL HELP THEM.

—A TENURED PROFESSOR, CURRENTLY AT CMU

BEST PRACTICES

GATHER INFORMATION AHEAD OF TIME ABOUT NEW FACULTY TO HELP THEM MAKE CONNECTIONS WHEN THEY ARRIVE. FOR EXAMPLE, INTRODUCE THEM TO COLLEAGUES WHO APPLY FOR GRANTS FROM THE SAME FUNDERS THEY LIKELY WILL, OR HAVE SIMILARLY AGED CHILDREN AND KNOW ABOUT CHILDCARE OR SCHOOL OPTIONS.

members best suited to provide it. In an academic community devoted to imparting known facts as well as to exploring new knowledge, teaching new faculty “the ropes” must be viewed as an intrinsic and critical component of academic culture.

MENTORING BENEFITS MORE THAN JUST THE NEW FACULTY MEMBER

Both former and current faculty interviewed in the Carnegie Mellon study tied satisfaction in their jobs to more senior faculty’s investment of time and interest in them. However, the benefits of mentoring extend to more than just the new faculty. Effective mentoring benefits:

- *the department*, enhancing its reputation and creating a healthier environment;
- *the university*, helping to retain those we want and maintaining a collegial environment that ensures the quality of our research and teaching reputation;
- *the discipline*, supporting the next generation of faculty and building upon current knowledge; and
- *those who mentor*, providing an often-invigorating opportunity for collaboration with a young colleague. Research points to mentoring as a “unique shared experience and also one of the most significant rewards of academic leadership” (Murphy, 2003).

THE ROLE OF DEPARTMENT HEADS

Faculty interviewed in the Carnegie Mellon study described effective department leaders as those who managed conflict constructively, created a sense of community in the department, provided

constructive feedback and mentoring, and communicated effectively. Faculty also described good department heads as those who treated people in ways that were “fair, consistent, inclusive, responsive and encouraging” (Ambrose et al., in press).

However, neither a Ph.D. nor experience as a faculty member necessarily prepares one to lead a department. After years of pursuing expertise in his or her specialty, the newly appointed department head must suddenly fill the shoes of generalist and “statesman,” all with little or no formal training for the job. These facts point to the need for continuing professional development for department heads, comprising these three spheres:

- *conceptual understanding* of the roles and responsibilities of academic leadership;
- *skill development*, including communication, negotiation, conflict resolution and resource deployment, which can be accomplished through formal training or on-the-job experience. In the words of an anonymous Chinese philosopher, “To know and not to use, is not yet to know”; thus, experimentation, receiving feedback, refining and perfecting are necessary to building one’s leadership skills (Ericsson & Smith, 1991); and
- *reflection-in-action*, which encompasses self-knowledge and personal awareness as a way to learn from past experiences and to “perfect the art of leadership.” Employing this important practice recognizes that even with perspective and knowledge, one must apply to *each situation* a full reflection within that specific context. This reflection takes into consideration what is appropriate

for the department, the university and for each individual impacted by the decision, advice or course of action.

(Schön, 1983; Kuh & Whitt, 1988; Gmelch, 2004)

Naturally, developing one's knowledge and abilities in these areas takes time and experience. For example, conceptual understanding of the roles and responsibilities of leadership may increase gradually as a department head sees new situations where his or her actions can make a difference. Likewise, the various skills and the strategies for reflection used by effective department heads also come with experience.

Keep in mind that the development of skill has many facets, and that one or another of these may be improving at a given point in time:

- **accuracy** (e.g., making more effective choices),
- **speed** (i.e., doing your job more efficiently),
- **automaticity** (i.e., doing the same task but utilizing fewer mental resources), and
- **recognition** of when particular skills or steps are appropriate.

It is important to note that automaticity can be in conflict with reflection-in-action (described previously) because even familiar situations that involve new people may present new challenges.

Effective department heads are patient with themselves; they understand that gaining expertise in any domain requires at least 10 years (Chase & Simon, 1973; Hayes, 1989). Moreover, research on the development of expertise shows that the time one spends practicing is most produc-

tive when it includes the following components:

- a specification of attainable, yet still challenging, goals;
- a focus on individual sub-skills as well as opportunities to combine them in more complex situations; and,
- most importantly, efforts to monitor one's effectiveness paired with adequate guidance in responding to that feedback (for example, Carnegie Mellon encourages peer-mentoring situations where department heads can discuss issues with current or former heads).

These components of "deliberate practice" are best viewed as part of an ongoing cycle in which feedback drives the specification of new, refined goals and hence a focus on potentially different sub-skills, identified as important to further improvements (Chase & Simon, 1973; Hayes, 1989; Ericsson et al., 1993).

The development of leadership skills cannot occur in a vacuum (Beineke & Sublett, 1999; Gmelch, 2004). One thing department heads can do to help monitor and improve their own effectiveness is to seek mentoring themselves. By sharing ideas and experiences with peers, former heads, etc., department heads not only learn from one another, they also model and affirm the importance of mentoring to the department as a whole (Hoppe, 2003).

Given the decentralized nature of our university and the conflicting needs of faculty—the need to be independent but also the need for guidance and connection—it falls to the department head to assess and balance the factors that allow the faculty to survive and thrive in their work at Carnegie Mellon.

A DEPARTMENT IS A MULTI-GENERATIONAL AND DIVERSE COMMUNITY THAT BEHAVES BY HABIT. SOME HABITS ARE SELF-DESTRUCTIVE, SUCH AS "I WAS NEVER MENTORED AS A JUNIOR FACULTY MEMBER SO I DON'T NEED TO MENTOR NEW JUNIOR FACULTY" AND "THE GENDER AND RACIAL MAKEUP OF THE DEPARTMENT OF MY PAST IS A GOOD GUIDE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF MY FUTURE."

THE FIRST HABIT LEADS TO JUNIOR FACULTY MEMBERS WHO WILL WANT TO LEAVE EVEN WHEN THE DEPARTMENT WANTS THEM TO STAY. THE SECOND LEADS TO DEPARTMENTS THAT WILL USE SAMENESS AS A POOR SUBSTITUTE FOR QUALITY.

ONE IMPORTANT ROLE OF THE DEPARTMENT HEAD IS TO STUDY THESE BAD HABITS AND HELP A DEPARTMENT BREAK THEM. SUCH ACTION TAKES TIME AND DETERMINATION, AND A HEAD EITHER TOO IMPATIENT FOR CHANGE OR TOO ACCOMMODATING TO THE STATUS QUO WON'T SUCCEED.

—DAVID KAUFER, DEPARTMENT HEAD, ENGLISH (2005)

SOME JUNIOR FACULTY GET VERY CLEAR INFORMATION ABOUT WHAT IS EXPECTED FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE, WHILE OTHERS GET VERY LITTLE. THIS MAKES A HUGE DIFFERENCE IN THEIR SUCCESS.

—A TENURED PROFESSOR,
CURRENTLY AT CMU

WHEN I FIRST ARRIVED AT CMU, I'D HOPED TO FIND A MENTOR, BUT I QUICKLY LEARNED TO KEEP THAT TO MYSELF. IF I ASKED ABOUT A MENTOR, IT MADE ME LOOK BAD, LIKE I NEEDED A CRUTCH.

—A PRETENURED PROFESSOR,
CURRENTLY AT CMU

IHAVE FELT ISOLATED IN MY PROGRAM, BECAUSE NONE OF MY COLLEAGUES DO SIMILAR WORK. HOWEVER, I FOUND A MENTOR IN A DIFFERENT DEPARTMENT, AND THAT HAS BEEN HELPFUL.

—A PRETENURED PROFESSOR,
CURRENTLY AT CMU

BEST PRACTICES

MENTORING RELATIONSHIPS OFTEN GROW FROM INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS. ENCOURAGE ESTABLISHED FACULTY TO DISCUSS THEIR WORK AND SHARE STORIES OF THEIR OWN EXPERIENCES INFORMALLY WITH NEW FACULTY.

IDENTIFYING AND RESPONDING TO THE MENTORING NEEDS OF JUNIOR FACULTY

If internal issues are not settled, if people are preoccupied with their position and identity, if they are insecure, if they do not know the rules of the game and therefore cannot predict or understand what is going on, they cannot concentrate on the important survival issues the organization may face.” (Schein, 1992)

New faculty will inevitably become caught up in the culture of the department, but when they are beginning their work at Carnegie Mellon, grasping the nuances of their surroundings is not going to be their primary concern. They will be more intent on the research they need to begin and classes they'll be teaching (not to mention settling in at home and attending to other domestic matters).

To be successful in their research, their teaching and even in their personal lives, new faculty need to be made aware early on of what is expected of them from the department, the college and the university. Research shows that new faculty often set unrealistic expectations for themselves in the absence of clearly articulated expectations, and report the following as major stress points: not enough time, inadequate feedback and recognition, unrealistic expectations from themselves and from others, lack of collegiality and finding a balance between work and personal life (Sorcinelli, 1992; Ambrose et al., in press). A smooth transition can be greatly facilitated by advice and guidance in these areas. This is where the department head and other more senior faculty need to actively step in and provide information and feedback—that is, to mentor the newcomer.

THE MANY FACETS OF NEW FACULTY'S NEEDS

The Carnegie Mellon study clearly showed that junior faculty benefit tremendously from having strong mentoring relationships. In discussing satisfaction in their jobs, both current and former faculty interviewed in the study identified their mentoring needs in four areas—intellectual, professional, cultural/political and personal.

On an *intellectual* level, junior faculty expect senior faculty to help them define their own intellectual space within the parameters of the department, specifically:

- help them understand where they and their research fit into the department's philosophy and goals,
- provide guidance and feedback on different areas of work (e.g., proposals, papers, courses), and
- serve as a “sounding board” for ideas.

On the *professional* front, junior faculty expected the following career development assistance:

- help in setting reasonable expectations, goals and timelines;

- help in determining “fit” to the department (e.g., aligning their values, goals and needs to those of the department);
- guidance in where to invest time and energy for the biggest payoff (e.g., research, teaching, committee work, outreach, connection to profession) and help in knowing when to say “no” to certain requests;
- help in establishing professional connections/network; and
- advice on balancing work and life outside of work.

Perhaps the most closeted of all dimensions of mentoring is the *cultural or political*. In this area, new faculty expect help in understanding what is usually unarticulated. For example, they may need:

- insight into understanding personalities and current power struggles within the department;
- help in addressing naive assumptions (e.g., “If I just do good work, everyone will notice”); and
- advice in securing departmental resources (e.g., Ph.D. students, space).

The Carnegie Mellon study found that political struggles within a department often result in little or no mentoring: junior faculty are reluctant to seek mentors because they did not want to be viewed as joining one of the “warring camps.” Furthermore, faculty in the study described effective department heads as successfully managing factionalization and warring subgroups, therefore unifying and creating a sense of community in the department.

In addition to the three dimensions noted above is the *personal*. Like the cultural/political, personal dimensions are seldom

articulated, and junior faculty may not be aware of the need for mentoring in that area. Personal matters they may be facing can include intercultural communication issues, medical or psychological problems that may affect research and teaching, or maternity/paternity leave or other family issues and responsibilities. By introducing personal topics into discussions with junior faculty, a mentor or other established faculty member thereby opens up a channel for communication in that area, indicating that the mentor and the department care about that dimension of the faculty.

ADDRESSING THE NEEDS OF NEW FACULTY

Promoting the Value of Multiple Mentors

Often, people assume that mentoring is provided by a single mentor. But just as a well-educated and well-rounded student cannot learn everything from just one professor, a junior-faculty member cannot learn about all aspects of faculty life from just one mentor, especially given the many dimensions that junior faculty expect—and need—guidance in (listed above).

There are countless reasons that junior faculty should be encouraged to consult multiple mentors, among them:

- In today’s increasingly diverse academy, the odds of finding—and bonding with—someone who can provide all aspects of guidance is slim. In addition, people may be more comfortable and effective when mentoring in certain areas (such as only the cultural or only the professional).
- Some aspects of mentoring are better filled outside the department. Making connections outside the department provides useful perspective, and enhances interdisciplinary research opportunities.

IT ONLY TAKES A MINUTE TO ASK THE MOST IMPORTANT QUESTION: EVERYONE IN THE DEPARTMENT SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED TO STOP AND ASK JUNIOR FACULTY, “HOW ARE YOU DOING?” AN ENVIRONMENT IN WHICH EVERYONE IS COMFORTABLE LISTENING TO WHATEVER COMES NEXT IS A HEALTHY MENTORING COMMUNITY.

—MARILYN TAFT THOMAS,
FORMER DEPARTMENT HEAD,
MUSIC

ONE SHOULD REALIZE THAT IT IS NOT JUST A MATTER OF THE JUNIOR FACULTY ADAPTING TO THE DEPARTMENT—THE DEPARTMENT MUST ALSO ADAPT TO THE JUNIOR FACULTY. THIS COULD BE DIVERSITY IN A WHITE MALE CULTURE OR NEW INTELLECTUAL DEVELOPMENTS.

—WILLIAM KEECH,
FORMER DEPARTMENT HEAD,
SOCIAL & DECISION SCIENCES

BEST PRACTICES

INTRODUCE NEW FACULTY TO STAFF WHOSE INSTITUTIONAL LONGEVITY, KNOWLEDGE AND CONNECTIONS CAN HELP NEWCOMERS NAVIGATE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESSES AND HELP THEM FURTHER ACCLIMATE TO THE UNIVERSITY.

MODERN LANGUAGES HOSTS A WEEKEND RECEPTION EARLY EACH FALL SEMESTER—ATTENDED BY THE H&SS DEAN AND ASSOCIATE DEAN, DEPARTMENT FACULTY, STAFF, GRADUATE STUDENTS, SPOUSES AND CHILDREN, AS WELL AS COLLEAGUES FROM PITT. THE DEPARTMENT HAS FOUND THIS GATHERING TO BE A GOOD WAY TO INTRODUCE NEWCOMERS TO THE “OLDTIMERS.”

—RICHARD TUCKER,
DEPARTMENT HEAD,
MODERN LANGUAGES (2005)

I THINK WOMEN IN MY PROGRAM TEND TO GET LESS MENTORING, SIMPLY BECAUSE THERE ARE FEWER WOMEN THAN MEN IN THE PROGRAM, AND BECAUSE THE MEN ARE MORE LIKELY TO HANG OUT TOGETHER SOCIALLY AND SWAP ADVICE.

—A TENURED PROFESSOR,
CURRENTLY AT CMU

BEST PRACTICES

ENCOURAGE SENIOR COLLEAGUES TO TAKE JUNIOR COLLEAGUES TO LUNCH, EVEN IN SMALL GROUPS. IF EVERYONE DOES THIS JUST ONCE IN THE FIRST YEAR, IT WOULD ALLOW FACULTY TO GET TO KNOW ONE ANOTHER BETTER AND MORE QUICKLY AS WELL AS BECOME FAMILIAR WITH EACH OTHER'S WORK.

- Faculty who rely on only one mentor can be left in a difficult situation if that person departs the university, leaving the junior faculty member with no strong allies or senior representation in the department.

Department heads should encourage multiple connections and facilitate meetings between new faculty and helpful, established faculty both inside and outside the department.

Beginning to Mentor New Faculty Right Away

Interviews conducted during the Carnegie Mellon career development study revealed that many new faculty found the first few months very lonely. Some junior faculty reported that established colleagues didn't even take the time to stop by and say “hello” and ask how they were doing, and that there were no invitations to lunch or dinner. Single junior faculty were especially affected by this oversight. For some, it eventually got better, but for others it didn't. While the more outgoing junior faculty may make overtures themselves, others will not. In fact, 42% of the former faculty that the university had wanted to retain reported lack of collegiality as a reason for leaving the university. These findings point to the necessity of departments to ensure that new faculty are welcomed both professionally *and* socially.

Attaining Equity in Mentoring Received

Many female and minority faculty report not receiving any, as much or as effective mentoring as they need or want—a national finding that was further substantiated in the Carnegie Mellon career development study. Of the current faculty

interviewed, more than twice as many women as men cited lack of mentoring as an issue. There are a variety of reasons that may explain this finding. For instance, majority men may *seek out* mentoring and be *sought out* for mentoring more actively than women and minority men, often during informal situations. Furthermore, although studies have found little difference in the quality or effectiveness of mentoring based on differences in gender or race (Boice, 1992), both junior and senior faculty may believe that mentoring is most effectively done within one's own demographic, thereby leaving junior faculty who are the minority in the department unmentored and isolated.

Whatever the reasons behind the Carnegie Mellon study's finding of unequal satisfaction in mentoring, departments must seek to remedy this discrepancy in mentoring in order to further the university's pursuit of a more diverse community.

Accepting That a Mentor Doesn't Have to Be “All Things”

Mentoring is certainly a beneficial method of maintaining collegiality, creating a sense of community and furthering the success of the junior faculty and the university as a whole. However, the individuals who offer the mentoring should not be expected to provide everything a new faculty member needs or wants. Although definitions of what a mentor *is* include such adjectives as “wise,” “trusted,” “faithful” and “experienced,” the definitions of what a mentor *does* are broader, including fulfilling the roles of sponsor, supporter, advisor, counselor and teacher. A single person cannot be expected to fulfill all of those roles, and both junior faculty and prospective mentors need to understand this.

Being Realistic About What It Takes for Mentoring to Succeed

- Realize that being a mentor requires a generosity of spirit, a quality that not everyone has. Mentoring—or even providing advice or feedback—doesn't appeal to everyone, and so they might do it poorly. (After all, many faculty and administrators enter academia precisely because they “wish to be left alone to pursue their own teaching, writing or ideas” (Bergquist, 1992)). Therefore, mentoring should be voluntary, or the result can be counterproductive.
- A successful mentoring relationship requires at least reasonably good chemistry. However, you don't have to like someone to give him or her constructive feedback on a proposal.
- Mentoring requires one to be conscientious and thoughtful—one must consider the individual being mentored, how best to give constructive feedback, how blunt to be about political faux pas, etc.
- If some faculty are much better at mentoring than others, departments could consider (if feasible) releasing those individuals from other time-consuming commitments (such as committee work) to allow more time to mentor.
- Remind faculty that mentoring is a partnership. The mentor must be willing to be a *facilitative* partner, while the mentored must commit to being an *active* partner in the mentoring process.
- Moreover, successful mentoring requires a culture that doesn't view the need for mentoring as a sign of weakness. This is why the department head's oversight and leadership in this area is imperative.

Strategically Identifying the Senior Faculty's Strengths

Department heads have a unique perspective to guide the creation of mentoring partnerships. For example, as head, you have seen that “Carol” is really great at reading proposals and providing feedback, so ask her if she's willing to do this for some junior faculty. Or you have noted that “John” is really good at understanding group dynamics, so ask him if he'll coach junior faculty through the department “minefield.” More specifically, you can ask a certain senior faculty member particularly suited to mentoring a certain newcomer to talk with that newcomer and share insights about the department. Recognizing established faculty's strengths and enlisting their expertise is a good way to engage them in the mentoring process.

Avoiding “Common Traps” or Accepted Assumptions About Who Should Mentor Whom

- While many believe that such obvious pairings as women mentoring women and minorities mentoring minorities are always the most advantageous to both parties, such pairings may provide only one perspective. Furthermore, it is not fair to require or expect senior female faculty members to be responsible for mentoring all new female faculty. Mentoring partnerships based on sharing the same subfield or graduate school can also be limiting.
- Certainly, being mentored in some dimensions by department “insiders” is useful, but faculty have reported getting equally good mentoring from outside of their department.

THE YEARS THAT I WAS GOING THROUGH TENURE AND PROMOTION ISSUES WERE PURE DISTRESS. I DO CROSS-DISCIPLINARY WORK, WHICH IS BY ITS NATURE DIFFICULT TO ASSESS, AND I HAD NO IDEA WHAT MY PROSPECTS WERE IN REGARD TO TENURE AND PROMOTION. ALSO, THE PEOPLE WHO HAD ORIGINALLY RECRUITED ME HAD LEFT CMU AND THERE WAS NO EFFECTIVE MENTORING. IT WOULD HAVE BEEN HELPFUL FOR ME TO KNOW THEN WHAT I KNOW NOW, WHICH IS THAT SENIOR COLLEAGUES DO READ—AND DON'T JUST COUNT—THE PUBLICATIONS OF TENURE CANDIDATES. THIS WOULD HAVE BEEN REASSURING TO KNOW

—A TENURED PROFESSOR, CURRENTLY AT CMU

BEST PRACTICES

DISPLAY PHOTOS WITH NAMES OF ALL FACULTY IN THE DEPARTMENT'S CENTRAL OFFICE. THIS WILL ALLOW ALL DEPARTMENT MEMBERS TO QUICKLY ASSOCIATE NAMES AND FACES OF NEW AND ESTABLISHED FACULTY, THEREBY ACCELERATING FAMILIARITY AND COLLEGIALITY WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT

DEPARTMENT HEADS SHOULD ENCOURAGE JUNIOR FACULTY TO SEEK OUT MENTORING FROM SENIOR FACULTY, AND NOT JUST SIT AND WAIT. OVER THE YEARS, MANY JUNIOR FACULTY I WOULD OTHERWISE HAVE BEEN UNACQUAINTED WITH HAVE CALLED ME UP FOR A LUNCH MEETING TO DISCUSS OUR MUTUAL RESEARCH INTERESTS. I'VE MAINTAINED THESE RELATIONSHIPS AND HELPED THESE COLLEAGUES IN WHATEVER WAYS I COULD—AND THEY'VE HELPED ME AS WELL, KEEPING ME YOUNG AND SEEING THINGS IN A NEW LIGHT.

JUNIOR FACULTY SHOULD ALSO BE ENCOURAGED TO APPROACH A SENIOR COLLEAGUE WITH AN IDEA FOR A JOINT PROPOSAL. BY TAKING AN ACTIVE ROLE, THE JUNIOR PERSON NOT ONLY ESTABLISHES A COLLEAGIAL RELATIONSHIP, BUT AVOIDS THE POSSIBILITY OF ENDING UP DOING THE "GRUNT" WORK ON A PROPOSAL THE SENIOR PERSON INITIATES.

—HARRY PAXTON,
FORMER DEPARTMENT HEAD,
MATERIALS SCIENCE &
ENGINEERING

- Mentoring does not necessarily require a major time commitment. Junior faculty understand that everyone is busy, but can benefit from “little pieces” of mentoring such as a chat about office politics over lunch or feedback on a proposal now and then.

Anticipating and Heading Off Potential Problems

Oversight is important. The department head should look for cues that mentoring isn't happening or isn't effective. Problems to watch out for include:

- **Boundary crossing.** Junior faculty may find it difficult to distinguish between professional and personal relationships when they are overwhelmed in beginning their new jobs. This is another rationale for having multiple mentors—one to discuss professional issues with, the other to ask for personal advice.
- **Unhealthy or biased advice.** Occasionally, notes one former department head, a senior faculty member may begin to pass along some negative or distorted views that threaten the successful development of a new faculty member, either professionally, politically or personally. Therefore, the department head, who knows the political climate of the department and the individual personalities within the organization, should remain vigilant for any indication of inappropriate mentoring and be prepared to steer junior faculty toward more positive role models. (The following section, “The Continuing Needs of Established Faculty,” further addresses issues that senior faculty may have with providing positive mentoring.)

THE CONTINUING NEEDS OF ESTABLISHED FACULTY

Research shows that the senior faculty “is critical to developing loyalty, commitment, and moral capital, all of which are integral components of a strong institutional culture.”

(Clark, 1970, in Kuh & Whitt, 1988)

One of the initial objectives in conducting the study “Links Between Experience and Career Development at Carnegie Mellon” was to assure a better experience for junior faculty. However, in conducting the interviews with both junior and senior faculty, the researchers were surprised to discover that a great many senior faculty (30% of the total) reported feeling profoundly disillusioned with and disengaged from their departments. Importantly, these were not faculty who had ceased to be productive, but rather “star performers”—highly productive and professionally involved, yet withdrawn in key ways from their departments (Huston et al., submitted).

When a substantial portion of the senior faculty is disengaged from departmental life, it erodes collegiality and hinders the development of a healthy mentoring community at any institution. Thus, it is important for department heads to understand and attend to potential sources of senior faculty disengagement.

SOURCES OF SENIOR FACULTY DISENGAGEMENT

The Carnegie Mellon study identified two types of experiences that seemed to predict senior faculty disengagement. One group of faculty interviewed discussed an “ideal” situation into which they were hired that, for a number of different reasons, changed

over time. Another group of faculty described one particularly painful incident, often taking place during a key transition, that negatively colored their subsequent experiences in their department. Because the research on faculty vitality did not adequately illuminate these issues or their effects on faculty morale, the researchers turned to other social science literature for explanations. Research in organizational behavior and adult development provided two useful explanatory models.

Violation of Psychological Contracts

The first, from organizational behavior research, is the concept of psychological contracts. Psychological contracts are unwritten, and often unspoken, expectations that a new hire has of the employer, and vice versa (Rousseau, 1995). Faculty might, for example, have certain expectations about their work environment, the frequency and type of communication they will receive from administrators, how resources will be allocated, how merit will be assessed in promotion decisions, etc. Because Carnegie Mellon is remarkably decentralized, with department heads directly negotiating salary and other terms, it is often the department head who is held accountable by faculty for meeting both written and psychological contracts.

THE TENURE PROCESS LEFT ME WITH A BAD TASTE IN MY MOUTH. I DID EVERYTHING I WAS SUPPOSED TO DO, AND DID IN FACT GET TENURE. BUT I FELT UNPREPARED FOR THE POLITICS OF THE SITUATION. NOW I UNDERSTAND THAT TENURE IS A VERY POLITICAL PROCESS, AND NOT EVERYONE WILL AGREE ABOUT THE QUALITY OF SOMEONE'S WORK OR WHERE DEPARTMENTAL RESOURCES SHOULD GO, BUT WHAT HAPPENED HURT REGARDLESS.

—A TENURED PROFESSOR,
CURRENTLY AT CMU

I FEEL THAT I WAS NOT REWARDED IN ANY WAY FOR BEING A TEAM PLAYER. SO NOW, WHEN I TALK TO JUNIOR FACULTY, I TELL THEM TO CULTIVATE THEIR OWN CAREERS RATHER THAN HELP THE INSTITUTION. “THE SCHOOL WON'T REMEMBER,” I TELL THEM. “YOU WON'T BE REWARDED.”

—A TENURED PROFESSOR,
CURRENTLY AT CMU

CLEARLY ARTICULATING PROCESSES UPFRONT IS IMPORTANT TO CREATING SHARED UNDERSTANDING OF GOVERNANCE, ETC.

—A TENURED PROFESSOR,
CURRENTLY AT CMU

ONCE I WAS TENURED, NO ONE PROVIDED ME WITH ANY MENTORING OR FEEDBACK ABOUT MY WORK. I FELT THAT NO ONE REALLY KNEW WHAT I WAS DOING. WHAT WAS PARTICULARLY HURTFUL WAS THE FAVORITISM. FOR EXAMPLE, THE DEPARTMENT HEAD ACTIVELY MENTORED A FEMALE COLLEAGUE WHO WAS AT MY SAME LEVEL, BUT DID NOT MENTOR ME AT ALL.

—A TENURED PROFESSOR,
CURRENTLY AT CMU

WHEN I FIRST CAME TO CMU, THERE WAS NO FORMAL MENTORING PROGRAM, AND THE GENERATION GAP BETWEEN SENIOR AND JUNIOR FACULTY WAS SUCH THAT THERE WERE FEW CLOSE FRIENDSHIPS. I THINK THE LACK OF MENTORING WAS A FACTOR IN MY SOMEWHAT SLOW START HERE.

—A TENURED PROFESSOR,
CURRENTLY AT CMU

When psychological contracts are broken—that is, key expectations are not met—faculty may respond in an outward manner (e.g., voicing disappointment in an attempt to remedy the situation), and positive outcomes can result. However, faculty can also respond by disengaging from their departments or the institution as a whole and/or withdrawing from decision-making processes and departmental duties. Moreover, disenchanting senior faculty may either withdraw from mentoring relationships or give junior faculty cynical and potentially discouraging advice. Even if the number of disengaged senior faculty is small, their negative impact can be significant, particularly in small departments.

Negative Transformational Experiences

Adult development theory offers another useful explanatory model. This literature focuses on transformational experiences; i.e., positive or negative experiences that take place during key life transitions and constitute significant turning points for the individual (Denzin, 1989; McAdams et al., 2002). These experiences have deep emotional resonance; and even when the experiences themselves are long past, when they are recounted they evoke all the emotion of the original experience. When such transformational experiences are negative or painful, their effects can be particularly long-lasting, creating a lens through which all subsequent experiences are viewed.

A number of such transformational experiences, as well as their long-term emotional impact, were revealed in interviews with senior faculty. Initial experiences at the university, key stages in the reappointment, promotion and tenure process, and changes in departmental di-

rection and leadership figured prominently. These are periods of heightened anxiety and uncertainty, in which faculty members often perceive themselves to be under intense evaluative scrutiny. Negative or embittering experiences during these transitions were recalled vividly long after they occurred, and appeared to set a tone that lasted throughout the faculty member's career.

THE EFFECTS OF SENIOR FACULTY DISENGAGEMENT ON MENTORING

When senior faculty members disengage from their departments, they eliminate themselves as a possible source of advice, encouragement, collaboration and feedback for younger colleagues. Because senior faculty members have professional connections, experience with funding agencies and expertise in their fields that would, if shared, benefit junior faculty, their unavailability as a resource proves particularly unfortunate. Even when disaffected senior faculty members do not withdraw from mentoring relationships, their influence may not be positive. An embittered senior faculty member who advises junior faculty to leave academia because of sexism or tells his protégés to cultivate their own careers but not invest in the institution may be giving considered, heartfelt advice based on his own experiences, but it comes at the cost of discouraging or frightening younger colleagues.

WHAT DEPARTMENT HEADS CAN DO

While it is impossible to avoid entering into psychological contracts, department heads can take measures to reduce the likelihood that faculty will perceive

discrepancies in what they expect and what is delivered. Department heads should first act during the hiring process to help new faculty set realistic expectations of the university; for instance, about the heavy faculty workload, financial constraints, etc. Such honesty allows new faculty to approach these challenges with their eyes open, and reduces the chances that they will feel deceived or disillusioned later.

Along the same lines, department heads need to understand how faculty may digest a combination of positive and negative feedback that the head gives during a one-on-one meeting. Often, a faculty member will come away from the meeting remembering only the positive remarks (particularly if they outnumber the negative). One strategy is for the department head to provide timely and honest feedback—with the positive and the negative comments equally stated—along with explicit corrective strategies. This strategy can deter a feeling of betrayal on the part of the faculty if they receive a particularly negative review in the future.

Equally important is for department heads to periodically meet with faculty to clarify both faculty members' own expectations and those of the department. Such meetings can be very revealing. For example, one department head discovered through such a conversation that a senior faculty member, who was never mentored himself, not only refused to mentor junior faculty (a departmental priority), but harshly judged junior faculty who sought mentoring for not standing "on their own two feet." Discovering the discrepancy between this faculty member's psychological contract (that mentoring was unnecessary and he was thus not required to provide it) and the department's pro-mentoring policy

helped this department head to identify a potential problem and take action (Norman et al., in press).

Similarly, department heads cannot necessarily predict what experiences will be transformational to faculty. What they can do, however, is to pay close attention to potentially difficult transitions, such as the first year of employment, important milestones (such as tenure and promotion) and changes in departmental direction and leadership. Such transitional periods create both new opportunities and new anxieties, and can lay the foundation for either a renewed sense of purpose and commitment, or a slide into disengagement. Department heads can assist faculty members during critical transitions by giving them clear and constructive feedback on their work and expected role in the department, and providing opportunities to develop new roles.

Department heads can thus play a critical role in preventing and addressing senior faculty disengagement by attending to psychological contracts and transitional experiences. They can also work more generally to foster a departmental culture in which senior faculty members feel invested in the success and happiness of their colleagues, and thus serve as constructive and engaged mentors.

ADDITIONAL TOOLS FOR BUILDING COMMUNITY

DEPARTMENT HEADS CAN HELP FURTHER CREATE A SUPPORTIVE ENVIRONMENT BY:

- **CREATING FORUMS FOR OPEN DISCUSSION** THAT BUILD AWARENESS OF PROBLEMS THAT AFFECT SENIOR FACULTY, FOSTER EMPATHY AMONG FACULTY AT DIFFERENT STAGES OF THEIR CAREERS, AND EMPOWER SENIOR FACULTY WHO ARE DISSATISFIED TO WORK TOWARD CHANGE RATHER THAN WITHDRAWING FROM DEPARTMENTAL LIFE.
- **DESIGNATING TIME AND SPACE FOR INTELLECTUAL EXCHANGE**, TO FOSTER A SENSE OF INTELLECTUAL COMMUNITY AND ALLOW SENIOR FACULTY WHO FEEL ISOLATED FROM THEIR COLLEAGUES TO RECONNECT (FOR EXAMPLE, AN INFORMAL WEEKLY DISCUSSION SERIES IN WHICH A JUNIOR AND A SENIOR FACULTY MEMBER DISCUSSES HIS OR HER RESEARCH).
- **RECOGNIZING AND CELEBRATING FACULTY ACHIEVEMENTS**, SO THAT ALL FACULTY—SENIOR AS WELL AS JUNIOR—FEEL THAT THEIR WORK IS ACKNOWLEDGED AND APPRECIATED WITHIN THE COMMUNITY.

AS A DEPARTMENT HEAD, ONE THING I ALWAYS DID WAS TO MAKE SURE I MADE TIME FOR THE FACULTY BY HOLDING REGULAR ONE-ON-ONE AND GROUP MEETINGS. THE ONE-ON-ONE MEETINGS, IN PARTICULAR, ENSURED THAT THERE WAS ALWAYS AN OPPORTUNITY TO FIELD QUESTIONS, PROVIDE GUIDANCE, SET STRATEGY, CELEBRATE SUCCESSES AND DISCUSS ISSUES ON THE HORIZON BEFORE THEY BECAME PROBLEMS. FINDING THE TIME TO DO THIS IS USUALLY THE BIGGEST CHALLENGE, BUT THE PRACTICE ALWAYS SERVED ME AND MY FACULTY WELL—SO WELL THAT IT IS ONE THAT I CONTINUE TODAY

—JARED COHON, PRESIDENT

BECAUSE THE DEPARTMENT HEAD WILL ALWAYS BE PERCEIVED AS “THE BOSS,” FACULTY ARE UNLIKELY TO FEEL COMFORTABLE DENYING A REQUEST FROM HIM OR HER. THIS INFLUENCE CAN WORK POSITIVELY IN PROMOTING A MENTORING COMMUNITY WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT, BUT CAN ALSO WORK NEGATIVELY WHEN HEADS ASK JUNIOR FACULTY TO TEACH EXTRA COURSES, SERVE ON COMMITTEES OR ADVISE ADDITIONAL STUDENTS WHEN THE NEW PERSON IS STILL ADJUSTING TO THE JOB.

—MARILYN TAFT THOMAS,
FORMER DEPARTMENT HEAD,
MUSIC

UNDERSTANDING AND SHAPING DEPARTMENT CULTURE

The bottom line for leaders is that if they do not become conscious of the cultures in which they are embedded, those cultures will manage them. Cultural understanding is desirable for all of us, but it is essential to leaders if they are to lead.” (Schein, 1992)

DEFINING CULTURE

In order to set goals for mentoring, department heads must first recognize the elements of the departmental culture into which newcomers are being socialized. The organizational culture of an academic department sets the stage for the success of the faculty and the quality of the work done by them, and thus the success of the entire department, the college and the university.

The culture of an organization is intangible, yet palpable, for those who work within it; still, the elements that comprise any culture are universal. Recognizing these fundamental ingredients can help departments identify key areas to address in the pursuit of a collegial atmosphere.

The elements of a culture include “customs, traditions, mythical or actual historical accounts, tacit understandings, habits, norms and expectations, common meanings, shared assumptions and intersubjective meanings” (Sergiovanni & Corbally, 1984). Moreover, members of a culture “share a common orientation and overarching purpose, face similar problems, and have comparable experiences” (Meyerson, 1991).

Even in an environment where each faculty member is caught up in his or her own individual—and often lone—research and

teaching pursuits, the culture of the department remains an entity that affects everyone who works within it.

Culture can be viewed as operating on three levels:

1. **Artifacts** include what one “sees, hears and feels” when one enters a new group culture—the physical environment, what people wear, the organization’s products, stories told about the organization and observable rituals—all of which are “easy to observe and very difficult to decipher.”
2. One can eventually decipher the meanings of artifacts, but to do so more quickly, one must delve a little deeper to the level of **espoused values**, “widely held beliefs or sentiments about the importance of certain goals, activities, relationships, and feelings.” These values can be either consciously and explicitly expressed or, more often, unconsciously expressed.
3. Underlying the other two levels are the **basic assumptions** of the organization. Often unstated, these powerful assumptions are the core of the organization’s culture, influencing what people think about and what they perceive as important, how they feel

about things and what they do. Moreover, these assumptions are so deeply ingrained that they are neither confrontable nor debatable.

(Kuh & Whitt, 1988; Schein, 1992)

Department leaders must fully understand the department's culture before they can make any necessary changes to it or to articulate it to newcomers who will need to find their way within it.

Culture-Embedding Mechanisms

The climate of an organization is created by ***culture-embedding mechanisms***, which department heads can utilize and manage to share assumptions that are important to the group's success. Comments Schein (1992):

“One of the most powerful mechanisms that founders, leaders, managers, or even colleagues have available for communicating what they believe in or care about is what they systematically pay attention to.... Even casual remarks and questions that are consistently geared to a certain area can be as potent as formal control mechanisms and measurements.”

The primary culture-embedding mechanisms are:

- *What leaders pay attention to, measure, control and reward; what they systematically and consistently do.* For example, releasing those who mentor a lot from some committee responsibilities.
- *The leader's reactions to critical incidents and organizational crises.* These reactions create norms, values and procedures and reveal the leader's underlying assumptions, e.g., initiating a departmental retreat when problems

arise or including open discussion among junior and senior faculty at faculty meetings.

- *Observed criteria for resource allocation.* These criteria further reveal assumptions and beliefs, e.g., when a department head creates a faculty lunch room for increased faculty interaction even when space is at a premium.
- *Deliberate role modeling, teaching and coaching.* For example, when the department head sets a positive example by mentoring also.
- *Observed criteria for allocation of status and rewards.* Leaders can quickly communicate their own priorities and beliefs by consistently doling out rewards or punishments for certain behaviors, e.g., establishing a mentoring award for senior faculty or chastising those who do not seek or provide assistance.
- *Observed criteria for recruitment, selection, promotion, retirement and excommunication.* For example, providing the Carnegie Mellon booklet *Mentors & Colleagues: A Guide for Junior Faculty and Their Mentors* to new faculty, or citing effective mentoring in the announcement of an awarded chair.

Obviously, some of the mechanisms noted above are more difficult to affect than others. All of the mechanisms listed above will help to convey the organization's culture to faculty, but it is the department head's place to decide how to manage what is communicated.

THERE IS A HARD-NOSED ATTITUDE IN MY DEPARTMENT. YOU'RE EXPECTED TO SINK OR SWIM, WITH NO HELP FROM ANYONE ELSE. NEW FACULTY ARE NOT EVEN INTRODUCED TO THEIR COLLEAGUES. THE SENSE YOU GET IS THAT YOU'RE TO WORK BUNKERED IN YOUR LAB, WITH YOUR NOSE TO THE GRINDSTONE.

—A TENURED PROFESSOR, CURRENTLY AT CMU

BEST PRACTICES

THE SOCIAL ASPECT OF THE DEPARTMENT IS VERY IMPORTANT—WHETHER IT'S A QUICK CUP OF COFFEE, A CASUAL LUNCH, REGULAR FRIDAY WINE AND CHEESE RECEPTIONS OR A DEPARTMENTAL SKI TRIP.

AS A DEAN AT YALE, I WAS THE HIRING MANAGER AND, FOR MOST JUNIOR FACULTY, THE MOST SENIOR PERSON WITH WHOM HE OR SHE INTERACTED ON A REGULAR BASIS. THIS IS NO DIFFERENT FOR DEPARTMENT HEADS HERE AT CARNEGIE MELLON. AS SUCH, I KNEW THAT ALL MY ACTIONS—HOW AVAILABLE I WAS TO OTHERS, HOW I CONDUCTED DEPARTMENT MEETINGS, MY FAIRNESS IN ALLOCATING RESOURCES, ETC.—WOULD SET THE TONE FOR THE SCHOOL AND FOR WHAT WAS “ACCEPTABLE BEHAVIOR.”

SHOWING LEADERSHIP IN THIS REGARD IS PERHAPS THE MOST BASIC FORM OF MENTORING, BUT IT’S A CRITICAL EXAMPLE THAT CAN ESTABLISH A LIFE-LONG PATTERN—GOOD OR BAD—FOR A YOUNG FACULTY MEMBER. IT IS, INDEED, A HUGE RESPONSIBILITY.

—JARED COHON, PRESIDENT

STIMULATING AND SUSTAINING A MENTORING CULTURE

At its weakest, mentoring is viewed as a somewhat offhand strategy to address deficits, providing some needed encouragement and advising of weaker and less confident individuals. At its strongest, however, *mentoring is understood as a powerful learning process, which assures the intergenerational transfer of knowledge and “know-how” on an ongoing basis throughout one’s life* (Zachary, 2000; Clutterbuck, 2001).

Signs of a Successful Mentoring Culture

Because some faculty may view seeking out mentoring as a sign of weakness, departments must be proactive in establishing a healthy mentoring culture, where mentoring and being mentored are both accepted and valued.

Although many mentoring guidelines seem to describe a formal program, mentoring does not have to be a formal pursuit. In fact, very few faculty in the Carnegie Mellon study thought a formal mentoring program does or would work at our institution. Furthermore, “mentoring programs enjoy sustainability over time when mentoring is embedded in an organizational culture that values continuous learning” (Zachary, 2000). In other words, mentoring happens naturally because all parties understand and appreciate the importance of the outcome.

MANAGING CULTURAL CHANGE

When a culture isn’t functioning as effectively as it could, it is the responsibility of leadership to manage change so that the group can thrive. In fact, leadership can be defined as the “attitude and motivation to examine and manage culture” (Schein,

1992). An understanding of methods to manage change can inform departments in employing strategies in fostering a healthy mentoring culture.

Here, we briefly examine models for effecting change and the rates at which it can be done.

Models of Change

Of the six models of change set forth in organizational change literature, the following three have been identified as the most effective in higher education institutions.

Political models of change. Politics can often *prevent* change: when an issue is recognized as political, people shy away from addressing it. However, certain strategies can be very effective in bringing about change in these seemingly untouchable areas:

- coalition-building between *interest groups* has been shown to be one of the most effective change strategies (Baldrige et al., 1977, in Kezar, 2001);
- to gain support for a mentoring initiative, heads might employ *persuasion and influence strategies* such as increasing one-on-one informal communication with faculty or citing an influential academic group’s support for mentoring;
- when a department head exerts influence via *informal processes* (e.g., casually but consistently mentioning a change initiative in every hallway conversation with faculty), it can be especially effective in creating rapid change;
- because a university is an “ambiguous and complex” setting where short-term efforts tend to get lost in the system, individuals or groups who *persistently*

advocate an idea and provide ways to implement it tend to be more successful in making their desired change occur (Baldrige et al., 1977, in Kezar, 2001; Cohen & March, 1991; and Hearn, 1996); and

- department heads can *mediate* among vying interest groups, conflicts and powers to bring about consensus.

Research shows that political processes can be extremely effective in creating rapid change, and these strategies may be particularly useful in influencing those who view receiving mentoring as a sign of weakness.

Social cognition models of change address the importance of altering mental models, learning and constructed interaction and other change-producing methods through tools such as seminars, discussion, debate and reframing.

- In these models, change is tied to learning and mental processes such as sensemaking and mental models.
- Social cognition models of change emphasize the importance of individuals, and address habits and attitudes that may be barriers to change.
- Social cognition models can help individuals see a need to grow, learn and change their behavior, and can particularly help senior faculty who went through the tenure process 20 years ago to understand the stresses on junior faculty today. For example, department heads might share the results of the Carnegie Mellon career development study and other research on the academy.

Cultural models of change recognize the importance of history, tradition, sym-

bolism and the institutional culture's effect on the change process (Kezar, 2001).

- As in the political model, cultural change can be thwarted by *campus history and tradition*, but effective leaders can positively incorporate those very features into the change process.
- Because people rely on symbols to provide predictability and direction, leaders can invoke *symbolism* in the implementation of change.
- Working within and for the benefit of the *institutional culture* is key to successfully bringing about change.

Rates of Change

Psychologist and organizational behavior consultant William Bergquist (1992) describes two rates of change, and also makes the case for employing a combination of the two.

Evolutionary change involves improving what is currently being done in the organization (e.g., more communication, less conflict and/or more collaboration). This type of change usually proves to be more accepted and less stressful, yet it can be difficult to maintain the motivation behind the change.

Revolutionary change involves doing something completely different; but, while this rapid change maintains its motivation, it produces more stress and resistance.

Although revolutionary change can provide quick and enviable results in a hierarchical business culture, it is unlikely to work in a collegial atmosphere. To maintain motivation and sense of direction, Bergquist recommends a combination of the two approaches to introduce change in an academic organization: change is initiated with the evolutionary model, but at a

THE DEPARTMENT OF MODERN LANGUAGES' APPROACH TO HELPING IN THE "SOCIALIZATION" OF NEWCOMERS INCLUDES:

- A TWO-DAY NEW FACULTY ORIENTATION PROGRAM, WHICH FOLLOWS THE UNIVERSITY-WIDE PROGRAM.
- A "JUNIOR FACULTY MENTORING PROGRAM" IN WHICH NEW FACULTY CHOOSE TWO MENTORS, ONE FROM ONE'S AREA OF SPECIALIZATION AND ONE FROM ANOTHER SPECIALIZATION (ONE OF WHOM IS TENURE-TRACK, THE OTHER TEACHING-TRACK).
- AT LEAST ONCE DURING THE FIRST SEMESTER, THE ASSOCIATE HEAD OBSERVES THE CLASSES OF ALL NEWCOMERS AND SHARES FEEDBACK WITH THEM.
- AT MOST MONTHLY FACULTY MEETINGS, TWO FACULTY MEMBERS MAKE BRIEF REPORTS ON THEIR WORK.
- IN ADDITION TO FREQUENT INFORMAL CONTACT, THE HEAD MEETS FORMALLY AT LEAST ONCE WITH EACH NEWCOMER DURING THE FIRST SEMESTER TO DISCUSS HIS OR HER SETTLING IN.

—RICHARD TUCKER,
DEPARTMENT HEAD,
MODERN LANGUAGES (2005)

NOT LONG AFTER I ARRIVED AT CARNEGIE MELLON, I APPROACHED TWO OF MY SENIOR COLLEAGUES FOR ADVICE. BOTH OF THEM EVENTUALLY BECAME MY MENTORS AND ALSO FRIENDS. THEY HAVE GIVEN ME INVALUABLE SUPPORT AND HELP ON MY CAREER PATH. I CONSIDER MYSELF LUCKY, THOUGH—THE MENTORING IN MY DEPARTMENT IS NOT GENERALLY VERY GOOD. HOWEVER, NOW THAT I'M IN A POSITION TO MENTOR YOUNGER FACULTY MYSELF, I THINK I CAN HELP MAKE POSITIVE CHANGES.

—A TENURED PROFESSOR,
CURRENTLY AT CMU

MENTORING CAN BE FOSTERED THROUGH BUILDING A COMMUNITY OF SUPPORT RATHER THAN COMPETITION. IN THE SCIENCES, WE ACCOMPLISH THIS THROUGH AN ANNUAL DEPARTMENTAL RETREAT WHERE IDEAS ARE EXCHANGED AND A COLLEGIAL ATMOSPHERE OF INCLUSIVENESS IS FOSTERED.

—WILLIAM BROWN,
FORMER DEPARTMENT HEAD,
BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

certain point, a short-term revolutionary change is introduced. This combination method allows the participants to assess the success or failure of the revolutionary change, at which point a decision can be made to follow through with the revolutionary change with renewed motivation or to return to the drawing board.

This is but a brief overview of the change literature, but it may serve as a launching point in forming ideas for facilitating change within one's department. For further information, consult the sources cited in this section.

COLLEGIALITY: THE ULTIMATE GOAL OF THE MENTORING PROCESS

Along with workload and autonomy, collegiality is cited by faculty as one of the chief sources of satisfaction with faculty life. Collegiality also exerts a powerful force among faculty and therefore affects their attitudes toward adopting or resisting change.

(Pollicino, 1996; Walvoord et al., 2000)

After examining methods for understanding organizational culture, facilitating mentoring and managing change, it is beneficial to step back and take a broad view of what we hope to achieve with these approaches: a true sense of collegiality within the department.

ELEMENTS OF COLLEGIALITY

In the Carnegie Mellon study, the presence or absence of collegiality was an issue raised by 80% of the 123 respondents, making it the most popular topic for discussion in the interviews.

An advantage of the interview method utilized in the Carnegie Mellon study was that respondents were able to define what they meant by the presence or absence of collegiality. The responses regarding collegiality clustered into the following three categories, which department heads have the responsibility for monitoring.

Time and Interest

Current and former faculty who were satisfied with the collegiality in their departments characterized their colleagues as supportive of and invested in each other's work (i.e., willing to listen and provide feedback on ideas, proposals, papers and teaching). Several faculty described

the welcoming atmosphere they experienced when they first arrived, explaining that their colleagues took the time to orient them and help them find resources within their departments. In contrast, lack of collegiality was pronounced when senior faculty lacked time for or interest in junior faculty.

Department heads should encourage senior faculty to take the time and make the effort to welcome and help orient new faculty. Departments should also develop ways to recognize the work and achievements of colleagues and encourage collaboration among all faculty.

Open Communication

Many respondents complained that tensions in their departments left little room for collegiality. For example, tensions occurred between traditional and emerging fields, especially when there was competition for limited resources. Additionally, many faculty were frustrated by the hidden processes affecting resource allocations or reappointment, promotion and tenure.

Some current faculty focused on the hidden decision-making that continued to leave them with what they saw as an unfair share of the workload (e.g., course load, committee work, etc.). Many faculty described multiple tensions within their

IN PAST YEARS THERE WAS A LOT OF FACULTY DISSATISFACTION AND TURNOVER. THE JUNIOR FACULTY GOT NO SINCERE MENTORING, AND A NUMBER OF THEM LEFT. THE LACK OF REGULAR FEEDBACK, COMBINED WITH THE FACT THAT NOBODY HAD BEEN TENURED IN SO LONG, GENERATED A KIND OF PARANOIA THAT AFFECTED EVEN PEOPLE OUTSIDE THE TENURE TRACK. ULTIMATELY, IT CREATED A VERY COLD ENVIRONMENT WITHIN THE PROGRAM.

—A TENURED PROFESSOR, CURRENTLY AT CMU

IFOUND CMU PRETTY INTIMIDATING AT FIRST. I CAME FROM A FAR MORE COMPARTMENTALIZED GRADUATE PROGRAM, AND SUDDENLY FOUND MYSELF DUMPED INTO THIS HUGE DEPARTMENT WITH PERMEABLE RESEARCH AREAS. HOWEVER, SEVERAL SENIOR COLLEAGUES HELPED ME MAKE CONTACTS, NAVIGATE THE ENVIRONMENT, AND GET MY RESEARCH STARTED. THIS HELPED ME APPRECIATE CMU'S INTERDISCIPLINARITY WITHOUT BEING OVERWHELMED BY IT.

—A TENURED PROFESSOR, CURRENTLY AT CMU

MY DEPARTMENT IS RICH IN SUPPORTIVE COLLEAGUES. THERE ARE SEVERAL SENIOR AND JUNIOR PEOPLE INTERESTED IN MY RESEARCH, AND I'VE FOUND A NUMBER OF MENTORS WHO GIVE ME AS MUCH FEEDBACK AS I WANT ON MY WORK. I'VE RECEIVED THE ENCOURAGEMENT I'VE NEEDED TO HELP MAKE THE DEPARTMENT A SHOWCASE FOR MY FIELD.

—A PRETENURED FACULTY MEMBER, CURRENTLY AT CMU

BEST PRACTICES

DEPARTMENT HEADS CAN FURTHER PROMOTE COLLEGIALLY WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT BY:

- NURTURING A CIVIL AND RESPECTFUL ENVIRONMENT
- MANAGING CONFLICT AND COMMUNICATING EFFECTIVELY.
- MAKING DEPARTMENTAL PROCESSES MORE TRANSPARENT.
- ENCOURAGING SENIOR FACULTY TO BE MORE INVOLVED WITH JUNIOR FACULTY. AND
- ASSURING THAT ALL JUNIOR FACULTY FIND MENTORS.

department, which created rifts, isolation and resentment. In other cases, intradepartmental tensions were not addressed early in a faculty member's experience and things grew from bad to worse.

Department heads can facilitate open communication among department members to help alleviate tension and anxiety.

Civility

Respondents also defined lack of collegiality as simply uncivil behaviors that were either thoughtless and careless or purposefully harmful. In addition to the lack of recognition for work well done, uncivil departments were described as enmeshed in "back-stabbing" and "blind-siding," such as when senior faculty neglected to voice reservations or concerns about a junior faculty member's work until promotion time.

On a personal level, current and former faculty mentioned that they perceived that one or more of their colleagues was trying to undermine their efforts or "trip me up." On a collective level, both groups of faculty described group dynamics within their departments as "warring sub-groups," "cliques" and "infighting."

Such incivilities have a profound impact on mentoring. Most junior faculty in uncivil departments said that they rarely, if ever, sought mentoring because they were reluctant to appear in one of the "camps." Because uncivil behaviors were described with equal frequency by all faculty—both current and former—these issues cannot be trivialized as problems of the past or as paranoia on the part of junior faculty (Ambrose et al., in press).

Department heads should be on the watch for uncivil behaviors and, again, promote open communication among department members.

THE COST OF UNCOLLEGIALLY

Research has shown that faculty members' reasons for leaving have shifted over the past two decades. Formerly, faculty left institutions over "prestige, security and authority" issues. Today, "quality of life and personal fulfillment" are catalysts (Burke, 1988; Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002). Certainly, the presence or absence of collegiality within one's department affects one's quality of life and, thus, retention.

In the Carnegie Mellon study, lack of collegiality was a major source of dissatisfaction, cited by 67% of former faculty and 35% of current faculty. (It is not clear, however, whether an inherently non-collegial environment provoked the former faculty to leave, or whether their departments made early determinations that these colleagues would not be retained, thus leading to an unfriendly climate.) Although causality cannot be determined from the study's research design, it is important to note that 42% of former faculty whom the university wanted to retain identified lack of collegiality as one of their reasons for leaving. This finding would suggest that the institution's lack of collegiality can be costly.

Successful mentoring and a collegial environment are not the result of serendipity. Although most of the faculty in the Carnegie Mellon study who reported satisfying mentoring experiences said mentoring happened "naturally," "informally" and "between people with good chemistry," departments still must strive to nurture an environment where mentoring can occur. Department heads have the advantage of perspective to oversee—and the responsibility to manage—an organizational culture where collegiality and mentoring thrive.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ambrose, S.A. "Links Between Experience and Career Development at Carnegie Mellon." Funded by the Alcoa Foundation, 2001-03.
- Ambrose, S.A., T. Huston and M. Norman. "A Qualitative Method for Assessing Faculty Satisfaction." *Research in Higher Education*, in press.
- Amon, C., and S. Majetich. "The Faculty Issues Report," 2001. As cited in Lopez, S., and R. O'Lare (eds.), *Periodic Review Report Prepared for the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools*, 2003, p. 11.
- Beineke, J.A., and R.H. Sublett. *Leadership Lessons and Competencies: Learning from the Kellogg National Fellowship Program*. Battle Creek, Michigan: Kellogg Foundation, 1999.
- Bergquist, W.H. *The Four Cultures of the Academy: Insights and Strategies for Improving Leadership in Collegiate Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1992.
- Boice, R. *The New Faculty Member*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1992.
- Burke, D.L. *A New Academic Marketplace*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1988.
- Chase, W.G., and H.A. Simon. "Perception in Chess," *Cognitive Psychology*, Vol. 4, 1973, pp. 55-81.
- Clark, B.R. *The Distinctive College: Reed, Antioch, and Swarthmore*. Chicago: Aldine, 1970.
- Clutterbuck, D. *Everyone Needs a Mentor*. Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development, 2001.
- Cohen, M.D., and J.G. March. "Leadership in an Organized Anarchy." In M.W. Peterson et al. (eds.), *ASHE Reader on Organization and Governance in Higher Education* (4th Ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Ginn Press, March 1991.
- Conrad, C.F. "A Grounded Theory of Academic Change." *Sociology of Education*, Vol. 51, 1978, pp. 101-112.
- Denzin, N.K. *Interpretive Biography*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1989.
- Ericsson, K.A., R.T. Krampe and C. Tesch-Romer. "The Role of Deliberate Practice in the Acquisition of Expert Performance," *Psychological Review*, Vol. 100, 1993, pp. 363-406.
- Ericsson, K.A., and J. Smith. *Towards a General Theory of Expertise*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Feldman, M. "The Meanings of Ambiguity: Learning from Stories and Metaphors." In P. Frost et al. (eds.), *Reframing Organizational Culture*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1991.
- Gmelch, W.H., and J.H. Schuh (eds.). *The Life Cycle of a Department Chair*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2004.
- Hayes, J.R. "Cognitive Processes in Creativity." In J. Glover, R. Ronning and C. Reynolds (eds.), *Handbook of Creativity*, New York, NY: Plenum, 1989.

- Hearn, J.C. "Transforming U.S. Higher Education. An Organizational Perspective." *Innovative Higher Education*, 21(2), 1996, pp. 141-154.
- Herr, K.U. "Mentoring Faculty at the Departmental Level." *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, no. 57, Spring 1994, Jossey-Bass.
- Hoppe, S.L. "Identifying and Nurturing Potential Academic Leaders." In S.L. Hoppe and B.W. Speck (eds.), *Identifying and Preparing Academic Leaders*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2003.
- Hoppe, S.L., and B.W. Speck (eds.). *Identifying and Preparing Academic Leaders*. San-Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2003.
- Huston, T., M. Norman and S.A. Ambrose. "Unexplored Terrain: Productive Yet Disengaged Senior Faculty." Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Johnsrud, L.K., and V.J. Rosser. Faculty members' morale and their intention to leave. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73 (4), 2002, pp. 518-541.
- Kezar, A.J. *Understanding and Facilitating Organizational Change in the 21st Century: Recent Research and Conceptualizations*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 2001.
- Kuh, G.D., and E.J. Whitt. *The Invisible Tapestry: Culture in American Colleges and Universities*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report Volume 17, No. 1. Washington, DC: George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development, 1988.
- Louis, M. "An Investigator's Guide to Workplace Culture." In P. Frost et al. (eds.), *Organizational Culture*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1985.
- McAdams, D.P., R. Josselson and A. Lieblich (eds.). *Turns in the Road. Narrative Studies of Lives in Transition*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 2002.
- Martin, J. *Organizational Culture: Mapping the Terrain*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2002.
- Meyerson, D. "'Normal' Ambiguity? A Glimpse of an Occupational Culture." In P. Frost et al. (eds.), *Reframing Organizational Culture*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1991.
- Murphy, C. "The Rewards of Academic Leadership." In S.L. Hoppe and B.W. Speck (eds.), *Identifying and Preparing Academic Leaders*. San-Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2003.
- Norman, M., S.A. Ambrose and T. Huston. "Assessing and Addressing Faculty Morale: Cultivating Consciousness, Empathy and Empowerment." *The Review of Higher Education*, in press.
- Pollicino, E. "Faculty satisfaction with institutional support as a complex concept: Collegiality, workload, autonomy." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 8-13, 1996, New York, NY.
- Rice, R.E., M.D. Sorcinelli and A.E. Austin. *Heeding New Voices: Academic Careers for a New Generation*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education, 2000.

Rousseau, D.M. *Psychological Contracts in Organizations: Understanding Written and Unwritten Agreements*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1995.

Sathe, V. *Culture and Related Corporate Realities: Text, Cases and Readings on Organizational Entry, Establishment and Change*. Homewood, IL: Irwin, 1985.

Schein, E.H. *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985.

Schein, E.H. *Organizational Culture and Leadership, 2nd Edition*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1992.

Schön, D.A. *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. New York: Basic Books, 1983.

Sergiovanni, T., and J. Corbally (eds.). *Leadership and Organizational Culture*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1984.

Sorcinelli, M.D. "New and Junior Faculty Stress: Research and Responses." In M.D. Sorcinelli and A.E. Austin (eds.), *Developing New and Junior Faculty. New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, no. 50, Summer 1992, Jossey-Bass.

Sorcinelli, M.D. *Principles of Good Practice*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education, 2000.

Sprague, J., and D. Stuart. *The Speaker's Handbook, 7th Edition*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing, 2004.

Walvoord, B.E., A.K. Carey, H.L. Smith, S.W. Soled, P.K. Way and D. Zorn. *Academic Departments: How They Work, How They Change*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 27. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000.

Zachary, L.J. *The Mentor's Guide: Facilitating Effective Learning Relationships*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the 123 former and current faculty who were interviewed for the study "Links Between Experience and Career Development at Carnegie Mellon." We are also grateful to those who provided thoughtful and insightful feedback on the contents of this booklet: Omer Akin, Elizabeth Bradley, William Brown, Jared Cohon, Mark Kamlet, David Kaufer, William Keech, Marsha Lovett, Indira Nair, Marie Norman, Harry Paxton, Anthony Rollett, Everett Tademy, Marilyn Taft Thomas, Richard Tucker, Robert White and William Williams.

This project was funded by the Office of the Provost, with the support of Human Resources.

THE EBERLY CENTER FOR TEACHING EXCELLENCE (formerly the University Teaching Center) was established in 1982 to organize and conduct programs to improve the quality of instruction at Carnegie Mellon. In recognition of support from the Eberly Family Charitable Trust, the Center was renamed in 1996. The Center helps faculty and graduate students to improve teaching practices by gaining an understanding of cognitive and educational principles of teaching and learning and by reflecting, practicing and receiving feedback on course design and classroom pedagogy.

The Center offers public forums to discuss and explore issues related to teaching and learning as well as private consultations on course design, implementation and evaluation. Individual consultations are strictly confidential.

Whenever possible, the Center facilitates discussions of teaching and learning across departments and colleges to address common concerns, facilitate interdisciplinary collaborations and to help transfer and adapt successful strategies to a variety of contexts. The Center aims to respond to the continually changing educational needs of the campus community.

In addition, the Center engages in institutional research, whose results impact policy and practice.

Carnegie Mellon



The Carnegie Mellon Mentoring Series
FOSTERING A MENTORING COMMUNITY:
A GUIDE FOR DEPARTMENT HEADS

©2005, Eberly Center for Teaching Excellence
Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

For additional copies, call 412/268-2896.

Carnegie Mellon University does not discriminate and Carnegie Mellon University is required not to discriminate in admission, employment or administration of its programs or activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex or handicap in violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972 and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 or other federal, state or local laws or executive orders.

In addition, Carnegie Mellon University does not discriminate in admission, employment or administration of its programs on the basis of religion, creed, ancestry, belief, age, veteran status, sexual orientation, gender identity or in violation of federal, state, or local laws or executive orders. However, in the judgment of the Carnegie Mellon Human Relations Commission, the Presidential Executive Order directing the Department of Defense to follow a policy of "Don't ask, don't tell, don't pursue," excludes openly gay, lesbian and bisexual students from receiving ROTC scholarships or serving in the military. Nevertheless, all ROTC classes at Carnegie Mellon University are available to all students.

Inquiries concerning application of these statements should be directed to the
Provost, Carnegie Mellon University, 5000 Forbes Avenue, Pittsburgh, PA 15213, telephone 412-268-6684
or the Vice President for Enrollment, Carnegie Mellon University, 5000 Forbes Avenue, Pittsburgh, PA 15213, telephone 412-268-2056.

Carnegie Mellon University publishes an annual campus security report describing the university's security, alcohol and drug, and sexual assault policies and containing statistics about the number and type of crimes committed on the campus during the preceding three years. You can obtain a copy by contacting the Carnegie Mellon Police Department at 412-268-2323. The security report is available through the World Wide Web at <http://www/cmu.edu/security/stats.html>.

Obtain general information about Carnegie Mellon University by calling 412-268-2000.