



The Implementation of a Pre-tenure Mentorship and Advisory Council

Roosevelt O. Shelton, Ph.D.
Interim Chairperson

Introduction

Divisional Chairpersons traditionally assume a mentoring role as they guide pre-tenured faculty members through the annual review, third year review, and tenure and promotion review. Nevertheless, DOFA's mentoring efforts seek to formally expand upon those practices and processes, while embracing the broader goal of ensuring that these issues are facilitated via more meaningful, continuous and expanded collegial engagements.

Mentoring

DOFA's perspective of mentoring is not intended to include rigid structures, but allows for flexibility in meeting the objectives of the division, as well as the common needs of our pre-tenured faculty members. That perspective is guided by specific standards, undergirded by a collegial exploration of typical considerations. From a general perspective, Mentors (individual members of the Advisory Council) will serve in a variety of "collegial" roles (professional, personal and social) in our efforts to ensure that pre-tenured faculty members receive guidance and support for successful career enhancement and professional advancement. It is an additional aim to be fully attentive to the needs of historically under-represented pre-tenured faculty members (gender and race) in order to cultivate and retain a diverse and productive faculty.

From a more specific perspective, Mentors will provide to pre-tenured Mentees: (a) critical assistance in understanding the structure and culture of the division and its programs (b) individual recognition and encouragement, (c) honest criticism and feedback, (d) advice on responsibilities and professional priorities, (e) intimate knowledge of institutional and divisional policies, procedures and expectations (f) long-range career planning, (g) support and advocacy, and (h) opportunities for collaborative projects.

Finally, while Mentorship will assume a variety of forms and pursue a number of specific

standards, DOFA's direct focus is on advancement in the broadest sense, which may or may not result in the granting of tenure and promotion to our pre-tenure candidates.

Dispositions

Generally, successful faculty Mentors are experienced faculty members that are highly interested in and familiar with the various systems of Kentucky State University, as well as the Mentee's professional growth and development.

Mentorship as a Component of Service

As professionals within a public institution of higher education, Kentucky State University faculty members have broad responsibility in the areas of instruction, service, and research. Faculty engaging in Mentoring activities will be qualified as fulfilling the highest level of service to the institution, and documented via the PDP, SES and annual evaluation procedures. Moreover, those faculty Mentors will gain: (a) the satisfaction of helping with the professional growth and development of junior colleagues, and (b) significant opportunities for collaboration, feedback and interaction with all colleagues.

The Division of Fine Arts and the university will additionally benefit through an anticipated increase in faculty productivity, collaboration and commitment, a decrease in faculty attrition, and the facilitation of an environment that values and promotes collegiality. The identification and appointment of Mentors will additionally be highly informed by the number of available senior faculty members in relation to the number of pre-tenured faculty members.

Responsibilities of the Chairperson

The Divisional Chairperson will assume a critical role in the implementation and success of these proposed mentoring and career advancement engagements. Arguably, the Chairperson assumes the primary responsibility of ensuring that pre-tenured faculty are successfully transitioned into their respective roles. For example, the Chairperson should clarify expectations and criteria at all levels (division, college, university), clearly explicate the relationship of the formal institutional criteria to the expectations of the divisional culture, provide timely notifications regarding deadlines and other timelines, effectively implement the Comprehensive Evaluation System for Assessment of Faculty Performance and ensure that professional development prescriptions within the PDP are mutually understood.

Responsibilities of Pre-tenured Faculty Members

While ultimate responsibility for career advancement rests with the individual mentee, DOFA's mentoring program is designed to provide collegial guidance to their individual efforts. Therefore, pre-tenured faculty mentees are strongly encouraged to proactively pursue

and exhibit the following dispositions and behaviors:

1. Willingness to frequently meet with and listen with an open mind to advice provided by the mentor.
2. Willingness to voice and explain concerns.
3. Willingness to weigh and judge advice (conservative vs. risk-taking).
4. Willingness to avail oneself of opportunities for professional growth and excellence in teaching, research, and service.
5. Willingness to take responsibility, be an active agent and judge of appropriate course of action for career advancement.

Responsibilities of the Pre-tenure Advisory Committee

The Pre-tenure Advisory Committee shall be composed of selective senior faculty members within the Division of Fine Arts. The committee shall function across individual divisional disciplines, and exercise individual and collective responsibilities that facilitate exemplary Mentorship and collegial guidance to pre-tenured faculty members (Mentees), especially regarding advancement. More specifically, those broad responsibilities will include:

1. Service as an official Mentor for pre-tenured faculty members;
2. Collegial counsel and advisement on the common expectations and responsibilities of divisional faculty members; and
3. Collegial counsel and advisement on the institution's relevant policies and procedures.

DOFA Mentors will use the *Mentor-Mentee Tracking Checklist* (Appendix A) to report the results of their individual engagement to the Divisional Chairperson, who will then report those results to the Dean of the University.

Standards and Typical Considerations

Again, DOFA's perspective of mentoring is not intended to include rigid structures, but allows for flexibility in meeting the objectives of the division, as well as the common needs of our pre-tenured faculty members. Mentors will engage pre-tenured mentees in an extended examination of the typical considerations associated with eight selected standards. While the listing of standards is not exhaustive, they are consistent with the overarching goal of this initiative, and they follow below:

Standard 1: Adjusting to the Divisional Culture

Typical Considerations:

1. What considerations are important in setting individual long-term goals and short-term objectives?
2. What considerations are important in setting priorities and developing a professional profile?
3. What considerations are important to understanding the divisional and institutional culture(s) and socialization processes?
4. What considerations are important for avoiding pitfalls and/or addressing difficult situations?
5. What considerations are important for the development of professional networks?
6. What considerations are important in preventing isolation?

Standard 2: Appointment and Advancement (KSU Faculty Handbook, Section 2.1)

Typical Considerations:

1. What are the various levels and types of faculty appointments?
2. What are the various types of appointment contracts?
3. What is meant by “*Locus of Appointment?*” (KSU Faculty Handbook, Section 2.2.4)
4. What are the various factors that influence professional advancement opportunities at KSU?

Standard 3: The University Faculty ((KSU Faculty Handbook, Sections 1.7.3 through 1.7.2.3)

Typical Considerations:

1. What specific authority does the University’s faculty exercise?

2. What specific jurisdiction does the faculty maintain?
3. What are the meeting requirements of the faculty?

Standard 4: Faculty Expectations (KSU Faculty Handbook, Section 2.9.2)

Typical Considerations:

1. How do these common expectations influence the establishment of professional priorities?
2. How do these common expectations influence comprehensive evaluation?
3. How do these common expectations influence the opportunity for professional advancement?
4. Are there specific categories of expectations and, if so, what are they?
5. What specific protocols must be followed when it is necessary to miss an instructional period or other distribution assignments and responsibilities?

Standard 5: Faculty Workloads (KSU Faculty Handbook, Section 2.11)

Typical Considerations:

1. What are primary three dimensions of professional responsibility expected of full time faculty members?
2. How are teaching loads determined by the institution and, where appropriate, the DOFA unit?
3. What are the specific guidelines for developing the course syllabus?
4. How are faculty required to evaluate student achievement?
5. What relationships exist between the components of Office Hours, Class Schedule and the Teaching Load?
6. What is the *Distribution of Effort* and how does it relate to the primary three dimensions

of professional responsibility?

7. What distinctions exist between the *Internal* overload and an *External* overload?
8. What are the procedures for changing a class from a printed schedule? (KSU Faculty Handbook, Section 3.2)

Standard 6: Grading (KSU Faculty Handbook, Section 3.0)

Typical Considerations:

1. Where is the *University Grading System* is found?
2. What are the standards associated with the system?
3. What are the distinctions between the *Mid-Term Warning* and the *Final Grade*?
4. What are the necessary procedures for changing a student's grade after the end of a term?

Standard 7: *The Comprehensive Evaluation System for Assessment of Faculty Performance* (KSU Faculty Handbook, Appendix I)

Typical Considerations:

1. What four components make up the comprehensive faculty evaluation system?
2. What are the three broad purposes of the comprehensive faculty evaluation system?
3. What are the performance and procedural goals of the comprehensive faculty evaluation system?
4. What are the four performance categories upon which faculty members are evaluated?
5. How is each category broadly defined?
6. What are the faculty member's responsibilities in the process?
7. What is the relationship of the Self-Evaluation to the Distribution of Effort Agreement?

8. What is the relationship of the Self Evaluation to the Administrative Review?
9. What is the relationship of the Professional Development Plan to institutional advancement?
10. What is the relationship of Student Evaluations of Instruction to institutional advancement?
11. What is the relationship of Peer Evaluations to advancement?

Standard 8: Promotion and Tenure (KSU Faculty Handbook, Section 2.6)

Typical Considerations:

1. What are the minimum standards for granting promotion and tenure?
2. What is the role of Teaching Effectiveness in these processes?
3. How is Teaching Effectiveness demonstrated and documented?
4. How is Scholarship demonstrated and documented?
5. What are the components of Service, and how is it demonstrated and documented?
6. What limitations exist regarding Tenure Eligibility?
7. What is the Probationary Period?

Appendix A: Mentor-Mentee Tracking Checklist

Mentor: _____ Date _____ Mentee _____ Date _____

Signature _____ Signature _____

Standards	Dates Engaged	Mentee Initials	Mentor Initials	Chair's Initials	Mentor Assessment			
					Novice	Apprentice	Proficient	Distinguished
Standard 1: <i>Adjusting to the Divisional Culture</i>								
Standard 2: <i>Appointment and Advancement</i>								
Standard 3: <i>The University Faculty</i>								
Standard 4: <i>Faculty Expectations</i>								
Standard 5: <i>Faculty Workloads</i>								
Standard 6: <i>Grading</i>								
Standard 7: <i>Comprehensive Evaluation</i>								
Standard 8: <i>Promotion and Tenure</i>								
Other:								

Chair: _____ Date: _____

Signature _____