

Recommendations for Departmental Mentoring Programs/Best Practices
Dean's Council on Faculty Affairs
Revised: March 2015

Each department is expected to develop the mentoring program that is most appropriate to the department's goals, needs and culture. While recognizing that mentoring relationships and programs can take many forms, the Dean's Council on Faculty Affairs suggests consideration of the following practices for the development or enhancement of departmental mentoring programs.

A. Create a mentoring committee and/or assign responsibility for the mentoring program to an existing departmental committee. This group could be responsible for determining goals for the program, reviewing existing mentoring options, making recommendations for changing/expanding/revising the existing program, initiating the processes, and documenting the program for posting on the department's website.

B. Assign a temporary advisor before a new faculty member comes on board. New faculty on all tracks, and assistant professors who do not already have a mentor could be eligible for having a temporary advisor, assigned by department head or mentoring committee. This relationship would be time limited (6 months-1 year) with the specific goal of assisting the new faculty member in choosing who should be his/her primary mentor,¹ based on review of the mentee's objectives, interests and workload assignment. The department should provide oversight for this process, to assure that a primary mentor is identified in a timely fashion.

C. Consider the issue of "chemistry" in the selection of the permanent mentor. There is some evidence that the most successful mentoring relationships are between individuals who have similar values, worldviews and/or aspirations.

D. Determine what the roles of the mentor will be, based on the individual faculty member's goals and those of the program.

E. Create written expectations for mentoring relationships in the department. The department should recommend how often the mentor and mentee should meet; who should make the first contact, the mentor or the mentee; how goals for the relationship should be set.

F. Encourage faculty to have more than one mentor. There might be different mentors for each of the faculty member's roles (research, teaching, clinical service, administration). Other mentoring relationships could be informal with infrequent meetings and/or focused on a single issue. They could be initiated by either the mentor or the mentee, the department head or mentoring committee.

G. Develop a process by which mentor/mentee relationships are evaluated, including feedback from mentees. Each mentoring relationship should be evaluated annually by

both mentor and mentee. This evaluation should assess whether the goals are being achieved, how the relationship could be improved, if it would be beneficial to identify other mentors, etc. Mentoring should be considered (and thereby reinforced) in the annual faculty evaluation.

H. Utilize/provide the following materials in discussing the mentee's goals and interests, as appropriate:

Copy of work load assignment for the faculty member
Copy of the mentees' CV
UA COM Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

The following mentoring resources are available on the Faculty Affairs website (<http://medicine.arizona.edu/faculty-staff/offices/faculty-affairs>)

Links to:

Department mentoring programs, both in the COM and at other institutions
Useful articles on mentoring
University of Arizona Faculty Mentoring Resources and Benefits

Tools for Departments (developed by the Dean's Council on Faculty Affairs):

Questions to consider in developing/enhancing a mentoring program
Template for description of departmental mentoring program
Best practices for departmental mentoring programs
Mentor self-assessment form (from Nature, 447, 791-797, 14 June 2007)
Mentoring guide and contract
Evaluation forms (separate ones for mentor and mentee)

1. Junior faculty at UA COM who selected their own mentor were significantly more likely to rate them as "very or extremely" helpful (64.8% vs. 30% of those whose mentors had been assigned). Survey conducted in 2008.