The **Committee on Mentoring** is a joint initiative between the Provost's Office and the Academic Senate. The Mentoring Committee is charged with designing and implementing a revised multi-layered, multi-pronged strategic plan for mentoring to be adopted across the university, building on the work of the Mellon Mentoring Forum, etc. The plan will be adaptable to the mentoring needs of each department or school. A mentoring philosophy based on the university's strategic plan should be developed, so that all mentoring activities at USC align with that philosophy. The committee will develop an overall framework, based on mentoring research, reflecting 1) The different mentee populations to be targeted, 2) The relevant touch points at which mentoring should be implemented for each population, 3) The forms of mentoring that should occur, and 4) The various contexts in which mentoring should take place. The task force should also determine how mentoring will be embedded within institutional structures, how it will be incentivized, and how it will be funded and supported. The plan should include mentor training, and a communications plan to create a culture of mentoring. The plan should make use of all existing successful mentoring programs on campus, as both inspiration for effective models, as well as resources to be better utilized across campus. The committee shall then serve to oversee and make recommendations for continued enhancement of mentoring on campus.

Committee on Mentoring Report for 2017-2018 Academic Year

Committee on Mentoring Members: Dorian Traube (Chair), Patrick Dent (Sub-Committee Chair), Briana Hinga (Sub-Committee Chair), Timotei Centea (Sub-Committee Chair), Janette Brown, Ginger Clark, Judy Garner, Chuck Gomer, Lessa Grunenfelder, Michael Hadjidaniel, Velina Hasu Houston, Rima Jubran, John Matsusaka, Carlos Sanchez, Diana York Blane

Focus of 2017-2018 Academic Year: In the third year of the Committee on Mentoring, the committee decided to deploy the mentoring guidelines developed in Years 1 and 2 of the committee. To ease burden on academic units in developing a culturing of mentoring we piloted a technical support approach with three academic units on campus: (1) USC Roski School of Art and Design, (2) USC Leonard Davis School of Gerontology, (3) Information Technology Program at the USC Viterbi School of Engineering. These programs were chosen for their unique makeup as an art school, a school with diverse faculty lines (e.g. tenure, RTPC, and post-doctoral training), and a school with a pre-existing mentoring program. The goal of this pilot program was to: (1) determine what mentorship structures currently exist in these units, (2) assess how the Committee on Mentoring's guidelines could be utilized by these units to develop a culture of mentoring, (3) determine common barriers that should be addressed when working with a larger population of academic programs on creating a culture of mentoring.

Summary of Approach: The mentoring committee divided into three sub-groups to provide technical support to each of the selected programs. Sub-committee chairs solicited the Vice Dean of Faculty Affairs or Program Director from each program to nominate a group of 3-4 faculty who would work with the sub-committee on this process. Each sub-committee met throughout the spring semester to assess the school or program's mentoring efforts and needs. All programs were provided with the Committee on Mentoring's Guidelines (see attached) and asked what policies and mechanisms are required for effective mentoring within their unit or

similar units and whether the guidelines prepared by the Committee on Mentoring reflect needs of similar academic units.

Summary of Current Mentoring Successes:
- Some programs have clearly articulated mentoring standards
- Some programs have formal mentoring structures based on group meetings, forums, or assigned mentoring teams
- Mentees report greater success when mentored by a team and having mentors in the mentees area of research or practice
- Smaller programs seem to be able to foster a greater sense of community
- Support from school or program leadership can create a culture of mentorship
- Informal mentoring structures can lead to warm collegial, working environments

Summary of Challenges in Creating a Culture of Mentoring:
- In multiple programs, there was a failure to articulate procedures for advancement and promotion (particularly for RTPC faculty). Without such guidance, mentoring is directionless.
- Diversity in faculty based on rank and type of faculty can impede mentoring relationships
- It can be difficult to find a mentoring relationship that can inform outside artistic or industry endeavors.
- Programs have not clearly articulated how to measure mentoring success
- Issues of equity and inclusion can be pervasive and under-addressed in mentoring relationships.
- Mentors may take on the role of supervisor which can be in direct conflict with the mentoring role
- It can be difficult to balance formal mentorship structures while trying to prevent rigidity.
- Faculty are unaware of university level mentoring resources

Summary of Future Applications and Recommendations:
- Schools and programs should begin their mentoring activities by clearly articulating the promotions standards for all types of faculty in their academic unit. Mentoring activities need to map on to promotion standards.
- Institutional supports need to be well articulated and advertised
- Faculty need to be provided training on the mentoring relationship
- Mentoring activities need to incorporate more focus on work-life balance
- Specific supports for historically marginalized communities need to be purposefully and transparently part of mentoring structures
- Formal mentoring assessment tools need to be developed

Proposed scope of work for 2018-2019 Academic Year:
- Development of formal assessment tools for mentoring that map on to both promotion criteria and CET's mentoring awards guidelines
- Development of a formalized technical assistance program for supporting academic units in creating mentoring plans that support a culture of mentoring

(Following are the sub-committee reports from which these general findings were extracted.)

JOINT COMMITTEE ON MENTORING
Roski School of Art and Design & Provost/Senate Committee on Mentoring

Final Report (Spring 2018)

Edgar Arceneaux (Roski), Timotei Centea (Viterbi), Patty Chang (Roski),
Velina Hasu Houston (Dramatic Arts), Rima Jubran (CHLA), Dorian Traube (Social Work),
Ewa Wojciak (Roski), Alexis Zoto (Roski)

1. **<u>Introduction</u>**

This sub-committee report summarizes and synthesizes discussions and lessons-learned related to mentoring from meetings between members of the Provost/Senate Committee on Mentoring and faculty from the Roski School of Art and Design. The main purpose of the collaboration was to investigate the relevance and applicability of the mentoring guidelines prepared by the Provost/Senate Committee in prior years to an academic unit such as Roski, and to support their potential implementation within a unit-level faculty mentoring framework.

The report begins with a short introduction to the Roski School and the reasons underlying its selection as a partner. Then, strengths and challenges associated with mentoring within Roski (and similar schools) are discussed. Finally, the report concludes by summarizing the relevance and applicability of these findings to the broader context of mentoring at USC.

2. **<u>Description of the Roski School of Art and Design</u>**

The Roski School is devoted to education, research, and practice of art and design. Focal areas include studio art, design, curatorial practice, and critical studies, and interdisciplinary approaches are encouraged. The School offers multiple degree programs, including Bachelor of Art, Bachelor of Fine Art, Masters of Art and Masters of Fine Art. These degrees offer multiple specializations, including *Art*, *Design*, and *Curatorial Practices and the Public Sphere*.

Faculty members consist of tenured professors (full, associate) and non-tenure track members (professors of the practice, and associate/assistant professors of teaching and art or design). Faculty are divided into three disciplines (Art, Design, and Critical Studies) although interdisciplinarity is encouraged.

The Roski School of Art and Design was selected as a partner by the Provost/Senate Committee because (1) it is an art school, with potentially unique faculty responsibilities, (2) the faculty composition is diverse in terms of discipline and class, and (3) the School does not currently have a comprehensive mentoring framework for faculty.

3. **<u>Current Mentoring Practices and Strength</u>**

Mentoring within Roski has typically consisted of *ad hoc* peer-to-peer advice and support, typically between faculty in related disciplines and with comparable professional responsibilities. Moreover, senior faculty have assisted junior members in specific tasks, also on an individual

basis. Such mentoring has been described as valuable and welcome because it (1) helped navigate internal procedures at USC, (2) led to useful advice on specific topics (e.g., submitting successful grant applications), and (3) provided emotional and moral support. Faculty members emphasized that the warm, helping atmosphere among faculty facilitated peer-to-peer advice-giving, and suggested that informal mentoring is preferable to increased governance and a more rigid mentorship structure.

4. **Challenges to Mentoring**

The nature and composition of Roski (and, likely, of similar academic units) can pose the following challenges for effective mentoring of faculty:

- Mentoring requires well-articulated responsibilities and goals for faculty, including clear criteria for evaluation, and transparent pathways for promotion and advancement. Within this sub-committee, the lack of clear requirements and procedures for advancement and promotion (particularly for RTPC personnel) was identified as the most significant issue, because without such guidance, mentoring is directionless.

- The faculty is diverse (e.g., tenure-line vs. RTPC, senior vs. junior) and divided into sub-units (i.e., Art, Design). This internal structure can create barriers and hierarchies that hinder the formation of effective mentor-mentee relationships, and can prevent faculty from finding mentors with relevant expertise and experiences. This issue could be particularly significant in units with a small number of highly-specialized faculty members.

- Within art schools, academic work and promotion/advancement are informed by the artistic practices of faculty members. However, practices are diverse and can often take place off-campus. How can mentoring (and evaluation) reconcile academic performance with success in outside work? How are on-campus and off-campus success evaluated in tandem, and how can mentoring navigate this ? How can policies be defined to enable effective mentorship of faculty with diverse practices? How does one find suitable mentors?

5. **Applicability and Lessons-Learned**

Discussions led to the following broad lessons-learned, which are relevant to the Roski School but broadly applicable to mentoring at USC:

- Mentoring is one element of a larger framework for ensuring faculty success. Two other critical elements were identified: (1) *tenure, advancement, and promotion pathways* with well-defined requirements and protocols for both tenure-track and RTPC faculty, and (2) *institutional support systems* that provide assistance and information (e.g., databases for grant applications, manuals for developing research proposals, staff that can assist with logistics). Mentoring can alleviate but not overcome the absence of these elements, nor can it be fully effective without them.

- Sometimes, non-tenure-track faculty are (or feel) excluded from faculty-centered events, or provided with fewer opportunities for success, promotion, and advancement than tenure-line counterparts. These inequalities can contribute to a feeling that RTPC faculty form a second-class population. Improvements to mentoring of RTPC faculty should be accompanied by other university-wide efforts to increase inclusion, clarify pathways for advancement, and support success.

- Certain academic units are composed of highly specialized and/or sub-divided faculty, for which job responsibilities, definitions of success, and pathways for advancement are diverse and/or difficult to generalize. Such units could encounter difficulty in adhering to broadly-worded university guidelines on mentoring.

The sub-committee has identified the following characteristics of an ideal mentoring practice for Roski. This template is likely applicable to other art schools, and relevant to most academic units. Mentorship should:

- Help faculty navigate internal processes at USC, including those associated with regular duties (teaching, research, practice) and those related to tenure, promotion, and advancement.

- Support the artistic practice of the faculty member both on-campus and off-campus (since external activities inform and enrich academic work, and influence performance evaluations).

- Provide an element of coaching that enables the faculty member to navigate the human and personal dimensions of professional life, in addition to navigating the institution.

- Help faculty members leverage the prior experiences of others, and learn from mistakes. This aspect is likely to be particularly important for the creative arts, in which academic duties are diverse and success is not as easily defined as, for example, in the sciences.

- Provide networking opportunities inside the School and enable community-building across the university, particularly if interdisciplinarity and convergence are prized. To support this idea, multiple dimensions of connectivity should be available. For example, faculty could be assigned a mentor within the School (or sub-unit), as well as access to external mentors. When discussing this point, committee members raised the idea of an university-wide interdisciplinary forum of rotating mentors and mentees, in which non-traditional mentoring relationships could be formed and previously-unknown opportunities could be identified.

- Focus on creating an informal, personal connection between mentor and mentee, rather than a relationship based on formality or hierarchy. Several faculty members promoted the idea of less governance, but more human interactions.

- Count as a portion of the service contribution of mentoring faculty members, and be considered when allocating service work as well as during annual performance reviews.

Provost's and Academic Senate Mentoring Sub-Committee Report on
USC Leonard Davis School of Gerontology Mentoring for Faculty and Postdoctoral Scholars

Compiled by: Briana Hinga, Diana York Blaine, Judy Garner, and Janette Brown

I. Overview
This report focuses on mentorship for faculty and post-doctoral scholars at the USC Leonard Davis School of Gerontology. Data from this report is based on two meetings between a four-person sub-committee of the Joint Senate and Provost's Mentoring Committee Task force and 2) three representatives from the school of Gerontology (including two tenured faculty members and one post-doctoral scholar). The report is broken down into three sections below: strengths, challenges, and applications.

II. Strengths
Representatives from the USC Leonard Davis School of Gerontology reported several strengths of their mentorship structure, including: small size of the faculty; a faculty-lead monthly Academic Advancement Forum (AAF); mentoring assignments to each junior faculty member; and support for leadership. There is a growing desire to support postdoctoral scholars, which we view as a strength. Support for post-doctoral scholars is also reported as a challenge, within this report. Lastly, Leonard Davis School of Gerontology representatives mentioned alternative paths to mentoring which supplement their within school mentoring programs. Each of these points is further explained below.

Small Size of Faculty. USC Leonard Davis School of Gerontology includes about 24 tenured track faculty and less than 60 total faculty including RTPC. The school is smaller than most. It was described as a "close knit community." Gerontology faculty tend to be on campus often with doors that are always open. This small community lends itself to a "multi-mentor" model, where faculty can reach out many different faculty members for a variety of reasons.

Monthly Academic Advancement Forum (AAF) for Junior Faculty. For the last five years, USC Leonard Davis School of Gerontology has hosted an Academic Advancement forum (AAF) once per month. This is a space run by faculty, designed to mentor junior tenure track and RTPC faculty. In the School of Gerontology there are 14 junior faculty members of which 8 – 10 (or an estimated 70 to 90 percent) show up each month for meetings. While post-docs are welcomed to join the space, this is not targeted to post-docs specifically.

The meetings cover a variety of topics (e.g., interpersonal relationships, promotion) meant to help junior faculty development. Every other month, there is set structure for meetings, driven by senior faculty who facilitate AAF. In the alternating months, the topic for the meeting is driven by the junior faculty members. In other words, a couple of junior faculty members are asked to come up with a topic they want more information about. Then, the leaders AAF (two tenured faculty members) arrange a workshop on this topic. Workshops include guest speakers and information sessions. The faculty driven agenda has worked well to understand the needs of junior faculty.

Mentor Assignments for Junior Faculty. Each junior faculty member is assigned a mentor to bounce ideas off of and to navigate promotion. This model seems to work fairly well but there is

no formal evaluation of the model in place. Additionally, not everyone utilizes their mentor very often. Note: AAF was designed to fill gaps in individual mentorship assignments, where information was not being passed from mentor to mentee.

Mentoring for Post-Doctoral Researchers. The strength of post-doctoral mentoring varies by individual. There is not a strong structure for post-doctoral researchers. While supports are not widely communicated or utilized, there are a few supports in place. One assistant professor in the USC Leonard Davis School of Gerontology organized a postdoc mentoring forum. However, this has not been as well attended as the AAF. Gerontology also has a few multidisciplinary training grants that cut across different disciplines. Some post-docs are supported through the training grant. They attend weekly meetings and get mentorship from the training grant.

Support from Leadership. Gerontology leadership is incredibly supportive. The dean supports AAF through purchasing food for the meetings and bringing in speakers. Often, the leadership attends trainings as well. Additionally, senior faculty members are willing to come in and speak at these meetings.

Outside mentoring. One faculty representative mentioned being on the Gerontological Society mentoring committee. In this case, he is matched with a mentor who virtually mentors him until a face to face meeting at their annual meeting. This representative noted that online meets are a helpful way to supplement face to face mentoring

II. Challenges
Representatives from the USC Leonard Davis School of Gerontology exemplified continual dialogue about their mentorship structure, that brought to light several challenges to their mentorship, including: defining the role of mentors; structural support for post-doctoral scholars; equity and inclusion; peer-mentoring and in-service training; navigating how much structure mentorship should include; navigating the wide range of faculty and postdoctoral needs; training for mentors; and measuring effectiveness of their mentorships. Each point is further described below.

Defining the Role of Mentors. The USC Leonard Davis School of Gerontology is challenged by the question of "What is the role of the mentor if not prompted for by the mentee?" It would be useful to have a workshop on this. There are lots of workshops on getting mentoring but giving mentoring workshops can be refined.

Structural Support for Post-Doctoral Scholars. Mentoring for post-doctoral scholars does not have a strong institutional structure. While every post-doc has a mentor, the quality of mentorship they receive is largely dependent on their Principle Investigator (PI). Another problem to creating a strong structure is the relatively short turnaround for many postdoctoral positions. While one workshops series at the Leonard Davis School of Gerontology has been organized for postdocs, the workshops have not been widely communicated and are not well attended.

Equity and Inclusion. There is no structural support to specifically target historically marginalized populations through mentoring. Rather, there is one on one support that should lend itself to unveiling whether individuals need further support.

Peer Mentoring and In-Service Training. There is a continual conversation taking place in the school of Gerontology to assess current mentoring structures and figure out how to improve the mentoring structures. Peer mentoring and in-service training are a few ideas that have stemmed from these conversations. For example, when faculty have been informally asked if they would be interested in peer mentoring, everyone raised their hand. However, this has not been put into not put it in practice in a formal manner. Likewise, in-service training for faculty to develop different skills has been requested, but is not something currently offered.

Navigating Structure versus Organic Process. The USC Leonard Davis School of Gerontology representatives explained the challenge of deciding whether there should there be a strict schedule or set of reminders to for mentors to follow rather than expecting that it happens organically.

Wide Range of Faculty and Postdoctoral Needs. Faculty at the Leonard Davis School of Gerontology cross a wide-range of disciplines and play a variety of roles. This makes it difficult to provide mentorship that fits everyone's needs, within the AAF. Many topics are chosen that should help everyone (e.g., career development, promotion, how to discuss research to a lay audience) but each individual has specific needs and guidelines to promotion vary by position.

Training for the Mentor. The structure of the Leonard Davis School of Gerontology sets up communication between mentor and mentee, where the mentor is obligated to reach out to mentee. One aspect that would be useful to senior faculty is figuring out how to engage the person they provide mentoring for, how to handle being turned down, and exploration of other ways they can provide mentoring.

Measuring Effectiveness. While the Leonard Davis School of Gerontology would like to measure the effectiveness of their mentoring, they have not fully discussed how to do this yet. Part of the success anecdotally is the success and promotion of their faculty. Also, they receive positive feedback about the AAF forum. However, they are looking for ways to quantify what success means and what areas for improvement look like. They want the measurement to be blinded and they want to use evaluations to drive their mentorship structure.

III. Applications
The process of learning about the USC Leonard Davis School of Gerontology mentoring structure brought to light several lessons for practice. These applications are listed below:

1) The USC Leonard Davis School of Gerontology would like support in figuring out how to evaluate their mentoring structures.

2) Continued dialogue about mentoring helps create a culture of inquiry and progress in mentoring structures.

3) Offering a wide range of mentorship opportunities (e.g., forums and individual mentoring) is useful to supporting junior faculty and postdoctoral researchers along a variety of needs.

4) Specific supports for historically marginalized communities (including faculty and postdocs of color and women in gerontology) need to be purposefully and transparently part of the mentoring structure. Otherwise, ahistorical and colorblind practices may invisibalize/minimize the larger structures at play within individual mentoring relationships.

5) Our future evaluation projects need to include voices of underrepresented faculty and postdoctoctoral scholars to ensure we are hearing a range of perspectives and not only perspectives of those who mentoring works for.

Mentoring Sub-Committee Report on ITP

In spring of 2018 a sub-committee of the Mentoring Committee focused on a case study of the Information Technology Program (ITP) within the Viterbi School of Engineering. ITP is a relatively small department within Viterbi, with about 50 faculty (17 of whom are full-time) who are 100% RTPC (non-tenure track) teaching faculty.

ITP has had a formal mentoring program for the past 5 years, with a primary mentor assigned to each part-time and full-time faculty and general guidelines sent out about mentoring activities. It does not have as formal a mentoring program as some departments, in terms of clearly defined policies, goals, and milestones.

A panel of faculty were included in a series of meetings to discuss their experiences, along with supplemental individual interviews. A survey was also sent to all ITP faculty.

The survey had about a 50% response rate. 88% of ITP faculty considered themselves to have at least one mentor, but only 32% had an active or regularly scheduled relationship with their mentor, which therefore required proactive contact with/to their mentor. It also highlighted areas that many faculty felt they received *no mentoring or knowledge*, including university mentoring resources, knowledge of university policies and general resources, and inclusion and diversity.

Below are the main mentoring observations/takeaways from group meetings and individual interviews with ITP faculty:

- In the most successful mentoring experiences, faculty had secondary/supplemental mentors in specific areas, in addition to their primary mentor.
- Department could have clearer guidelines as to expectations and responsibilities for mentorees and mentors. The guidelines compiled by the University Committee on Mentoring were broadly useful, but not concrete or specific enough to act as a model for a department like ITP to use.
- While the department circulates a list of suggested mentoring activities, there is no formal set of guidelines or practices for mentoring.
- Most cited lack of tangible mentoring was in the area of promotion. Faculty widely feel uninformed about the overall promotion process and (Viterbi) School guidelines for promotion, and generally are not mentored in planning out a strategy and timeline for their personal promotion. Oftentimes it is not until a faculty applies for a promotion that they discover the requirements for promotion in the School, including that the School's promotion criteria and metrics for success are often different than those of their department and director.
- Second most cited mentoring deficit was in the area of broader School and University knowledge. Many faculty were unaware of faculty resources for mentoring and career advancement. Most cited difficulty in making connections to the broader university. Many felt that beyond the onboarding process at USC, little focus, time or resources were put into broader knowledge of the university beyond suggestions to join committees.

- One common concern was that mentors be supportive advocates. Some faculty felt mentors acted more as supervisors, and in some cases the goals of mentors and mentees were in conflict.

In drilling down into successful and unsuccessful mentoring experiences, faculty cited as sourced of poor/unsuccessful mentoring experiences that mentors were:

- Too busy. They were not proactive, requiring mentees always reach out to them
- Closed minded
- Acts more as a supervisor than advocate
- Do not meet expectations of mentees

A number of faculty drew on industry mentoring experiences and policies to suggest ways that USC mentoring could learn/improve:

- Clearly defined expectations and metrics for success in the department.
- A program to shadow and learn from successful faculty, especially in the areas of teaching and curriculum.
- A gradual ramping up of duties and responsibilities. Many faculty cited struggles with being asked to write and teach brand new classes in their first year.

Appendix: Results of 2018 spring survey to all (PT and FT) faculty in ITP

Note: Results below are divided into three sections: combined, part-time only and full-time only.

Overall survey results (all): 50% response rate

Do you consider yourself to have at ITP

Field	Choice Count
No mentor	12.00%
One primary mentor	44.00%
One primary plus other supporting mentors	44.00%

Relationship with your mentor:

Field	Choice Count
None	12.00%
You had to contact your mentor whenever you wanted information or advice	56.00%
You and your mentor had a regular meeting schedule	16.00%
Your mentor was very proactive in meeting and checking in on your status and goals	16.00%

Through your mentor, you were supported with information, resources and advice on:

Field	No mentoring	Addressed but not supported	Some support	Extensive support
Rubrics and/or examples of good course, lecture and teaching practices	25.00%	25.00%	16.67%	33.33%
Promotion and career track	24.00%	12.00%	40.00%	24.00%
Clearly defined personal goals in department (for you)	20.00%	24.00%	40.00%	16.00%
Expectations of the department (of you)	24.00%	8.00%	48.00%	20.00%
Department (ITP) policies and resources	24.00%	8.00%	36.00%	32.00%
School and University policies and resources	32.00%	20.00%	24.00%	24.00%
Awareness of campus-wide mentoring centers and resources	56.00%	12.00%	12.00%	20.00%
Inclusion and diversity	40.00%	20.00%	16.00%	24.00%
Work/life balance	32.00%	8.00%	36.00%	24.00%
Networking information and opportunities within the School and University	28.00%	24.00%	20.00%	28.00%

Text feedback/comments:

Additional comments, observations or personal reflections on mentoring in y...

There are specified mentors, but mostly, the collective faculty pool would regularly share ideas and advice to all other faculty, including part-time faculty. It provided for a lot of feedback and help in areas and also naturally led to certain faculty being champions of certain aspects of mentorship, like expectations, career advancement, etc.

I haven't received much guidance. I've had to figure things out on my own and cobble together answers from various sources and people who had varying degrees of interest in helping.

My mentor did their best, and was a great resource for basic information. However, I found that there are many things mentor did not know or had misinformation on, which was not necessarily their fault. There are simply so many policies/resources/expectations that the department and USC as a whole offers. I wish there was a maintained guide of best practices (on teaching), common policies (such as AFR, what constitutes as service) that everyone could refer to. Furthermore, having a designated mentor is great but also it would be great to have regularly scheduled meetings with the ITP director. I feel that mentors should not be a replacement for meeting with the director. Mentors are not our boss, but it often feels like they are.

My mentor gave me all of the support I needed to do my job. As a temp I don't have higher issues (promotion, research, etc), so this is mostly just course content and working with TAs and students.

Of the 10 topics, I didn't need/want mentoring in half and they didn't really come up. I'm pleased with the mentoring I received, which was in areas I cared about but not on the above list, such as handling issues with students.

We don't actually meet that often, but my mentor has been invaluable to me in coming to understand, grow into and naviagte the logistics, culture, and opportunities at USC.

My Director is, I suppose, my mentor. I've been with ITP much longer than the Director (which I suppose means my response is no longer anonymous) and therefore I don't have many questions regarding what is expected, how to do my job, and who to see for certain tasks. The Director, however, has always been very supportive in activities I choose to support by adding who I could/should talk to. In addition, the faculty member whom I mentor is also a long time member of ITP and thus we share about the same "distant" relationship as I and my mentor do.

I'm not sure if all of these really apply to part-timers. For example, I don't have work/life balance issues as a part-timer so I haven't needed mentoring. I guess despite me checking "No mentoring" for most of them, I have a great mentor, and I can go to that person whenever I want and they are always helpful.

The responses are for my current mentor. My previous mentor provided me with more extensive support.

We try to meet at least once every couple of weeks. Most of the items were marked as "No Mentoring" because I did not have a need in those areas. Whenever I need advice my mentor was available regardless of how busy he was. I completely respect him.

My mentor was ALWAYS available when I needed questions answered or problems solved. But, there was not a lot of discussion of available campus resources or career growth. I will assume some of the blame - if "blame" is the right word - for not asking the right questions to spur discussion. I feel that I am supported in my teaching, but unaware of anything outside the department.

Results filtered by full-time faculty responses: 70% response rate

Do you consider yourself to have at ITP

Field	Choice Count
No mentor	8.33%
One primary mentor	33.33%
One primary plus other supporting mentors	58.33%

Relationship with your mentor:

Field	Choice Count
None	12.00%
You had to contact your mentor whenever you wanted information or advice	56.00%
You and your mentor had a regular meeting schedule	16.00%
Your mentor was very proactive in meeting and checking in on your status and goals	16.00%

Through your mentor, you were supported with information, resources and advice on:

Field	No mentoring	Addressed but not supported	Some support	Extensive support
Rubrics and/or examples of good course, lecture and teaching practices	25.00%	25.00%	16.67%	33.33%
Promotion and career track	24.00%	12.00%	40.00%	24.00%
Clearly defined personal goals in department (for you)	20.00%	24.00%	40.00%	16.00%
Expectations of the department (of you)	24.00%	8.00%	48.00%	20.00%
Department (ITP) policies and resources	24.00%	8.00%	36.00%	32.00%
School and University policies and resources	32.00%	20.00%	24.00%	24.00%
Awareness of campus-wide mentoring centers and resources	56.00%	12.00%	12.00%	20.00%
Inclusion and diversity	40.00%	20.00%	16.00%	24.00%
Work/life balance	32.00%	8.00%	36.00%	24.00%
Networking information and opportunities within the School and University	28.00%	24.00%	20.00%	28.00%

Results filtered by part-time faculty responses: 40% response rate

Do you consider yourself to have at ITP

Field	Choice Count
No mentor	15.38%
One primary mentor	53.85%
One primary plus other supporting mentors	30.77%

Relationship with your mentor:

Field	Choice Count
None	15.38%
You had to contact your mentor whenever you wanted information or advice	38.46%
You and your mentor had a regular meeting schedule	23.08%
Your mentor was very proactive in meeting and checking in on your status and goals	23.08%

Through your mentor, you were supported with information, resources and advice on:

Field	No mentoring	Addressed but not supported	Some support	Extensive support
Rubrics and/or examples of good course, lecture and teaching practices	16.67%	25.00%	25.00%	33.33%
Promotion and career track	30.77%	15.38%	38.46%	15.38%
Clearly defined personal goals in department (for you)	15.38%	30.77%	38.46%	15.38%
Expectations of the department (of you)	15.38%	15.38%	53.85%	15.38%
Department (ITP) policies and resources	23.08%	7.69%	46.15%	23.08%
School and University policies and resources	23.08%	23.08%	30.77%	23.08%
Awareness of campus-wide mentoring centers and resources	46.15%	15.38%	15.38%	23.08%
Inclusion and diversity	30.77%	15.38%	15.38%	38.46%
Work/life balance	30.77%	7.69%	23.08%	38.46%
Networking information and opportunities within the School and University	23.08%	23.08%	15.38%	38.46%

Committee on Mentoring Guidelines for Effective Mentorship

Mentoring Committee's Definition of Mentoring: Mentoring is an exchange of knowledge gained through personal experiences. It is designed to build individual relationships between experienced faculty and faculty and post-doctoral scholars striving to succeed within a discipline. Mentors support the mentee in meeting his or her goals through questioning, providing guidance and feedback, sharing of experiences, and connecting the mentee with other individuals or groups who can provide assistance and resources. Every mentoring relationship will unfold differently based on the individuals involved. The purpose of mentoring is not to tell the mentee what to do, but to help the mentee make his or her own informed decisions.

Effective mentors offer the following:

- *Information and Advice*
  Mentors share their knowledge, experiences, and wisdom to guide mentees in reaching academic, career, and personal goals.
- *Contacts*
  Mentors provide valuable opportunities by facilitating academic, career, and personal contacts.
- *Support*
  Mentors encourage growth and achievement by providing an open and supportive environment.
- *Goal Setting*
  Mentors help mentees discover talents and interests and define and attain their goals.
- *Role Models*
  By modeling a strong work ethic, engaging in respectful relationships with colleagues and students, and behaving with integrity and principle, mentors can become role models.

Step 1: Ensure goodness of fit between mentor and mentee based on career track, expertise, and experience.

- **Be cognizant of the mentees career track**: Tenure Track Faculty, Research Faculty, Teaching Faculty, Practice Faculty, and Post-Doctoral Scholars to ensure that goals and opportunities match career expectations.
  - o **Also consider rank –** associate professors need mentorship too**.**
  - o **There is a specific value proposition of having a mentor group of mixed composition (e.g. RTPC/tenure/emeriti faculty) that can also be considered.**
- **Clearly define career goals in keeping with mentee's role:** Examples may include gaining promotion and/or tenure, expanding research impact to a national or international scale, prestigious performance opportunities, securing employment in private industry or academia, developing cutting edge teaching approaches, learning how to write a manuscript, learning how to review a manuscript, learning how to write a grant, learning how to run a research program, navigating the university, engaging in community engaged research
- Clarify method of mentoring given mentee's goals. The method may differ if it is industry versus academia focused.

- **Identify other aspects important to the mentee's development where mentors can assist:** Work life balance, family, being a veteran, being a person of color, gender orientation
- **Identify both within the school, within the university, and within the profession mentors.**

Step 2: Identify touch points where mentorship can and should take place

- **Utilize Pre-existing USC mentoring opportunities**: Center for Excellence in Teaching, Former Mellon Mentoring Forum Efforts, Special Interest Groups(e.g. WiSE), Office of Research Mentoring Plan, Office of Postdoctoral Affairs
- **Develop mentoring plans and meeting schedules** with mentee that account for key goals in their developmental timeline
  - Post-Doctoral fellows should complete an Independent Development Plan (IDP) following the outlined format provided by the Office of Post-Doctoral Affairs. Each academic unit should establish a mechanism for reviewing, approving, and monitoring progress of IDPs.
- Include award nomination processes in mentorship plans

Step 3: Utilize best practices in mentoring

- **Intentionality** (having a clear vision for your role as a mentor, commitment to excellence in mentoring, and a clear understanding of the mentee's goals)**.**
- Being **prepared** for mentorship duties
- Good **communication** and **feedback**
- **Trustworthiness** (follow policies and guidelines, make expectations clear, maintain a positive tone, demonstrate concern)
- **Motivate** and **empower**
- **Share resource network** while being careful to not damage that network
- Allocate appropriate **time** to mentoring duties
- Be clear about your **expertise** or knowledge base
- **Evaluate** effectiveness of mentoring
- Attention to **diversity**

Step 4: Develop Institutional Structures within and across Academic Units to Support and Hone Mentorship

- **Create networking opportunities to develop mentorship collectives that support mentorship outside of academic units and across campus (see Harvard Business Review** https://hbr.org/2016/04/the-benefits-of-virtual-mentors**, resurrect Baxter**)**.**
- **Provost's Office or academic units could offer small grants for lunch, meetings, or programs to foster development of affinity mentorship groups.**
- **Identify point people in each academic unit to disseminate and hone mentoring initiatives germane to their field.**
- **Utilize Emeriti Center for mentorship networks.**

- Develop institutional **incentives** for mentoring within academic units
  - Formats for evaluating and rewarding mentoring.
  - Develop formal mentoring structures for all faculty and post-doctoral trainees (e.g. mentoring committees, mentoring oversight committees, cross-disciplinary networks)
  - Provide meeting incentives for mentoring committees (e.g. refreshments, travel for external mentors, honorarium for external mentors)
  - Sanction individuals who have demonstrated poor mentorship quality. In the case of mentoring post-doctoral fellows, academic units could refuse to allow mentors to submit proposals that included post-doctoral fellows if they had a sustained trajectory of providing poor mentorship.
- **Reduce redundancy** with other mentor training programs at USC.
  - The Provost's Office, Center for Excellence in Teaching, and several discipline specific special interest groups have mentor training programs that can be utilized.
  - The USC Faculty Portal lists senior faculty liaisons who are primarily focused on issues of diversity. This focus should be expanded to include all types of faculty (e.g. Tenure track, RTPC, and part-time faculty)
- **Identify why your faculty and post-doctoral scholars are not using current mentoring programs**
  - They have not heard of the efforts
  - No centralization of mentoring
  - No long term oversight
  - Not applicable to my career goals
  - Not required or incentivized
  - Do not think it is valuable
  - Systematically overlooking certain populations of faculty or post-doctoral scholars
- Create network and mentorship opportunities across academic units and provide diverse and interdisciplinary opportunities for mentorship.
- Smaller unit response may necessitate hiring outside mentors or pooling mentorship efforts with other units.
- Develop structured protocols for mentees to be able to troubleshoot mentorship issues.

Step 5: Vice Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs Oversight of Faculty Mentoring

- **Formal mentoring plans from each academic unit should be filed with the Vice-Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs Office**.
- Mentoring plans should **incorporate promotion standards** based on type of faculty
- Mentoring plans for post-doctoral fellows should include mechanisms for the review and enforcement of IDP plans. All units should promote plans and infrastructure that support the post-doctoral fellow's pursuit of both academic and non-academic career options.
- The Provost's office should conduct an **annual audit** of every unit's mentorship plan to ensure effective implementation
- Any new line of faculty or post-doctoral trainees added to a unit must be included in the formal mentorship plans.

- **Deans and program directors should be evaluated** on their unit specific mentoring plans

Additional Recommendations for Post-Doctoral Fellows:

- Each academic unit needs to identify which positions qualify as post-doctoral fellows. These may include research associate positions, etc. They also need to develop goals germane to each type of post-doctoral position.
- The University and Academic Units needs to find ways to prevent the possible of abuse of post-doctoral fellow category as a cost savings mechanism and urge units to assign people to fixed term appointments or a research associate appointments.
- The recommendations should not be applied to residents at Keck and CHLA because they already have a highly regulated mentorship structure. However, those fellows that are in individual labs should be included.
- Academic units are encouraged to include post-doctoral fellows in the development of mentorship plans, review of mentorship plans, and mentoring procedures in each academic unit.
- Discipline specific career development programming should be offered to post-doctoral fellows.