University of Washington, Tacoma
School of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences
Decennial Review Report
Site Visit Dates: May 22 and 23, 2017
Final Report Submitted, July 19, 2017

Submitted by:

Christine Harold — Associate Professor, Department of Communication
UW Seattle
(Committee Chair)

Kari Lerum — Associate Professor, School of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences, UW Bothell

Sukhwant Jhaj — Vice Provost for Academic Innovation and Student Success, Academic Affairs, Portland State University, Portland, OR

Louis Mendoza — Professor and Director, School of Humanities, Arts and Cultural Studies, Arizona State University, West Campus, Phoenix, AZ

SUMMARY

UW Tacoma, and the School of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences (herein SIAS) specifically, fills an important niche in the state of Washington, serving an interdisciplinary education to a diverse urban population -- many of whom are first generation, students of color, and non-traditionally aged students. It is evident that students, faculty, and the larger community all recognize its value. The SIAS administration, faculty, and staff appear genuinely committed to providing a robust interdisciplinary curriculum to their diverse student body.

UW Tacoma and SIAS have experienced dramatic change and expansion in recent years. This committee's impression is that SIAS is comprised of a dynamic and vibrant community of scholars and student advocates who very much want to make the most of the opportunities this growth affords. At the same time, rapidly escalating growth has brought a number of significant challenges that demand concerted and immediate attention.

While the administrators, faculty, and staff of SIAS seem to share a common understanding of many of their challenges, they collectively appear to remain at an impasse as to how to address them. The observations and recommendations made in this report are intended to specify key challenges, struggles, and points of conflict faced by SIAS at UWT and to recommend strategies for addressing these issues while staying true to its mission. This report is organized around central challenges and recommendations for three interrelated components of SIAS: 1) *School vision & organizational structure*, 2) *Faculty & staff experiences*, and 3) *Student experiences*.

For the sake of candor, the committee must note upfront that the morale among SIAS faculty and staff is strikingly low. Good will and the flow of communication is demonstrably strained between administration and the rest of the School. However, because there remains a shared commitment to the mission of UW Tacoma and SIAS, this committee believes that the will and the ability to make the necessary improvements to this rich and innovative program are in abundance.

Principal Recommendations to SIAS

- Engage in a coordinated, transparent, and strategic planning process to address the structural inefficiencies of the School. Fully support the recently established "structure task force" and prioritize a collaborative effort to reconsider the current divisional structure based on its findings.
- Address the pervasive perception that communication and decision making in SIAS is overly administrative and opaque.
- Take immediate steps to address the service workload for faculty. Alleviating some of this burden, even if only a short term fix while larger structural solutions are being explored, would go a long way toward raising faculty morale, a central barrier to the School's effectivity.
- Incorporate a strategic School-wide plan for increasing diversity at all levels.

Background and Process
On March 27, 2017, Vice Provost and Dean David L. Eaton and Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Planning Rebecca Aanerud of the Graduate School, charged the review committee (composed of two internal UW faculty members and two external members) with the task of assessing the quality of the Masters in Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences (herein MAIS) program within SIAS and providing constructive suggestions for strengthening the MAIS program. Because the MAIS program is intricately embedded within the larger SIAS the committee's work entailed a review of SIAS as a whole.

The committee conducted a site visit on May 22 and 23, 2017, in which they met with SIAS administration, faculty, staff, and students. The committee formed the observations and recommendations detailed in this report by considering 1) in-person meetings with administrators, faculty, staff, and students during the site visit, 2) the SIAS self-study and 3) a subsequent on-line, anonymous survey of faculty and staff using the same self-study questions designed by the Graduate School.

The SIAS self-study survey questions were posed as follows:
1. How does the distinctive interdisciplinary and urban-serving mission and curriculum of SIAS address the intellectual and educational needs of undergraduate and graduate students in the geographical areas we serve?
2. How well is the current structure serving the needs of faculty, staff, and students?
3. How manageable is the current faculty and staff workload?

In response to several faculty members' expressed concerns that they had not been given adequate time to read or respond full to the initial self study, at the exit discussion concluding the site visit, the review committee made the immediate recommendation that

SIAS administrators establish an anonymous online survey for an extended period of two weeks so that SIAS faculty and staff could have ample opportunity to offer feedback on the self-study questions.

During this two-week comment period, the review committee heard from a small handful of faculty members who reported that they and their colleagues had concerns the online survey was not 100% anonymous and they were therefore reluctant to offer candid feedback. In an effort to ensure as many faculty and staff members as possible had the opportunity to engage in the process without hesitation or concern over anonymity, the Graduate School administered its own survey posing the same questions and asked SIAS administration to close theirs.

Note: Neither the review committee, nor the Graduate School has any evidence the SIAS administered survey was not anonymous, but nonetheless wanted to alleviate any concerns that may have prevented SIAS faculty from participating.

Brief Overview of the SIAS at UWT
In 2014, UW Tacoma's Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences program became a school, in an effort to manage its rapid growth and better serve its constituents. While it maintained a non-departmentalized structure, the new SIAS subdivided into five divisions: *Culture, Art and Communication* (CAC); *Politics, Philosophy and Public Affairs* (PPPA); *Science and Mathematics* (SAM); *Social, Behavioral and Human Sciences* (SBHS); and *Social and Historical Studies* (SHS). These five divisions were established based on research areas in an effort to foster community and streamline communication among faculty while also continuing to support the faculty's commitment to interdisciplinary research and teaching. The divisions vary widely in terms of size and degree of affiliation between specialty areas. Eighteen undergraduate majors are clustered within the five divisions; in contrast, students in the MAIS program may receive mentoring from faculty across all 5 divisions. Striking the difficult balance between establishing a unified, interdisciplinary mission while also allowing for more localized, divisional control has proven a challenge at both the undergraduate and graduate level of instruction and governance.

In 2016, Dr. Anne Bartlett was appointed the first permanent dean of the new School of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences. Serving with Dean Bartlett on the administrative team is Dr. Rikki Thompson (Associate Dean for Curriculum and Academic Initiatives), Dr. Chris Demaske (Associate Dean for Faculty and Student Affairs), and Patricia Kruse (Director of Administration and Operations). The faculty, at the time of this report, is composed of approximately 130 members of varying ranks with at least 10 new hires planned for 2017-18. Just over half of the current faculty is tenure-track. SIAS employs 19 permanent staff members.

1. SCHOOL VISION & ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Organizational Structure and Governance

In addition to the four top administrative positions described above (Dean, Associate Dean for Curriculum & Academic Initiates, Associate Dean for Faculty & Student Affairs, and Director of Administration and Operations), SIAS currently hosts a number of other governing structures. This includes the Shared Leadership council, the Faculty Council, the graduate Steering committee, and the Committee of Division Chairs. In addition, Divisions have their own internal governing structures including Division Chairs, faculty, and some have Major Coordinators, tasked with curriculum and scheduling issues and setting hiring priorities.[1]

While on paper it appears that there is an enormous and complex structure of governance opportunities for faculty (both within Divisions and across SIAS), the faculty we heard from reported a lack of efficiency for utilizing faculty-governance. As we detail in this section, this results in overburdened service loads as well as widespread frustration and alienation.

Divisional Structure

While the divisional structure of SIAS has served to organize the school into clusters of faculty researching and teaching in similar areas, this organizational structure has resulted in several challenges:

- Many faculty commented that the Divisions (and Division chairs) have no budget, little meaningful decision making authority or support regarding personnel and other important policy issues relevant to the faculty they represent.
- At the same time Divisions seem not to be incentivized to work together toward a common vision for SIAS. Instead it appears that Divisions may be more often than not competing with one another for resources.
- This combination of a lack of autonomy combined with a lack of incentivization for the common good of SIAS contributes to some faculty advocating for their division to separate from the SIAS and/or to departmentalize. Others, still, expressed concern that departmentalization seems like a "foregone conclusion" without adequate public deliberation.
- Frustrations at the Divisional level also contribute to a larger perception that the leadership and service of faculty at lower levels of SIAS are underappreciated and underutilized at higher levels of the organization. More than one Division Chair described feeling less like a leader or representative for their faculty and more like a staff member executing orders from on high. As one put it, "we're often left out of the loop, when if consulted, we could be of use."

---

[1] For visual detail, see SIAS Program Review document, Appendix A: School Organization chart, p. 30.

Numerous faculty members felt that the current governance structure is dysfunctional and detracts from their experience on multiple levels. There is a sense that for most faculty, participation in faculty governance is:

- limited to participating in work groups where recommendations to administrators in SIAS are rarely acted upon,
- an inefficient and draining use of faculty expertise, time and energy, and
- takes away from efforts to create stronger programs, build community, and cultivate a shared sense of purpose across program areas within the school.

Personnel matters are perhaps the most overwhelming demand on faculty time under the current structure. One faculty member noted that the faculty had reviewed files and voted on over 200 personnel matters that school year alone. The impossibility of adequately reviewing that many files leaves many faculty members feeling that this important work is rendered meaningless in practice. Further, many faculty noted that the mandate that they vote on personnel matters far outside their areas of expertise does not make sense, is inappropriate, and ultimately diminishes the authority of faculty experts.

Many faculty connected the problems of governance with the structure of the school. In particular, it appears that the high level of service/governance expected is both overwhelming in terms of time and inefficient in terms of impact. Comments from faculty include:

- "The current structure is not tenable. It requires unreasonably high levels of service that reduce the quality of governance."
- "SIAS is unwieldy, and so leaves many faculty, staff and students feeling like their voices are ignored, and like decisions are made without transparency. In fact, it might just be too big."
- "I have found the structure a constant source of frustration (both in trying to get this accomplished personally, such as figuring out who to talk to deal with administrative issues, and in the constant waste of time in unproductive meetings)."
- "While structure is problematic, some of this is independent of it. But it is exacerbated by our relatively unfunctioning division structure."
- "It does not serve anyone. It creates so much unnecessary administrative overhead and bureaucracy."
- The current structure is unwieldy. It seems to skew between micromanagement of a large school (e.g. the proposed new scheduling process) to DIY (little to no budget or staff support for divisions).
- "[The structure] does not serve anyone. It creates so much unnecessary administrative overhead and bureaucracy. Students and faculty are equally confused who does what."
- "[The structure works] not at all. Staff are removed from students (except advisors, who are great). Faculty are disengaged and discouraged, as there is very little sense that the administrative structure."

Although opinions about solutions seem to differ, online and in-person comments from faculty and staff on the issue of SIAS's structure were overwhelmingly negative. The above quotes are merely a representative sample.

Communication between Administration and Faculty/Staff
The perceived centralization of decision making and lack of organization in the SIAS administration is exacerbated by what many faculty and staff members see as poor processes of communication between themselves and administrators. The resounding message from the faculty and staff we heard from in person and online was that communication lacked *transparency* and *timeliness*, resulting in a profound lack of *trust* that they are legitimate participants in the life of the department. Representative sentiments expressed by faculty include:

- "leadership seems to be scrambling all the time"
- "we always hear about things last minute, when it's already a rush"
- "the leadership team seems to have closed ranks"
- "we only hear about things after they've already been decided"
- "decisions aren't transparent, they feel like edicts from on high"
- "lines of communication and responsibility are seldom clear"
- "poor communication outside the leadership team"
- "My view: the top must be more transparent (about what's to be decided, who will decide it, what was decided, + where to find the relevant bylaw)"

Many faculty members pointed to the site-study itself as indicative of what they see as a top-down approach to school business. We heard in person and in writing from several members that the self-study was written without their input. Faculty were brought into the loop after the study was already completed and only then were invited to provide feedback via catalyst.

Representative comments:

- "We are hopelessly dysfunctional. This self-study is a case in point--it was done, as far as I can ascertain, with virtually no input from us, the faculty. Why? Because getting input from such an unwieldy concatenation of people is simply too complicated and time-consuming and so it went like most things go around here: top-down and administration-heavy, faculty governance-light...We Need A New Structure."
- "The report contains important inaccuracies, misrepresentations, and outdated information. Some parts reflect partial understanding, or some fundamental understanding of SIAS faculty, our curriculum, or our collective goals and challenges. These shortcomings stem from the hurried nature of the report…"

Note: Regarding the above problems with the self-study, the review committee recognizes that SIAS had recently hired a new dean, and that some internal miscommunications required the dean to rush to complete the study before the graduate school's deadline.

In sum, although we did not hear from even a majority of SIAS faculty members, those faculty and staff who did meet with us and/or share their views online overwhelmingly described an environment in which important decisions are hurried and disorganized, communication is centralized, unilateral, and lacking transparency, resulting in their feeling disempowered and out of the loop.

Masters in Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences (MAIS)
When discussing graduate education, a common theme that emerged from faculty, students, and staff involved in MAIS was the perceived lack of support for the MAIS program from SIAS administration. For example:

- A number of faculty indicated that the program is being surreptitiously phased out, without faculty input. (When asked about this, the Dean said that she had no plan for phasing out the MAIS).
- There is a perception that the administration devalues graduate courses due to lower enrollment, without consideration of the intellectual value and need for the course.
- There is no shared understanding of "compensation" or incentives for mentoring graduate students. For instance, the Dean mentioned that a system exists to grant faculty a course release for every MA thesis they supervise, but faculty said there are no course releases.
- There is no clear sense of which faculty are graduate faculty. For instance, we could not locate a list of faculty members (at least online) of who the faculty members are who are committed to mentoring graduate students.
- There are no clear guidelines establishing how to fairly distribute mentoring load for faculty members.
- Graduates and current students highly praised their experience in the program, but had a sense the program was not well supported by administration.

The lack of coherence on who comprises and leads the graduate faculty negatively impacts the quality of the student experiences in the program. For example:

- Students expressed that they struggled to develop a cohort or community among their peers. This is exacerbated by the fact that they do not have a place to be together (like a graduate lounge) and there are no assistantships offered.
- Graduate students are on their own to court faculty members to be their mentors. This means that those who are less outgoing, have less cultural capital and/or who need more guidance are more likely to fall through the cracks.
- A faculty member noted that "small changes" like instituting an incentive system for faculty involved in the graduate program, offering courses on a regular cycle, designating space for grad students and offering them assistantships "might really help to make it a more attractive and sustainable program from the student point of view."
- Another faculty member stated: ". . . we have an opportunity and obligation to provide more [graduate] degrees at UW Tacoma. To do so requires a commitment to greater support for faculty scholarship, and for faculty time freed up to devote to doing scholarship with graduate students. It also requires the approval of

several graduate programs to attract a critical mass of graduate students that will justify sufficient graduate course offerings."

Recommendations re: Improving Vision & Organizational Structure of SIAS
Several of the structural challenges we have observed for individuals working in SIAS involve a lack of clear alignment between its structural organization with its core values of SIAS (e.g. inclusion, interdisciplinarity, and diversity).

Aligning the organizational structure of SIAS with its core values requires attention to intersecting issues pertaining both culture and structure. Our recommendations below attempt to elucidate the interdependence of recommended cultural and structural change:

1. ***Provide regular opportunities for faculty and staff to reflect on, affirm, and be rewarded for enhancing the School's core values***

   Based on our research and discussions, we understand these values to be *interdisciplinary, inclusion, and diversity*. Regardless, it is important for the faculty to collectively affirm and revise, if necessary, the school's core values. This may be driven from Division level conversations on up to full faculty conversations.

2. *Prioritize the core values of SIAS in all school level decisions*.

   SIAS has a well-crafted mission, vision, and values statement on its website. We encourage SIAS administrators and faculty to revisit those statements (revising if necessary) and consider ways to more explicitly integrate them into the life and culture of the school.

3. *Prioritize community building within and across divisions in SIAS.*

   a. Consider enhancing the funding allocated for Division and inter-Division social/intellectual events.

   b. Incentivize collaborative research and curriculum building within and across Divisions (e.g., competitive funding streams for joint research activities).

4. ***Prioritize the practice of transparent, respectful communication at all levels.***

   a. This includes communication between and among SIAS administrators, faculty, staff, and students.

   b. Provide opportunities for administrators, faculty, and staff to clarify, practice, and establish best practices for communication horizontally and laterally across SIAS.

   c. Establish a cultural norm in which faculty are given sufficient information and time to address "action items."

5. ***Institute a culture of faculty governance at all levels, including divisional, that enhances meaningful participation***

   a. Clarify (and revise when necessary) the responsibility and authority amongst and between all administrative positions and committees.

   b. Introduce a faculty conversation about appropriate service load expectations for all faculty ranks (from *too low* to *too high*). This may start at the Divisional Level and then make its way to School level policy.

   c. Consider moving (or centering) more personnel decisions to the Division level.

      i. e.g., Primary votes may be made by eligible voting faculty at the Division level; from there cases may go to an SIAS personnel committee with representative faculty members across all 5 divisions.
      ii. Focus full SIAS faculty meetings more on issues pertaining to SIAS core values and agendas.

6. ***We strongly encourage SIAS administration to make addressing the school's structural constraints its <u>top priority</u> in the 2017-18 academic year.***
   It is imperative that the administrative leadership consult with the senior UW administration to address major structural changes that impact the faculty and the dean's ability to work efficiently. Any proposed reorganization should lighten the service load of faculty and administrators to streamline decision-making without compromising faculty governance.

   a. The SIAS faculty council recently charged a "structure task force" with collecting data about these pressing issues. The review committee recommends giving that task force ample time and resources to collect information and to present that information to the full faculty in a transparent and timely manner. Subcommittees could be established to research successful models at peer institutions, conduct "cost-benefit analysis" of possible structural changes, soliciting input from the general faculty and staff along the way. The committee is less inclined to suggest a specific solution to the structural problem than to encourage SIAS administration and faculty to commit to a collaborative, open dialogue that includes as many voices as possible with the goal of democratically arriving at an agreed-upon model.

   b. Ensure that a process is put in place that allows for public deliberation among stakeholders to weigh the pros and cons of any course of action. Certainly departmentalization is one potential outcome, but based on our inquiries, favor for that option is hardly unanimous and could

> ultimately be at odds with the school's overall commitment to interdisciplinarity.

> c. Consider bringing in an outside consultant who specializes in problem solving, large group communication, and building effective teams. This would potentially mean a substantial short-term expense, but the long-term benefits will likely be worth the investment.

Recommendations specific to the MAIS Program

1. A core group of SIAS faculty should be cultivated, publically named as MAIS faculty mentors, and incentivized for mentoring MAIS students.[2]
2. Upon entering MAIS every student should be assigned a faculty mentor affiliated with the MAIS program.
3. By the end of their first year, every MAIS student should be assigned a capstone advisor affiliated with the MAIS program.
4. Instigate a system to ensure that the work of graduate faculty mentors and capstone advisors is evenly distributed amongst the pool of trained and committed faculty.
5. Consider allocating additional resources to support the above recommendations.

2. FACULTY & STAFF EXPERIENCES

The external review committee spent a considerable amount of time listening to faculty regarding their experience as scholars, teachers, and engaged members of SIAS and the UW Tacoma community. It is important to note that there is a strong and widespread appreciation for being part of a unit that has very strong potential to be highly rewarding because of its innovative mission and faculty expertise that has an impressive scope of research and teaching interests. Yet it is also clear that SIAS is beset by a number of issues that must be intentionally addressed. Below we identify and expand on the key areas of concern. These include: faculty morale, diversity, lack of shared understanding or attention to the meaning, significance and practice of interdisciplinarity, and support for professional advancement.

Faculty and Staff Morale
Faculty and staff almost uniformly identified morale as a central issue impeding their effectiveness. One faculty member stated that "faculty morale is dangerously low and decision-making becomes a farce." Some faculty expressed distrust and lack of respect as an issue. For example, we were presented with the case of a lecturer learning that they were not selected into a pool of candidates for full time lecturer conversion via a school-wide email. Other issues affecting morale include:

---

[2] E.g., The SIAS at UW Bothell has an incentivized point system (resulting in eventual eligibility for a course release) for faculty for working with students as mentors.

- Summer work groups for faculty seem inefficient when recommendations not implemented.
- Strong perception of disconnectedness between staff and senior administration.
- Several staff members indicated feeling their work wasn't respected or facilitated by the administration, no budget is allotted for their professional development, and that they're asked to participate in a variety of time-intensive training programs that aren't directly relevant to their work.
- Many tenure track faculty members felt that the instructional workload of 2-2-2 was unreasonable given the promotion and service requirements.
- Because the faculty is disproportionately composed of associate and assistant level professors, the bulk of the service load is falling on them. This makes it difficult for junior faculty to pursue their research agendas and meet the expectations for tenure and/or promotion.

As detailed in Section 1, the divisional structure in its current form contributes to a widespread perception among both faculty and staff that decision-making power is inappropriately centralized, faculty governance is inadequate, and communication is not consistent or timely. Several faculty described this "dysfunctional" model as the root cause of low morale. One faculty member describes, "very low faculty morale and disengagement, because in the face of the dysfunction, disengagement becomes a rationale, protective response. Once faculty get tenure, in particular, they disengage and lecturers take up a lot of the slack in service because they feel (and are!) vulnerable." Staff also expressed low morale: "I feel that morale is low among the staff; I feel unsupported and unseen by our leadership." Advisors, for example, are geographically isolated from the rest of the school, making their work harder and integration into the life of the school inconsistent.

It is important to note that independent of the structural issues that appear to be damaging faculty and staff morale by creating problems such as unmanageable workloads, unit leadership could do more to correct the impression that SIAS is in an overly top-down environment where faculty and staff have little meaningful input. We encourage the leadership team to consider ways to remedy these perceptions even while the more concrete organizational structure is being assessed and deliberated.

Lack of shared understanding or attention to the meaning, significance, and practice of interdisciplinarity
There is a sense that as the campus and the school have grown, the innovative interdisciplinary nature of SIAS has suffered as the school tries to meet the needs of students across campus. One faculty noted in recent years the "curriculum is definitely less interdisciplinary than it was 10 or 20 years ago . . . because financial and enrollment pressures have discouraged things like team-teaching and experimenting with innovative courses."

Many faculty expressed that not enough time is devoted to discuss and practice what it means to be part of an interdisciplinary school. Although some senior faculty remember early days when it was a frequent subject of discussion, most of the faculty we heard from on this matter said they would welcome and benefit from forging a deeper shared

perspective and commitment to interdisciplinarity. At the same time, faculty identified the structure of SIAS meetings as a roadblock to meaningful discussions about interdisciplinarity, as well as a source of frustration, alienation, and in some cases, apathy. As one faculty member commented, "what do we mean when we say 'interdisciplinarity'? We never talk about it -- don't have time at faculty meetings amid the rest of what we have to deal with, and we never articulate what we mean by it, why we value it, and what we hope to accomplish via it. It is a sacred cow. In fact, I think each of us as scholars is interdisciplinary in our approach. The problem comes when we link, as we for some reason have, interdisciplinarity with our organizational structure."

One common source of complaint was the custom of meeting agendas being heavily stacked with personnel business pertaining to faculty hires and promotions across the school. While all SIAS faculty may value interdisciplinarity, interdisciplinarity does not necessarily extend to knowledge, scholarship, or best practices across all disciplines within SIAS. This concern is particularly prevalent for hiring and promotion decisions. (e.g., it may not be the most effective or meaningful use of time for humanists and social scientists to take a central role in discussions in hiring or promotion matters within the natural sciences, or vice versa.)

Lack of support for faculty and staff advancement

Faculty and staff members in our review articulated a need for clarity and support to advance in the profession. From our conversations we learned that:

- No uniform mentoring program is in place.
- Annual reviews and progress towards tenure are not made distinct and this creates confusion about what expectations are for promotion and how to gauge progress towards advancement.
- The expectations for annual reviews and promotion appear to be unstable and inconsistent with respect to standards and the method of delivery. For instance, some faculty spoke of receiving only verbal feedback while others acknowledged receiving written evaluations
- Staff has no defined professional development, and some indicated they would be more effective and feel more respected and vital if they had a set budget each year to devote to professional development and training.

Diversity

Issues and concerns pertaining to diversity are prevalent in SIAS. While some progress has been made in recent years in terms of diversifying its faculty ranks, the faculty demographics of the school as a whole are still far less diverse than the demographics of its students.

Compounding these demographic imbalances are gravely important concerns coming from faculty of color as well as faculty speaking from a variety of minoritized identities. These include experiences such as:

- Finding SIAS faculty meetings to be abusive and hostile, especially in relation to hiring matters

- o General discussions of hiring POC and diversifying faculty ranks are often met with resistance.
- o when a person of color at the top of the pool, then the discussion is about race rather than the person's merit.
- Perceiving a lack of valuing and respect for diversity-related teaching as something that faculty might be quickly trained into.
- Perceiving a lack of valuing/respect for the work of mentoring students of color and first gen students
- Asking diverse faculty to perform more service but not listened to when decisions are made.

Existing Diversity Efforts in SIAS

While there have been efforts to address concerns about diversity in SIAS, as of this writing there are no active governing efforts for Diversity in SIAS.

The SIAS self-study report states that:

> In spring 2015, IAS approved a Diversity Plan, aligned with development of a campus-wide plan at the same moment. Given the turnover in leadership at all levels, the plan has not yet been fully fleshed out and implemented, but with an EVCAA and a dean who have a track record of support for diversity initiatives, we will begin addressing this need. SIAS is committed to using best practices in faculty recruitment and retention to hire and keep a diverse faculty. Our efforts are guided by these three principles: ***1) diversity and inclusion are essential to academic excellence; 2) encountering a wide range of perspectives through curriculum and embodied in members of the university is critical to student success in and beyond higher education; and 3) enhancing diversity requires confronting our own biases, commitment, advance planning, and integrity and accountability at all levels.*** We know that diversity is our future, as minority student populations grow due to the demographic shifts, and simultaneously, the universities from Australia, Canada, Europe, and India increasingly compete against our universities.

In addition the self-report states: "SIAS has recently established a ***Dean's Advisory Council on Diversity***, comprising faculty, staff, and community members. The Council has not met yet, but will do so at the beginning of the next academic year."

Since SIAS is embedded within UW Tacoma as well as the UW tri-campus network, it is also relevant to mention campus and University Diversity efforts:

- In 2016 the University of Washington debuted an extensive new Diversity Blueprint.[3]
- In 2016 UW Tacoma established "equity" as one of its priorities.[4] In its declaration of strategic impact goals, campus plan is to:

---

[3] https://www.washington.edu/diversity/files/2017/01/17_DiversityBlueprint-010917.pdf

a. Improve the satisfaction of traditionally underrepresented students, especially racial/ethnic minority students, with the UW Tacoma experience.
b. Increase the number and percentage of traditionally underrepresented racial/ethnic minority faculty members and staff by rank or position, and achieve equity in relation to promotions, compensation and workload.
c. Better systematize and regularize the reporting of data incorporating the intersectionality of students, faculty and staff identities to inform our decision making and benchmark our achievements.
d. Reduce disparities in achievement, experience and opportunity across diverse groups of faculty, staff and students.
e. Increase the percentage of faculty and staff with demonstrated expertise and experience in multicultural competency, inclusive pedagogy and culturally responsive curriculum design.
f. Increase opportunities for students to understand and embrace the assets of our diverse communities through local and global learning and engagement experiences.

Recommendations re: Improving Faculty & Staff Experiences
While all of our recommendations in the previous section (on Vision and Organizational Structure) also impact the experiences of faculty and staff, our recommendations below provide additional specificity.

1. *Prioritize the importance of faculty and staff morale*

    a. Provide regular mechanisms for identifying ways to improve the working conditions for faculty and staff.

    b. Engage in meaningful collaborative effort to create both cultural and structural solutions that are a win/win for individuals and for the educational mission of SIAS.

    c. Whether through structural changes or some other mechanism, **the service workload for faculty must be addressed as soon as possible**. In its current form, it is out of step with peer institutions and reasonable expectations for faculty at any rank, tenure track or otherwise. Finding a way to alleviate some of this burden, even if only a short term fix while the larger structural issues are being explored, would go a long way toward raising faculty morale.

---

[4] https://www.tacoma.uw.edu/sites/default/files/sections/Chancellor/ChartingOurCourse-FINAL-1a.pdf

d.   Establish more regular meetings or communication channels between staff and administration to ensure staff input is solicited and considered when it comes to making decisions that affect them and their performance.

2. *Prioritize Diversity and Inclusion in all SIAS practices and decisions*

a.   The Dean should prioritize the formation of an empowered Diversity Council or Committee within SIAS. (Such as the proposed "Dean's Advisory Council" mentioned in the SIAS self study). This SIAS Diversity council should:

i. be responsible for reviewing diversity related concerns and providing recommendations to the Dean and the Shared Leadership Council.

ii. create a list of objectives at the beginning of each year and an end-of-the-year activity report. Both should be made available to all SIAS faculty and staff.

iii. be mapped onto and aligned with both UW Tacoma's priorities and with the UW Diversity Blueprint.

iv. be financially supported with at least nominal funds to develop diversity related trainings for SIAS.

v. also, if community members and students are asked to serve on this council then appropriate compensation should be offered.

b.   The Dean and SIAS should also consider developing a new Associate Dean for Diversity & Inclusion. This Associate Dean may also serve as chair of the SIAS Diversity Council, and would be a direct liaison to Diversity related leadership efforts across all three UW campuses.

3. *Prioritize cross/inter/trans disciplinary training and engagement opportunities for faculty*

a. Consider developing a required course such as "Introduction to Interdisciplinary Studies" for all SIAS students, to be developed and taught by a committed group of core faculty.[5]

---

[5] At UW Bothell, all SIAS students are required to take BIS 300: Interdisciplinary Inquiry. See p. 56 of the Course catalogue for a description of this course. https://www.uwb.edu/getattachment/catalog/catalog16-17-final.pdf

b. If not already doing so, consider holding regular faculty colloquia (perhaps including an opportunity for socializing after) in which faculty can share their current projects with colleagues.

c. Consider SIAS-hosted events for book releases or other major publication milestones to celebrate faculty achievements and foster community among and across divisions.

4. ***Provide more professional development opportunities for staff***
Especially those that enhance their skills in fulfilling the core values of SIAS

5. ***Consider offering leadership training opportunities for faculty***

6. ***Develop a formal faculty mentoring program for junior faculty*** (Assistant Professors + newly hired full-time lecturers).[6] [7] Such a program will serve to:

   a. Address confusion around annual review and promotion processes.
   b. Provide additional moral support for junior faculty.

7. ***Investigate the possibility of moving the advising staff closer to the rest of the school. Advisors are central to the culture of the school and students' perception of the program. Allocating space to better include them into the life of SIAS would greatly enhance the experience of the advising staff, the faculty and administrators who work with them, and SIAS students.***

3. STUDENT EXPERIENCES

As part of the discovery process, the review committee engaged students through listening sessions to get a clear understanding of their experiences. The committee met separately with undergraduate and graduate students, considered faculty, staff and administrators' input about the student experience, and reviewed Academic Program Review Report submitted by School of Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences. As formal assessment practices for understanding undergraduate and graduate student experience are not in use, committee's observations are guided by input received during the site visit.

---

[6] See Appendix A as an example of a Mosaic model that provides flexibility and accountability to mentors and mentees. Arizona State University's New College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences Policy for Mentoring Faculty.

[7] Another example: in the School of IAS at UW Bothell, the chair of a successful faculty search committee is expected to serve as that newly hired faculty member's formal mentor through their first promotion period.

Academic and Career Advising
Undergraduate students asked for sufficient time with their advisors. Some reported that it is often difficult to schedule appointments or receive adequate time in sessions, although these comments varied based on division. There are also inconsistencies in the advice students are receiving. Students asked for advising to address a broad range of issues. Ideally, students want not just course planning, but someone who can help them align life goals with academic and career goals. Many students are seeking stronger career guidance.

Degree Completion
Students and staff shared that undergraduate transfer students face some challenges transferring their courses as course equivalency might not be recognized in the course equivalency guide. The process can be time-consuming, resulting in increased workload for advisors and reduced advisor availability for holistic student advising. Students and advisors also highlighted the importance of structuring course offerings and prerequisites so students can graduate within four years.

Research and Internship Opportunities
Both undergraduate and graduate students expressed the desire for more guidance for graduate school (including a stronger pathway to graduate programs at UW Seattle), more access to research teams and internships, and more applied learning. Students also expressed concerns that many of the system level resources are geared for access by UW Seattle students.

Student Experience and Identity
While the committee had robust discussions with faculty about the significance of their Division within SIAS, undergraduate students overwhelmingly only identify themselves with their major (and not with SIAS or with their Division). Advisors echoed this, saying most undergraduate students wouldn't be able to say what division their major is in. The divisions "are meaningless to students," as one advisor put it. This disconnect between organizational structure and student identity may feed a larger sense of compartmentalization rather than a sense of common vision and identity for students as well as faculty and staff.

In addition, some students expressed the desire for more community (e.g. within their major or program, their division, or within the SIAS) as part of their educational experience. In a large respect this may be driven by the structural obstacles of being a commuter campus. However, many opportunities still exist for creating and incentivizing enhanced points of meaningful connection and community for students.

Interdisciplinarity as a Shared Learning Goal
More extensive discussions around how best to cultivate interdisciplinary training among students across major areas can lead to stronger and clearer learning outcomes. One example given of this is that some "majors refuse to include pre-requisite courses for upper-division classes for fear of low enrollment. This does not lend itself to pathways and scaffolded learning." The result is that "students are frustrated with the undefined model that leaves them unprepared for the demands of upper-division." Another

commenter noted "I find the lack of consistency in the courses that students take (perhaps due to the "interdisciplinarity") a hindrance in the classroom because there is no consistency in what students have learned in past courses." Another observer noted that "It is very hard for us to carve out the space to have these sort of sustained conversations, except within the Divisions, that do not the authority, autonomy nor resources to make the sort of curricular adjustments we feel better addresses our students and our university's mission."

Recommendations for Improving Student Experiences

For undergraduate students:

1. ***Establish common practices for advisors and advising milestones for students***

   a. Consider mandatory career exploration with assigned advisors.

   b. Advisors should be supported in developing the capacity to help students with certain career readiness functions. They may engage in career discussions with students to explore values, interests, and skills in connection with their major and/or division.

   c. Through individual appointments or workshops, students may have the opportunity to work with an assigned advisor on job readiness activities that may include résumé and cover letter review, interview preparation, job search skills, and networking strategies.

   d. Advisors should be prepared to help students move forward in their degree, division, and career in specific and intentional ways.

2. ***Review the course equivalency process, including the guide, to ensure that the process and the tools serve the needs of transfer students in SIAS and UW Tacoma.***

   We encourage automation of workflow to reduce advisor workload.

3. ***Increase access to internship and research opportunities.***

   a. Consolidate information about internship and research opportunities on an accessible webpage.

   b. Develop other ways to directly reach out to students regarding internship and research opportunities.

    c. Consider, as a longer-term plan, establishing both an online and "brick and mortar" hub where students can learn about mentor programs, internships, and professional development.[8]

4. ***Provide more opportunities for students to connect with other students, faculty, and staff in their major and division.***

5. ***Introduce assessment practices for improving understanding of student experience***.

We believe the availability of SIAS-wide student experience data will inform faculty discussions on student experience, and may result in the development of practices that improve the student experience and reinforce student's connection with SIAS.

6. ***Cultivating a Strong Foundation for Understanding Interdisciplinarity***

SIAS students and faculty can benefit from developing shared understanding of the meaning of interdisciplinarity and how it can best serve students' educational goals. We encourage such discussions even as we caution faculty to limit prerequisites, which can become a burden on student progress and scheduling. It is worth noting that UWB has one prerequisite for *all* of its IAS students (Intro to Interdisciplinary Studies). This can be a highly coordinated and effective way to get students started with some shared language before they go off into their separate majors. Having a single, well-designed course can help eliminate roadblocks to students' time-to-degree.

For graduate students (MAIS):

1. ***Assign a faculty mentor to every new graduate student in MAIS for their first year.***

    a. Faculty mentors might be incentivized via a point system that leads to eventual course releases to work with graduate students.
    b. All faculty members who mentor MAIS graduate students should receive training and clear expectations of their obligations as a mentor.

2. ***By the end of their first year, Graduate students should choose/be assigned a Capstone advisor.***

Similar to general faculty mentors for first year faculty mentors, training and incentivization should occur for faculty capstone advisors.

3. ***Instigate formal and systematic assessments of***:

---

[8] See UW Seattle's Department of Communication's "Career Kickstart" series as one potential model: http://www.com.washington.edu/ck/

a.   Graduate student learning in relationship to program goals

b.   Graduate student satisfaction in terms of mentorship, intellectual engagement, and preparedness for future career trajectories

CONCLUSION

The review committee recommends another full review be conducted by the Graduate School in 5 years, with an interim review to be conducted in 2 years. The review committee encourages the SIAS administration and faculty to engage in a collaborative process to establish what they see as their most pressing and realistic goals for each review deadline. The committee also recommends that they reach out to colleagues at UW Bothell's SIAS program for consultation regarding policies and practices pertaining to the issues covered in this report. So the Graduate School can be an effective partner in this process, it would be useful if SIAS administration would submit these goals to the Graduate School by the end of the Fall 2017.

Arizona State University
New College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences
Policy for Mentoring Faculty
2016

The goal of this mentoring policy is to assist junior faculty in Arizona State University's New College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences (NCIAS) with career development and the tenure process. The policy is intended to primarily assist tenure-track faculty. The mentoring process should be voluntary, constructive, collegial, inclusive, and collaborative.

A Mosaic Model for Mentoring Junior Faculty

The 'mosaic model' represents a team approach to mentoring that utilizes all of the available departmental, college, and university resources. A robust mosaic model requires input from a variety of sources. For example, new and early-career faculty should seek out "constellations" and "networks" of mentors who can address a variety of career competencies. These mentors may include peers, near peers, tenured faculty, directors, administrators, librarians, students, etc. This mentoring approach will better accommodate the faculty member's personal, cultural, and professional preferences for contact (e.g., one-on-one, small group, team, and/or online).

The NCIAS policy emphasizes the development of a specific mentor-mentee relationship that operates within the context of the mosaic model. A senior faculty member (the mentor) will be assigned to provide one-on-one guidance to a junior faculty member (the mentee). The School Director has the responsibility of initiating this mentor-mentee relationship.

Participation: All untenured junior faculty are strongly encouraged to participate in the mentoring program, but participation is not mandatory. Faculty may elect to opt-in or opt-out of the program at anytime during the probationary period.

No-fault policy: either the mentor or the mentee may request a change in mentoring partner at anytime, no questions asked, and without prejudice. A request to change the role of a mentor or mentee shall not be considered in P&T or any other administrative decisions.

Confidentiality: Trust and confidentiality are critical components of the mentor-mentee relationship. Mentors must respect confidentiality to the greatest extent possible and avoid conflicts of interest.

Execution of the Mentoring Policy

To aid in execution of this policy, the NCIAS Mentoring Policy Guidelines have been developed. The guidelines describe the roles and responsibilities for the School Directors, Deans, Mentors and Mentees. It is the responsibility of the School Director to arrange for the periodic review of the guidelines and to arrange for their distribution.

I. Roles of the NCIAS Administration

General expectations for NCIAS Dean and School Directors: The NCIAS Dean and School Directors have the responsibility to ensure the physical, structural and information resources are available to enable junior faculty to meet expectations. Resources, broadly defined, include startup packages, institutional support and traditional mentoring in academic life, including teaching, research, and service.

Role and responsibilities of the NCIAS Dean:
- Ensure the training and oversight of School Directors in best practices for mentoring, including one-on-one feedback to Directors.
- Hold School Directors accountable for their program's culture, stimulating a collegial and collaborative climate, and for implementing mentoring practices and charting results.
- Orient new faculty to expectations for promotion, tenure and University citizenship
- Be mindful of the extra service burdens often placed on women and underrepresented minorities when nominating them for committee work.

General Recommendations for School Directors: As a part of the mosaic model the School Director has roles to both initiate and establish the mentoring relationship and facilitate the mentee's success.

Role and responsibilities of the School Director:
Initiating the process
- Consult with newly hired faculty to assess their needs and use this assessment to identify an appropriate mentor and mentoring "network".
- As soon as possible during the first year of hire, select a mentor from the ranks of the faculty (typically tenured faculty). The mentor may be a faculty member from within the program, the college, or from outside the college. The research discipline of the mentor and mentee should be related but need not be identical. In a small program, it might be appropriate to ask someone in a related program to serve as a mentor.
- Encourage tenured faculty members to volunteer to be mentors and reward their service.
- Give the mentor and mentee a copy of the mentoring policy and any supporting documents.
- Discuss the policy, specifically addressing the goal, 'no-fault' provision, and confidentiality sections with both the mentor and mentee.

Advising
- Make the expectations and criteria for promotion clear.
- Give the mentee copies of the promotion and tenure guidelines for the program, college and university upon arrival.
- Make sure the mentee understands the timetables and deadlines.
- Be explicit about the way in which a new faculty member will be evaluated. Speak to the relative importance of student evaluations of teaching, peer evaluations, letters from inside or outside the institution, external grants, independent scholarship, publication, and service.
- Give frequent and accurate feedback.
- Formally evaluate junior faculty annually or regularly, typically as part of P&T or similar reviews. This should include peer-review of teaching.
- Share and discuss the recommendations of any reviews with the faculty member.
- Take advantage of ad hoc opportunities to provide constructive, collegial feedback.

Facilitating Success

- Facilitate the acquisition of resources to meet expectations.
- Reduce the impediments to progress towards promotion.
- Support faculty development activities
- Avoid burdening the mentee with new course preparations every semester, and do not overload with program committees.
- Be watchful for issues related to personal life or work imbalance.

General expectations from the institutional structure: The University provides regular training related to University policies and procedures governing research, ethics, travel, honorariums, grants, lab safety, and other activities.

Institutional resources and the supporting roles they provide:
 The university is a large institution and contains multiple offices and sources of information for faculty and staff. These are collected together in the Accessing the policies and Procedures manuals web page (http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/index.html). The Academic Affairs Manual (ACD, 2011), which covers professionalism, faculty responsibilities, personnel, and benefits information, is accessible via this web page (http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd002.html). The ACD is a university wide manual and as such does not contain resource information specific to NCIAS.

II. Roles of the Mentor and Mentee

Overview of the mentor-mentee relationship:

The goal of the relationship between mentor and mentee is to help the mentee reach their full potential in all aspects of their work at Arizona State University. Mentoring can help define the critical institutional benchmarks that lead to tenure, namely success in scholarly work and excellence in teaching or service. Mentoring can also help the mentee become part of the broader university community and establish a work-life balance. There are no hard rules for this type of relationship, but it is typically built on mutual respect, trust, and confidentiality.

The general role of the mentor: Mentors should be interested in the mentee's professional growth and development, be willing to commit time and attention to the relationship, to give honest feedback, and to act on behalf of the mentee. A mentor is not necessarily a friend "exclusively" assigned to a mentee, nor expected to be "on call" to listen to grievances and frustrations. Mentors should serve both as sources of information, as advocates for the new faculty member, and as a "safe" person to whom the mentee can bring questions or problems without fear of impact on a promotion decision.

Responsibilities and expectations for mentors:
- Initiate the first contact and arrange meetings or other proactive approaches to assure interactions with the mentee.
- Proactively develop discussion topics and resources appropriate for the mentee's goals.
- Clarify expectations about the extent to which guidance and time will be offered.
- Establish and maintain confidentiality with the mentee.
- Listen with an open mind and be willing to change goals for the relationship based on progress and changes over time.
- Exchange information about professional and personal experiences. The relationship is strongest when the mentor is willing to share experiences openly. Exchanging CVs is an easy method to provoke discussion and inform future meetings.
- Share experiences on stress management, life-work balance, and effectively managing time.
- Assist in crafting and clarifying the mentee's goals for teaching, research and service. Brainstorm about strategies to achieve goals and measurable outcomes.
- Ask about and encourage accomplishments. Provide constructive criticism and feedback. Give criticism when warranted, but present it with specific suggestions for improvement. Use knowledge and experience to help the junior faculty member identify and build on strengths.
- Inform colleagues and administrators about the mentee's achievements. When appropriate, nominate the mentee for awards or other opportunities that will help build their reputation within the program, college, and university.
- Help the mentee identify and balance responsibilities in teaching, research, and or service.

- Identify areas where the mentee's work overlaps with programs in other programs and colleges. Help the mentee connect with faculty they might become research collaborators with or offer other resources (e.g. research equipment).
- Help the mentee learn about institutional support for professional travel, conferences, workshops, release time for special projects, equipment funds, and other resources. Help the mentee find resources for self-development.
- Evaluate grants, papers, or presentations as part of a 'pre-review' process. Introduce the mentee to others who may be able to perform similar services.
- Discuss how to say 'no' to some of the demands made on valuable work time.

Responsibilities and expectations of mentees: The NCIAS mentoring program is designed to provide assistance and guidance, but the ultimate responsibility for career advancement resides with the mentee.

- Participate in the selection of the mentor. Assess personal strengths, needs and concerns with the School Director to help select the most appropriate mentor. Needs may change through time.
- Arrange meetings or other proactive approaches to assure interactions with the mentor and prepare questions and discussion topics in advance to make the most efficient use of the mentor's time.
- Exchange CVs and information about professional and personal experiences with the mentor.
- Work with the mentor to clarify short- and long-term goals. Brainstorm about strategies to achieve goals and measurable outcomes.
- Keep an open mind to advice given by the mentor. Be open to changing goals and expectations for the mentoring relationship over time. Be open to and learn from the experience of others. Accept feedback in a constructive manner.
- Be willing to voice and explain concerns. Discuss duties and responsibilities (research, teaching or extension) with the mentor to help define priorities (publications, research, teaching, setting up the lab, committee work, etc).
- Weigh and judge advice (conservative vs. risk-taking). Seek out other established on-campus and external faculty for additional advice.
- Utilize opportunities for professional growth and excellence in teaching, research, and service. The mentor will make introductions to colleagues in the home and related programs. Use these encounters to explore opportunities for collaborations and discuss them with the mentor.
- Take responsibility, be an active agent and judge of appropriate courses of action for career advancement.

III. Suggested Topics for Discussion

School and College Culture and Expectations:

- Every college and program has a unique culture. Expectations may or may not be clear in all areas. Discuss explicit and implicit expectations.
- What is valued within the college and program? What is rewarded?
- What important program, college, university, and professional events should junior faculty attend?
- How visible must one be in the program? Is it acceptable to work at home?
- What seminars and social events occur regularly? What is expected with regard to attendance and participation?
- How important are undergraduate clubs? Are you expected to participate in these events?
- Discuss the benefits of mosaic mentoring.
- Who can the mentee contact for additional input and feedback?
- Explain Annual Review Process

Promotion and Tenure Process (P&T):
- Discuss criteria for achieving promotion and tenure.
- Discuss the process as it pertains to the pre-tenure period.
- Discuss annual performance reviews with regard to how to prepare them, what to expect, how to deal with different outcomes.
- Evaluate the mentees annual performance document together before it is submitted to the program P&T committee.
- Consider how to identify people to write external letters of reference. How many external letters are need? From where?
- Discuss how to get feedback at any point in the pre-tenure career. Discuss the use of mosaic mentoring to gain feedback on the P&T documents and to strengthen weak areas.
- Discuss the importance of tracking accomplishments.

Research:
- Discuss the mentee's research area, goals, and benchmarks for success. Discuss the criteria for research excellence. How is research evaluated in your program, university and the scientific community?
- Discuss the process for becoming part of the graduate faculty.
- Explore mechanisms for developing visibility and prominence within the profession. Which journals and conferences might be most useful for establishing a national and/or international reputation?
- Discuss the important supervisory skills for running a lab.
- Discuss potential funding sources and the University Office of Research and Sponsored Projects Administration (ORSPA).

- Discuss the differences between grants and gifts, and the differences between federal, foundation, and industry funding sources. Are there differences in the weight placed on these grants during the P&T process?
- Talk about the process of writing grants and establishing budgets. Review issues such as: the forms required by the institution (e.g. cover sheet), the percent time committed, and separating direct/indirect costs.
- Explore opportunities that will aid in improving grantsmanship (e.g. workshops, review processes). Discuss how to contact the program manager/director before writing a grant.
- Discuss the internal funding opportunities, deadlines for these programs and how proposals are they reviewed and ranked?
- Discuss publishing. Is there a required internal review process prior to submission? If an article is rejected by a journal, how do you turn it around swiftly for re-submission?
- Negotiating authorship upfront.
- Discuss potential collaborations with other faculty. What are the advantages and disadvantages? How is credit received for collaborative grant writing and other work?

Teaching:
- Discuss the teaching load as defined by the program, college and university. What is required? What new courses could be developed?
- Discuss the methods used to evaluate teaching, the criteria are used, and the weight placed on student teaching evaluations. How is teaching evaluated beyond student evaluations? Is a teaching portfolio important?
- What are the options for having colleagues and mentors evaluate and offer feedback on teaching style?
- Explore the resources offered through the University and College to improve teaching skills.
- Discuss the process for obtaining and/or keeping a teaching or course assistant. What is the School policy for having assistants? Who selects the assistant? What can be reasonably expected from assistant? How should problems be handled?
- Discuss the guidelines for grading, providing midterm grades, and submission of final grades.
- What documentation should be retained for P&T files? How are course evaluations conducted, evaluated, and weighted?

Outreach and Service Appointments:
- Discuss how much committee work should be performed within the program, college, and university before tenure. What committees are important to serve on or avoid?

- Discuss options for professional service outside of the university (e.g. assistant journal editor, grant panels, ad hoc journal reviews, professional associations).
- Discuss ways of meeting colleagues from around the state and region.
- Discuss how to develop and document an excellent record of service and outreach.

Mentoring Graduate and Undergraduate Students:
- Discuss the process of reviewing and accepting graduate students. How to identify the best graduate students? What qualities are important and what are good recruitment strategies?
- How many graduate students should be supervised? What are the benefits of small and large laboratory groups?
- Discuss what is reasonable to expect from graduate students. How can problems be identified and addressed at an early stage? What are the options when there is a problem? How to set limits on the amount of time and effort invested?
- Discuss the relative merits and disadvantages of recruiting graduate students, and postdoctoral researchers.
- What role does the Graduate College and the School play? What resources do they provide to faculty and graduate students?
- •How many undergraduate and Honors students should be advised? How can their needs and expectations be managed? What are the requirements for undergraduate degrees (majors and minors)?

Work/Life Balance:
- Discuss University policies for family, maternity, and personal leave. How is leave requested? Is there an appeals process if the request is turned down?
- What assistance does the university provide for childcare?
- How is information obtained regarding benefits such as health insurance?
- What are the university's sexual harassment policies? Ethics and diversity policies? Discuss the requirements for training in these areas.
- What resources are available if there is a controversy or disputes.
- Discuss the benefits jr faculty have (i.e, lower teaching load, junior leave, access to world-class library and resources) and take advantage of these assets fully.
- Present university-wide programs, such as: wellness program, workshops by different organizations (e.g. The FWA offers tenure and promotion workshops and roundtables)

Considerations for tenure-track faculty from under-represented groups:
- Discuss the possibility of a hidden workload given the mentee's gender, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, or disability.

- Discuss situations where a mentee may feel uncomfortable or where different standards are being applied unconsciously by others. Are cultural differences playing a role?
- Mentors and mentees can discuss ways to overcome barriers to informal networks or gatekeepers. Is there an 'old boys' club? Another type of hidden barrier?
- Review the groups, organizations, and support networks within the University that can help prevent or resolve feelings of isolation. These groups provide an opportunity to connect with others that share a specific bond (regardless if the primary mentor also shares this link).

IV. Example of Mentee-Needs Assessment Matrix*

The mentoring mosaic includes many types of support. The mentor will not be expected to handle all needs. Use this form to periodically (e.g., once per term) assess how needs are being met, and to identify other ways gain the additional support needed.

Need	I'm getting what I need from my mentor or other source	I don't have a need for this	I should ask my mentor for guidance on this issue	I should find another source other than my mentor to guide me	Other strategy?
Obtain guidance on research & scholarship					
Obtain guidance on publications					
Obtain guidance on tenure & promotion process					
Obtain guidance on teaching					
Obtain advice about service					
Obtain advice and information on university & School policies					
Seek out needed university resources					
Guidance in establishing professional networks at ASU					
Guidance in establishing professional networks					

outside of ASU					
Gain advice on adapting to university/college/School politics					
Advice on work-life balance					
Establish and maintain regular communication with Mentor					
Seek out needed community resources					
Gain advice on program/School politics					

*Adapted from the WAGE mentoring toolkit and the ADVANCE University of Rhode Island's mentoring program, Faculty Mentor Profile – a self analysis.

Mentorship Agreement Template

The purpose of this template is to assist you in documenting mutually agreed upon goals and parameters that will serve as the foundation for your mentoring relationships. While mentors and mentees may find mentorship agreement to be useful, they are optional. This template is expected to be altered to meet individual needs.

1) *Goals* (what you hope to achieve as a result of this relationship; e.g., gain perspective relative to skills necessary for success in academia, explore new career opportunities/alternatives, obtain knowledge of organizational culture, networking, leadership skill development, etc.):

2) *Steps to achieving goals* as stated above (e.g., meeting regularly, manuscripts/grants, collaborating on research projects, steps to achieving independence, etc.):

3) *Meeting frequency* (frequency, duration, and location of meetings):

4) *Confidentiality:* Any sensitive issues that we discuss will be held in the strictest of confidence. Issues that are off limits for discussion include:

5) Plan for ***evaluating relationship effectiveness*** (e.g., bi-annual review of mentorship meeting minutes, goals, and outcomes/accomplishments):

6) ***Relationship termination clause:*** In the event that either party finds the mentoring relationship unproductive and requests that it be terminated, we agree to honor that individual's decision without question or blame.

7) ***Duration:*** This mentorship relationship will continue as long as both parties feel comfortable with its productivity or until:

Mentor's Signature _____ Mentee's Signatuare _____ Date _____