SUPPORTING FACULTY

AN ACADEMIC LEADER PUBLICATION

LEADING FACULTY WITH PURPOSE AND VISION

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

Providing Leadership and Support to Professionally Develop Adjunct Faculty

By Amy B. Harkins

Adjunct faculty may be the most over-used and under-resourced groups of individuals in higher education. Many departments and courses would not function, or at least not function well, without adjunct faculty. Yet despite being in many cases essential members of a department, adjuncts receive modest pay, typically by the course and term. They often function on the periphery of a department or program with little if any attention paid them or their development as a faculty member. As the chair of a department that includes a variety of clinical health disciplines, my philosophy and approach are to involve adjunct faculty in the department and as members of the academic programs in which they teach. Investing in mentoring them as if they were full-time faculty members and supporting their development as educators can, I believe, provide valuable returns. In my department's case, the possibility that a current adjunct can become our next best full-time clinical faculty applicant should not be

If the individual has no college teaching experience, then providing professional development and teaching resources is essential.

ignored. While not all department units may be structured in a way that would permit full-time hires, adjunct instruction may be foundational to the unit. Regardless of the department or the organizational structure, ultimately, one goal is that there should be no discernible differences in the quality of instruction between full-time and adjunct faculty.

I recognize that my departmental need of specialized clinical health professionals for adjunct instruction tends to fall on the side of the expert lecturer for upper-level and discipline-specific courses. However, I believe the same principles apply to the entry-level core and prerequisite courses that adjunct faculty teach at most institutions. To assist in hiring the appropriate individual as an adjunct faculty member, we rely on the networks established among our full-time faculty in the program, the department, and the college. The optimal adjunct faculty candidate is an appropriate-

COMING NEXT MONTH:

Faculty Mentoring: Using a Faculty-Led Peer Review Process to Improve Performance

Communicating through Conflict: Dos and Don'ts

Conducting Equitable Faculty Searches

New Thinking on Accountability for DEI Work

Seven Ways to Help Burned Out Faculty

Six Strategies to Support VITAL Faculty in Professional Development

By K. C. Culver and Adrianna Kezar

In recent years, critics have pointed out the poor working conditions of VITAL faculty (Visiting, Instructional, Teaching, Adjuncts, and Lecturers; coined by Rachel Levy in 2019 as an asset-minded framing for non-tenure track faculty), but less attention has been paid to the lack of investment in them as teachers and how that shapes the teaching and learning environment. Engaging VITAL faculty in professional development is a critical dimension of helping them develop teaching effectiveness and campus connectedness. Thus, it is important to understand the expanding suite of professional development options that offer VITAL faculty sustained engagement and how administrative policies and practices shape the successful engagement of the new faculty majority in such initiatives.

Given that there has been extremely limited research on this topic, we studied 14 campuses that have altered their professional development to specifically meet the needs of VITAL faculty, conducting interviews and analyzing documents related to the policies and programs that supported the engagement of VITAL faculty in programs. As we describe in our report, *Designing Accessible and Inclusive Professional Development for NTTF* (Culver & Kezar, 2021), these campuses offered a wide variety of professional development opportunities for VITAL faculty. Creating a suite of professional development options is often necessary to support VITAL faculty in different career stages and who have varying needs, interests, and time constraints.

Most campuses offered several less-intensive options, including new faculty orientation, workshops, institutes, and symposiums, and one-to-one consultations. Leaders also developed newsletters or resource websites specifically for VITAL faculty and expanded the availability of teaching awards and other forms of recognition for professional success. We found four general models of more intensive professional development: modified faculty learning communities, curricular redesign and departmental action teams, certification programs, and discussion groups. The purpose, structure, and design of these initiatives varied across campuses according to the model and the institutional context. Yet, across campuses, we found that VITAL faculty benefitted from these more intensive models in terms of instructional improvement, sense of belonging, institutional integration, and knowledge of resources, professional networks, career development, advocacy opportunities, and leadership opportunities.

Best practices

One key finding from our study is that organizational considerations surrounding the professional development of VITAL faculty create an important foundation for initiatives' success. Institutional policies, structures, and practices present opportunities and constraints related to the role of professional development, the value placed on it, and the opportunities for VITAL faculty to participate in it. For instance, departments and colleges often employ different hiring practices, pay scales, and role expectations for VITAL faculty. The uneven

recognition and rewards that faculty receive for participating in professional development shapes their motivation to engage in it.

In addition, sustained professional development models are often designed implicitly for full-time faculty, including a yearlong timeframe that excludes VITAL faculty with semester contracts. Thus, campuses also need to engage in intentional work to design and implement opportunities in ways that center the realities of VITAL faculty careers.

To facilitate this work, we highlight several best practices that emerged from our campus case studies and cross-campus report. These practices enable VITAL faculty to participate as well as setting the tone and environment for the right supports to be in place to make professional development efforts successful.

Align the professional development of VITAL faculty with institutional mission and culture

To more broadly engage VITAL faculty in professional learning, campuses should include the development of all faculty in their institutional mission, vision, and values. Leaders at Valencia College (VC) and Sinclair College (SC) described a culture and set of values that reflect a growth mindset for faculty, including expectations that all people should be constantly developing their knowledge. Aligning the mission creates a sense of priority, motivation, and willingness to engage VITAL faculty who otherwise tend to be overlooked. Another way that mission and culture can support involving VITAL faculty is by adopting a student success initiative that identifies the significance of faculty for student success and articulates the need for support of all faculty members regardless of contract type. We found these student success initiatives at California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB); CSU San Francisco; Texas Tech University; Kennesaw State University (KSU); and VC.

Integrate professional development with faculty evaluation and rewards

Institutional leadership should make it a priority to connect incentive systems with professional development. SC and VC both tied VITAL faculty career advancement and higher pay to participation in professional development. At Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University's Worldwide campus, department chairs acknowledge faculty who participate in professional development and link it to their annual evaluation and merit increases. Another example is at KSU, where those leading efforts have tied professional development to annual evaluations, program review, and revised student evaluations, which are now geared toward the instructional practices that they are promoting in professional development.

Position initiatives within a framework of ongoing support for instructional effectiveness and career advancement

These considerations include thinking about how to extend support beyond the formal timing of an initiative, offer development for VITAL faculty across a spectrum of instructional and career expertise, and integrate professional development with other institutional processes related to teaching. Such considerations shape how designers think about the initiative, how facilitators lead, and how participants view the work of effective teaching. For instance, at Ohio State University (OSU), the facilitator of the VITAL-specific faculty learning community (FLC) emailed participants a few times during the summer to start building relationships before the FLC began and give participants helpful resources for the first week of classes. In addition to meetings, the facilitator scheduled individual midsemester check-ins during the fall and again in the spring after the FLC had ended. These proactive check-ins that extended beyond the FLC helped faculty feel supported in their work.

Create planning groups to support the development of effective initiatives

Another facilitating mechanism that helps in designing professional development in systematic ways is having planning groups that assemble the right individuals and groups across campus who are tapped for their expertise. Among the most beneficial structures that we identified were advisory boards or councils that brought together individuals from academic affairs, unions, and the office of diversity, equity, and inclusion to design professional development. CSUSB and SC both had such advisory groups. These advisory groups help to not only create better initiatives but also connect professional development to other campus operations. For example, advisory groups can make sure that teaching awards are open to VITAL faculty, that union contracts include professional development, that new faculty orientation describes professional development, and that technology professionals communicate the availability of technology support to adjuncts. Additionally, many campuses have created a position within their center for teaching and learning in which VITAL faculty helps design professional development and services as part of a planning group. We saw this position at Boise State University, OSU, and KSU.

Collaborate with others on campus who focus on faculty work

Campuses that had more systemic designs worked with their governance systems, collective bargaining units, and leadership to both get feedback to inform the design and use these groups to advocate for VITAL faculty to pursue and make normative professional development. In terms of governance, interviewees at KSU talked about the

Utilizing AI in Your Faculty Department

By Eric Lyerly, Esq.

Faculty have often been suspicious of the emergence of generative AI like ChatGPT and its applications in higher education settings. On the student side, faculty have expressed concern that ChatGPT could be a vehicle for academic misconduct. On the faculty side, professors and academic administrators have worried that the chatbot could have negative impacts on authorship, attribution, and other intellectual property concepts.

Although concerns about ChatGPT have merit, eliminating or prohibiting the use of generative AI seems more and more unfeasible. Therefore, faculty leaders should learn how to embrace it and advocate for its responsible usage in their departments.

Specifically, faculty leaders should consider taking the following actions to encourage the use of ChatGPT among colleagues.

Understand how ChatGPT works

ChatGPT's language models are developed using three sources of information: (1) information that is publicly available on the internet, (2) information that OpenAI (the creator of ChatGPT) licenses from third parties, and (3) information that users or human trainers provide. When a user inputs a prompt or "query," ChatGPT reads large amounts of existing text and analyzes how words appear in relationship to other words. It then predicts the next words that are most likely to appear based on the user's request to generate its outputs.

ChatGPT is trained using publicly available information that is "freely and openly available" online. It does not store training information in a database. Rather, it uses associations between words to help update its **language model**.

When ChatGPT arrived on the scene, its responses to user queries were based on digital information available before September 2021, the informal cutoff date for training material used in the language model. Accordingly, the chatbot was not able to respond to prompts related to current events or provide real-time information. However, ChatGPT can now access the internet to provide users with current information and data.

ChatGPT has a learning curve. It can take time to learn what prompts and queries yield the best results.

Help faculty understand the risks of plagiarism associated with ChatGPT

Plagiarism is the intentional duplication of others' ideas, works, or creative expressions without authorization or attribution. Plagiarism is often prohibited by faculty handbooks and can expose faculty to discipline and dismissal. Plagiarism also violates long-standing academic norms and can result in reputational damage and other professional consequences.

ChatGPT carries a risk of plagiarism and intellectual property violations due to the structure of its language model. As indicated above, the chatbot is trained using publicly available information on the internet. Therefore, its responses to user prompts and queries will be drawn from existing information online. And since

ChatGPT doesn't automatically offer citations or attribution to the sources from which it bases a response, it can be difficult to tell how original its outputs are.

Knowing these risks, OpenAI has published a "**Sharing & Publication Policy.**" Open AI allows for the publication of first-party written content co-authored with ChatGPT so long as:

- The author attributes the content to their name or company.
- The role of AI in generating the content is "clearly disclosed in a way that no reader could possibly miss, and that a typical reader would find sufficiently easy to understand."

The risk of plagiarism is highest when faculty use ChatGPT to generate large parts of a book, article, or research document. The risk is lower when faculty use ChatGPT to generate research ideas/topics, headings for an article, and text that will not form the substantive basis for an academic work.

Help faculty understand appropriate uses of ChatGPT

Faculty leaders can help their departments avoid abuses of ChatGPT by advocating for appropriate uses of the chatbot. As an example, I asked ChatGPT how faculty can use ChatGPT in their research and teaching roles. I've edited the response below for length and clarity. I've also divided the responses into two sections: student support and faculty applications.

Student Support

1. **Grading Assistance:**
   - Implement ChatGPT to assist in grading assignments, quizzes, or essays, providing quick feedback to students.

- Evaluate higher-order thinking skills while leaving routine feedback to ChatGPT.
2. **Facilitate Online Discussions**
   - Enhance online discussions by having ChatGPT moderate and facilitate conversations.
3. **Academic Advising Support**
   - Utilize ChatGPT to guide academic and career-related queries.
   - Help students with advice on course selection, career paths, and skill development.
   - Use ChatGPT to simulate interview scenarios for students, helping them practice and refine their communication and problem-solving skills.
4. **Accessibility Support**
   - Integrate ChatGPT to provide accessibility support, such as generating alternative text for images, summarizing content, or answering questions related to course materials.

Faculty Applications

1. **Content Creation**
   - Generate lecture outlines, lesson plans, or supplementary materials using ChatGPT.
   - Collaborate with ChatGPT to develop course content and materials.
2. **Research Assistance**
   - Utilize ChatGPT to assist in literature reviews, summarizing research papers, and generating ideas for research projects.
   - Get quick insights and suggestions for refining research questions or methodologies.
3. **Language Translation**
   - Use ChatGPT to assist with language translation for international students or collaboration with researchers from different linguistic backgrounds.

4. **Student Feedback Analysis**
   - Use ChatGPT to analyze and summarize student feedback from evaluations to help faculty identify areas for improvement and common criticisms or suggestions.

As these applications suggest, ChatGPT is best used as a supplement rather than a replacement for human interaction and creation. Faculty leaders can generate additional ideas for utilizing ChatGPT by asking the chatbot how their faculty discipline can use the tool (e.g. "How can engineering faculty use ChatGPT?").

Help faculty learn how to input the right prompts

ChatGPT has a learning curve. Often, one has to ask the chatbot the same question different ways before they are satisfied with the output. It can take time to learn what prompts and queries yield the best results. This practice is so technical that it has a name, "prompt engineering."

As a faculty leader, you should consider offering training to faculty on how to input effective prompts into ChatGPT, even informally. You can help faculty master the ChatGPT learning curve by encouraging the following prompt design strategies:

Be as specific as possible

The more specific faculty are with their instructions, the more likely they will be to achieve their desired outputs. As faculty get familiar with prompt design, they might start with a general query and narrow it down to achieve the desired results.

For example, if a faculty leader wanted to generate topics for a faculty review, a prompt sequence might take the following form:
1. What topics should be part of a faculty review?
2. Give me eight topics for a faculty review.

3. Write a brief outline for a faculty review.
4. Provide feedback for faculty who should be more engaged with students.
5. Write a short, conversational faculty review for faculty who should have more office hours and student engagement opportunities outside of class.

Minor tweaks to the prompt can shift the results significantly. Directing ChatGPT to keep the prompt "short," "conversational," or in line with a particular tone can help faculty achieve the feel they want from the text.

Faculty can also add a specific goal to the prompt for more effective results. For instance, to obtain the ideal feedback copy for prompt number five, one could add, "with the goal to have faculty offer four additional office hours a week."

Reduce fluff

Faculty should be direct—and avoid fluff—when crafting their prompts. Remind faculty that ChatGPT is AI, and it will not take offense at terse queries. More succinct prompts are likely to yield better results than conversational ones. The following example illustrates this point.

Less Effective: This email to a student about class participation should be fairly short, a few paragraphs only, and not much longer.

More Effective: Write a three-paragraph email to a student about increasing their class participation.

Split complex tasks into multiple tasks

ChatGPT can produce errors when confronted with long, complex tasks or prompts. Faculty can reduce the error rate by splitting complex tasks into simpler subtasks. For example, faculty who would like ChatGPT to summarize a long article can have the chatbot review the

ly credentialed expert on the course topic who has college teaching experience. If the individual has no college teaching experience, then providing professional development and teaching resources is essential. A content expert isn't necessarily good or natural at imparting the information students require. Those with formal teaching experience may have gained it by serving as a graduate TA, guest lecturing, or having previously been an adjunct faculty. Moreover, the best adjunct faculty candidates have a passion to teach and want to learn how to improve this craft. In my experience, the most highly engaged adjuncts are interested in giving back to their discipline and to students. Below, I discuss four ways that our program supports adjuncts.

Faculty peer-mentoring

When our department hires an adjunct faculty member to teach a course, the individual is paired with a program director or a faculty mentor (or both) who can assist with the daily needs for course delivery. The faculty mentor works closely with the new adjunct faculty to develop the course. The faculty mentor assists the adjunct in navigating the institutional systems of electronic publishing of the course and other didactic details for in-seat or online delivery, including the university's syllabi requirements and formats, and all policies and procedures relevant to the adjunct's needs. The department purchases books and printed or electronic resources for the adjunct. Established administrative staff support for student needs is quite beneficial; didactic support for classroom assistance, electronic exam preparation, and any other course material needs are also provided. All adjunct faculty should have access to an office, even if shared space, for teaching preparation and holding office hours as well as access to common spaces within the department or college for small group work. In some

instances, access to office and common space may require a dean's approval.

Professional development and resources

Importantly, when I hire an adjunct faculty, I am sure to provide any needed professional development, including resources and chair support and mentoring. As opportunities arise in the campus teaching and learning center, it is important to nominate and support adjuncts who have an interest in additional training and pedagogical programming. I also recommend that each adjunct faculty new to teaching participate in available free training sessions on the curricular management systems and video systems for the classrooms. In addition, I help to identify opportunities to support adjunct faculty and their professional development. There is a high return in providing even small amounts of funding to offset expenses for an adjunct to attend a discipline-specific academic meeting. For example, I helped to defray the cost of an adjunct faculty member to attend a national pedagogical conference. This adjunct faculty has subsequently redesigned the delivery of a human anatomy and physiology laboratory with augmented virtual reality, the first of its kind on our campus. While many of these resources can be provided by departmental funds, it is always necessary for a dean to have knowledge and to be supportive of the resources allocated to adjunct faculty members for their professional development.

Feedback for measurable improvement

While these resources are helpful, I believe that a primary way to develop adjunct faculty members is simply to make time for them. I make myself available through email and phone and in person. At the end of term, I meet individually with each adjunct to review how their course went and what they believe they should change and improve

upon for the next term. Approximately once every three terms, I meet casually with the students to get feedback about the course and what they would like to see changed for the next set of students. While course evaluations have a place and provide some information, open conversation and direct interaction with students can provide even richer feedback. From students' verbal feedback and course evaluations, I review the course's strengths and weaknesses with the adjunct face-to-face, and together we review how to improve the course, what is working, and what additional instructional needs can be provided.

Inclusion

Lastly, as they're integral members of the department, I make certain that adjuncts feel valued. This is easily accomplished by invitations to departmental and group meetings when the topics are relevant, especially when an adjunct can provide needed input and perspective for topical meetings. We include adjunct faculty members in the department and programmatic work toward strategic goals, academic program reviews, and accreditation site visits. Inclusion in these activities is essential as adjuncts rarely have a prior understanding of the larger contextual aspects of higher education, which include curricular mapping, competencies, and accreditation requirements. All adjuncts are invited to department social events as social opportunities permit assimilation and integration regardless of a person's role. Inclusion builds a sense of community for and underscores the valuable contributions of adjunct faculty.

Adjunct faculty can substantially strengthen an academic program and pedagogical instruction. Investing even a small amount of time, resources, support, and mentoring toward adjuncts' professional development can guarantee an excellent learning experience for

students. Professional development for adjuncts can allow them to become invested academic collaborators and, just possibly, the next best applicants in a faculty search. 🏛

This article first appeared in Academic Leader on March 2, 2020.

---

document in sections and construct a full summary based on its section recaps.

Place limits on the response

ChatGPT may ramble if faculty don't build proper constraints into their queries. Setting length and word count parameters on an output can help faculty achieve better results. Even then, the results may not comply with the prescribed length or word count. However, from there, you can direct ChatGPT to make its outputs shorter or longer.

Provide reference text

When faculty ask ChatGPT to generate content, it can be helpful to provide an example or reference text. For example, if a faculty leader asks ChatGPT to create a faculty review form, the faculty leader could provide a past review form as context for the prompt. Reference text helps ChatGPT refine its response to prompts.

The bottom line

Many faculty are reluctant to embrace ChatGPT and other generative AI. However, ChatGPT can simplify many tasks, resulting in more efficient research, writing, and instruction. Faculty leaders can play a unique role in demystifying the use of generative AI in their department and advocating for its responsible usage. 🏛

development of the adjunct council as a systemic way to obtain ongoing needs assessment from adjunct faculty, communicate needs, and create a feedback loop from the institution. Some members of the adjunct council also served on other campus committees, working to ensure that adjuncts' voices were being included in many types of decision-making across campus. At the University of Michigan, administrators worked with the union that bargained for VITAL faculty so that the union would welcome rather than resist the professional development they created.

Address cultures that marginalize VITAL faculty

Finally, institutional and disciplinary cultures that marginalize VITAL faculty create enormous challenges. Some campuses reported that tenure-track faculty members and administrators did not value the work of VITAL faculty; this made it challenging to engage VITAL faculty in professional development. When VITAL faculty are stressed because they feel a lack of respect, they are much less likely to engage and are unlikely to feel safe participating in professional development models where their peer group includes tenure-track faculty members. Leaders on several campuses noted that it's important to focus on improving the culture so that VITAL faculty feel safe and have confidence that participating in professional development is worthwhile.

Final takeaways

In the end, we learned that a few key perspectives can help drive a strong process for establishing quality professional development for VITAL faculty. First, perhaps the most important takeaway was that without a systems perspective that addresses the needs of VITAL faculty, including the ways that the institution can minimize or enable their participation,

planners will be limited in their success.

Second, having compassion and empathy for VITAL faculty is essential for designing professional development to meet their needs. Without this empathy, planners will not be able to create equitable experiences, empower VITAL faculty, understand their vulnerabilities, and advocate for their interests. We recommend that individuals read our companion report, *Design for Equity in Higher Education* (Culver et al., 2021).

Third, working across campus to create a culture where growth and development are expected is critical to obtaining the resources, priority setting, and structures to support professional development that is inclusive of VITAL faculty. When professional development is an expectation rather than a perk, it will also be valued and recognized much more so than it is otherwise.

References

Culver, K. C., Harper, J., & Kezar, A. (2021). *Design for equity in higher education*. University of Southern California, Pullias Center for Higher Education. **https://pullias.usc.edu/download/design-for-equity-in-higher-education**

Culver, K. C., & Kezar. A. (2021). *Designing accessible and inclusive professional development for NTTF*. University of Southern California, Pullias Center for Higher Education. **https://pullias.usc.edu/download/designing-accessible-and-inclusive-professional-development-for-nttf**

Levy, R. (2019). *VITAL faculty: A growing workforce in colleges and universities*. Mathematical Association of America. **https://www.mathvalues.org/masterblog/vital-faculty** 🏛

This article first appeared in Academic Leader on January 3, 2022.

The Value of Intergenerational Faculty Mentoring

By Edna B. Chun and Alvin Evans

For the most part, U.S. higher education has not recognized the value of intergenerational workforce practices as a valuable source of expertise and transmission of institutional knowledge. But faculty mentoring programs are the exception: they represent one of the most highly developed intergenerational practices in higher education today. These programs draw upon the reciprocity needed among different generational faculty cohorts and serve as a vehicle that enhances institutional capacity, advances organizational learning, and facilitates faculty career success. Typically, these programs involve the mentoring of junior, pre-tenure faculty by more senior, tenured faculty to facilitate the progress of new faculty toward the attainment of tenure. Yet many of these programs have not kept pace with the changing faculty landscape, in which almost three-quarters of the faculty workforce consists of full- and part-time non-tenure-track faculty. In fact, roughly half of all faculty now serve as part-time adjuncts, and approximately one-fifth hold full-time contingent positions (Yakoboski, 2018).

As a result, some colleges and universities have begun to implement mentoring programs for the now predominant non-tenure-track faculty cohort. These programs, however, are considerably sparser than and have not attained the same level of institutional recognition as tenure-track mentoring practices. As Amy Harkins (2020), chair of clinical health sciences at Saint Louis University, points out, mentoring adjunct faculty as if they were full-time provides valuable returns both in affording development opportunities for part-time faculty to move to full-time teaching roles and ensuring that instructional delivery does not discernibly differ between full-time and adjunct faculty. One exemplary example of non-tenure-track faculty mentoring is the program at Northeastern University, established through an ADVANCE grant (Advancement of Women in Academic Science and Engineering) from the National Science Foundation. In this program, faculty mentoring circles comprised of four to six faculty meet during the academic year to exchange information and share opportunities.

In addition, some institutions may assume that senior tenured faculty will not benefit from mentoring opportunities as they are too close to retirement. As Samantha, a senior White faculty member explains, because of her age her institution views her as not needing mentoring advice since she is simply expected to retire and, as she explains, "be put in a nursing home:"

> I think because I am old, I think my age doesn't allow me to be encouraged to grow, to change, it's like "you're already there, it's fine." I think in its own way it is discrimination. I am still very active. I had a book come out. . . . In the minds of some folks, I should have retired, and therefore I can't contribute, so why would they ask me too? (Chun & Evans, 2021).

Clearly, mentoring programs offer an important source of psychosocial and career support to mentees, enabling them to navigate hidden workplace barriers, accelerate career progress, and create supportive networks. In our new book, *Leveraging Multigenerational Workforce Strategies in Higher Education*, we highlight some of the leading-edge best practices in faculty mentoring. Characteristics of effective programs include the facts that they are formalized, structured, and systematized; address different career stages; and respond to the needs of different faculty cohorts. In recent years, these programs have evolved significantly to include innovate mentoring models that entail networked or group mentoring as well as hybrid blends of individualized and group mentoring approaches. Despite the growth of mentoring programs, however, relatively few institutions have expanded these programs to address the similar workplace needs of administrators or staff.

Mentoring programs differ from sponsorship programs that are specifically directed to the sponsorship by an individual with significant organizational clout who can advocate for the success of the mentee and protect them from negative influences. Sponsorship programs are particularly important for women and minorities, although a study of 40 high-potential individuals found that women had fewer such opportunities (Ibarra et al., 2010).

Types of mentoring programs

Best practice mentoring models for junior faculty include the University of California, San Francisco's program, which assigns mentoring facilitators to each department, division, and organizational research unit. Each junior or new faculty member in the four professional schools participates in a mentoring partnership agreement and development plan. The program also provides mentoring awards and monitors outcomes through an evaluation process. Another innovative model is the University of Oregon's grant-funded

faculty and external mentor program, which supports early, mid-career, and underrepresented faculty by pairing faculty members with a scholar at a peer institution in the same discipline. At New York University, the Office of Global Inclusion offers the Mentoring Program for Diverse Faculty, which specifically focuses on early career, minoritized faculty, with one-on-one mentoring, group mentoring, sponsorship, and faculty development programs.

Mid-career faculty mentoring programs are less frequently offered but can provide valuable career advice for individuals who feel stuck in their career progress after having attained tenure. Our study identified normative, ageist pressures that can arise, for example, when faculty have remained for six or more years at the associate professor rank. As Michael, the director of an innovative teaching and learning center at an elite college, explained,

a couple of observations around professors who have been at the associate rank for an extended period of time and who have come up for full and have been turned down or not put themselves up for full or delayed. . . . I have heard a lot of discussion about the longer that goes on, the more bias there is against the person (Chun & Evans, 2021).

New mentoring models that have emerged in recent years include network mentoring circles or mutual mentoring opportunities that create nonhierarchical collaborative interactions among faculty members at different career stages. These networks have been implemented within the confines of a given discipline or involve interdisciplinary collaboration. For example, at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, an innovative mutual mentoring model was implemented with support from the Andrew Mellon Foundation between 2006 and 2014.

Through a program of micro-grants, individual mentoring networks were established between and among mentors and protégés at different stages of career development. A unique feature of these networks is the inclusion of both academic and nonacademic mentors, such as librarians and administrators, as well as students. In a similar vein, the Coaching and Network Resource Program (CRN) implemented at the Susan Bulkeley Butler Center for Leadership Excellence at Purdue University, blends both mentoring and networking models to build community among assistant and associate professors.

Another important type of program that capitalizes on intergenerational learning is reverse mentoring. In such programs, members of more recent generational cohorts share knowledge with seasoned and veteran faculty in ways to incorporate technology in the teaching process. For example, consider the reverse mentoring program offered in the School of Education at Baldwin Wallace University. In it, student tech coaches mentor veteran professors who may be exploring new methods of technical integration in their teaching. The reverse mentoring program was launched by Dr. Susan Finelli-Genovese, associate dean of the K–12 master's program, and was instantly successful. Heather Sanderell, a senior majoring in early childhood education, mentored a faculty member who was 15 years her senior and felt the reciprocity involved in the mentoring process was beneficial to both herself and the faculty member. As she explained, "I think it's a very beneficial program for both parties, the student and the professor, because it allows both of us the opportunity to communicate with someone from a different generation, someone who comes from a different background and perspective of learning" (Chun & Evans, 2021).

As academic leaders design and implement mentoring programs for different constituencies, it is particularly im-portant to consider the overall needs of the workforce, especially the new dominant cohort of non-tenure-track faculty as well as administrators. In particular, mentoring programs need to address the barriers faced by women and minoritized faculty who may endure isolation, marginalization, and differential pressures within their departments and institutional culture. Structured mentoring programs that address different faculty cohorts can help advance career progress, transmit valuable institutional knowledge, and strengthen organizational learning. Through development of innovative mentoring models and systematic expansion of existing programs, colleges and universities can enhance retention, foster intergenerational engagement, and contribute to career success in fulfillment of institutional mission and goals.

References

Chun, E., & Evans, A. (2021). *Leveraging multigenerational workforce strategies in higher education*. Routledge.

Harkins, A. (2020, March 2). Providing leadership and support to professionally develop adjunct faculty. *Academic Leader*. https://www.academic-leader.com/topics/faculty-development/providing-leadership-and-support-to-professionally-develop-adjunct-faculty

Ibarra, H., Carter, N. M., & Silva, C. (2010, September). Why men still get more promotions than women. *Harvard Business Review, 88*(9), 80–126.

Yakoboski, P. (2018). *Adjunct faculty: Who are they and what is their experience?* TIAA Institute. https://www.tiaa.org/content/dam/tiaa/institute/pdf/insights-report/2019-07/tiaa-institute-2018-adjunct-faculty-survey-november-2018.pdf 🏛

This article first appeared in *Academic Leader* on March 1, 2021. AD

Let's Start from the Very Beginning: Implicit Bias Conversations for Faculty Search Committees

By Annie Soisson, Donna Qualters, and Mary Anne McInnis

There is a great deal of discussion in higher education about how to create diverse, equitable, and inclusive campuses. Tufts is not unique in its desire to diversify its faculty to better mirror the student population. One challenge in achieving this goal is implicit bias—that is, attitudes or stereotypes that affect our understanding, actions, and decisions in an unconscious manner—in search committees. The Deans of Arts & Sciences and Engineering have made it a priority to address this concern and requested that Human Resources (HR) develop mandatory implicit bias training for faculty search committees. Our HR partner in turn engaged the director of the Center for the Enhancement of Learning and Teaching (CELT) to discuss how we might together develop a mandatory program that would appeal to and benefit faculty on search committees, providing space for deep discussions about how to address implicit bias in the search process. To mitigate the reaction to all things mandatory, we immediately reframed the sessions from "search committee training" to "search committee conversations." We decided to work with intact departmental search committees (not mixed groups across departments) to work toward diversifying their faculty in their disciplines. Below we discuss the final model and some preliminary outcomes.

This is a conversation, NOT a training

"I think a powerful part of the workshop is that we all saw that all the committee members were learning and thinking about this topic. There's something about this shared mutual awareness that I think is very important and is likely to improve the chances that it will actually be carried out."—Faculty participant, fall 2019

Tufts HR had developed an Awareness of Implicit Bias in the Hiring Process program for staff drawing on the expertise of two faculty members who study implicit bias. We used their content as a baseline and tailored it to the faculty search process, adjusting terminology to align with an academic audience. We piloted the process with departments to get feedback and make revisions before it was launched for all search committees in the College of Arts and Sciences.

We facilitate the three-hour sessions as conversations, or working meetings, during which the search committees discuss when and how implicit bias can appear by using their current search process and their own materials for a series of exercises. We begin by sharing the program's goals and developing ground rules for discussion to show how developing their own as a search committee might be useful. During introductions we describe the session as a conversation that would hopefully improve their search process and decrease bias. We also reinforce that the meeting content was developed with implicit bias expert input.

The first activity sets the tone for the session as collegial and conversational. Using an **affinity diagram**, the committee develops its collective definition of bias in response to the prompt, *What do you think of when you hear the term bias?* The affinity diagram process allows each individual to share their understanding of the term and models a democratic process. While the language choices and completeness of the collective definition may vary across departments, the process effectively allows groups to begin a conversation by sharing what they already know about bias. This assessment of the group's expertise allows the facilitators to fill in knowledge gaps or ask questions to draw out where necessary rather than present information already familiar to faculty on the search committee.

Implicit bias can occur in any of the five phases of the search process

Because implicit bias can enter the search process at any point and is important to mitigate from the beginning, we walk through five phases (below) in sequence to determine where bias might emerge. We also created a workbook that went along with the topics so faculty can take notes, make comments to themselves, or write questions to ask each other in subsequent meetings. One of the most valuable set of questions we've seen is a *Chronicle of Higher Education* article by Oregon State University's Anne Gillies entitled "Questions to Ask to Help Create a Diverse Applicant Pool."

Phase one: Determining the search criteria

The conversation then transitions to understanding the selection criteria for the open position, which are not usually

BIAS FROM PAGE 10

well defined. The selection criteria are the knowledge, skills, abilities, and experience that are required to be successful in the role. Each member generates a list of criteria they think most important. We then distribute their job description as currently written and have them search for the criteria they just identified. This activity makes some departments realize that across the committee there are differences in priorities and sometimes even conflicts. We have found this to be a place where being neutral facilitators is helpful and appreciated. We emphasize the importance of a set of common evaluation criteria to be used throughout the process as well as criteria that are truly essential to the role. Each section ends with the question, What might be some biases to be aware of in this phase of the search? Some biases might be asking for more qualifications than are necessary to do the job; keeping the criteria too narrow; not determining what candidates of color might bring that is outside the box to the role; forgetting to capture the affective criteria (for example, good collaborator or effective mentor); or quite commonly, not having thoroughly discussed what each committee member means by "good collaborator" or "effective mentor."

Phase two: Defining the recruitment strategy

Next, in a conversation around their recruiting strategies, we ask participants what they currently do and then brainstorm additional strategies and venues that will help generate a more diverse applicant pool. An interesting outcome of this part of the conversation was one committee's realization that its main source of recruiting was the discipline's annual conference. In response to the question, What might be some biases to be aware of in this portion of the search?, participants realized that only those with the financial resources could

attend the conference and they might want to offer an opportunity for those not able to attend to connect in another way. We discuss the pitfalls of heavily relying on faculty they know at other institutions as sources of candidates, of posting only in their own discipline's listserv, and similar matters.

Phase three: Selecting qualified candidates

Identifying qualified candidates is the crux of the process. We hand out mock (but realistic) CVs and pair up participants to review them. We ask not which ones they would interview but rather what stands out about each candidate and what some potential sources of implicit bias in reviewing CVs are (e.g., degree granting institution, controversial areas of research or references). Conversations have been very candid. We offer the research on human tendency to gravitate toward likeness and offer some suggestions to mitigate bias, such as ensuring at least two people review each candidate, using the established criteria, and continually questioning our assumptions.

Phase four: Conducting interviews

Next, we address bias in the interview process itself. We share some best practices, such as asking the same core questions of all candidates, and the questions should tie back to the selection criteria the committee determined for the job. We ask for the "traditional interview questions" they have asked in previous searches, and then introduce behavioral interview questions—not hypothetical questions but ones that ask for specific examples of how candidates have handled situations to get at criteria that might not be evident in submitted materials. Behavioral interview questions are based on the premise that the best predictor of future performance is past performance in similar circumstances. Behavioral questions generate

significant conversation and interest and foster an understanding of how to move away from gut feelings to data-driven responses. We review personal questions committees should never ask. In cases where the group intends to conduct virtual screening interviews, we point out potential bias in online environments. Since we are dealing with academics, we outline the literature relevant to interviewing that highlights confirmation bias, recency bias, halo effect, in-group bias, and groupthink bias.

Phase five: Evaluating candidates

One of the most interesting sections of this workshop is the closing discussion. Departments differ in the roles the search committee and the department as a whole play in selecting finalists and in making the final decision. Collecting feedback from faculty and students following campus visits also varies widely in consistency and in how that feedback is weighted. Some departments have a vote after seeing the candidate's presentation; some have feedback forms. Few have a structured process to ensure that feedback from those outside the search committee is related to the actual criteria in the job description. This raises the possibility that implicit bias of colleagues who have not been part of the search committee enters the process, and the need for departments to mitigate bias beyond the search committee, especially when the final decision-making power resides in the department, not the search committee.

Conclusion

We don't yet have data on how this process is influencing applicant pools or actual hiring, but we do collect feedback after each session and have additional anecdotal data. First, while there was some initial faculty resistance to a mandatory three-hour session, all but

one faculty member (who was then taken off of the search committee) attended of 68 requested faculty from 14 departments, and the follow-up survey feedback strongly indicated that faculty valued this training. Most rated it highly, saying they had gained new insights and felt it was valuable. In most cases we achieved our intended goal of raising awareness of bias at each phase of the search. One participant said, "It was helpful to break down the various stages of the search process and to concretely identify the types of bias that may enter at each. The activities attuned me to my own perspectives and preferences and encouraged more thoughtful consideration of evaluation processes."

We have since had requests for follow-ups from participants as they go through their search process. After conversations with faculty who had gone through the experience, other schools at Tufts have invited us to work with their search committees. The importance of working with intact committees and focusing on their current searches was clear in this feedback:

Having a safe space to discuss concrete details about the search process with my fellow committee members [was the most important outcome of the program]. The critical thing is that we already started discussing these issues. This means that a) I have a sense of how my fellow committee members think about this issue and vice versa, b) we had substantive discussions about this particular search, and c) we identified areas that we need to continue discussing. This is *so* much better than having an abstract lesson on implicit bias that we then as a committee have to put into practice in our own private meetings.

Overall, we feel these departmental conversations have raised awareness of implicit bias, caused some departments to revisit their procedures, and general-

ly signaled that diverse faculty hiring is an important priority for the school. This makes awareness of equity and bias important from the inception of a position rather than at the end of the process. "It gave me the hands-on experience (by going through the activities) of taking a step in the process such as considering the desired criteria and thinking through how our decisions at this stage could influence who applies/who we select. It feels like it will now be a reflex and one that occurs at each step rather than at the end in some sort of 'ok, let's review what we did to see if it was good.'"

The biggest lesson learned is that the earlier we can have the conversations in the process, the better—before commit-

tees have been formed and job descriptions written. In future we will develop information for department chairs prior to their forming a search committee. Careful thought and conversation about bias in the search process will be valuable to chairs in considering elements of implicit bias in the forming of committees.

Exploring such questions as who is appointed to a committee, how does the committee reflect the diverse perceptions of the department, what is the role of the appointed chair all will help to increase the likelihood that a search committee will bring multiple perspectives and diverse viewpoints and talents to the process. We also see the need to

develop a repository of resources for chairs and committees.

Reference

Gillies, A. (2016, September 11). Questions to ask to help create a diverse applicant pool. *Chronicle of Higher Education.* https://www.chronicle.com/article/Questions-to-Ask-to-Help/237747 🏛

This article first appeared in *Academic Leader* on October 5, 2020.

Contributors:

Edna B. Chun, DM, is an award-winning author with more than two decades of experience in higher education. Chun teaches in the Human Capital Management Department at the Columbia University School of Professional Studies and is chief learning officer of HigherEd Talent, a national HR and diversity consulting firm.

K. C. Culver, PhD, is an assistant professor of Higher Education Administration at the University of Alabama. She is the associate director of the Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student Success at the University of Southern California.

Alvin Evans is an award-winning authors with more than 20 years in higher education. Evans is higher education practice leader for HigherEd Talent.

Amy B. Harkins, MBA, PhD, received her doctorate at the University of Pennsylvania and did postdoctoral training at the University of Chicago. From 2002 to 2017, she was faculty in

the School of Medicine at Saint Louis University, and in 2017, she became chairperson of the Department of Clinical Health Sciences in the Doisy College of Health Sciences, where she oversees nine academic programs that provide education to more than 600 students.

Rob Jenkins has spent 38 years in higher education, including 20 as an administrator. He is currently an associate professor of English at Georgia State University Perimeter College. A frequent contributor to *The Chronicle of Higher Education* and other publications, Jenkins is also the author or co-author of six books, including *Think Better, Write Better* and *The 9 Virtues of Exceptional Leaders.* Follow him on Twitter @HigherEdSpeak **Adrianna Kezar**, PhD, is the dean's professor of leadership, Wilbur-Kieffer Professor of Higher Education, and the director of the Pullias Center of Higher Education in the Rossier School of Education at the University of Southern California.

Mary Ann McInnis is the director of training, learning, and development in Tufts University's Human Resources Department. She holds a graduate cer-

tificate in instructional design from the University of Massachusetts Boston. She works collaboratively to identify the appropriate learning and development solutions for Tufts senior leaders and faculty clients.

Annie Soisson is the director of the Center for Learning and Teaching at Tufts University and an assistant professor at the Cummings School of Veterinary Medicine. She holds an EdD from Boston University and is president of the New England Faculty Development Consortium. Her work with faculty has long been centered on creating equity in learning environments and facilitating difficult dialogues.

Donna Qualters is the former director of the Center for Learning and Teaching and currently associate professor of public health and community medicine at Tufts University. She holds a PhD in educational studies from Lesley University, where she adapted an innovative technique called Dialogue to facilitate change by raising beliefs and assumptions around faculty thinking and practice. 🏛

administrators, colleagues in student services, the library, the business office, and the bookstore. They may become some of your best friends while opening new vistas for you professionally.

Practice self-care

Several years ago, when I was interviewing for a department chair position, the dean conducting the interview complained (bragged?) that she never took vacation time. I replied, "If I get this job, I promise that won't be an issue." I did get the job, and I did take my vacation time. Well, most of it.

One reason people avoid administration is that it can become all-consuming, monopolizing your time, energy, and emotional bandwidth. To survive your tenure as chair, it's important to engage in a little self-care. Make an effort to eat well and exercise regularly. Get some rest. Say "no" occasionally. Take your vacation days. Spend time with family and friends. Watch a movie. Read a book.

Above all, go home. Don't work late night after night. One of the best pieces of advice I ever received, as a new administrator, was that "there's no such thing as an academic emergency." That might not always be true, but it's generally true. Most things can wait till tomorrow.

Self-care also involves making time for the things you love, professionally. If the main reason you went into education is that you enjoy the classroom, and now you rarely teach, consider picking up an additional course. If you still teach but find that, with your administrative responsibilities, you don't have time for writing and research, try carving out a few hours a week for those activities, even it means letting other things slide—like responding to every single email. Chances are, you'll discover those "other things" weren't as urgent as they seemed.

Remember, serving others doesn't mean neglecting your own mental health. Your department needs you. Your institution needs you. Your colleagues need you. But they all need you to be relatively stable, happy, and content with your lot. Harried, bitter, stressed-out chairs are no help to anyone, least of all themselves.

The good news is that you can do both, fulfilling your responsibilities while still maintaining your sanity and having a life. You just have to keep things in perspective, take advantage of new opportunities, and find satisfaction in helping others succeed. 🏛

This article first appeared in *Academic Leader* on May 6, 2019.

Dear Reluctant Administrator: You've Got This

By Rob Jenkins

Colleges and universities differ from most other organizations in that not everyone longs to be in charge. At corporations, government agencies, and even non-profits, staff members all seem intent on clawing their way up the ladder, while the intrigue within a typical home-owner's association or youth sports league might shock Machiavelli.

Academia isn't completely immune. We have our share of climbers and careerists, lusting for power and prestige. Ironically, they're usually the last people most of us would wish to work for. We also have plenty of decent, talented folks who are skilled managers and inclined to follow that career path—thank goodness. We need all of those administrators we can get.

Yet we also have, in academia, a fair number of decent, talented folks who have leadership ability but no interest in leading. They just want to be left alone—to teach, pursue their scholarly interests, and serve on committees. (Well, maybe not that last one, so much.) For them, administration represents more work (often for not much more money), more headaches, and less autonomy. Plus, it's a distraction from their "real job" as scholars.

That's unfortunate because, as I said, we need good people, especially as department chairs. That's where most of the administrative work of the college gets done. And I've observed, over my three decades in academia, that those who most covet the position tend to be least suited for it, while the ones who are initially reluctant to accept it often make the best leaders.

On the bright side, given the culture on many campuses, those individuals—the reluctant ones—sometimes find themselves taking on the duties of department chair, anyway. Perhaps they were talked into applying by colleagues or recruited by the dean. Or maybe, as is the case at many smaller institutions, it was simply their turn—they "rotated in" when a colleague's stint ended.

If you find yourself in that situation, reluctantly serving as chair for a fixed term with an end date that can't seem to arrive soon enough, just know that your time in office needn't be miserable. You can make it a rewarding and even enjoyable experience.

> **Good leaders, however reluctant, understand that leadership is often a form of sacrifice for the common good.**

See the big picture

As dean, I once presided over the formation of a new department, basically splitting a large unit in half. That was easy enough. The challenge was finding someone to lead it.

First, I emailed the faculty to see if anyone was interested. No response. Then I talked to several of the more experienced professors. I was uniformly rebuffed. I briefly considered resorting to blackmail before one faculty member agreed to take the job. When I asked him why he changed his mind, he said, "Because I realized it's not about me. It's about what's best for the campus, my colleagues, and the students."

That's exactly right. Good leaders, however reluctant, understand that leadership is often a form of sacrifice for the common good.

Focus on service

For me, department chair was by far the most satisfying administrative job I ever held. As difficult as it was at times—I actually found it more demanding than being a dean—it also provided me with countless opportunities to help others, especially faculty.

As chair, you can serve your colleagues in ways you never could otherwise, using your skills and influence to make their jobs easier. That entails a great deal of work behind the scenes—scheduling classes, horse-trading for space, procuring equipment—that garners little recognition, much less thanks. Your reward will be a happy, productive faculty, successful students, and a smooth-running department.

Cultivate relationships

Sadly, as chair, you can no longer pal around with your former faculty buddies, lest you appear to play favorites. You needn't abandon those friendships entirely, and you certainly shouldn't alienate colleagues if you can avoid it, especially if you're headed back to the faculty in a few years. But you may need to put some relationships temporarily on hold in the interests of fairness and objectivity.

As difficult as that may be, it also gives you a chance to make new friends among people you might not have known before—or bothered getting to know. That includes, in addition to other mid-level

SUPPORTING **FACULTY**