

California State University, Fullerton



**Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Mentoring
Final Report and Recommendations**
February 25, 2008

Committee Members:

Peggy Atwell, AVPAA
 April Bullock, LBST
 Kathryn Dickson, BIOL
 Reyes Fidalgo, MLNG
 Ellen Junn, Committee Chair, HHD
 Tom Klammer, H&SS
 Hyekyeung Seung, COMM
 Ken Walicki, MUSC

Guests:

Robin Graboyes, FAR
 Linda Patton, OGC
 Tony Rimmer, FDC
 Ed Sullivan, IRAS

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction.....	2
II. Existing CSU Faculty Mentoring Programs.....	3
A. CSU, Fullerton.....	3
1. Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry & Department of Biology.....	3
2. Other Departments on Campus.....	3
3. College of HHD/COE and Faculty Organizations.....	4
B. Other CSU's.....	4
1. San Diego State University.....	5
2. California State University, Fresno.....	5
III. Summary of Research on Faculty Mentoring in Higher Education.....	5
IV. Summary of Junior Faculty Data from Harvard's COACHE Survey	6
1. Faculty Response to Specific Mentoring Questions.....	6
2. Items Garnering Positive Faculty Responses.....	7
3. Items Garnering Negative Faculty Responses.....	8
4. Significant Differences by Gender and Ethnicity.....	8
5. Open-Ended Questions.....	9
6. CSU Comparison Data.....	9
7. COACHE National List of Top Academic Workplaces.....	10
V. Concluding Comments and Thoughts.....	10
VI. Acknowledgements.....	13
VII. References on Mentoring.....	14
VII. Committee's Recommendations Matrix.....	15

I. INTRODUCTION

California State University, Fullerton (CSUF) currently is home to **404** fully-tenured faculty (minus FERP's). Following a comprehensive faculty flow analysis, the President and Vice President of Academic Affairs determined that an aggressive tenure-track hiring plan would be warranted. Consequently, in 2004, the President announced a five-year, tenure-track recruitment plan authorizing approximately 100 searches per year, with an anticipated hiring of 80-90 new tenure-track faculty per year. We currently are in the third year of this five-year faculty recruitment campaign. Over the first two years of this recruitment campaign, 174 new faculty members have joined our ranks, and combined with the 124 probationary faculty from previous years, the campus currently has a total of **298** probationary faculty who are in the RTP process, bringing the number of tenured and tenure-track faculty to a total of **702**¹.

Of importance is that this significant growth in faculty recruitment is paralleled by unprecedented growth in our student body. In fact, CSUF has had the highest headcount of students in the CSU system for the last two years in a row, with a student headcount of **37,130** for 2007 (see <http://www.calstate.edu/as/inbrief/inbrief07.shtml>):

- Tenured faculty = 404 (57.5%)
- Tenure-track faculty = 298 (42.5%)
- Part-time faculty ² = 1,069 vs. 702 tenured/tenure-track faculty
- Student headcount ² = 37,130

Given this significant surge in the numbers of new tenure-track faculty, the Academic Senate identified mentoring of junior faculty as a high priority at its annual August of 2007 retreat with Academic Affairs. As a result, in late Fall of 2007, the Senate established an ad hoc Faculty Mentoring Committee and charged the committee as follows:

- Review literature on best practices in faculty mentoring;
- Examine policies/practices at other universities;
- Survey junior faculty and faculty mentors regarding needs and/or department chairs on existing practices, if deemed necessary;
- Interview relevant campus administrators;
- Review results of COACHE survey of CSUF faculty; and
- Report findings and recommendations to the Academic Senate Executive Committee no later than March 1, 2008.

The Faculty Mentoring Committee was convened on 11/29/07 and met on 1/24/08, 2/7/08, 2/14/08 and 2/21/08.

Initial Committee Discussion

Discussion among committee members was far-ranging, spirited and centered on a number of key issues and questions to be resolved:

- Preference for an optional, rather than mandatory faculty mentoring program;
- Preference for a less formal, non-bureaucratic mentoring program;

¹ While the campus does publish federally-mandated IPEDS (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System) figures, for the purposes of this internal report, we rely on more up-to-the-minute data from the office of Faculty Affairs and Records (FAR), as reflecting most closely data for our tenured, tenure-track and FERP faculty.

² Data on part-time faculty and student headcount are taken from our IPEDS database as of Fall 2007 (Institutional Research & Analytical Studies Office).

- Strong concerns about providing adequate incentives to mentors—ideally, release time for mentors due to the significant time demands of mentoring many junior faculty;
- Concerns about how mentors and junior faculty might be matched;
- Concerns about providing effective training for mentors;
- Need for multidimensional mentoring in a variety of areas such as:
 - ✓ research support and collaboration
 - ✓ teaching support and/or technology support
 - ✓ grant-writing support
 - ✓ other professional development support
 - ✓ politically-savvy advice
 - ✓ collegial, social support
 - ✓ other life adjustment information and support (e.g., housing, maternity/paternity leaves, childcare, schools, accessing health care, etc.)
- Preference for increasing the visibility and linkage between existing campus resources (e.g., Faculty Affairs and Records, Faculty Development Center) in a more comprehensive and easily accessible way by leveraging technology (e.g., creating a faculty website or considering electronic email mentoring).
- Enthusiasm for using the COACHE data from our faculty as a starting point to shape the form and features of our proposed faculty mentoring program.
- Interest in exploring multiple models of mentoring. Mentoring does NOT have to exist only in a one-to-one relationship; a panel of mentor experts might be amenable for some areas such as teaching consultation support or political advice.

II. EXISTING CSU FACULTY MENTORING PROGRAMS

A. CSU, Fullerton

1. Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry & Department of Biology

The CHEM department utilizes a formal mentoring plan as part of their Department Personnel Standards document for all probationary faculty in the department as excerpted below.

Specific steps in the process of Developmental Narrative development are as follows:

(a) Before the end of the first two weeks of the fall semester, the Department chair shall consult with each newly appointed faculty member concerning appropriate faculty mentors and shall designate at least two tenured faculty members as mentors. The Department chair and the mentors shall help the new faculty member develop the DN.

(b) Within the first 6 weeks of the first semester of the probationary faculty member's appointment, the DPC shall conduct an orientation meeting with the new faculty member, and if possible, the mentors and Department chair. At this meeting, the DPC shall distribute and discuss a set of guidelines it has developed to help the new faculty member prepare the DN and the Portfolio.

Similarly, the Biology Department personnel document states under item: *"I.C.5. Mentors and Developmental Narrative for Probationary Faculty. First year probationary faculty will be assigned one or more Mentors before the end of the first two weeks of the fall semester. The Mentor(s) will provide guidance, advice and support to the probationary faculty member during preparation of a Developmental Narrative during the first year as outlined in UPS 210.000 Section II."* The Biology department has assigned faculty mentors for their new faculty for at least the last 20 years. To our knowledge, these are the only two departments on our campus that have elected to explicitly formalize the mentoring process as part of their Department Personnel Standards.

2. Other Departments on Campus

It is important to note that it is possible that other departments on our campus also may formally assign mentors for probationary faculty as a direct result of the prior version of UPS 210.000 (approved in 2004) which mandated faculty mentors as part of the RTP process. However, since

that time, UPS 210.000 has undergone various modifications and faculty mentors are no longer required as part of UPS 210.000. Thus, it is possible that some departments on campus may still see the value of assigning mentors even though it is no longer mandated by policy.

3. Colleges of HHD/COE Faculty Organizations

While not initially designed as faculty mentor programs, the colleges of Health and Human Development (HHD) and Education (COE) established two faculty organizations in 2001 which work closely with the deans' offices (i.e., associate dean) to host a series of workshops and activities to support faculty in both colleges. The two organizations are: ULO (Untenured Faculty and Full-time Lecturer Organization) and RACE (Researchers And Critical Educators). While RACE originally was established by faculty in HHD and COE, it has expanded its membership to now include faculty in other colleges including COMM and HSS. Both faculty organizations have bylaws, elect officers, hold monthly meetings, host activities, and maintain websites featuring their work.

These faculty-led organizations provide a host of meaningful and important support activities for probationary faculty in both colleges throughout the year, including workshops on a variety of topics such as RTP issues, research and grant-writing support, teaching support, support for topics involving cultural diversity, leadership development, and social activities. Faculty participation in the organization is very strong and faculty report that they find the interactions among colleagues and the activities extremely beneficial.

A sample of some of the workshops hosted by these organizations are listed below:

ULO (<http://hhd.fullerton.edu/ulo/>):

- *New Faculty Welcome to Campus Luncheon with the Deans of HHD and COE*
- *1st Year Faculty RTP Fall & Spring Meetings with the Dean*
- *Full-Time Lecturer Portfolio Spring Meeting with the Dean*
- *Developing a Research Agenda: How to Avoid the Negative Mindset of No Time and No Money*
- *Collaborating with Colleagues Over Cabernet, Chardonnay and Canapes*
- *Grant Writing De-mystified: How have others done it? How can you get started?*
- *Getting Inside Academic Journals: Reviewers and Editorial Board Members Talk About How They Got There*
- *Improving your Teaching with Mid-Semester Evaluations*
- *How Important is Service and Professional Development?: Words of Wisdom from the Experts*
- *Effective and Meaningful Service and Professional Development: Advice From a Panel of Experts*
- *Improving Student Writing Using Rubrics*
- *A Discussion of Student Affairs Issues, Nancee Wright, Assistant Dean of Student Affairs*
- *Multicultural Education: "I Am Orange County" Moving Past the Stereotypes of the "O.C." Student*
- *Dealing with Student Prejudice and Racism*
- *Springtime Junior Faculty Barbeque*

RACE (<http://hhd.fullerton.edu/race/>):

- *Building our CSUF Faculty Family: Recruiting & Retaining a Diverse CSUF Faculty, Keynote by Dr. Caroline Turner, Arizona State University*
- *Distinguished Speaker Series in Education, Dr. Peter McLaren, Professor of Education, Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, University of California, Los Angeles*
- *Expulsion of U.S. Citizens: Unconstitutional Deportation of Mexican Americans During the 1930's Educational Forum, Dr. Christina Balderrama, Ray Rodriguez, Dr. Christine Valenciana, Senator Joseph Dunn, Alex Madrigal, Sue Dunbar, Steve Reyes*
- *Understanding Religiously Conservative Students, Dr. Benjamin Hubbard, Comparative Religion*
- *Introducing RACE to All New Faculty*
- *Who Are We? CSUF Faculty Profile: Supporting Junior Faculty—Demographic Data and Campus Efforts*
- *Working with the Office of Grants and Contracts to Obtain External Funding, Ignacia Royer, OCG*
- *Buying a Home in Orange County on a Faculty Member's Budget!*
- *Summer barbeque parties*

B. Other CSU Faculty Mentoring Programs

1. San Diego State University (SDSU)

The College of Professional Studies and Fine Arts at SDSU provides all junior faculty with an Information Resource Packet and the dean's office (associate dean) coordinates and hosts a series of meetings, workshops and social gatherings for all probationary faculty throughout the year. These activities include:

- *Breakfast (7:30-9:00 am) for 1-3 year and 4-6 year faculty--round table format where faculty have a chance to talk with the Dean and Associate Dean, share their research, ask questions, meet each other.*
- *Evening social: Celebration of Tenure & Promotion--at a home hosted by the dean for faculty who have received promotion & tenure along with their spouses and department chairs. No agenda, casual time to celebrate with refreshments.*
- *Late afternoon social for probationary faculty--on campus near art gallery or theatre venue, opportunity to come together as a whole group for all probationary faculty. Dean and associate dean attend.*
- *Fall workshop for internal grants--associate dean and mentors meet with probationary faculty on a Friday for two hours to explain the internal grants and assist with ideas.*
- *Late fall RTP workshop--introduce faculty to the RTP process in preparation for Spring review.*
- *Spring semester repeats breakfast and late afternoon socials.*
- *Spring workshop on interpretation of student evaluations and how to improve teaching based on feedback.*
- *Final gathering of mentors and probationary faculty with Associate Dean to wrap up the year.*

In a personal communication, associate dean Dr. Kathy Lamaster reported that faculty attendance, enthusiasm and appreciation for these meetings are high in part because faculty value the opportunity to interact with the dean and associate dean.

2. California State University, Fresno

In 1988, Fresno State adopted a formal mentoring program for all probationary faculty. Their mentoring program is an integral part of their RTP process. Their Policy on Probationary Plans and Faculty Mentoring can be found at <http://www.csufresno.edu/aps/documents/apm/324.pdf>. At the time of initial appointment, the department chair selects a mentor(s) for the probationary faculty. Together, the mentor(s) and the probationary faculty member prepare the draft probationary plan during the first year for review during the second year. The mentor(s) and the probationary faculty discuss the draft probationary plan with the department chair, and the plan can be modified before submission to the tenured departmental faculty. The approved plan is next reviewed by the appropriate college committee, dean, University Board on Retention and Tenure, and Provost. Their policy statement does not include additional language regarding the role and responsibilities of the mentor once the probationary plan is complete and approved. In a personal communication, it appears that this mentoring RTP process is well understood and viewed positively by junior faculty at Fresno.

III. SUMMARY OF RESEARCH ON FACULTY MENTORING IN HIGHER EDUCATION

In order to facilitate a review of the literature on faculty mentoring programs in higher education, paperback copies of *On Being a Mentor: A Guide for Higher Education Faculty* by W. Brad Johnson (2007) were made available for each member of the Faculty Mentoring Committee. A brief summary of the research results follows below and a reference list can be found toward the end of this report.

Recent research on junior faculty mentoring has demonstrated that mentoring has multiple positive effects on both junior and senior faculty, as well as institutions that develop a strong culture of mentoring (Boice, 1992). For junior faculty the benefits include more career success with grants, publications, tenure and promotion, teaching and greater personal satisfaction. Junior faculty who are mentored also develop a stronger bond with the university (Bode, 1999), leading to higher retention rates and more effective teaching and university service. Mentoring relationships help junior faculty learn to balance work and

family while they adjust to a new institution (Neilson, Carlson, & Lankau, 2001). Mentors also benefit from their relationship with junior faculty. The benefits for mentors include professional rejuvenation, greater motivation to remain current in their field, and personal satisfaction and fulfillment (Cawyer, Simonds & Davis, 2002; Gersick, Bartunek, & Dutton, 2000). The institution benefits since mentored faculty are less likely to leave prematurely and are more likely to “demonstrate collegiality and institution-affirming behaviors” (Johnson 2007, p. 13).

Outstanding mentors are accessible, encouraging and supportive, and clear about performance expectations. They provide information and clear feedback; demystify the system; challenge, and protect when necessary; provide exposure and promote visibility; foster professional networks. The personality of the mentor is just as important as the mentor’s skills and competencies. Genuine competence as a mentor includes foundational character virtues that address: codes of behavior; interpersonal and emotional abilities such as integrity, caring and prudence; and a fundamental orientation to helping others, empathy, personal warmth, and congruence.

Research suggests that, when a mentor initiates a mentorship, protégées receive more mentor functions. Mentorship programs should take into account the following considerations: role expectations; goal clarification; duration of relationship; matching concerns; relationship boundaries, periodic evaluation. The mentor carries a moral and ethical obligation to ensure that the protégée’s best interests are served by the relationship. This obligation encompasses to assume responsibility for benefiting others, avoiding harm, protecting the other person’s autonomy and privacy, remaining loyal, and acting with prudence and fairness at all times.

Mentoring for junior faculty takes a variety of forms. Some institutions have university-wide formal mentoring programs, while others have formal programs in which new faculty are assigned individual mentors by department chairs or college deans. Still other programs assign teams of mentors within a department who meet with junior faculty as a group as well as individually (De Janasz & Sullivan, 2003). This last approach has the benefit of increasing the accessibility of mentors which is a critical ingredient in a successful mentoring relationship. Regular meetings and frequent contact between mentor and new faculty are important in establishing fruitful mentoring relationships. Successful mentoring requires thoughtful and intentional preparation on the part of the senior faculty mentor (Rodenhauser, Rudisill, & Dvorak, 2000). Therefore, mentors should be rewarded in some way by their institutions. Mentoring is too often considered an add-on to the traditional divisions of academic work—teaching, research, and service—rather than an important and separate category of its own. Moreover, mentoring for traditionally under-represented faculty can be very important to faculty success (Smith, Smith, & Markham, 2000).

While early research on mentoring in education and business settings involved small sample sizes and generally resulted in enduring and highly successful mentor-protégé relationships, unfortunately, negative and dysfunctional mentoring may also occur (Merriam, 1983; Zey, 1984). Johnson (2007) provides useful information and case studies on how to identify, diagnose and correct negative mentoring situations as well as specific information on how to meaningfully assess mentoring programs (e.g., Gray & Johnson, 2005; O’Neil & Wrightsman, 2001). Johnson (2007) concludes the book with recommendations for department chairs and deans, citing the importance of creating a culture of mentoring, recruiting competent mentors, considering non-traditional forms of mentoring (team mentoring, peer mentoring, e-mentoring), developing policy, and evaluating and rewarding mentors.

IV. SUMMARY OF JUNIOR FACULTY DATA FROM HARVARD’S COACHE SURVEY

In the Spring of 2006, our campus convened a regional CSU meeting to generate interest among the CSU’s for participating in Harvard University’s *Collaborative On Academic Careers in Higher Education* (COACHE, <http://gseacademic.harvard.edu/~coache/>) initiative to improve the quality of faculty work life.

As a result, seven CSU's joined COACHE (CSUF, CSULB, CSUSLO, CSUSB, CSUSM, Pomona, Sonoma State). Nationally, the survey has been administered in 2005-06 and 2006-07 at fifty-six universities and twenty-two liberal arts colleges. The recommended survey cycle is four years (CSUF faculty would take the survey again in 2010-11).

During Fall 2006, all CSUF tenure-track faculty who started in a position at CSUF prior to Fall 2006 were invited to participate in this online survey. Of the 204 tenure-track faculty on campus who had started their position prior to Fall 2006, 114 faculty responded to the survey (56% response rate; 67 women, 47 men).

1. Faculty Response to Specific Mentoring Questions

The COACHE survey include four questions specifically addressing the importance and effectiveness of mentoring—both formal and informal mentoring. Rankings were on a 1-5-point scale with 1=very unimportant/ineffective to 5=very important/effective:

1. Please rate how important you think each would be to your success—formal mentoring for junior faculty = 3.691
2. Please rate how important you think each would be to your success—informal mentoring for junior faculty = 4.133
3. How effective for you have been the following at your institution—formal mentoring for junior faculty = 3.004
4. How effective for you have been the following at your institution—informal mentoring for junior faculty = 3.623

Taken together, faculty respondents on our survey report that mentoring (whether formal or informal) is very *important to their success* (mean=3.912). They also report that the *mentoring* (formal or informal) they have received thus far has been fairly *effective* (mean=3.313). When asked about the importance and effectiveness of *formal versus informal mentoring*, faculty endorsed informal mentoring more strongly (informal mentoring mean= 3.878; formal mentoring mean=3.348). In sum, faculty on our campus believe very strongly that mentoring is important to their success and they voice a stronger preference for informal versus formal mentoring options.

As a result of these data and many anecdotal reports, committee members unanimously agreed to make recommendations for establishing a multidimensional, voluntary program that would lead to promoting informal mentoring relationships, as well as other coordinated resource supports for tenure-track faculty.

In order to design a comprehensive support system, the committee went on to review all of the other items on the COACHE survey to identify which areas of support faculty on our campus perceived as most in need, as well as areas of strength. A summary of these data follows below.

Faculty Responses to Other Satisfaction Survey Items

The survey examines five themes: (1) Tenure (i.e., clarity and reasonableness of the tenure process); (2) Nature of the Work (i.e., level of satisfaction); (3) Policies and Practices (i.e., importance and effectiveness); (4) Climate, Culture, and Collegiality; and (5) Global Satisfaction. Open ended answers to questions and level of agreement on topics of interest data were also collected.

2. Items Garnering Positive Faculty Responses

Our faculty had high ratings for the following items:

- Satisfaction with the discretion they have over the content of the courses they teach (4.59 on 5-point scale)
- Satisfaction with the influence they have over which courses they teach (4.43 on 5-point scale)
- Satisfaction with the influence they have over the focus of their research (4.37 on 5-point scale)
- Satisfaction with the fairness of their immediate supervisor's evaluation of their work (4.29 on 5-point scale)
- Clarity of the expectations for performance as a teacher (4.26 on 5-point scale)
- Clarity of the tenure process (4.26 on 5-point scale)

They most frequently rated the following items as the best aspects about working at CSUF.

1. *Geographic location*
2. *Support of colleagues*
3. *My sense of "fit" here*
4. *Quality of colleagues*

3. Items Garnering Negative Faculty Responses

Our faculty had low ratings for the following items:

- *Satisfaction with the amount of access they have to Teaching Fellows, Graduate Assistants, et al. (2.31 on 5-point scale)*
- *Effectiveness of spousal/partner hiring program (2.38 on 5-point scale)*
- *Satisfaction with the amount of time they have to conduct research (2.39 on 5-point scale)*
- *Effectiveness of paid or unpaid research leave during the probationary period (2.48 on 5-point scale)*
- *Effectiveness of financial assistance with housing (2.56 on 5-point scale)*
- *Satisfaction with compensation (2.57 on 5-point scale)*
- *Effectiveness of professional assistance in obtaining externally funded grants (2.58 on 5-point scale)*
- *Effectiveness of an upper limit on committee assignments for junior faculty (2.65 on 5-point scale)*
- *Person who serves as the chief academic officer seems to care about the quality of life for junior faculty (2.65 on 5-point scale)*
- *Effectiveness of child care options (2.84 on 5-point scale)*

They most frequently rated the following items as the worst aspects about working at CSUF.

1. *Cost of living*
2. *Teaching load*
3. *Compensation*
4. *Lack of support for research/creative work (e.g., leave)*

4. Significant Differences by Gender and Ethnicity

Gender

CSUF women's ratings for the following questions were significantly ($p < 0.05$) higher than men's ratings. All items had overall ratings above 3.4 on a 5.0 scale. Paid/unpaid personal leave is only item in the list below with men rating below 3.0 on a 5.0 scale.

- *Is what's expected in order to earn tenure clear to you regarding your performance as a colleague in your department/institution*
- *Please indicate your level of satisfaction with the following: The quality of graduate students with whom you interact*
- *Please rate how important you think each would be to your success: Formal mentoring program for junior faculty*
- *Please rate how important you think each would be to your success: Informal mentoring*
- *Please rate how important you think each would be to your success: Paid or unpaid personal leave during the pre-tenure period*
- *Please rate how important you think each would be to your success: Paid or unpaid research leave during the pre-tenure period*
- *Please rate how important you think each would be to your success: Stop-the-clock for parental or other family reasons*
- *Please rate how important you think each would be to your success: Travel funds to present papers or conduct research*
- *Please rate how important you think each would be to your success: Written summary of periodic performance reviews for junior faculty*
- *Please indicate your level of satisfaction with the following: The amount of personal interaction you have with senior colleagues in your department*

Ethnicity

COACHE generated race comparison categories (White Faculty compared to Faculty of Color) showed that CSUF White Faculty ratings for the following questions were significantly ($p < 0.05$) higher than those of Faculty of Color. All items had overall ratings above 3.60 on a 5.0 scale.

- *Clarity of the standards for tenure*
- *Clarity of the body of evidence that will be considered in making decisions about their own tenure*
- *Satisfaction with the quality of clerical/administrative services*

CSUF Faculty of Color ratings for the following question was significantly ($p < 0.05$) higher than those of White Faculty. Item had an overall rating 3.17 on a 5.0 scale.

- *Clarity of the expectations for performance as a community member*

5. Open-Ended Questions

Open ended responses were solicited by the survey to the following question: *Tell us the number one thing that you, personally, think your institution should do in order to be a great place to work.*

Two themes emerge in the responses.

1. Reduce the teaching load

- *Reduce teaching load and increase teaching support (i.e., support Teaching Assistants for each class) to truly allow for high quality research and excellent teaching. 80%+ of time is spent on teaching responsibilities, severely reducing ability to produce research quality/quantity.*
- *Reduce the teaching load for tenure-track faculty. Although I knew that teaching a 4/4 load was required, I did not realize how limiting that was in terms of trying to conduct meaningful research. For a tenure-track faculty member who plans on staying here for his/her career, this is fine. However, for those of us who intend to work at a Research I or other institution, trying to establish a strong record of research is next to impossible with this heavy of a teaching load.*
- *We teach a number of classes, which matches our mission at CSU that 'teaching' is our number one priority. However, the trend seems to be that we are urged to get big grants, write many papers and books, etc. The CSU needs to decide if this is a research institution or a teaching institution. We can't do both. If we are going to be UC-wannabees, then the CSU needs to reduce the teaching load. They also need to fix the salary structure so that new hires aren't getting paid way more than older hires (who never get raises).*
- *Reduce the official teaching load from a 4/4 to a 3/3. Otherwise, it makes producing quality research difficult.*
- *Reduce the teaching load. The university offers many good programs for getting course releases through intramural grants, but I feel I spend a lot of time and energy working to get release time that would be better spent working on research requirements for tenure. CSUF seems to be in a strange position. Because it is a CSU, the primary focus is teaching and the course load is 4/4. However, it is also very large and seemingly striving to be a research institution. My department requires at least 4 quality peer reviewed publications for tenure.*

2. Increase salary/pay

- *Either pay us enough to live above the 'basic survival' mode, or require less of us so that we can take a second job/seek creative research opportunities.*
- *Increase compensation for excellence in teaching or non-parity of teaching salaries for non-parity in qualifications. My compensation as a new tenure-track faculty was limited for the stated reason that tenured faculty were not yet making that salary. I come in with higher qualifications than some others in their field.*
- *Salary/Cost of Living issues are always an issue. At same time, they reflect a system problem and not an institution-specific problem.*
- *Pay a living wage.*
- *Increase compensation to the point where a faculty member can support a family without requiring the spouse to work.*
- *The administration should be more supportive of faculty compensation issues.*
- *Pay higher salaries, comparable to other institutions.*
- *The compensation needs to at a very minimum keep up with costs of living.*
- *Increase faculty salaries. A starter home near the campus costs in the 600-700K range; my base salary is \$66K.*
- *Increase salaries so I could afford a home in the area.*
- *Raise salaries to better reflect the cost of housing in this area.*
- *The university needs to create a competitive, equitable compensation system.*

6. CSU Comparison Data

As part of the agreement for participating in a consortium with other CSU campuses, a CSU comparison report was developed by COACHE. We had the highest mean scores of the seven campuses on seventeen questions (including five where the mean CSU score was less than 3.0 on a 5.0 point scale). We had the second highest mean scores on twenty-four questions (including four where the mean CSU score was less than 3.0 on a 5.0 point scale). We were in the middle group (third to fifth highest score) on forty questions

(including nine where the mean CSU score was less than 3.0 on a 5.0 point scale). We had the second lowest score on six questions (five of the six questions had mean CSU scores higher than 3.50 on a 5.0 scale). We had the lowest score on two questions (both had CSU mean scores above 3.3 on a 5.0 scale).

Compared to CSU peers we scored well on Tenure (top 2 mean rating on 18 of 19 questions), Nature of Work (top 2 mean rating on 7 of 17 questions), and Climate, Culture, and Collegiality (top 2 mean rating on 4 of 10 questions) categories. Mixed results were seen in the Policies and Practices (11 of 38 questions rated in top 2 and 6 of 38 questions rated in the bottom 2) and Global Satisfaction (1 of 5 questions rated in top 2; 1 of 5 questions rated in the bottom 2 categories).

7. COACHE List of Top Academic Workplaces

In December 2007, COACHE released a list of top academic workplaces

<http://gseacademic.harvard.edu/~coache/reports/20071205.html>. The release provided the top four (occasionally more than four if within 0.05 of fourth place school mean on a 5-point scale for the listed dimension) of fifty-six participating universities that were rated exemplary in twelve dimensions based on survey data. CSUF was designated as an “Exemplary Institution” on three of the twelve items.

- *Tenure Practices Overall (19 questions dealing with Tenure Process, Clarity of Process, Reasonableness of the Process)*
- *Tenure Clarity (6 questions dealing with Clarity of what is expected to achieve tenure and is a subset of the Tenure Practice overall variable)*
- *Climate and Collegiality (12 questions dealing with mentoring, collaboration, interaction, sense of belonging, intellectual vitality of senior colleagues, and treatment of junior faculty within a department)*

V. Concluding Comments and Thoughts

Our campus is at a crucial, historic juncture in the life of the university. Consider some important facts. First, our campus is now home to over **37,000 students**—both the largest in our fifty-year history and the ***most populous among the entire twenty-three CSU campuses!*** Second, currently, our campus has 404 tenured faculty (57.5%) and 298 (42.5%) probationary faculty. Even with the hiring slow-down due to the imminent state budget crisis, ***it is highly likely that five years from now, the absolute numbers of tenure-track faculty will exceed the number of tenured faculty*** on our campus. Third, the historical context, demands and pressures confronting probationary faculty have changed over time and Departmental Personnel Standards (DPS) have evolved to reflect these increasing demands for attaining tenure, particularly with respect to specific achievements in scholarly and creative activity and teaching. Fourth, the majority of our newest probationary faculty enter our ranks as young women and men who also are coping with bearing and raising children often within dual-career, working family relationships. Taken in totality, CSUF represents a “brave new world” for the professoriate—***we literally are at the brink of welcoming, nurturing, growing and launching our next generation of powerful faculty researchers, teachers and leaders*** who will go on to inspire and support the groundswell of students who aspire to become college-educated Cal State Fullerton graduates. So how as a campus might we ensure our efforts result in greater success? We are at a crossroads—we **MUST** support our junior faculty since they will become our core professoriate, and are the future of the university.

One avenue is to turn to the research on effectively mentoring junior faculty. This research supports the power and efficacy of mentoring in promoting the success and adjustment of junior faculty, if the mentoring program is of high quality and takes into account a variety of key factors as outlined in the prior section of this report summarizing the research literature. This report capitalizes on that research and strongly recommends a variety of mentoring options for probationary faculty which are outlined in more detail in the Recommendations section at the end of this report.

Second, while establishment of this committee was an important and vital effort, instituting mentoring for probationary faculty as a sole solution cannot be seen as a panacea for adequately supporting junior faculty. Therefore, our Ad Hoc Faculty Mentoring Committee opted to enlarge its charge and went on to review, discuss and recommend a far more comprehensive list of support mechanisms, programs and possibilities that could be implemented for probationary faculty.

Third, this report makes substantial use of Harvard's COACHE survey data as a foundational guide for identifying and prioritizing items of need as deemed most salient by our probationary faculty. In other words, the COACHE survey results can be read as the responses of tenure-track faculty to discreet items and clusters of items related to their experience as faculty members. In fact, most of the committee's recommendations are grounded in this more traditional interpretation of data. Many of our recommendations involve strengthening or building upon many disparate current resources, as well as standardizing and centralizing key information and resources. For example, instead of a New Faculty Orientation where new faculty are bombarded with information overload, instead a year-long, series of just-in-time meetings and workshops might be much more beneficial (see Strategy 4.05, p. 21).

Finally and most telling, we also turn to a more provocative, deeper and meaningful interpretation of the COACHE data: What if we read the probationary faculty's responses as an expression of their *aspirations* for their university, for their careers, and for their lives as teachers and scholars. Read in this way, *what do the Fullerton faculty who responded to the COACHE survey long for?*

Naturally, as the data indicate, they aspire to be well paid, to be able to lead a balanced life, to be assisted with affordable housing, and to be supported by the institution in regard to personal needs like bearing and raising children. But equally clearly, they seek reduced teaching loads and increased support for research "to truly allow for high quality research and excellent teaching," as one of the survey respondents wrote.

Implicit in their survey responses is the question, "Who are we as a university, and who do we want to be?" Their vision is not that we should be a research university on the model of the UC. And their vision is also not that we should be a traditional CSU, where everyone teaches four courses and gradually abandons any hope of a life in which teaching is balanced with an active agenda of research, scholarship, and creativity.

The vision and aspirations of these assistant professors are, in the opinion of this committee, shared by **all** faculty. If faculty were offered the option of foregoing a personal mentor, a breakfast with the dean, brown bag lunches, guest speakers, awards for service, or any number of the other "little fixes" that we present at the end of this report as options to consider, in exchange for a lower teaching load and greater support for research and creative activity, we believe that faculty would choose the latter in a heart-beat.

In other words, as a faculty, we want our university to make learning pre-eminent. We want our university to combine the best qualities of teaching and research universities. We want to achieve the goal of enhancing scholarly and creative activity at the same time as we create an environment where all students have the opportunity to succeed. Moving toward these aspirations, so central to the University's Mission and Goals, would mean changing University long-term priorities to accomplish objectives on the same scale as building parking structures and a student recreation center, purchasing College Park, expanding to the Irvine Campus, and any number of other high priorities of the past. What should the new priorities be, in order to achieve the aspirations of the faculty?

- Reduce the Student-Faculty Ratio.
- Reduce the teaching load.
- Increase support for scholarly/creative and grant-writing activity.

- Expand external support from grants and philanthropy.

In an environment with priorities such as these, faculty work could flourish, students would learn as never before, and Cal State Fullerton would forge for itself a unique identity based solidly on our highest aspirations. If this is a core goal of the campus, it need not be an unreachable dream. Making progress towards this dream will not be easy, but it is possible if the collective will is present. In conclusion, it is our sincere hope that this report opens serious dialogue within departments, colleges and across campus and engages faculty, both senior and junior alike, to debate, discuss and begin building together a campus culture that will support all faculty. Cal State Fullerton is a wonderful place to be—and our own junior faculty responses confirm this perception. Just imagine if we take the next steps to achieving this larger dream!

Acknowledgements

The Committee on Faculty Mentoring is grateful to the Academic Senate Executive Committee for flagging the importance of establishing and convening this ad hoc committee.

This report is made possible by the generous writing contributions of many colleagues. Thanks go to April Bullock (LBST) and Reyes Fidalgo (MLNG) for their concise summaries of the research literature on mentoring faculty in higher education. Ed Sullivan (IRAS) deserves outstanding recognition for his comprehensive and excellent analysis and presentation of the Harvard COACHE faculty survey data. Dean Tom Klammer deserves special credit for his grounded reflections and comments as part of the concluding summary of the report. Thanks also go to Kathy Dickson (BIOL), April Bullock (LBST), Tom Klammer (HSS) and Hyekyeung Seung (COMM) for their patient and careful editing of the document.

Special thanks also go to guests, Tony Rimmer (FDC), Robin Graboyes (FAR), Linda Patton (OCG) and Ray Young (AVPGSR) for attending meetings and/or reviewing and providing valuable feedback on earlier drafts of this report.

Finally, many thanks go to all members of this committee, who met willingly and within a very condensed window of time in order to submit the final report by the March 1, 2008 due date.

Respectfully submitted by Ellen Junn, Chair
February 25, 2008

References on Mentoring

- Bode, R. K. (1999). Mentoring and Collegiality. In R. J. Menges & Associates (Eds.). *Faculty in new jobs: A guide to settling in, becoming established, and building institutional support* (pp. 118-144). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Boice, R. (1992). *The new faculty member: Supporting and fostering professional development*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cawyer, C. S., Simonds, C., & Davis, S. (2002). Mentoring to facilitate socialization: The case of the new faculty member. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 15*, 225-242.
- De Janasz, S. C., & Sullivan, S. E. (2003). Multiple mentoring in academe: Developing the professional network. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 64*, 263-283.
- Gersick, C. J. G., Bartunek, J. M., & Dutton, J. E. (2000). Learning from academia: The importance of relationships in professional life. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*, 1026-1044.
- Gray, P. J., & Johnson, W. B. (2005). Mentoring and its assessment. In S. L. Tice, L. M. Lambert, & P. Englot (Eds.), *University teaching: A reference guide for graduate students and faculty* (2nd ed., pp. 217-224). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Johnson, W. B. (2007). *On being a mentor: A guide for higher education faculty*. New York & London: Laurence Earlbaum Associates.
- Merriam, S. (1983). Mentors and protégés: A critical review of the literature. *Adult Education Quarterly, 33*, 161-173.
- Neilson, T. R., Carlson, D. S., Lankau, M. J. (2001). The supportive mentor as a means of reducing work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 59*, 364-381.
- O'Neil, J. M. & Wrightsman, L. S. (2001). The mentoring relationship in psychology training programs. In S. Walfish & A. K. Hess (Eds.), *Succeeding in graduate school: The career guide for psychology students* (pp. 111-127). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Rodenhauser, P., Rudisill, J. R., & Dvorak, R. (2000). Skills for mentors and protégés applicable to psychiatry. *Academic Psychiatry, 24*, 14-27.
- Smith, J. W., Smith, W. J., & Markham, S. E. (2000). Diversity issues in mentoring academic faculty. *Journal of Career Development, 26*, 251-262.
- Zey, M. G. (1984). *The mentor connection: Strategic alliances in corporate life*. Homewood, IL: Dow Jones-Irwin.

COMMITTEE OPTIONS MENU & RECOMMENDATIONS MATRIX:

The committee recommends providing systematic support infrastructure and accessible resources to probationary faculty in five areas:

- (1) Research support and research collaboration;
- (2) Teaching support;
- (3) Grant-writing support;
- (4) Other professional and politically-savvy advising support;
- (5) Social and collegial support; and
- (6) Family and Life Circumstance support.

Support and resources in these five areas may be offered using a variety of strategies and models, not all of which involve direct mentoring. Items listed include new proposed strategies, as well as strategies that may already be implemented in some departments. We have color-coded the various strategies: **pink for new strategies**; **yellow for strategies that may exist somewhere on campus that could be expanded**; and **green for ongoing strategies**. Specific strategies are enumerated under each of the five broad category areas below, along with responsible offices, possible timelines and costs.

* NOTE Abbreviations: **ASC**=Auxiliary Services Corporation, **AVPAA**=Associate Vice President Academic Affairs, **AVGSR**=Associate Vice President for Graduate and Student Research, **BFA**=Business and Financial Affairs, **CAS**=Child and Adolescent Studies Department, **CC**=Children’s Center, **DOD**=Director of Development, **FAR**=Faculty Affairs & Records, **FDC**=Faculty Development Center, **HR**=Human Resources, **IRAS**=Institutional Research and Analytical Studies, **ODE**=Office of Diversity and Equity, **OGC**=Office of Grants & Contracts, **PA**=Public Affairs, **UA**=University Advancement, **VPAA**=VP Academic Affairs **VPA**= Vice President of Advancement..

Strategies to support faculty at the DEPARTMENT & COLLEGE LEVELS	Who?*	Timeline	Cost
<p>Based on the success of SDSU’s program, department chairs and/or college deans might consider organizing and hosting a series of meetings for probationary faculty.</p> <p>FALL SEMESTER:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Breakfast (7:30-9:00 am) for 1-3 year and 4-6 year faculty--roundtable format where faculty have a chance to talk with the Dean and Associate Dean, share their research, ask questions, meet each other. o Evening social: Celebration of Tenure & Promotion--at a home hosted by the dean for faculty who have received promotion & tenure and their spouses. At this event we also invite their department or school director. No agenda, casual time to celebrate with refreshments. o Late afternoon social for probationary faculty--on campus near art gallery or theatre venue, opportunity to come together as a whole group for all probationary faculty. Dean and associate dean attend. o Fall workshop for internal grants--associate dean and mentors meet with probationary faculty on a Friday for two hours to explain the internal grants and assist with ideas. o Late fall RTP workshop-- introduce faculty to the RTP process in preparation for Spring review. <p>SPRING SEMESTER</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Repeat Fall semester breakfast and late afternoon socials. o Workshop on interpretation of student evaluations and how to improve teaching based on feedback. o Final gathering of mentors and probationary faculty with Associate Dean to wrap up the year. 	<p>Each department and/or college (e.g., coordinated by the Associate Dean in the case of a dean’s program)</p>	<p>Start Fall 2008</p>	<p>Costs for food</p>
<p>SPRING SEMESTER</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Repeat Fall semester breakfast and late afternoon socials. o Workshop on interpretation of student evaluations and how to improve teaching based on feedback. o Final gathering of mentors and probationary faculty with Associate Dean to wrap up the year. 	<p>Each college, coordinated by the Associate Dean</p>	<p>Start Fall 2008</p>	<p>Costs for food</p>

(1) Strategies to support faculty RESEARCH and COLLABORATION	Who?*	Timeline	Cost
<p>1.01 Identify 10 (each college, except 2 for H&SS, plus Library) Faculty Research & Creative Activity/Grant Mentors (FRGM) within colleges who would be willing to provide informal research and grant writing mentoring advice to junior faculty. These faculty mentors (@ 3-unit release time/yr) would be organized by the FDC Faculty Research Coordinator into a FRGM Council with participation from college Associate Deans and the AVPGSR.</p>	FDC, College Deans, AVPGSR, Associate Deans	Start Fall 2008	MGI (9 course releases)
<p>1.02 Institute a formula to regularly review, assess all intramural grant funds to increase proportionately with the numbers of probationary faculty.</p>	VPAA, AVPGSR, FDC, IRAS, FAR	Start Summer 2008	TBD by VPAA
<p>1.03 Ask all probationary faculty to complete the Faculty Research Profile form as required and utilized by the OGC (e.g., New Faculty Orientation for new faculty).</p>	FDC, OCG, AVPGSR, Dept. Chairs	Start at Fall 2008 New Faculty Orientation	NA
<p>1.04 Invite FDC Faculty Research Coordinator and/or Associate Vice President for Graduate and Student Research to department meetings for discussion and brainstorming of additional faculty research support ideas (e.g., info about SPSS, qualitative research).</p>	Departments, AVPGSR, FDC	Start Fall 2008	NA
<p>1.05 Make new probationary faculty more aware of intramural and extramural research support via regular OCG workshops and other FDC and AVPGSR communications. Disseminate newsletters, other publications or email messages showcasing faculty and student research.</p>	AVPGSR, OCG, FDC	Start Fall 2008	NA
<p>1.06 Raise the visibility of faculty research and collaboration at the department and college levels. Strongly encourage departments and/or colleges to create a community of scholars and a sense of expectation for faculty attendance and participation in <u>regularly</u> scheduled research forum meeting opportunities. This can be achieved in a variety of ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Regular research roundtables; Brown bag lunches, breakfasts or dinners; Department meeting spotlights featuring department faculty research; 	Departments, Colleges, FDC	Start Fall 2008	Some costs

d. Faculty journal editors or editorial board members brown bags.	Who?*	Timeline	Cost
(1) Strategies to support faculty RESEARCH and COLLABORATION (Continued)			
1.07 Invite FDC Faculty Writing Assistance Coordinator to department meetings for discussion and brainstorming of additional faculty research writing support ideas.	Departments, FDC	Start Fall 2008	NA
1.08 Create small faculty publication writing groups where faculty meet to set writing deadlines and read, review, critique and support each other during various stages of the publication process (e.g., the ULO Faculty Research Group in COE/HHD, FDC).	Colleges, FDC	Start Fall 2008	NA
1.09 Continue with externally publicizing faculty research through Public Affairs (e.g., <i>Inside</i> magazine and online version, CSUF homepage, local media).	Departments, Colleges	Continue	NA
1.10 Provide modest funds to bring noted visiting faculty researchers to campus to create research interest communities or for presentations and consultation (e.g., during Intersession or summers).	President, VPAA (funds to be disbursed by the VPAA)	Start Fall 2008	MGI
1.11 Host college-wide faculty collaboration events (e.g., “Collaboration with Colleagues Over Canapés and Cabernet” in HHD/COE) to bring together senior and junior faculty to informally discuss research interests and collaborative possibilities.	VPAA, Colleges	Start Fall 2008	Some marginal costs for colleges
1.12 Reinstate funding for the Southern California Impact Research to encourage more faculty to conduct and publicize research that will have an impact on our local region.	VPAA, AVPGSR	Start Fall 2008	TBD
1.13 Continue with recognizing Outstanding Scholar/Teacher Recognition awards.	VPAA, FDC	Continue	Some marginal costs

(2) Strategies to support TEACHING	Who?*	Timeline	Cost
<p>2.01 Identify 3 Teaching Faculty Mentor (TFM) who would serve as informal mentors (@ 1 course release/yr), offering teaching advice and consultation (for classroom and online teaching). These Teaching Faculty Fellows would be organized into a Teaching Faculty Mentor Council by the FDC Teaching and Learning Coordinator and the FDC Faculty Technology Coordinator to provide a variety of teaching supports, such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Individual consultation; Peer observation of teaching; Analysis of SRI data; Modeling of teaching (permitting observation of their classroom). 	AVPAA, FDC	Start Fall 2008	MGI (3 course releases)
<p>2.02 Reinstate an optional Videotape Observation of Teaching (VOT) program in the FDC with graduated levels of feedback:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Videotape only, with observation checklist, but no feedback; Videotape, plus feedback only in designated areas of concern; Videotape, plus full feedback. 	FDC	Start Spring 2009	Some costs for FDC
<p>2.03 Establish a Student Observer of Teaching program. Successful programs at the University of Toledo, Indiana State University, Brigham Young University and others carefully select and train students who work with faculty to improve classroom teaching. Student Observers serve as excellent resources to faculty members, providing valuable data: (1) Student observers are objective observers in that they are not working for a grade; (2) students offer a helpful perspective because they have seen a wide variety of college teaching; (3) students provide information to help instructors have a better sense of what is happening in the classroom.</p>	FDC	Start Spring 2009	Some costs for FDC
<p>2.04 Encourage more departments to consider establishing Faculty Course Coordinators for core courses to help organize, meet, discuss and share among all faculty (full and part-time) who are teaching the same core course in the major.</p>	Deans, Department Chairs	Start Fall 2008	Some costs
<p>2.05 Publicize more widely campus programs for faculty interested in accent reduction (e.g., American Languages Program, TESOL, Multicultural Clinic at the</p>	ALP, TESOL, SPHCD, FDC	Start Fall 2008	NA

Speech and Hearing Center in the Communicative Disorders Program).

	Who?*	Timeline	Cost
<p>(2) Strategies to support TEACHING (Continued)</p>			
<p>2.06 Create Faculty Teaching Interest Groups or Brown Bags. Faculty interested in sharing, presenting and discussing teaching ideas, innovations and concerns would meet regularly. Similarly, all departments could be encouraged to devote a portion of their department meetings to discuss teaching issues on a regular basis.</p>	Colleges, Departments, FDC, RACE, ULO	Start Fall 2008	NA
<p>2.07 Enhance visibility of FDC teaching and learning programs such as the Teaching and Learning Academy Certificate (TLAC) Program.</p>	FDC	Continue	NA
<p>2.08 Continue with Outstanding Teacher/Scholar Recognition awards, as well as teaching awards at the college level.</p>	VPAA, FDC, College Deans	Continue	Some costs

(3) Strategies to support GRANT WRITING	Who?*	Timeline	Cost
3.01 Hire college-based, full-time grant-writing staff (e.g., with college Directors of Development) to work with assisting college faculty in identifying and writing extramural grants.	President, VPAA, VPA, OCG, DOD	Begin Fall 2009	Significant
3.02 Identify 10 Faculty Research and Creative Activity/Grant Mentors (FRGM) within colleges who would be willing to provide informal grant writing mentoring advice to junior faculty. These faculty mentors also would work closely with the FDC Faculty Research Coordinator.	VPAA, AVPGSR, College Deans, FDC	Start Fall 2008	MGI (9 course releases; the same faculty for Research)
3.03 Continue hosting grant writing workshops one month before intramural grants are due. These workshops should involve representatives from the FDC and OGC.	FDC, OGC	Currently available	NA
3.04 Make successful grants available for viewing by other interested faculty.	Colleges, FDC, OGC	Some currently available	NA
3.05 Continue with recognition events for faculty who have obtained grants.	OCG, UA	Continue	Some costs
<i>See other related grant collaboration activities under (1) Research Support above.</i>			

(4) Strategies to support OTHER PROFESSIONAL needs	Who?*	Timeline	Cost
<p>4.01 Establish 3 New Faculty Advisors (NFA) (@ 1 course release/yr) who provide informal advice and consultation to junior faculty on a variety of issues such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. navigating the university; b. life-work balance issues; c. other professional development issues. 	VPAA, A VPAA, Colleges, FDC	Start Fall 2008	MGI (3 course releases/yr)
<p>4.02 Continue with regular assessment of probationary faculty to inform policy and program funding decisions (e.g., COACHE survey in 2010, WASC accreditation information)</p>	President, VPAA, IRAS	Continue	Some costs
<p>4.03 Create and maintain a Comprehensive Faculty Resource Website where all of these support programs and resources would be featured. The initial prototype is now available from RACE and will be linked to all colleges, FAR, FDC and VPAA office homepages.</p>	VPAA, Colleges, Departments, FDC, FAR	Will be launched	TBD
<p>4.04 Conduct interviews and/or surveys of newly tenured faculty or faculty leaving the campus regarding their experiences.</p>	ODE, FAR	Begin Fall 2008	NA
<p>4.05 Continue but dramatically reorganize the New Faculty Orientation program with a year-long series of workshops timed to meet unfolding faculty needs.</p>	FDC	Continue	Some costs
<p>4.06 Continue with Outstanding Faculty Service Recognition awards.</p>	VPAA, FDC,	Continue	Some costs

(5) Strategies to support SOCIAL and COLLEGIAL needs	Who?*	Timeline	Cost
5.01 Ask New Faculty Advisors (NFA) to join with the University Club to organize and host a variety of campus social activities such as: Monthly Book Club, cycling trips, museum tours, Night at the Theatre and Dinner with the Director, city walking tours, cultural site tours, etc.	FDC	Start Fall 2008	NA
5.02 Continue with campus plans to identify the site and build a Faculty and Staff University Club .	Senate Ad Hoc Faculty and Staff Club Planning Committee, Senate, President	Start planning, Spring 2008	TBD
5.03 Encourage untenured faculty to form and join various untenured faculty organizations either at the college or university level (e.g., ULO=Untenured Faculty and Full-Time Lecturer Organization in HHD/COE; RACE=Researchers And Critical Educators in COE/HHD/other colleges).	College Associate Deans, faculty	Continue and expand	NA
5.04 Continue with campus events such as Concert Under the Stars, Front and Center, etc. but perhaps encourage senior department faculty to personally invite junior faculty to attend with them.	President, UA, Departments	Continue and expand	NA

<p>(6) Strategies to support FAMILY and LIFE CIRCUMSTANCES needs</p>	<p>Who?*</p>	<p>Timeline</p>	<p>Cost</p>
<p>6.01 Family, Childbirth and Adoption Leaves Policy Information Website</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bereavement • Illness • Stop the Clock for Faculty • Parental Leave 	<p>FAR</p>	<p>Start Spring 2009</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>6.02 Childcare Information and Options Website</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSUF Childcare Center Info • Orange County NAEYC Accredited Childcare Centers and Family Childcare Homes 	<p>FAR, CC, CAS Dept.</p>	<p>Start Fall 2008</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>6.03 HR Benefits Website Linked to New Faculty Resource Website</p>	<p>HR, FAR</p>	<p>Start Fall 2008</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>6.04 Housing Information Website</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSUF Affordable Housing Projects with Housing Authority (University Auxiliary Services) • Local realtor information and contacts • Rental property website (with CSUF disclaimer) 	<p>FAR, BFA</p>	<p>Start Fall 2008</p>	<p>NA</p>