

**Orientation/mentoring Shared Leadership for Family Living Programs Faculty  
Program Area/Academic Department/Association  
April 2002**

**Committee members:** Peggy Nordgren, Peggy Olive, Lori Zierl, Ann Keim

**Background:** Over the years, Family Living faculty have enjoyed a number of orientation and mentoring efforts provided by their colleagues. Much of this is accomplished through the development of informal relationships with colleagues that you admire and choose to work with on various projects. However, formal orientation and mentoring efforts have also existed. These include: Big Sisters (WEAFCS program for new faculty), District Program Leaders (currently in the form of State Liaisons), District Vice Chairs (Academic Department) and others. In the mid to late 1990's, WEAFCS, the Department of Family Development, and the Family Living Program Area joined forces to construct a Mentoring Program for new faculty. This effort resulted in a comprehensive Web Page document (currently de-linked) detailing orientation steps with new faculty. In practice, when a new faculty member was hired, the State Liaison in consultation with the District Representative of each district would determine who would be a good mentor match for a new faculty member.

**Current situation and observations that led to the formation of this ad hoc committee:**

1. Non-tenured faculty reported confusion with multiple processes and people who seemed to provide similar orientation, support and review functions, ie. County Department Heads, peer reviewers, State Liaisons, Mentor, and Faculty Mentoring Teams. At the same time, there seemed to be a recognition that high quality orientation and support is crucial given the fast-paced work of Extension faculty.
2. Tenured faculty reported that they are rapidly becoming "overextended" with both individual Mentor roles and Faculty Mentoring Team roles. Some tenured faculty members serve on several Faculty Mentoring teams in addition to serving as a mentor for a new faculty member. This condition is worsened by the substantial number of faculty who also serve as County Department Heads. Concern was expressed that overextended faculty are not as likely to be as helpful as they would like to new faculty.
3. Faculty serving in individual Mentor roles did not receive training in this role and it appears that they assumed a broad range of level of interaction from none to extensive, often without knowledge of others providing orientation and support to the new faculty member.

**To address this situation, this committee took the following steps:**

1. Investigated some of the literature on mentoring and noted that the best mentor matches are ones that are selected by the “mentees” based upon their needs and their judgements of the skills offered by the “mentors”.
2. Reviewed the Family Living Mentoring notebook on the web, developed Spring 1999.
3. Learned more about the Family Living State Liaison role and how they provide early orientation and support to new faculty.
4. Studied Department documents concerning peer review and Faculty Mentoring teams to note overlap and gaps with State Liaison work.
5. Developed a chart for review (end of document) that describes the timeline of orientation and support currently being used with new faculty and included some of the suggestions that follow.

**Suggestions:**

1. The current “mentor” process should be stopped (the assignment of a mentor upon hire).
2. The State Liaison will continue the intensive work in orientation in the first six months as done currently, with a gradual decrease in involvement through the Year Three Review process.
3. The Department Vice Chair, rather than the Department Chair, should assist the new colleague in slowly assembling a Faculty Mentoring Team being mindful of the best matches for the new colleague’s program interests and also keeping a balance of assignments across the district so some people are not overextended.
4. Training should be conducted for Faculty Mentoring Teams to assist them in providing support for their colleagues.
5. Each partner in the orientation and support process should fine-tune their efforts to clearly define their role and expertise.

**For your review:**

The committee developed the following chart to describe the interplay of the program area, association and academic department in the orientation and support of non-tenured faculty. This chart is designed to show the timeline for existing support and could serve as the basis for future discussions on this issue. Please keep in mind that this committee focused on mentoring and merely noted the various time points for review.

<b>Timeline</b>	<b>FLP State Liaison/Program Area</b>	<b>District Reps.</b>	<b>Department of Family Development Roles</b>	<b>WEAFCS</b>
Pre-hire	State Liaison has participated in the screening of applicant folders and the preliminary interview process. When a hire is made in a county position, the State Program Leader sends a welcome letter that is CC: County Department Head, District Director, State Liaison, District Representatives (FLP and WNEP), District Vice Chair of the Department of Family Development and WEAFCS President and Membership Chair.	District Reps receive copies of welcome letter.	Chair of the Department of Family Development is consulted on the assignment of rank for the new hire.  District Vice Chair receives copy of welcome letter.	President and Membership Chair receive copies of the welcome letter.
First Week of employ	State Liaison calls to schedule first meeting in county office.	Welcome phone call and introduction at first district meeting.	District Vice Chair makes a contact at first district meeting.	Membership information shared. Information about meetings/and other opportunities shared over time.
First Month	Meeting in county office to begin orientation process. (Liaisons have a checklist for the first three years of support for new colleagues.) Topics include: -Exit report of previous			

	<p>agent/educator.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Extension 's structure, mission, vision, values, and resources.</li> <li>-Introduction to all UWEX web pages and Family Living Program Development resources.</li> <li>-Discussion of program area structure, specialists.</li> <li>-Assessment of content and process competencies.</li> <li>-Enrollment in New Colleague Orientation, core competency workshops and other professional development sessions.</li> <li>-Scheduling office visits with other colleagues.</li> <li>-If needed, develop plan for Family Living team in office.</li> </ul>			
Second Month	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting in county office to continue orientation process, answer questions, etc.</li> <li>-Begin development of plan of work.</li> <li>-Monitor participation in core competency workshops.</li> <li>-HCE Orientation if appropriate.</li> </ul>			
3-6 Months	Continued meeting and phone	District Rep. encourages	District Vice Chair begins discussions with	Encourages participation in

	conferences to work on Plan of Work. Continued support to answer questions, deal with concerns, etc.	participation in district activities and responsibilities.	new colleague on possible members of Faculty Mentoring Team.	Association meetings and activities.
6 Months	First Plan of Work Completed!! New Colleague Orientation held (within first 6 months). Contacts made with appropriate specialists.		First Faculty Mentoring Team member chosen. If timing is right, this first member can conduct first peer review and comment on first plan of work. First Faculty Mentoring Team member helps in selection of other team members.	
6-12 Months	State Liaison continues to work with new colleague as needed. If not already addressed, Civil Rights programming and the Review Process is discussed. Support given to Reporting and development of Success Stories.			
1 Year	State Liaison conducts Year One Review. The resulting document is used as the Program Area's input to the Self Initiated Performance Review Process. (SIPR). If there are performance concerns, the State Liaison provides needed counsel to colleague.	District Rep encourages participation in district meetings and activities.	Colleague develops relationship with First Team member and begins to identify additional team members with advice of Department Vice Chair.	Encourages participation in association and committee membership.

				Faculty Mentoring Team meets with colleague between 6-18 months depending upon peer review and other needs. Reviews first plan of work, makes suggestions for second plan of work.	
2 Years		State Liaison conducts Year Two Review with colleague. The resulting document is used as Program Area's input to the SIPR process. State Liaison continues to provide support as needed. If there are performance concerns, State Liaison provides needed counsel to colleague.		Faculty Mentoring Team meets with colleague, provides peer review input, advises on portfolio development.	
3 Years		State Program Leader conducts Year Three Review with colleague, District Director, County Department Head and Chair of Faculty Mentoring Team. The resulting document contributes to SIPR.		If colleague successfully passes the Year Three Review, Faculty Mentoring Team increases their involvement with colleague .	
4 Years		State Liaison continues support as needed. Contributes to SIPR.		Faculty Mentoring Team meets in support of colleague's progress towards tenure.	
5 Years		State Liaison continues support as needed. Contributes to SIPR.			

5 Years PLUS	State Liaison continues support as needed. Contributes to SIPR.		Faculty Mentoring Team meets with colleague offering advice and counsel towards tenure process.	
Tenure achieved.	State Liaison continues support as needed through future challenges or transitions. Celebrate!	Celebrate!	Celebrate!	Celebrate!