


| | |
|--|--|
|  <p>TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY Women's Faculty Network</p> | <p>Women's Faculty Network</p> <p>Steering Committee Meeting May 4, 2010 Room 103 Butler Hall</p> |
|--|--|

Mentoring Meeting (Special Meeting)

The meeting was called to order by President Ginger Carney at approximately 9:40 a.m. Members present: Ginger Carney, Dominique Chlup, Antonio Cepeda-Benito, Vanessa Diaz (Dean of Faculties office), Marian Eide, Lori Taylor, Veronica Sanchez, Penny Riggs, Mary Jo Richardson, Elizabeth Umphress, Mindy Bergman, Louise Abbott, Jia Wang.

- I. Some things that came up at the April 2010 meeting regarding the mentoring program (report by Ginger Carney):
 - Mentoring program may not have enough money to sustain itself, so suggestion made by Val Coleman to have the program for 2 years
 - Need to discuss how best to pair mentors and mentorees
 - How to encourage more pairings to take place
 - Need to identify more mentors for the program
 - Need to discuss mentoring of both assistant and associate level professors
 - How do we plan to communicate with the DOF office
 - Assessment of our program—for instance whether or not the mentoring social is helpful or whether or not the lunches are beneficial. Are there alternatives we haven't thought about?

- II. Discussion Point 1: Pairing the Mentors and Mentorees
 - Lori's point what is the objective of the mentoring program? We can't be all things to all people, so to help us figure out how to do the pairing need to think about what we want our priorities to be.
 - For instance, how are we serving and what are we trying to accomplish? What is our focus? Are we tenure track? Are we for associate professor? For clinical professors? We have had lecturers in the past who have been mentored and then taken on tenure track positions elsewhere.
 - Elizabeth's point: Women don't get the mentoring they need. Lori's point: But mentoring to what end? If we have limited resources do we focus on tenure track, junior versus senior?
 - Mary Jo gave the historical background: When the mentoring program began there were very few women in the departments, so this gave women the opportunity to focus on whatever they might have needed in terms of mentoring. For instance, it could be elder care, childcare. It's historically been helping women with both aspects—to get them

through the tenure and promotion pipeline and aspects of whatever they might have need in relation to their well-being. Priority was given to assistant professors. Then felt they would take anyone who needed it. What really lacked were women full professors, so opened up the mentoring of women faculty for that purpose.

- Penny's point of making "perfect" matches. Currently, Val uses a survey with criteria points to help pair mentorees to their mentors. Used to choose from 3 possible mentors and not always matched with your first choice but that might be fine. The list was made available on the WFN website. Should we consider returning to that model?
- Lori's point: We are now too customer oriented; we implicitly over promised.
- Mindy's point she was paired with someone who needed teaching advice and she was the best choice for that. So it's not about the perfect match; it is the importance of prioritizing needs.

III. Discussion Point 2: Access to the Database

- Antonio's point: more than Val's eyes should be looking to make the pairs. And prioritizing the women's needs (mentorees).
- Ginger's point: we have been told we cannot have access to the mentoring database, which is critically important.
- Antonio's point: he doesn't have any problem with an appointed WFN representative having access to the database. The program belongs to us, so if we wanted to have a subcommittee to look at the database to establish pairings we could do that.
- Ginger asked if we could put the information back on the web as had been done in the past Name, affiliation, and then link to the faculty member's website. Antonio pointed out that individuals had not been told that this was being done, so that's why information was removed. Antonio needs to know who is our mentoring contact person from the Network. He'd like for us to continue to coordinate with Val, but this is our project. She's not going to want to continue to do this if she is merely an administrative assistant filing papers. We also remember that the Black faculty alliance and MALFA are also a part of the mentoring network, but they have not been an active recently.

IV. Discussion Point 3: Val Coleman's Role with WFN

- Mary Jo shared the history of hiring Val—used to be a graduate assistant and we were asked by DOF if we needed a more permanent staff position to assist with the program.
- Linda Castillo when she was President of WFN also served as the Mentoring Coordinator. Discussion that the constitution does not make the mentoring coordinator role clear.
- Mary Jo spoke to Valerie Taylor of BFA about how their network is going (BFA) not as active in the mentoring because working on their constitution. How their mentoring program worked was they could have a mentor for as long as they needed. If just wanted for a year, they could do that. She did not hear back from the person she contacted at MALFA regarding how their mentoring program was going.
- Antonio: Fred Bonner will be Val's new supervisor—she does not yet know this. He needs to know whether or not we want her here at every meeting. She's had no supervision from us on the marketing and changes she's made to the Mentoring program. She's had lots of initiative. Elizabeth said she's been great. Antonio would like us to have more involvement in the process, so we aren't in this position again in the future. We should be making the pairings, have access to the database. Both Ginger and Mary Jo point out she's been fabulous, and the program is going very well. There are just a few tweaks that need to be made. Discussion that she should be included in the WFN

meetings--group decision making that is important, and she needs just one point of contact from our group.

- Elizabeth and Ginger both like to have her at the meetings. Elizabeth would like for us to vote on things, so Val knows what decisions were made regarding her role for WFN.

V. Discussion Point 4. Who should we be serving? Tenure-track? Tenured to Full? Clinical?

- Marian's point—to take us back to one of the original points raised At the luncheon the statistics provided by the DOF--35 men promoted to full, only 2 women promoted to full, so while our focus has been on assistant professors getting tenure it might be time to change that. Marian's point: Perhaps, we should consider mentor based groups—on grant writing, moving into administrative positions, we could clarify other needs of the women faculty and have mentoring groups around those topics. Say 1 Friday a month the group would meet to discuss a preplanned topic of interest as opposed to individual mentoring pairs.
- Ginger asked Antonio do we have limited resources because she would like to have us mentoring associates as well. Antonio is committed to the mentoring program. More so than to professional development sessions that aren't well attended and people forget the information 10 minutes later. They tried something that failed. The college circles. Asked senior professors to meet with junior faculty members. Paid up to so much per person for them to meet 3-4 times per the semester for dinner. You have a group of people and decide 2-3 topics that the group focuses on.
- Jia Wang indicated that she participated in one of these through the college of education and she found it most useful. The group was meeting regularly and then informed by the senior professor that was it there was no more money toward the program, so there would be no more meetings. Penny Riggs indicated they tried to get something going at her college and the senior professors never made the time to meet with the junior faculty, so it was unsuccessful.
- Marian made the point that we don't want to give the DOF office back the money they are investing in the program just want to make sure using it to its best benefit.
- Mary Jo reported that the Advance proposal has come back from NSF as a revise resubmit it would be funded \$2.8 million—there is group mentoring in that. One of the goals of that grant is institutional transformation for women. WFN can't move forward on this until it's formally funded. The hope is that it will be funded as the NSF presented 3 innocuous questions for the group to answer.
- Ginger's point: Have the WFN contact person for Val actually be more than 1 person—1 person to focus on pre-tenure, and someone else looking out for the associates. Discussion that we don't want things to get over complicated and one contact person with a subcommittee might work best.

VI. Motions

- Motion called by Elizabeth to have Val attend the meetings. Seconded. Majority Rule: Unanimous to have Val attend the general steering committee meetings. I asked if we follow Robert's Rule of order—not sure what our constitution has in it, so Ginger indicated she would check. For the purposes of this meeting, Antonio asked us to follow Robert's Rules.
- Mary Jo as the person who is supposed to be the contact for Val it should be 1 person, but we need to have further discussion regarding this.
- Louise suggestion (motion): Have a subcommittee to oversee with mentoring and one point of contact from that subcommittee communicates with Val. Friendly amendment

that the point of contact be the mentoring coordinator. Mary Jo seconded. Discussion that it's important to have a subcommittee. Mary Jo called the vote. Unanimous pass vote

- Antonio asked who is the point of contact right now: Mary Jo Richardson. Until the new board comes in and selects individuals. And for right now the point of contact for us in the DOF is Vanessa until Fred Bonner takes over to supervise Val.

VII. Other Discussion Points

- Penny's point of the multiple socials: It is confusing as the 1st Wednesday social, the mentoring ones, and which were which.
- Veronica asked Are the Health Sciences individuals invited to attend the socials as technically the Health Science is not a part of the University. Antonio made the point he'd like for us to remain inclusive, so yes they are invited.
- Mary Jo shared that she was presented with a mug and pen that read DOF faculty mentor on the mug and pen. Mary Jo's point she's a WFN mentor. Antonio expressed that the issue is that BFA and MALFA also mentors, so rather than including the long description that Val presented he cut it down to "DOF mentor." He didn't think it would offend anyone as it's paid by DOF, but in the future he'll defer to us. For right now, though, the pens and mugs will be used until this supply runs out. Mary Jo and Ginger both believe in the future if low on funds rather than use it for mugs and pens should spend it on lunches. It's being framed as a marketing idea. Antonio approved it as it wasn't just a gift of recognition. Ginger asked Antonio are you still sending the letters out to the mentors and Dept. Head to send a thank you letter. That was Val's idea. He sees no reason to stop doing that.
- Ginger's point that we should complete a formal assessment of the program. Lori's point need to see if there is funding/resources for this so we do a full comprehensive job with this. Mindy will ask her colleagues who offer a class on research if there class could take this on a project. If do it for 2011-2012, then the Bush school can take it on as a capstone project and the students can do it. Val doesn't keep record of how often people are meeting and using the lunch funds. Discussion that people get questionnaire fatigue, so surveying individuals need to be aware of. One informal way to assess the program is the fact that we now have a waitlist with mentorees still waiting to be paired.
- Discussion as soon as the new steering committee members are elected and the board members are chosen we need to get a mentoring subcommittee established, so we are ready to go in the fall when the new faculty arrive.

VIII. Other Business

- Mindy's work on the WFN Brochure. Do we want to do this annually? So we can include dates and make it specific per year.
- Mary Jo's additional suggestion. We should also send it out as a pdf since orientation is a chaotic time and new faculty overwhelmed with paper.
- Elizabeth makes a Motion that we update the brochure yearly. Lori Taylor seconded. Unanimous pass.

Meeting adjourned approximately 10:40 a.m.