

## **Faculty Development Committee Year End Report 2021-2022**

**Committee Members:** Lorna Hayward (co-chair), Darin Detwiler (co-chair), Frances McSherry, Vaso Lykourinou, Neal Lerner, Ted Miller  
**SAC Liaison:** Michelle Carr

During the 2021-2022 academic year the Faculty Development Committee (FDC) met a total of 17 times. We were charged with seven items to research. Below is a summary of our efforts documented by charge, the methods used to research each charge, and our recommendations to the Faculty Senate based on that research.

**FDC Charge 1:** *In collaboration with the Dialogues of Civilizations (DOC) Advisory Board, evaluate GEO policies and procedures for faculty leaders of DOC courses and make recommendations for best practices regarding development, implementation and communication between GEO and DOC faculty leaders.*

**Methodology:** To investigate Charge #1, we met with the GEO Faculty Advisory Board (GEFAB) several times to understand the current status of the committee and to evaluate its effectiveness in supporting DOC faculty leaders. GEFAB was established in 2019 by the offices of the Chancellor and the Provost to act (in part) as a conduit between GEO and DOC faculty leaders. GEFAB, composed of faculty members with DOC and/or global learning experience across multiple colleges plus a representative from Faculty Senate, was charged with recommending policies and procedures that affect the experience of DOC faculty leaders, improving communication between DOC faculty leaders and GEO, and conducting regular surveys to get feedback from DOC leaders.

While GEFAB has been meeting monthly with Marina Markot (GEO) and Chris Gallagher (Vice Chancellor of Global Learning Opportunities) for updated reports focusing on all study abroad programs (DOC, Global Engagement Program, Global Co-op, Study Abroad, Semester In, N.U.in, NU Bound, Global Quest, etc.), GEFAB reports that GEO and the Office of the Chancellor continue to make changes to DOC-related policies and procedures despite GEFAB members' concerns about these changes; essentially, GEFAB's recommendations have been disregarded. The members of GEFAB also report that they have not been able to take an active role in supporting DOC faculty leaders in the 2.5 years since its founding due to this passive role. They also noted that there is no liaison from the Faculty Senate currently on the committee, and, as a result, the committee is unable to efficiently report concerns to the Faculty Senate regarding GEO policies and procedures for DOC faculty leaders.

We also conducted interviews with several DOC faculty leaders for feedback about their experiences while organizing DOC programs for Summer 2022 and found that faculty leaders are still facing significant challenges as they develop their DOC programs. Some of the challenges (program support, faculty compensation) were considered critical by most of the leaders contacted. In addition, faculty leaders may not be aware of GEFAB's role as a resource supporting faculty during different phases of the Dialogue process. Considering these challenges, GEFAB is considering developing and distributing a new survey in the fall to collect constructive feedback from all Summer 2022 DOC faculty leaders.

**Recommendations:** The FDC recommends that a Faculty Senate liaison be appointed to GEFAB as soon as possible. It is important to keep an effective and efficient line of communication open between GEFAB and the Faculty Senate. We recommend that information about GEFAB (its mission and its representatives) be prominently displayed in the Faculty Led Program Handbook and on the GEO website. We also recommend that GEFAB develop a new DOC Faculty Leader Survey to be distributed in Fall 2022 to gather information and feedback from faculty leaders at the end of the Summer 2022 DOC cycle.

In addition, with the university's growing interest and commitment to national and international experiences, research opportunities, and partnerships, we recommend that next year's FDC continues to work with GEFAB as it reorganizes and redefines its mission to become a more proactive advisory board.

One possibility might be the formation of a new Faculty Senate Standing Committee for Global Programming and Mobility, a Senate-based faculty-only oversight committee which works in parallel with GEFAB to support and promote global learning opportunities and experiences for faculty, students, and staff.

**WHEREAS** the GEO Faculty Advisory Board (GEFAB) was established in 2019 by the offices of the Chancellor and the Provost to act (in part) as a conduit between GEO and DOC faculty leaders. GEFAB, composed of faculty members with DOC and/or global learning experience across multiple colleges plus a representative from Faculty Senate. **BE IT RESOLVED** that a Faculty Senate liaison be appointed to GEFAB by SAC as soon as possible.

**FDC Charge 2:** *Evaluate GEO's progress on development of a sustainable and strategic multi-year plan that supports the needs of our students and faculty, and that addresses the concerns raised in regular surveys of faculty and students.*

**Methodology:** Given that the 2018-19 FDC issues a report on GEO policies and procedures for DOC programs, rather than duplicate that effort, we forward below the recommendations created at that time. We support these recommendations and anticipate that more recommendations will be added to this list after the results of the 2022 DOC Faculty Leader Survey are published. We recommend that next year's FDC investigate whether or not the following recommendations have been implemented.

### **Recommendations**

- 1) Developing a sustainable and strategic multi-year plan that takes into account documented trends in student demand over time and supports creating and growing DOC programs in the fields and regions with increasing student demand;
- (2) Sharing past student demand for DOC programs with faculty considering development of new DOC programs;
- (3) Investing in staff retention and better planning of staff allocation across multiple programs, taking into account documented student demand;
- (4) Examining ways to reduce excessive number of hours that DOC faculty leaders currently have to spend on administrative tasks;

- (5) Conducting a thorough assessment of the compensation module for DOC-related administrative duties and teaching DOC courses to provide a system of equal and fair pay for all faculty;
- (6) Developing a faculty mentorship program to foster relationships between seasoned and new DOC faculty leaders;
- (7) Working with colleges to accelerate Phase 2 approval process, to enable earlier DOC fair and program promotions;
- (8) Re-establishing the priority application deadline;
- (9) Allowing faculty leaders to choose between group and individual international flights for students, based on their DOC program logistics;
- (10) Improving effectiveness and appropriateness of student evaluations, by announcing the timeline in advance and allowing faculty to redact false or damaging comments made by students (similar to TRACE practice);
- (11) Developing a standardized and transparent procedure for GEO coordinators and staff visiting DOC programs on the ground;
- (12) Creating an Outstanding International Teaching award at college and university levels, to celebrate the accomplishments of DOC faculty leaders
- (13) That the Global Programming and Mobility Committee, when formed, in collaboration with GEO/GEFAB, or the FDC (or subcommittee of the APC) will examine the aforementioned recommendations and develop a sustainable and strategic multi-year plan that supports the needs of our students and faculty for DOC's next year.

**FDC Charge 3:** *As the impact of COVID 19 pandemic will extend past one year, review and make recommendations regarding tenure and promotion with the goal to maximize flexibility and transparency.*

**Methodology:** To investigate charge 3, we first checked with Debra Franko in the Provost's office. On their website is the policy related to tenure clock delay due to COVID, which reads: "In light of the coronavirus crisis and likely impact to teaching, research, and service, the Office of the Provost has amended the tenure clock extension policy to be applicable to all tenure-track faculty who were hired before July 1, 2020. A candidate may request to extend their tenure clock by one year any time before July 1 of the year when dossier is due (e.g., if the dossier is due October 1, 2024, the candidate may request an extension any time before July 1, 2024). The candidate's request, with rationale, should be sent via email to Deb Franko, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, with a copy to the candidate's unit head and dean. All submitted requests will be approved. The candidate will receive an approval letter to which the candidate will need to respond and indicate acknowledgment and agreement to the new tenure review date. All interested candidates are advised to contact their associate dean for faculty and/or unit head to discuss their plans well in advance of making the request. Once a tenure extension year is granted, requests to reverse the approval back to the original tenure review year will be accepted only under very exceptional circumstances."

<https://provost.northeastern.edu/covid-19-tenure-extension-requests/>

There is a standard tenure extension policy for parental teaching relief or other circumstances that can always be applied – these requests get reviewed by the provost’s office.

Faculty can take two tenure clock delays during their tenure period.

### **Recommendations**

- Charge 3—no resolution needed. Policy is still in effect via Deb Franko. In March 2020 the Provost Office offered an opt in or opt out for a 1-year delay for people on the tenure clock. Based on the persistent pandemic, the option to delay or extend a tenure or promote clock should remain as an option. Funding delays, potential decrease in lab-based research capacity, access to subjects, access to archives, family concerns, or immunocompromised, travel restrictions, etc. will all have an impact on research productivity.

**FDC charge 4:** *In collaboration with the FTNTTF committee, review promotion criteria for FTNTTF across all colleges and identify areas for standardization (i.e., evaluation of teaching) following the one faculty model. (This charge was combined with the FTNTT Committee’s charge 6 and made a joint report.)*

**Methodology:** The committee reviewed the promotion documents from colleges at NU and has had extensive communication about the documents with the FTNTTF committee. The committee noted a wide range in expectations for promotion for FTNTT faculty. Given the inherent differences in practice across disciplines, it may not be feasible, or even desirable, to standardize such expectations. The promotion process usually begins at the unit level, and the emphasis of each criterion necessarily differs. For example, some require evidence of competence in teaching, service, scholarship, and professional practice, while others do not require all of these. Some require external reviewers for FTNTT promotion candidates, while most do not. While teaching performance is an important factor for FTNTT faculty, standardization of teaching evaluation here may also be difficult due to some faculty teaching multiple sections compared to fewer for others, the disparity of teaching to majors vs. non-majors--all of which may influence teaching performance scores. Such differences should be taken into account. In addition, some colleges considered class size in rating teaching. Additionally, there is empirical evidence that teaching evaluations are biased.

However, we did note that some colleges have specific written criteria for promotion to each FTNTT rank (e.g., Bouvé, COS, and DMSB), while others do not.

### **Recommendations**

In the interest of transparency and convenience, we recommend that every rank of FTNTT faculty have available and accessible the specific criteria for promotion. How each criterion may be achieved should be noted (e.g., teaching: TRACE scores alone, evidence of teaching creativity, self-reflection). Any individual holding one of the ranks who is eligible or becoming eligible for promotion shall be notified of candidacy for promotion by their immediate Dean. For purposes of notifying said eligible faculty, the provost, faculty directors, and other parties shall be involved in ensuring access to available criteria and procedures, including but not limited to

the material on the Provost Website, and that such criteria and procedures are clear, transparent, and available to eligible faculty.

**FDC Charge 5:** *Review Remote work strategy employed during the COVID 19 pandemic and make recommendations regarding efficient and flexible work arrangement options for the future.*

**Methodology:** To investigate Charge 5, we researched the context for the charge which involved: examining the FDC Faculty Survey Results from 2020-21 in regard to faculty comfort with NUFlex hybrid. According to that survey, only 39% of faculty felt comfortable using the technology and raised concerns related to technology support. We note that NU Flex hybrid teaching is different from remote due to extra workload and technological support required. It is, in a sense, teaching two classes simultaneously. We also note that the remote policy was temporary and changed three times since March 2020. Prior to the Fall 2021 term, there was no announcement regarding the submission of remote work requests from the faculty. Faculty were encouraged to return to campus indicating there was no policy for remote work. NU global and mobility aspirations are not reflected in the policy as currently presented. Moving forward, the policy needs to be flexible due to the changing nature of our students, more global nature of society, and continuation of the COVID-19 pandemic. The policy should be based on transparency, convenience, safety, and flexibility (i.e., Less top down, more collaborative).

## **Recommendations**

### **1. Teaching Colleges/Degree Programs should provide:**

- Specifications of quality that apply to their mission, any required certifications for faculty preparation, legal requirements, and training preparation faculty must engage in deemed essential for flexibility.
- Specific metrics used to decide whether a course can be hybrid, 100% online, or 100% on ground, considering feasibility. (Considering labs, performance in person, and accreditation requirements, for example.)
- Explicitly formulated guidelines denoting a range of % of online teaching, a minimum of days per week, or semesters faculty could choose to deliver instruction online and/or blend it with in person, as needed.
- Additional guidance related to experiential education (clinical, coop, local, global).
- These recommendations will provide an essential pathway to decentralize the top down and unclear process by which faculty structured their courses during the pandemic. Flexibility is needed to support faculty creativity while recognizing their needs as human beings and professionals, acknowledging the presence of high levels of stress, burn out, and a sense of hopelessness.
- Flexibility needs within policy:
  - a. Use Canvas and NUFlex during snow days, faculty travel, illness, and for issues related to family stability.
  - b. Faculty office hours on Zoom—drop in more convenient, or by appointment in person.

### **2. Research and Scholarship**

- Allow flexibility in faculty handling of research duties with regular remote days as each faculty member decides best how to accommodate research teams meetings and laboratory work.
- Tenure clock considerations should continue due to persistent COVID – 19 pandemic.
- Increased NUREs infrastructure to support cross disciplinary mentoring, networking, grant submissions, and post award—all of which are more important during pandemic conditions.

### 3. Service

- **Service** metrics must reflect the effort faculty engaged in during the pandemic. Increased service engagement should be accounted for in promotion dossiers and annual merit reports/workload policy.
- Move administrative staff and other committee meetings to remote mode, when possible, to decrease the volume of face-to-face meetings on campus, reduce carbon footprint, and create flexibility and greater inclusion for meetings.
- Evaluate in person engagement with community partners (local and global) depending on the population served—children, adults, immunocompromised--due to safety concerns.

**FDC Charge#6:** *In Collaboration with the APC evaluate what student evaluations of teaching (SETs) are being used other than or in addition to TRACE across the University to evaluate teaching and learning for common categories of classes, including lecture, online, hybrid/remote, labs, popups and DOCs (Senate resolution #19, 3/18/20), and make recommendations regarding which of these SETs should be adopted university wide, and/or additional or alternative SETs that may be used. Include the inclusivity of learning environment recommendations from SGA (Senate resolution #13, 3/18/20).*

**Methodology:** To investigate this charge we reached out to the APC committee (Chair Connie Lorette) in early February and joined one of their meetings to discuss the committee’s feedback regarding this common charge given to both committees (APC charge#5 and FDC charge #6). The APC committee shared with us the summary report from the SAC Faculty Survey (Fall 2021) with questions explicitly relating to charge#7 in the following sections:

Q 4.8 "what other types of SETs are being used in your department/unit in conjunction with TRACE) and Q 4.9 "Do other types of SET capture aspects of your teaching that are not captured in TRACE?"

A large number of open responses in Q 4.8 mentioned the following alternative methods used by faculty to obtain feedback on teaching: a) peer evaluations by faculty in similar cohorts or dept heads b) use of dept evaluation surveys c) CATL personnel d) student reflections in various points in the semester prepared by faculty themselves or using Dept outcomes including questions closely related to learning goals of the course and questions relating to specific aspects of the course design or assignments and assessment. Many faculty mentioned the use of alternative surveys and feedback forms throughout the semester (including informal midterm feedback) with questions prompting more student reflection regarding their involvement with specific course content as well as feedback on how to improve specific content/aspects of the course.

A large number of faculty (>60%) in Q 4.9 reported that TRACE was the only method used to capture aspects of their teaching and the remaining surveyed faculty mentioned other forms such as peer evaluations and a variety of other methods summarized above. The outcome of Q 4.9 suggests that the majority of the faculty are evaluated in their teaching role solely by the TRACE evaluation surveys at the end of the semester.

Many faculty expressed concern in the open feedback of these questions (as well as related questions Q 4.4-4.6) pointing out that TRACE design is not structured for such granular feedback/reflection as other methods used and summarized above and the rating scale is subjective as well as more geared to measure customer satisfaction. Moreover, many pointed to strong biases and subjectivity in the rating by students especially in the first-year courses and expressed concern of the strong influence of this student-based SET as the single method of rating used almost exclusively in all aspects of faculty evaluation: Merit, Promotion and Retention despite the strong shortcomings expressed in the survey, including the new additions to the TRACE survey (Q 4.3-4.4).

**Recommendations:** If the TRACE survey remains in its current form, it is recommended that other forms of teaching evaluations are incorporated in course and faculty evaluations such as peer evaluations, reflections by faculty and students prompting more granular feedback related to course and student learning goals. Such methods should be equally considered in conjunction with the TRACE surveys. Faculty (and unit heads) can get more feedback on alternative surveys used informally (such as midterm evaluations, reflections and surveys matching course and unit learning goals) as well as with student latter can provide additional insight into course design and delivery from faculty observer (peer evaluation) as well as an opportunity to include an overview of the course environment, goals, and outcomes both from the faculty and the student. Such considerations will promote a growth approach to course evaluation and its use.

***FDC Charge #7:** Evaluate mentorship structures across colleges and make recommendations regarding university wide mentoring processes, with specific reference to the identification of multiple mentors and the development of diverse mentoring networks.*

**Methodology:** To investigate Charge #7, we first queried NU's ADVANCE Office to get an idea of mentoring activities university wide (see last item in table below). We then queried each college's Associate Dean for Faculty (or equivalent) for descriptions of mentoring activities by college. As shown in the table below, those activities vary from quite fully developed at the college level to largely focused on department or unit level efforts (e.g., COE and COS). We also note that almost all colleges describe mentoring support for both tenure-track faculty and non-tenure-track faculty though those efforts vary considerably. We present these results by college in the table below.

**Recommendations:** We recommend that the ADVANCE office play a more active role in reviewing and giving feedback on college-level mentoring efforts, given their expertise on the topic. Several Associate Deans indicated being eager to develop more mentoring efforts, particularly for non-tenure-track faculty, and would benefit from a more structured planning and

implementation process. We particularly want to note Khoury College’s mentoring efforts as a model for the other colleges to follow when it comes to attention to both tenure-stream and non-tenure stream faculty. Based on the presence and potential variability of department or unit-level mentoring efforts, we also recommend that next year’s FDC be charged with collecting data through unit heads on those efforts.

**BE IT RESOLVED that the Provost Office through ADVANCE take a more active role in advising, assessing, and supporting mentoring efforts in the colleges and in the units within the colleges.**

**Table Mentoring Efforts by College**

<b>College/Assoc Dean</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>Bouve</b> (Margarita DiVall)	<p>Unit heads are expected to establish mentoring teams within one month of the faculty member’s appointment and report these to the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs. Mentors should be provided to all new full-time faculty including those hired at higher ranks, whether they are clinical, teaching, tenure-track, or research professors. Faculty who have gone through tenure and promotion at NU can also request a mentor, and this can be handled on a case-by-case basis. (see attached guidelines for details)</p> <p>In addition to this guidance the college has a faculty development and recognition committee which provides input in faculty development needs and programming. Gene Tunik (our Associate Dean for Research and Innovation) and I also run a monthly group mentorship program focused on research for our TT faculty but we also incorporate sessions of interest for all faculty.</p>
<b>CAMD</b> (Matthew McDonald)	<p>In CAMD, all tenure-track faculty are assigned a mentor through the tenure process. The Associate Dean of Faculty works with unit heads each year to assure that new faculty are assigned mentors and existing assignments are working. Each unit has workload documents that recognize faculty mentoring as a form of service. We are currently looking at developing more formal mentor structures for our NTT faculty, who increasingly are seeking promotion, and our associate professors, who have expressed a need for mentorship as they navigate the pathway to full professorship. I think additional programs for these two groups would be welcome.</p>
<b>COE</b> (Sandra Shefelbine)	<p>Every department does it differently:  <b>MIE</b> uses a mentor committee (Career Development Committee) of 3 tenured faculty assigned to each assistant professor. The committee meets every semester with the assistant prof (or as needed). The chair of the committee writes the annual tenure letter in collaboration with the rest of the committee. This results in regular, formal feedback. The letter is approved by the tenure committee each year (all tenured faculty).</p>



	<p><b>BioE</b> assigns each assistant prof a single faculty mentor. Most assistant profs do not know who their mentor is and have not met with them. Most tenured faculty don't know who their mentees are. For the tenure letter, the assistant prof picks 3 tenured people and presents their case. Typically different people each year. One of those 3 people writes the annual tenure letter and it is approved by the others. Because it is a very young department, there is a lot of informal mentoring going on as well.</p> <p><b>CEE</b> – formal assigned two mentors meet 2x per year</p> <p><b>ChemE</b> – assigned a research mentor and a teaching mentor. Meet 1-2x per year.</p> <p><b>ECE</b> – assigned mentors and mentees meet monthly.</p>
<b>COS</b> (Oyinda Oyelaran)	For now, the College does not have college-wide structure, guidelines, or policies on faculty mentoring, and policies and practices vary across departments.
<b>CPS</b> (Joe Griffin)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CPS Faculty participate in the ADVANCE Mentoring circles</li> <li>• GSE (Grad School of Education) Joe McNabb has extensive mentoring circles in EdD for advising, each DIP faculty member has a small cohort of advisors who meet regularly on their work</li> <li>• The FDSC (Faculty Development and Support Committee) Promotions sub-committee is hosting sessions to support faculty re. pursuing promotions, but not formal ongoing mentorship</li> <li>• The FDSC Faculty Development Models and Opportunities sub-committee is hosting a series of support sessions on various topics but, again, not formal ongoing mentorship.</li> </ul>
<b>CSSH</b> (Mai'a Cross)	Each new faculty mentor has a mentoring team. This includes more than one mentor in the person's home department as well as at least one mentor from each department in which there is a joint appointment. (see attached guidelines)
<b>DMSB</b> (Olubunmi Faleye)	<p>Each Group in the DMSB has a formal mentoring committee. The relevant portion of our Faculty Handbook is reproduced below:</p> <p><b>Group Mentoring Committee</b>  <b>Charter:</b> The Mentoring Committee in each group will designate one or more members to act as a link to each tenure-track faculty member in the group. Committee members will communicate regularly with their designated tenure-track faculty member(s) to measure their progress, circumstances, and needs. The committee will meet formally at least one time per academic year, although they may meet more frequently as needed. At these meetings they will assess progress and formulate and convey recommendations for potential actions or changes in the tenure-track faculty member's program. These recommendations, along with strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member, will be conveyed to the faculty member and to the Group Chair. The committee should provide guidance to Group Chairs as they evaluate the committee's support, resource, and teaching or service load recommendations. When differences arise, the Senior Associate</p>

	<p>Dean will be contacted for guidance. Tenure-track faculty may approach and talk with any member of the committee, or any other member of the faculty if desired.</p> <p><b>Structure:</b> Each group will have a mentoring committee consisting of two tenured faculty from the group plus a Group Chair from a different group. The Group Chair will chair the committee.</p>
<p><b>Khoury</b></p>	<p><b>Tenure-Track Mentoring</b></p> <p>Every tenure-track faculty member at the Assistant Professor and Associate Professor levels has a mentor of higher rank. The mentor assignment is made by the Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs when the faculty member joins Khoury, and revised as needed (e.g., when the candidate is promoted, or the mentor goes on sabbatical). Each mentor is expected to meet with their mentee one or two times each term to discuss their progress and help address their challenges, especially in research and teaching.</p> <p>-- Tenure Committee Reviews: The mentor leads the annual review, third-year review, and the reading group for the tenure review for the candidate. (Occasionally, for example when the mentor is on sabbatical, this responsibility is undertaken by another faculty member of the tenure committee.) Per our bylaws, the annual review is a combined effort of the candidate, the mentor, and an additional reader selected by the Tenure Committee.</p> <p>-- Faculty Mentor-Mentee Lunch: Khoury provides support for one mentor-mentee lunch each term. (Since the pandemic, this has not been used; we hope to revive it soon.)</p> <p><b>FTNTT Mentoring</b></p> <p>-- In their first year, new faculty are mentored by their supervisor (i.e., Assistant Dean for Teaching Faculty in Boston/online; network directors on other campuses).</p> <p>-- In Boston, the DEI subcommittee is also trialing a "buddy" system, which pairs new faculty with someone that is not their "boss" for answering questions, chats, etc.</p> <p>-- Faculty with teaching concerns in annual evaluation typically receive a formal teaching mentor (typically a senior faculty member).</p> <p>-- Individual faculty members are encouraged to take advantage of multiple other opportunities (e.g., CATLR inquiry fellows, professional mentoring/networking).</p> <p>-- Pre-Covid, we had have a regular "Teaching Seminar" which involved talks &amp; discussions regarding pedagogical advances &amp; tools, but that somewhat got integrated into teaching-related mentoring circles (and related events) during Covid times (see below).</p>

	<p><b>All-Faculty Programs</b></p> <p>-- Faculty Mentoring Circles: Faculty Mentoring Circles provide an opportunity for all faculty (regardless of research area, rank, title, or tenure status) to pursue advice from senior faculty on a variety of topics. These topics are typically selected by the group ahead of time or in real-time. The faculty mentoring circles was designed to help faculty at a younger academic age (junior faculty) to form connections with faculty at an older academic age (senior faculty). This group was also formed as a place where all faculty can go to in the event they need additional resources or need help acclimating to the College.</p> <p>-- Faculty Socials: Faculty socials provide an open forum for all faculty members of Khoury College to connect with one another in a much less formal setting. The purpose of faculty socials is for our faculty to have an opportunity to get to know one another on a variety of levels and were established to assist with faculty in forming organic professional relationships that would be minimal otherwise. As the College has grown, the opportunities for informal gatherings diminished over the years, but we have brought them back over the past several years. Khoury College offers two types of faculty socials. We have held these formerly in-person for faculty on the Boston campus (pre-COVID era) and virtually. In addition, we have also offered these virtually and across campuses..</p>
<p><b>Law</b> (Kristin Madison)</p>	<p>Our tenure and promotion rules call for the appointment of a tenured faculty member as a mentor to a junior faculty member at some point during that candidate’s first year. Tenure mentors play a prominent and important role in advising and supporting the faculty member throughout the tenure track, including by acting as a liaison if necessary between the candidate and the Dean or other tenured faculty. The mentor works with the tenure &amp; promotion chair and the candidate to assist the candidate in preparing a plan for the progression of teaching, scholarship, and service to the level required to support tenure. This plan, which may be modified over time, is reviewed by the full tenured faculty, so it becomes an important part of the mentoring process.</p> <p>Full-time non-tenure track faculty are all assigned a full professor (tenured or FTNTT) as a mentor. As with tenure-track faculty, this person is selected during the professor’s first year. The expectations of mentors for FTNTT faculty parallel those for tenure-track faculty, although there is no tenure plan. Our rules also allow for individuals hired as full professors not on the tenure track to request a mentor.</p>
<p><b>University-wide via ADVANCE</b></p>	<p><u>Full-time Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Mentoring Circles</u>  <u>Mutual Mentoring Advancement Program (M2AP)</u>  Mentoring SOS –We send automated email messages out to faculty mentor pairs each year</p>

Mentor Training – Each year, we host mentor training for those who supervise research training based on the Center for the Improvement of Mentored Experiences in Research curriculum. We currently have three trained facilitators but are looking to do more.