

Teaching and Learning in Higher Education

Number 39

February 2005

Does Mentoring New Faculty Make a Difference?

Heather Kanuka
Athabasca University

The primary purpose of a mentoring program is to help new faculty to fully develop their professional careers, support professional identity and build competence (Toal-Sullivan, 2002). Mentoring programs also facilitate professional learning, socialization and adaptation of new faculty into their professions (Kalbfleisch & Bach, 1998). This can be effectively accomplished through the implementation of a support system that augments guidance with experienced colleagues. Business and industry have applied the philosophy and principles of mentoring to attract, retain, and promote junior employees - which also improve individual and corporate performance and effectiveness. More recently, institutions of higher education are applying these same mentoring concepts and achieving many of the same benefits as business and industry.

Why bother with mentoring programs?

At the core of the mentoring process is an interpersonal relationship between an experienced faculty member and a new faculty member - or faculty members who are at different stages in their professional development - whereby the experienced faculty member takes an active role in the career development of the new faculty member (Newby & Corner, 1997). The experienced faculty member may serve as a role model, adviser, and guide in various formats that range from highly structured and planned interactions to informal interactions (Jipson & Paley, 2000).

The underpinning assumption of mentoring as a form of learning and professional development originates from the belief that learning occurs through observing, role modeling and/or apprenticeship, and questioning.

Recently, there has been a surge of interest in mentoring for professional development within higher education settings. While the reasons for this are varied, there is a fairly extensive body of literature that suggests mentoring programs lead to important benefits in university settings for new faculty, senior faculty, and the institution in general. Specifically, mentoring programs can help develop more collegial and compassionate departments and institutions (Boyle & Boice, 1998).



It is a process where tacit knowledge may be passed on to less experienced faculty (Blanford, 2000) and is a means for making explicit the ethics, rules and skills that are necessary for productive performance within the university culture (Nicholls, 2000). Making tacit knowledge explicit is necessary for new faculty to become initiated into the traditions, habits, rules, cultures, and practices of the department and/or faculty they have joined. Simply making explicit what faculty **do** is a powerful means for preparing new faculty for their new roles.

How does mentoring benefit new faculty?

Through mentoring, it is more likely that new faculty will gain an understanding of the organizational culture (Kram, 1986), access informal networks of communication that carry significant professional information (Luna & Cullen, 1995), and receive assistance in defining and achieving career goals (Bogat & Redner, 1985). New faculty members have reported they feel that they are welcomed and valued through mentoring (Boyle & Boice, 1998).

In academic settings, Queralt (1982) found that faculty with mentors demonstrated greater productivity as leaders in professional associations, received more competitive grants, and published more books and articles than faculty without mentors. Mentored faculty members also reported greater career satisfaction.

Experts in the field of mentoring maintain that mentoring programs attend to

a variety of faculty needs over a period of time (Kram, 1986). For example, mentoring programs help new faculty to develop as leaders through the receipt of professional and institutional information, sponsorship, advice, and guidance.

As such, new faculty involved in mentoring are more likely to have opportunities to develop not only professionally (career orientation) but also personally (psycho-social needs) throughout their careers.

Continued on page 3

STLHE/SAPES

Steering Committee

Harry Hubball, BC
Margaret Wilson, AB
Dieter Schönwetter, SK/MB
Debra Dawson, ON, SW
Teresa Dawson, ON, Central
Aline Germain-Rutherford, ON, NE
André Bourret, Francophone QC
Bluma Litner, Anglophone QC
Lynn Taylor, NS
Eileen Herteis: NL/NB/PEI

Ex-Officio Members

Julia Christensen Hughes, President
Gary Poole, Past-President
Alan Wright, Chair, Publications Cmt.
Arshad Ahmad, Teaching Awards Crdtr.
Christine Kurbis, Treasurer
Alex Fancy, Council of 3M Teaching Fellows
Joy Mighty, Educational Developers Caucus

Electronic Discussion:

STLHE Forum

The STLHE electronic mail forum has been active since October 1988, to support the exchange of opinions, ideas and experiences concerning teaching and learning in higher education.

To subscribe, contact the list coordinator, Russ Hunt, e-mail: hunt@stu.ca or visit the STLHE website at www.stlhe.ca. See Communication.

Teaching and Learning in Higher Education Number 39, February 2005

Newsletter of the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (STLHE/SAPES)

Editor: Erika Kustra
c/o Centre for Leadership in Learning
McMaster University, GSB-217
Hamilton, ON L8S 4K1
Canada
e-mail: kustraed@mcmaster.ca

Material may be reprinted or photocopied for institutional use within Canada. Please note appropriate credit and, as a courtesy to the author, forward two copies of the reprint to the above address.

Winter Newsletter: Mentoring Issue

This newsletter focuses on the theme of 'Mentoring'. Informally, the STLHE has been the source of mentoring opportunities for many members. We appreciate the contributions from the STLHE membership to this newsletter, and look forward to many more years of informal mentoring.

The Spring Newsletter will explore the STLHE conference theme: A Fine Balance, the Student Experience in Higher Education / Trouver le juste milieu: l'aventure de l'apprentissage chez l'étudiant. We welcome submissions of approximately 500 words. Please send any contributions or questions to the editor.

In the future, we would like to recognize members of the STLHE who are taking new positions or retiring. Please let us know of anyone who we can recognize. Additionally, if there are any recent publications from STLHE members that you would like to see included in a list, please let us know.

Your feedback on any aspect of the newsletter would be welcome.

STLHE Green Guides Series



Green Guides are short handbooks that offer pragmatic advice on a wide variety of teaching and learning issues, with the aim of encouraging reflection on current practice and enhanced effectiveness. For details: www.mcmaster.ca/stlhe/publications/green.guides.htm

To Order:

Dalhousie University Bookstore
Telephone: (902) 494-6704
Fax: (902) 494-3863
Email: bookstore@dal.ca
Online: <http://bookstore.sub.dal.ca/index.htm>

New Faculty Mentoring

Continued from page 1

In addition to creating new incentives and career opportunities, assigning mentors to work with new faculty provides a smoother transition, rather than an abrupt and unassisted entry into the professorial that characterizes the experiences of most new faculty.

How does mentoring benefit senior faculty?

New faculty members are not the only ones to benefit from mentoring programs. Mentors gain satisfaction from assisting new colleagues, improving their own managerial skills, and increasing stimulation from bright and creative new faculty members (Reich, 1986).



Informal networks carry significant professional information.

Experienced faculty members who mentor new faculty may also derive enhanced status and self-esteem from being seen as successful and as having something to offer new faculty.

Research has also revealed that mentors find the mentoring experience provides opportunities for reflection and renewal of their own teaching and research career (Boyle & Boice, 1998).

Nicholls (2002) further asserts that mentoring plays a crucial role for the mentor through the systematic critical reflection that occurs during the mentoring process.

How does mentoring benefit institutions?

In the last decade universities have become more concerned with enhancing productivity to survive in an increasingly competitive environment. Inherent within the concept of productivity in academic circles is the need to develop faculty, enabling them to make full use of their knowledge and skills.

While most, if not all, new faculty members have spent many years in a university environment learning the content of their subject areas, they typically receive little, if any, formal preparation and guidance in the

knowledge, skills, and procedures necessary for them to become successful in their professorial roles.

Recent recognition and acknowledgement of this void by institutions of higher education is motivating universities to initiate mentoring programs as a means to address this problem.

While many academic institutions have some form of mentoring activities (most often through informal collegial friends), only a few have instituted formal mentoring programs. Institutions that have successfully implemented

mentoring programs have demonstrated that they are not only of benefit to new and senior faculty members, but also contribute to the general stability and health of the organization. In particular, mentoring programs have been found to be effective at facilitating the development of future organizational leadership and developing potential leaders (Luna & Cullen, 1995).

Reprinted with permission, University of Calgary, Learning Commons, Communities of Inquiry
http://commons.ucalgary.ca/documents/Mentoring_p1

References

- Blanford, S. (2000). *Managing professional development in schools*: London: Routledge.
- Bogat, G. & Redner, R. (1985). How mentoring affects the professional development of women in psychology. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 16, 851-859.
- Boyle, P. & Boice, B. (1998). Systematic mentoring from new faculty teaching and graduate teaching assistants. *Innovative Higher Education*, 22(3), 157-159.
- Jipson, J. & Palye, N. (2000). Because no one gets there alone: Collaboration as co-mentoring. *Theory into Practice*, 39(1), 36-42.
- Kalbfleisch, P. J., & Bach, B. W. (1998). The language of mentoring in a health care environment. *Health Communication*, 10(4), 373-392.
- Kram, K.E. (1986). Mentoring in the workplace. In D.T. Hall (Ed.), *Career Development in Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Luna, G. & Cullen, D.L. (1995). Empowering the faculty: Mentoring redirected and renewed. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report no.3*. Washington, DC: The George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development.
- Newby, T. J. & Corner, J. (1997). Mentoring for increased performance: Foundations and methods. *Performance Improvement*, 36(2), 11-15.



Heather Kanuka
Athabasca University

Heather Kanuka is Associate Professor and Canada Research Chair in the Centre for Distance Education at Athabasca University. Prior to her appointment at Athabasca University, Heather was an assistant professor and associate director at the Learning Commons, University of Calgary. Her role at Athabasca University continues to include teaching development.

These tips and check lists were developed through a combination of Heather Kanuka's experience at the University of Calgary and her reading of the literature.

Articulating Assumptions

An effective way to acknowledge the commitments by both the new faculty member and the mentor is to construct an unofficial understanding that outlines the commitments of both people. This can be tailored to include any aspect of the mentoring relationship. By developing this together, you have some assurance of a stable, mutually beneficial relationship.

Our goals are _____.

We will meet every ____ from ____ to ____.
We will begin and end on time.

Each of us will participate actively in the relationship.

We will respect each other's expertise and experience.

We will put interruptions aside during our meetings.

We will answer each other's emails in a timely fashion.

We will make an effort to openly discuss any challenges in the relationship.

The individual missing a meeting will provide an explanation of the absence.

We agree not to disclose conversations without the permission of the other party.

It is acceptable for one of us to 'drop by' the other individual's office for short consultations outside of our regular meetings.

Our mentoring relationship will last for _____.

Mentoring Activities Checklist

One of the hallmarks of an effective mentoring relationship is the ability to meet the specific needs of both the mentor and mentee. The mentor, new faculty member, and department head may find it useful to devise a plan outlining areas they wish to address, including:

- Share formal and informal rules, orientation to academic culture.
- How is the department organized? How are decisions made in the department? (e.g., teaching loads, course assignment)
- Information on teaching resources.
- Information on ordering texts, the university bookstore, library services.
- What supplies and expenses are covered by the department?
- Where do you obtain teaching equipment? (e.g., projectors, keys)
- Past course syllabi, similar courses, and contact information for people who have previously taught the course.
- The advantages and disadvantages of teaching the same course, within a single area, or a variety of different courses.
- The advantages and disadvantages of developing a new course.
- An estimate of the necessary time for course preparation.
- Department and faculty guidelines for grading, including final exam schedules and examination procedures and policy.
- How much do student ratings count toward tenure and promotion?
- How can you integrate other kinds of teaching evaluations within a course?
- What documentation that should be kept for a teaching dossier?
- Information on teaching development opportunities (eg., listservs, workshops, or invite them to observe you teach).
- What are typical problems that arise? How can you deal with them, or avoid them?
- Assistance with accessing a network of professional contacts.
- Suggestions for development of effective teaching strategies.
- Identification of high pay-off activities, and strategies to reduce low pay-off activities (eg., describe relative importance of committees).

État des lieux du mentorat par les pairs à l'Université d'Ottawa

Extrait de Vol. 6 No. 4 Août 2003 / August 2003, *Teaching Options Pédagogique*
à texte intégral: www.uottawa.ca/academic/cut/options/aout_03/mentorat.htm

Ruth Phillion

Université d'Ottawa

Depuis une trentaine d'années, dans la plupart des pays occidentaux, l'université connaît une massification importante de sa clientèle, une situation qui l'oblige à réviser ses finalités. L'université n'est plus perçue que «comme un instrument de reproduction des élites de la société» (Noël et Parmentier, 1998), mais davantage comme un outil devant permettre à chaque étudiant de réaliser son projet personnel.

Pour parvenir à cette fin, les universités doivent repenser leur pédagogie universitaire, notamment en ce qui concerne le soutien et l'accompagnement des étudiants de première année qui sont de plus en plus nombreux à vivre des échecs et à abandonner leurs études (Bruneau, 1997; Romainville, 2000). Une des façons d'y parvenir consiste à instaurer, au sein de ses différentes facultés, des programmes d'accompagnement par des pairs pour ses étudiants.

Mentorat par les pairs

L'entraide par les pairs (mentorat par les pairs Terme interchangeable), effectué en petits groupes ou de façon individuelle, a des effets positifs indéniables aussi bien au plan cognitif qu'affectif chez les étudiants en difficulté (Topping, 1996). À l'université d'Ottawa, cette mesure d'entraide est appelée *mentorat par les pairs* et le terme choisi pour désigner l'étudiant qui offre cette entraide est *pair mentor*.

Les recherches indiquent que les meilleurs résultats sont obtenus lorsque ces programmes sont de longue durée, qu'ils englobent dans leurs objectifs les dimensions affectives et motivationnelles de l'apprentissage, et qu'ils permettent le développement d'habiletés cognitives et métacognitives des étudiants en difficulté (Hattie, Biggs et Purdie, 1996; Kaldewey et Korthagen, 1995). De façon générale, les recherches identifient quatre justificatifs pour expliquer ce succès :

1. La nature de l'interaction entre les étudiants facilite la relation d'aide;
2. La valeur de l'aide par les pairs mentors facilite l'adaptation des étudiants à leur nouveau milieu;
3. L'aide apportée par les pairs mentors contribue directement à réduire le stress et à offrir un soutien émotif et pédagogique aux étudiants en difficulté;

4. On souligne les bienfaits du mentorat pour le pair mentor qui affirme sa personnalité tout en consolidant ses savoirs et sa capacité à enseigner (Lawson, 1989; Topping, 1996).

Toutes ces raisons ont incité l'université d'Ottawa, par l'entremise du Service d'appui au succès scolaire (SASS) et ses différentes facultés, à mettre en place divers programmes de mentorat par les pairs. Les divers programmes comptent sur la participation active d'étudiants provenant de leur faculté pour offrir pareil appui. L'université offrira aussi un programme de mentorat spécifique aux étudiants athlètes pour qui la conciliation des études et du sport comporte des enjeux particuliers.

Afin de respecter les différentes cultures et réalités facultaires, voire départementales, le SASS collabore avec chacune des facultés pour instaurer des programmes à leur image. La formation et le suivi portent essentiellement sur les dimensions affective et cognitive de l'accompagnement. Les modules spécifiques à la dimension affective touche des contenus relatifs à la relation d'aide, à la communication, à l'identification des besoins, aux défis que représente la transition de l'école secondaire à l'université, à la motivation, à la persévérance scolaire, à la confiance en soi, à la gestion du stress ainsi qu'une connaissance générale des différentes ressources universitaires afin que les pairs mentors sachent où référer les étudiants vers de l'aide spécialisée lorsque nécessaire. Les modules liés à la dimension cognitive portent sur les méthodes d'études (gestion de temps, prise de notes, mémorisation, préparation aux examens, présentations orales, la lecture efficace, etc.), la recherche en bibliothèque et la rédaction des travaux universitaires.

Les programmes de mentorat par les pairs proposent donc une formule d'encadrement donnée par des étudiants, de premier, deuxième et de troisième cycles universitaires, qui accompagnent, individuellement ou en groupe, d'autres étudiants pour leur offrir une aide en prévention, en soutien ou en intervention d'aide spécialisée. L'accompagnement vise tout à la fois le développement de stratégies d'apprentissage à utiliser pour la réussite scolaire ainsi que tout autre support touchant la motivation et l'engagement dans les études. Il ne s'agit donc pas de tutorat spécifique au contenu, mais davantage de favoriser chez l'étudiant le

développement d'habiletés d'apprentissage aptes à le supporter dans ses études universitaires. En conséquence, il s'agit de favoriser une approche qui privilégie le partage de stratégies particulières au regard des difficultés identifiées et le partage de l'expérience universitaire dans toutes ses composantes, soit de l'intégration à l'université à l'obtention d'un diplôme.

Conclusion

Devant les difficultés endémiques que rencontrent les universités à répondre à la diversité des profils de ces nouveaux et nombreux étudiants, il y a nécessité de développer des formules d'accompagnement qui permettent de faire avancer la pédagogie universitaire et ainsi de contribuer à la rendre plus pragmatique et plus proche de la réalité des étudiants. À cet égard, l'accompagnement par des pairs mentors apparaît comme étant une avenue nouvelle et prometteuse dans la mesure où il s'agit d'un accompagnement qui englobe les dimensions affectives et motivationnelles de l'apprentissage, et qui permette de développer les habiletés cognitives nécessaires à la réussite d'études universitaires.

Références

- Bruneau, M. (1997). Le tutorat et le monitorat: Faits et questions. Dans L. Langevin et L. Villeneuve (dirs.), *L'encadrement des étudiants. Un défi du XXI^e siècle* (280- 300). Montréal: Les éditions logiques.
- Hattie, J., Biggs, J. et Purdie, N. (1996). Effects of learning skills interventions on student learning: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 66(2), 99-136.
- Kaldewey, J. et Korthagen, F.A.J. (1995). Training and studying in higher education: Objectives and effects. *Higher Education*, 30 (1), 81-98.
- Lawson, D. (1989). Peer Helping Programs in the Colleges and Universities of Quebec and Ontario. *Canadian Journal of Counselling*, 23(1), 41-54.
- Noël, B. et Parmentier, Ph. (1998). De l'élève à l'étudiant. Dans M. Frenay, B. Noël, Ph. Parmentier, M. Romainville (Coll). *L'étudiant apprenant, Grille de lecture pour l'enseignant universitaire* (p.7-15). Bruxelles : De Boeck.
- Romainville, M. (2000). *L'échec dans l'université de masse*. Paris : L'Harmattan.
- Topping, K.J. (1996). The Effectiveness of peer tutoring in further and higher education. *Higher Education*, 32, 321-345.

Mentoring Between Countries: To Russia with Love

Anton Allahar

University of Western Ontario

Three years ago I was invited to participate in a teacher-training programme held under the auspices of the Russian International Higher Education Support Program (HESP), which underwrites the Regional Seminar for Excellence in Teaching. This seminar is aimed at institutionalizing the practice of mentoring as senior colleagues share knowledge and teaching techniques with young teacher trainees in interactive classroom and seminar groups.

On my first visit, while I designed and taught a three-week course on "Ethnicity and Nationalism" to 25 student teachers from 15 former Soviet countries, the focus was equally weighted on the content of the course and on matters of pedagogy. The HESP promotes the advancement of higher education in the humanities and social sciences throughout the region of post-communist countries of Central and Eastern Europe, the former Soviet Union and Mongolia (the target region). As such, it is an ambitious and large-scale experiment in mentoring young teachers that we in Canada may do well to emulate.

In 2004, I was invited back to share my teaching insights with our Eastern European colleagues and their students with a view to a more long-term goal. The Regional Seminar for Excellence in Teaching is based on the idea of mentoring and presumes that, though not infallible, experience is the best teacher. In this spirit seasoned university teachers, both from the region and without, participate in the Summer Session with the idea of promoting and nurturing university-level teaching excellence in the social sciences and humanities.

Mindful of the fact that knowledge derived from comparative studies constitutes the cement of what we do as teachers, my Russian colleagues, especially Dr. Nikolai Skvortsov, Dean of the Faculty of Sociology at St. Petersburg State University in Russia, and Dr. Andrei V. Rezaev, Director of the International Center for Comparative and Institutional Research at the same university, are keen to establish relationships with those of us who live and work outside of their region. For in my experience, my students from Eastern Europe are not only very familiar with the issues and literature that speak to their own social and intellectual reality, but they are also most conversant with the current debates in western academia. Where

they are less knowledgeable, however, is in terms of the pedagogical styles employed by teachers in the West, and just how the social and empirical realities of the West condition those styles.

On the other hand, my Eastern European experience has been so highly enriching that I have incorporated many of the lessons I learned into my own classes at Western. After my first visit to Russia in 2002, I was made a permanent member of the resource team at St. Petersburg State, and together we secured continuous funding for a three-year term that will take us to the Summer of 2006. This has permitted me to return to St. Petersburg in the capacity of faculty adviser and teacher on an on-going basis. All of the students are pursuing teaching careers back in their respective countries and attend the Summer School on teaching excellence as part of their preparation.



Anton Allahar with students in Russia.

The idea of mentoring between countries belongs to two Russian colleagues at St. Petersburg State University

At my suggestion, the Russians have become very interested in pooling their insights and knowledge with us in the West and this is why I thought I would share some of the features of their programme with readers of the STLHE Newsletter. I also happen to know that some colleagues in Ottawa are currently interested in establishing a similar programme in Canada.

What better proof of collaboration and international cooperation than to emulate their example and to show intellectual leadership even as we follow that example? In other words, mentoring between countries is a reciprocal affair. We learn from them as they learn from us and the net gain accrues, across

international borders, to our students. This is precisely how I view my invitation to, and reception at St. Petersburg State University. We have as much to teach them as we have to learn from them.

To achieve its long-term goals, the HESP has:

- a) moved to improve the existing curricula by modelling after outside expertise and embracing collaborative critical scholarship on teaching methods and the state of the art in the discipline;
- b) sought to emphasise innovations in the techniques of classroom instruction geared to a deeper understanding of teaching and learning as scholarly activities; and
- c) stressed continuous development and self-renewal of the most committed individuals and empowers them to become catalysts for the development of critical pedagogy in their home institutions.

To these ends, the HESP Regional Seminar revolves around intensive summer sessions (2-4 weeks in length, hosted in the region), and inter-session activities, which engage the participants and resource persons in collaboration on the following levels:

- a) exploration of the state of the art in higher education, along with an assessment of contemporary trends in scholarship related to teaching;
- b) collaborative advancement of learning in the discipline of higher education within the international context; and

- c) engaging the young teachers (program participants) in the processes of teaching and learning, and fostering an appetite for critical inquiry tied to their continuous self-renewal as teachers.

I see no reason why we in Canada cannot do the same as our Russian colleagues. We can collaborate in such a venture. For we and our students have everything to gain and nothing to lose.

Hence my rhetorical question: What's in a preposition? 'To' Russia with love, or 'From' Russia with love? It matters naught!

Reflecting on Our Teaching

Mark Weisberg
Queen's University

White Space

It requires a long time to take in a few words.

On either side of the word we need a patch of white, of silence, like the white space that defines a Chinese painting, or the rests in music that permit the notes to be heard.

By and large, our students are relentlessly over stimulated. They sing the body electric: plugged in, tuned out, motorized. And we are over stimulated, too. Many of us hate silence, especially in the classroom. It is the teacher's ultimate nightmare: what if I can't fill fifty minutes? And yet, if students spend twenty minutes in silence looking at ten lines of Homer, it can be time well spent.

I heard a student talking the other day about the difference between two sociology professors. "I love Professor Jones. He lectures from the moment he enters the room, without ever looking at his notes. You really get your money's worth in there. I don't know about Professor Smith. Sometimes you ask him a question and he looks out the window for a while before he answers."

*Mary Rose O'Reilly,
Radical Presence*

In our busy lives, are we like Professor Jones, never stopping to look at our notes? At our teaching? At our lives? Do we leave ourselves enough white space? Do we make time to reflect?

However busy we are, by not reflecting, I think we're missing a significant dimension of our professional (and personal) lives; for me, moving from experience to reflection to experience constitutes an essential educational rhythm. That doesn't mean that people who don't reflect must be poor teachers; however, I do think reflecting increases our chances of being both effective and fulfilled.

There are no formulas for reflecting, but here are several strategies that individuals have found helpful.

1. Keep a log in which you observe your teaching activities, and visit it periodically to see what you discover. Pay attention to the feelings that accompany those activities and to the assumptions that seem to lie behind what you do. Explore whether your experience supports those assumptions.
2. Note and examine several critical incidents in your teaching; they could be what Stephen Brookfield calls high points and low points: a time when you felt, YES, this is what teaching is all about, and a time when you felt discouraged, wondered why you were in this profession.

3. Exchange classroom visits with a colleague and discuss what you have observed.

4. Read thoughtful and possibly provocative books about teaching, such as: Don Finkel's *Teaching With Your Mouth Shut*, Mary Rose O'Reilly's *Radical Presence: Teaching as Contemplative Practice*, Jane Tompkins's *A Life in School: What the Teacher Learned*, and Peter Elbow's *Embracing Contraries: Explorations in Learning and Teaching*. Discuss them with a group of interested colleagues.

5. You might use that group to help you carry out what my Yale colleague Jean Koh Peters and I call an *Individual Reflection Event*, something designed to meet your most pressing needs for feedback and reflection.

6. Or join Jean and me this summer for a reflection retreat at Banff Centre, and enjoy 3 days of thinking, talking, writing, and walking.



Mark Weisberg,

Banff Summer Retreat: Reflecting on Our Teaching

How does who we are affect how we teach, and how does teaching affect who we are? What does it mean to lead a professional life as a teacher in a post-secondary institution? What aspects of ourselves are the most supported and engaged by the work we do? What aspects are the most threatened?

If you're interested in these questions and looking for a unique professional development opportunity to turn inward and reflect on your teaching with a group of interested colleagues, join Mark Weisberg (Queen's) and Jean Koh Peters (Yale) at the Banff Centre next July for three days of thinking, talking, writing, and walking.

Having facilitated two highly evaluated reflection retreats in recent years, Mark and Jean are looking forward to building on their experience, hoping, as in the previous retreats, participants will explore their teaching through a variety of lenses, meet people with similar concerns and goals, come away with renewed energy for teaching. . . and have fun doing so.

For more information and to register: www.iathe.org/BanffRetreat

Early registration discounts apply. Limited to 30 participants.

Rae Review Submission

Dale Roy

McMaster University

Julia Christensen Hughes

University of Guelph

On behalf of STLHE, Dale Roy drafted an official response to the Rae Review. Chris Knapper commented on the draft and made a number of suggestions as did several others including Ros Woodhouse, Gary Poole, Debra Dawson, Julia Christensen Hughes, Aline Germain-Rutherford, Teresa Dawson, Paola Borin, Erika Kustra, Sylvia Riselay and Del Harnish.

In our submission we challenged the Panel to think beyond the specifics of the draft report, and focus on improving the process by which students learn. We argued that simply doing more of the same is inadequate to prepare

students for the increasingly complex challenges they will face after graduation, and suggested a number of mechanisms for encouraging innovation and change. These included:

- Making preparation for teaching a requirement for all doctoral programs.
- Ensuring attention to teaching and learning issues in the certification of all new undergraduate programs.
- Using a small part of the formula funding to support non-traditional educational approaches.

- Establishing a province-wide fund to encourage innovative teaching and curriculum initiatives (potentially in conjunction with the Federal Government's Canada Research Chairs program).
- Requiring the development and annual reporting of institutional strategic plans on teaching and learning.

Final Report and Recommendations

Now available: www.raereview.on.ca/en/report

A FINE BALANCE • TROUVER LE JUSTE MILIEU

The Student Experience in Higher Education / L'aventure de l'apprentissage chez l'étudiant

STLHE CONFERENCE/CONGRES SAPES • JUNE 8-11 JUIN, CHARLOTTETOWN, PE



www.upei.ca/stlhe

STLHE
SAPES

The Webster Centre
UNIVERSITY OF PEI

U
PEI

Assessing Quality in Canadian Universities: The Challenge Continues



Gary Poole

Past-President, Advocacy Portfolio
University of British Columbia

When Yogi Berra coined the phrase, “It’s déjà vu all over again,” he probably wasn’t referring to our renewed concern for indicators of quality in higher education. But he could have been.

At least 10 years ago, STLHE members were engaged in lively discussions about the ways in which institutions show that they care about teaching. The Making Teaching Count project featured articles in this newsletter by Ron Smith, Pat Rogers and others, as well as surveys that probed the value placed on teaching.

Macleans’ magazine has been publishing its rankings of Canadian universities since 1991. The Globe and Mail produces its own ratings, and the National Post might soon follow suit. Those of us who work in higher education tend to be critical of the criteria featured in these media-based evaluations, but we have not been assertive in forwarding something better.

However, that might change. There has been an upsurge in the energy being devoted to the identification of indicators of effectiveness in higher education. One reason is that higher education has become very expensive, not just for governments, but for students and their families. High price tags engender high expectations of quality, and definitions of quality differ. These differences lead to debates in which each party has considerable personal investment. Thus, interest in quality indicators is piquing.

A second reason is that the movement known as the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) has kindled a widespread interest in assessment of impact. In January, UBC’s newly established Institute for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning offered a seminar on outcome indicators that go beyond grades and student satisfaction surveys. Last October, Pat

Hutchings, Vice-President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Higher Education, addressed the first conference of the International Society for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. She said that the current emphasis on SoTL offered real hope that we would finally get assessment right.

We have a history of research on quality indicators in Canada. Janet Donald was publishing with Brian Denison in this area in the mid-90s. However, the SoTL movement is bringing far more people into the fray.

So it really is “déjà vu all over again,” and STLHE wants to be actively involved in the conversations. That is why we were very pleased to be invited to participate in a one-day roundtable on measuring the quality of Canada’s post-secondary institutions, hosted by the Canadian Policy Research Networks (CPRN), on December 7th in Ottawa.

Our main focal point was a paper co-authored by Ross Finnie (Queen’s) and Alex Usher (Education Policy Institute) entitled, “Measuring the Quality of Post-Secondary Education: Concepts, Current Practices, and a Strategic Plan.” The paper presents a model to help make sense of the complex process of assessing quality in higher education as a regression equation. Ross Finnie is an economist, who is open about his preference for such equations to understand the world.

The equation contains four broad factors. Finnie and Usher call these: Beginning Characteristics, Inputs, Learning Outcomes, and Final Outcomes. By necessity, these categories are over-simplifications. All the same, they proved very useful for us at the roundtable when discussing the current landscape of quality assessment in higher education.

For example, we could characterize the Maclean’s rankings as being based on Beginning Characteristics and Inputs. What calibre of student is being attracted to an institution and what does the institution provide in terms of library facilities and access to tenure-track faculty? Students’ transcripts are a measure of Learning Outcomes, but there are many others. For example, the National Survey of Student Engagement, recommended in the Rae Report, attempts to quantify the frequency with which certain engaging learning opportunities are part

of a student’s educational experience. Also, programs that feature community service learning would assert that students learn things that might not be manifest in their transcripts.

Final Outcomes are more macroscopic. They include the sorts of indicators that were of interest to many of those in attendance at the roundtable. How many people with university and college degrees are gainfully and happily employed? What are their income levels compared to those who do not attend? Are universities and colleges graduating people whose skills are consistent with the needs of Canada’s job markets? In addition to employment statistics, consider assessing things like civic engagement?

One goal of the roundtable was to identify tangible measures within each of the model’s four categories. I use the word “measures” cautiously here, knowing that those who favour qualitative methods might find the word alienating. However, as empirical as Finnie and Usher’s model might appear, they were emphatic in their endorsement of qualitative indicators.

There has been an upsurge in the energy being devoted to the identification of indicators of effectiveness in higher education.

Alas, we did not generate a long list of tangible indicators at the roundtable. More time and dialogue are needed for this. We did, however, engage in an important and penetrating discussion of the relationship between Learning Outcomes and Final Outcomes.

It makes perfect sense that many of the people who attended the roundtable see universities and colleges as institutions that support Canada’s job markets and economy. Many of our students and their families feel the same way. Personally, I see this as an important role for institutions of higher education. I also think we are trying to do more than this. I came away committed to finding ways to define and assess these other things we are trying to achieve in ways that make sense to all who have a vested interest in Canadian higher education.

Message de la présidente

Julia Christensen Hughes
STLHE President
University of Guelph

Des vœux de nouvel an auraient été tout à fait de circonstance dans notre bulletin de février, mais le moment était mal choisi en raison de la récente catastrophe causée par le tsunami et la souffrance inimaginable des milliers de victimes qui s'en est suivie. Notre collègue, Suki Ekaratne, qui représentait le Sri Lanka au conseil de ICED (International Consortium of Educational Developers) à la conférence de la SAPES l'an dernier à Ottawa signale que plus de sept cents étudiants et professeurs d'université de ce pays ont perdu la vie et un grand nombre est toujours porté disparu. Ce désastre met certainement nos défis et nos frustrations en perspective. Je vous souhaite donc une année "des plus positive" au cours de laquelle vous pourrez enrichir la vie de vos étudiants et de vos collègues et participer pleinement aux causes qui vous tiennent à cœur.

J'ai déjà indiqué dans mon courriel de décembre que la Société entreprendra de nombreuses activités au cours de 2005 dont le point culminant sera incontestablement notre congrès annuel à l'Île-du-Prince-Édouard. Les organisateurs ont reçu plus de deux cents demandes et comme nous l'avions espéré, un bon nombre provient d'étudiants et plusieurs d'administrateurs. Alastair Summerlee, président de l'université de Guelph et récipiendaire d'une bourse 3M fera l'ouverture du congrès et présentera deux autres ateliers dont l'un sera un cours d'apprentissage par problème "en direct" avec plusieurs de ses étudiants et l'autre sera destiné aux administrateurs. Je suis ravie d'être témoin de la collaboration entre étudiants et administrateurs.

Le congrès de cette année rappelle le vingtième anniversaire du Prix 3M pour l'Excellence de l'Enseignement. Plusieurs d'entre vous ont contribué au livre, *Making a Difference/Toute la différence: A Celebration of the 3M Teaching Fellowship*, qui sera distribué au congrès. C'est une initiative remarquable qui souligne l'importance d'encourager et de célébrer l'excellence en enseignement au Canada. Les organisateurs ont reçu plus de cent demandes dont une quarantaine sont des témoignages

d'étudiants. À l'issue du congrès, il y aura en plus une assemblée des récipiendaires du Canada et de plusieurs pays, dont les États-Unis, la Grande-Bretagne, l'Australie et la Nouvelle-Zélande, afin d'explorer les différentes perspectives en matière de pédagogie dans l'enseignement supérieur.

participeront à l'assemblée "EDC" qui aura lieu à Kingston en février. Le thème sera la qualité en enseignement et le développement pédagogique.

Plusieurs d'entre vous ont contribué au livre,
*Making a Difference / Toute la différence:
A Celebration of the 3M Teaching Fellowship*,
qui sera distribué à la conférence.

J'aimerais également attirer votre attention sur un événement important qui aura lieu le 22 avril au Campus de Scarborough de l'Université de Toronto : le symposium **Leadership for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: A National Symposium for University and College Administrators**. Ce symposium organisé en collaboration avec le CHERD et la SAPES vise à aider les administrateurs à mieux comprendre l'importance des bourses dans le domaine de la pédagogie en enseignement supérieur et à identifier des moyens efficaces.

Le conférencier principal sera Richard Gale de la Fondation Carnegie. Parmi les autres conférenciers et experts, nous compterons : Anna Kindler, AVPA, UBC, Teresa Dawson, Directrice, UTSC, Lynn Taylor, Directrice, Dalhousie, Alastair Summerlee, Président, Université de Guelph, Janet Halliwell, VP CRSHC, Ann Buller, Présidente Centennial College, et représentante principale de HRSD. Nous espérons que nos membres qui ont des responsabilités administratives (p.ex. en tant que président, doyen ou vice-président associé) se feront un devoir de participer à cet événement unique. Les modalités d'inscription seront bientôt publiées sur notre site web. Je me réjouis à l'avance de revoir ceux qui

C'est une formidable occasion de perfectionnement professionnel pour les enseignants à travers le pays. Une plénière interactive animée par Robert Sauder du HRSD constituera une des principales activités. On présentera également un atelier visant à clarifier nos principes et nos liens avec l'Institut, ce qui constitue un sujet d'intérêt pour plusieurs de nos membres.

Nous amorcerons également le débat sur les indicateurs de qualité (lire l'article de Gary Poole), nous lancerons un nouveau Guide Vert et nous solliciterons votre contribution pour publier une "collection d'essais sur la pédagogie" (Collection of Essays on Learning and Teaching (CELT)), nous peaufinerons notre proposition sur l'adhésion des établissements d'enseignement et sur les partenariats et nous continuerons à explorer les moyens d'accueillir une plus grande variété de membres dont nos collègues francophones, des administrateurs et des étudiants.

Si vous désirez en savoir davantage sur ces activités, je vous invite à consulter le site web de la SAPES ou à communiquer avec moi.

English version on page 11

President's Report



Julia Christensen Hughes
STLHE President
University of Guelph

While "Happy New Year" might have seemed an entirely appropriate beginning to a February newsletter in year's past, the recent tsunami disaster and unimaginable suffering of countless people that has followed, challenges the appropriateness of this greeting. Our colleague, Suki Ekaratne, who attended the STLHE conference last year in Ottawa, and represents Sri Lanka on the ICED Council (International Consortium of Educational Developers), reports that over 700 university staff and students have died in his country, while many others remain missing. This certainly puts our own professional challenges and frustrations in perspective. With this in mind, I would like to wish you a "Meaningful New Year" – one in which you are able to contribute to the quality of your students' and/or colleagues' lives, and to those causes that most inspire you.

As I mentioned in the December e-mail update, the Society will be involved in many exciting and important activities during 2005, the highlight of which will undoubtedly be our annual conference in PEI. The organizers have received over 200 submissions – and as we had hoped – many involve student presenters and several are directed at university administrators. Alastair Summerlee, President of the University of Guelph, and 3M Teaching Fellow, will be providing the opening keynote along with two concurrent sessions. In one session, Alastair and several of his students will be conducting a "live" PBL class. In another, he will be leading a session for university administrators. I am delighted to see our commitment to involving students and administrators taking hold in this way.

This year's conference also celebrates the 20th anniversary of the 3M Teaching Fellowship Program. Many of you have made contributions to the anniversary book

Making a Difference/Toute la différence: A Celebration of the 3M Teaching Fellowship that will be distributed at the conference. This is a fabulous initiative that will speak loudly to the importance of encouraging and celebrating teaching excellence in Canada. The organizers received over 100 submissions of which approximately 40 were student testimonials.

In addition, at the close of the conference we will be hosting the Second International Forum of Teacher-Scholars, "Towards a framework for quality assurance for teaching and learning". This event will involve representatives from the US, UK, Australia and New Zealand, meeting with several of our Canadian Fellows, to explore the quality indicators in higher education from various national perspectives.

I would also like to draw your attention to a very important event that will be happening on April 22nd at the University of Toronto's Scarborough Campus - **Leadership for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: A National Symposium for University and College Administrators**. This symposium is a collaboration between CHERD and STLHE and is designed to help administrators better understand the importance of the scholarship of teaching and learning and identify ways they can best support it. The keynote speaker is Richard Gale of the Carnegie Foundation. Other speakers and panelists include: Anna Kindler, AVPA, UBC; Teresa Dawson, Director UTSC; Lynn Taylor, Director, Dalhousie; Alastair Summerlee, President, University of Guelph; Janet Halliwell, Executive VP SSHRC; Ann Buller, President Centennial College and a senior representative of HRSD. This will be a seminal event and we hope administrative members (Chairs, Deans, AVPAs, Provosts, Presidents) will make a point of attending. Registration details will be available soon on the STLHE website.

For those of you who are attending the EDC winter meeting in Kingston in February, I look forward to seeing you soon. The theme of the meeting is Quality in Teaching, Learning and Educational Development. This event is a fabulous professional development opportunity for those working in teaching centres across the country. One of the highlights will be an interactive plenary with Robert Sauder from HRSD. There will also be a very important session on helping clarify our guiding principles and relationship with the Institute – an issue of concern to many EDC members.

In addition to these events, over the coming year we will be wading into the debate on quality indicators (see the article by Gary Poole); considering the implications of the Rae Report; launching a new Green Guide and seeking contributions for a "Collection of Essays on Learning and Teaching" (CELT); refining our proposal for institutional memberships and sponsorships; and continuing to explore ways the Society can be more welcoming to a broader diversity of members including our francophone colleagues, university administrators, and students. If you would like to know more about any of these activities please visit the STLHE website or contact me directly.

En français à la page 10



Leadership for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning:

**A National Symposium for
University and College**

Administrators

April 22nd, 2005

University of Toronto, Scarborough

Plan to join Richard Gale, Senior Scholar of The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (www.carnegiefoundation.org), higher education leaders from across the country, heads of national organizations and government leaders for this seminal event. We will be exploring: what the scholarship of teaching and learning is; why it is important; how it can be assessed; how it can best be supported within individual departments and institutions; and the support implications for national associations and government bodies.

For further information please contact:
Julia Christensen Hughes,
President STLHE/SAPES
jchrste@uoguelph.ca
(519) 824-4120, #56938

Registration details will be available soon. For immediate inquiries call:
Joyce Joyal (CHERD) 204 474-9975
A CHERD / STLHE collaboration

Society for
Teaching and Learning
in Higher Education



La société pour
l'avancement de la
pédagogie dans
l'enseignement supérieur

What's inside?

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| Does Mentoring New Faculty Make a Difference? | 1 |
| Winter Newsletter: Mentoring Issue | 2 |
| Mentoring: Articulating Assumptions | 4 |
| Mentoring Activities Checklist | 4 |
| État des lieux du mentorat par les pairs | 5 |
| Mentoring Between Countries: To Russia with Love | 6 |
| Reflecting on our Teaching | 7 |
| Rae Review Submission | 8 |
| Assessing Quality in Canadian Universities | 9 |
| Message de la présidente | 10 |
| President's Report | 11 |



c/o Centre for Leadership in Learning
General Sciences Building Room 217
McMaster University
Hamilton, Ontario, Canada, L8S 4K1