

Faculty Mentoring: Considerations and a Template with Timelines (optional resource)

Context for the Creation of this Document: Following on the recommendations of the Working Group on Faculty Mentoring (2017-19), Bowdoin has worked to develop more robust informal and formal mentoring structures, and departments/programs as well as individual faculty have begun to embed faculty mentoring more intentionally into many facets of faculty life. This is the kind of progress we can collectively celebrate.

In August 2024, Rachel Beane, Eric Chown, Belinda Kong, and Dharni Vasudevan¹ came together for a summer working group with the expressed goal of creating a menu of mentoring pathways aimed at giving departments/programs and individual faculty more ways to approach mentoring. This goal was motivated by observations made by the Council of Mentors in the 2023-24 academic year: department/program faculty members are sometimes unclear on how to follow through on the mentoring plan included in the authorization proposal for faculty positions, and pre-tenure faculty are sometimes unclear about the level of mentoring they can expect from their departments and when and where they should seek out mentoring beyond their home departments.

In our discussion, we took into consideration two important values—our commitment to mentoring pre-tenure colleagues and helping to ensure that they have the resources and support they need to thrive, and our commitment to supporting chairs/directors, whose workloads continue to escalate. In this spirit, the template presented in this document is intended to decrease chair/director workload by obviating the time needed for each department/program to design its own mentoring plan. The template is not intended to be prescriptive but instead offers possible mentoring pathways for consideration, as well as reminders and suggestions about things that can be included in any mentoring plan. This should also help ensure consistency of mentoring in the face of chair/director transitions.

Following generous feedback and suggestion², we offer our suggestions in two parts: (a) General Considerations and (b) Template and Timeline for Mentoring Tenure-Track Faculty.

¹ *Why was this document created by this particular group of faculty?* Belinda, Eric, and Rachel were all members of the Working Group on Faculty Mentoring (2017-19); Belinda is the current chair of the Council of Mentors (2023-2024 and 2024-2025); Dharni is the Associate Dean for Faculty Development and Inclusion (2020-2025); and Rachel was the former Associate Dean in this position (2016-20) and former chair of the Council of Mentors (2022-2023).

² **Acknowledgements:** Our sincere gratitude to Katie Byrnes, Dallas Dennery, Michele LaVigne, Suzanne Lovett, and Jen Scanlon for important and wise feedback that greatly strengthened this document.

A. General Considerations

Guiding Principles: Faculty mentoring provides support across a spectrum of areas including teaching, scholarship, career advancement, student advising and mentoring, departmental citizenship and leadership, navigation of workplace dynamics, and challenges specific to women, faculty of color, and other underrepresented faculty. (Adapted from the description of Council of Mentors in the Faculty Handbook and from the Working Group on Faculty Mentoring)

We have framed the suggestions below as considerations for mentors and/or topics for discussion at department/program meetings.

Assigning Primary Mentors: These suggestions should be contextualized based on department/program size and number of pre-tenure and visiting faculty. Because a chair/director may have difficulty handling all of a department/program's mentoring duties alone, some departments/programs assign other faculty members to mentor individual pre-tenure and visiting faculty (henceforth referred to as designated mentors*). In these departments/programs, mentoring is often shared by the chair/director and the designated mentor(s). In these situations, it would be helpful for the mentee to have clarity about whom they should approach with questions. *Please note: New faculty are encouraged to adopt the mentor-map model (Appendix 1) at new faculty orientation and tenure-track faculty workshops. This model emphasizes building a network of support rather than relying on a single guru-mentor.*

Setting up the Mentor-Mentee Relationship: It is useful for chairs/directors or designated mentors to:

- Give new faculty an overview of how their department/program approaches mentoring.
- Reference the mentor-map approach (Appendix 1) that is offered in orientation/workshops and discuss how department colleagues, chair/director, and designated mentor(s) fit within the network.
- Provide an overview of the timeline the new faculty might expect in terms of check-ins and how they could find support between the planned meetings if they have questions.
- Remind and empower faculty to take initiative to ask for feedback from *other* mentors and sponsors as this is the central idea behind the mentor map approach. Note examples when possible, such as seeking feedback on a manuscript/book proposal/grant application or timelines/plans for research trajectory.
- Following the first workshop for tenure-track faculty, offer to go over mentor map with new faculty and offer suggestions for adding people to the map on different topics.

Set the tone for mentoring conversations by practicing active listening: In your mentoring conversations, try to set the tone by noting that you are there to listen to the mentee rather than to prescribe their behavior. It may be helpful to pitch some of your conversation as brainstorming and, when appropriate, note that the suggestions you provide are simply suggestions and not expectations. Exceptions are, of course, college criteria around reappointment, tenure, and promotion review as outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

- **Active Listening:** Create a space where the faculty member feels heard. Please try to wait before problem-solving and allow/guide them to arrive at solutions on their own when possible.
- **Allow topics of discussion to emerge.** With thoughtful questions and active listening, the conversation is likely to open up and topics of concern to your mentee will emerge.

Special considerations in the first semester: Depending on their discipline and graduate program, some faculty may arrive at Bowdoin with little or no prior experience in designing and teaching courses. Even faculty with prior experience will often find adapting to their new life at Bowdoin, and especially the rigors of teaching at Bowdoin, challenging. Hence, many new faculty will spend at least their first semester at Bowdoin focused primarily on teaching. In these cases, it is important to allay the anxieties that arise when new faculty realize that teaching new courses (and learning a new institution) takes much more time than they anticipated and that they are finding it difficult to make progress on their planned scholarly or artistic work. Try to reassure them that this is not unusual and that it is normal for there to be an adjustment period.

Class observations: It can be hard for faculty to know how well their teaching is going and what good teaching looks like at Bowdoin. Class visits can be a great way to gain context. Some mentees may be forthcoming and will ask you to observe their class and provide feedback. Others may not know that this is a resource they can utilize or may simply be nervous about the process. It might be appropriate to allow faculty to experiment and come into their own in their first semester. In the second semester or following semesters, when appropriate, suggest reciprocal observations as a resource. For observations from faculty outside the discipline, Katie Byrnes (Director of Baldwin Center for Learning and Teaching) can set up a teaching triangle and guide faculty through a careful framework for observations. For observations within the discipline, you can invite your mentee to observe your or other faculty members' classes, and you may suggest that your mentee consider inviting a colleague to observe their class if they wish. Again, please make this offer in a manner that allows your mentee to decide what is best for them.

Department/Program Meetings and Procedures: Thinking through, framing, contextualizing, and discussing expectations with respect to department/program service, searches, procedures, email etiquette and response timelines can bring clarity to all faculty. Clarifying the role of academic department coordinators at the first meeting of the year can be especially helpful for new faculty.

Building Community: Consider inviting a new faculty member to accompany you to the convocation reception, first faculty meeting and reception, and/or the first faculty seminar of the year and introducing them to other faculty as appropriate. Faculty have shared that this can help allay anxiety around making connections at a new institution.

Jointly Appointed Faculty: On May 16, 2024, the Office of the Dean for Academic Affairs shared with the faculty the memo "Pathways to support jointly-appointed faculty." This memo is attached below (Appendix 2), with aspects relevant to mentoring highlighted in yellow.

Visiting Faculty: Please know that there are several avenues of support for visiting faculty (see below). To complement these resources, it would be helpful if a department/program mentor checks in with new visiting faculty a couple of times in their first semester (perhaps in weeks 2 or 3 of their first semester and after fall break), and at least once a semester in the 2nd semester and beyond. Suggested topics for meetings in the first semester may include how things work in your department/program (emphasizing what new members need to know), addressing concerns as they launch their courses, and how to solicit mid-semester feedback from students. Please know that visiting faculty often reach out to pre-tenure faculty for support; in these cases, please make the labor of the pre-tenure faculty mentors visible. For example, when appropriate, as you are apportioning department/program service, you may consider assigning a post-reappointment pre-tenure faculty as a mentor to a visiting faculty member (this makes this service visible to all members of the department/program).

When you connect/check-in with visiting faculty, please draw their attention to the support available outside the department/program:

- **Guidance on Jobs Searches and Applications:**

- The Associate Dean for Faculty Development and Inclusion conducts a series of workshops on “On the Job Market,” with three sessions spread throughout the academic year and focused on the application, the interview, and negotiations, respectively. If a visiting faculty member is unable to attend these workshops, they can access these resources and workshop materials on Canvas (Org: Resources for Faculty and Instructors/For Visiting Faculty) and reach out to the Associate Dean for a one-on-one consultation.
- The Council of Mentors and the Associate Dean for Faculty Development and Inclusion are available to read and provide feedback on job applications.

- **General Support**

- Every year, the Council of Mentors reaches out to all new faculty to invite them for opt-in one-on-one conversations, with extra outreach to visiting faculty mid-semester.
- The Associate Dean for Faculty Development and Inclusion plays a non-evaluative role (i.e., not involved in decisions of extension of contracts) and is available as a confidential resource when available.
- For pedagogy related matters, Katie Byrnes and other members of the Baldwin Center are available for support.

If there is an upcoming search in your department and if a visiting faculty member might be an applicant, please follow the guidelines from the Faculty Recruitment Procedures" and pose any questions to the associate dean for faculty recruitment and pre-major advising.

Lecturer-Track Faculty: The template below follows the timeline for tenure-track faculty. The timeline and institutional expectations for lecturer-track faculty review are distinct, but the expectations related to teaching and pedagogy are similar. We have not included lecturer-track faculty in this document because the review timelines and Faculty Handbook language are currently under revision and will be brought to the faculty floor later this year. We will add a section relevant to lecturer-track faculty to this document when the revisions have been approved by the faculty.

B. Template for Mentoring Tenure-Track Faculty with Timelines

Below we provide suggestions on times and topics for mentor-mentee check-ins and conversations. We have tried to align our suggestions with the flow of the academic year and the new faculty member's learning curve with respect to institutional expectations. We have also included suggestions on who to do the outreach in parentheses, i.e., chair/director or designated mentor (we recognize that in some departments the designated mentor is the chair). Please note the suggestions below are distinct from the formal elements of faculty mentoring and evaluations as outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

Suggestions for handling chair transitions in the middle of this timeline: If the chair is the primary mentor, the incoming chair might join a mentor-mentee meeting ahead of time to share their approach to mentoring and acknowledge their commitment to the department mentoring plan to provide continuous support. This may also be the moment to check in with the mentee on what worked well for them in terms of mentoring structure in previous years and ask about their preferred frequency of meetings.

The 1st Year Fall Semester template (below) is the most intensive in terms of meeting time. For subsequent years, we recommend one check-in per semester. We recognize that some departments/programs already offer routine chair/mentor meetings (sometimes biweekly) and have existing mentoring rubrics. Again, what follows are suggestions for consideration, and each department/program may adjust the template based on what best serves you and your faculty.

- 1st Year: Fall Semester
- 1st Year: Spring Semester
- 2nd Year
- 3rd Year
- 4th Year: Typically sabbatical leave year
- Post-sabbatical, Year 1
- Post-sabbatical, Year 2 or 3
- Tenure Review Year

1st Year: Fall Semester

Note: The Associate Dean for Faculty Development and Inclusion conducts a [series of three workshops for 1st year tenure-track faculty](#) to support new faculty as they create a career development plan; the 2nd workshop (typically held in November) focuses on institutional expectations for tenure.

Late August Prior to the Start of the Semester (*chair/director): Check-in by email

Topics: heads up about convocation, invitation to the first faculty meeting noting that new faculty will be introduced. You may also consider asking if they would like to test out their syllabi with you.

September 1st week (*designated mentor): Check in, problem-solving, and looking ahead (priorities: immediate course/student-related issues)

Areas to explore during an in-person meeting: add/drop, enrollment, classroom dynamics, students. If there is a search that is beginning in your department/program, set the frame and context and clarify expectations for search participation specifically and department service expectations in general.

Please give the faculty member a heads up about scheduling for the Spring semester and provide guidance on submitting a new course proposal if required. *Note: Martina Duncan (Registrar) and the Associate Dean for Curriculum lead a workshop on “Course Proposals” during new faculty orientation.*

Late September (*chair, both chair and director if jointly-appointed): Listening and heads up

General questions to explore: How are things going with respect to classes, campus life, community, settling in? What's going well? What seems challenging? *Please ask explicitly about challenges with respect to facilities, pedagogy, and anything else.* (We hear that new faculty are hesitant to share challenges with tenured colleagues and that an invitation to share the challenges allows us to understand what is not going well and provide support.)

Heads up: Talk about Spring courses and departmental procedure for curriculum decisions and selection of teaching time blocks.

Questions that might arise: Resources for attending conferences, extended add/drop, students changing to Credit/D/F, expectations for department/program service, honors/independent study students, honors readers.

Other avenues to explore: Remind them of the resources for conference travel, noting that it is not an expectation for new faculty to attend conferences in their first year. Other sources of information: The Digest, Teaching Times, Inclusion Times, Faculty_All emails.

October Post-Fall Break (*designated mentor): Listening and heads up

Consider the following check-in/opening questions: Ask about assignments and assessments (an exam/paper/project that students turned in): How did it go? What was grading like? How is the dynamic in class? What's going well? What's challenging?

Consider asking about mid-semester feedback: Enquire if they might consider mid-course feedback from students and if they need examples. If they are considering mid-semester feedback, note that it would be important to share the collated feedback with the class to help students understand what they are not changing (where they are staying the course) and their reasons for this, and what they are modifying as a result of feedback. *Please feel free to emphasize that the faculty member knows what's best in their classroom and do not have to feel obliged to respond to student feedback not aligned with the course learning outcomes and their own pedagogical philosophy.*

Remind the faculty member that the Baldwin Center and the Associate Dean for Faculty Development and Inclusion are additional resources.

Mid-November after the 2nd workshop for 1st year Tenure Track Faculty (*designated mentor): Gentle check-in on scholarship/artistic work

As noted in the general suggestions document, faculty designing and teaching their own courses for the first time are often anxious that they have not progressed on scholarship to the extent they expected. We suggest that mentors make a gentle entry into the topic of scholarship and allow for a careful tone that signals care and support while allaying anxieties.

Mentor Map: 1st year faculty have been introduced to the mentor-map and discussed it in their first workshop (typically end of September). You might consider working with the map together focusing on aspects relevant to scholarly and artistic work, emphasizing that it is a living document that will continue to change, and that the objective is not to completely fill it out (ever!) but to use it as a tool to discuss and identify resources needed for career-long success.

Planned Trajectory of Scholarly/Artistic Work: You might open the conversation with questions such as: How are you thinking about the trajectory of your scholarly work? How can we support you in this trajectory, your ideas, your goals? Any questions the 2nd workshop for 1st year faculty triggered? *Again, we invite you to listen and answer questions as they arise.*

Questions to be prepared for in case they arise: How to balance scholarship and teaching, who is the professional guild, how do you begin to establish yourself in your professional guild, what do you think about conference X or journal Y or press Z, departmental tenure expectations.

December, last week of the semester (*designated mentor): Pop by their office

You might pop by and consider sharing something like “Good luck as you wrap up the semester, please know I am available if you need any assistance or have any questions.”

1st Year: Spring Semester

January, early in the semester (*designated mentor and chair coordinate with respect to BCQ discussions): General check-in, BCQ processing, Spring semester syllabi and semester goals

Winter in Maine: Many of us have been here a while or are accustomed to winters. For many new faculty, experiencing their first winter in Maine is difficult, not what they expected, alongside struggles of creating community in a new place. Checking in on how the winter in Maine feels (expectations/challenges), listening to their response, and acknowledging the challenges will be reassuring to faculty unaccustomed to winters here.

BCQs check-in and processing: Chairs/directors have access to departmental/program faculty BCQs, but the designated mentor will only get access if a faculty member shares BCQs with them. It is likely that the faculty member has already identified patterns of success and challenges in the classroom; they are also likely to fixate on outlier feedback. Support them in identifying patterns in the feedback, and brainstorm ideas for changes as appropriate. Share department specific patterns you are aware of with them. Remind them that Katie Byrnes and the Associate Dean for Faculty Development and Inclusion can also support processing as needed.

Syllabi: Check in and ask if they might want to go over their syllabi with you.

Goals: Ask about their goals for the semester and offer support.

Early March (*designated mentor): Listening and check-in

Everyone is at an energy low point at this time of the year. You might open with very general check-in questions (teaching/pedagogy, community, scholarship) and listen to topics that arise regarding success and challenges. Follow up on ongoing topics from the fall. Provide a heads-up on what Bowdoin is like post-spring break!

Late May/Early June, post-BCQ release (*chair and another faculty member, both chair and director if jointly-appointed): First-year conversation (required, see Faculty Handbook)

1st year tenure-track faculty will have completed three workshops and arrived at a career development plan, along with some talking points for their first-year conversations. Please follow guidelines from the Dean for Academic Affairs as you have these conversations. A letter summarizing this conversation is submitted to the Dean for Academic Affairs (see Faculty Handbook, 2024-25, Section IV:c.1. p.21).

Please give faculty a heads up that they will have a mandatory pre-major advisor training, typically in late August before the start of classes. They will be assigned pre-major advisees and can also begin advising majors and minors in the Fall. In case your department reassigns advisees over the summer, please explain how major and minor advisees are assigned in your department and the department's expectations for mentoring majors and minors, while acknowledging that they only need to begin advising after they have completed their training.

2nd Year

Note: 2nd year tenure-track faculty will have completed their pre-major advisor training before classes start. In lieu of college service, 2nd year faculty participate in a faculty development program led by the Dean for Academic Affairs and the Associate Dean for Faculty Development and Inclusion. At the end of their second year, they are invited to a workshop on "Effective Reappointment Dossiers" led by a recent CAPT member and the Associate Dean for Faculty Development and Inclusion.

Fall Check-in, before Spring Advising begins (*designated mentor): Check-in, major advising, scholarship

Check in on the faculty member's career development plan (scholarship and teaching). Inquire specifically about scholarly/artistic trajectory and where they might need support; listen and answer questions as these arise. Anticipate questions about start-up and follow-up questions after the first-year conversation. In case conversation about beginning pre-major and major advising did not take place at the end of their first year, explain how major and minor advisees are assigned in your department/program and the department/program's expectations for mentoring majors and minors.

Spring Check-in (*designated mentor and chair, both chair and director if jointly-appointed): Check-in and looking ahead to reappointment and proposal for sabbatical

Check in on teaching and scholarly trajectory, what's going well, what's challenging. Provide a heads-up about reappointment in the third year and note the fully paid leave in the 4th year. If the faculty member is considering going away for sabbatical or seeking residencies, applications may be due as early as the summer or the Fall of the 3rd year. *You may register this as your yearly conversation required for all pre-tenure faculty, as noted in the Faculty Handbook.*

3rd Year: the year of the reappointment process

Note: In the Spring, post-reappointment, the Associate Dean for Faculty Development and Inclusion offers a workshop on "Visioning and planning your pre-tenure sabbatical leave" and the librarians offer a workshop on "Managing and Promoting your Intellectual Property."

Fall Check-in (*chair, both chair and director if jointly appointed): Check-in and the Reappointment Process

Check in on teaching and scholarly trajectory, frame and provide context to the reappointment process, answer questions that arise (See Faculty Handbook, 2024-25, Section IV.C.2, pp. 21-24). Note that you can discuss broadly the expectations for the self-evaluative statement and the dossier. Note that the Council of Mentors and faculty from adjacent departments can provide feedback on self-evaluative statements and dossiers.

Spring Check-in (*chair, both chairs if jointly-appointed): Sabbatical plans and expectations during sabbatical

Following a general check-in and celebrating the reappointment, open a conversation about sabbatical vision and plans. Encourage faculty to focus entirely on their research and resist the temptation to prepare or redesign their courses during the sabbatical.

When assistant professors and recent associate professors are given an option to participate in department/program service activities while on sabbatical (i.e., writing an external review self-study and/or the response, participating in reviews for reappointment

or tenure, etc.), they often agree to everything as they are not sure how to weigh these choices as good departmental/program citizens while protecting time for scholarly/artistic work. To address this proactively, meet with the faculty member and come to a shared understanding of an appropriate overall level of participation, noting clearly that no participation is often the best option. *You may register this as your yearly conversation required for all pre-tenure faculty, as noted in the Faculty Handbook.*

4th Year: Typically, the sabbatical leave year (some exceptions if faculty postpone)

No meetings. Signal you are available if questions arise and are happy to meet in person or online.

Note: The Council of Mentors usually reaches out to check in and offer opt-in support for tenure-track faculty on junior leave.

Post-sabbatical, Year 1

Note: Faculty who chose to not extend their tenure clock (based on sabbatical leave) are eligible to initiate their tenure review in the spring of their 1st year post-sabbatical. They will be notified of their eligibility early in the spring semester; should they decide to go through tenure review the next year, the process of submitting their list of external reviewers will be in April (see Faculty Handbook for exact dates). We also hear that mentoring often drops off post-sabbatical even as the post-sabbatical and pre-tenure review years are the most anxiety-provoking. Also, every December, a recent member of CAPT and the Associate Dean for Faculty Development and Inclusion offer an “Effective Tenure Dossier” workshop; invitations go out to all faculty post-reappointment and pre-tenure.

Fall Check-in (*chairs, both chair and director if jointly-appointed): Sabbatical re-entry, what changed in the department/college, post-sabbatical plans and trajectory

As we all know, re-entry from sabbatical can be difficult and there are often anxieties about reentering the classroom. Some may feel like they fell short of the expectations of what they wanted to accomplish during sabbatical, and the timeline to tenure feels close. Please be cognizant of these feelings as you enter this conversation.

Reentry from sabbatical and changes: Acknowledge that re-entry from sabbatical can pose challenges. If the department/program changed any procedures and practices, please share with the faculty member. If there were changes at the college level, please share and make space for processing.

Check-in on scholarly trajectory: How was sabbatical? What are the goals post-sabbatical? What are you considering as your timing to tenure review? Revisit career development plan and the mentor map if that would be useful. Discuss the teaching trajectory, courses they plan to repeat, having a workable teaching schedule that balances new preps, curriculum requirements, and the opportunity to repeat courses prior to tenure review.

Spring Check in (*chair, both chair and director if jointly-appointed): Check-in and tenure timeline

Open the conversation for general check-in on teaching and scholarship. They will likely get an email noting the eligibility for tenure in early in the Spring semester, and if they are considering going up for tenure, clarify questions they might have about external reviewers and discipline specific dossier questions. *You may register this as your yearly conversation required for all pre-tenure faculty, as noted in the Faculty Handbook.*

Post-sabbatical, Year 2 or 3

Note: Every December, a recent member of CAPT and the Associate Dean for Faculty Development and Inclusion offer an “Effective Tenure Dossier” workshop; invitations go out to all post-reappointment pre-tenure faculty.

Fall Meeting (*chair, both chair and director if jointly-appointed): General check-in, review CV and discuss publication plans

There is often a high level of anxiety around the timing of publications. You can use their publication profile (contracts, manuscripts) in the CV to anchor the conversation. Please approach this discussion acknowledging the anxiety, expressing support, and being clear about the expectations consistent with those outlined in the third-year review. Continue to check in on the teaching trajectory.

Spring Meeting (*chair, both chair and director if jointly-appointed): Follow up on Fall conversation

Follow up the Fall conversation and continue the themes discussed. Point to the Council of Mentors as another possible resource. *You may register this as your yearly conversation required for all pre-tenure faculty, as noted in the Faculty Handbook.*

Tenure Review Year

Fall Check-in (*chair).

The dynamic will likely be a bit awkward as they undergo review. Check in on their well-being.

Spring Check-in.

Celebrate (fingers crossed!!)

Note: The Dean for Academic Affairs and the Associate Dean for Faculty Development and Inclusion offer a “Post-tenure Visioning” workshop in late May.

Appendix 1: Mentor Map

Department Colleagues 1. <input type="text"/> 2. <input type="text"/> 3. <input type="text"/>	Professional Editor 1. <input type="text"/> 2. <input type="text"/>		On Campus 1. <input type="text"/> 2. <input type="text"/> 3. <input type="text"/> 4. <input type="text"/>	Off Campus 1. <input type="text"/> 2. <input type="text"/> 3. <input type="text"/> 4. <input type="text"/>		
Readers (see Intellectual Community)			Friends 1. <input type="text"/> 2. <input type="text"/> 3. <input type="text"/>	Family 1. <input type="text"/> 2. <input type="text"/> 3. <input type="text"/>		
Senior Faculty in Your Department 1. <input type="text"/> 2. <input type="text"/> 3. <input type="text"/> 4. <input type="text"/>	On Campus Mentors 1. <input type="text"/> 2. <input type="text"/> 3. <input type="text"/> 4. <input type="text"/>		Off Campus Mentors 1. <input type="text"/> 2. <input type="text"/> 3. <input type="text"/> 4. <input type="text"/>	Other 1. <input type="text"/> 2. <input type="text"/> 3. <input type="text"/>	1. <input type="text"/> 2. <input type="text"/> 3. <input type="text"/> 4. <input type="text"/>	5. <input type="text"/> 6. <input type="text"/> 7. <input type="text"/> 8. <input type="text"/>
Peer Mentors 1. <input type="text"/> 2. <input type="text"/>	1. <input type="text"/> 2. <input type="text"/> 3. <input type="text"/>		Readers 0-25% 1. <input type="text"/> 2. <input type="text"/> 3. <input type="text"/>	25-50% 1. <input type="text"/> 2. <input type="text"/> 3. <input type="text"/>	50-75% 1. <input type="text"/> 2. <input type="text"/> 3. <input type="text"/>	75-100% 1. <input type="text"/> 2. <input type="text"/> 3. <input type="text"/>
Access to Opportunities 1. <input type="text"/> 2. <input type="text"/> 3. <input type="text"/> 4. <input type="text"/>	Accountability for what REALLY matters 1. <input type="text"/> 2. <input type="text"/> 3. <input type="text"/>	Safe Space 1. <input type="text"/> 2. <input type="text"/> 3. <input type="text"/> 4. <input type="text"/>	1. <input type="text"/> 2. <input type="text"/> 3. <input type="text"/>	1. <input type="text"/> 2. <input type="text"/> 3. <input type="text"/>	1. <input type="text"/> 2. <input type="text"/> 3. <input type="text"/>	

Appendix 2. Pathways to support JAF Memo with highlights.

Bowdoin College

Senior Vice President and Dean for Academic Affairs

To: The Faculty
From: Office of the Dean for Academic Affairs
Date: May 16, 2024
Subject: Pathways to support jointly-appointed faculty

Background

How do joint appointments enhance the academic experience at Bowdoin? Most Bowdoin faculty are appointed to one department or program; however, we currently have roughly thirty-five faculty at the College who are jointly-appointed to a department *and* a program or to *two* departments or *two* programs. Joint appointments allow us to expand our curricular offerings, provide curricular stability to academic programs, and recognize the inter- or multi-disciplinary nature of faculty members' professional guilds and their own expertise. Courses taught by jointly-appointed faculty or offered by interdisciplinary programs also allow our students to discover new areas of interest and illuminate intersections and overlaps between them.

What is the purpose of this document? All faculty contribute to curricula, pedagogy, advising, mentoring and department/program stewardship, but they may approach or experience this work differently depending on whether they are singly or jointly-appointed. Although we cannot achieve full equivalency in workload, the goal of this document is to make faculty roles and expectations more transparent and to develop practices that foster greater equity. *We appreciate and acknowledge the work departments and programs already do to account for and accommodate differences in faculty workload and have incorporated our learning from their practices into this document.*

What is the structure of joint appointments? The faculty handbook does not offer clear guidelines for the workload of jointly-appointed faculty, noting only the following, in part, regarding tenure and promotion: "Faculty members hold appointments either singly in a department or program or jointly in two. When joint, one department/program will be identified as primary. . . ." The faculty handbook goes on to note "standard compositions" of review committees of jointly-appointed faculty as "all tenured members" of the primary department or program and "two tenured members" of the secondary department or program. However, some jointly-appointed faculty were hired prior to this designation in the faculty handbook and, as such, are not aware of their primary designation.

As we developed this document, with input from six faculty members (see acknowledgments), it became clear that without an adequate definition of or guidance for what it means to be jointly-

appointed at Bowdoin, jointly-appointed faculty may assume and/or experience their roles and expectations differently. For example:

- a. Even though most jointly-appointed faculty have a primary and secondary designation, many experience the designation in two units as fairly equivalent, particularly with respect to service and stewardship (e.g., search committees, review committees, and decennial reviews). Notably, the equivalent service they provide is in tension with the primary and secondary designation and differential representation of colleagues on reappointment, tenure, and promotion review committees.
- b. Others experience the primacy of one appointment even where service and stewardship are concerned. As such, one department/program truly serves as the faculty members' primary department; curricular and administrative work and service take precedence in this department/program over contributions to the secondary department/program.

How may the workload of jointly-appointed faculty who experience their appointments as fairly equivalent differ from that of singly-appointed faculty? Faculty who experience equivalent joint appointments ("a ", above) may perform additional labor compared to singly-appointed faculty. They may be part of two sets of department meetings, events (e.g., welcome to the major events, research information sessions, social events), faculty searches, chair rotations, decennial reviews, and reappointment, tenure, and promotion reviews; they also likely have obligations to two sets of students for independent studies and honors projects as well as advising and summer research.

Given the reasonable confusion around joint appointments, it is important that we align our practice and the faculty handbook with our values and expectations. As such, we hope to soon initiate conversations with chairs, directors, and jointly-appointed faculty to bring clarity to roles and expectations of jointly-appointed faculty generally, and primary and secondary designations in particular. Then we will work with GFA and the faculty at large to make necessary changes to the faculty handbook. This will take time.

In the meantime, to acknowledge and address faculty labor, facilitate transparency, recognize effort, and work toward equity, we offer the following guidance for departments and programs with jointly-appointed faculty. As noted earlier, we draw on work that departments and programs already do in offering these suggestions.

Current Guidance for Supporting Jointly-Appointed Faculty

(pending development of policy changes and faculty handbook revisions noted above)

I. Share expectations across departments and programs

It is helpful for chairs and directors of each jointly-appointed faculty to discuss with one another the expectations of their respective departments and programs, focusing specifically on the topics noted below. While these topics are organized by semester, chairs and directors are invited to schedule the conversations in ways that are most useful to them.

Fall Semester

- *Discuss mentorship of jointly-appointed pre-tenure faculty:* decide how you will check in on consistent messaging, share mentoring without overwhelming the jointly-appointed faculty member, and ensure that expectations from the two departments/programs do not contradict each other, especially around reappointment and tenure reviews.
- *Make explicit the priorities of both departments and programs:* check in to understand curricular and service needs of both departments/programs and how to support faculty in navigating these demands. For example, if a faculty member is appointed to multiple searches as well as review committees across two units within a given semester, how might the department and program alleviate this faculty member's service load?
- *Determine the need for leave replacements for jointly-appointed faculty:* discuss how the faculty member's courses will be covered in both departments/programs when they are on leave – will one visiting professor/instructor search cover both curricular areas, will this leave gaps?

Spring Semester:

- *Determine sabbatical obligations of jointly-appointed faculty:* When assistant professors and recent associate professors are given an option to participate in department/program service activities while on sabbatical (e.g., writing an external review self-study and/or the response, or participating in reviews for reappointment, tenure and promotion), they often agree to everything as they are not sure how to weigh these choices as good departmental/program citizens while protecting time for scholarly and artistic work. To address this proactively, hold a meeting with the jointly-appointed faculty member and both chairs/directors prior to a sabbatical to brainstorm together and come to a shared understanding of an appropriate overall level of participation, noting clearly that no participation is often the best option.

II. Make workload visible and account for faculty obligations

The following are ways to bring transparency to curricular and service obligations and workload of all faculty.

1. *Use a centralized tool to facilitate transparency and recognition in an efficient manner.* The Bowdoin Faculty Workload Equity Dashboard Pilot³ (dash), available on Canvas, was created for departments/programs to use and modify. Engaging with the dash recognizes the work of singly-appointed faculty and helps make visible the labor of jointly-appointed faculty to all members of the department/program. When a jointly-appointed faculty is chair, it may be awkward to advocate for reducing their own workloads, either with the department/program they chair/direct or with the chair/director of the jointly-appointed unit. The dash can help. If your department/program uses the dash, information relevant to curricular (e.g., teaching of introductory or core classes, or a specific elective and timing of offerings) and stewardship (e.g., searches, reviews, chair/director

³ This pilot dashboard was inspired and informed by the FOC_IF Working Group report recommendation (Section B.2) and subsequent requests to expand the recognition, rewarding, and redistribution of invisible labor and other workload inequities; the publication *Equity-Minded Faculty Workloads: What We Can and Should Do Now*, authored by Kerryann O'Meara, Dawn Culpepper, Joy Misra and Audrey Jaeger, and published by the American Council on Education; and feedback from chairs and directors on an initial draft of the dashboard and accompanying material. Importantly, the dashboard is intended to be modified and used at the departmental/program level and is not designed to be shared with the Dean's office.

roles) obligations in both units can be listed in the audit of faculty “Interests and Obligations” tab. Please note that a dash can help departments/programs:

- *Understand and acknowledge the advising, independent study (IS)/honors workload of jointly-appointed faculty.* The work of advising majors (and if applicable, minors) in two different departments and/or programs may involve advising more students as well as learning two different sets of requirements for those majors, grant/fellowship/graduate school opportunities, study abroad programs, and more. Jointly-appointed faculty may have to double their knowledge base in this regard, even if they have the same number (or even fewer) advisees as that of a colleague who is singly-appointed. Whether you are using the dash or not, please consider arriving at a policy within your department or program that takes into consideration the advising effort and the total number of major/minor advisees and IS/honors students in both units. Out of respect for all faculty, singly- and jointly-appointed, please avoid using student requests as the primary guide for advisee and IS/honors allocations.
- *Account for history of service as chair/director in both departments or programs in your deliberations on the next chair/director.* Most departments have a “queue” of tenured faculty in consideration for chair/director. Again, whether you are using the dash or not, we urge departments/programs to move faculty who have served as chair/director in their jointly-appointed department or program behind those at their rank who have not served as chair/director. Consider the following examples as you develop your own practices:
 - *Faculty who have not previously served as chair/director in your department or program:* Three faculty, A, B, and C, have never served as chair, and based on years of service at the college the queue is A, B and C. However, A has served as a program director in their jointly-appointed program. In this case, the queue may change to B, C, A.
 - *Faculty have previously served as chair/director in your department or program:* Three faculty, X, Y, and Z, have previously served as chair and based on time of service the queue is X, Y, and Z. If X has in the interim served as chair/director of another unit, after also considering years of service, X may be moved to a lower position in the queue.

If your department/program is not using the equity dash, chairs and directors can create opportunities for quick check-ins with jointly-appointed faculty (perhaps, at the end of each semester/academic year) to learn about their upcoming work in both units (searches, external review, dossier reviews, etc.). Please prioritize pre-tenure faculty in this outreach. This gesture will validate and make visible faculty labor and help chairs/directors (and departments/programs) calibrate expectations each semester.

III. Alleviate Service Loads for Jointly-Appointed Faculty

Faculty searches, reappointment, tenure and promotion review committees, and decennial reviews often require participation of all faculty, singly- and jointly-appointed. There may be semesters/academic years in which jointly-appointed faculty are serving on multiple searches and review committees; in these cases, please consider the following options for alleviating service loads:

- Collaborate with the Office of the Dean for Academic Affairs to find out whether your jointly-appointed faculty are involved in another decennial review the same year or in adjacent years. If there is some flexibility with the timing of reviews, please incorporate these considerations or provide other modifications to ease their workload.
- If your jointly-appointed faculty are involved in another faculty search the same year and there is some flexibility with the timing of the search, please incorporate these considerations or provide other modifications to ease their workload.
- *Eliminate a category of departmental/program service for jointly-appointed faculty, including those currently serving as chair.* Examples of approaches used by some departments⁴.
 - Faculty jointly appointed in a program are not expected to advise majors in the department.
 - Try to make sure jointly-appointed faculty understand that they do not need to attend all department student events.
 - Emphasize that if jointly-appointed faculty will be chair of their program, they would not be chair of the department within X years of each other.
 - In deciding honors theses supervision and readers and in assigning major advisees, account for load they carry in the program (or secondary appointment) to ensure that the overall load for all members of the department is equivalent (i.e., they carry a reduced load in the department).
 - Use the equity dashboard (or equivalent) as a guide to consider the overall service load of all members, including jointly-appointed faculty, before delegating tasks on *special projects* (e.g., nature of their role in formulating/writing external review self-study or response, reappointment/tenure/promotion reviews, allocations of faculty positions, and others)
 - Exempt jointly-appointed faculty from responsibilities for working with students on study away *transfer credit approval*.

The redistribution of faculty work, where appropriate, will allow all members of the department/program to secure critical time for scholarship and artistic work.

IV. Share the onboarding of new jointly-appointed colleagues

At the time of appointment and during onboarding we strongly encourage chairs and directors to collaborate on such plans as the office location of a new jointly-appointed colleague, mentoring and retention plans, service workloads, and expectations arising from department/program cultures. Please keep in mind that campus location of a new colleague's office influences the visibility of the faculty member in one department or another (both to colleagues and to students), the kind and amount of mentoring that takes place, and ultimately the ability of that faculty member to participate in departmental culture and informal decision-making.

Sincere Gratitude: Barry Logan, Belinda Kong, Brian Purnell, Danielle Dube, Erika Nyhus, and Sakura Christmas provided important, thoughtful, and wise input and feedback. In addition, six

⁴ Examples were included at the suggestion of chairs/directors. We acknowledge that the first three suggestions were provided by a chair of a department with jointly-appointed faculty (via an anonymous form).

chairs reviewed the close-to-final draft and provided important additional feedback. The collective input of these colleagues significantly improved and strengthened this document and will inform future conversations with all our jointly appointed colleagues and GFA, as well as faculty handbook revisions.

If you have questions, concerns or could use support with the equity dashboard, please contact Dharni Vasudevan, dvasudev@bowdoin.edu.