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Mentoring as Inclusion Strategy for Racialized Faculty

In November 2009 the Human Rights and Equity Office (HREO) at the University of Guelph initiated a collaborative research project with the Institute for Community Engaged Scholarship / The Research Shop to examine the value of mentoring as a strategy for inclusion for racialized faculty members at Canadian universities. As a descriptor, “racialized” is considered to be an inclusive term that focuses on race as a social construct and better acknowledges the power relationships implicit in racism (Canadian Race Relations Federation, n.d.). Using the term racialized as opposed to visible minority challenges minority status and names marginalization and disadvantage as part of the social constructs of race, colour, and ethnicity. Despite this, the term is not yet widely used in the literature and, as the research conducted for this literature review was broad in terms of time (30 years) and location (Canada, United States, and international), other terminology was used to conduct the research including “visible minority”, “faculty of color”, “marginalized”, “non-dominant”, and “diverse” populations. In addition, mentoring research focuses on three primary domains: youth, student-faculty, and workplace (Allen & Eby, 2007). Faculty mentoring programs fall between two of the domains, student-faculty and workplace: student-faculty in terms of the academic context and workplace in terms of the career development and institutional impacts associated with mentoring processes and outcomes. Both domains were examined for the literature review along with the limited literature available exploring faculty mentoring.

The focus on racialized faculty was selected for this project based on evidence of under-representation especially at higher academic ranks, experiences of isolation and marginalization, experiences of lower levels of job satisfaction and higher levels of work-related stress compared to non-racialized faculty, and concerns with regards to recruitment and retention (Laden, 2009; Turner, González, & Wood, 2008). Recruitment and retention of racialized faculty are important issues for post-secondary institutions, colleges, and departments for reasons beyond equity practice. Racialized faculty make unique scholarly contributions (Turner et al., 2008), are found to be highly committed to the profession (Laden, 2009), and may help with regards to recruiting a more diverse student body (Hood & Boyce, 1997).

The literature review focuses on the mentoring literature in order to establish a definition of mentoring, the roles of those involved, and attributes of effective mentoring programs. Also
included is an examination of theoretical perspectives providing insight into how mentoring works and the outcomes of mentoring programs. Conducted with a specific focus on racialized faculty, the literature review did include research examining the intersectionality of areas such as gender, disability, and sexual orientation. For example, although gender would not be focused on in the absence of a racialized lens, research examining the intersection of race and gender was included. The literature review was conducted to guide the development of the research project and provide an overview of the current state of knowledge about mentoring programs with a specific focus on establishing considerations for mentoring with diversified populations. This research was conducted to determine the value of mentoring as a strategy for inclusion for racialized faculty members in order to provide information to guide program development at Canadian post-secondary institutions.

**Literature Review**

**Racialized Faculty in Canada**

Although there is some evidence of diversity in the Canadian Academy, it is difficult to determine whether equity exists with regards to race. Based on 2001 Census data, the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT, 2007) reported that 12.4% of university teachers self-identified as visible minorities\(^1\). This is reflective of the Canadian labour force composition where 12.7% of all workers identify as visible minorities. Despite this visible minority faculty reported earnings of 12% less than the overall average for university teachers in Canada, suggesting the possibility of a pay gap. Unfortunately, interpreting the Census data findings is limited in that university teacher designation does not account for the type of appointment or academic rank and it is possible that the distribution of visible minority faculty across ranks may differ. Although the University and College Academic Staff System (UCASS) does collect this information, its demographic data is limited to gender, age and citizenship, rendering the data inadequate for analyzing equity issues for visible minority faculty (CAUT, 2007).

**Mentoring in Academia**

In general, relatively few universities are found to have mentoring programs available to their professors (de Janasz & Sullivan, 2004). Academic institutions can gain competitive

---

\(^1\)“Visible minority” is the terminology currently used in the Canadian Census.
advantages by providing faculty mentoring programs, much the same as those for industry, such as reducing turnover and increasing organizational commitment and satisfaction (de Janasz & Sullivan, 2004). Faculty can also gain from participation in mentoring programs through higher levels of job satisfaction and work-family balance, lower levels of stress, and a greater likelihood of achieving tenure (de Janasz & Sullivan, 2004).

In a review of mentoring programs for racialized faculty, Laden (2009) concludes that effective programs can lead to successful academic outcomes, especially when mentoring relationships are characterized by mutual respect for cultural values, mentors who are dedicated and supportive, and both partners are willing to spend time engaged in collaborative undertakings. Additionally, networking is viewed as an important strategy for the promotion of academic success, in that mentors can provide their protégés with opportunities to establish networking relationships within their departments, colleges, institutions, and professions. Laden (2009) also refers to the relational aspect of mentoring relationships, concluding that participating in effective and meaningful mentoring programs helps to reduce feelings of isolation while providing guidance, friendship and opportunities for peer collaboration that lead to the creation of comfortable working environments.

**Defining Mentoring**

Mentoring is traditionally conceptualized as a relationship occurring between a more experienced mentor and a less experienced protégé for the purposes of supporting, developing and enhancing the protégé’s career (Kram, 1985; Mullen, 1994). Mentoring can occur on a formal or informal basis. Formal mentoring programs are endorsed by the organization/institution and involve a matching process conducted by a third party (often a member of the organization or program staff) whereas informal mentoring occurs spontaneously in naturally occurring relationships that form without outside assistance (Eby, Rhodes, & Allen, 2007). It is important to differentiate between formal and informal mentoring as research demonstrates differences between formal and informal programs related to the amount of mentoring provided and the impact of the relationship on protégé outcomes (Eby et al., 2007); this review is primarily focused on formal mentoring programs.

Mentoring is considered to be a developmental process, allowing protégés to participate in meaningful activities within a particular community (Bearman, Blake-Beard, Hunt, & Crosby, 2007) or profession. Although much research is devoted to protégé outcomes, conceptualizing
the relationship as unidirectional, the relationship is actually dyadic, a reciprocal relationship in which the mentor and the protégé each devote considerable amounts of time and energy with potential benefits and costs associated with each role (Ragins, 2007).

Effective mentoring focuses on the individual’s need to belong; this need is fulfilled through the formation and maintenance of interpersonal relationships with others that are positive (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Positive relationships are distinguished by two main features: 1) frequent interactions characterized by positive affect, and 2) a perception that there is ongoing affective concern within the relationship (Allen & Eby, 2007). When these two features are present in mentoring relationships, it is more likely that the relationship will be effective. Important defining relational aspects of successful mentoring relationships include respect, mutuality, authenticity, emotional closeness, trust, positive regard, and interpersonal comfort (Allen & Eby, 2007). Mentoring relationships are seen as a “powerful agent for individual growth and well-being” (Allen & Eby, 2007, p. 399) because of their ability to fulfill the need to belong, allowing individuals to affiliate and gain acceptance from others, first with the mentor and later the larger networks to which the protégés gain access through the mentoring relationship.

**Functions of Mentoring Programs**

Mentoring has been found to serve two primary functions, career and psychosocial (Kram, 1985). Mentoring serves career (instrumental) functions through the mentor providing sponsorship and coaching to their protégé in a particular profession along with exposure, visibility, and protection; psychosocial (emotional) functions are served through the mentor acting as a role model, counsellor, and friend to their protégé (Scandura & Pellegrini, 2007; Welch, 1997). Although not all mentoring relationships provide all of the various functions, Kram (1985) suggests that protégés will benefit more from the mentoring relationship when their mentor provides more of the functions.

Mentoring itself is a process of learning that evolves through a reciprocal, dynamic relationship that is unique to each mentoring dyad (Eby et al., 2007). Relationships can be effective or ineffective, short-lived or long-term, and almost always have learning-oriented (i.e., developmental) goals. Even though mentoring relationships are reciprocal, it is important to note that they are asymmetrical as the growth and development is the primary goal of the relationship, not that of the mentor, although this is also likely to occur (Eby et al., 2007).
Specific to mentoring in the academic environment, de Janasz & Sullivan (2004) suggest that taking a competency-based approach to the development of faculty in their academic careers is useful in that it focuses on the different forms of knowledge that are applied to shifting career opportunities in response to changes in personal, employment, and environmental variables. This speaks to the uniqueness of each mentoring relationship referred to by Eby et al. (2007); each relationship will be unique based on the needs of the specific mentoring dyad. In academe, career competencies are important because they are required in order to achieve tenure and promotion. Career competencies include three forms of knowing – knowing why, knowing how, and knowing whom – these are apparent in individual beliefs and values (why), knowledge and skills (how), and network or relationships (whom) (de Janasz & Sullivan, 2004). These areas are useful in determining potential areas for development that can be focused on in mentoring programs (see Table 1).
Table 1

*Academic career ranks and knowing competencies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career ranks</th>
<th>Knowing why</th>
<th>Knowing how</th>
<th>Knowing whom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral student</td>
<td>Is this what I want?</td>
<td>Need to amass technical skills (to do research)</td>
<td>Need to network with professional colleagues to obtain first job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Did I make the right choice?</td>
<td>Increase skills in non-research areas, such as teaching, service</td>
<td>Network with members of the organization to learn through whom decisions are made and how work gets assigned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>How can I balance my live and work after obtaining tenure?</td>
<td>Increase skills in administration and coaching others (e.g., junior faculty, doctoral students), increase skills in new technologies and pedagogies</td>
<td>Network with professional colleagues for collaboration and job change opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>What is my legacy?</td>
<td>Increase skills in development and community service</td>
<td>Network with junior colleagues to provide them mentoring and benefit from their newly developed skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**How Mentoring Works (Theoretical Perspectives & Models)**

A key component of success for students and faculty is engagement in the academic world. Tinto (1998) concludes that students who develop meaningful relationships with faculty and peers are more likely to persist in their studies than those with lower levels of engagement. Moreover, faculty engagement in the academic community is also important and related to persistence: “The consequence [of engaging in shared learning] for some faculty, as it is for students, is a revitalization, a rediscovery of the joy of engaging with others, faculty and student alike, in learning…They too gain from being shared, connected learners” (Tinto, 1998, p.175).

Expanding on the concept of engagement to consider mentoring for marginalized and diversified populations, it is also important to consider the ways in which mentoring can increase
opportunities for social inclusion. The concept of social exclusion suggests that when certain groups or individuals are prevented from gaining access to aspects of society that are required for social integration, their opportunities for development and optimization of potential are limited (Mitchell & Shillington, 2005). Opportunities for development and growth are important for racialized faculty to both their job satisfaction and academic opportunities and success. Opportunities may include connecting with and establishing professional networks, creating collaborative research partnerships and projects, and establishing personal connections with colleagues in the workplace. Racialized faculty may feel isolated and have more difficulty connecting to these opportunities and networks, underscoring the importance of mentoring programs for these individuals (Evans & Cokley, 2008; Hood & Boyce, 1997; Laden, 2009).

Allen & Eby (2007) define a comprehensive causal model of mentoring that takes into account the multiple contexts in which mentorship relationships occur. They describe two axes of mentoring relationships: 1) horizontal, referring to the developmental aspects of mentoring relationships, recognizing that mentoring occurs within and across various life stages; and 2) vertical, referring to the contexts in which the mentoring relationships are embedded.

Developmental aspects of the horizontal axis include two levels (Allen & Eby, 2007). The first is the individual level which relates to the developmental life stage of the individual (childhood, adolescence, early adulthood, middle adulthood, late adulthood). The second is the dyadic level which relates to the developmental stage of the mentoring relationship (from start to redefinition). Using development theories to understand the life stage aspect of mentoring can be useful because they are applicable to the mentors and their protégés, each facing developmental challenges and transitions throughout their life cycles. Effective mentoring relationships can facilitate successful negotiation and resolution of the challenges. Related to the discussion of academic rank and development of career competencies (Table 1), identification of the developmental needs of the individuals within the mentoring relationship can be useful in designing and delivering formal mentoring programs.

Contextual aspects of the vertical axis include four levels (Allen & Eby, 2007). The levels are individual, dyad, setting, and society, with each level is nested within the next. At the individual level, the focus is on the need to belong. Considered to be a fundamental human need, the need to belong drives emotional, cognitive, and behavioural responses including the need for social contact. Applied to mentoring, this suggests that mentoring relationships are important for
individuals lacking other forms of “satisfying interpersonal bonds” (Allen & Eby, 2007, p. 407).

At the dyad level, the focus is on the mentoring pair, the mentor and the protégé. Effective mentoring relationships form through a sense of connection to one another that can include feelings of interconnectedness, mutuality, shared goals, reciprocity, and a sense of obligation to one another. At the setting level, the focus is on the immediate contexts in which the mentoring relationship is embedded. Most organizational structures have multiple layers; in the academic community these settings can include specific research specialties, departments, colleges, and the institution. These organized social structures contribute to feelings of belongingness in that members feel that they are a part of a larger community contributing to feelings of fitting in and a sense of professional identity; this sense of belongingness can contribute to feelings of loyalty and psychological safety. In addition, these settings may contribute to mentoring relationships by both constraining and facilitating all aspects of the mentoring process including decisions to become a mentor, the formation of mentoring relationships, and the effectiveness of those relationships. For formal mentoring programs, the setting is critical in that influences relational dynamics through establishing a foundation for the program including the program’s philosophy and structure (Allen & Eby, 2007). At the society level, the focus is on the larger community where the mentoring programs reside, including government and culture. Society contributes to the fulfillment of the need to belong through a sense of shared belonging with social and/or cultural groups who share similar characteristics that are valued by an individual. When marginalized groups are cut off from this sense of place within society, their contributions to broader societal goals are minimized (Allen & Eby, 2007).

For racialized faculty, these broader contexts are important because feelings of isolation or a lack of belonging at the various levels (analogous to the concept of social exclusion presented earlier) within the university community can operate to minimize individual contributions and negatively impact departmental and institutional goals. It is not surprising then that mentoring initiatives often target marginalized populations in order to facilitate connections, a sense of belonging, and maximize potential for contributions to broader societal goals. These initiatives work to foster social justice within the marginalized populations (Allen & Eby, 2007).

Although traditional models of mentoring are useful to develop a broad understanding of how mentoring works, they are limited in that they tend to be hierarchical and paternalistic in nature (Chesney-Lind, Okamoto, & Irwin, 2006). The traditional model of the senior mentor and
the junior protégé as described by Kram (1985) has been widely adopted but may not provide an adequate foundation for mentoring programs with marginalized or diverse populations. Recent work moving the traditional models of mentoring forward to include feminist and multicultural considerations includes that of Benishek, Bieschke, Park, & Slattery (2004). Benishek et al.’s multicultural feminist model of mentoring emphasizes the relational aspects of mentoring, building mentoring relationships on open and honest communication and collaboration between mentors and protégés. Their model recognizes the hierarchical nature of the relationship including the power differential but avoids the hierarchies and works to empower the protégé. In addition, it recognizes the importance of the political aspect, suggesting that mentors work to challenge the status quo on behalf of their protégés. The political aspects of mentoring are noteworthy because it moves the focus on the sources of problems outward from the individual to broader systems of inequality (Chesney-Lind et al., 2006).

Outcomes of Effective Mentoring

Researchers have demonstrated many positive outcomes related to mentoring for protégés (Chao, 1997; Eby, Allen, Evans, Ng, & Dubois, 2008; Lankau & Scandura, 2002; Nielson, Carlson & Lankau, 2001), mentors (Eby, Durley, Evans, & Ragins, 2006; Scandura & Pellegrini, 2007), and organizations (Egan & Song, 2008; Scandura & Pellegrini, 2007; Singh, Ragins, & Tharenou, 2009). Mentoring demonstrates a significant relationship with positive protégé outcomes for both academic and workplace mentoring programs (Eby et al., 2008). Academic mentoring is associated with positive career and employment outcomes. Workplace mentoring is associated with favourable career attitudes including job satisfaction and attachment and interpersonal relationships. Mentored individuals have been found to garner greater career-related benefits than non-mentored individuals in terms of career planning, organizational socialization, job satisfaction, and income, with benefits enduring over a period of time (Chao, 1997). Mentoring has demonstrated a positive relationship with job satisfaction and a negative relationship with role ambiguity, intention to turnover, and actual turnover (Lankau & Scandura, 2002) in addition to decreased levels of work-family conflict (Nielson et al., 2001).

Benefits are not limited to protégés and are also found to accrue for mentors and organizations (Scandura & Pellegrini, 2007). Benefits for mentors include both external (instrumental) benefits such as enhanced job satisfaction and recognition from mentoring and internal (relational) benefits such as enjoying the experience and increased intentions to mentor
in the future (Eby et al., 2006; Scandura & Pellegrini, 2007). Organizations benefit from increases in retention (e.g., increased levels of organizational commitment, reduced levels of intention to turnover, and actual turnover rates), job satisfaction, and organizational commitment (Egan & Song, 2008; Singh et al., 2009).

Effective mentoring relationships act both as a form of positive social capital and the means for developing positive social capital in organizations and in careers (Ragins, 2007). This perspective suggests that outcomes of mentoring relationships should be considered in terms of both relational outcomes (e.g., those related to positive social capital including mutuality in the relationship, expanded identities, psychological growth, development of new knowledge and new ways of learning) and psychological capital outcomes (e.g., self-efficacy, confidence, and resiliency) (Ragins, 2007). Processes underlying mentoring relationships and connecting outcomes for both protégés and mentors may be better understood using this perspective.

**Features of Effective Formal Mentoring Programs**

Formal mentoring programs are set up with organizations providing support, structure, and direction for the mentoring relationships (Finkelstein & Poteet, 2007). Important considerations for organizations seeking to run formal mentoring programs include development of the program, provision of orientation and training, and the matching process.

In developing formal mentoring programs, organizations are encouraged to consider clearly communicating the program’s objectives, plan for monitoring and follow-up with program participants, specify a matching process for mentors and protégés, clarify role expectations, and provide opportunities to share experiences (Eby & Lockwood, 2005). In order to develop an effective mentoring program, the following process is recommended to ensure that the program is comprehensive and well-developed:

- Inception – demonstrating a high level of organizational support for the program;
- Structuring the program – determining the program’s objectives and intended outcomes, selecting program participants and clarifying participation guidelines, and determining the process by which protégés and mentors will be matched;
- Setting up orientation and training for program participants;
- Structuring the mentoring relationship – setting goals, responsibilities, and expectations for the mentoring relationship including the frequency and method of meeting and the expected duration for the formal mentoring relationship; and
Monitoring and evaluation of the program – planning for structured monitoring and evaluation of the program (Finkelstein & Poteet, 2007, pp. 346-362).

The provision of training and orientation to the mentoring program is often overlooked when creating formal mentoring programs. Training for program participants, both mentors and protégés, is often not considered to be critical to the success of mentoring programs, assuming that mentoring is a naturally occurring intervention (Bearman et al., 2007). Orientation sessions, especially for recruiting potential mentors, are required to share the potential costs and benefits of participation. They can lead to better self-selection for program participation and may help to set realistic expectations of the relationship (Eby et al., 2006). Orientation and training provides a safe forum in which participants can acquaint themselves with one another and a structured process through which mentoring agreements and relationship guidelines can be articulated. In addition, information can be shared with regards to clarifying mentor and protégé roles and responsibilities and how to avoid typical problems. Finally, the inclusion of formal orientation/training sessions allows the organization to reinforce its belief in the value of the mentoring program by demonstrating that the organization supports and values the development of the program participants (Bearman et al., 2007).

One other important consideration for formal mentoring programs is the matching process. Although formal mentoring programs are considered to hold much promise, Bearman et al. (2007) suggest that not enough attention is paid to the match process, how mentoring partners are brought together. There are many ways by which the match can be formed such as self-selection, random assignment, geography, convenience or other anecdotal considerations. Bearman et al. (2007) state that the matching process is a critical component in creating effective formal mentoring programs. How matches are formed is important because the formation and continuation of the mentoring relationship is so influential to the relationship’s success through the instrumental and emotional functions provided. A common assumption about matching is that participants should be matched based on similar characteristics. Characteristics used for matching often include race and gender assuming that participants who don’t know each other will be better able to form a relationship if they have something in common. One major issue with this assumption is the question of how similarity is determined. Research has demonstrated that matching on deep-level variables (such as attitudes and interests – personality characteristics, values, and research interests) is more important in predicting the success of
mentoring relationships than matching on surface-level variables (such as demographic characteristics of diversity) (Bearman et al., 2007; Ortiz-Walters & Gilson, 2005). In addition, the research demonstrates that matching participants based on complimentary characteristics can be quite successful (Bearman et al., 2007). For racialized faculty, matching based on similar surface-level characteristics such as race may not even be possible due to the limited availability of suitable mentors and race may not be the primary issue (or predictive of relationship effectiveness) in cross-race mentoring relationships; instead success may be dependent on the particular dyad and their perceptions of similarity on characteristics beyond race (Johnson, Xu & Allen, 2007). Furthermore, it may also be advantageous that matches within mentoring programs for racialized faculty and other marginalized groups be with members of the dominant groups as a way of building networks and linking to resources to which they may not otherwise have had access. Viets and colleagues (2009) note that traditional mentoring relationships often occur on an informal basis and suggest, based on evidence that women and ethnic minorities can be excluded from these networks, that formal mentoring programs can “become crucial for individuals from underrepresented backgrounds who might otherwise be excluded from this beneficial process” (p. 1119).

**Considerations for Diversified Populations**

Mentoring relationships occurring between mentors and protégés from different races, ethnic backgrounds, genders, sexual orientation, disability, religions, socioeconomic status, or other group memberships are referred to as diversified mentoring relationships (Ragins, 2007). As one of the functions of effective mentoring programs is to fulfill the need to belong, when considering diversified populations such as racialized faculty, it is important to consider that culture influences the nature, strength, and stability of belongingness needs (Allen & Eby, 2007). Individuals in certain cultures may be more or less inclined to engage in mentoring relationships (Sedlacek, Benjamin, Schlosser, & Sheu, 2007) and cultural differences between mentors and protégés could influence the success of mentoring relationships.

In order to facilitate the success of diversified mentoring relationships, Chan (2008) recommends five guidelines to be used as strategies for multicultural mentoring programs:

1. Remaining attentive and sensitive to cultural variables in the lives of protégés;
2. Providing for open communication about race and racism;
3. Being aware of personal and societal stereotypes, prejudices, biases, and attitudes;
4. Having ease in interacting with racialized people; and
5. Focusing on both the personal and the professional dimensions of the protégé (Chan, 2008, p. 139).

Although these guidelines were written with regards to multicultural student-faculty mentoring relationships, they are highly applicable to faculty mentoring relationships as well. Chan’s guidelines refer to the dyadic level of interaction between the mentor and protégé and are useful considerations when working to build successful mentoring relationships. They are also valuable to consider when selecting mentors and for creating orientation and training sessions; however, for formal mentoring programs, cultural differences need to be considered earlier, when designing the programs. McCormick (1997) recommends that guiding principles for multicultural mentoring programs be addressed prior to program implementation. Guiding principles include ensuring that the program is sensitive to the unique needs of the diverse participants and tailored to their specific backgrounds and goals. Formal programs must be created with explicit policy that is supported by the organization/institution. Augmenting the formal program are informal networks, various resources, rewards for mentors, and alternative support systems. Instead of being conceptualized as a vehicle to satisfy equity practice requirements, the program should be conceptualized at a broader level; to be a dynamic, ongoing, and evolving process. Finally, the program needs to be conceptualized as a medium reinforcing cooperation, sharing, and connectedness within the community (McCormick, 1997).

As per Benishek et al.’s (2004) model, power relationships within organizations are also important considerations for mentoring programs. Group memberships relating to power within organizations are of interest because mentoring relationships are influenced by existing inter-group power structures (Ragins, 2007). Consideration of the power relationships inherent within the institution and/or departments is important, especially for junior, tenure-track faculty entering into mentoring relationships. No research was located exploring this power relationship; much of the research on faculty focused on gender and race and most of the race research has focused on African Americans (Ragins, 2007). In addition, research has often limited group memberships to single groups ignoring the possible, and likely, issues related to intersectionality that are also important considerations when designing mentoring programs. Although there is some evidence of work exploring the intersection of gender and race (e.g., Evans & Cokley, 2008), programs are
often designed to enhance the developmental opportunities for specific, marginalized groups. Consideration of the multiple group memberships of program participants should occur.

The formation and continuation of successful diversified mentoring relationships have many positive implications in terms of career-related outcomes and relational outcomes including the development of positive social capital. Ragins (2007) discusses four implications of effective mentoring relationships and the positive social and psychological capital that can result. First, the mentoring relationship can provide a safe context to explore, develop and construct an authentic identity in an organization where norms typically reflect the identity of the dominant groups and can marginalize or even penalize those of non-dominant groups. Even without broader organizational change, feeling valued within the mentoring relationship can be a source of psychological validation and support. Second, experiences of exclusion, marginalization, prejudice, and discrimination in the workplace erode positive psychological capital; mentoring can compensate for this by restoring and creating positive psychological states through the intimacy, closeness, and acceptance of a high quality relationship. In these relationships, both the mentor and protégé can benefit from the ability to explore their own attitudes, attributions and prejudices, and mentors from dominant groups can confront their own stereotypes and sources of privilege associated with group membership, all avenues for positive psychological growth. Third, mentors and protégés can learn from one another and provide unique opportunities for the acquisition of new information, skills, knowledge, and ways of learning. Fourth, through the effective mentoring relationship, both the mentor and the protégé can benefit from an exchange of resources. For protégés, this can include the social capital provided within dominant-group networks, as well as information and knowledge. For mentors, this can include developing multicultural skills and competencies and opportunities to learn about other cultures, values, and experiences.

**Identification of a Research Gap**

Given the three primary research foci in the field of mentoring – youth, student-faculty, and workplace – mentoring of faculty in the Academy has been identified as an area requiring further research (de Janasz & Sullivan, 2004). Research identifying and evaluating mentoring programs particular to racialized faculty is even more uncommon. Given the pressures and complexities of the academic environment, the unique needs of racialized faculty, and the challenges related to diversified mentoring relationships, future research is recommended that
explores existing mentoring programs for faculty, particularly those for racialized faculty, considers the benefits and challenges related to these programs, and evaluates their effectiveness. This research can be used to articulate best practices and recommendations for the development of future programs for racialized faculty.

**Research Questions**

The primary research question for this project was to determine the value of mentoring as a strategy for inclusion for racialized faculty members. Racialized faculty refers to persons who are full-time and tenure-track university teachers, other than aboriginal persons, and are non-white in colour or race regardless of place of birth or citizenship. In order to answer the primary research question, several secondary research objectives were evaluated. The secondary research objectives were to identify existing faculty mentoring programs and to review published research to determine the impact of these programs (i.e., evaluation, results, conclusions).

**Methods**

In order to answer the research questions, a secondary review of peer-reviewed literature was conducted to obtain a purposeful sample of articles and reports written about relevant mentoring programs. Mentoring programs that were included in the review were those designed specifically for racialized faculty or graduate students. Programs for racialized female faculty or race intersecting with other minority distinctions were included; however, those dealing solely with gender, excluding race, were excluded from the analysis.

In order to locate programs to include in the secondary review, Internet searches were conducted in addition to searches of the following databases: ERIC, Social Sciences Citation Index, PsychINFO, and Web of Science. Searches were conducted using the following terms: mentoring, faculty, diverse faculty, minority faculty, program evaluation, and program effectiveness. Although these searches uncovered many thousands of web sites and articles, many of the mentoring programs were focused on faculty-student mentoring, developing graduate students into future faculty, mentoring of new and junior faculty, and mentoring female faculty. Very few programs were identified that focused on mentoring racialized\(^2\) faculty or

\(^2\) A majority of the programs were found in the United States where the term racialized was not used. In these cases the programs were more likely to use terms such as “faculty of color” and “underrepresented minority faculty.”
students. Ultimately four journal articles detailing relevant mentoring projects were selected for analysis. Identified programs were then reviewed for the following details: Population of interest, program goals, program structure and activities, measured outcomes of program, and models developed from and used by the programs/projects that can be used to inform future program development.

As a majority of the programs identified were from the United States, an additional review of 12 Canadian Universities was conducted to determine the availability of faculty mentoring programs in Canada. Twelve institutions were selected based on institutional rankings, size of the institution, and the geographic location of the institution. The websites of each institution were searched using the terms “mentoring” and “faculty” to determine what, if any, programs were available.

Findings

Identification of Existing Faculty Mentoring Programs

Four articles on faculty mentoring projects with a specific focus on racialized faculty or students were located and included in this analysis. The projects reviewed for this study included faculty retention initiatives at Virginia Tech (Piercy et al., 2005), the Southwest Addictions Research Group at the University of New Mexico (Viets et al., 2009), a junior faculty development program at the University of California San Diego (Daley, Wingard, & Reznik, 2006), and the W. K. Kellogg/ADEA Minority Faculty Development Program run at 11 institutions in the United States (Sinkford, West, Weaver, & Valachovic, 2009). These articles were selected based on the inclusion of sufficient and relevant details on the programs that could be used to inform the creation of recommendations for mentoring programs for racialized faculty at Canadian institutions.

Description and Impact of Faculty Mentoring Programs

Each of the four reviewed articles detailed a unique program or project. Two of the articles detailed specific mentoring programs focusing on racialized faculty (Daley et al., 2006; Viets et al., 2009). Although the other two articles were not about specific mentoring programs, the decision was made to include these two articles as the focus of each project/initiative was some aspect of inclusion of racialized faculty. These articles detailed a retention initiative (Piercy et al., 2005) and an overarching funding program for projects related to minority faculty
development (Sinkford et al., 2009). The information detailed in these articles was able to make a unique contribution to this research project and to inform the resulting recommendations. Indeed, the lack of literature on relevant mentoring programs made the inclusion of these articles necessary and valuable to the resulting findings. Although each of these programs/projects was unique in their development and structure, their goals were very similar and developed based on evidence of underrepresentation of racialized faculty and students in the Academy. An overview of each of the programs, population of interest, goals, and their activities is presented in Table 2.

There is some evidence of positive impacts related to participation in formal mentoring programs for racialized faculty. Viets and colleagues (2009) documented increases in research productivity for program participants following the four year program, all of whom were racialized faculty and a majority were female. Research productivity increases were found for grant applications and awards (200%), publications (336%), and professional publications (144%). Daley and colleagues (2006) demonstrated increases in retention rates for underrepresented minority faculty participating in the mentoring program. Increased retention rates were seen for both faculty in the school of medicine and academic medicine; underrepresented minority faculty retention rates increased from 58% to 87% in the school of medicine and from 75% to 93% in academic medicine (retention rates also increased for non-underrepresented minority faculty program participants). No other outcomes were measured for any of the programs.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name; Location</th>
<th>Population of Interest</th>
<th>Program Goals</th>
<th>Program Structure / Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty retention initiatives; Virginia Tech (Piercey et al., 2005)</td>
<td>• New faculty, specific focus on “faculty of color”</td>
<td>• Support and retention of new faculty</td>
<td>• Series of initiatives designed to increase retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Initiatives included a benchmarking retention project of 15 top-ranked U.S. institutions, focus groups, new faculty development breakfasts, university-wide faculty retention workshop, and a college-wide diversity summit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Name; Location</td>
<td>Population of Interest</td>
<td>Program Goals</td>
<td>Program Structure / Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Southwest Addictions Research Group; University of New Mexico (Viets et al., 2009) | • Junior faculty and graduate students of color  
• Research interests related to ethnic minority communities | • Train and mentor those from underrepresented backgrounds  
• Development of culturally or empirically supported interventions for ethnic minority communities | • 3 senior faculty mentors  
• 9 mentees  
• Activities included bi-weekly meetings, systematic learning opportunities, minority monthly symposia, conference support, pilot project grants, and annual process evaluation  
• Program length – 4 years |
| Junior faculty development program; University of California San Diego, School of Medicine (Daley et al., 2006) | • Underrepresented minority (URM) faculty  
• All URM faculty eligible, non-URM faculty could apply or be nominated  
• Minority dental faculty | • Increase productivity, academic success, and careers of minority faculty  
• Recruitment, retention, and development of minority faculty | • One-to-one mentor-mentee pairing  
• Activities included 12 half-day faculty development workshops, seven months of mentoring (approximately 12 hours/month), two hour academic performance counseling session, and a professional development project  
• Individualized programs at each school  
• Programs to include: formal faculty mentoring programs, academic partnerships with other programs, additional training opportunities, community-based practice/projects, and visible commitment from institutions to diversity through support of diversity programs  
• Program funding available to provide for payment of tuition, faculty development seminars, and other academic activities |
| W. K. Kellogg/ADEA Minority Faculty Development Program; 11 U.S. institutions (Sinkford et al., 2009) | • Minority dental faculty | • Recruitment, retention, and development of minority faculty | |

The research articles reviewed also present evidence of a strong interest in mentoring programs from both faculty and institutions, demonstrating an increasing recognition of the benefits of such programs to each. Piercy and colleagues’ (2005) analysis of focus groups with new faculty suggest the need for institutions to develop initiatives that support diversity,
inclusion, and to build and strengthen social connections within the university culture. Even with the specific focus on faculty retention for this initiative, participants still identified mentoring as a way to develop networks and support inclusion. Supporting inclusion through the development of networks and other activities suggests the importance of psychosocial supports for racialized faculty. The importance of psychosocial supports was highlighted by Viets and colleagues’ (2009) findings. Although originally conceptualized as a mentoring program that would provide specific instrumental supports – structural supports designed to develop technical skills in research – need for the provision of psychosocial supports emerged as the program progressed. Program participants felt that these supports had to be culturally-based and that they provided opportunities to consider the impact of cultural issues on themselves and their research. An important method of providing this type of psychosocial support was through a discussion panel of racialized, senior faculty. This forum allowed mentees to connect with role models, to share stories about successes and challenges, and to better understand ways to overcome barriers within the institution.

Models for Mentoring Programs Relevant to Racialized Faculty

Two of the articles offered unique models upon which mentoring programs for culturally diverse populations could be developed. Both models can be used to provide starting points for program development and to highlight specific considerations that are important for the inclusion of racialized faculty.

The first model was developed by the Southwest Addictions Research Group Program, the Culturally Centred Mentorship Model (CCMM), and was developed based on the mentoring experiences of their participants (Viets et al., 2009). Reproduced in Figure 1, this model demonstrates how cultural and community factors influence the career and research choices of new faculty, in particular racialized faculty. Mentoring is situated within a setting comprised of both institutional barriers and the structure of the mentoring program. This model describes mentorship core activities which seem to function as the process through which the setting influences the desired outcomes. This mentorship core, in particular the inclusion of both culturally-based psychosocial support and technical (instrumental) support, is considered to be important to the success of mentoring programs. Additional mentorship core activities in the CCMM are related to conducting research in ethnic minority communities to make a positive difference. These core activities may not be relevant to all mentoring programs for racialized
faculty but may be important considerations depending on the research interests of the specific population of interest. Outcomes in this model include those at both the individual and system level.

**Figure 1.** Culturally Centred Mentorship Model (Viets et al., 2009, p. 1123)

The second model details the W.K. Kellogg/ADEA Minority Dental Faculty Development (MDFD) Program (Sinkford et al., 2009). This program is a large funding program for the promotion of minority dental faculty within 11 participating institutions. Although the article does not provide details of each institution’s individualized program, it does provide a well-developed program logic model (Figure 2) that can be very useful for program design considerations.
1. Visible commitment by university leadership to diversity
2. Financial commitment to diversity by department/university
3. Time commitment by faculty
4. Adequate patient base/clinical opportunities
5. Adequate research opportunities
6. Strong academic partnerships
7. Pipeline/recruitment base

**Resources (Inputs)**

**Activities (Outputs)**

**URM Faculty Development**
- Formal mentoring process
- Research/clinical activity
- Career development process/seminars
- Recruitment/pipeline development
- Research presentations/publication opportunities

**Academic Partnerships**
- Research collaboration/student exchange
- Community-based practice opportunities
- Leadership development opportunities

**Leadership Commitment/Sustainability**
- Creative funding priorities
- Commitment to cultural competence
- Provide educational experiences associated with faculty role

**Short-Term Outcomes**
- Measurable increase in number of URM candidates available to dental education
- Measurable strengthening and expansion of pipeline to dental education

**Long-Term Outcomes**
- Measurable change in academic environments for career enhancement
- Measurable change in institutional climate concerning diversity

**Contextual Factors**
- Severe cuts of Title VII, eliminating HCOP/COE funding; institutional cuts to diversity programs
- Political/economic climate that hinders diversity/constrains opportunity
- Attractiveness to profession (financial incentive, practice, flexibility, infrastructure to work support)
In general, creating a program logic model is a process through which programs can demonstrate the links between program activities, expected outcomes, and the broader changes that the program is attempting to make (Renger & Hurley, 2006). Logic models are useful tools to guide program planning and delivery as well as to demonstrate the program’s goals, expectations, and outcomes to stakeholders. Similar to the CCMM, the MDFD logic model situates the program within a broader setting (contextual factors) and it also demonstrates both individual and system level outcomes. This model identifies both short- and long-term outcomes linked to the program activities. Although this model is likely for a broader level program than many mentoring programs for racialized faculty, the mentoring specific component of this model (included in the “URM Faculty Development” activities area), the resources and activities areas, and the contextual factors area are all important considerations for future program development.

The Canadian Context

There was little evidence of formal mentoring programs at the 12 Canadian universities reviewed for this project. Formal programs were located at six out of the 12 institutions, three located in Ontario and the other three in Central and Western Canada (Table 3). All of the programs were focused on new and junior faculty and none focused specifically on racialized faculty. In addition, three of the six programs were offered through individual faculties and not available institution-wide.
### Table 3

**12 Canadian Universities – Provision of Mentoring Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province/Institution</th>
<th>Formal Mentoring Program?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alberta</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Alberta</td>
<td>• Faculty of Science – Mentoring Program, specifically for new faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>British Columbia</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Fraser University</td>
<td>• No formal program; however, each new faculty member assigned a faculty mentor (informal mentoring)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of British Columbia</td>
<td>• Faculty of Medicine – Mentoring Program, specifically for junior faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manitoba</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Manitoba</td>
<td>• New Faculty Program – teaching mentors assigned with focus of development of teaching skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Brunswick</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Allison University</td>
<td>• No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Newfoundland &amp; Labrador</strong></td>
<td>• No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nova Scotia</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalhousie University</td>
<td>• No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ontario</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen’s University</td>
<td>• Faculty-Student Mentorship Program for Self-Identified Racialized Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Toronto</td>
<td>• No formal program; however, U of T (Mississauga) assigns each new faculty member a faculty mentor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Faculty of Medicine – Formal Mentoring Program, specifically for new faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Many individual programs – upper &amp; lower year students, alumni (lawyers) &amp; students, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Waterloo</td>
<td>• Mentoring Program for new faculty available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Information about mentoring available from the Centre for Teaching Excellence including a “Mutual Mentoring Guide”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Western Ontario</td>
<td>• Faculty Mentor Program offered through Teaching Support Centre, specifically for new faculty (jointly developed through faculty association and administration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Québec</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGill University</td>
<td>• Student mentoring programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No faculty mentoring and nothing specific to racialized faculty or students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One program of note was offered at Queen’s University in Kingston, Ontario. Although this institution did not offer faculty mentoring, it did offer a program to racialized students called the “Faculty-Student Mentorship Program for Self-Identified Racialized Students.” Few details were provided on the activities of this formal program beyond the matching process of one faculty with one or two students and there was no evidence of any program evaluation being conducted. The program was notable both because it appeared to be unique in Canada and also because the program objectives were similar to those that would be of interest for a faculty program: The program aims to use the mentoring role as a way to promote the well-being, motivation, campus engagement, and retention of participating racialized students (Centre for Teaching and Learning, n.d.) ³.

**Discussion**

The primary objective of this study was to determine the value of mentoring as a strategy for inclusion for racialized faculty members in order to provide information to guide program development at Canadian post-secondary institutions. The extensive review that was conducted demonstrated that there are very few formal mentoring programs for racialized faculty being offered by North American universities. Furthermore, the review of Canadian universities suggests that there are very few formal faculty mentoring programs being offered by the top post-secondary institutions in Canada and those programs that are being offered are limited to programs for new and junior faculty. Assuming that mentoring programs are more likely to be offered by the larger schools as tools for the recruitment and retention of talented faculty, it is possible that very few Canadian institutions offer such programs for their faculty in general and that even fewer offer programs designed to support racialized faculty.

Based on the review of the four selected articles, there is some evidence that racialized faculty members can benefit from participating in formal mentoring programs. Researchers have demonstrated benefits including increased research productivity (Viets et al., 2009) and retention rates (Daly et al., 2006). Viets and colleagues’ (2009) work also indicates the importance of psychosocial supports for racialized faculty, particularly with regards to well-being and retention.

³ A similar program (for students from racialized backgrounds) was launched at the University of Guelph in September 2010. For further information, visit the project website at [http://studentlife.uoguelph.ca/oia/navigate-oia/chroma](http://studentlife.uoguelph.ca/oia/navigate-oia/chroma)
retention. Psychosocial supports are likely related to participants’ experiences of increased life and job satisfaction in addition to other individual benefits. Generally, the activities included in formal mentoring programs that are offered appear to focus primarily on providing instrumental and technical supports to protégés. These supports are objective and practical; they typically provide protégés with opportunities for knowledge acquisition and skill development about being a faculty member at a particular institution such as available institutional resources, ways to increase research productivity, the improvement of teaching skills, and the process of achieving tenure. While these instrumental supports are undoubtedly essential components of any formal mentoring program, Viets and colleagues’ (2009) findings underscore the importance of providing psychosocial supports for racialized faculty, a lesson that should not be overlooked when developing programs. It is quite possible that psychosocial supports are critical to the success of formal mentoring programs, especially for racialized faculty. This is supported by mentoring research demonstrating the importance of the mentoring relationship (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Allen & Eby, 2007), as this relationship is likely to be one of the primary sources of psychosocial supports for protégés, especially during the early parts of the program.

**Limitations**

This study was limited by the lack of literature on mentoring programs with a specific focus on social inclusion for racialized faculty. In addition, all of the programs that were offered were located at institutions in the United States. Although the programs were formal faculty mentoring programs offered at post-secondary institutions, it is possible that the differences in the social, political, and economic context from that in Canada could limit the applicability of the findings. Yet these programs offer a good place to start in terms of developing programs for Canadian institutions, especially given the overall lack of literature on this topic (in order to assist in terms of future program development, selected mentoring resources uncovered during the research are included in Appendix A).

**Conclusion**

This study demonstrates that there is a research gap with regards to formalized mentoring programs for racialized faculty especially with regards to programs designed to increase social inclusion. There is little evidence of formal programs being offered at post-secondary institutions in North America and, for those that are being run, research establishing the effectiveness of
these programs is quite limited; there is evidence of programs that exist but very little formal examination of the process or outcomes of the programs beyond anecdotal evidence and a few outcome variables.

There is a need for both process and outcome evaluations of established programs in order to develop an understanding of how faculty mentoring programs work, to identify best practices, and to pinpoint successful inclusion strategies for racialized faculty. There is evidence that formal mentoring programs are beneficial for both individual faculty and institutions. In the short term, formal mentoring programs for racialized faculty can be used to both recruit and retain skilled faculty. In the longer term, these programs could be the key to increasing the diversity of faculty, both in terms of their individual characteristics and also their research interests.
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## Appendix A

### Mentoring Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Resource</th>
<th>Resource Annotation</th>
<th>Website / Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Mentoring Resources @ UW Oshkosh</strong></td>
<td>List of mentoring resources for both mentors &amp; protégés, includes a useful worksheet on the mentoring process.</td>
<td>Website – <a href="http://www.uwosh.edu/mentoring/faculty/">http://www.uwosh.edu/mentoring/faculty/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Mentor Program @ California State University Northridge</strong></td>
<td>Program directed at faculty-student mentoring; however, some useful resources including Faculty Mentoring Resource Booklet and Faculty Mentor Training Project.</td>
<td>Website – <a href="http://www.csun.edu/eop/htdocs/fmp.html">http://www.csun.edu/eop/htdocs/fmp.html</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>