

ADVANCE Faculty Mentoring *Fall 2004 Panel Discussion and Workshop*

On a scale from 1 to 10, with 10 being the highest rating, how would you rank the workshop/panel discussion?

- Average: 9.05
- Number of Feedback forms collected: 31
- Number of Participants: 36 (+ 6 panel members)

1. Why did you rate this workshop/panel discussion as you did?

Reasons for rating the workshop HIGH

- useful, especially the second half
- excellent case discussions
- good questions and responses, keep new mentors and seasoned mentors on the panel
- flexibility and variety of experience offered to the participants
- quite good
- most if not all of the important themes about mentoring were addressed
- there were many issues that came up that I never considered before
- second part was great
- the people selected were particularly candid and clear
- nice open discussion
- provoked great discussion
- I liked the mix of panel/case study and thought the panelists were great. I appreciate Bette's attention to keeping us on track
- The discussion was good and meaningful
- Average of two components (panel = 5, case discussion = 9)
- excellent, open, sharing of experiences, relieves anxiety of feelings of isolation
- good interaction with different faculty members
- missed most of panel; group discussion of situations was lively, interactive, creative and informative
- enjoyed it a lot
- Incredible interaction from a diverse array of faculty. Good thought-provoking scenarios. Nice variety of activities (panel, questions, small group and large group discussions)
- excellent job of encouraging/facilitating discussion and thoughts on all aspects of mentoring
- interaction, ideas of best practices, many voices
- the second part had a very good discussion--topics were selected very well

Reasons for not rating the workshop HIGHER

- more focus for mentors than mentees, how to find effective unofficial mentors
- what's the difference between mentor and a formal program for one vs. a friendly colleague and common sense? Maybe common sense isn't so common here?
- A bit too fast paced; more discussion might have helped
- problems discussed were important. Did not touch on the development of the research of new faculty.
- This I feel is the most critical issue and needs the most time for discussion.
- hoped there would be more guidelines, available resources for mentors
- small group discussions were more informative and addressed issues more so than the panel

2. What are the concerns that kept you from rating the workshop/panel discussion higher?

- Have it in a larger room, make it easier to see and hear panel
- needed more time, question of one on one mentoring versus utilizing campus resources for mentoring such as IDP, specific workshops, multicultural fellows, etc.
- better buffet
- enough time to delve into the issues more thoroughly
- too generic
- no concerns
- perhaps checklist of mentoring concerns would be helpful; fliers in packet help with this
- we could have used more time to discuss issues
- it could have been more concrete
- so much of this subject and exercise seems to be little more than formalization (and unnecessarily so) of common practice and common sense. If mentoring is best accomplished as a volunteer effort, then leave it as informal.
- we need some mentoring training
- not enough time
- I rarely rate anything perfectly
- It was great to get to meet more people from different disciplines
- there are many issues and we need more time to discuss them
- A little rushed, perhaps less questioning of mentors and mentees in first half of workshop the panel seemed somewhat uncoordinated and disjointed; perhaps more prepared presentation would be helpful, just asking questions for the panel to respond to seemed to create too variable an experience across panel members would have been good to try to establish real criteria for evaluation of mentor/mentee relationship
- none
- provide more time
- not enough time for all to discuss, engendered
- should summarize views and write an action plan for optimizing the mentor/mentee match
- it was superb
- none really
- time was a factor
- the first part was too general

3. What suggestions do you have for improving this workshop/panel discussion?

- you guys are the best
- make it more professor/college specific
- we could use more time to digest the scenarios
- more time
- start with some sort of brief structured presentation to give workshop some framework
- sorry, but little comes to mind.
- Frankly, any person coming into a new organization needs the good will of successful, established people. If neither newcomers nor old timers are willing and able to assist each other, both groups and their enterprise will suffer. Assistance can not and should not be formalized. Assignment of mentors is like forcing a blind date where neither is interested.
- official mentoring workshop is needed
- none, it was a good format with the initial panel discussion and then the scenario discussions
- It was quite good as it is
- more time for case studies
- lengthen it by one hour and try to really produce a draft outline of mentor tasks and criteria for the assessment of the process
- if deans and chairs appoint mentors they should participate/know about these issues,
- need training session for mentors
- send out literature in right hand packed ahead of time, maybe additional for those willing to read in prep. No time here
- no ideas, first time, surprised that it was so engaging, thanks to my mentee for inviting/encouraging me to come
- hold it again, advertising about the positive benefits previous participants mentioned in their evaluation
- use some structured activity designed to help attendees get to know one another
- (thus, facilitate informal mentoring matches)
- lengthen the time that is allocated for the workshop
- a certain topic can be selected for discussion every time