

JUDY SINGER: Good morning, everybody. I'm Judy Singer. I'm the senior vice provost for faculty development and diversity. And I want to welcome everybody here to a university conversation about mentoring.

We see this as a unique opportunity to bring together several different types of groups of people who don't normally cross paths. So, one particular feature of this event is that it's across the university. We have people from the Longwood area who are both medical school and the school of public health who are here, and we have people from all across the Cambridge campus joining us.

This conversation was also designed to be a cross cohort. So, we have both distinguished senior mentors and senior faculty who want to learn more about mentoring and what they can do, as well as some tenure track faculty who are hopefully willing to share with us their perspectives on what would be helpful.

One of the things you learn when you start to think about mentoring is the people who want to be helpful don't actually know what it is that they could be doing to be helpful. And we're hoping that this conversation will stimulate ideas.

I want to say a few words about why we're focusing on mentoring. This is actually the first of three faculty development events we're holding over the next few weeks. The other two are focusing on book publishing and media training-- learning how to talk to reporters and people in the media.

We're starting out with mentoring because we are using that to focus on the renewed commitment of the university to a tenure track system. And that's something that's a sea change from old Harvard. I was at a conference last week down in Washington, and I saw a faculty member who's now at the University of Michigan who used to be a faculty member one of our professional schools who we try to keep but who left, and I asked how things were going and whether we could possibly lure him back. And he said, well-- but, where I am is much better-- much better for junior faculty. And I said, well no, Harvard has a tenure track system now. And he said, what happened to the eight-year postdocs you used to give people.

We actually see this as a commitment to the development of people that we hire that we hope to be promoting up through the ranks. And we need mentoring programs, because if we

actually commit to this kind of system, we need to make sure that our tenure track faculty can succeed as they move up the ladder.

In my own career, mentoring has been keenly important. In fact, as I walk into the faculty club, I'm always reminded of my first encounters here which were breakfast with my graduate school thesis adviser, Fred Mosteller. And we would meet for breakfast in the main dining room at the ungodly hour of 7 o'clock, which to me was like-- I couldn't believe it. But Fred would very kindly take me aside and sort of talk to me about my own professional development. When I was hired as-- I actually knew I didn't want to be a professor because of the way I saw junior faculty in the Harvard statistics department be treated. In fact, the department has just tenured last year its first person from within in about 45 years. Just to recognize the kind of sea change.

But I saw a junior faculty. And they were treated like rotating day labors. And it just didn't make a very attractive career. The reason I did end up going into academia was because of mentors. For people who took me aside and said, Judy, you'd be really good at this. You don't really understand as a graduate student what life as a faculty member is like. And so why don't you apply-- in fact, the only job ever applied was an assistant professor at the Graduate School of Education, where my faculty position is now. And there, too, I was fortunate enough to have mentors who really helped me and helped me understand-- that was at a time when there were very few women at the University.

Pat Graham was the first-- was my dean-- she was the first woman dean at the University. Appointed in 1981 by President Bok. She was the 13th female tenured faculty member at the University. People used to know their number, just to put it in perspective. And when she joined the faculty and came to the faculty club, she had to go through the back door because that's where women went.

I tell those anecdotes just to say that this is a new Harvard. Or, as Martha Minow said in a recent interview in the *New York Times* about Harvard five years after Larry Summers' infamous comments on women in science, this is not your father's Harvard. And what I hope today is we can actually have a conversation about how Harvard can support all faculty in their professional development.

So, with that I'm going to turn it over to my colleague, Liza Cariaga-Lo, assistant provost for faculty development and diversity, who will do some housekeeping matters and also introduce

our distinguished panel. Thank you very much.

[CLAPPING]

SPEAKER 1:

Good morning, everyone. And thank you all for coming this morning. We are so delighted with the response that we got when we sent out the mentoring invitation. In fact, the response was so large that we were unfortunately unable to meet everybody's needs, and so we actually to turn away some people. But we hope to have additional conversations around mentoring at the various schools very soon.

Just a few housekeeping notes. So, you all received a packet. The green packets are actually sciences packets, so the articles are slightly different. The purple is a humanities and social sciences packet. And the only real difference is really the research articles that we've included in there to help you think about mentoring from the perspective of your disciplines and fields.

In addition, in the packet we provided some tools that we hope will help you think about mentoring, not just for faculty in your department, but also thinking about mentoring in different perspectives and through various opportunities that you might find yourself in, whether it's working with young faculty, or working with trainees, or working with students. So, I hope that you find that useful.

In addition, as you think about mentoring your departments, we do hope that you will allow us to assist you as needed. If you are thinking about developing mentoring programs, in particular for your tenure track faculty, we have some wonderful experts in the room. And I hope that you will use them today, but also beyond that to be in touch with them as you begin to think about developing mentoring programs for your faculty.

Today we are very honored, actually, to have in our midst leadership from the schools. Four individuals who actually have been instrumental to developing mentoring activities at the various schools. And I am I'm honored to have them come with us today. Some of them just flying in early this morning from Chicago-- Joan Reede. And others who are also just running in and out of meetings. So, we are grateful to them for taking the time to come here.

Our four panelists this morning who will speak from the perspective of leaderships in the schools around mentoring are Cherry Murray, dean of Harvard University School of Engineering and Applied Sciences, and the John A. and Elizabeth Armstrong Professor of Engineering and Applied Sciences; Julio Frenk, dean of the faculty and T & G Angelopoulos

professor of public health and international development at the Harvard School of Public Health; Joan Reede, dean for diversity and community partnership and associate professor at the Harvard Medical School, as well as associate professor of society human development and health at the Harvard School of Public Health; and Michele Lamont, Robert I. Goldman professor of European studies, and professor of sociology and African and African American studies, as well as the senior adviser on faculty development and diversity in the faculty of Arts and Sciences.

Thank you all for coming today, and we look forward to hearing your thoughts on mentoring.

So, we will start with Dean Murray, and then Dean Frenk, and Dean Reede, and then Professor Lamont.

CHERRY

So, I'm glad to see so many people here interested in mentoring. I was asked by Judy to talk a little bit about my own personal experience, and then what I've done at the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences, which we call SEAS.

MURRAY:

So, first off I've been here at Harvard for exactly six months.

[LAUGHTER]

So, I don't know Harvard that much but I'm learning a lot about it. And I have been having lunches with the tenure track faculty at the School of Engineering. We're a growing school, and so we actually are hiring quite a few. By that I mean we have only 70 FTE faculty. And we're hiring, in proportion to that, quite a few people.

Engineering is moderately new at Harvard. That is to say it's been around for hundreds of years, but it's a brand new school since 2007. It's the first-- it's the last school, and the first and 70 years, that is a new school at Harvard. And so, we're kind of getting ourselves together as, what is the school going to be.

So, let me first talk a little bit about my personal experience with mentoring. I went to MIT, got a PhD in physics, and was recruited by at Bell Laboratories, and went to Bell Laboratories. Just immediately after graduate school. And my first week at Bell Laboratories, I had an anti-mentoring experience. Someone from the department came in and said, so you're here. What are you going to do? So I said, here's the kind of stuff I was planning on doing. I'm going to set up these experiments. This is what I told people. And the reaction of this person was, well you're never going to survive here. So, that was my anti-mentoring experience, which I did not

consider to be very positive.

And when I became-- let's see-- I got on the leadership council, which is very much like the faculty council here. I set up-- I actually went around to all of the new members of technical staff in the research area and asked them, would you like a mentor. And 100% of them-- whether they were male, female, underrepresented, didn't matter-- said yes. And so I set up a mentoring program at Bell Labs. Which actually worked quite well.

Then as I got up higher in management there, I was assigned a formal mentor who was the head of a business unit which I found to be extremely useful when I was a department head, which is the third level of management.

Bell Labs did not do very well until we actually put in a mentoring program for the young people, but by the time you got into management they did extremely well.

So, when I arrived at Harvard, I discovered that we did not have a mentoring program. That is to say we had an informal mentoring program where the former dean had said, why don't you go mentor this person, too. But the person didn't know they were being mentored, and it was quite--

So, what I set up is mentoring networks, which is-- we don't have departments in the school, so I had to assign an associate dean to each tenure track faculty member so nobody fell between the cracks. And then they are in charge of a mentoring developmental committee. And the committe-- so we all sat together as associate deans and suggested names of people for each of the tenure track faculty. And then asked the tenure track-- the associate dean sits with the tenure track faculty member and asks, what do you-- which of these people would you like, are you thinking of someone else as your formal mentors.

So, three or four people are on this mentoring committee. And I have a meeting every quarter with the associate deans, who are the chairs of these mentoring committees, to see how people are doing.

Michelle asked me today, how is this going? And, actually it's going very well-- except some of the tenure track faculty were on leave, either maternity leave or some other leave, and they kind of fell between the cracks. That is to say, all of the associate deans at the very beginning went out when I asked them to. But the ones-- to talk to their tenure track faculty-- but the ones who weren't there at the time, they kind of forgot about it. So, I reminded the associate

deans again, and now I'm having lunches with the tenure track faculty and asking them how it's going. And I think it's going a whole lot better.

So, I guess the storyline about this is, keep following up if you're setting up a mentoring program. Keep following up with both the mentors and the mentees to make sure it's working.

Thanks.

[CLAPPING]

JULIO FRENK: Good morning to everyone. My name is Julio Frenk. I have been the Dean of Harvard School of Public Health for twice the amount than Cherry. For about a year. So, you have the table here of new deans, at least on this side of the table.

But thank you very much for inviting me, because mentoring is really a topic that's very, very near and dear to my heart. Probably stemming from the opposite-- a very, very fundamental mentoring relationship I developed, first as a graduate student, and then as a junior faculty member, with Avedis Donabedian who was actually a graduate of the Harvard School of Public Health. And I went to the University of Michigan to study with him, and under him. And then I joined the faculty with him.

And I think this was probably not just one of the most informative, but one of the most formative, experiences of my life. So, I think through having benefited from what a good mentoring relationship is, I'm a strong believer in that. Because-- again, it's a highly competitive environment, and it is not obvious, even after having been there in the student role-- how to navigate those waters without the sort of very, very personal guidance.

Fortunately, the Harvard School of Public Health has had a long tradition of emphasizing mentoring. Particularly my predecessor, Barry Bloom, already in the year 2000 formed a committee to assess junior faculty mentoring. And based on the recommendations of that faculty committee, each department was then required to develop its own mentoring policy which included assigning each new faculty member a mentor at the time of the faculty members appointment.

So the school, in addition, looks like a play on words-- you have to monitor mentoring. Monitoring mentoring is a key aspect. There's-- it's called a biannual mentoring survey, and through that we've learned that a lot of progress has been made. But also, there's a lot of--

much more that needs to be done.

So, since I've begun my tenure, because I had the privilege of spending the full term of 2008 already been appointed but not just having taken office, I spent those four months coming every month for a week to Harvard. And mentoring was one of the topics that emerged right the top of my conversations. Early conversations with department chairs and the faculty members.

So, I made this one of my priorities. Particularly because the way I've expressed not so much the vision, but the ambition for School of Public Health is to make it the first school of public health of the 21st century-- the first both in time and in quality. And you can only build the school of the 21st century with the generation of the 21st century. And that generation is a generation of the junior faculty members. So, the only way to be effective in realizing that ambition is to actually invest in junior faculty.

So, among other things, we've established the first time an office of an associate dean for research that funds seed grants, provides scientific editorials report, external review of grant proposals, a number of support mechanisms for a school that's heavily dependent on research. And where promotion is heavily dependent on research productivity.

We've also-- probably my diagnosis is that a lot of progress has been made, but the remaining challenge is heterogeneity across departments. So, the quality of your mentoring relationship should not have such variation. Because then also in the networks of your faculty, the realization of very different experiences is a factor in demoralizing some people that don't get the quality that they see peers getting.

So trying to achieve some uniform standards, high standards, is one of my bridges. Some school-wide mentoring guidelines have been established. And under these new guidelines, each new junior faculty member meets with the chair of the department soon after arriving at the school. At that time a primary mentor is identified. Sometimes there's also a secondary mentor. The mentors meet with the mentees at the beginning of their appointment. And then at a minimum they have to meet at the end of each academic year to review academic progress and plan for the next year.

So, there's a formal structure. But I think it's also very important to stimulate informal mentoring relationships. So, in a sense, it's a multi-tiered strategy with primary, secondary, and informal mentors. And the additional members of the leadership of the academic

administration in the school, particularly the Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs, and the Associate Dean for Research that I just mentioned, meet with the junior faculty at critical points in their careers.

So, it's this three layers of the chair, the formal and informal mentors, and then the school-wide academic leadership.

But let me end-- because they did ask us to talk a little bit about personal experience, and I thought what I would do-- and this will take literally a minute-- when my beloved mentor, Avedis Donabedian, passed away after a very, very productive and rich life, I was-- having been his student and pupil-- to speak at his memorial. And I reflected on the relationship. So, let me quote two paragraphs from-- just a very brief mention to what I said there.

And this is I said. Our-- referring to Avedis and me-- was the paradigmatic mentoring relationship. In our age of mass education, the mentor has become an endangered academic species. A mentor teaches you, but is much more than a teacher. A mentor befriends you, but is much more than a friend. A mentor guides you, but is much more than a guide. What a true mentor does is one of the greatest gifts of generosity. He-- I was talking about Avedis but we will say he or she-- sows in your mind, and your soul, the seeds that will nourish intellect and spirit for the rest of your life.

So, I mean to me this is the nature of the mentoring relationship. And let's not forget where this word comes from. It's actually an individual-- a figure in Greek mythology, Mentor, who's entrusted with the care of Telemachus when his father has to go to the Trojan War.

So, although in this marvelous plasticity of the English language, we've turned it into a verb and an adjective, let us not forget that the root of the word refers to an individual. And it's this personal dimension-- this very, very profound, deep relationship-- that I think is-- holds both the enormous potential, and also the great rewards of mentoring.

Thank you.

[CLAPPING]

JOAN REEDE: So, good morning. Like others I've been asked to give both a personal perspective, but also part of a perspective from Harvard Medical School.

And so I'll say personally. In terms of mentoring, as you look through the literature and you

people talk about it, they talk about issues such as matching on gender and matching on race ethnicity and how important those things are. And what I would say is that, if I look at my career my progression, if I were to find the perfect mentor that was matched on all of my dimensions, the only person that could mentor to me is me.

And so for me, I had multiple mentors. The idea of a network of mentors is the only way I have survived. And they have crossed race ethnicity, and gender, and discipline. They have been individuals-- and as you talk about the anti-mentoring-- that have protected me from what [INAUDIBLE] calls the dementors and the tormentors.

And they continue as I move forward in my career. Critical elements for my success and my balance. And those are the individuals, who early on when I was at Harvard Medical School and Harvard School of Public Health and my interests were very different from others, told me to pursue my interests. And backed me in pursuing my interests and creating my own space for what I thought was important. And actually showed me that there was a value to advancing academically. Before then I had not thought there was any value to it. It was my mentors who told me that there was and were able to show me the way.

I want to give you an example of some of the things that we've actually done at the medical school. And the first begins with everyone is saying that mentoring is critically important but not really recognizing it. And our faculty feeling it wasn't really recognized.

So, in 1995 our office established a mentoring award for the school that has grown over time. It is an award that was established in 1995, but has grown. And since then, over 3,700 nominations have come in for close to 1,200 individual faculty members. It's grown from an initial award that was named the Cliff Barger award to having three categories. A Cliff Barger award for those who have been in service for a minimum number of years, a silent award for those who've been in service for more than 20 years, and what we call young mentor award for those who've been service for less than 10 years.

To date there have been more than-- there have been 122 awardees. What I find important about this is when we did our new promotion criteria for the school, these awards were recognized within the promotions.

And so, how do you start to recognize mentoring, and recognize it in a way that it starts to show up on individual CVs, it's taken into consideration for promotion, recognized throughout our environment.

Other ways in which it has been recognized include CHADD, which is a consortium, or committee, across the faculty development and diversity offices at the various Harvard affiliated institutions with medical school. And they actually offer a mentoring course much led by Jean Emmons who is here, who is a silent mentoring awardee. There is also a task force on faculty development and diversity that will be coming out with a report the next few months. And one of the three main committees of this task force deals with mentoring, again shared by Jean Emmons.

When we look at mentoring-- because I want to mention some of the other people that are here, and often times you get an image of a sage white man with white hair, and blue eyes, and all the other kind of things that go along with that-- and an important part of this is recognizing that mentoring occurs across all our faculty. And one of the people that we have here that I really want to point out is Jessica Henderson Daniel, who is the first woman, and the first person of color, to win the mentoring award at Harvard Medical School. And recognizing across the board. Jessica, you should go like this.

[CLAPPING]

So, there are many ways, I think, in which we are trying to advance mentoring. The last part is actually taking from those individuals who have won the mentoring award, and now there is a council of mentors that is actually meeting and looking at what is going on within mentoring in the school, ways in which we can improve mentoring, but it's taking from the best across our campus and across disciplines.

Thank you.

[CLAPPING]

**MICHELE
LAMONT:**

Well, I have been-- I was appointed a year ago to this new role as a faculty advisor on faculty development and diversity. And one of the reasons I agreed to do this is because I thought there was a really nice team in place with many people committed to creating a cultural change in FAS. And this is not a minor thing. FAS is a very large part of the university. It's 40% of the faculty, 42 departments. And these departments are very different in their culture. Some of them have never promoted, some of them have been promoting regularly over the last few years. So, it's really a complex mosaic.

First, my experience with my own mentoring.

I'm Canadian. I went to Paris as a graduate student at a very young age. And there was no mentoring. It was a pure swim or sink system. And that was very difficult. It taught me resilience. And in 1983 I went to Stanford as a postdoc. And I discovered a world that was totally unknown to me. I felt those students were unbelievably lucky, privileged. And also, they were getting extremely good training.

Then in '87 I was hired at Princeton in sociology where I was for 15 years before coming here in 2003. And Princeton, at the time, still had a system where only one person in six approximately got tenure. And that was also a little bit baptism by fire. I really felt that they were not taking very good care of us, and many, many of my friends left when we got tenure. All my friends were gone, basically.

And then I came here in 2003. My scholarship is on culture and inequality. I am presently working on anti-racism in France and the US. I really have a long term commitment to trying to understand how collective definitions of work influence for production of inequality. So, my involvement in this is very much driven by my own scholarship.

I also happen to have a significant other who also studies diversity. And actually in *The Globe* this weekend there was a big article on his work, which basically shows that he studied 800 corporations looking at which ones have been most successful at favoring diversity. And he finds that what is most effective is structural change. That is appointing people who actually have as a responsibility-- or appointing task force or in charge-- overseeing diversification. And also using carrots and stick to really create change. And mentoring is a very big part of this-- of the equation.

So, with all this background, when my predecessor, Liza Martin, had resigned in 2005 after having created a mentoring program where women were matched-- only junior tenure track faculty-- were matched with mentors in other departments. Which was a very good idea, because you can actually ask advice to people who will not be involved in your promotion, that-- you know-- where you can look more vulnerable than to people who will be one day be in charge with looking at your work.

Departments were asking FAS to report on their mentoring activities, but there was just an enormous amount of informal mentoring occurring. And the literature shows us that informal mentoring mostly benefits people who are entitled. And many, many people did not benefit

from it.

So, the idea was really to create a new system that was launched this fall, where we're asking both departments and individuals to create mentoring plans. And actually, we don't use the word mentoring. We use the word development network, drawing on the work of David Thomas, who was an expert on the question who works in the business school, and Monica Higgins who works in the school of education. And the idea is that a tenure track faculty create a network of people who will-- with multiple nodes that will answer various needs-- and the needs are evolving as they move through the tenure track system.

And the word mentoring itself is not that great of a word because, in fact, what most people are seeking is intellectual exchange. That is the ability to get people to read their work. When we work in my department, to launch our mentoring plan this fall, talking with-- this is what they want. They know that the faculty are unbelievably busy, but they want us to really understand that we're supposed to set aside a few days a year to read manuscript and give them feedback so that they will be able to get-- improve the work that on which they will be judged when they come up for tenure.

So, departments had until March 1 to turn in their mentoring plans. And many of them have. I'm very pleased. The cultural change is very-- the purpose, in fact, is not to create these mentoring plans. It's really to create a cultural change, and creating a structure in itself is probably the easiest part of the challenge. What will be much more of a challenge will be to monitor in a year what has been happening. I'm certainly going to email my co-panelists to learn more about the tools that they have put in place.

I think that at Harvard, where there's such a strong culture of excellence, diversity is often viewed as a pollutant, or even claiming aid-- help-- is viewed as a pollutant because we're all supposed to be so talented that the cream will rise naturally. Well, in fact, everyone who gets tenure gets a lot of help. They get their colleagues to read their work, they present their work at Colloquium, et cetera.

So, the idea is that-- to acknowledge that getting help is crucial to the raising of the cream. But we want more of an even playing field where more people get the help that they need to become all they can be. And Harvard is, I think, a little bit-- if we think of what's happening at Stanford or at Yale-- our peer institutions are fully engaged in this. Stanford as its motto, diversity and excellence together. And we are very much moving in the same direction. Drew

Faust made a very important statement last week to this effect.

So, I think that a lot of people are pushing in the same direction, and I'm personally quite optimistic for the future. Thank you.

[CLAPPING]

SPEAKER 1:

Panelists, we'll have to-- we are, in fact, just as an FYI-- we are, in fact, video taping this section of this event. And so, we hope to be able to have your faces on our website soon, so that others who are not able to attend can be guided by your wisdom. So thank you.

We are privileged on many fronts here at Harvard. But I think that our human capital at Harvard is unsurpassed. And we do indeed stand in the shoulders of many giants here. And often we don't recognize how they profoundly change our lives, and how they profoundly change our academic community.

So, today we wanted to be able to acknowledge some of these individuals. And I hope that we can do more of this, as Joan had mentioned. We can do more to recognize the mentors, and those who support us. Those who help us through the difficult challenges ahead as we try to develop careers here at Harvard.

So, I would like to have Professor Scott Edwards-- if you could, as I call your name, if you could please stand in the front so that we may embarrass you further.

Professor Scott Edwards, Professor Jean Emmons, Professor David Golan, Professor Virginie Greene, Professor Ichiro Kawachi, Professor Michele Lamont, Professor Everett Mendelsohn, Professor Joan Reede, and Professor Marianne Wessling-Resnick.

For many years, these individuals have toiled at many levels to support mentoring. Not just in their schools, but in the university. Some of them have established awards to honor those colleagues who have done mentoring in their departments and their schools. Others have simply developed their own informal mentoring programs without virtue of resources, and often at the expense of their own personal scholarship. So, we are very grateful to them for the work that they do, and I hope that you will enjoy meeting them in your discussion groups because they will serve as guides as you think about the questions that we have posed for these discussion groups.

So, on behalf of the university, we thank you for your profound contributions to mentoring, and

hope that we can gain insights and guidance from you in the years ahead as we think about mentoring in the Academy. Let's give them a warm round of applause.

[CLAPPING]

JUDY SINGER: Sorry we keep on having to cut off the conversation, but that the conversations want to continue I take as a very good sign. And, in particular, the cross school conversations and the cross cohort conversations are very eye opening in some cases with some concrete ideas about things that we might be able to try in our own environments, and in some cases some very challenging problems to address.

I have the pleasure now of introducing our Provost, Steve Hyman, who is going to share with you some university perspectives on mentoring. So, please join me in welcoming Steve. Thank you.

[CLAPPING]

STEVE HYMAN: Let me just start by thanking you, Judy and Liza, and the staff of your office and the Bok Center for organizing this very, very important event. And let me thank in absentia those deans who either have been here, or will be here later, because high level commitment is necessary to this activity.

Those of you, whether you are tenure track faculty or people who have leapt over that hurdle let at some time in the past, recognize the importance of mentoring. And at the same time recognize that it's often thankless. Or that the rewards have to be internal, because you know you've done the right thing.

As a university, we often don't find adequate ways to thank people for their extraordinary efforts. For their citizenship, for their caring. At least I feel, at a time of famine and dearth, at least we have muffins for you, and unhealthy things like bacon to express our thanks. To express our thanks.

But in all seriousness, this is such an important area for the university. And before I launch into my remarks, I want to particularly recognize some of you here who have won mentoring awards. And I've seen some of you already. Everett Mendelsohn from arts and sciences, Jean Emmons from HMS, Ichiro Kawachi from public health, Marianne Wessling-Resnick from public health, Scott Edwards, who I saw, from arts and sciences, and Professor Virginie Greene from FAS, who I also saw a few minutes ago. You are-- and I hope I'm not missing

other names, but you are really exemplars.

I also, again, we want to thank members of the leadership team and tenured faculty who are here to talk about this.

Although the president of the university is the person who actually confers tenure, I chair half of the tenure cases except for the medical school, where actually I'm the last signature on all of them. And, very often-- the good news is that at this last step of the ad hoc, the success rate is very, very high. But all too often we see people for whom the case is closer than it should be despite their brilliance and their effort. And sometimes people who really should have made it don't make it.

And in some sense-- there are many reasons for this-- but often I've thought to myself after a difficult case that, had there only to the right kind of mentoring, this would have had a different outcome. And often people are left to fend for themselves, or they have sort of glancing intermittent mentorship.

And also from the point of view of the mentors, it's important to engage in groups like this and stay up to date and understand what the different schools are looking for. Because, for example, in many of the schools-- arts and sciences in particular-- teaching, which at one time was considered to be something that you had to do, but it wasn't worth all that much-- is now an important part of tenure cases.

We just saw a new criteria from the School of Public Health that made teaching important. So, each school has a different culture and different weights. And while tenure track faculty shouldn't enslave their energies and their interests to some plan for what it takes to achieve tenure-- obviously people have to follow their loves and their intellectual leads-- still, it is so important that people understand the system. And have the kind of helpful engagement at every stage so that we can achieve what we want, which is the success of all of our tenure track faculty.

So, in that sense, I'm really happy to see this room full. And the only thing I could wish for is to see many, many more rooms full.

And because in the end we have committed ourselves as a university increasingly to a tenure track system, or in some of the professional schools something like that without the name. And what that really means is that we want to be committed to our tenure track faculty. We want to

get them through the set of processes. But, this is not a matter of magic. This is a matter of effort and engagement where mentoring is particularly important.

And I think many of us think back to the importance of senior faculty and mentors in our own careers, and it's something though that just has not been adequately institutionalized.

And so, I commend everybody for being here. I wish you all s productive and useful day. And I hope, especially those of you who are already tenured-- I was told it's no longer PC to talk about senior and junior faculty-- but those of you who are senior faculty, I hope you'll be evangelists for the importance of mentoring in your schools. Because frankly, as I said at the outset, this is not enough recognized or enough rewarded, but it is absolutely critical if we are going to succeed as a university in one of our most important goals, which is to help our tenure track faculty make it over this bar and permanently join our community.

So, thank you very, very much.

[CLAPPING]

**MICHELE
LAMONT:**

I was in a group that included senior faculty and tenure track faculty in the social sciences and humanities, but across different schools. In the Kennedy School, FAS, and the Harvard School of Public Health, and the medical school. And we have a really interesting conversation. A troubling one, too, because some of the tenure track faculty who were there, I would say three of them describe context where they were really caught between two chairs. In a sense of having an appointment in a school where the discipline is fairly not marginalized, but not the dominant discipline, what pack to follow when basically your chair is very busy and is not immediately available to give you feedback about whether you should publish in your own field, or publish for your school.

Another case where the department hasn't promoted since 1950. And the person basically doesn't know if his FT will be in one department or another. So, really another case where the production that is being-- the output of the scholar-- is a very unconventional one by Harvard's criteria. So, for me in my role, I'm thinking, we really need a kind of ombudsperson to whom people could go and raise a red flag early on to try to understand better the criteria by which they're going to be evaluated.

Second issue that was raised was that of variation in the faculty, and how much weight they put on various criteria. Of publication, what kind of publication, books verses articles, service,

and teaching. And Judy Singer was there, mentioned experience-- an experiment they did in the School of Ed where they asked all the faculty to attribute 100 points to the various dimensions they use while looking at a file. And they found it was a very teachable moment when the results were distributed, and the faculty came to the realization of how much difference there was, and how much weight they put on the various criteria.

Which really made me think about the importance of spending much more time among the tenure-- the senior faculty-- thinking very much more explicitly than we do about, what do we do when we are evaluating. We have now in the FAS situation where some departments have never promoted, others have promoted regularly. And I think among the more senior faculty who have been here for 40 years, and those who've come over the last 10 years, there are different expectations about what a Harvard faculty should be. And this really needs to be talked about much more explicitly. So that's a second central theme in our conversation.

A third one was how to find good mentors. Some of the members of our group mentioned the importance of gossip, and of hanging out in hallways, and really how much good ideas come at the most unexpected time.

Ichiro Kawachi who was trained in New Zealand was regretting the good habit of drinking tea together three times a day for 15 minutes. So we conclude, I think we should just institute that here in all schools.

So, that's basically what came up. I don't know if any other group member would like to highlight any other point that I did not mention.

[CLAPPING]

SPEAKER 2:

So, we had a very active discussion raising first, the fact that there are very different rules and ways of looking at quote "latter faculty", so that we didn't necessarily share a common language from the medical school, the hospitals, FAS, the School of Public Health. And therefore, as mentoring goes forward at Harvard overall, to make sure that the language is more global and more, really accepting of the entire group.

And so, just in terms of the common language, the issues of promotion versus career satisfaction, and really accepting some heterogeneity in the definition of what we want for mentoring. It was clear that there should be expectations Harvard-wide of a change of culture that mentoring was important across all career trajectories.

A lot of interest in mentor and mentee training, so that, again, there was more uniformity both in our senior faculty of knowing how to really effectively mentor, but for our junior faculty to have more information on how to be a great mentor and what to expect. And this could be in the form of part of the boot camp that's part of-- apparently when the new faculty come to FAS and some other areas. Perhaps orientation at the hospitals, so that there's sort of a module that explains some of the ways that one can think about being a mentee.

The other issue is to certainly leverage the infrastructure of already the hospitals, the departments, et cetera. And just to make it part of the faculty discussions, part of every area. Whether it's the faculty meeting-- perhaps do mentor training because the faculty are already there at the faculty meeting, and they're not likely to show up at other places sometimes.

And then we talked about some of the various models, which could be junior faculty doing peer mentoring. There could be a senior person there or not there, so it could serve a networking focus. And also to help the junior faculty develop skills. There was a sense that many of our junior faculty are told, well don't mentor anyone because that will ruin your own career. And so we're giving sort of an early message that's not really what we want to develop in the long run.

And then Jessica brought up some issues around serial mentoring. You may think of it from the adolescent point of view, which is where I think of it, which is serial monogamy.

But, certainly to think about the fact that what needs developmental networks that [INAUDIBLE] and David Thomas, and Monica Higgins and other have really thought about, in terms of a more broad based issue for our faculty.

It was interesting that the word career mentors is used very differently. In some places it's the scholarly or research mentor, and other places it's somebody worrying about your career who's not your division chief. So, I think if we can develop some common terminology, at least we have these meetings we'll know what each one's talking about.

But it was a very good discussion. We'd still be there in the living room if you hadn't brought us back upstairs. So, thank you.

[CLAPPING]

JOAN REEDE: We need to be mentored in the most effective way to weave from back to front and take the least amount of time.

We had a very good discussion. We had representatives from FAS, from Harvard School of Public Health, and the medical school. And from the medical school from both the hospital and from the medical school itself.

And I'm going to go over lots of discussion, lots of ideas thrown out. But going down across the questions in terms of what are some of the critical needs.

Some of the areas that were discussed were increasing knowledge about multiple career paths, that there's not only one path. Being able to help people with their transitions. Helping and encouraging individuals to take risk, and understanding that advancement requires risk. This idea that although we're focusing now on those who are in the ladder and understanding that we need the mentoring across the spectrum, and that many of the people at the early stages of the ladder are transitioning to more senior positions, and they need that same kind of advice and mentoring. So, keeping something in place across the spectrum.

There needs to be a mechanism for acknowledging and dealing with anti-mentoring. And the other one was, the mentees, and what's needed for them, is this network of those both inside and outside. So, much of our focus today has been on the mentoring within our institution. But equally, there's a need to create the networks and the supports outside of our institutions.

In terms of some of the roles and responsibilities for mentors and mentees-- with regard to the mentors-- they talked about a cultural competence and a holistic approach. Knowledge for the mentor themselves, that you just don't need one mentor, but you need multiple mentors. And this issue of it being quality and not quantity in terms of the mentor.

And then for the mentees, this idea of paying it forward. And at all levels that someone could mentor someone else who is coming behind them.

In terms of some of the policies and practices, we talked about something called mentor domain. Somebody mentioned mentor domains. They talked about four domains. Practice, or what I'd call part the scholarship or discipline. Second being promotion, and understanding the system there. The third, academic productivity. And the fourth, environmental and things such as work life balance.

The other component dealt with more of the institutional aspects, and what institutions or departments could do. We talked about ways in which departments or institutions could support the mentoring by offering other programs.

What was mentioned from the psychiatry department of Mass General were these writing seminars, and what they call charisma conferences. We also talked about faculty development sessions. It was mentioned that there was a need for mechanisms to make matches for individuals to be more aware of who's in the environment and who may be able to help them. And Harvard School of Public Health talked about they're going to put in a mentor registry.

Talked about the need for the rewards or awards for mentoring. Having mentoring resources available, something that might be online. The training and teaching of mentors. And then they talked about-- and it alluded to an ombuds-- somebody earlier alluded to an ombuds, but it was stated that that in it of itself would not be adequate.

Anybody from our group that has other things that I might have left out?

Thank you.

[CLAPPING]