**IUPUI Mentoring Academy
Proposal from the**

MUSCLE

Mentoring Untenured Scholars for
Clinical and Legal Scholarship Excellence

Lea Shaver, Associate Professor of Law
Yvonne Dutton, Associate Professor of Law
Emily Morris, Associate Professor of Law
Margaret Ryznar, Associate Professor of Law
Lahny Silva, Associate Professor of Law
Diana Winters, Associate Professor of Law
Max Huffman, Professor of Law
Xuan-Thao Nguyen, Gerald L. Bepko Chair
Michael Pitts, Professor of Law

Lea Shaver, 317-278-4475
lbshaver@iupui.edu

Yvonne Dutton, 317-274-7729
ydutton@iupui.edu

1. Abstract

Law professors who received mentoring report greater career and institutional satisfaction (Haynes 2003). At American law schools, mentoring of faculty overwhelmingly takes the form of informal mentoring (Haynes 2006). Yet informal mentoring too often does not reach all potential protégés. Inadequate mentoring is also believed to be a significant factor in the extreme gender and racial disparities that persist in law faculty hiring and promotion.

We propose to build an evidence-based mentoring program at the Indiana University Robert H. McKinney School of Law that will enable early-career law faculty to successfully develop and advance a focused research agenda, become highly productive and accomplished scholars, succeed in developing a national and international reputation and attaining the rank of full professor, and make significant contributions to their specialty fields.

The target population for this intervention is the law school's cohort of pre-tenure faculty (six researchers and one clinician). All seven in the cohort are female; two are women of color. If this target group is successful in achieving tenure and promotion, the proportion of female full-rank faculty (including both research and clinical) at McKinney will rise from 30% to 40%. The proportion of female full-rank *research* faculty will rise from under 20% to over 30%, and the proportion of minority full-rank faculty will rise from 12.5% to 15%.

Members of the target group consistently state that they have the greatest unmet mentoring needs in research as opposed to teaching, service, or other areas. Senior faculty interviewed also identified research-focused mentoring as the top priority, in line with the law faculty's strong expectation that pre-tenure scholars will go up for tenure based on excellence in research. As an exception, one member of the group is a clinical faculty member pursuing long-term contract status based on excellence in teaching.

The intervention seeks to combine the advantages of both formal and informal mentoring. Protégés will be matched with a panel of mentors from the law school, across campus, and sister campuses, as appropriate to individual research interests or clinical teaching specialty. Protégés will also receive training in the "why and how" of cultivating their own network of informal mentors on a continuous basis.

Because of factors specific to the structure of legal research, it is particularly important for pre-tenure law faculty to develop a network of mentors "beyond the building." For this reason, enhanced travel funding is a critical component of the proposal. We seek the maximum amount of $10,000 in funding from the proposals committee, to be matched (and enhanced) by the law school for a total of $22,000 over two years.

Assessment of the intervention will take several forms, combining quantitative measures of subjective and objective indicia, narrative self-evaluations, and regular dialogue about how to improve the program. Documentation of the program's effectiveness will help the law school to seek funding to continue the program in the future. Even without additional funding, protégés will continue over their careers to reap the benefits of early participation.

2. Purpose and Goals

The target population for this intervention is the law school's all-female cohort of pre-tenure faculty. The focus of mentoring will be on achieving excellence in research or clinical teaching as the foundation of tenure and promotion. The program will address a gap in the law school's existing mentoring efforts by: raising awareness among the target population of the "why and how" of cultivating a network of mentors and providing financial support to pre-tenure faculty to build the academic connections beyond McKinney that are critical to developing their national and international. The end goals are to enhance scholarly achievement, ensure success in promotion and tenure, and promote satisfaction and retention of these faculty.

Supportive data

- Nationwide, law remains a male-dominated field, constituting half of all students but only 30% of full-rank faculty (Abdullina 2008).
- The underrepresentation of women at the McKinney School parallels the national trend; among full-rank clinical and teaching faculty, 28 are male and 12 are female (30%).
- Among McKinney's full-rank research faculty (excluding clinicians), the imbalance is even more pronounced: 25 are male and only 6 are female (19%).
- Among McKinney's full-rank faculty (both research and clinical), 35 are white and 5 are members of minority groups (12.5%).
- Literature identifies law faculty mentoring as significant to institutional satisfaction, socialization, and success in tenure and promotion. (Haynes 2009)
- Literature specific to the law field identifies faculty mentoring as crucial to diversifying the legal academia and overcoming barriers to success (Haynes 2009, Levit 2001).
- In interviews with law faculty about mentoring needs, both junior and senior faculty consistently identify research-focused mentoring as the top priority.
- Student evaluations indicate that McKinney's pre-tenure law scholars are already exceeding expectations in teaching, with an average score of 4.7 (out of 5.0).
- In interviews, McKinney's pre-tenure faculty members state that they have the greatest unmet mentoring needs in research (as opposed to teaching, service, or other areas).

Target population

The current cohort of pre-tenure faculty – six research faculty and one clinical faculty - is particularly important to the school for reasons of faculty diversity and the long-term health of the faculty. All seven faculty in the cohort are female; two are women of color. Four of the seven joined the faculty in 2012. Soon after, it became apparent that law schools nationwide are facing very difficult financial times due to declining enrollments. Because it may be several more years before the law school is in a position to resume hiring, the success of this cohort is particularly important to the law school's long-term health. Because this cohort is of a significant size relative to the faculty as a whole (47 full-time), it is anticipated that the achievements of this cohort will significantly impact the overall culture of the law school.

Mentoring for excellence

Members of the target group consistently state that they have the greatest unmet mentoring needs in research as opposed to teaching, service, or other areas. (The cohort is already well

exceeding expectations in teaching, with an average student evaluation score of 4.7 out of 5.0). Senior faculty also identified research-focused mentoring as the top priority.

The law school has a very strong expectation that all non-clinical faculty should go up for tenure and promotion based on excellence in research. The law school's pre-tenure research faculty also have a strong motivation to achieve this excellence, not merely for the purposes of tenure and promotion but also for the more fundamental purposes of advancing our research agendas, contributing to our profession and society as a whole, and fully enjoying our calling as scholars.

Yet achieving true excellence requires guidance, and legal scholars experience unique challenges in this respect. Traditionally, law faculty do not necessarily complete a PhD program, a context in which substantial informal mentoring would naturally take place. Additionally, traditional expectations in legal scholarship actively discourage coauthorship prior to tenure, depriving junior law faculty of yet another prime opportunity for informal mentoring. Thus there is a particular need in the law faculty for an intentional and structured program of research support and mentoring.

Measurable goals

- Participants are better informed of the mentoring resources found within McKinney Law School and the IUPUI campus.
- Participants express greater confidence that they know how to effectively cultivate a network of mentors to help them achieve excellence in research.
- Participants express greater confidence that they have access to the necessary resources to effectively cultivate a network of research mentors.
- Participants expand the network of scholars whom they view as mentors and report stronger relationships with the mentors in that network.
- Participants increase their frequency of research-related mentoring contacts (advising conversations, commenting on drafts, collaborations, visits, etc.)
- Participants report greater satisfaction with research-related mentorship.
- Participants report greater satisfaction with the progress of their research agendas.
- Participants report greater satisfaction with the research culture of the law school.
- Participants express greater preparation and motivation to serve as mentors themselves.
- Participants report more frequent invitations to present their research on an expenses-paid basis rather than needing to rely on personal, internal, or IUPUI funding.
- Participants report more frequent invitations to present and publish their work, placement of scholarship in more prestigious journals, grants, and other research honors.
- Participants achieve 100% success rate in promotion and tenure of participating faculty, including timely achievement of the rank of full professor.
- Participants achieve 50% success rate in election to the American Law Institute.
- Within five years, increase female full-rank faculty from 30% to 40%.
- Within five years, increase female full-rank research faculty from 20% to 30%.
- Within five years, increase minority full-rank faculty from 12.5% to 15%.

3. Methodology of Intervention

The intervention seeks to combine the benefits of formal and informal mentoring, with an emphasis on building mentor networks both inside the law school and beyond the building. Initially, participants will take part in a workshop to sensitize them to the value of mentoring for their careers and the resources available to them at the law school and IUPUI campus. They will also be formally matched with a panel of mentors from within the law school, the campus, and sister campuses. Importantly, protégés will be encouraged to initiate and cultivate informal mentoring relationships with potential mentors at other law schools. To facilitate this, protégés will receive travel support enabling them to attend a disciplinary conference or to arrange a visit to another institution, with a plan for how to use the travel to develop a sustainable mentorship network. Participants will assess their development at regular intervals and engage in activities designed to foster the culture of mentorship within the law school and strengthen future iterations of the program.

Combining formal and informal mentoring

Mentors provide protégés with both career and psycho-social support (Kram 1985). According to a metananalysis of empirical literature, individuals who have been mentored report higher compensation, more promotions, greater career satisfaction, commitment, and optimism that they will advance further. (Allen et al 2004) Mentoring may be informal (initiated by the participants) or formal (encouraged by the institution.) Protégés receiving informal mentoring report better satisfaction and outcomes than those receiving formal mentoring (Ragins & Cotton 1999). As these forms of mentoring are not mutually exclusive, a combination of informal and formal mentoring is likely to be most effective.

Informal mentoring remains the predominant mode in which younger American law faculty members are socialized to the expectations and methods of legal research and collegiality. Only 23% of law faculty report receiving formal mentoring, while 75% report receiving informal mentoring. (Haynes 2009) Law faculty protégés are also substantially more likely to characterize the mentoring they received as *effective* when it was informal (81%) rather than formal (56%). (Haynes 2009, 47)

Unfortunately, the legal academy's reliance on informal mentoring is problematic for female and minority law faculty. Law school faculty remain overwhelmingly white and male (Abdullina 2008, Ward 2008, Haynes 2009). Haynes reports that formal mentoring programs are "virtually nonexistent" at American law schools; "A further but more injurious consequence of the lack of formal mentoring programs is the likelihood that women and people of color are intentionally or unintentionally excluded from these informal mentoring relationships because they are demographically different from law faculty mentors." (*49)*

Activating mentors beyond the building

Interviews with the target population also highlighted the particular importance of mentoring "beyond the building." Law departments tend to seek a *diversity* of research interests in hiring, in order to offer the broadest variety of courses to students, each taught by expert faculty. Thus, law faculty often do not have colleagues in the building with intersecting research agendas. For this reason, research collaborations in the law most commonly take place "beyond the building" - between faculty from two or more different

law schools who share a specialty field of interest. Thus, the organic opportunities for research mentoring through collaboration that would be found within many IUPUI departments are lacking here. To achieve them, pre-tenure faculty must reach "beyond the building" to activate networks of mentors and collaborators within their field.

Unfortunately, McKinney's pre-tenure faculty members are at a disadvantage in developing these cross-campus networks and mentors. Scholars in major cities on the East or West Coast can travel cheaply and frequently to many nearby law schools – to present research, keep abreast of scholarly trends, network with colleagues, and cultivate mentors and collaborators. Being based in Indianapolis, essentially all of our travel requires a flight and hotel. Unfortunately, McKinney's budget for faculty travel had to be cut by 11% in July 2012 as a fiscal austerity measure.

Pre-tenure faculty currently receive no preference in the allocation of travel support funds. During this early-career stage, law faculty are the most dependent on funding from their own institution to support travel expenses. At present, two of the pre-tenure faculty members (without dependents) report spending substantial personal funds to facilitate the travel they view as necessary to their professional success. Others (with dependents) report that they are simply not traveling as often as they know they should.

Components of the program

Formal Mentor-Protégé Assignments
• Assign each participating faculty member a formal mentoring team composed of more senior faculty from within McKinney Law School
• Assist participating faculty members with interdisciplinary research interests in identifying suitable disciplinary mentors in other IU departments
• Assist participating faculty members in identifying mentors at the IU Maurer School of Law in Bloomington (who may share a research specialty)

Nurturing the Culture of Mentorship
• Host an initial lunch or evening gathering focused on helping participating faculty members identify how to best make use of their mentors (both formal and informal)
• Make participation in a mentorship and reading of colleagues' draft research elements of the law school's annual Faculty Achievements Report (the basis of assigning bonuses.)
• At least annually, bestow a formal recognition upon an "MVP Mentor" voted by participating faculty members to a member of the McKinney faculty.

Workshops and Travel
• Host a lunchtime gathering before the spring submissions season to guide faculty on norms and strategies for placing articles with law reviews.
• Provide funding for participating faculty members to attend a conference notable for its mentoring component, or a conference specific to the faculty member's research specialty.
• Provide funding for participating faculty members to travel to another law school to spend time with a mentor in their research specialty, while also presenting a work in progress for feedback from that institution's faculty.
• Provide funding for participating faculty members to fly in to McKinney's campus a mentor from another institution. Participating faculty members will present a research work in progress for comments from the mentor-in-residence.

Participation among pre-tenure faculty members will be on a purely voluntary basis. From polling, we anticipate that all eligible faculty will choose to participate.

Timeline

Notification of proposal funding (Spring 2015)
Notification of eligible faculty members (Spring 2015)
Identification of participating pre-tenure faculty members (Spring 2015)
Present initiative to law school faculty at faculty meeting (Spring 2015)
Initial workshop on the "Why and How of Mentoring for Research" (Summer 2015)
Review evaluations of initial "Why and How" workshop (Summer 2015)
Identify mentors within law school, IUPUI, and sister campuses (Summer 2015)
Incorporate mentorship items into Faculty Annual Report (Summer 2015)
*Participants initiate contact with mentors (Summer and ongoing)
*Participants plan travel to cultivate mentors beyond the building (Summer 2015)
*Distribute travel funding to participating faculty members (Summer 2015)
*Participants travel to mentors beyond the building (Summer and ongoing)
*Extend invitations for mentors-in-residence event, as applicable (Summer 2015)
*Distribute Faculty Annual Report to faculty members (December 2015)
*Receive completed Faculty Annual Reports from faculty members (February 2016)
*Host mentor-in-residence event (January 2016 and/or August 2017)
*Host workshop on law journal submissions process and strategies (January 2016)
*Participating faculty members assess and improve the program (March 2016)
*Selection of the law school's "MVP Research Mentor" (March 2016)
*Presentation of the "MVP Research Mentor" Award (April/May 2016)
*Conduct empirical assessment of program outcomes (May 2016)
*Discuss program results with senior administration (Summer 2016)
*Look for additional funding to continue/enhance the program (ongoing)

Items highlighted with an asterisk will repeat annually.

4. Budget

Our proposal seeks the maximum amount of $10,000 from the Committee. The Law School commits to cover the remaining $12,000 in the form of travel funding.

BUDGET ITEM	YEAR 1	YEAR 2
Food for meetings (3 per year)	$450	$450
Plaque/gift for Mentoring MVP	$50	$50
Travel subsidies ($1500 x 7 participants)	$10,500	$10,500
TOTAL:	$22,000	

The travel elements of the program proposal are the most resource-intensive, but are considered critical to the success of the program.

We assume that a protégé can organize a two-day trip to another institution on a self-organized mentorship mission for approximately $750. Alternatively, the protégé could attend a national conference with a substantial mentoring component for around $1500 (or at least, $1500 would make a substantial contribution to the total expenses of such a trip).

In the first year, we seek to enable all seven participating faculty members to conduct one self-organized trip per semester, or to attend one annual meeting or subject-area conference per year, at a cost of $1500/faculty member or $10,500 total.

In the second year, the funds could be allocated differently based upon: 1) the participants' reports of how well they used their first year funds, 2) the participants' in-time contributions to the success of the program, and 3) the participants' choice to pool funds to bring one or more mentors-in-residence to McKinney.

5. Assessment

Assessment is crucial to improve future iterations for the program, to determine whether the law school should continue to fund the program after its initial two-year phrase, and to provide an evidentiary basis for seeking other sources of funding. Our assessment strategy relies on four components:

1. **An entry, midway, and exit survey to obtain quantitative benchmarks.**
2. **An annual narrative assessment by each participating faculty member.**
3. **Annual meetings for collective self-assessment and program improvement.**
4. **Continuous solicitation of suggestions for improvement.**

Subjective indicia of program success:
Perceived value of the program among participating faculty
- o   Whether they have broadened and deepened their network of mentors.
- o   Whether they are getting more out of their mentoring relationships.
- o   Whether they have clarity about how to achieve their research goals.
- o   Whether they are satisfied that they are achieving success in their research.
Satisfaction with opportunities for professional growth at McKinney
- o   Whether they feel satisfied with the institutional support for research growth.
- o   Whether they would rate research support as better than at other institutions.

Objective indicia of program success:
External recognition of research achievement and quality
- o   Number of participating faculty placing articles in top journals.
- o   Number of participating faculty presenting on high-status panels.
- o   Number of participating faculty obtaining external grant money.
- o   Number of participating faculty earning external prizes for scholarship.
- o   Total number of articles completed by participating faculty.
Retention of participating faculty members
- o   Participating protégés are achieving tenure and promotion.
- o   Participating protégés are not being "picked off" by other institutions.
- o   Achieve target of full-rank faculty that is 40% female.
- o   Achieve target of full-rank faculty that is 15% minority.

6. Unit Support

Of the seven pre-tenure faculty members within the target group, six have already expressed a strong interest in participating in the mentoring program as proposed and have served as members of the proposal committee named above.

The proposal process has been strongly supported by the senior faculty, including members of the Research Committee and the Executive Committee, and senior faculty who shared advice on the proposal in their personal capacities, in addition to those who formally served as school representatives in the proposal process.

The Dean is highly supportive of the value of mentoring generally, including recognizing the potential of efforts invested in mentoring to make our faculty more effective at mentoring law students. The Dean is particularly supportive of the target group focus and has confirmed the law school's ability to make the matching grant.

A sizeable group of volunteers has emerged to join the ad-hoc committee to plan the project and proposal, consisting of both junior and senior faculty. Additional members of the faculty have provided support by sharing ideas and advice in one-on-one conversations.

7. Sustainability

The sustainability strategy for this two-year program has four prongs.

First, several components of the program will not require significant ongoing financial support. This is true, for example, of the mentoring teams that draw upon mentors from McKinney law school, other departments, and ongoing campuses. This is also true of the annual "Mentoring MVP award." These mechanisms will serve to continue a greater cultural commitment to mentoring.

Second and most importantly, mentoring is by its nature a renewable resource. Participants will use their initial training and early travel funding to identify and cultivate beyond-the-building mentors. Once established through an in-person connection, these relationships can be continued for years to come, including through inexpensive means such as phone calls. In this way, a one-time investment will pay dividends throughout the scholars' careers. Participants will also be empowered to continue cultivating new informal mentors throughout their careers.

Third, we anticipate that as pre-tenure scholars build their networks "beyond the building," further invitations to travel on an expenses-paid basis will emerge. These invitations are common in legal academia, but often come through mentorship relationships or as a result of the recognition and familiarity forged through earlier meetings.

Fourth, the documentation and assessment that accompany this project – to the extent they demonstrate a significant return on investment – will provide a basis for seeking new funding from outside sources or most wisely allocating internal resources.

8. Conclusion

By investing in formal mentoring, McKinney School of Law can help its pre-tenure faculty leverage the benefits of both formal and informal mentoring to achieve their career, teaching, and research goals, and significantly improve the diversity of its full-rank faculty

9. Bibliography

Abdullina, P. "2007–2008 AALS Statistical Report on Law Faculty: Association of American Law Schools Statistical Report on Law School Faculty and Candidates for Law Faculty Positions." 2008.

Allen, T.D. at al, "Career Benefits Associated with Mentoring for Protégés: A Meta-Analysis." Journal of Applied Psychology, 2004, 127-36.

Farley, C. H. "Confronting Expectations: Women in the Legal Academy." Yale Journal of Law and Feminism, 1996, 8, 333–358.

Haynes, R.K. "An investigation of mentoring and socialization among law faculty." Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Leanring, 2009, 41-52.

Haynes, R.K. "An Exploration and Assessment of Mentoring within the American Law Professoriate." 2006. ERIC Online Submission (PhD thesis)

Kram, K. E. (1985). Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.

Levit, N. "Keeping Feminism in Its Place: Sex Segregation and the Domestication of Female Academics." Kansas Law Review, 2001, 775–807.

Ward, L. "Female Faculty in Male-Dominated Fields: Law, Medicine, and Engineering." New Directions for Higher Education, 2008, 63-72.