In Homer’s *Odyssey*, Telemachus, the son of Odysseus, is placed in the care of the wise old man Mentor while his father goes off to the Trojan War. Mentor teaches and advises the boy, but as he grows up, the goddess Athena takes the form of Mentor to approach Telemachus and offer him the wisdom and guidance he needs to find his father and reclaim his birthright.

Thus it was that even at its earliest conceptions, a “mentor” was not a single individual. In fact, Telemachus needs both Mentor and Athena to succeed in his quest. And recent research shows that the multiple mentor model—academic mentoring by way of peer groups—is emerging as a powerful alternative to the one-on-one model. A 2012 study that evaluated a peer mentoring group that met over four years found that the benefits included improved workplace satisfaction, social connection, scholarly productivity, collaboration, and more. A second study that same year showed that participants in five academic medicine mentoring groups reported after one year an increase in their satisfaction with academic achievement, improvement in medical literature search skills, and improved ability to critically evaluate the literature.

In 2013, the Center for Faculty Development and Excellence (CFDE) launched a pilot peer mentoring program aimed at exactly those sorts of improvements and advantages for faculty below associate level. Eight mentoring groups of peers, each group facilitated by a senior faculty member, focused on informal meetings and networking as well as more formal professional development opportunities. Peer groups combined junior faculty from different schools with the intention of creating a sense of a cohort that spans the university. From January to May of 2014, the groups gathered for development activities that helped drive the participants toward professional goals they had set for themselves.

The evaluations of the program after its conclusion were, as CFDE director Pamela Scully puts it, “interesting and somewhat conflicting: some people really...”
liked the interdisciplinary nature of the peer groups, while others did not. Seventy-seven percent of the mentees, however, said they had met at least one of their goals during the semester. From the mentors we heard that they would like training on mentoring.”

Scully goes on to say that the CFDE is using the current 2014-15 academic year to investigate mentoring best practices beyond Emory. “This will add to the study we did this past summer on mentoring of faculty at Emory,” she says. “One of our goals is to find out what mentoring needs to happen at the central level and what is best done in the individual schools.”

In 2013-14 the Commission on the Liberal Arts also took a keen interest in mentoring on the Emory campus, ranging from faculty mentoring programs to those that focus on graduate and undergraduate students. In February 2014, the Commission and the CFDE co-sponsored a panel discussion that featured several successful mentoring initiatives within the professional schools, the health sciences, and Emory College. The Commission also developed an extensive annotated inventory of mentoring programs around campus, from student-alumni programs to those benefiting faculty and staff.

This issue of the Academic Exchange explores some of those programs—new, ongoing, and even one from the past. Prachi Sharma (Yerkes) writes of her experiences participating in the CFDE’s pilot peer mentoring program last year. Pat Marsteller (biology and the Center for Science Education) makes an argument for team mentoring as modeled in the CFDE’s pilot program. Cathryn Johnson and Barry Ryan from the Laney Graduate School describe that school’s new mentoring project that focuses on faculty and graduate student relationships as well as graduate/undergraduate student relationships. Then Sheryl Herron and Natasha Southworth from the Center for Injury Control explain the longtime, successful mentoring program in that Center.

A Q&A with Kim Loudermilk (Emory College) examines the lessons of the “Passages” mentoring program for faculty, which existed from 1999 to 2004. A second Q&A with Peter Brown (anthropology and global health), 2014 winner of the Cuttino Award in Mentoring, reveals one experienced mentor’s secrets of success. Deborah Bruner of the nursing school, who was a vice-chair of the Commission on the Liberal Arts, then posits an idea of how lifelong mentoring programs within the university might be structured. To conclude the issue, Pamela Tipton from the Goizueta Business School discusses some of the effective mentoring programs in the business school and why they work.

—Allison Adams, Editor

The multiple mentor model—academic mentoring by way of peer groups—is emerging as a powerful alternative to the one-on-one model.
last year, an announcement from the Center for Faculty Development and Excellence (CFDE) piqued my interest. It called for a pilot mentoring project led by Debra Houry, an Emergency Room physician and a faculty member in the School of Medicine. I had heard of such programs at higher levels such as the HERS (Higher Education Resource Services) leadership institutes for women in higher level faculty and administrative roles, but not at the junior faculty level. I responded by email to the announcement and expressed interest in the program.

One of the aspects of the invitation that got my attention was that the program was structured as a “peer mentoring” program rather than a structure of senior-to-junior mentoring pairs. I was a bit skeptical about that before it began: when you think of a mentor, you imagine a person who has already “been there and done that,” and not someone who is still figuring out the ropes. I was wrong! I soon realized that even some colleagues in the early stages of their careers had already faced and successfully overcome the same issues that others faced now, and they were equipped to give excellent suggestions. People who had identified book writing as one of their goals benefited from the experiences of others who had already checked it off their list. Some members who had excellent time-management and workflow skills helped others (like me) with their tips. But we also received guidance and wisdom from more senior faculty, such as Nadine Kaslow (professor of psychiatry) and Sheryl Heron (professor of emergency medicine), who spoke in the orientation session on how formal and informal mentoring leads to valuable, lifelong professional relationships and opportunities for career development for both the junior and senior faculty members in the mentoring relationships.

When the program launched, all the participants had been divided into groups based on their departments/career goals and what they wanted to achieve by the end of the program, such as refining skills in grant writing, writing and publishing, and teaching. Each group was assigned a senior faculty mentor. Our group’s senior mentor made a point of attending every meeting and promptly answering all of the group’s emails.

Even though I had already started communicating with my group members through emails before the orientation session, it was here that I actually met all of them. It was an impressive, likeable, pleasant group of women from different disciplines. I was struck by the fact that even though everyone was extremely busy, they all had a common motivation to move forward by overcoming professional hurdles and helping others do the same. Because of this common thread, it was easy to meet monthly.

Working with my group, I have been awed by how focused, generous, and helpful everyone is. Based on mutual suggestions, we usually pick a topic of common interest and priority for discussion for every meeting. The topics have included writing a tenure narrative, managing workplace conflicts, interacting with students, and finding the right balance between grant writing/research time and teaching responsibilities. We also got suggestions from the program’s leaders about how to deal with issues raised by members. Even now, after the official pilot project has ended, my group still meets, and we hope to continue our association. I am sure that I would have figured out a way to keep going professionally by myself, but it was very helpful to see how other professionals in similar shoes are moving forward and what they are doing right, so that I can apply their advice and examples to my own situation. My heartfelt thanks to those who initiated this program and brought my group together. I can only see benefits of continuing to offer the program to junior faculty members so that they can have a similarly rewarding experience.

Even colleagues in the early stages of their careers had already faced and successfully overcome the same issues that others faced now, and they were equipped to give excellent suggestions.
Whether you are an undergraduate, a graduate student, a postdoc, a faculty member, or a university president, everyone needs mentors. I deeply believe that everyone needs multiple mentors at all stages of their personal and career development.

According to the AAAS’s *Mentoring Matters*, mentoring is often cited as a critical factor in:
- Programs to increase the participation of groups traditionally underrepresented in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields
- The decision of undergraduate students to pursue graduate education in STEM, particularly students who participate in undergraduate research programs
- The retention of students in STEM doctoral programs
- Promotion and advancement of employees in academia, government, and industry

Teacher, trainer, director, coach, sponsor, counselor, guide, friend, tutor, expert, listener, adviser, role model, director: Can one person be all of these? Another reason for considering mentoring teams is that at all stages of a career we may have multiple needs. New faculty may desire a writing coach, a grant-writing mentor, or someone who understands university politics. They may want assistance navigating the discipline, developing a national reputation, or understanding the tenure and promotion process. They may want a mentor for improving teaching or curriculum development. Rarely are all these skills found in one person.

Being a mentor is a tough job. It requires patience, understanding, time, and consummate tact. Mentors must balance evaluative responsibilities with advocacy. It’s part of the responsibility to critique your written, oral, and class or lab work; research design ideas; and dissertation progress. Mentors need to assess the protégée’s potential to succeed in the discipline. A good mentor can help a protégée find the right match for their skills and potentials, without destroying dreams.

Ideally a good mentor for undergraduate and graduate students will help the student optimize the educational experience in classes, labs, and advising settings. They will be knowledgeable and willing to recommend coursework, appropriate projects, internships, and career pathways. They will develop expertise in mentoring the research process, including grantsmanship, technical writing, design of experiments, data analysis, teaching improvement, and next steps for the developmental path of interest to the student. Particularly in the research setting, the mentor will socialize students into the disciplinary culture, making sure they are aware of written policies and procedures and unwritten norms of conduct. They will introduce the protégée into professional networks, ensure that they understand responsible ethical conduct, and guide them through expectations for tenure and promotion. A great mentor also uses incentives, gentle nudges, and constructive critique and planning to encourage the protégée to develop to the fullest capacity.

A good mentor can teach unofficial lessons, such as who the powers are in the department, institution, or field; how people find out about and get nominated for special opportunities (fellowships, awards, prizes); what are the leading journals; which organizations are important to join; what conferences are important to attend; how job searches are done;
and how to negotiate, raise issues and concerns, and when to take risks. For undergraduates, graduate fellows and postdocs, mentors should be able to provide advice about jobs in industry and government as well as different levels of the academy or be prepared to refer their students to knowledgeable people.

I often tell students that choosing a mentor or a team of mentors should be given the same consideration as choosing a life partner. It’s a relationship that develops in phases similar to group work theory: forming, storming, norming, performing, and at its best evolving into collegiality and friendship. The same kinds of approaches that make relationships work are essential to good mentoring. Clear communication, clear expectations on both sides, exceptional listening skills, renegotiation as the relationship develops and changes, deep concern for the protégées’ continued growth and personal and professional development. No two relationships are alike because the needs of both parties in each relationship differ. A mentor must be flexible, willing to change the approach to fit the protégée’s needs.

Both mentors and protégées need to set boundaries and limits since each person has other duties and obligations beyond the mentor-protégée relationship. A good mentor will teach students what to ask for and what is reasonable for mentor to provide, including the field-specific unwritten rules.

Learning to mentor
The book Entering Mentoring (Handelsman 2005) provides a syllabus, workshops, and readings for reaching graduate students, postdocs, and new faculty in the sciences. Such trainings have been proven to improve mentor and mentee perceptions and experiences. Some of the materials covered include

- Getting started
- Learning to communicate
- Goals and expectations
- Identifying and resolving challenges and issues
- Evaluating our progress
- Elements of good mentoring
- Mentoring philosophy
- Career development

Career development can include

- Teaching and mentoring philosophy
- Letters of recommendation
- Personnel management
- Interaction with own mentors
- Inclusion of materials from other disciplines
- Complex case studies, discussion guides

It can also involve “individual development plans” that identify skills, strengths, values, and interests and permit career exploration and goal setting in research areas, networking, and professional development.

Faculty mentoring programs often focus on junior faculty and show that faculty who have formal planning such as individual development plans succeed and are more satisfied in their positions. They work best when mentees are also coached on what mentors can do and when they are not evaluative, but more aligned with coaching.

Paying it forward in cascades
While many programs at Emory take advantage of peer and near peer mentoring, only a few purposefully build in tiered or “cascade” mentoring. Mentoring cascades are the real-life version of “paying it forward.” Mentors at all levels reach back to mentor the people coming up the pathway and lift them by making all the implicit rules explicit and encouraging persistence. Faculty mentor postdocs, grad students, and some undergrads. Postdocs mentor grad students, undergrads and peers. Grad student reach back to undergrads at previous institutions and here at Emory.

The advantage of mentoring cascades is that often these forms of mentoring eliminate age and cultural barriers and emphasize building a community and also reaching out to others to share what you have gained from mentoring!

Teaching and mentoring are inextricably intertwined. An excellent teacher mentors students, helping them find their own best vocation that uses their special talents to make a difference in the world. An excellent teacher believes and affirms in her teaching that all students can learn and is disappointed when all do not. An excellent teacher
creates an atmosphere simultaneously welcoming and challenging to all her students by inviting all her students to reach beyond the text, to extend their learning, to apply it in new contexts, to envision the future. Engaging students in and out of class and mentoring their development is the most rewarding aspect of my job.

Let me illustrate with an example. A few years ago a young man in one of my classes asked if we could do a directed reading to explore some of the texts we had mentioned in class. He showed up with seven of his closest friends and we spent a semester discussing several important works on behavior and evolution over coffee and pizza. Each of those students became close advisees, and after nearly ten years we still keep in touch, following each other’s progress.

With graduate students and undergraduates, mentoring often involves getting to know the whole person, their aims and aspirations, their qualms about the future. Over coffee, lunch, or walking across campus together, I always try to take time to ask about the student’s family and goals. Connecting students to the right resources or empowering them to bring up difficult questions with their faculty or research mentors requires that you be open, listen carefully, and know them as persons. That rarely happens fully within the classroom setting.

An excellent teacher/mentor understands students: their needs, their rhythms, and their goals. She urges them to ever greater striving without setting them against one another in destructive competition. She engenders collaboration, modeling and encouraging them to teach one another, to develop a mastery of expertise and share it. She is sensitive to the feelings and emotions of individual students. She motivates and inspires.

Every day I hope to be a little more like her. 

MORE RESOURCES


Research Mentor Training from the Wisconsin Center for Education Research: www.researchmentortraining.org


Dolan EL, Johnson D. (2010), The undergraduate-postgraduate-faculty triad: unique functions and tensions associated with undergraduate research experiences at research universities CBE Life Sci Educ, 10:543–553 (www.lifescied.org/content/9/4/543)

My Individual Development Plan, Science Careers: myidp.sciencecareers.org

National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity: www.facultydiversity.org/

National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity, Re-Thinking Mentoring: Building Communities Of Inclusion, Support & Accountability: www.facultydiversity.org/?page=rethinkingmentornm&terms=%22mentor+and+map%22
Mentorship is a cornerstone of graduate education. Not only does the mentor-student relationship shape the graduate student experience, but it can also have a lasting impact on a student’s career. Indeed, many current faculty can point to the relationships with their own mentors as major influences in the direction of their careers and in their own mentoring practices. In national conversations, mentorship is increasingly discussed as important to the recruitment, retention, and progress of graduate students. It is also a critical component to student professional development, particularly as students negotiate career options beyond their graduate studies.

Questions to ask ourselves

What does it mean to be a good mentor? What does a good mentoring relationship look like? What do students expect of their advisors and mentors? What practices do faculty believe to be characteristic of good mentors and advisors? In major research universities such as Emory, what should the mentoring expectations of faculty be as they try to balance their advising responsibilities and their own research? How do faculty mentor students whose careers interests or trajectories significantly differ from their own? What is the student’s responsibility in strengthening the mentor relationship? How can graduate schools strengthen mentorship?

No single document or dedicated project can answer all of these questions. And the answers to some of them will naturally evolve over time to meet the changing demands of students and faculty, and of higher education. With these points in mind, the Laney Graduate School Executive Council is leading a project on best practices in graduate mentoring in 2014-15. The LGS Executive Council is the elected body of graduate faculty that oversees curricular and related policy matters pertaining to graduate programs. The Council also provides critical feedback and recommendations to LGS leadership on both ongoing and emerging issues of significance.

Establishing best practices

Mentorship has become a primary focus in LGS professional development programs as students and faculty negotiate new realities in the changing job market, as well as emerging areas of professional opportunities for students. But to date, there have been no documented best practices that capture those activities and behaviors that constitute good mentoring in the Laney Graduate School.

To address this, in spring 2014, the Executive Council initiated a mentoring project, the mission of which is two-fold: 1) to enhance the quality of mentoring in graduate faculty; and, 2) to prepare LGS students to become good mentors themselves. The project’s goal is to produce a best practices document that serves as a reference and guide for students, faculty, program leadership, and LGS as it develops new programming.

To launch the project, LGS and the Executive Council hosted an inaugural event on September 18, 2014, featuring keynote remarks by Jeffery Gibeling (Vice Provost of Graduate Education and Dean of Graduate Studies), who oversees the Mentoring Critical Transitions Program at UC-Davis. The event also featured a moderated panel discussion with Gibeling, graduate faculty, and graduate students.

To establish a baseline of perceptions and practices, LGS solicited information from each graduate program on current mentoring in summer 2014. In fall 2014, LGS administered surveys to both graduate students and graduate faculty to assess experiences, expectations, and mentoring processes across LGS. The survey results are being discussed with the Executive Council and in discussions with the directors of graduate studies.

Based on the survey responses, discussions with directors of graduate studies, and conversations emerging from the inaugural event, a sub-committee...
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ee of the Executive Council will begin preparing a draft of a mentoring “best practices” document. The Graduate Student Council, along with several directors of graduate studies, will also be involved in the design and direction of this document. In consultation with LGS leadership throughout the academic year, the Executive Council aims to have a final product ready in fall 2015.

A best practices document is important for several reasons:

**Accountability:** Mentoring relationships, by nature, vary across disciplines and research contexts. They also vary according to culture, experience, and individual needs and expectations. The document would help to define and manage mentoring expectations and develop pathways to negotiate and communicate those expectations and needs. A best practices document builds in some accountability in developing and sustaining an effective mentor relationship because it establishes a broad-stroked baseline of practices against which the relationship can be assessed by the student, the faculty member, program leadership, and LGS.

**Training:** A best practices document would be a valuable tool in the systematic training and preparation of faculty and students. As a reference, the document could be incorporated into LGS longstanding programs such as TATTOO (Teaching Assistant Training and Teaching Opportunity) and Pathways Beyond the Professoriate, into new programming such as the NIH-funded Broadening Experiences for Scientific Training program and the NIH-funded Initiative to Maximize Student Development program, and in new training programs developed specifically to address mentoring.

**LGS Programming:** Mentorship is a component of several relatively new LGS professionalization programs, such as the LGS Jones Program in Ethics and the NIH Pathfinder Series, and including those that are federally funded (noted above in Training). A reference for best mentoring practices would not only help LGS shape new programming, but also signal to extramural funders that mentorship is a priority of LGS.

**Eleanor Main Graduate Faculty Mentor Award:** And finally, a best practices document would also guide the selection criteria for a new Laney Graduate School faculty award, the Eleanor Main Graduate Faculty Mentor Award, to be established in 2014-15. LGS graduate faculty is a diverse group of nearly 1,000 distinguished researchers and teachers representing almost every school at Emory, as well as partner institutions in Atlanta and across the globe. This award will be presented to an LGS graduate faculty mentor annually at commencement and carry a monetary prize. In addition to honoring the important legacy of Dr. Eleanor Main at Emory, it will be a visible commitment of the importance of mentorship in graduate education at Emory, as well as recognition of those that do it well.

**An ongoing effort**

There are many moments when mentoring interventions propel a student’s graduate career forward. Mentorship can come from a primary advisor, from faculty in another program, or from a network of individuals that guide a student in specific areas, from research to navigating the job market.

Establishing best practices in graduate mentoring is an opportunity for all of us to learn about the many rewards and challenges of graduate mentoring, to understand student needs from the students themselves, and to identify areas where LGS might support and strengthen mentorship with dedicated programming and resources.

The Executive Council project is just the beginning step in what LGS plans to be an ongoing effort to create space for discussions and to offer training to both faculty and students as their needs and challenges evolve.
The central mission of the Emory Center for Injury Control’s (ECIC) Faculty Mentorship Program is to foster interest in injury prevention and support the pursuits of injury prevention researchers, including physicians, public health and sociology professionals, and injury prevention specialists in metropolitan Atlanta. Its three primary goals are to 1) build the field of injury prevention by supporting the professional development of faculty members at local universities; 2) enhance the knowledge and skills of faculty currently working in the injury prevention field by sharing their expertise with one another; and 3) strengthen the interdisciplinary and collaborative relationships among faculty across universities in the metro Atlanta area.

The Faculty Mentorship Program falls under the ECIC programmatic and educational umbrella. It works by pairing senior faculty mentors with junior faculty mentees. This year-long program was launched in 2010 with an inaugural cohort of eighteen faculty from five Atlanta area universities. The senior faculty were matched with their junior faculty colleagues based on mutual areas of interest and the mentors’ academic expertise. The nine pairs were encouraged to meet regularly and focus on professional development opportunities for the junior faculty participants.

In 2012 we assembled the second cohort and modified the program using a more structured approach, modeling it after Emory Learning Services’ successful Mentor Emory program. There were two mandatory formal trainings during the year as well as an introductory meeting and a year-end celebration. In addition, the mentor/mentee pairs were strongly encouraged to meet for at least two hours every month. This second cohort consisted of six mentor/mentee pairs from four universities and across various disciplines (Table 1). They focused on professional development opportunities for the mentees, such as coauthorship of scholarly papers, grant and proposal development support, and collaboration. In addition, there were informal meetings and networking opportunities within the field of injury prevention. Building upon each other’s strengths and experiences, each member of a pair worked to foster a new relationship driven by the mentee’s professional goals. This structured approach was well received and enabled mentors and mentees to gain useful information about mutual areas of interest and to socialize regularly.

When soliciting mentors, we highlighted the benefits they could expect from participating, such as increased motivation to see junior faculty succeed; exposure to a new perspective from junior faculty; a chance to hone their coaching, leadership, and management skills; and most importantly, to foster growth within the injury prevention field. For mentees, the clear benefits included career guidance; exposure to diverse perspectives and experiences; focused attention on academic advancement; and an opportunity to identify gaps in skill sets needed for professional advancement.

Both cohorts in the Faculty Mentorship Program achieved great success. For example, one of the junior faculty earned a promotion from assistant to associate professor; papers were published by the mentor/mentee pairs including a manuscript written by Danner and Heron in 2012 titled “Health Outcome Disparities in Trauma Care” in the Western Journal of Emergency Medicine; and one of the pairs wrote a successful grant application to fund and expand work on the immunologic link between intimate partner violence and HIV in Africa. Post-program evaluations from participants revealed that half of the pairs accomplished all of the goals they had listed in their mentorship agreements, and the other half achieved some but not all of their goals.

At the outset of each mentoring relationship, the two faculty members created a mentoring agreement (also adapted from Mentor Emory). The agreement was a signed document between the mentor and mentee that included, among other things, statements about individual style and work ethic; preferred meeting dates and times; promotion trajectory with a focus on education, scholarship, and service; and target dates for action items. The agreement also stipulated that the participants would gather information about
what would be of most benefit to their relationship. For example, mentees would have a goal of publishing a manuscript by a certain date or aim to meet the deadline for promotion for the upcoming year. This structured approach effectively spelled out the individual and shared responsibilities of the team.

At the end of the program, we asked participants to evaluate and provide feedback that we could use to improve the program. Notable suggestions for improvement included extending the mentorship program beyond the allotted one year, increasing the number of sessions on statistics, and offering faculty development tailored to the mentees’ needs and geographic variability in the location of the group meetings (for instance, outside Atlanta).

As the director for education and training for ECIC, I oversee the Faculty Mentorship Program and served as a faculty mentor in the second year of the program’s inception. I am delighted to say it has been a great opportunity for faculty from different schools to come together and work toward individual and mutual career goals. My life at Emory began in 1996 as a fellow in the ECIC, and I was fortunate to have Nadine Kaslow as my mentor. Through her I learned what a mentor is and how a mentee can benefit from senior leadership and expertise. Our mentoring relationship is strong and our friendship even stronger. Nadine and I have taught lectures together on mentoring, including a lecture to the other mentors and mentees in the ECIC Mentorship Program. Our highlight was receiving an award from the President’s Commission on the Status of Women that highlighted our successful mentoring relationship.

In the end, my most rewarding experience was forming a professional and personal relationship with Omar Danner, a trauma surgeon at Morehouse School of Medicine. I was his faculty mentor in the second year of the program. We co-authored a paper, worked together on the Reach One/Each One community program for underprivileged youth in Atlanta, and wrote letters of support for each other’s promotion. Omar has been promoted to associate professor and I have been promoted to full professor. The joys and satisfaction of our shared success speaks volumes to the impact that mentoring can have for both junior and senior faculty, and the ECIC mentoring program is one shining example of why and how mentoring works. 

Dedicated to Dr. Debra Houry, Director Emerita and shining light of the ECIC. Thanks, Deb.

When soliciting mentors, we highlighted the benefits of participating, such as increased motivation to see junior faculty succeed; exposure to a new perspective from junior faculty; a chance to hone their coaching, leadership, and management skills; and most importantly, to foster growth within the injury prevention field.

---

**TABLE 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MENTEES</th>
<th>MENTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ameeta Kalokhe, MD, MSc</td>
<td>Rob Stephenson, PhD, MSc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory University</td>
<td>Emory University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesha Ellis, PhD</td>
<td>Deb Houry, MD, MPH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morehouse School of Medicine</td>
<td>Emory University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omar Danner, MD</td>
<td>Sheryl Heron, MD, MPH, FACEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morehouse School of Medicine</td>
<td>Emory University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dajun Dai, PhD</td>
<td>Phaedra Corso, PhD, MPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeConté Dill, DrPH, MPH</td>
<td>Monica Swahn, PhD, MPH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morehouse School of Medicine</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan Greenbaum, MD</td>
<td>Ruth Shults, PhD, MPH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie V. Blank Center for Safe and Healthy Children, Children’s Healthcare of Atlanta</td>
<td>Centers for Disease Control and Prevention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Academic Exchange: Can you generally describe Passages?

Kim Loudermilk: Passages began as a structured mentoring program for women faculty at Emory. It grew out of the President’s Commission on the Status of Women (PCSW). The Faculty Concerns Committee of the Commission had been talking about mentoring, and people felt that mentoring was very hit-or-miss for them, particularly when they were junior faculty members. So that committee decided to put together a structured mentoring program for women. They felt that men got better mentoring on their own, through networking, because of the fact that there were so many more male faculty members than female faculty members, particularly in 1999. They felt there was a particular need for mentoring for women for a variety of reasons.

It was successfully piloted in 1999 under the auspices of the PCSW. In 2000, the program was moved to the Office of the Provost, and I was hired, at least in part, to be its director. The idea was that junior women who wanted to be paired with a mentor would complete an application to the Passages program and send it to me. I would then send out a call for mentors and ask people—women—who were willing to be mentors to tell me what their strengths were. We purposely paired junior faculty with senior women who were not in their department or program but who were in the same school. We wanted women to be feel free to talk about all of the problems they might be facing, including departmental problems, but we wanted them to be in the same school because the tenure and promotion guidelines for different schools are slightly different. Both mentors and mentees had to fill out a mentoring contract. The expectations were really clear up-front.

The goal was to help junior women take the initiative to establish themselves as faculty members deserving of tenure and promotion. The thought was that not enough women were getting tenured at Emory, and the goal of this program was to help more of the junior women we brought in achieve tenure.

AE: If someone were to start a mentoring group at Emory, what is one piece of advice you would give him or her?

KL: If it’s going to be really a structured program, then I think having a clear mentoring agreement is really important. It makes sure that everybody’s on the same page, and that there aren’t expectations that can’t be met.
met. It also gives people a sense of comfort to know that there’s an end date, that you can say, “Okay, I’m done.” It was my experience that most people didn’t say that, that in fact, these relationships continued throughout years, and I’m guessing there are many of them that are still continuing, but you knew that [if needed] you could step back, because you knew you had agreed to do it for this particular amount of time.

AE: What do you see as Emory’s greatest strengths and weaknesses with regards to faculty mentoring?

KL: One of Emory’s strengths is that faculty here are basically friendly and helpful, so finding a network of folks to form a mentoring relationship with is relatively easy. A weakness is that, to my knowledge, we don’t have a really great structured mentoring program. There’s something of an attitude—I would say this is widespread: “Why should people need mentors? We’re all sort of independent, and we work on our own.” I think that’s not just an Emory problem; I think that’s an academia problem.

AE: Do you have any ideas for faculty mentoring programs you would like to see at Emory today?

KL: I would like to see a program for lecture-track faculty. All of the programs I’ve seen here at Emory have been for people on the tenure track, and I would like to see something for people who are not on the tenure track. Emory has been at the forefront of thinking about non-tenure-track faculty as professionals who do real and important work for the university, and I think that having some kind of program that was specifically directed at lecture-track faculty would take that to the next step.

Mentoring is not handholding; sometimes it’s pushing students out the door and getting out of their way.

Peter J. Brown
Professor of Anthropology and Global Health

Peter Brown is the recipient of the 2014 George P. Cuttino Award for Excellence in Mentoring. He joined Emory in 1978 and is one of the three founding members of the Anthropology Program. He teaches in both the Anthropology Department and the Hubert Department of Global Health in the School of Public Health and is the director of the Center for Health, Culture, and Society. He also serves as a senior academic adviser for the Emory Global Health Institute.

The Academic Exchange: What influenced you to become such an active mentor?

Peter Brown: I’m fascinated by anthropology, which means I’m fascinated by people, and students are pretty amazing, interesting people. I particularly enjoy watching an undergraduate develop over four years, or a graduate student over six to ten years. Getting to know them and helping to shape their intellectual development is a pleasure. I don’t think of mentoring as work; it’s part of my job that’s not a burden, but it can be very time consuming. I tend to focus more on graduate students, because our relationships are longer, and they don’t always end when someone gets their doctorate, particularly if someone is doing work in my field. I was at a meeting of the Society for Medical Anthropology and noticed that out of eleven
people listed on one of the boards, four were previous students of mine.

**AE:** What components are needed for a successful mentoring relationship?

**PB:** Mentoring is really just an old-fashioned human relationship. For the mentor, it’s partly being a sounding board, partly being a cheerleader, partly giving students a little kick sometimes. The trick is just appreciating them as individuals. If I’m your mentor, I’m not necessarily your friend; we don’t hang out together. But I’m going to take your work seriously and talk to you as a peer. I’m going to respect you and not be condescending or overly judgmental, and I’ll let you know when you’re on the wrong track. The important thing is that students know you’re in their corner. Another part of mentoring is helping them create more independence, just as in teaching. For undergraduates in particular, I want to help them become more confident thinkers and writers. Mentoring is not handholding; sometimes it’s pushing students out the door and getting out of their way, [perhaps by saying,] “Wow, that’s a very interesting question; come back and tell me the answer when you find it.”

**AE:** What purposes does mentoring serve in higher education?

**PB:** Undergraduate education has a lot to with broadening a student’s worldview. Those four years are really transformational and often difficult, and it’s important for a student to feel comfortable enough to talk to a faculty member. At the graduate level, that’s often mutually beneficial, because graduate students are doing all sorts of fascinating work. Faculty can become really overly focused and narrow—and rather boring—if they don’t work with graduate students. When I’m mentoring graduate students, it’s a challenge to keep up with all of the things they’re doing, so I have to read more about other areas of study and research just to keep up with them. To me that’s a real perk of mentoring. It keeps me sharp. Also, I know a lot from the literature that existed before electronic search engines. Knowing that part of intellectual history is something a mentor can provide beyond the myopia of looking at only what has been published in the last year or two. Helping students understand the longer view of intellectual discourse is important.

**AE:** How do you deal with students who blur the professional/personal boundary of a mentoring relationship?

**PB:** You can make the mistake of getting too close to students and letting them push you around. Students are grown ups, and you’re not responsible for their actions. If they don’t meet deadlines or the like, they need to face the consequences. I have avoided parenting frameworks and metaphors, but there are sometimes similarities—maybe like a helpful uncle. I don’t want them to think of me as their metaphoric grandfather. A mentor is not a psychological counselor, but a student should feel free enough to tell you about personal problems, particularly if they affect academic performance. You can listen to a student complain about pressures they’re feeling from home, or talk about something as fundamental as telling their parents they’ve decided to become an anthropology major. That’s a regular discussion. I had that very dilemma as an undergraduate myself. Part of mentoring is listening to those kinds of concerns and giving advice, and that comes with the territory in any human relationship.

**AE:** What advice do you have for younger faculty interested in mentoring?

**PB:** Get tenure first before you invest too much in mentoring. Sometimes there’s a danger for a junior faculty member to spend a lot of time and effort mentoring students but at the risk of not getting their own work done. I think that’s one reason why mentors tend to be older professors. They’ve made a reputation for themselves in their field and can afford to be more generous with their time. Junior faculty can be mentors, but because it can be so satisfying they need to keep their priorities straight. **AE**
In the final recommendations of the Emory Commission on the Liberal Arts (CoLA) circulated to faculty by Provost Sterk last autumn, mentorship was raised as central to a residential liberal arts education in a research intensive university. In CoLA’s many discussions with students and faculty over the past year, the value of good mentors emerged repeatedly.

From the partial listing on the CoLA website (liberalartsforwardemory.com) of the multitude of mentoring programs Emory already engages in, it is clear that Emory offers a wide menu of excellent, university-wide as well as school-, department-, or discipline-specific mentoring opportunities to undergraduates, graduate students, and young faculty. It is reasonable to assume discipline-specific approaches to mentoring will always be desired, but at the same time, there may be resource efficiency and wider equity to a centralized approach for at least some aspects of mentorship.

Coordinating and supplementing Emory’s extensive mentoring activities could enhance the structure, incorporate best practices, and increase the number of students and faculty who participate in formal mentoring. CoLA recommended that Emory consider a life-long learning program for mentorship. An evolving university-wide coordination program could link existing Emory programs and supplement identified gaps.

Here I propose one vision for such a progressive program, based on the karate belt achievement system. Undergraduate students would start a lifelong journey with practice that would help them from novice to mastery.

Students would begin with achieving a “White Belt” by learning to proactively seek mentors and build skills to become mentors themselves. Emory could develop an interactive web-based interface for matching mentors and mentees. Undergraduates would be able to achieve a “Yellow Belt” as they transform from a pure novice to developing a basic understanding of the skills required to provide peer-to-peer mentorship. The white and yellow belts are the basic building blocks and, as in karate, all other skills in higher belts are built upon these basic skills.

Graduate and post-doctoral fellows would participate in this lifelong learning program for mentorship by progressing through “Orange Belt” training that would teach beginning mentorship skills, including advising and mentorship by example of undergraduate students, as well as interpersonal skills of supportive critique and encouragement. At the “Purple Belt” level...
### A schema for lifelong mentoring at Emory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Level</th>
<th>Belt</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
<th>Examples of Emory resources for each level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Undergraduate  | White| Learn how to choose a mentor; set, meet, and communicate expectations and goals. Learn to listen and to incorporate advice into action. Practice proactive communication, initiative, and timeliness. Take opportunities to explore and understand diversity. Commit some portion of time to volunteerism. | • Pre-Major Advising Connections at Emory—academic advising support for students until they declare major  
• Office of Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual/Transgender Life—coordinates programs from which mentoring grows  
• Academic Fellows Program—upper-class student mentors work with first-year international students |
| Undergraduate  | Yellow| Demonstrate increasing proficiency of the above skills. Develop/increase good decision-making, documentation, time management, and interpersonal skills, including compassion, ethics, critical thinking, and how to take and provide formal, respectful critique. Develop a basic understanding of peer-to-peer mentorship skills. Explore community needs and experiences. | • EPASS Peer Led Mentoring Groups—Emory College based peer-led mentoring Groups  
• Scholarly Inquiry and Research at Emory—Emory College based, promotes undergraduate research projects through grants, faculty-student research partnerships. |
| Graduate       | Orange| Begin to understand the multifaceted aspects and when to seek and use advising, counseling, coaching, and mentoring skills. Increase focus on follow through. Learn to build trust and manage the mentoring relationship. Practice encouragement of mentees and peers. Practice work-life balance and stress management. | • Laney Graduate School (LGS) Grant Writing Program—addresses every stage of grant proposal writing  
• Mentors on Call—connects graduate students to successful alumni |
| Graduate       | Purple| Increase proficiency of incorporating use of advising, counseling, coaching, and mentoring into life-long learning/teaching. Be a role model to undergraduate and peers. Learn the basics of adult learning/education. | • LGS TATTO—preparation in the art of teaching |
| Junior Faculty | Green| Learn to manage risks and risk-taking. Understand how to build and communicate impact of scholarship. Explore methods to promote dissemination of scholarship and/or personal branding. Increase proficiency of teaching. Advocate for mentees. Learn to balance service, teaching and research. Refocus on developing as well as thanking and dissolving mentorship teams as appropriate. Learn to appreciate/accommodate different mentor-mentee styles. Employ tools for evaluating mentorship teams and own performance as mentee and mentor. | • Center for Faculty Development and Excellence—assists faculty at every level of their professional careers, from graduate student to emeritus. CFDE offers seminars, workshops, presentations, and services each year on a diverse set of topics.  
• School specific mentoring programs—some formal with appointed mentorship teams or formal programs; others informal. A 2012 survey of 168 associate tenure track faculty, (all Emory schools represented) indicated 61 percent did not have formal mentorship pre-tenure. |
| Junior Faculty | Brown| Begin to open doors for and promote mentees. Celebrate achievement of mentees and peers and nominate for appropriate awards. Explore community needs and opportunities for mentorship locally and globally. | • In same survey as above, faculty indicated 88 percent did not have formal mentorship post-tenure. |
| Senior & Emeriti Faculty | Red| Be generous. Promote independence. Provide opportunity and resources to take advantage of them. Exude confidence, creativity, and ethical conduct. Role model assertiveness over aggressiveness, provide direction over dictates. Engage in succession planning and mentorship. | • Senior faculty clearly serve as mentor; however, it is unclear if there are gaps at Emory in serving the life-long mentorship needs at this level. Faculty survey is recommended. |
| Senior & Emeriti Faculty | Black| Inspire! Reflect and share expertise and experience. | • Emeritus College—promotes cross-disciplinary intellectual exchange among members through lectures, discussions, support, service, and advocacy. |
the student would have advanced to the intermediate level as a proficient and successful mentee, an expert peer-to-peer mentor, and a beginning mentor of graduate students.

Junior faculty would begin at the “Green Belt” level, as they meet the challenges, responsibilities, and tremendous opportunities of tenure or other faculty career trajectory. They are trained to renew and revise their mentee training and their mentorship of undergraduate and graduate students. Dedicated time as mentee and mentor becomes harder and more intense at this level. As junior faculty progress from assistant to associate professor they also should move from a green to a brown belt. At the “Brown Belt” level the mentee learns to balance independence with select interdependence and to advance their level of student and assistant professor mentorship and peer-to-peer mentorship of other associate professors. Evaluation of mentorship activities increases, and critical evaluation, taught at all levels, becomes more intense.

Senior and emeriti faculty progress to the terminal levels of mentorship achievement. At the “Red Belt” level, they are nearing mastery. Lifelong learners will have achieved skills that foster both practical and creative mentorship skills. Confidence, creativity and thoughtful course correcting influence are the exemplar skills role modeled for mentees at this level. Red Belts identify their own continuing and mature needs and foster appropriate mentorship/collaborative relationships to meet those needs. At this level faculty actively advise, counsel, and coach mentees as well as seek opportunities to reward and promote mentees. At the “Black Belt” level of mentorship, the faculty have reached the summit of achievement in mentorship. As in karate, those at the Black Belt of mentorship “work years to accomplish the mastery of a black belt,” as karate teacher Allen Sandoval explains it: “While the black belt is a symbol of great achievement, the belt itself is not the ultimate goal. The real reward is in the new self-awareness this belt represents.”

As described in this schema, one possible method for implementing CoLA mentorship recommendations could utilize a karate-based belt achievement system to coordinate and enhance a lifelong learning program for mentorship beginning with undergraduate students through emeritus faculty.

MORE RESOURCES


The Pre-Major Advising Connections at Emory Program. Emory College of Arts and Sciences website. http://college.emory.edu/home/trash/advising/pace-premajor.html


Academic Fellows Program. Emory College of Arts and Sciences website. http://college.emory.edu/home/trash/learning/fellows/index.html

EPASS Peer Tutoring Program. Emory College of Arts and Sciences website. http://college.emory.edu/oue/student-support/epass/index.html

Scholarly Inquiry and Research at Emory (SIRE) Overview | Undergraduate Research. Emory College of Arts and Sciences website. http://college.emory.edu/home/academic/research/sire/


Mentors on Call. Laney Graduate School website. http://www.graduateschool.emory.edu/professional_development/resources/mentoring.html


Center for Faculty Development and Excellence. Emory University website. http://cfde.emory.edu/


Emory University Emeritus College. Emory University website. http://www.emory.edu/emeritus/about/index.html
he stood at the front of the room, by all appearances poised and in command. Visually compelling slides projected to the main screen, the audience attentive. She ended her presentation and invited questions and discussion with the executive committee. You could hear a pin drop—the death knell for the project and proposal she had spent long hours researching and perfecting.

As she left the boardroom, mumblings began around the table: “Were you aware this was in the works?” “Did your folks have any input into the operational implications for this project?” “There were some great ideas in the proposal, but apparently no consideration for cross-organizational impacts.” Deflated, “Elizabeth” plopped into a plump leather chair in the reception area to await her VP’s emergence from the board room. Confident her proposal would knock their socks off, she was surprised by the lackluster response. She had been sure this proposal would be her ticket to promotion. Couldn’t they see how smart she was?

At the time of the presentation, Elizabeth had just begun her first year as an Evening MBA student at Goizueta Business School. She recounted the scenario in class with unvarnished disbelief. Clearly those people just didn’t get it. What went wrong? Some MBA faculty will attest that the overconfident students are the ones who flounder early in their careers, especially those with low self-awareness about how he or she is perceived, how his or her behaviors impact others, and how she or he builds relationships. Each of these factors impacts an individual’s ability to influence.

Enter Elizabeth’s mentor/coach in the Goizueta Leadership Academy, a program established primarily for the purpose of elevating the self-awareness and leadership capacity of early and mid-career working professionals. Along with seminars taught by Goizueta faculty, her mentor brought real life experiences from more than twenty years in corporate leadership. Understanding political nuances and honing influence skills are just two areas explored during the six-month Leadership Academy program.

Mentoring can take many forms, both formal and informal, and can occur in any type of institution—corporate, academic, not-for-profit, governmental. The key ingredients remain constant: a mentee self-aware enough to recognize the need and benefit of a mentor and a mentor with the experiences and desire to help others grow and develop. In the corporate world, more and more research suggests that career progression, especially for women, hinges in large part on whether an individual has a mentor or sponsor who can coach to the political trip hazards, guide leadership competency-building, and invest relationship capital to help mentees move ahead.

The Atlanta division of a national bank, for example, enlisted the support of the boutique consulting firm Pathbuilders to offer designated high potential managers the opportunity to participate in a structured mentoring program. The program individually pairs participants with more senior leaders. Participants and leaders alike have been interviewed to tease out developmental needs and career enhancing experiences, respectively, that align to create strong partnership matches. Mentor and mentee training educational seminars, mentoring module discussion guides, and regular check-ins provide the needed guardrails to help keep mentoring partnerships on track.

The Leadership Academy at Goizueta is but one of the business school’s several constructs for mentoring. In certain custom Executive Education programs, for example, we’ve built peer mentoring into the leadership development component. This structure affords participants the opportunity to practice coaching skills in a safe environment while benefiting from the perspective and experiences of a trusted peer. A development plan constructed from 360 feedback marks the deliverable at the end of each four-month partnership.

The Goizueta Mentor Program connects any interested business school student (undergrad or graduate) with alumni located domestically or abroad. Goals for this program are threefold: offer professional and life skills mentoring in a one-on-one partnership, enhance alumni connectivity to the school, and highlight the importance and effectiveness of relationships built within the Goizueta network.

Less formal mentoring also takes place: Steve Walton, a faculty member seasoned in facilitating executive MBA and executive education programs, has helped faculty less experienced with the executive audience elevate their facilitating skills. One such benefactor commented that Steve can see something in you that you don’t see and help you become a better version of yourself. After Steve’s coaching, this faculty member went from dead last in student ratings to a consistent presence in the top. Another faculty member, Brandon Smith, mentors colleagues on effectively incorporating storytelling into their teaching toolkit.
What are the constants across all these forms of mentoring? What makes a good mentoring relationship? It depends. For less formal or ad hoc mentoring relationships, the fundamental ingredients I mentioned above, in addition to a few others, apply:

- a mentee self-aware enough to recognize his or her blind spots and who is open to help from others with more experience in those blind spot areas;
- a mentor who has the desire to see others grow and succeed and who is in the right season of life to have the experiences from which he or she can draw to show the way;
- clearly articulated goals regarding what the mentee seeks to accomplish or improve upon (for example, I want to understand how to better integrate story-telling into my teaching methods);
- a mutual agreement about the how much time each partner is willing to commit to the relationship and for how long (for example, would you be willing to have coffee a couple of times over the next month to explore this topic and perhaps observe my teaching approaches at least once this quarter, followed by your feedback?).

Choosing a mentor for the less formal mentoring relationship is where things can be a bit tricky. Like attracts like, so our human tendency is to find someone like us, just more “mature.” On the contrary, your best opportunity for change will occur with a mentor who pokes you in the side rather than one who pats you on the head. Said differently, consider someone who excels in an area you want to develop, will challenge you to grow and who will also hold you accountable for change.

For more structured programs, there are several fundamental ingredients:

- a solid, rational partnership match objectively based on a mentee's underlying developmental needs (not just the spoken needs) matched to an individual with the desire to help others and experiences aligned with the mentee's particular development need(s);
- time-bound, written partnership goals grounded in the mentee's short and longer-term developmental goals;
- a written or spoken confidentiality agreement;
- agreement on the frequency of meetings and the acceptable form(s) and frequency of communication; meetings should be no less frequent than once per month;
- common understanding about who will drive the relationship (it should be the mentee), whether meetings will have an agenda, and how you will overcome scheduling challenges;
- some form of content and/or discussion guide that offers thought-leading questions, especially during the early stages of partnership formation.

What are the lessons for higher education from corporate-based mentoring programs? Just as mentees should seek mentors who represent some difference and opportunity for change, faculty seeking mentors might face head-on the challenge of breaking down the silos between schools. The natural structures within higher education create expected challenges for broader informal mentoring. Departments and schools are physically separated into different buildings, making professional network extensions unnatural unless you sit on a university-wide committee, not to mention the cultural norm of rarely crossed staff/faculty lines and the hierarchies of faculty ranks and tenure status.

How did Elizabeth’s mentor help her grow from her painful experience in that boardroom? Together they conducted a post-mortem, of sorts, to learn how she could have gained broad-based support for her project before the big reveal. She focused on stakeholder analysis—identifying the likely beneficiaries, detractors, and key influencers for the project she proposed based on the degree to which the project may impact the influencer, positively or negatively. Next, she diagnosed the missed opportunities for gaining broader input and support from these key influencers. This post-mortem approach shed light on best practices Elizabeth successfully executed on a project just six weeks later.

Are you a closet mentor? Do you have experiences that may benefit others? If so, seek out opportunities to share your experiences with others in different parts of the university. Are you a closet mentee, experiencing professional development opportunities that you are willing to work on? If so, seek someone with connections in other parts of the university and explore together to find a potential mentor to work with you in a confidential setting. In the words of the old proverb, “Each one, Teach one.” Happy mentoring!

SEEK A MENTOR WHEN YOU

- Want to elevate your performance in a certain area
- Want to elevate your management, leadership, or other competencies
- Are at a career cross-roads, transition, or change in focus
Empathy and Healthcare

Stephen K. Klasko
President and CEO,
Thomas Jefferson
University and Jefferson
Health System, from
the symposium, “U.S.
Healthcare: What’s
Broken & How to Fix
It” October 20, 2014,
presented by the
Healthcare Innovation
Program

In 2014, I had written an article called “From Marcus Welby to House: How Did We Get There?” If you think about doctor shows, back in the seventies we had Marcus Welby. He was a family physician who would get up in the morning, go to the homeless shelter and take care of people for free. On the way to lunch he’d deliver a calf because a cow was having trouble on the side of the road, then go to his family medicine office in the afternoon, then do left ventricular Norwood surgery at night. We were gods. We could do everything—that’s how people viewed us. If you then look at what things were like in the 2010s, it was House, right? So if you came down from Mars, you’d think we were really smart, narcissistic, sex-addicted, drug-addicted, analytic—not great people. How did we evolve? Doctors in 2014 were chosen based on three criteria: science GPA, MCATS scores, and organic chemistry performance, and somehow we were amazed that physicians weren’t more empathetic, communicative and creative.

Competition and the University Press

Cecelia Cancellaro
Editor and Literary Agent,
from her talk about
trends and expectations
for faculty authors in
the current environment
of scholarly publishing,
April 8, 2014, presented
by the Center for Faculty
Development and
Excellence

Between the 1960s and
the 1990s, the number
of university presses increased
significantly, from sixty to
ninety-six, and their output
increased dramatically as
well, from forty-one ti-
tiles per year on average to
eighty-eight per year. Things
plateaued after that, and
although there definitely
have been changes in how
various segments of the
market purchase and consume scholarly material, for the most part university presses still publish between 8,000 and 9,000 books each year. That sounds pretty good, until you hold it up next to the number of PhDs being produced in North America annually, which is somewhere around 50,000. Not all of these, of course, are in humanities and related fields, where a book is a requirement for tenure, but even if one third of those 50,000 falls into this category, that means there are many dissertations and manuscripts vying for those available book contracts.