A Survey of Faculty Mentoring Programs in AACSB Schools of Business

As reported by The Association for the Advancement of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), the number of academically qualified faculty available to fill open faculty positions in accredited schools of business is not sufficient. ". . . recurring shortages of new Ph.D.s, and the expectation that these shortages in academia will be an ongoing condition for business schools, threaten the essence of business scholarship as schools burden a shrinking number of research faculty to cope with growing demands in other professorial areas" (Management Education at Risk, 2002, p. 13). The shortage of academically qualified faculty has created excess demand for scarce faculty resources. This has resulted in the bidding up of salaries and made it difficult for schools to recruit and retain qualified faculty. In recent years, economic circumstances have placed additional fiscal burdens on both private and public institutions, placing an even greater premium on expenditures on faculty recruitment and compensation (Gardner, 2011). In light of these challenges, the retention and development of existing faculty takes on increased importance.

One practice that offers promise for improving faculty retention is the use of formal faculty mentoring programs. Evidence from the literature indicates that mentoring can enhance career and professional outcomes. It also suggests that business schools can improve faculty retention by implementing well-designed programs. The potential benefits of formal mentoring and the utility of mentoring programs can be illustrated using a hypothetical vignette[1].

The Case of the Informal Mentor

Dr. Newbody recently joined the faculty and took the office next to Professor Seasoned. During a formal orientation for new faculty members, Dr. Newbody was directed to the College's Promotion and Tenure documentation which outlined general scholarship expectations

[1] The vignette is intended purely for illustrative purposes and does report on an actual faculty experience.

for retention and tenure. A faculty mentor, Dr. Newly Tenured, was assigned to work with Dr. Newbody, but no training was provided to either, nor was any effort made to establish expectations for the mentoring process or relationship.

At the end of his first semester, Dr. Newbody had a performance review with his Dean. Dr. Newbody was made aware that intellectual contributions were expected for retention and tenure, and made a commitment to be more proactive in establishing a research program. During his first semester Dr. Newbody had relied on the advice and direction of Dr. Seasoned. Dr. Seasoned had served on the faculty for over 25 years, but was many years removed from going through the tenure and promotion process himself. However, he was able to provide a wealth of advice on how to succeed at the university. Dr. Seasoned also offered his opinions about the lack of experience and institutional knowledge of the recently appointed Dean. In particular, Dr. Seasoned suggested that refereed proceedings had counted towards tenure for many years, and advised Dr. Newbody accordingly.

During the annual review at the end of Dr. Newbody's second year, the Dean made it clear that a refereed publication in the proceedings of a national meeting would count for little with respect to the retention decision at the end of the third year. The Dean directed Dr. Newbody to focus on refereed journal publications, indicating that a record of success in refereed proceedings alone would not be acceptable. Dr. Newbody submitted one manuscript to a peer reviewed journal during the third year, but the manuscript was not accepted prior to the third year review. As a result, Dr, Newbody was not retained due to the lack of development of his research program.

As this vignette illustrates, even though a mentor was assigned to Dr, Newbody, the mentoring was informal at best and offered no clear and credible performance expectations.

Moreover, nothing was done to evaluate the quality of mentoring outcomes. Had a more formal, structured effort to mentor Dr. Newbody been in place, the outcome may have been different.

The current study uses a survey of AACSB accredited colleges and schools of business in the United States to examine the current state of faculty mentoring programs. It seeks to draw insights on three specific research questions

1. To what extent are mentoring programs being used?
2. What are the key characteristics of programs and how do these align with best practices?
3. What are the performance benefits of formal faculty mentoring?

The following sections review the literature on mentoring, identifying benefits and challenges, and best practices specific to academia. Details of the research methodology and survey results are then presented. Finally conclusions and implications are offered that institutions can use to build or develop mentoring programs.

Definitions of Mentoring

There is no consensus definition of mentoring. Bozeman and Feeney (2007) for example identified thirteen definitions from the research literature. Based on this, they proposed a comprehensive definition that centered on differential sharing between mentor and protégé. Part of this definition states that mentoring is " . . . the informal transmission of knowledge, social capital, and psychosocial support . . . between a person who is perceived to have greater relevant knowledge, wisdom, or experience (the mentor) and a person who is perceived to have less (the protégé)." This definition implies that anyone can simultaneously be both a mentor and protégé based on their relative knowledge and experience across various domains.

Benefits of Mentoring

A large body of literature on mentoring has developed since Kram's (1985) seminal work that suggested that effective mentoring could result in career development and psychosocial benefits. Indeed, over 1,500 articles have explored the benefits of effective mentoring programs (Colley, 2001). A number of review articles and meta-studies provide insights into the key findings and conclusions of prior research. Boyle and Boice (1998) examined the benefits of mentoring for graduate students, graduate teaching assistants, and new faculty members. They identified a willingness to take risks, increased political savvy, and positive research productivity and career advancement as key benefits of mentoring. Ragins, Cotton and Miller (2000) provided statistical evidence that mentoring leads to positive outcomes on a variety of measures including job satisfaction, commitment to the organization, and satisfaction with opportunities for promotion. Allen, Eby, Poteet, Lentz and Lima (2004) conducted a meta-analysis of the literature, concluding that mentoring was related to positive outcomes with respect to several objective and subjective measures of career development. These included compensation and salary growth, expectations of advancement, and intention to remain with an employer. Hegstadt and Wentling's (2005) identified improved employee retention, networking, organizational learning, loyalty, and awareness of issues related to diversity among other benefits of mentoring.

Zellers, Howard, and Barcic (2008) explored the organizational benefits of mentoring. They found that mentoring not only had a positive impact on performance and organizational stability, but on socialization, communication, the preservation of intellectual capital and institutional memory, leadership capacity, and succession planning. They also cataloged benefits specific to protégés and mentors. Protégés benefited in terms of assimilation into the organization, job, income, and promotion prospects, leadership development, and the motivation

to mentor others. Academe specific benefits included improvements in confidence, scholarship, and teaching effectiveness, and reduced feelings of isolation and alienation. Academe specific benefits to mentors included a feeling of contribution and accomplishment, personal satisfaction, revitalization, and the ability to gain new perspectives. Table 1 summarizes key findings from the literature on the benefits of mentoring programs.

Challenges of Mentoring

While the literature has focused primarily on the benefits of mentoring, the challenges inherent in mentoring cannot be overlooked. Indeed, according to Scandura (1998), " . . . when dysfunctional mentoring does occur, its consequences might be quite serious." Eby and Lockwood (2004) listed a range of problems associated with mentoring. Those identified by both mentors and protégés included mismatches and scheduling difficulties. Problems as seen by protégés included unmet expectations, mentor neglect, having a cynical mentor, and not having enough time to develop the mentoring process. Problems as seen by mentors included feelings of personal inadequacy. Ragins, Cotton and Miller (2000) examined whether the real potential benefits of good mentoring were masked by the real costs of bad mentoring. Their results suggested that for protégés reporting marginal or low satisfaction with the mentoring relationship, organizational benefits were negligible or negative (costs).

Several studies have also examined factors that limit the potential of mentoring programs. According to Luecke (2004) and McCauley and Velsor (2004), women and minorities may not have the same access to information on mentoring as other peers, and mentors may tend to seek out only protégés with whom they can personally identify. Johnson (2007) suggested that faculty members in particular may be more inclined to mentor junior colleagues in whom they see themselves. Studies have also suggested that cross-race mentoring relationships have unique

challenges. These include negative stereotypes or preconceptions, a lack of trust, and difficulties when it comes to discussing certain sensitive issues (Johnson-Bailey and Cervero, 2004, McCauley and Van Velsor, 2004). The relative shortage of women and minorities amongst more senior faculty thus poses particular challenges.

Best Practices in Formal Faculty Mentoring

Three key themes emerged from the literature in the context of best practices in faculty mentoring programs; administrative support, program objectives/assessment, and program structure.

Administrative Support. The primary intent of mentoring programs is to develop faculty rather than to serve as remedial programs to be used once performance issues, whether they be related to research or teaching, have emerged. As such, when administrators see the strategic significance of mentoring programs, they can build appropriate systems that can enable their success. Hegstad and Wentling (2005) identified a number of common organizational characteristics in effective mentoring programs. These include top management support, a flat organizational structure, an organizational culture characterized by teamwork and trust that is founded on a respect for confidentiality, effective and open communication, and effective job design. They noted that faculty mentoring programs often fail due to a lack of focus and commitment. Lindenberger and Zachary (1999) provided a practitioner's guide for developing a successful mentoring program, again highlighting the importance of top management support and long-term commitment. The importance of top management support was also identified by Parise and Forret (2008) as a key success factor.

Program Objectives and Assessment. As with any programmatic initiative, a faculty mentoring program should be aligned with broader organizational priorities, and there should be

clarity in terms of its purpose and objectives. Hegstad and Wentling (2005) highlighted the importance of this alignment between program objectives and organizational mission, as well as of the importance of commitment and continuity. Zellers, Howard and Barcic (2008) spoke of the need to link program objectives to other organizational programs and practices such as performance appraisal and promotions, and systems for reward and recognition.

Wanberg, Kammeyer-Mueller and Marchese (2006) provided a theoretical framework for understanding mentoring effectiveness from a relationship perspective. Variables included in their model included proactivity, openness, perceptions of similarity, and perceptions of organizational support. Their results indicated that mentor proactivity was positively related to successful career and psychosocial mentoring. Boyle and Boice (1998) highlighted the importance of evaluating levels of mentor and protégé participation and the quality of mentoring interactions, and analyzing issues that mentoring relationships raised.

Program Structure. Effective mentoring involves more than merely pairing faculty mentors and protégés. Successful programs involve comprehensive planning prior to program implementation, and the formalization of required activities and anticipated outcomes. Hegstad and Wentling (2005), and Boyle and Boice (1998) highlighted the desirability of advanced planning in managing mentor-protégé dyads. The latter also noted the importance of having required meetings, and clear expectations regarding meeting frequency and who was expected to participate, i.e. mentors, protégés, mentoring dyads, or all program participants. They also recommended using incentives to motivate and reward program participants.

Hegstad and Wentling (2005) found that effective mentoring programs placed an emphasis on careful mentor/protégé selection to avert potential matching problems. Both their work and that of Allen, Eby and Lentz (2006a) highlighted the importance of seeking input from

both mentors and protégés in making assignment decisions. Parise and Forret (2008) explored the impact of voluntary participation and the solicitation of input to the matching process from the mentor's perspective. They found that both factors were positively related to mentor perceptions of the mentoring program. Boyle and Boice (1998) suggested that it was important to have clear policies to guide either a mentor or protégé's desire to terminate a mentoring relationship.

Allen, Eby and Lentz (2006a) found that closeness of academic rank but not physical proximity had a positive effect on the success of a mentoring relationship. They also suggested that mentors and protégés should come from the same department. In contrast, Ragins, Cotton, and Miller (2000) and Boyle and Boice (1998) indicated a preference for cross-departmental relationships, arguing that this insulated participants from conflicts associated with promotion/tenure considerations. These contradictory results suggest that organizational/departmental culture can play an important role in making assignment decisions.

Several authors have examined the role of gender, race, and ethnicity in making mentor-protégé matches. Knox and McGovern (1988) found that women sought mentors who were willing to share knowledge, competent, understanding and consistent, knowledgeable about institutional and professional issues, and would push them to define/clarify goals. They also found that protégés who had positive mentoring experiences characterized their mentors as being experienced, having a sense of humor, and having treated the protégé as a colleague. Gibson (2004) noted that having a caring and supportive mentor, feeling connected, having one's worth affirmed, and not being alone were important to female protégés. Allen, Day, and Lentz (2005) found that interpersonal comfort mediated gender differences, and suggested that cross-gender mentoring dyads based on commonalities could help to mitigate potential gender-related issues.

Tillman (2001) examined the mentoring experiences of African American protégés at two predominantly white universities. Tillman noted that same-race mentoring relationships offered greater psycho-social support than did cross-race relationships, and in the latter case, secondary same-race mentors were often sought. A case analysis of the mentoring relationship between a white male professor and a black female associate professor highlighted several issues that can improve the effectiveness of cross-race mentoring (Johnson-Bailey and Cervero, 2004). These issues included overcoming hidden racism and a lack of trust that may have historical roots, and mentors positively embracing racial and cultural difference rather than using them to exert power and influence or compartmentalize minority faculty.

Boyle and Boice (1998) addressed the importance of orientation and training, and the need to set clear expectations for both protégé and mentor that were known to each other. They noted that both mentor and protégé have expectations of the relationship, particularly regarding career and social support, thus each should bring to the relationship a commitment to satisfying the expectations of the other (Young and Perrewe, 2000). Allen, Eby and Lentz (2006b) found evidence that the quality of training is an important consideration. They also suggested that training programs should include contextual expectations related to gender, race and ethnicity.

Table 2 summarizes the findings on best practices in faculty mentoring and provides additional support from the literature for various dimensions of mentoring programs. As the literature suggests, there are a number of steps that can be taken to develop effective programs that can elicit benefits both to faculty and academic units.

Summarizing the findings from the literature, a number of conclusions can be drawn. First, successful mentoring programs are viewed as being strategically important initiatives that are aligned and integrated with broader objectives of the academic unit/institution. In addition,

successful programs receive significant support and commitment from top management. Program design and implementation are characterized by having a well-defined structure that is understood and embraced by all program participants. Key elements of this structure include careful matching of mentors and protégés that considers a variety of critical success factors, clear articulation of program and individual expectations, carefully thought out training and mentoring activities, and formal assessment of execution and outcomes at both the program and individual levels. Underlying all of this is the need for the program to operate in an atmosphere that fosters trust in the program and its objectives, and is perceived as being conducive to faculty development.

In the context of the present study, our goal is to examine to what extent business schools have adopted faculty mentoring as part of their DNA, and whether it has the potential to help address the challenges raised by AACSB regarding faculty shortages. Our interest is in identifying how prevalent formal faculty mentoring is in business schools, and, building on the literature, identifying what is motivating mentoring programs, how they are structured and administered, and what are the drivers of positive program outcomes.

Survey Methodology

A survey instrument was developed based on the literature. It included a section that sought information on institutional characteristics, and sections that examined specific details of mentoring programs themselves; structure, goals/objectives, and assessment/effectiveness. Questions on institutional characteristics sought data on institution type (public, private), and the size (number of students) and types of degrees granted (bachelor, master and doctoral) by both the institution and business school. Specific to the business school, questions were also asked about the academic mission and whether a formal mentoring program was in place.

Structural issues included ownership/funding of the program (department, college, university), program age, participation (mandatory, voluntary), faculty to whom mentors are assigned (rank, new/continuing faculty), processes/criteria used to assign and evaluate mentors, the structure of mentoring relationships (hierarchical or peer), program oversight (department, college, university), training/activities for program participants, reward structures for mentors, and policies for dissolving mentoring relationships. Questions regarding objectives explored whether programs included explicit objectives for the program/individuals, desired outcomes for protégés, or expectations of mentors. Details of program activities were also sought. Survey items related to program assessment and evaluation included the frequency and ownership of assessment, the integration of the mentoring program with other faculty evaluation processes, protégé and program outcomes, and the importance of variables used to match mentors and protégés.

The survey instrument was pre-tested by faculty members at the authors' institutions and refined accordingly. It was then distributed electronically to Deans and Associate Deans at AACSB accredited schools in the US. An initial e-mail was sent to request participation in the study and to ensure that the survey was directed to the appropriate individual at the respective institutions. After eliminating institutions that preferred not to participate in the study, the survey was sent to respondents at 473 institutions. The initial distribution plus two follow up reminders yielded a total of 118 useable responses, representing a response rate of 25%.

The sample represented a diverse set of institutions in terms of size, whether the institution was public or private, degrees offered, and the mission of the reporting unit (Table 3). Fifty six responses (48%) came from units reporting a formal faculty mentoring program. Of the

fifty six responses, fifty three were complete. The analysis presented in the following section is based on the responses from these fifty three schools.

Results

The survey results will be presented in three sections, program structure, goals/objectives and assessment/effectiveness followed by a section highlighting the differences between high performing programs and low performing programs characterized through a post-hoc analysis.

Program Structure

Forty five percent of programs were college programs, and twenty one percent and eight percent respectively were university and department programs. The remaining programs were operated jointly by the college and department and/or university. Forty percent of programs were between five and ten years old, twenty eight percent were less than five years old, and twenty two percent were more than ten years old. Given the long history of interest in faculty mentoring it is of note that so few programs had been functioning for more than ten years. Seventy percent of programs were not funded. Funding, when provided, was most likely to come from the college alone (7 of 16 cases) or from both the college and university (7 cases).

While it was not surprising that programs were not funded, the results indicate a gap between desired outcomes (as implied by the existence of a program) and resource support. Further evidence of this gap between intention and funding is that in almost sixty percent of institutions, mentors received no compensation or recognition, and in a further forty percent they were acknowledged only as part of the faculty evaluation process.

Programs were largely managed by department heads (38%) or college administration (28%), though in some institutions (13%) the program was managed by a director. One quarter of programs received no formal program oversight. In fifty six percent of programs, the

department head was responsible for assigning mentors to protégés, and in twenty six percent it was the sole responsibility of college administration. Assignments in the remaining programs were most likely to be made by a college level committee or by the department head in conjunction with college administration.

In forty seven percent of programs participation was voluntary for both protégés and mentors, and in forty two percent it was mandatory for protégés only. Five respondents (9%) reported that the program was mandatory for both protégés and mentors. For schools reporting formal mentoring programs mentors were always assigned to newly hired assistant professors, and in forty five percent of programs they were also assigned to new associate professors. It was less likely that new full (19%), adjunct (15%), or visiting professors (13%) were assigned a mentor. In sixty six percent of programs continuing assistant professors were assigned mentors, with the corresponding figures for associate and full professors being twenty one and nine percent respectively. In thirty two percent of programs, no continuing faculty members were assigned mentors.

These mentor assignment results suggest that mentoring is seen by some as a one-time event rather than an ongoing process. Many (29%) mentoring relationships lasted one year or less, while a similar amount (30%) lasted at least 2 years. It was however most common (34%) that relationship duration was open ended. It was equally likely for relationships to be terminated by the mentor, protégé, or program administrator respectively.

Mentoring relationships were typically (96%) one to one, and in only five instances was it reported that protégés had multiple mentors. Mentor-protégé relationships were generally hierarchical (68%), with only three reported instances of protégés being assigned mentors of the same rank. Fourteen programs used both hierarchical and peer to peer relationships raising the

question of whether or not a mentor of higher rank who is somewhat removed from the protégé's career stage is necessarily the best mentor for a new faculty member.

Typically neither mentors (79%) nor protégés (60%) received any formal training. In seventeen percent of programs protégés received at least eight hours of training/orientation, but it was more common for training to last fewer than eight hours.

Most (83%) programs had no requirements regarding the frequency of meetings between mentor and protégé, but when they did, the requirement typically called for a once a semester/quarter meeting (9.4%). Almost ninety percent of programs had no required structured activities, seventy seven percent had no workshops/seminars, and a similar number had no planned social activities. When required, activities were typically required of both the mentor and protégé rather than for either group alone.

It was common for there to be no formal processes to screen potential mentors (89%) nor match mentors with protégés (83%). However, one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) of responses to questions on the importance of variables used to assign mentors to protégés yielded two distinct groups. The first group consisted of the variables gender, race/ethnicity, and age (Table 4). Mean responses (five point Likert scale, extremely unimportant = 1, extremely important = 5) within the group range from 2.52 (gender) to 2.35 (age), but differences were not statistically significant ($\alpha = 0.05$). The observation that gender and race/ethnicity were not viewed as important in making mentor assignments is contrary to evidence from earlier studies (Tillman, 2001) that such factors can impact the effectiveness of mentoring.

Mean responses for the second group of eight variables ranged from 4.15 (tenure status) to 3.62 (preference and interest of the protégé), but differences in means were not statistically significant. Ninety percent of responses indicated that tenure status was important (54%) or very

important (36%) in making assignments. The corresponding figures for academic discipline/department, academic rank, preference/interest of the mentor, and experience/ effectiveness of the mentor were 81%, 79%, 77%, and 77% respectively.

It should be noted that academic discipline/department is the only variable for which the most frequent response was 'extremely important'. Other variables that related to the potential fit between mentor and protégé were considered to be relatively less important. For example 72% of respondents indicated that compatibility of the mentor and protégé was important or extremely important, and the corresponding figures for unique qualifications of the mentor and preference/interest of the protégé were 69% and 63% respectively.

Goals and Objectives

A majority of programs (53%) had no formal program goals. When program goals were present, they were equally likely to be established at the university or college level (15% each), but less likely to be set at the department (11%) or individual levels (6%). It was also the norm (81%) that program participants were not required to set personal goals. Only nine percent of programs required protégés alone or both mentors and protégés to set goals.

The primary focus of most (78%) programs was on career development, the remainder having an equal focus on career and psychosocial success. The lack of focus on psychosocial support is interesting in light of prior findings that indicated that mentoring can provide significant benefits in psychosocial development (Zellers, Howard, and Barcic, 2008). In the domain of career success, most (81%) programs focused on improving both teaching and research performance, and in a further eleven percent the focus was on teaching alone. Two respondents each indicated that the program was focused on research alone and on career success outside the realm of teaching and research.

In terms of specific dimensions of professional support, mean scores for six variables varied from 4.19 (providing guidance and advocacy) to 3.7 (opening doors/making introduction). One way ANOVA indicated that differences in means were statistically insignificant ($\alpha = 0.05$, Table 5). Over three quarters of respondents indicated that faculty mentors directly provided formal training and guidance to protégés regarding tenure and promotion.

Assessment/Effectiveness

A majority (53%) of mentoring programs were not formally evaluated, but for programs where evaluation did occur the frequency of evaluation was annually (22%) or less often (24%). Similarly, mentoring outcomes were typically not evaluated (80%), but when outcomes were evaluated the evaluations only took place at the college level (12%). The fact that evaluation only took place at the college level is consistent with programs being largely college owned. Only in twenty two percent of programs were outcomes tied to other faculty evaluation processes.

Despite the limited evidence of formal program evaluation, there was evidence to suggest that programs had a positive impact on protégé outcomes (Table 6). Mean responses for nine variables ranged from 3.82 (adjustment to organizational culture) to 3.08 (self-esteem). Aside from the four variables - adjustment to organizational culture, promotion and tenure outcomes, teaching performance, and research performance - fewer than fifty percent of respondents suggested that the programs were effective in achieving desirable outcomes. While one way ANOVA was inconclusive, it should be noted that the variables rated as being least effective relate to psychosocial benefits of mentoring programs (self-esteem, self-confidence, personal well being and managing work-life balance).

In terms of measures of program effectiveness, mean scores for six variables ranged from 3.75 (overall organizational culture) to 3.2 (development of leadership capability, Table 7). For three of the variables - overall faculty retention, overall organizational culture, and tenure and promotion outcomes for female faculty - a majority of respondents indicated that programs were effective, but in each case, the majorities were small. Overall, the results suggest that programs were limited in their impact, and one way ANOVA did not yield additional insights.

High Performing versus Low Performing Business School Mentoring Programs

While the results offered evidence, all be it limited, of the value of mentoring programs, an important follow up question is what distinguishes effective programs from less effective. To answer this question, mean responses of each survey respondent to two dependent variables, protégé outcomes and program outcomes, were computed. Based on this ad-hoc analysis, the sample was split into three groups to be referred to as high, medium, and low performing programs respectively [2]. Mean responses of the high performing programs were compared to those of the low performing programs for a number of variables related to program structure and how mentors were assigned to protégés. While caution should be exercised in interpreting the results as the sample size in each group was small, certain patterns emerge.

High performing programs, both in terms of protégé and program outcomes, were twice as likely as low performing programs to be funded, and had been in existence for a longer period of time (Table 8). High performers were more likely to require protégés to participate in mentoring programs and establish specific goals. High performing programs were also more likely to require formal training for both mentors and protégés, and require workshops or other related activities. Mentors in high performing programs were more likely to receive some form

[2] Groups each contained approximately the same number of respondents so as to keep respondents with the same mean score together.

of recognition than those in the low performing programs. Finally, high performing programs were more likely to have some form of formal program evaluation process than low performing programs.

For the dependent variable protégé outcomes, t-tests indicated that high performing programs attached statistically greater importance than low performing programs to three variables used to match mentors with protégés ($\alpha = 0.05$, Table 9). For the dependent variable program outcomes, significant differences existed for five variables. Of particular note was that for both performance measures, high performing programs attached greater importance than low performing programs to the compatibility of the mentor and protégé, consistent with the results of prior studies (Hegstad and Wentling, 2005). In addition, relative to program outcomes, high performing programs attached greater importance to assigning mentors based on protégé preference/interest and mentor qualifications.

Discussion and Implications

AACSB standards call for the systematic orientation and mentoring of faculty. According to Standard 11, "The school has well-documented and communicated processes in place to manage and support faculty members over the progression of their careers consistent with the school's mission. These include: Providing orientation, guidance and mentoring." (Eligibility Procedures and Standards, 2012, p. 52). While not motivated by AACSB mandates, the goal of this research was, in essence, to examine the extent to which AACSB accredited business schools were meeting Standard 11. While schools of business may have processes to 'manage and support' faculty, the evidence from our survey suggests that these efforts do not rise to the level of systematic mentoring. The observation that only half of the schools surveyed reported a formal mentoring program is at one level encouraging, but at another level, an area for concern.

In many schools of business faculty receive targeted guidance regarding annual review and tenure and promotion processes. However, faculty orientation and training often is focused on narrow, targeted career outcomes but does not address broader developmental goals. Our results suggest that in many business schools a significant opportunity exists to strengthen efforts to develop faculty rather than merely to get them through a process.

Another important conclusion to be drawn from the results is that significant gaps exist between current practice and best practice in business school mentoring. As Table 10 highlights, mentoring programs fall short on several dimensions[3]. In particular, it is not clear that programs are aligned or integrated with broader strategic initiatives, or managed in a manner that suggests recognition of the value that they can offer.

To the contrary, the results suggest that many mentoring programs are implemented in an ad hoc manner absent awareness of the research on best practices. The ad hoc nature of many formal mentoring programs demonstrates that significant opportunity exists to improve mentoring outcomes. The need for greater mentoring program development and formalization is shown in contrast to the characteristics of high performing mentoring programs identified in this study, i.e. dedicated funding, requirements for individual goals/training/program activities, program evaluation, mentor recognition and consideration of important inter-personal characteristics in matching mentors with protégés. These high performance mentoring practices are consistent with best practices in faculty mentoring more generally.

Business schools continue to face challenges associated with attracting and retaining productive faculty. With the growth of AACSB throughout the world and the concurrent competition for scholarly faculty it appears likely that these challenges will be ongoing in the years ahead. Schools that recognize the important benefits of mentoring faculty will be at an

[3] Only best practices listed in Table 2 that the survey explicitly addressed are included.

advantage, not only in retaining faculty but in helping faculty to be more productive and healthy scholars. The evidence from this study suggests that when appropriate infrastructure and processes are in place, faculty mentoring can generate productive outcomes.

The current work raises several opportunities for future research. The fact that fewer than half of business schools have a formal faculty mentoring program, and that programs are typically loosely structured and managed, raises the question 'why'? One can speculate that time, personnel, and budgetary constraints, and the independence of faculty members are part of the answer. Objective evidence may offer potential solutions that can motivate schools to adopt programs that have been shown to be successful. A more nuanced analysis of successful programs is another area for study. Whether these programs share contextual or cultural characteristics would offer significant insight. Moreover, this may lead to an understanding of how to create conditions for program success.

References

Allen, T.D., Day, R. & Lentz, E. (2005). The Role of Interpersonal Comfort in Mentoring Relationships. *Journal of Career Development*, 31(3), 155-169.

Allen, T., Eby, L., & Lentz, E. (2006a). Mentorship Behaviors and Mentorship Quality Associated With Formal Mentoring Programs: Closing the Gap Between Research and Practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(3), 567-578.

Allen, T., Eby, L., & Lentz, E. (2006b). The Relationship Between Formal Mentoring Program Characteristics and Perceived Program Effectiveness. *Personnel Psychology*, 559, 125-153.

Allen, T.D., Eby, L.T., Poteet, M.L., Lentz, E. & Lima Lizzette (2004). Career Benefits Associated with Mentoring for Proteges: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(1), 127-136.

Boyle, P., & Boice, B. (1998). Systematic Mentoring for New Faculty Teachers and Graduate Teaching Assistants. *Innovative Higher Education*, 22 (3), 157-179.

Bozeman, B. & Feeney, M.K. (2007). Toward a Useful Theory of Mentoring: A Conceptual Analysis and Critique. *Administration and Society*, 39(6), 719-739.

Colley, H. (2001). Righting Rewritings of the Myth of Mentor: A Critical Perspective on Career Guidance Mentoring. *British Journal of Guidance & Counseling*, 29, 177-197.

Eby, L.T., Lockwood, A. (2005). Proteges' and Mentors' Reactions to Participating in Formal Mentoring Programs: A Qualitative Investigation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 67, 441-458.

Eligibility Procedures and Accreditation Standards for Business Accreditation (2012, January) Retrieved May 29, 2013 from http://aacsb.edu/accreditation/standards-busn-jan2012.pdf

Gardner, B. (2011, November 17). We're Hiring. *Wall Street Journal*, Retrieved May 28, 2013 from http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204224604577032232809553166.html

Gibson, S. K. (2004). Being Mentored: The experience of Women Faculty. *Journal of Career Development*, 30(2), 173-188.

Hegstad, C.S. & Wentling, R. M. (2005). Organizational Antecedents and Moderators that Impact on the Effectivess of Exemplary Formal Mentoring Programs in Fortune 500 Companies in the United States. *Human Resource Development International, 8(4), 467-487*.

Johnson-Bailey, J. & Cervero, R.M. (2004). Mentoring in Black and White: The Intricacies of Cross-cultural Mentoring. *Mentoring and Tutoring*, 12(1), 7-21.

Knox, P. L., & McGovern, T. V. (1988). Mentoring Women in Academia. *Teaching of Psychology*, 15 (1), 39-41.

Kram,, K.E. (1985). *Mentoring at Work*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Lindenberger, J.G. & Zachary, L.J. (1999). Play "20 Questions" to Develop a Successful Mentoring Program. *Training and Development*, February, 12-14.

Luecke, R. (2004), '*Coaching and Mentoring: How to Develop Top Talent and Achieve Stronger Performance'*, Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Johnson, W.B. (2007), '*On Being a Mentor: A Guide for Higher Education Faculty',* Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum

Management Education at Risk: Report of the Management Education Task Force to the AACSB International Board of Directors, (2002, August) Retrieved September 25, 2012 from http://www.aacsb.edu/publications/metf/metfreportfinal-august02.pdf

McCauley, C.D. & Van Elsor, E. (Eds). (2004) '*The Center for Creative Leadership Handbook of Leadership Development*', San Francisco: Jossey:Bass.

Parise, M.R. & Forret, M.L. (2008). Formal Mentoring Programs: The Relationships of Program Design and Support to Mentors' Perceptions of Benefits and Costs. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 72, 225-240.

Ragins, B.R., Cotton, J.L. & Miller, J.S. (2000). Marginal Mentoring: The Effects of Type of Mentor, Quality of Relationship, and Program Design on Work, and Career Attitudes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(6), 1177-1194.

Scandura, T.A. (1998). Dysfunctional Mentoring Relationships and Outcomes. *Journal of Management*, 24(3), 449-467.

Tillman, L.C. (2001). Mentoring African American Faculty in Predominantly White Institutions. *Research in Higher Education*, 42(3), 295-325.

Wanberg, C.R., Kammeyer-Mueller, J. & Marchese, M. (2006). Mentor and Protégé Predictors and Outcomes of Mentoring in a Formal eMentoring Program. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69, 410-421.

Young, A. M., & Perrewe, P. L. (2000). What Did you Expect? An Examination of Career-Related Support and Social Support Among Mentors and Proteges. *Journal of Management*, 26 (4), 611-632.

Zellers, D. F., Howard, V. M., & Barcic, M. A. (2008). Faculty Mentoring Programs: Reenvisioning Rather Than Reinventing the Wheel. *Review of Educational Research* , 78 (3), 552-588.

Table 1

Key Benefits of Mentoring Programs

Focal Point	Authors	Benefits of Mentoring
Organizations	• Hegstadt and Wentling (2005) • Zellers, Howard, and Barcic (2008)	• Organizational learning and socialization • Preservation of intellectual capital, institutional memory • Awareness of cultural diversity • Networking, engagement, communication • Leadership capacity, succession planning • Organizational performance, cost effectiveness • Organizational stability, retention
Individuals	• Ragins, Cotton and Miller (2000) • Allen, Eby, Poteet, Lentz and Lima (2004) • Hegstadt and Wentling (2005) • Zellers, Howard, and Barcic (2008)	• Performance • Compensation/growth • Job/career satisfaction • Assimilation, socialization • Expectations of advancement, leadership opportunities, promotions • Self-esteem within organization • Commitment , loyalty to organization • Perceived procedural justice • Motivation to mentor • Lower actual/intended turnover
Graduate Students New Faculty	• Boyle and Boice (1998)	• Willingness to take risks • Political savvy • Research productivity • Career advancement
Faculty Members	• Zellers, Howard, and Barcic (2008)	• Confidence • Adjustment to organization • Job satisfaction • Scholarship • Teaching effectiveness • Lower feelings of isolation, alienation
Faculty Mentors	• Zellers, Howard, and Barcic (2008)	• Sense of contribution, accomplishment and personal satisfaction • Revitalization • Fresh ideas and new perspectives

Table 2

Best Practices in Faculty Mentoring

Best Practice	Authors
• Strategic/long term commitment, focus, top management support • Alignment of program goals with organizational mission, performance appraisal, promotions, rewards, incentives and recognitions.	• Boyle and Boice (1998) • Lindenberger and Zachary (1999) • Hegstad and Wentling (2005) • Parise and Forret (2008) • Zellers, Howard and Barcic (2008)
• Positive organizational culture (trust, teamwork, communication, respect for confidentiality) • Flat organizational structure	• Hegstad and Wentling (2005)
• Detailed prior program design and planning • Required activities, formal expectations	• Boyle and Boice (1998) • Hegstad and Wentling (2005)
• Voluntary participation, elective termination • Matching based on mentor/protégé input • Consideration of relative rank, gender, race in matching decisions • Broad network of academic mentors	• Knox and McGovern (1988) • Tillman (2001) • Gibson (2004) • Johnson-Bailey and Cervero (2004) • Hegstad and Wentling (2005) • Allen, Eby and Lentz (2006a) • Parise, and Forret (2008)
• Congruent, formally established/evaluated mentor/protégé goals and expectations	• Boyle and Boice (1998) • Young and Perrewe (2000) • Allen, Eby and Lentz (2006b) • Wanberg, Kammeyer-Mueller and Marchese (2006)

Table 3

Profile of Responding Institutions

	Institution	Reporting Unit
Type of Institution		
Public	75.4 %	
Private	24.6 %	
Size (Students)		
< 5,000	14.4 %	10.2 %
5,000 - 9,999	29.7 %	22.0 %
10,000 - 19,999	25.4 %	33.9 %
20,000 - 29,999	16.1 %	28.0 %
> 30,000	14.4 %	5.9 %
Degrees Offered		
Associates - Masters	5.9 %	5.9 %
Associates - Doctoral	11.9 %	1.7 %
Bachelors - Masters	23.7 %	58.4 %
Bachelors - Doctoral	54.2 %	23.7 %
Bachelors Only	4.2 %	10.2 %
Primary Mission		
Teaching		30.5 %
Research		8.5 %
Balanced		61.0 %

Table 4

Mean Responses - Mentor Assignment Criteria

Assignment Criterion	Mean*
Age	2.35
Race/Ethnicity	2.40
Gender	2.52
Preference/Interest of Protégé	3.61
Unique Qualifications of Mentor	3.63
Academic Rank	3.69
Preference/Interest of Mentor	3.87
Compatibility of Mentor/Protégé	3.87
Experience/Effectiveness of Mentor	3.88
Academic Discipline/Department	4.12
Tenure Status	4.15

* 1 = extremely unimportant, 5 = extremely important

Table 5

Mean Responses - Mentor Roles

Role	Mean*
Open Doors/Make Introductions	3.70
Professional Development - Teaching	3.94
Professional Development - Research	3.96
Serve as Role Model	4.02
Personal Support/Advice/Coping Strategies	4.11
Professional Guidance/Advocacy	4.19

* 1 = extremely unimportant, 5 = extremely important

Table 6

Mean Responses - Protégé Outcomes

Protégé Outcome	Mean*
Self-Esteem	3.08
Self-Confidence	3.14
Personal Well Being	3.16
Managing Work-Life Balance	3.31
Job Satisfaction	3.32
Research Performance	3.47
Teaching Performance	3.57
Promotion and Tenure Outcomes	3.72
Adjustment to Organizational Culture	3.82

* 1 = extremely unimportant, 5 = extremely important

Table 7

Mean Responses - Program Outcomes

Program Outcome	Mean*
Development of Leadership Capacity	3.20
Mentor Job Satisfaction	3.22
Promotion and Tenure Outcomes – Minority Faculty	3.49
Promotion and Tenure Outcomes – Female Faculty	3.51
Faculty Retention	3.63
Organizational Culture	3.75

* 1 = extremely unimportant, 5 = extremely important

Table 8

High versus Low Performing Programs – Program Structure

Variable		Protégé Outcomes		Program Outcomes	
		High (n=19)	Low (n = 16)	High (n=20)	Low (n=17)
Funded Program	Yes	40%	23.5%	37%	18.8%
	No	60%	76.5%	63%	81.3%
Age of Program	> 5 years	80%	47%	73.7%	37.5%
	< 5 years	15%	41.2%	21.1%	50.1%
Mandatory for Protégés	Yes	60%	47.1%	69.4%	37.6%
	No	40%	52.9%	31.6%	62.4%
Length of Mentoring	> 2 years	30%	29.4%	52.6%	37.6%
	≤ 2 years	40%	35.3%	21.1%	31.3%
Formal Program Goals	Yes	55%	52.9%	63.2%	25.1%
	No	45%	47.1%	36.8%	74.9%
Personal Mentoring Goals (Protégés)	Yes	25%	11.8%	36.9%	6.2%
	No	75%	88.2%	63.1%	92.8%
Formal Training for Mentors	Yes	30%	11.8%	31.6%	6.2%
	No	70%	88.2%	68.4%	93.8%
Formal Training for Protégés	Yes	40%	29.4%	52.6%	37.5%
	No	60%	70.6%	47.4%	62.5%
Workshops/Meetings	Yes	35%	17.6%	42.1%	18.8%
	No	65%	82.4%	57.9%	81.2%
Recognition for Mentors	Yes	60%	11.8%	57.9%	25%
	No	40%	88.2%	42.1%	75%
Formal Program Evaluation	Yes	60%	35.3%	63.1%	25.1%
	No	40%	64.7%	36.8%	74.9%
Formal Evaluation of Mentoring Outcomes	Yes	25%	23.5%	21.6%	12.6%
	No	75%	76.5%	78.9%	87.4%

Table 9

High versus Low Performing Programs – Mentor Assignment

Variable	Protégé Outcomes		Program Outcomes	
	High (n=19)	Low (n = 16)	High (n=20)	Low (n=17)
Race/Ethnicity	2.67	1.81	3.00	1.94
Gender	3.00	1.75	3.16	2.00
Preference/Interest of Protege			4.00	3.00
Compatibility of Mentor/Protege	4.11	3.38	4.25	3.53
Unique Qualifications of Mentor			3.89	3.29

Table 10

Current versus Best Practice

Best Practice	**Current Practice**
• Strategic/long term commitment, focus, top management support • Alignment of program goals with organizational mission, performance appraisal, promotions, rewards, incentives and recognitions.	• 70% of programs not funded • 60% of mentors not compensated/recognized • 26% of programs subject to no oversight • 53% of programs not formally evaluated, 80% do not evaluate mentoring outcomes
• Detailed prior program design and planning • Required activities, formal expectations	• 79% of mentors, 60% of protégés receive no training • 90% of programs have no required activities
• Voluntary participation, elective termination • Consideration of relative rank, gender, race in matching decisions	• 47% of programs have voluntary participation, 51% require participation of protégés • 34% of programs permit termination by mentor/protégé • 89% of programs do not formally screen mentors • 68% of programs assign mentors of higher rank • Race/gender least important variables in assigning mentors, tenure status amongst most important
• Congruent, formally established/evaluated mentor/protégé goals and expectations	• 53% of programs have no formal goals, 81% do not require personal goals • 76% of programs have primary focus on career development, 81% suggest balance between teaching and research