

Calderwood, P. E., & Klaf, S. (2014). Facilitating mentoring across three models of faculty work: Mentoring within a community of practice for faculty development. *Journal on Centers for Teaching and Learning*, 6, 59-91.

Facilitating Mentoring Across Three Models of Faculty Work: Mentoring Within a Community of Practice for Faculty Development

Patricia E. Calderwood
Suzanna Klaf
Fairfield University

Using a recently developed framework for mentoring within a community of practice (Smith, Calderwood, Dohm, & Gill Lopez, 2013) as an organizing schema, the authors examine how a Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) facilitates mentoring. The CTL explicitly and implicitly locates its work at the intersections of three models of faculty work (traditional, porous, and integrated) and three modes of mentoring (dyadic, network, and co-mentoring).

Introduction

Centers for Teaching and Learning (CTLs) have become important sources of faculty development in teaching and scholarship on many campuses. Typically framed as service providers within university infrastructures, CTLs provide numerous venues and opportunities (consultations, workshops, learning communities, new faculty mentoring, cross-campus collaborations, and so on) that educate and support faculty to become more expert in all aspects of teaching, and to become scholars of teaching and learning. In a study of the literature on faculty development in higher education, Amundsen and Wilson (2012) proposed a framework of faculty development work—skill, method, reflection, institutional focus, disciplinary focus, and an action research or inquiry focus—noting that they found a predominant focus on outcomes over process. Other

researchers have discussed the notion of marginality of centers and faculty developers in light of the transformative possibilities that such marginality incubates (Green & Little, 2013; Little & Green, 2012; Schroeder, 2012).

In their 2013 study, Smith et al. conceptualized integrated mentoring within a community of practice (CoP) framework, in which shared practice, individual and common identity formation, and a system of teaching, learning, norming, negotiating and celebrating the community are co-constructive of each other. Smith et al. built upon the characteristics of the “generic” community of practice model to propose a CoP *for mentoring*, in which the practice itself is mentoring, akin to “learning” being the primary practice (and process) of a community of learners. Adopting the Smith et al. framework of a CoP for mentoring, we have come to think of our CTL as a community of practice (CoP) for faculty development. We believe that mentoring faculty, and supporting them to mentor each other, are essential practices of faculty development work and, thus, are essential practices of our CTL.

Considering the transformative possibilities of CTLs’ support of faculty work, we offer a conceptual model of mentoring as a facilitative process within a CoP for faculty development. In other words, we believe that CTLs, regardless of the manifest purpose or outcomes of activities they provide, are significant facilitators of mentoring within a community of practice, the situated context for faculty work and for faculty development (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Smith et al., 2013). In this article we explore the reach of our CTL’s “mentoring as faculty development” activity across three ways that faculty on our campus pursue their teaching, scholarly activity, and service activity.

Mentoring as a facilitator of enculturation into organizations and academe, growth in one’s professional expertise, and an interpersonal support system has generated a substantial literature (Johnson, 2007; Luna & Cullen, 1995; McGuire & Reger, 2003; Sorcinelli & Yun, 2007; Yee & Hargis, 2012; Zachary, 2005, 2011; Zachary & Fischler, 2009; Zellers, Howard, & Barcic, 2008). Most of the literature explicitly or implicitly refers to the easily recognizable dyadic model of mentoring, a partnership in which a more experienced faculty member (mentor) provides a new faculty member with guidance through didactic means, modeling, conferring, and other activities, with the explicit purpose or expectation that the less experienced or junior person (mentee) learns from and applies the transmitted knowledge. Often, these partnerships are arranged by a third party (a faculty development center, department chair, or dean, for example).

Models of co-mentoring and networked mentoring usually highlight

the positive effects on job satisfaction and professional development (Sorcinelli, 2013; Sorcinelli & Yun, 2007). Networked mentoring occurs on an episodic, as-needed basis, as faculty reach out across social networks to exchange advice and assistance in limited interactions. Co-mentoring fundamentally differs from dyadic mentoring in that the mentoring give-and-take arises naturally from ongoing, purposeful, shared activity, such as might occur within a faculty study group (Reder & Gallagher, 2007). The building of a commons, interdependence, and sense of community in shared practice are consistently noted as key outcomes of co-mentoring groups. Lindholm (2003) notes that faculty, seeking a goodness of fit within their universities, often locate this fit outside their departments, in those spaces where faculty find community and relationships energized by commonality of interests and values, intellectual stimulation, professional resources, and emotional nurturance, all of which are also elements of co-mentoring, mentoring dyads, and networks. CTLs, including our center at Fairfield University, are often such spaces where faculty are nurtured and mentoring can occur.

Our CTL, founded in 2003, is located in a mid-sized comprehensive Jesuit university in New England. During our case study period (July 2012 to January 2014), we, as director and associate director of the center, offered learning communities, new faculty mentoring programs, over 60 workshops and events, approximately 65 confidential individual consultations, and 83 small-group instructional diagnoses (SGIDs, which are mid-semester assessments of teaching). We introduced writing retreats (Elbow & Sorcinelli, 2006), course design institutes, and cohort-based co-mentoring seminars for faculty and professional staff at all career stages; piloted a leadership fellows program; collaborated with campus partners (Lee, Jones, Verwood, Iqbal, & Johnson, 2011; Schroeder, 2012); and organized our annual conference. We envision all of these activities as significant elements of a mentoring culture (Zachary, 2005, 2011; Zachary & Fischler, 2009), within which multiple models of mentoring are institutionalized to support faculty development and professional advancement. This conceptualization of center activities furthers the center's mission to support innovation and scholarship in teaching and learning across the university. It also aligns with our university's values of *cura personalis*, or holistic care for the person, and of academic rigor and excellence, with its "... concerns for scholarship, justice, truth and freedom, and the diversity which their membership brings to the university community" (Mission Statement of Fairfield University, n.d.).

Mode of Inquiry

We incorporated a qualitative approach to support grounded theory building (Strauss & Corbin, 1990), such as content analysis of center documents and artifacts, various aspects of participant observation, and informal interviews and surveys. In particular, the conceptualization of how faculty work is most prevalently pursued on campus is grounded by first author Calderwood's familiarity with the local expectations for faculty teaching, service loads, expected quality and quantity of scholarly products, and the processes of professional advancement through the tenure and promotion process at our university. This familiarity was acquired over 16 years as a peer reader and evaluator of faculty dossiers prepared for annual reviews and for tenure/promotion, successful passage through her pre-tenure years to full professorship, a three-year term on the university rank and tenure committee, and confidential consultations conducted as center director.

Building upon Smith et al.'s (2013) model of a CoP for mentoring, we developed a conceptual map for mentoring within a CoP for faculty development (see Table 1). We integrated that conceptual map with one outlining three models of faculty work co-existing on our campus (see Table 2) and then examined our CTL's mentoring facilitation. We found that almost every CTL activity triggered mentoring that often seemed to rise organically from shared activity. We found that this mentoring added value, regardless of whether the CTL was deliberately structured for mentoring to occur or if mentoring arose organically from shared activity. We found that mentoring, for both faculty and CTL staff, increased a sense of "safe space," particularly in consultations and formal co-mentoring configurations (Calderwood & Klaf, in press).

These findings prompted questions: Does it matter whether the mentoring facilitation is intentionally built into the process, or if it occurs naturally as a by-process or by-product within shared activity that has another purpose? Does deliberate design for mentoring, and an activist mentoring stance by CTL staff, have limits and boundaries relative to its mission? For example, does designing for mentoring support or interrupt the "safe space" for faculty development that many CTLs strive to provide? How do we conceptualize and negotiate the shared identity and practices of a community of practice for faculty development that includes the center staff as peers (rather than merely service providers) in the co-construction of the CoP?

As we considered the questions above, we also wondered if faculty with differing conceptualizations of faculty work expectations (which, on

Table 1
**Mentoring Within a Community of Practice
 for Faculty Development (adapted from Smith et al., 2013)**

<p>Shared Practice</p>	<p><i>Mentoring Within a Community of Practice</i></p> <p>Mentoring and being mentored through dyadic relationships, networking, and co-mentoring are signifying practices of the CoP. Mentoring within a CoP is frequently an informal or implicit outcome of shared practice, regardless of the activity's primary purpose.</p>	<p><i>Mentoring Within a Community of Practice for Faculty Development</i></p> <p>Mentoring and being mentored through co-mentoring, dyadic mentoring relationships, and networking are embedded within the center's activity, regardless of the activity's primary purpose. Mentoring and mentoring leadership can be an impetus to or outcome of shared practice, regardless of the activity's primary purpose; is fluid and contextualized; and is possible for all participants.</p>
------------------------	---	--

Table 1 (*continued*)
Mentoring Within a Community of Practice for Faculty Development (adapted from Smith et al., 2013)

<p>Development of Group and Individual Identity</p>	<p><i>Mentoring Within a Community of Practice</i></p> <p>Mentoring identity is contextualized by socio-cultural constraints (e.g., gender, race, age, or longevity of one's membership in the community). Mentoring identity can be transitional and situational, evident only during episodic shared practice or can endure over time, transcending specific or episodic shared practice.</p>	<p><i>Mentoring Within a Community of Practice for Faculty Development</i></p> <p>New faculty mentors have a formal and explicit identity within an identified traditional dyad and co-mentoring group. Co-mentoring group participants identify explicitly as co-mentors during shared activity. Mentoring and mentoring leadership identity are contextualized by socio-cultural factors (e.g., gender, race, age, or longevity of one's membership in the community), formal roles and role-related identities (department chair, dean, program director, center director, etc.).</p> <p>Mentoring and mentoring leadership identity can be transitional, arising only during episodic shared practice or can endure over time, transcending specific or episodic shared practice.</p>
---	---	---

<p>Teaching, Learning, Norming, Negotiating, and Celebrating the Community of Practice</p>	<p>Shared meaning and valuations of the community's practices and roles, including that of mentoring, are negotiated (contested, accepted, ratified or otherwise examined) formally, informally, explicitly and implicitly by the community participants during shared practice.</p> <p>Shared meaning and valuations of mentoring and mentoring leadership are negotiated (contested, accepted, ratified or otherwise examined) formally, informally, explicitly and implicitly by participants during participation in some center activities, most notably those that are explicitly labeled as mentoring events.</p> <p>Transitions, changes and continuity in mentoring and mentoring leadership configurations and practices within the center's activity within the CoP may be explicit or implicit, as may access to mentoring and mentoring leadership opportunities.</p> <p>Participants expect to gain access to mentoring or to learn how to mentor, be mentored and to lead through mentoring through participation in center activities that are intentionally designed as mentoring catalysts or advertised as mentoring events.</p>
--	---

Table 2
Three Models of Faculty Work

	<i>Scholarship</i>	<i>Teaching</i>	<i>Service</i>	<i>Collegiality</i>
Traditional Model	Disciplinary scholarship is the norm.	Teaching is focused on content knowledge and pedagogical skill sets.	Professional service is a co-construction of one's scholarly discipline and is conceived, weakly, as scholarship. Campus citizenship is a duty.	Collegiality is an implicit process in scholarship, teaching, & service. Collegiality is an explicit personal characteristic.
Porous Model	Disciplinary scholarship dominates. Discipline-specific SoTL appears. Generalized SoTL may appear.	Disciplinary and pedagogical knowledge and skills serve student learning. Scholarly teaching is evident. Some engaged teaching may appear.	Professional service is a co-construction of one's scholarly discipline and, thus, a scholarly activity. Campus citizenship is a co-construction of one's local community of practice.	Collegiality is an implicit process in scholarship, teaching, & service. Collegiality is an explicit personal characteristic. Collegiality is an explicit process in peer review of teaching.

<p>Integrated Model</p>	<p>Disciplinary scholarship need not dominate. Discipline-specific SoTL appears. Generalized SoTL may appear. CES (community-engaged scholarship) may appear. Public scholarship may appear.</p>	<p>Disciplinary and pedagogical knowledge and skills serve student learning. Scholarly and engaged teaching are conspicuous.</p>	<p>Professional Service is a co-construction of one's scholarly discipline. Campus citizenship is a co-construction of one's local community of practice. Public citizenship and community engagement are valued.</p>	<p>Collegiality is an implicit process in scholarship, & teaching, & service. Collegiality is an explicit personal characteristic. Collegiality is an explicit process in peer review of teaching. Collegiality is an essential element of community engagement.</p>
--------------------------------	--	---	---	---

our campus, are labeled as teaching, scholarship, and service) engaged in center activities and mentoring modes in ways that were specific to one conceptualization or another. This last question required us to develop a description of how faculty across campus managed their teaching, scholarship, and service activities, as elaborated next.

Multiple Models of Faculty Work That Invite Mentoring to Arise Through Shared Activity

As we considered ways of thinking about faculty work on our campus and addressed our first research question, we saw that the center served—sometimes deliberately or explicitly, and sometimes implicitly and informally—as an intersection within multiple mentoring networks. The CTL arranged co-mentoring cohorts, suggested dyadic mentoring partnerships, and provided a variety of catalytic activities to extend any of the three mentoring modes one would expect to find within a community of practice (Smith et al., 2013).

Based upon participant observation, participant surveys, informal conversations and interviews with participating and non-participating, and review of tenure and promotion processes, we identified three distinct conceptualizations of the relationship between and among scholarship, teaching, and service: traditional (with clearly bounded scholarship, teaching, and service); porous (in which the boundaries between teaching, scholarship, and service were not rigid, and one's teaching or service could clearly be seen as scholarly); and integrated (in which one's teaching, service, and scholarship were interdependent, and the more traditional boundaries between those activities were, consequently, difficult to discern) (see Table 3). Regardless of traditional or alternative conceptualizations of faculty work, the infusion of *collegiality* was an implicit element of each work sphere. We also noted that many of the faculty on our campus participate in dyadic mentoring partnerships, and provide informal mentoring through networking or co-mentoring activities as an element of their collegiality (Yee & Hargis, 2012). On our campus, this collegiality, at its thinnest iteration, means cooperating with one's fellow faculty to accomplish necessary shared work with as little bloodshed (actual or symbolic) as possible. In its thicker iterations, collegiality expands to include a shared sense of identity, purpose, and practice, an element of beneficence toward one's fellows, and a sense of responsibility for their collective professional development. Our local manifestations of collegiality fit snugly into the parameters of a CoP's generation of shared practice, identity, and the negotiation of both.

Insert Table 3 as a fold-out on pp. 69-70

A Traditional Conception of Faculty Work

In the guidelines for tenure and promotion on our campus, we do not formally rank any of the three work categories of teaching, scholarship, and service as inherently more valuable than the others, nor is there an explicit requirement that discipline-specific scholarship lead all other scholarly activity. We do not have explicit requirements for numbers of publications required for a promotion, clear explanations for what constitutes excellence in teaching, or how extensive one's service must be. Our guidelines are deliberately worded with considerable room for interpretation. The evaluation process is substantially, but not completely, transparent. For example, dossier preparation guidelines are detailed and orderly, with categories and sub-categories of teaching, scholarship, and service clearly delineated. Disciplinary scholarship, in the form of peer-reviewed books, book chapters, and journal articles, appears sooner in the guidelines than do other forms of scholarship, which implicitly privileges it. A faculty member learns how to navigate the tenure and promotion processes under the mostly informal guidance of his or her more experienced peers. He or she also learns how to be (or not to be) collegial. Under these conditions, an individual faculty member has some opportunity to choose how she or he manages the separation or integration of teaching, scholarship, and service.

At Fairfield, a majority of faculty follow a traditional conception of faculty work, within which teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service are clearly bounded and ranked in significance. Within this conceptualization, service is expected, but it is less valued within the reward system (annual merit reviews and tenure and promotion bids) than disciplinary scholarship or teaching, and specific kinds of service are expected and accordingly valued (Price & Cotten, 2006). Community service has fairly low value compared to service on elected university-wide committees. Service to one's profession is identified in our tenure and promotion dossier preparation guidelines as an element of scholarship, but with relatively low scholarship weight in high stakes evaluations such as tenure decisions, because it is enumerated after other elements of scholarship, such as publications and presentations. There is an expectation that one's service includes co-construction (such as providing peer reviews, holding office, or serving as a panel discussant) of one's scholarly discipline, establishing the faculty member's commitment to and legitimacy within a disciplinary community of scholars. A study of recently tenured faculty's expectations for their service within this conception of faculty work by Neumann and Terosky (2007) found that faculty

commonly avoid or minimize service activities, as the ancillary benefits of engaging in service were not seen to be connected to the continued development of their scholarly production. Faculty at Fairfield who follow a traditional path emphasize the performance of classroom teaching and the content knowledge and pedagogical skill set of the teacher, deemphasizing or ignoring other aspects of teaching (student learning, mentoring, collaboration, advising, program design, assessment design, and the like). Traditionally oriented faculty offer student satisfaction surveys and formal observations provided by their more established peers as evidence of teaching competence, but often they do not proffer evidence of other aspects of teaching (advising, curriculum development, and so on) in their tenure or promotion dossiers. The more traditionally oriented among the faculty value disciplinary scholarship most highly. Boyer's 1997 original conceptualization of scholarship modes and products suffices as the paradigm for scholarly activity. Peer-reviewed publications are most highly regarded, limited notions of peer review are validated, and limited products are recognized, with traditional scholarly venues (publication in journals or books) expected as evidence of scholarly work.

Based on conversations with new and experienced faculty and their participation in certain of our center's offerings, traditionally oriented faculty approve of the new faculty mentoring program as an enhancement to the formal or informal mentoring offered within their departments. Departmental colleagues often offer advice to the newcomers, such as to focus on fine-tuning their classroom teaching as their first priority during their first year or two on campus, to spend some time on their disciplinary research, and to refrain from engaging in service. Experienced faculty urge the new faculty members to utilize our midterm assessments of teaching (MAT), back-to-school workshops (particularly the sessions on course management systems), and course design institutes to build their pedagogical knowledge and skills. Department chairs or colleagues may conduct evaluative peer observations of the new hires' classroom teaching. In this scenario, the center's staff-based mentoring arises most commonly during MATs. A good number of more experienced faculty whose conceptions of faculty work are traditional always have volunteered as new faculty mentors, and their advice to faculty mirrors intra-departmental advice. In addition to their roles as experts of our local culture within dyadic mentoring relationships, traditionally oriented faculty participated in straightforward pedagogical workshops during the case study period, using the center as part of their mentoring network. Traditionally oriented faculty have joined departmental teaching circles as well as center-sponsored peer review of teaching groups and faculty

learning communities, where co-mentoring frequently occurs organically in the pursuit of the shared work and manifest purposes of these groups.

For some of our faculty, this traditional conceptualization of faculty work solidly and uncomplicatedly resonates with their disciplinary training and expectations for academic life. At our mission-driven university, however, our shared project draws us toward a construction of academic life and work that etches a greater porosity of boundaries across teaching, scholarship, and service.

A Porous Notion of Faculty Work

An alternative conceptualization of faculty teaching, scholarship, and service is that these activities build upon and support each other. This porosity across the categories of teaching, scholarship, and service is thriving on our campus (Bernstein & Ginsberg, 2009; Fairweather et al., 2013; Michael et al., 2010). In this conceptualization, the category of disciplinary-specific scholarship retains its privilege, although traditional venues, activities, and products of scholarship increasingly include the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) and community-engaged scholarship (CES). The peer-reviewed and published SoTL is defined by Potter and Kustra (2011) as “the systematic study of teaching and learning, using established or validated criteria of scholarship, to understand how teaching (beliefs, behaviors, attitudes, and values) can maximize learning, and/or develop a more accurate understanding of learning, resulting in products that are publicly shared for critique and use by an appropriate community” (p. 2). Bernstein and Ginsberg (2009) advocate that CTLs such as ours incorporate a full-circle approach to mentoring for SoTL expertise. Centers mentor faculty, who, in turn, mentor additional faculty, creating a sustainable culture of SoTL and scholarly teaching. Although not explicitly shifting the expert/novice axis toward a more egalitarian co-mentoring model, this recommendation aligns well with our model of mentoring within a CoP for faculty development, particularly noticeable during our peer review of teaching initiative (Calderwood & Klaf, in press). We also found that the co-mentoring clusters organized for our new faculty mentoring program prompted a number of reciprocal teaching observations and conversations (Bottoms et al., 2013), supporting an egalitarian peer review of teaching climate within which even the least experienced faculty members’ approaches to teaching and understandings of student learning were mined for wisdom (Chism, 2007; Holmgren, 2005). Participating senior faculty were excited to learn with and from their new colleagues (S. Etemad, personal communication, April 9, 2014).

Those new (and experienced) faculty who then joined the January 2014 course design institute spent a week together in scholarly study of their teaching and of student learning needs.

Community engagement, characterized by reciprocity and mutual benefit between university and community partners, overlapping to some degree with SoTL, has as one output its peer-reviewed and published CES (Austin, Gappa, & Trice, 2007; Barker, 2004; Bringle, Clayton, & Price, 2009; Bringle, Hatcher, & Clayton, 2006; Hubball, Pearson, & Clarke, 2013; Hutchings, Huber, & Ciccone, 2011; Jordan, 2007).

In the porous conceptualization of faculty work, we see the rise of peer regard for scholarly teaching and scholarly service. We also see that this stance augments one's identity as a scholar of teaching, learning, and engagement within and beyond one's professional discipline (Caster & Hautala, 2008; Rehrey, Siering, & Hostetter, 2014; Williams et al., 2013; Zakrajsek, 2013). Some aspects of teaching and service become increasingly scholarly, particularly when embedded in a well-articulated tradition of pedagogical theory and practice. Scholarly teaching is reflective practice that includes the explication of teaching philosophies and the incorporation of research-based "best" practices (Potter & Kustra, 2011). Expanded notions of teaching emphasize learning outcomes for students, and faculty employ (and critique) theoretically informed teacher content knowledge and pedagogical skills to support desired student learning. Scholarly teaching may be considered as actual scholarship (SoTL or other) if peer-review and publication of the work occurs in traditional scholarly venues. Faculty critique their teaching and related student learning in peer-reviewed and published venues, although SoTL may augment but not replace the scholarship of discovery or application in one's discipline.

As community engagement and service learning gain in value, CES enriches traditional notions of service (Clayton, Bringle, Senior, Huq, & Morrison, 2010; Doberneck, Glass, & Schweitzer, 2010, 2011; Glass, Doberneck, & Schweitzer, 2011). Scholarly service is informed by the growing literature on community engagement and partnerships, and includes reflective practice, self-study, and critical studies literatures. Scholarly service, like scholarly teaching, can count as scholarship on our campus when published in traditional peer-reviewed venues.

In order to support more porous and integrated models of faculty work, our CTL collaborated with the University's Office of Service Learning to educate and entice our faculty to become engaged teachers and scholars of this engagement, bringing a mentoring network of nationally renowned experts (Tim Eatman, Diane Doberneck, Patti Clayton) to campus for conversations and networked mentoring. Candid conversations with

our network of experts and with our tenured and tenure-track faculty participants revealed that a number of our faculty put off engaged scholarship and teaching until they felt that they had satisfactorily crossed the threshold of tenure, viewing a more porous organization of their faculty work as a next step in a trajectory away from a strictly traditional approach to faculty work. As our university has recently added explicit language supporting community engaged scholarship, teaching, and service to our rank and tenure guidelines, we hope to see tenure-track faculty becoming more open about anchoring their teaching in engagement, and in producing CES. Our collaboration with the Office of Service Learning is a key to supporting networked mentoring among interested faculty.

An Integrated Conceptualization of Faculty Work

We also see a third model of faculty work gaining traction at the university, one that is fundamentally integrated. This conceptualization of faculty work builds on a substantial integration of teaching, service, and scholarship within which it becomes more difficult to identify integrated activity as residing solely in one category or another. As a consequence, traditional scholarship is not automatically the most privileged aspect of faculty work. In this emerging model, traditional venues and alternative venues for publication are accepted and valued. Authorship and ownership of projects and products vary, notions and processes of peer review expand, methods and methodologies are multiple. Scholarly, engaged teaching increases in visibility and value. Theoretical and practical knowledge and skills intersect not only in teaching, but also in service and scholarship, increasing the regard for applied and engaged scholarship (Boyd, 2013). Additionally, formerly low-ranking service activities increase in visibility and value as engaged scholarship and/or engaged teaching (for example, service-learning courses or other course-based community engagement) is highly valued. There is some shared territory between SoTL and CES that sometimes surfaces in the integration of scholarship, scholarly teaching, and engaged service, and this blurring of formerly distinct arenas resonates deeply with a growing number of our faculty. For some of our faculty it becomes quite difficult to delineate where SoTL and CES diverge in their teaching, scholarship, and service. Our collaborative workshops, invited speakers, and annual conference were notable opportunities for shared exploration of this integrated approach to faculty work. As for faculty pursuing a porous notion of faculty work, a deeply integrated model often is eschewed by tenure-track faculty until they have earned tenure, and it also is infrequently pursued by tenured associate professors on the road to a full professorship. Disciplinary scholarship

and disciplinarily distinct teaching are still of significant importance in the strategic approach to this last promotion. Our co-mentoring seminars have been opportunities for mid-career faculty to explore an integrated approach to their work with senior faculty and with faculty leaders. As with advice given to those seeking tenure or promotion to associate or full professorship, the mentoring advice to faculty with an integrated configuration of their faculty work cautions that they must be sure to argue (implicitly or explicitly) that their cases also meet the thresholds expected for scholarship, teaching, and service in the traditional model. When asked, in April 2014, "In light of our collegial conversation about the cultural shift toward a broader base of engaged scholarship here at Fairfield, what do you identify as the most significant institutional challenges and opportunities?" one faculty member told us this:

Faculty who do community-engaged work should be encouraged and praised accordingly. I do not expect this type of work to be embraced by everybody, as not everybody is properly equipped or willing to do the (extra) job. But those who do it should be properly supported by the University and have incentives to do it, while those who do not do it need to understand that there is great value in what their other colleagues are doing.

Another faculty member responded as follows:

[A challenge is] getting administrators to realize that the language does have to be explicitly re-written to break down the fears that faculty have towards building portfolios that could be considered "non-traditional." Although there is a good deal of institutional support here at Fairfield, just because there is a culture of service is not enough to alleviate faculty worries about the value of the work while they are under review of the P & T committee.

However, as with faculty whose profiles demonstrate at least some porosity in the arenas of their faculty work, a well-explained case for integration of the arenas can be well-received by colleagues, and by the rank and tenure committee, as long as it is also clear that disciplinary scholarship is present, and that one's service includes recognizable professional and university-based service. Two of the participants in the dossier preparation group, one of whom considers her work to be thoroughly integrated, and the other who considers his work to be porous, were subsequently promoted and tenured with dossiers that effectively showcased how they met the threshold and gold standard of disciplinary teaching, scholarship, and service along with their more integrated or

porous approaches to faculty work. One participant wrote in her tenure dossier that “Service in and with the community beyond Fairfield University is important to me. Working for social justice is my passion and believe I cannot ask students to do the same if I am not engaged in social action” (S. Storms (personal communication, April 29, 2014).

Findings

In our preparatory inquiry leading to this study, we learned that the center’s signature activities (workshops, consultations, learning communities, collaborations) made existing and potential mentoring networks visible and accessible to faculty, regardless of whether we labeled them as mentoring opportunities. We learned that the opportunity to engage together in authentic work holds great appeal for our faculty. Understanding that we are constructing shared practice together, from the ground up, positions our center as deeply connected to faculty work rather than as an ancillary service provider (Calderwood & Klaf, in press).

When we asked faculty participating in CTL offerings why they did so and what they hoped to gain from activities intentionally named as mentoring, their comments included the following: the desire to form a “a community of learners, especially those engaged in the work of mindful reflection, guidance, comity”; “to share info and tips to make our lives better!”; to create a “support group”; and to be more plugged into a network of co-mentors: “I hope to gain a better working and mentoring relationship with various members of the university community. Every semester, I see how easy it is to become focused on teaching, research, and department responsibilities, which can lead to increased isolation from the university community. I am excited about this opportunity” (mid-career mentoring program participants, 2013-2014). Faculty opt-in to our offerings because they are seeking a community in which they can make their work visible, feel supported and validated, render their practices meaningful, and de-silo by participating in co-learning. These motivations are universal regardless of the mentoring configuration or faculty work engaged.

Our inquiry indicates that dyadic mentoring, networked mentoring, and co-mentoring facilitated or catalyzed through our center appealed to faculty espousing any of the three conceptualizations of faculty work outlined above. We observed some patterns of participation that are useful for understanding what mentoring opportunities embedded in which center activities appeal more or less strongly to faculty with one or another conceptualization of faculty work. These insights will be useful

for configuring our future offerings to appeal to a broad representation of our faculty. In particular, we need to recognize the various pressures that faculty face professionally as well as the constraints on their time. As one co-mentoring circle participant noted, "It is unfortunately quite challenging to make time in our busy work lives to talk with others and reflect on one's work. I look at this as a great opportunity to work with different people and hear different perspectives on leadership, management, and work at the University" (leadership co-mentoring circle participants, 2013-2014). Through our offerings, we embed mentoring so that faculty self-select into activities that best fit their personal and professional needs.

The dyadic mentoring configuration, aligned within an expert/novice paradigm, was seldom facilitated by the center, as we only organized dyadic mentoring for the new faculty mentoring program. Our new faculty mentoring program interdisciplinarily pairs experienced faculty with new tenure-track faculty for informal mentoring focused on acclimation to our university culture, with specific emphasis on professional advancement toward tenure. During our case study period, we blurred the dyads by forming co-mentoring clusters, interrupting a singular expert/novice configuration, and emphasizing networking and co-mentoring (Calderwood & Klaf, in press). As the new faculty mentoring partnerships were intentionally cross-disciplinary, the mentoring focused on pedagogy, student learning, and service. We noted that a traditional paradigm for service was espoused by the partners so as to better enable the new faculty to protect their time for scholarship.

When we asked what faculty hoped to gain from the new faculty mentoring program, they indicated the importance of sharing across participants, networking, and building a sustainable community across campus, including

- sharing of best practices, increase my connectivity with other professors;
- learning strategies for balancing teaching and research responsibilities and to build community that extends beyond the departmental and college levels;
- building lasting and supportive partnerships that will assist me to grow as a teacher and scholar; and
- sharing ideas and resources that will help all of us participants hone the craft of teaching and shape our career for the long-term. (New faculty mentoring program participants, 2013-2014).

New faculty are seeking networks of support by proactively engaging in a structured CTL offering. In forming networks, they are looking for assistance as they transition into our university culture and for guidance on finding balance across the demands of being a professor. Through participation, new faculty hope to build a strong foundation for their success in the professoriate.

Participating faculty noted what a valuable opportunity it was to engage in center activities labeled as mentoring, whether for the satisfaction of helping colleagues—"I like that [the center] hooked me up with some candidates for mentoring who I would not have otherwise met, and who seem to find it useful" (mentor to new faculty, 2013-2014)—or seeking assistance from colleagues—"if challenging situations come up, we have a safe place in which to seek advice and discuss alternatives" (new faculty mentoring program participant, 2013-2014).

The participants in the new faculty mentoring clusters extensively used co-mentoring and networking to support development in teaching expertise. They focused on pedagogical knowledge and skill more explicitly than on student learning, but did not exclude a focus on student learning. The co-mentoring clusters, interestingly, displaced the more senior faculty as the exclusive pedagogical experts, substituting a more egalitarian peer-mentoring climate for attending to the arena of teaching. The orientation of faculty to their work (traditional, porous, or integrated) was not particularly salient to this particular center offering, although a porous orientation toward the arena of teaching was most apparent. Probably because the reciprocal teaching observations did not interrupt a traditional viewpoint of either scholarship or service, even the most traditionally oriented person remained comfortable, as noted in end-of-semester surveys. Similarly, because the new faculty mentoring cohort advocated a light service load for the first year, and because, regardless of their orientation, new faculty were most concerned with establishing their teaching credibility, even those with an integrated understanding of faculty work were not discontented with the mentoring exchanged.

The concerns of new faculty about their teaching are echoed in the research of Boice (1992), who notes that, for new faculty, teaching takes precedence over other important tasks. Thus, new faculty need support in finding work-life balance.

The other cohort-based co-mentoring groups (lifework balance, dossier preparation, leadership exploration) similarly held appeal across all three orientations toward faculty work, but dyadic mentoring was not visible during their activities. As an example, networking and co-mentoring predominated in the dossier preparation group, and the eminence of

disciplinary scholarship and the distinctions between campus and professional service dominated the advice shared. However, during each of the planned activities, the participants explored the porosity and integration of their scholarship, teaching, and service. The participants embraced scholarly teaching and an emphasis on students as preferred approaches to making constant improvements in their teaching. All of the participants in the dossier preparation group hailed from three of our four professional schools (engineering, education, and nursing), and they were thoroughly immersed in community engaged teaching. This common professional orientation prompted several critical conversations among the dossier group about the wisdom and logistics of a fully integrated approach to faculty work for pre-tenured faculty, and for faculty applying for promotion to full professor. All participants in the group agreed that the production of peer-reviewed disciplinary scholarship was necessary to gain tenure and promotion, but all were deeply invested in their SoTL and CES scholarship as well. Given that their disciplines were inherently engaged and required critical reflection on teaching, the education and nursing faculty found it natural that their disciplinary scholarship included foci in SoTL and CES. Teaching was engaged for the education and nursing faculty as well, all of whom accompanied their students into community-based engagement in settings authentic to their professions. These faculty, one full professor holding an integrated vision of her own faculty work, and three tenure-track assistant professors with porous or integrated conceptualizations who were preparing for tenure and promotion, strategized together, co-mentoring each other to foreground and background aspects of the integrated work so as to clarify their crossing of the traditional thresholds while not hiding or disguising their porous or integrated conceptions of their work as faculty. Our engineering participant, planning for a promotion to full professor, saw his own work as porous, and he was very pleased that he would be able to demonstrate a trajectory that showcased the enhancements that SoTL and CES approaches had brought to his work over time.

Similarly, the leadership co-mentoring group drew five faculty members with varied conceptualizations of faculty work. All tenured associate or full professors (and all female) group members were either tentatively porous (an engineer), comfortably porous (a poet), or deeply integrated (a school psychologist and two teacher educators) in their approaches to faculty work. Although the co-mentoring focus was on leadership and collegiality, many of the conversations revealed the varied scope of the integration of scholarship, teaching, and service among the group members. A common interest in leadership drew the group together, co-mentoring

glued the group together, and opportunities informally to explore the spectrum of faculty work were a welcome bonus. In this co-mentoring group, differences in faculty conceptualizations about their work were incidental to their common interest in exploring leadership.

As with our sustained learning communities, making existing or potential mentoring networks visible and accessible was a consistent element of the CTL's episodic offerings, such as workshops, our conference, or individual consultations. Because most of the episodic activity was brief and clearly bounded in focus, we had little opportunity to observe dyadic or co-mentoring in those contexts. For the pedagogical workshops, group consults, institutes, and conferences, how faculty conceptualized their work (traditional, porous, or integrated) took a back seat to their other reasons for participation (for example, learning how to use a course management system, or learning how to interpret IDEA, our student course evaluation system). Faculty with porous or integrated approaches attended events featuring SoTL or CES, while MATs and other individual consultations and our varied learning communities drew faculty with all three conceptualizations of their work.

As our research has progressed, we have reorganized our original triangulated set of models of faculty work, noting a dynamic interplay and set of trajectories within. We observed that what we had assumed were three conceptually distinct organizations of faculty work (traditional, porous, and integrated) are not necessarily so distinct or polarized for many faculty. On our campus, the traditional conception of clearly bounded arenas of faculty work (scholarship, teaching, service, all threaded through with collegiality) is both a threshold and "gold standard" within the university's faculty reward system. For some of our faculty, this traditional conception endures regardless of their rank or tenured status. For a subset of those faculty members, maturity into their profession and into our campus community not only allows, but also encourages, increased porosity of categories. Prior to and during this case study period, our CTL has helped faculty learn about and try SoTL and scholarly teaching, catalyzing co-mentoring or making mentoring networks visible as an element of this effort. Some of our participants incorporate SoTL perspectives to their disciplinary teaching as an addition to their reflective practice; while others transform their teaching into scholarly inquiry. For a more select group of faculty, the choice to engage deeply through their teaching, scholarship, and/or service grows in appeal and possibility. Given our university's mission, the move toward community engagement in any or all areas of faculty work is encouraged by administrators and faculty, so long as it does not interfere with one's progress toward tenure. Our center has

collaborated with campus partners prior to and during the case study period to organize and facilitate many offerings, some sustained and some episodic, to educate and mentor faculty toward engagement and CES.

For some faculty, an orientation toward a porous or integrated conceptualization might be present in the early years of their academic careers, but it lies fallow until they have established their disciplinary scholarship, teaching competence, and professional and campus service sufficiently for tenure or promotion. For others so inclined, porosity or integration of arena boundaries are visible from the start, augmenting but not displacing the primacy of a traditional conceptualization. For a very small minority of our faculty, an integrated conceptualization is present at the start of their careers.

Whether faculty organize their work arenas to be porous or integrated, the traditional conceptualization looms large in their professional advancement. For example, faculty work that has porous boundaries for scholarship, teaching, and service still includes disciplinary scholarship, content-rich teaching, and good campus citizenship. The blurriness of the borders and the seeping together of scholarly teaching or engaged teaching, for example, can be backgrounded in a case for tenure or promotion, allowing the traditional activities to be foregrounded. It is a matter of finessing the emphasis in the story one tells about one's work so that SoTL, for example, enriches, but does not displace one's more traditionally organized teaching or scholarship activities. Even for more thoroughly integrated conceptualizations of faculty work, one still discerns what is not scholarship, what is not teaching, what is not service. What changes in the more integrated conceptualization is that many practices are simultaneously scholarship, service, and teaching, and that these practices interact and meld to fill out a rich system of multiply valenced activities.

Does Mentoring Matter?

Earlier, we noted three questions that we hoped would be answered by our investigation. Our first question inquired if it matters whether the mentoring facilitation is intentionally built into the process, or if it occurs naturally as a by-process or by-product within shared activity that has another purpose. We found that labeling and advertising an activity as co-mentoring appealed to faculty who were inclined to think of mentoring as a significant facilitative factor for professional development. But when we surveyed participants across all activities, they frequently noted aspects of a CoP for faculty development as being valued, although rarely did anyone actually use the term "CoP" or "mentoring." Upon scrutiny

of the design of our CTL activities that included shared activity, such as collaborative course design, we observed that they indeed prompted co-mentoring and networked mentoring to arise naturally during and after the activity. Participant responses corroborate this finding. Although not all participants used the words “co-mentoring” or “networked mentoring” when they commented on the processes in which they engaged, they used words such as “learned from,” “reflected with,” and “observed.”

Our second question inquired about the relationship of the Center’s mentoring work to its mission. We wanted to know if deliberate design for mentoring and an activist mentoring stance by CTL staff have limits and boundaries relative to the center’s mission to support development of faculty excellence in teaching and scholarship. In particular, we wondered if designing for mentoring supports or interrupts the “safe space” for faculty development that many CTLs strive to provide. We found that designing for mentoring supported and, in some cases, extended the safe space. For example, a space safe for faculty members to be vulnerable with regard to their desire, ambition, and progress toward promotion to full professor was achieved beyond our expectations during an activity sponsored by our mid-career faculty group. Faculty who had not published in a while were worried that the quality and quantity of production they would need to muster might be beyond their capacity. Faculty who had successfully earned promotion shared their struggles and insights with the associate professors, pinpointing turning points (such as just after earning tenure, or when experiencing changes in family obligations) that had a significant impact on their professional advancement (for better or for worse) along with their toughest challenges. Others, invited to the discussion to share a “big picture” based on extensive experience at the university, offered insights about shifting gears or jumpstarting their scholarship toward the SoTL and/or CES. During the conversation, we noted that many of the interested faculty did not want to pick up or continue their “traditional” research, but they were intrigued by becoming community-engaged scholars or scholars of teaching and learning. We asked participants in this event if the CTL should encourage such a shift. They encouraged us to do so, as long as we also cautioned faculty to not neglect their disciplinary scholarship in the process.

We found mixed answers to our third question, which asked us to identify how we conceptualize and negotiate the shared identity and practices of a CoP for faculty development that includes the center staff as peers (rather than as merely service providers) in the CoP. We can note that the disparate faculty status of the center staff (one tenured full professor; one professional staff person with contingent faculty status) was influential to

some degree in defining both our peer status and service provider status. Each of us, as individuals, interacted with differing influence in cross-campus collaborations with deans and directors and in faculty governance, acting within the boundaries of “peer” and “service provider” as dictated by our roles and faculty status within the specific context. As reflective practitioners reviewing our interactions, we surmised that neither of us was always seen as a peer by those with whom we were working, nor were both of us always exclusively seen as service providers. The CTL, however, as an entity, was almost always identified as service provider, and its activist stance toward supporting faculty development was not always salient for the faculty who attended our events. The content of the events, rather than the CTL’s reasons for offering them, was the explicit draw for the participants. One notable exception was the session on moving toward full professor, which was the first center offering specifically designed for associate professors seeking a promotion to full professor and, thus, was a foray into territory generally occupied only by tenured faculty. This event was designed and promoted by the center director (a tenured full professor) in conjunction with the mid-career faculty co-mentoring cohort as a co-mentoring event. It was intended as a safe space within which to converse frankly about the challenges, concerns, and care of tender, tentative identities with faculty who had successfully negotiated promotion. It mattered to the participants that this event was a conversation among tenured faculty, that it was not an event open to all comers, and that it was sensitively organized from an insider’s perspective. It mattered to the participants that the CTL director, who organized the event, was a tenured full professor who had successfully navigated her own way to full professor. She was a peer in this instance and was intent on using a CoP for mentoring approach. She used her insider status as successful faculty member to propel the CTL into explicitly activist support for faculty who had been struggling for years, alone and unnoticed, on the path to a promotion. To this end, the event represents a more significantly activist stance by the center staff than otherwise might have been possible.

Implications for Practice

We cannot claim that, as of yet, our campus has developed a sense of a collective community of practice for faculty development, or that there exists a pervasive “culture of mentoring” (Zachary, 2005). To institutionalize such a university-wide CoP and culture is a considerable undertaking, and our CTL’s role in such a shift is still in development. We suggest that the CoP framework for mentoring is a potentially powerful approach

that our small, faculty-centric center could further develop in the service of contributing to a rich, university-wide culture for mentoring. We also note, but have not had the opportunity to explore, the roles that gender, race, and sociocultural constructs play in faculty orientation toward faculty work and modes of mentoring. Investigating this question is a next step for study. Further, we have not yet sufficiently analyzed faculty *non-engagement* with the center's activities to discern if their mentoring and other developmental needs are being met elsewhere or going unmet.

These observations suggest several next steps for our CTL to consider. If supporting faculty to become excellent teachers and scholars of teaching and learning continues as our core responsibility, we need to understand how to do that well for faculty with differing understandings of and expectations for their work. If, as we've learned from our previous work, conceptualizing our center as a CoP for faculty development makes sense, our programs and events can and should continue to facilitate and catalyze mentoring (dyadic, networked, and co-mentoring). We have seen that faculty are engaging in mentoring regardless of their orientation to faculty work, and that the CoP model of learning through shared participation in authentic activity holds considerable appeal for our faculty. Finally, if our university were to shift more emphatically toward a "culture for mentoring" (Zachary, 2005), our CTL's role as activist or neutral needs to be carefully planned. The tension between the reactive and proactive stances will need constant monitoring and rebalancing as (or if) our culture shifts. We need to maintain constant collaboration and communication, critically reflective practice, and authentic engagement within our CoP for faculty development.

To this end, we offer a few simple suggestions for including mentoring practices and mentoring identities into CTL activity that will appeal to faculty with traditional, porous, or integrated conceptions of faculty work. We invite other CTLs to test our findings and suggestions, engaging with us as co-mentors and networked participants in a CoP for faculty development.

- Faculty and center staff can capitalize on the generalized CoP model of shared engagement as a mechanism for learning and development of practice and of identity, and they can also capitalize on the CoP for mentoring model as a structural-functional model of faculty development (Calderwood & Klaf, in press; Smith et al., 2013). For example,
- Faculty and center staff can explicitly consider the inter-

connected activity of the local campus CoPs for faculty work and faculty development, seeking to understand how differing conceptualizations of faculty work play out across the campus culture, including how they intertwine with the faculty reward system.

- Faculty might link their departmental and cross-curricular work, faculty governance work on promotion and tenure, and notions of collegiality with center activities, thereby connecting human and material resources (and needs) strategically. This embrace of a CoP model could prompt faculty and center staff to engage collaboratively in CTL activities that support faculty development through mentoring.
- Center staff might analyze patterns of faculty participation in CTL activities, mapping these with how faculty members understand their work with regard to disciplinary and campus expectations. Such mapping may make visible the appeal and value of CTL offerings, or it might reveal gaps in the center's appeal to subgroups of faculty who do not see that their developmental needs or conceptualizations of faculty work are met by certain center activities.
- Using this information, CTLs can adjust their offerings better to meet a wider range of need. To support this analysis, centers also need to recognize and understand patterns of faculty nonengagement in CTL activities.
- Center staff might investigate, through conversations, focus groups, or other shared activity, whether nonengagement indicates that certain faculty developmental needs are being met in other ways, or if the CTL is delinquent in organizing activities complementary to how faculty conceptualize their work.

Final Thoughts

Whether mentoring facilitation is intentionally built into the process or occurs naturally as a by-product within shared activities, we found that faculty engaged in meaningful ways when CTL offerings aligned with their work and professional needs. Our intentionally designed and

named mentoring activities attracted faculty who were looking for support within a community of colleagues. Our center staff served as both guide-on-the-side and embedded members of CoPs, depending on the activities and the faculty's perceptions of their work.

By examining the work of our CTL and employing a CoP framework, we provide a lens through which professional developers can explore their own practice and offerings in support of faculty mentoring. We hope that dialogue ensues among CTLs to further the understanding of our work and efforts to meet faculty mentoring needs.

References

- Amundsen, C., & Wilson, M. (2012). Are we asking the right questions? A conceptual review of the educational development literature in higher education. *Review of Educational Research*, 82(1), 90–126.
- Austin, A., Gappa, M., & Trice, A. (2007). *Rethinking faculty work: Higher education's strategic imperative*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Barker, D. (2004). The scholarship of engagement: A taxonomy of five emerging practices. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 9(2), 123-137.
- Bernstein, J. L., & Ginsberg, S. M. (2009). Toward an integrated model of the scholarship of teaching and learning and faculty development. *Journal on Centers for Teaching and Learning*, 1(1), 57-72.
- Boice, R. (1992). *The new faculty member: Supporting and fostering professional development*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bottoms, S., Pegg, J., Adams, A., Wu, K., Smith Risser, H., & Kern, A. L. (2013). Mentoring from the outside: The role of a peer mentoring community in the development of early career education faculty. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 21(2), 195-218.
- Boyd, W. E. (2013). Does Boyer's integrated scholarships model work on the ground?: An adaption of Boyer's model for scholarly professional development. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 7(2), Article 25.
- Boyer, E. (1997). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Bringle, R. G., Clayton, P. H., & Price, M. (2009). Partnerships in service learning and civic engagement. *Partnerships: A Journal of Service Learning & Civic Engagement*, 1(1), 1-20.
- Bringle, R. G., Hatcher, J. A., & Clayton, P. H. (2006). The scholarship of civic engagement: Defining, documenting, and evaluating faculty work. *To Improve the Academy*, 25, 257-279.
- Calderwood, P. E., & Klaf, S. (in press). Mentoring within a community

- of practice for faculty development: Adding value to a CTL's role. *To Improve the Academy*, 33(2).
- Caster, B., & Hautala, R. (2008). Changing our brains: Transforming a traditional view of scholarship and teaching. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 2(2), Article 18.
- Chism, N. (2007). *Peer review of teaching: A sourcebook* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Clayton, P. H., Bringle, R. G., Senior, B., Huq, J., & Morrison, M. (2010). Differentiating and assessing relationships in service-learning and civic engagement: Exploitative, transactional, or transformational. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 16(2), 5-22.
- Doberneck, D. M., Glass, C. R., & Schweitzer, J. H. (2011). Beyond activity, place, and partner: How publicly engaged scholarship varies by intensity of activity and degree of engagement. *Journal of Community Engagement & Scholarship*, 4(2), 18-28.
- Doberneck, D. M., Glass, C. R., & Schweitzer, J. H. (2010). From rhetoric to reality: A typology of publicly engaged scholarship. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 14(4), 5-35.
- Elbow, P., & Sorcinelli, M. D. (2006). The faculty writing place: A room of our own. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 38(6), 17-22.
- Fairweather, J., Martinez Aleman, A., Bensimon, E., Cochran-Smith, M., Labaree, D., & Stanley, C. (2013). *Rethinking faculty evaluation: AERA report and recommendations on evaluating education research, scholarship, and teaching in postsecondary education*. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Glass, C. R., Doberneck, D. M., & Schweitzer, J. H. (2011). Unpacking faculty engagement: The types of activities faculty members report as publicly engaged scholarship during promotion and tenure. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 15(1), 7-30.
- Green, D. A., & Little, D. (2013). Academic development on the margins. *Studies in Higher Education*, 38(4), 523-537.
- Holmgren, R. A. (2005). Teaching partners: Improving teaching and learning by cultivating a community of practice. *To Improve the Academy*, 23, 211-219.
- Hubball, H., Pearson, M. L., & Clarke, A. (2013). SoTL inquiry in broader curricular and institutional contexts: Theoretical underpinnings and emerging trends. *Teaching and Learning Inquiry: The ISSOTL Journal*, 1(1), 41-57.
- Hutchings, P., Huber, M. T., & Ciccone, A. (2011). *The scholarship of teaching and learning reconsidered: Institutional integration and impact*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

- Johnson, W. B. (2007). *On being a mentor: A guide for higher education faculty*. Mahway, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Jordan C. (Ed.). (2007). *Community-engaged scholarship review, promotion & tenure package*. [Handout from Peer Review Workgroup, Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative, Community-Campus Partnerships for Health]
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, Z., Jones, L., Verwood, R., Iqbal, I., & Johnson, J. (2011). Engaging in a collaborative project as a team-building strategy during a period of organizational change. *Journal on Centers for Teaching and Learning*, 3, 21-41.
- Lindholm, J. (2003). Perceived organizational fit: Nurturing the minds, hearts, and personal ambitions of university faculty. *The Review of Higher Education*, 27(1), 125-149.
- Little, D., & Green, D. A. (2012). Betwixt and between: Academic developers in the margins. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 17(3), 203-215.
- Little, D., & Palmer, M. S. (2011). A coaching-based framework for individual consultations. *To Improve the Academy*, 29, 102-115.
- Luna, G., & Cullen, D. (1995). *Empowering the faculty: Mentoring redirected and renewed* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, No. 3). Washington, DC: The George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development.
- McGuire, G. M., & Reger, J. (2003). Feminist co-mentoring: A model for academic professional development. *NWSA Journal*, 15, 54-72.
- Michael, R., Case, K., Danielson, M., Lott Hill, L., Lochbaum, J., McEnery, L., & Perkins, K. (2010). Mentoring new scholars of teaching and learning: The national CASTL institute model. *Transformative Dialogues: Teaching & Learning Journal*, 3(3), 1-15.
- Mission Statement of Fairfield University. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.fairfield.edu/aboutfairfield/missionvalueshistory/missionstatement/>
- Neumann, A., & Terosky, A. L. (2007). To give and to receive: Recently tenured professors' experiences of service in major research universities. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 78(3), 282-310.
- Potter, M., & Kustra, E. (2011). The relationship between scholarly teaching and SoTL: Models, distinctions, and clarifications. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 5(1), Article 23.
- Price, J., & Cotten, S. R. (2006). Teaching, research, and service: Expectations of assistant professors. *The American Sociologist*, 37(1), 5-21.
- Reder, M., & Gallagher, E. (2007). Transforming a teaching culture through

- peer mentoring: Connecticut College's Johnson Teaching Seminar for incoming faculty and the scholarship of teaching and learning. *To Improve the Academy*, 25, 327-344.
- Rehrey, G.; Siering, G., & Hostetter, C. (2014). SoTL principles and program collaboration in the age of integration. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 8 (1), Article 2.
- Schroeder, C. (2012). *Coming in from the margins: Faculty development's emerging organizational development role in institutional change*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Smith, E. R., Calderwood, P. E., Dohm, F., & Gill Lopez, P. (2013). Reconceptualizing faculty mentoring within a community of practice framework. *Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 21(2), 175-194.
- Sorcinelli, M. (2013, May). *Mutual mentoring: Moving beyond one-size-fits-all mentoring*. Keynote presentation at the 12th annual Conference on Innovative Pedagogy and Course Redesign, Fairfield CT.
- Sorcinelli, M. D., & Yun, J. (2007). From mentor to mentoring networks: Mentoring in the new academy. *Change*, 39(6), 58-61.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Williams, A. L., Verwoord, R., Beery, T. A., Dalton, H., McKinnon, J., Strickland, K. . . . & Poole, G. (2013). The power of social networks: A model for weaving the scholarship of teaching and learning into institutional culture. *Teaching and Learning Inquiry: The ISSOTL Journal*, 1(2), 49-62.
- Yee, K., & Hargis, J. (2012). Indirect faculty development and the role of sociability. *Journal on Centers for Teaching & Learning*, 4, 61-78.
- Zachary, L. J. (2005). *Creating a mentoring culture: The organization's guide*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Zachary, L. J. (2011). *The mentor's guide: Facilitating effective learning relationship* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Zachary, L. J., & Fischler, L. A. (2009). *The mentee's guide: Making mentoring work for you*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Zakrajsek, T. (2013). Scholarly teaching: Suggestions for a road more traveled. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 7(1), Article 2.
- Zellers, D. F., Howard, V. H., & Barcic, M. A. (2008). Faculty mentoring programs: Reenvisioning rather than reinventing the wheel. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(3), 552-588.

Patricia E. Calderwood is a Professor of Educational Studies and Teacher Education at Fairfield University, and the former Director of the Center for Academic Excellence, Fairfield University's Center for faculty teaching and learning. Building on her book, *Learning Community: Finding Common Ground in Difference* (Teachers College Press, 2000), she has authored or co-authored numerous SoTL and critical self-study papers about university teaching, teacher education, and the social construction of community across varied educational contexts. Her current work focuses on university faculty co-mentoring within a community of practice paradigm. **Suzanna Klaf, Ph.D.**, is Director of the Center for Academic Excellence and Assistant Professor in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Fairfield University. She is responsible for professional development; working with faculty, departments, and schools on course design; curriculum development; assessment of student learning; and teaching and mentoring communities, among other teaching and learning areas.