

# Facilitating mentorship Scribe document

**Please note and remind yourself frequently:** The intent of this document is for it to lead to a public-facing record of your workgroup’s activity. By the day of the Summit it will be accessible to anyone at the Summit, and after the Summit it will be turned into a fully public-facing document. This means that although you should take notes however makes sense for you, it will be important to refine the notes to be comprehensible to others.

## Guiding Committee:

Christine Larson	Tiffany Jenzer	Christie Petrenko	Jane Simoni	Ann Haynos
------------------	----------------	-------------------	-------------	------------

**Moderators:** Catherine Grus and Annette Stanton

**Scribe:** Chris Larson

**Describe intended product of the workgroup:**

**Who is willing to lead on this topic** (future efforts at the Summit and beyond):

## Main Notes Area

**From original email from Tom:**

**The preferred outcomes of these guiding committee meetings in advance of the summit would be:**

- a) organize gathering information about what is already known about the workgroup topic,
- b) decide on an intended workgroup product, and
- c) communicate with the rest of the workgroup members during this process, gathering their input and taking it into account.

**Product for workgroup:**

1. Describe a study that the breakout group recommends be commissioned by the Academy.
2. Write a paper, after the summit, based in part on the discussion both before and during the Summit (determine likely authors during the Summit).
3. Write an initial “charge” for a workgroup to carry on after the Summit. The workgroup should be largely members of the breakout group.
4. Describe a way to test or disseminate an innovation in training related to your topic.
5. Or other idea

## **Guiding Committee Meeting Notes - March 24, 2023 12:30-1:30 EDT (CLL)**

**Attendees:** Cathi Grus, Annie Haynos, Tiffany Jenzer, Chris Larson, Christie Petrenko, Jane Simoni

### **Summary of discussion:**

- Began with introductions, reasons for participating, and any relevant expertise
- Discussed balancing trying to think big picture in the spirit of the Summit and the changing landscape of the field, society, and students, and how mentorship can adapt to these changes with also making a practical product that can be implemented and be helpful in the near term too.
  - Goal: Can we do both?
- Discussed how to focus our short time at the Summit (~1 hour) and how to prepare to best use this time with the other 20+ members of the workgroup. Discussed need for input from faculty attendees and also students/trainees.
- Discussed current challenges in mentorship
  - Changing views on mission and purpose of a clinical psychology program training – increased focus on social justice
  - Increasing demands on faculty mentors, with decreasing resources and insufficient time to keep up with changes in field. Faculty feel unable to meet expectations (which they would like to meet), leading to burnout
  - Less program cohesion (post COVID-related remote work)
  - Some changes need to be systemic (e.g., incentivizing mentorship). Would help to identify levels of institutions that could institute change.
  - Would help to acknowledge these stressors and identify practical ways to support mentors
- Discussed possible products (perhaps a white paper). We decided to survey some stakeholders and use that information to prioritize topics and productive activities to engage in at the Summit.
  - Tiffany will help put together a survey using the list of gaps in field identified by Annie (see below), plus anything unique to clinical science. Framed in the context of forward thinking, adapting to changing field.
  - Will poll Summit workgroup members, and student/trainee stakeholders in APCS (student engagement committee) and PCSAS. The guiding committee can also discuss with our own students (biggest issues related to mentorship right now).
- Discussed creating a Google repository with mentoring resources
- Next meeting of guiding committee: Friday, April 21 1-2pm EDT

### **Annie reported on a literature search she had done and summarized gaps in the literature:**

- Reliance on a single mentor model and need to consider other mentorship models
  - Single mentor model isn't often realistic or doesn't match with time burdens faculty have, not always possible to find mentor that shares an identity with you, may limit diverse mentor models, may lead to more abuses stemming from power differential, unequal access to mentorship
  - Other models to consider: multiple mentors, vertical mentorship model
- Lack of formal training in how to mentor
  - Typically no training, at best variable training
  - Not great consistency in training on mentoring individuals from underrepresented backgrounds

- Not good information on training under demands of COVID (e.g., dealing with student health concerns)
- Lack of incentive for good mentorship
  - Not incentivized for T&P
- Lack of consensus on how to best evaluate mentorship
- Sometimes tasked with mentoring on career paths they have no experience with (e.g., academic mentors advising on industry careers)
- Less mentorship during certain critical periods
  - Undergrads learning to apply for grad school
  - When people are assistant professors and now mentoring students but still could use/may want mentorship of their own

**Jane: In addition to considering these gaps, what's unique to clinical psychology?**

- Training in many different roles & activities (e.g., clinical, research, specific methodologies, quantitative approaches)
  - Unreasonable that a single mentor would have knowledge in all those domains
  - Some mentors only focus on research and don't take into account clinical or other activities and careers

## Guiding Committee Meeting Notes - April 21, 2023 1:00-2:00 EDT (CLL)

**Attendees:** Annie Haynos, Tiffany Jenzer, Chris Larson, Christie Petrenko, Annette Stanton

Reviewed results of survey on priorities for mentorship to be discussed at summit. Survey was sent to faculty members of workgroup and PCSAS student reps.

### Faculty Survey Results (N=15)

- Most highly ranked
  - Lack of training in mentorship
  - Current mentorship model
  - Incentive structure for mentorship
  - (although others not far behind)
  - Mentioned in comments frequently
    - Dealing with problem mentors came up in comments
    - Training in mentorship for students from diverse backgrounds

Survey poll on preferences for product

- Paper most common
- One comment - combine study description, paper, & initial charge

### Students

- Most highly ranked
  - Lack of training in mentorship
  - Current mentorship model
  - Incentive structure for mentorship
- (although others not far behind)
- Mentioned in comments frequently
  - Cultural competence
  - Dealing with problem mentors

### 4/21/2023 Meeting Discussion

- Lack of formal training - broad umbrella, within that lack of training in culturally affirming mentorship
  - Esp. true for people trained earlier
- Center around these three topics - would be the way to go - just one hour
  - So stick with the three most highly rated things
- Think in advance about how the product (a paper) might look and then use time to fill in the content
- s
- Look at other fields to see what they have done
- Annette - Entering Mentoring program & a set of resources
- What are advantages of status quo?
  - Spectrum of multiple mentors - lower vs higher levels of commitment
  - End recommendation might be an examination/definition of what the mentorship structure might look like
    - Put more structure/unification on multiple mentors
- Could be three separate papers
  - Incentivize & train might go together
- Send three orienting questions to the group in advance & if speak at meeting have an issue then also have an idea/recommendation

- Have people break into three groups for a bit and then come back to the full group
- Prompt - what do people want to see in this paper?

#### **Assignment to workgroup:**

- Think about which group want to be in ahead of time
- What can you bring from other fields
- What's working with current mode
- What are challenges
- What are recommendations
- What would you like to see in the paper
- EDI issues inherent in all
- Can someone be a notetaker

#### **Structure for the Time at the Summit**

- 
- Who is going to report back from each group - us, notetaker?
- Time structure
  - 5-10 minutes for larger introduction & survey results
    - Annette - keep time & ground rules
    - Annie share some background on gaps in the literature (can also go in orienting email), can share the references in Google drive
    - Tiffany share results in the intro (can also do in an email)
  - Groups for each of the three topics - one of us will lead and will need a notetake
    - Mentorship model: Annie
    - Lack of training: Christie
    - Incentivize: Chris
  - Larger group
    - Each group shares
    - Next steps
- Put resources in a google drive folder

## Summit Work Group Meeting - May 5, 2023

**Moderators:** Cathi Grus, Annette Stanton

**Scribe:** Chris Larson

**Attendees:** Ann Haynos, Ayelet Meron Ruscio, Bethany Teachman, Christie Petrenko, Darby Saxbe, David Rozek, Erica Spotts, Hollen Reischer, Joel Hughes, Lorenzo Lorenzo-Luaces, Loretta Hsueh, Marisol Perez, Marcy Tompson, Melissa Latham, Michael Pogue-Geile, Nicholas Eaton, Richard McNally, Sandra Barrueco, Stacy Frazier, Tiffany Jenzer, Vanessa Malcarne

### Introduction

- Ground rules (Annette Stanton)
- Background: gaps in the literature (Annie Haynos)
- Results of workgroup and student survey (Tiffany Jenzer)

### Three primary topics - breakout into small groups

- Models of mentorship (Annie Haynos)
  - Shift in field toward emphasizing team science, which is often inconsistent with this goal
  - Problems from JEDI perspective - many students are privileged to tailor self for one particular mentor (entry playing field isn't even)
  - Relying on mentor is outdated
  - Potential problem with current model - told to demonstrate independence from mentor as soon as graduate, but with single mentor it is hard to demonstrate independence
  - Other models
    - Extreme: general admission, not single mentor - likely people aren't open to that
    - Spectrum of multiple mentorship models
      - Formal second mentor for different perspective, techniques, if share a primary identity
      - Thesis & diss committees could have more of a team science approach
      - PCSAS or accrediting bodies could give bonus points for multiple mentors
      - Use alumni networks for additional mentorship
    - Barrier - faculty are already busy and burden could fall on some more disproportionately. So can consider different levels of commitment, and measure this taxation
- Lack of training in mentorship (Christie Petrenko)
  - Hard for any one mentor do all aspects of mentorship well
    - National Research Mentoring Network, NSF, and other evidence based approaches
  - When is an ideal time to do training
    - When a new faculty mentor
    - Infusing in other department activities for folks at all levels (treat like teaching)
  - Suggestion: compile resources and centrally
- Incentivizing mentorship (Chris Larson)
  - What is good mentorship? Hard to agree on & what is goal, productivity vs happiness?

- Historically has been defined as productivity, but some students (and mentors) may have different goals (e.g., more holistic professional and personal development)
- Mentorship also falls disproportionately to women and faculty of minoritized identities.
- Good mentorship can be disincentivized because it is time consuming and pulls faculty away from other activities that are more directly incentivized
- What are we trying to incentivize? What are we disincentivizing? Make good mentorship more visible.
  - How to manage and remediate poor mentors
  - How to incentivize folks to use tools available
- How to handle individual differences - having basic foundational expectations, but also allow for different mentor-mentee relationships depending on goals (e.g., prioritizing number of papers vs. well-being)
- Concrete ideas
  - How to evaluate - ways to also protect students
    - Share norms on what other mentors do - can collect data from faculty in the department (how often do you meet, how long do you take to return feedback on papers) and share that with other faculty. Can be coupled with mentor-mentee check in and revisiting of mentorship agreement
    - Collect data at an aggregate level in the area
    - Establish & check in on minimum mentorship expectations
    - Create a culture where it is expected that feedback about mentorship is expected - within the relationship and more broadly
    - Town hall or some way of gathering data from students to provide feedback
  - Incentives
    - Who gets students and when
    - Evaluate interest in mentorship at the time of hiring
    - Mentorship award for department - have student do a presentation to the department on what they do to share what good mentorship looks like
    - Ways to build into funding mechanisms to promote good mentorship
    - For new faculty and faculty who moved protect time for developing mentorship (e.g., what is my vision for mentorship, seeking training)
    - Protect time (e.g., course releases) for those who have lots of mentees, esp. Those who transfer labs
    - Funding for faculty do a lot of mentorship
  - Other supports
    - Provide mentor materials & resources & reminders - might not be bad people, just not thinking about (e.g., normed data), send out reminders to engage people in good practice
    - Share expectations - & reminders, share amongst each other

Breakout groups reported back to larger group

Report to whole group (Cathi Grus)

- These topics are intertwined, all about the structure that exists in the department

- Not a one and done - train people and build in continued opportunities
- Need to consider new models (one person can't be everything
- Students benefit from multiple mentors), evaluation
- Maybe not set the bar too high - minimum expectations
- Evaluation - how to get honest and clear feedback (see info from incentives group)

#### Resources

- Funding that supports mentorship
  - NIH Administrative Supplements to Recognized Excellence in Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility (DEIA) Mentorship, NOT-OD-23-002:  
<https://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-23-002.html>



### **Parking Lot**

*The parking lot is for anything that was noted during the group that does not fit well on the topic. You may wish to refer this information to other groups after your group meets.*