Mentoring

A major component of a PhD program is the relationship between the student and their faculty mentor(s). Unlike some other degrees where the focus may be on success in coursework (a more individualistic endeavor), the success of PhD study emerges from the ongoing interactions between a mentor and student. This is a unique two-way relationship, and it is most successful when both parties approach the process with similar expectations and commitment. The department's expectation is that students view the mentorship as an opportunity to learn the content knowledge, techniques, "soft skills" and professional skills needed to understand and contribute to the academic community. Mentors should facilitate this learning through a mixture of direct instruction, guidance, and example as active and engaged members of the academic community. To that end, this document includes a number of things:

1) A description of different approaches to mentoring, along with recommendations for best practices and expectations
2) General advice on mentoring (based on a brochure developed by Gaelle Kolb of NACS)
3) A template for setting up mutual expectations, based on one developed by the Graduate School for paid research assistants; we encourage all PhD students and their faculty advisors to complete the first version of this document together at the start of the mentoring relationship, and to revisit these issues with the second one on a yearly basis
4) A resource list on mentorship relationships

We also strongly advise mentors and mentees to read the following paper:

Lee, A., Dennis, C. & Campbell, P. (2007). *Nature*'s guide for mentors. *Nature, 447*, 791-797. available at http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v447/n7146/full/447791a.html

Approaches to mentoring and best practices

Mentoring relationships can work in a number of ways, depending on the needs of both parties. Our primary expectation is that mentors should demonstrate a concern for their students' welfare, academic development, and professional success, and that both mentors and students put effort towards making their relationship meet their needs. This can be demonstrated through a variety of behaviors:

- Having regular individual meetings between mentors and mentees, either once a week or every other week (see frequency of meetings, below)
- Mentors and students knowing and keeping track of student progress
- Students adhering to agreed-upon deadlines for submitting written work, and mentors providing feedback in a timely manner on that written work (articles in progress, proposals for presentations, etc.). Feedback should generally require less than 2 weeks, although this can obviously vary depending on the time of the year, other deadlines (e.g., mentors may be slower near the time of their own grant deadlines, etc.), and the length and complexity of the work. If deadlines are going to be missed or feedback is going to be delayed, it is reasonable to expect both parties to be able to provide information about their expected timeline proactively (i.e., *before* the deadline or range is missed).
- Mentors providing comments as well as tracking any changes to students' writing, rather than merely editing it, so that students have an opportunity to learn from this experience (e.g., they should provide explanations for their edits, or ask thoughtful questions that student should think

about, rather than simply re-write for them). Alternatively, they could ask students what kind of feedback they wish to receive.

- Mentors providing general feedback in a structured manner that evolves as the student grows, and provides feedback on a consistent basis. One recommended approach is to have a shared joint document (e.g., google document) where decisions made at each meeting are written down as part of an ongoing record; this avoids any concern about goalposts moving from meeting to meeting. However, there are multiple approaches to maintaining consistency across time, and this may not be the best approach for all mentor-mentee relationships. The goal is for students to become increasingly independent self-learners and investigators, such that direct feedback and mentorship falls away over time in favor of the student's own skills and the network of collaborative support that exists within the professional academy.
- Mentors providing the opportunity during meetings for students to discuss their personal well-being and any equity concerns.
- Mentors providing mentees with the opportunity to take a leadership role on projects and manuscripts (see authorship order, below).
- Mentors and mentees jointly networking with other researchers in the field while at conferences, or when researchers visit.
- Mentors speaking with their mentees about long-term goals and longer-timeline plans, not just about current projects.
- Mentors providing their mentees with information about awards or opportunities they can apply to, conferences they can go to, or other opportunities. This includes informing students about the nature and timeline of government-sponsored grants and discussing whether attempting to apply for a grant is realistic and appropriate to a given student's academic goals and progress.
- Mentors creating opportunities for their mentees, such as by offering opportunities for giving joint talks at conferences, joining the mentor in writing chapters or manuscripts, co-reviewing with students, etc.
- Equitable treatment of students regardless of their race, gender, ethnicity, religion, country of origin, residency status, primary language or spoken English language ability, or sexual orientation. It is important to note that the needs and responsibilities of students, postdocs, research faculty, and other lab members differ greatly between individuals and continually change as student's progress. As a result, different opportunities may be provided at different times for students at different stages of their education and research training.

Some additional recommendations and suggestions:

It is important to recognize that mentoring involves growth and change – even the best mentoring relationships will not be perfect at all points in time. Both mentors and mentees are human, and each may have other things on their mind at a particular meeting. A strong mentoring relationship is one where both mentors and mentees are willing to communicate openly and earnestly without fear of reprisal, listen actively, make improvements, try new things, and forgive prior mistakes.

Mentors and mentees may differ tremendously on the extent to which they feel comfortable sharing personal information. While some mentors and mentees are deeply knowledgeable about one another's lives outside of academia, others may wish to keep such information out of the workplace – and neither approach is appropriate or desirable for all students. While it is necessary for mentors to provide mentees with a safe space and an opportunity to bring up matters of personal concern and well-being, it is not required that mentees choose to do so. Likewise, mentors may lead by example in choosing to

share personal information or not. Below are a number of suggestions for questions a mentor could ask to provide an opportunity for their mentees to bring up either work-related or personal concerns:

1. How's life?
2. What are you worried about right now?
3. What are your biggest time wasters?
4. Would you like more or less direction from me?
5. What you like more or less feedback on your work? If more, what kind of feedback would you like?
6. Are there any decisions you're hung up on?
7. Is there anything in the news you want to talk about?

Bringing in a third party / relationship evaluation

Students typically have one or two mentors, and also have a Program Planning Committee that they meet with annually. As part of the process of guiding mentorship, one member of the PPC, who is not a primary mentor for the student, should be identified as the Mentorship Liaison (ML).

This faculty member will meet separately with the mentor and the mentee on a yearly basis, usually just after the PPC meeting, to review the statement of mutual expectations, determine if the mentorship relationship is working as expected, and to make suggestions on how to improve the mentoring relationship should there be a need. Often times, mentor-mentee interactions can fall into routines that create difficulties for identifying less productive habits and/or considering new approaches to increase mutual understanding. Bringing an outside observer to mentor-mentee interactions may enable mentors and mentees to consider alternative methods for problem solving and provide much-needed support and training as they navigate each unique, mentorship relationship. Examples of questions to be asked during this meeting:

a. How often do mentoring meetings take place?
b. Does the mentee adhere to agreed-upon deadlines and does the mentor provide feedback on the mentee's work according to what is specified in the SME?
c. Is communication between the mentor and mentee satisfactory, and if not, what can be done to improve it?
d. Does the mentor provide the mentee with support for acquiring new skills?
e. Does the mentor provide the mentee with support for meeting their goals?
f. Does the mentee demonstrate consistent follow-through when appropriate supports are in place?
g. Does the mentee have reasonable expectations and bring forward concerns in a professional manner?
h. Does the mentee feel they are being treated equitably with other members of the lab?
h. Do both the mentor and mentee engage in actively listening?
i. Does the mentor challenge the mentee to engage in critical thinking?
j. Does the mentee regularly reflect on their own progress and areas of strengths and weaknesses?
k. Do both the mentor and mentee feel the other has effective interpersonal communication and good rapport?
l. Does the mentor demonstrate enthusiasm for the student's research?
m. Are your meetings useful, and is time used effectively?

After meeting separately with both mentor and mentee, the Mentoring Liaison will then review their observations with the pair, either individually or jointly. This meeting is intended to facilitate effective communication interactions between mentors and mentees, identify potential sources of difficulty before they become ingrained, and encourage honest discussion. If there are clear difficulties in the mentoring relationship, the ML may also suggest that an advisement meeting be recorded for them to look at in more depth.

Frequency of meetings

Students must receive individual attention from their mentor to maintain consistent progress. Some mentors and mentees set up regular weekly or bimonthly one-on-one meetings; others meet when needed. Some mentors and mentees may regularly see each other in the lab; others may primarily see each other at scheduled meetings. Different approaches may work best for different students, and for different stages of the student's career. This is something best discussed as part of expectation-setting discussions; however, we feel that having regularly scheduled (weekly or bimonthly) meetings is the best approach, and should be considered best practice. Students can expect to be included in multiple different types of meetings with their mentor in addition to one-on-one meetings, including lab meetings, project and grant planning meetings, journal clubs, seminars, group writing tasks, etc. The student's responsibilities in these meetings should be clear and change as their experience and abilities develop.

Expectations for other research experiences

In general, the Department of Hearing and Speech Sciences encourages our students to gain a variety of research experiences; this is often best approached by working with multiple mentors or in multiple labs. Some students may work in multiple labs throughout their graduate training; others may work in one lab, but pursue short-term rotations or other projects with additional faculty. In general, this variety of experiences is encouraged; however, it is important to note that student funding may place important limits on this. While some funding sources are not tied to particular labs (e.g., fellowships), others are - if a student is being paid as a research assistant on a particular grant, for example, the student must contribute the expected time amounts to that grant effort, and this may limit the time that can be spent in other labs. **It is important to discuss requirements and limitations on other research experiences before accepting any particular doctoral appointment or funding source.**

Co-mentoring

Some students have a single primary mentor. Others have a primary mentor, but may also spend time in another lab, where they have a secondary, separate mentor. Others have two mentors – and may have separate projects with each, or may have projects that overlap across the areas of interest. When there are two mentors, there may be separate meetings/discussions with each mentor, or there may be 3-way joint meetings (either in person or virtual) on a regular basis; in some cases, all meetings are 3-way meetings, and are regularly scheduled for every 1-2 weeks. The latter approach helps keep everyone well-informed, and we encourage discussion of this approach as part of the broader expectation-setting discussions.

In some co-mentoring relationships, both mentors are actively involved in the mentee's research training and activities; in others, the co-mentor has minimal lab interaction with the mentee but instead serves more as an outside advisee. This can potentially lead to differing assumptions about the responsibilities each mentor has for the mentee's training. For this reason, we feel it is important in co-mentoring relationships for there to be a frank discussion regarding the division of responsibilities between mentors at the start of the co-mentoring relationship, and to identify potential roles for each faculty member. When there is more than one mentor, good communication and documentation is essential to ensure that all parties are equally informed about student progress. There also needs to also be frequent communication among all parties to ensure consistency of expectations. One way to accomplish these goals is for all parties meet as a group on a semi-regular basis, ideally multiple times per semester.

It is also worth noting that even with the best mentoring relationship, mentees' interests may change, and this could lead them to choose to switch mentors during the course of their program. While HESP does not have a general policy of lab rotations, that does not mean that changing one's area of interest as they progress is wholly atypical. However, because this can have definite implications for a student's funding sources, it is important to discuss these issues openly if they come up.

Mentorship training

Students should be paired with both senior and junior members of the lab (or regular collaborators) to expand their mentorship opportunities and develop their own mentorship skills. More senior students may themselves mentor less advanced students, or may lead discussions in meetings dedicated to a particular project, journal article, or other lab activity. It is worth discussing different approaches to mentorship in these hierarchical relationships.

Healthy mentoring relationships

Finally, it worth noting that mentorship relationships necessarily involve two people with very different degrees of prior knowledge and experience, and different degrees of perceived "power", particularly when the faculty mentor is providing funding to the student. It is important that both parties feel comfortable discussing their expectations with one another in an open fashion. The attached mutual expectations template is a useful starting point for having such conversations, but these discussions need to continue throughout the mentee's program. In the case of a difference of opinion, it might be useful to consult with the graduate student ombudsperson for the department, with the ML or with other faculty advisors.

What to do, or who to talk with, when there is difficulty in a mentoring relationship

When there are concerns within the mentoring relationship, it is best to begin a discussion about it with the mentor or mentee directly. If that is not feasible, or if does not lead to a solution, the next step would be to have a discussion with the Mentoring Liaison, since that position was created specifically for this purpose.

Beyond speaking with the ML, the next individuals to speak with would be either the Department Ombudsperson or the Director of the PhD program, or (either instead or subsequently) the Chair of the

Department. While students should feel free to discuss issues with others as needed, it is generally best to discuss issues with the ombudsperson or a departmental administrator rather than to "jump" to speaking with a Dean or Provost. However, there may be some issues that are so severe that they need to go to higher levels of administration; these might include issues of sexual harassment that should go to the Title IX office, issues regarding other issues of bias or inequity, etc.

If you have concerns about a student or faculty member that is outside of the mentoring relationship, some other important resources are:

Counseling center, including after-hours crisis support: 301-314-7651

Comprehensive support services that promote the personal, social, and academic success of UMD students, including psychological and consultation services for those experiencing distress or mental health challenges, study skills training, and group therapy sessions, as well as support in emergency situations and following traumatic events.

Office of Civil Rights & Sexual Misconduct (Title IX office): 301-405-1142

The OCRSM administers the University of Maryland's non-discrimination policies, and accepts reports of sexual misconduct and discrimination.

Bias incident support services (BISS): 301-405-0980. Or biassupport@umd.edu

BISS provides support and advocacy for any student, staff, or faculty member impacted by bias, hatred, and/or an act of identity-based violence.

UMPD (Police Dept.) for emergencies: 301-405-3333; mobile phone #3333

CARE to stop violence crisis line: 301-741-3442. (non-crisis: 301-314-2222)

The Campus Advocates Respond and Educate (CARE) to Stop Violence provides free, confidential advocacy and therapy services to primary and secondary survivors of sexual assault, relationship violence, stalking, and sexual harassment, and serves as a resource that can help individuals navigate their options or connect them with the appropriate resources. The crisis line is available 24 hours during the academic year.

Maryland HELP center: 301-314-HELP (-4357)

A student-run peer counseling and crisis intervention hotline that provides free and confidential help to the UMD community with any problems you are facing (any issue, no matter how big or small). Also available for drop-in visits on the third floor of the South Campus Diner in room 3105.

BETA Team (Behavior Evaluation & Threat Assessment): 301-314-BETA (2382)

The BETA team evaluates reports about members of the UMD community who are concerning, disruptive, or threatening. Examples may include individuals who are being verbally aggressive, acting bizarrely, seeming disturbed or odd, threatening physical harm to others or to oneself, suicidal ideation, possessing a weapon, being violent, or damaging property.

Additional Mentoring

No one can be an ideal mentor for everything, and someone can be an excellent mentor yet still be unable to provide some forms of mentors. It is perfectly acceptable to seek out additional mentors who can have different skill sets. One such resource in our field is the Mentoring Academic-Research Careers (MARC) program, an on-line 9-month-long mentoring program that pairs mentors and mentees within the field: https://www.asha.org/students/mentoring/marc Prior HESP students that have participated have remained connected with their mentors long-term and testified to its usefulness.

Authorship issues

One issue that frequently comes up between mentors and mentees is that of authorship on projects. We recommend establishing an agreement about the order of authorship at the start of a project. That said, we also recognize that things change over time. For example, a student may start off being highly involved in a project, but then leave that lab, such that the project shifts to a different student. Alternatively, a student may not have a very large role on a project to begin with, but takes on a more substantive role as the project moves forward. As such, issues of authorship are an ever-evolving process, even when all parties agreed at a project's onset. For that reason, we recommend that mentors and mentees complete a written authorship agreement at the onset of a project, but also revisit this on a regular basis as responsibilities and roles change. One example of such an authorship agreement can be found at http://www.apa.org/science/leadership/students/authorship-agreement.pdf.

We also recommend that both students and faculty read the APA's statement on authorship, downloadable at http://www.apa.org/science/leadership/students/authorship-paper.pdf, and complete the CITI training module on Responsible Conduct of Research at http://www.citiprogram.org/(which is separate from the module on human subjects research, which most labs also require).

We note, however, that part of a strong mentoring relationship is for the mentor to provide their mentee with opportunities to earn authorship, and first authorship, on research projects.

Despite these recommendations, authorship is high-stakes and issues related to authorship are not uncommon within the academy as a whole. If you feel there has been a significant conflict related to credit for work or authorship, you should speak to the department ombudsperson or Chair.

General advice on mentoring

(developed by Gaelle Kolb, NACS)

MENTOR

Emotional Intelligence

- Be personable, open-minded and honest
- Learn about your mentee's culture
- Respect your mentee's differences; adapt to your mentee's needs
- Have your mentee's best interest at heart
- Respect your mentee's time and commitments

Communication

- Be and remain available
- Set up regular meetings, come prepared, and provide ample notice if you need to reschedule
- Listen attentively to your mentee; problem solve through asking questions
- Make your mentee aware of your lab environment and work ethic
- Understand your mentee's time demands outside the lab

Skill Development

- Determine the training expectations
- Build upon your mentee's qualifications
- Establish, update and follow a training plan for your mentee; set clear and reachable milestones
- Challenge your mentee more as she/he gains more confidence

Building Bridges

- Introduce your mentee to your scientific network
- Discuss career goals with your mentee
- Be open to learning about a career path of interest to your mentee and to discussing it
- Encourage your mentee to actively seek opportunities to develop/improve her/his skills or learn about different career paths
- Encourage training that enhances your mentee's competitiveness on the job market

Transition to the Next Level

- Work with your mentee to identify job opportunities
- Review your mentee's job search material and/or refer her/him to your colleagues
- Help your mentee connect with alumni
- Consider your mentee as a colleague

MENTEE

Emotional Intelligence

- Understand your mentor's expectations
- Understand the lab dynamics and your mentor's leadership style
- Seek multiple mentors for different aspects of your training and career goals
- Respect your mentor's time and commitments

Communication

- Communicate clearly and openly with your mentor
- Come prepared to your meetings
- Discuss your responsibility and time demands outside the lab
- Welcome new challenges
- Listen carefully to your mentor's suggestions
- Discuss regularly with your mentor about the next steps/milestones in your training
- Understand requirements for graduation and discuss them with your mentor
- Open up to your mentor about your career aspirations
- Understand your mentor's time demands outside the lab (other academic responsibilities)

Skill Development

- Manage your time effectively
- Attend career development workshops
- Identify your research training needs with your mentor
- Set clear and realistic milestones for your career development
- Understand the different job sectors (academia, industry, government etc.)

Exploration

- Explore career options and meet with professionals to discuss their career path
- Develop a career development plan and ask your mentor for help

Transition to the Next Level

- Learn how to tailor application materials to specific jobs
- After graduation, continue to update your mentor on your career trajectory
- Be prepared to support the next generations of students in reaching their career goals
- Become a colleague to your mentor

University of Maryland

Statement of Mutual Expectations for

Ph.D. students / Graduate Research Assistants and Faculty Supervisors in their initial year

Please read the mentoring document prior to completing this form

Graduate Research Assistant: _____

Supervisor: _____

Period of time of Graduate Research Assistantship covered below: _____

This Statement of Mutual Expectations (SME) is intended to describe and clarify the duties, responsibilities, and procedures that make for a productive appointment as a Graduate Research Assistant while a PhD student. This document is slightly different from the more basic SME document intended for all GRAs, as it includes some aspects that may be specific to Ph.D. student GAs. All graduate research assistantships are subject to University of Maryland (UM) policies and procedures as set forth in the Graduate Catalog. Nothing in this SME supersedes UM policies. See http://apps.gradschool.umd.edu/catalog/assistantship_policies.htm. In the event of a conflict between UM policies and this SME, University policies control.

Responsibilities of Graduate Research Assistant (e.g., specific duties, goals, deliverables, reporting)

1. What are GA's duties? (e.g., running participants, coding, general lab responsibilities, mentoring undergraduate and graduate students, recruitment.)
2. What paper/conference submission deadlines should be met this year? What are the intermediate things that need to be accomplished to be on track?
3. What work can be assigned to undergraduate research assistants? How does the assignment process work? How much oversight is the GA expected to have over those undergrad Ras?
4. What other members of the lab does the GA "report to"? In other words, what types of questions and assignments should go to the advisor vs the lab manager vs a postdoc/more senior student?
5. What is the expectation for responding to the mentor's communications (e.g., email)?

Responsibilities of Supervisor (e.g., availability, project design, supervision, office hours, training)

1. How often will we meet? *(Please see mentoring document for best practices.)*
2. How does the GA get in touch with the supervisor between meetings?
3. What is the expectation for the supervisor to respond to email? If GA doesn't get a response, what should they do?
4. What is the expectation for the supervisor to provide feedback to GA on written work? What kind of response time for feedback on written work should the GA expect?

Scheduling (e.g., work hours, meetings, vacation and holiday procedures)

1. How often will the GA and supervisor meet? If co-advised, how often will the GA meet with each individual supervisor, and how often will the GA and supervisors meet as a group?
2. When is the GA expected to be at the lab? If co-advised, what are the expectations for how much time the GA dedicates to each lab?
3. Do lab hours need to be consistent week-to-week? If the GA needs to change lab hours one week, does the student need to request permission, notify anyone, or can they just do it?
4. What work can be done remotely?
5. What is the process for requesting time off?
6. What are the expectations for both work and communication over the weekend? What about over winter and spring breaks? What about if there are emergency closures of the university (e.g., snow days)?

Procedures and Best Practices (e.g., training, standard methods, safety and security protocols, ordering)

1. What equipment/skills does the GA need to learn to use, how should they go about learning that (i.e., read manual, meet with someone else in lab, etc), what is the timeline, and how will the GA demonstrate competence?
2. Where is the lab manual? What is the procedure for updating it?
3. What documentation of lab work is required of the GA?

Professional Development and Individual Development Plan (e.g., skills, training, publication, travel)

1. What are the GA's goals for skills, training, publication this year?
    1. How does this fit into lab goals?
    2. What support does the student need to reach these goals?
    3. What is a realistic timeline?
    4. Which goals are higher priority?
2. What is the process for requesting travel funds? When is conference travel supported by the lab (e.g., when presenting a paper)? What other sources of travel funds are available to the GA?
3. What is the authorship policy of the lab?
4. How much time should/can the GA spend on personal career development activities when funded by the lab? (e.g., can a GA miss a lab meeting to attend a seminar at the TLTC? Should students prioritize running a subject over attending a visiting lecture?)

Organizational Culture (e.g., office space, work space, dress codes, titles and means of address)

1. What is the dress code? Is the dress code different depending on responsibilities (e.g., running participants vs sitting in office with no participants present)?
2. How does the GA address the advisor (first name? Dr.? Professor?)? Is this the same as how the undergrad RAs address the advisor?
3. Expectations for workplace behavior: maintaining a clean lab space, shared equipment vs. equipment assigned to a specific person
4. Is there a dedicated workspace for the GA?

Conference and event expectations

1. Is it expected that the GA and advisor will attend conferences together? If so, are there expectations about how often they will check in with one another, or about sharing meals?
2. Is it expected that the student will find their own sources of funding to present work at conferences, or that the advisor will provide funding? If the advisor provides funding, what are the expectations about attendance at all conference events?

Other Notes:

We have met in person to review and discuss this agreement on the date noted below. The GRA was given an opportunity to ask and receive answers to any questions about the assistantship:

Graduate Research Assistant

Name: _____ Signature: _____ Date:_____

Supervisor

Name: _____ Signature: _____Date:_____

University of Maryland

Statement of Mutual Expectations: Ph.D. students / Graduate Research Assistants and Faculty Supervisors

Years 2+

Graduate Research Assistant: _____

Supervisor: _____

Period of time of Graduate Research Assistantship covered below: _____

This Statement of Mutual Expectations (SME) is intended to describe and clarify the duties, responsibilities, and procedures that make for a productive appointment as a Graduate Research Assistant while a PhD student. This document is slightly different from the more basic SME document intended for all GRAs, as it includes some aspects that may be specific to Ph.D. student GAs. All graduate research assistantships are subject to University of Maryland (UM) policies and procedures as set forth in the Graduate Catalog. Nothing in this SME supersedes UM policies. See http://apps.gradschool.umd.edu/catalog/assistantship_policies.htm. In the event of a conflict between UM policies and this SME, University policies control.

Responsibilities of Graduate Research Assistant (e.g., specific duties, goals, deliverables, reporting)

1. What are GA's duties this year? (running participants, coding, general lab responsibilities, mentoring undergraduate and graduate students, recruitment…)
2. What paper/conference submission deadlines should be met this year? What are the intermediate things that need to be accomplished to be on track?
3. What work can be assigned to undergraduate research assistants? How does the assignment process work? How much oversight is the GA expected to have over those undergrad Ras?

Responsibilities of Supervisor (e.g., availability, project design, supervision, office hours, training)

1. What worked and didn't work in terms of communication last year? How can we improve our communication?
2. What worked and didn't work in terms of supervisor feedback last year? What kind of feedback would the GA like that they aren't getting?
3. Was feedback on written work timely enough? If not, what can we change to improve this?
4. If applicable: What worked and didn't work in terms of co-advising last year? What could be changed to make co-advising more useful to the GA?

Scheduling (e.g., work hours, meetings, vacation and holiday procedures)

1. Were there any issues regarding work hours, time in lab, meetings, vacation last year? If so, how can we address them? Are there any expectations that will be different this coming year?

Procedures and Best Practices (e.g., training, standard methods, safety and security protocols, ordering)

1. What new skills would the supervisor like the GA to learn this year?
2. What support will the GA have to learn these skills?

Professional Development and Individual Development Plan (e.g., skills, training, publication, travel)

1. What are the GA's goals for presentations and publications this year?
    1. How does this fit into lab goals?
    2. What support does the student need to reach these goals?
    3. What is a realistic timeline?
    4. Which goals are higher priority?
2. What are the GA's goals for department milestones (e.g., candidacy paper, qualifying exam) this year?

3. What support does the student need for reaching these goals? What is a realistic timeline? Which goals are higher priority?
4. How much time should/can the GA spend on personal career development activities when funded by the lab? (e.g., can a GA miss a lab meeting to attend a seminar at the TLTC? Should students prioritize running a subject over attending a visiting lecture?)

Organizational Culture (e.g., office space, work space, dress codes, titles and means of address)

1. Were there any issues with respect to organizational culture last year? If so, how should we address them?
2. Are there any expectations for changes for this coming year?

Conference and event expectations

1. Is it expected that the GA and advisor will attend conferences together? If so, are there expectations about how often they will check in with one another, or about sharing meals?
2. Is it expected that the student will find their own sources of funding to present work at conferences, or that the advisor will provide funding? If the advisor provides funding, what are the expectations about attendance at all conference events?

Other Notes:

We have met in person to review and discuss this agreement on the date noted below. The GRA was given an opportunity to ask and receive answers to any questions about the assistantship:

Graduate Research Assistant

Name: _____ Signature: _____ Date:_____

Supervisor

Name: _____ Signature: _____Date:_____

Resources on mentoring

Articles

Ahmad, A. S. (2020). Isolation is part of the disease of sexual harassment in academe. Connection and community are part of the cure. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from: https://www.chronicle.com/article/how-to-detect-and-dodge-a-predatory-professor

Biswas, S. (2019). Advice on advising: How to mentor minority students. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, *65*(30).

Brennan, M. B. (1999). Graduate school-Smoothing the passage. Chemical & Engineering News, 77(4), 11-19.

Lee, A., Dennis, C. & Campbell, P. (2007). *Nature*'s guide for mentors. *Nature*, *447*, 791-797.

Patel, V. (2017). Mentoring the Mentors. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, *63*(34).

Sambunjak, D., Straus, S. E., & Marušić, A. (2006). Mentoring in academic medicine: a systematic review. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, *296*(9), 1103-1115.

Wanberg, C. R., Welsh, E. T., & Hezlett, S. A. (2003). Mentoring research: A review and dynamic process model. Research in personnel and human resources management.

Wisdom, M. L. (2021). Who's responsible for a Ph.D. student's success? *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from: https://www.chronicle.com/article/whos-responsible-for-a-ph-d-students-success

Books

Atkins, M., & Brown, G. (2002). *Effective teaching in higher education*. Routledge.

Bloom, D. F., Karp, J. D., & Cohen, N. (1998). *The Ph.D. Process: A Student's Guide to Graduate School in the Sciences*. Oxford University Press.

Bowen, W. G., & Rudenstine, N. L. (2014). *In pursuit of the PhD.* Princeton University Press.

Kennedy, D. (1997). Academic duty. Harvard University Press.

Peters, R. L. (1997). *Getting what you came for: the smart student's guide to earning a master's or a Ph.D.* New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Reis, R. M. (2012). *Tomorrow's professor: Preparing for academic careers in science and engineering*. John Wiley & Sons.

Walker, G. E., Golde, C. M., Jones, L., Bueschel, A. C., & Hutchings, P. (2009). *The formation of scholars: Rethinking doctoral education for the twenty-first century* (Vol. 11). John Wiley & Sons.

Other Resources

ASHA Mentoring Academic-Research Careers (MARC) program
https://www.asha.org/students/mentoring/marc/

Society for Neuroscience Mentoring Resources
https://neuronline.sfn.org/collection/best-practices-for-mentoring-relationships

American Psychological Association Mentoring Resources
https://www.apa.org/members/your-growth/mentorship

National Association of Graduate-Professional Students
http://nagps.org/

Ph.D. S.O.S. Podcast
https://phdsossite.wordpress.com/