

ALL ABOUT

MENTORING

A Publication of the Empire State College Mentoring Institute



EMPIRE STATE
COLLEGE

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Issue 2 • Fall 1993



Issue 2, Fall 1993

Table of Contents

- Editorial (Lee Herman and Miriam Tatzel)
- Introducing Tom (Rounds, Chris)
- All About Bob (Rivera de Royston, Irene)
- Seeing Mentoring: Little Voices, Little Pictures (Herman, Lee)
- Dialoguing About Mentoring In Atlanta (Nagler, Sylvain)
- Joining the Family of Mentors (Coulter, Xenia)
- Spirituality and Academic Work (Goulston, Wendy)
- Shoshana's Journal: Charting Organizational Culture and Individual Emotions (Starr-Glass, David)
- Interactions: What Would You Do? (Silver, Paula)
- Innovations in Education (Chickering, Arthur W.)
- MI News

ALL ABOUT

MENTORING

A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 2, Fall 1993

From the Editors

Lee Herman and Miriam Tatzel

Individual Faculty Development: Mentors as Learners, Mentors as Partners

By now we've done many activities for the Mentoring Institute, many visits, meetings, conversations and e-mails. A discovery that we didn't much anticipate was how good it would be to learn more about our colleagues, in particular, to find out something about their inner lives and how mentoring is part of their life-development.

We find when we work with adult learners that learning and living are intertwined. We need to understand their jobs, the situations they find themselves in, their aspirations, their insecurities. We get to know the backgrounds that have shaped them and the inner promptings as well as the objective circumstances that have brought them to us.

So perhaps we shouldn't be surprised that when we focus on faculty development at the level of individual mentors - who are also "adult learners" -we encounter individual lives. How did you get to be the mentor you are? What drew you to Empire, and what do you draw upon from your accumulated experience? What are your aspirations? Where are you stuck?

- One mentor wants to travel to renew his connection with his area of specialization. "How do I disengage?" -a question both personal and practical.
- Facing educational planning, a newer mentor wonders: "How do I help students become independent learners? How do I identify 'credit-by-evaluation'? How do I advise students outside my own academic expertise?"
- Another mentor is fascinated with the possibilities of educational technology: "How can I find the time and the help to learn to use this new piece of software?"
- "How do I get to write that paper that's been hanging over me?"
- "There's an author I want to read. Maybe I can find another mentor in my field who will read along and talk about it with me."

There are people we've worked alongside of for years without knowing their dreams. We know what they're like at faculty meetings. We know their opinions and maybe their work habits. We don't often know: What was it like for you when you went to school? What matters to you? What were the turning points in your life? How do you feel about your current life situation? What do you want to be doing? And what are you resisting doing? (Maybe they're the same thing.) What do you want to learn?

It's striking that these are the same kinds of questions we, as mentors, ask our students. Our interest in these questions and our skill at making them into learning make us all mentors, make the kind of education we offer at ESC individualized.

As cochairs of the Mentoring Institute, we have put ourselves into these conversations with our colleagues. We've talked about our pasts and our futures, and have often arrived at the question, "What do we want for ourselves from our work?" Knowing about one another flows into helping one another. "I'll help you figure out how to get your unit covered while you're on sabbatical." "I'll read your manuscript, critique and help edit." "Let's read those books together." We can build helping relationships with each other like those we build with our students. That's the idea behind "faculty development learning contracts."

Individual faculty development does not have to mean going it alone. From what we've experienced in the Mentoring Institute, individual faculty development can come about, can be educed, as we come to know more about that part of one another that has to do with our life's projects. It's inspiring to know that if we choose this collaborative -this "mentorial" - approach to faculty development, we can draw upon and put at one another's service the fine skills we are so used to putting at the service of our students. As we have done so well with our students, we can help each other fulfill our dreams.

- Miriam Tatzel, Lee Herman

ALL ABOUT

MENTORING

A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 2, Fall 1993

Introducing Tom Chris Rounds, Central New York Center

Dr. Thomas Hodgson joined Empire State's faculty at the Syracuse Unit in the Spring of 1992. He came to the College with 20 years of experience in advising and counseling. He holds a doctorate in Counseling Psychology from the University of Massachusetts, Amherst. Tom's exposure to adult learners includes personal familiarity with the work of Larry Daloz and work with the University Without Walls program at U. Mass. Most recently, Tom had been working for the Control Data Corporation as an employee assistance counselor .

I asked Tom what had attracted him to Empire State.

The Empire model is unique in that I could be both involved in mentoring/advising as well as being active in the literature of my field...I've since found out that I'm active in the literature of a number of fields beyond what I studied!

Tom then went on to compare and contrast some elements of the UWW program with those of ESC. Among other things, he noted that UWW provides more structure, relying on a classroom format to guide students through the academic planning process.

I do think there was one positive benefit to the classroom environment... there was a lot of social learning that went on. The thought of looking at yourself critically was completely foreign to [some students]. The thought of writing an essay about themselves was a very challenging experience. It was helpful to have the other students in the class to serve as models and catalysts. Otherwise, I think they would have rejected the process more readily. I think, to some extent, the stop-out rate associated with Educational Planning might be ameliorated by having more group experiences.

In exploring the contrast between classroom-based and individualized education, Tom drew on an analogy from his experience as a musician:

If you're playing music, the old adage is to make eye contact with somebody who's really interested, and use that as a barometer for how well you're doing ,knowing that there's going to be some that really love you, some that think you're okay, and some that would rather be some other place.

In a classroom you can accommodate that, but in the Empire model you don't have that luxury...you're going to be faced one-on-one with those who are less enamored of whatever the process is. And I find that I spend an inordinate time trying to get them more enthused, or to play to them, to use the performer's

analogy. I observe that a fair number of those who come to Empire State are 'recovering' students. They bear the scars of unsuccessful academic experiences.

For a lot of our students, education is something that either they're regretting or they're looking forward to, but they're looking for the credential that's going to enable them to have a meaningful life. They're not necessarily seeing, until they get into it, that this educational process can have meaning in and of itself...independent of what-ever horrors have been associated with it in the past.

Tom notes that Empire State provides an excellent venue for the pursuit of what Jack Mezirow calls 'critical reflection', Yet, while our one-to-one approach provides a promising environment for the development of reflective attitudes, the relatively abstract nature of the endeavor provides a real challenge to some students. Tom observes that many of our students

appreciate a far more realistic relationship with the world...more hands-on as opposed to abstract... For them it's a real struggle internally... There are people who just run with this process and they get really excited. I often think those are the people I'm not paid to work with. In fact, I would pay to work with those people! But I think we're paid to inspire the people who have not had a good experience, and I think that they're simply not disposed to having this be a way of getting knowledge.

We agree that mentors often get trapped by their efforts to please everybody all of the time.

I know that in the one-to-one sessions with students I feel very competent and that there's a reason for my being here. But if I get two calls... "Where's this? Where's that?" I feel like hell! And I'm not used to feeling that. It seems like there's always somebody who's disappointed about something.

I don't want to be insensitive to that. On the other hand, if I let it rule me, it interferes with my ability to be productive in other domains. So there has to be a way of developing a philosophical attitude about it that is not unresponsive but is, at the same time, realistic.

With all of the frustrations involved in trying to keep up with the paperwork, Tom finds composing narrative evaluations very useful:

When I revisit the relationship with the student in an evaluation, it is really a wonderful experience. Teachers who just give letter grades are missing an important part of the educational process, which is their own learning.

In coming to Empire State, Tom has been struck by a shift in the nature of his collegial relationships. He had been accustomed to intensive interaction with others in psychology and counseling.

What I'm not used to is being in such a diverse group, where I'm the only psychologist... I wish faculty meetings and All College meetings would deal with the process of mentoring and pedagogy or andragogy... I think there's a lot we can learn from each other.

ALL ABOUT
MENTORING
A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 2, Fall 1993

All About Bob Irene Rivera de Royston

As a relative newcomer to Empire State College, I am amazed at the dedication and commitment of my colleagues. Whether it is with an early morning appointment, a group study extending to late evening hours, Saturday morning sessions, telephone contacts, or returning reports with extensive feedback, a mentor's work is never done. Close to a year ago, Robert Seidel returned from his sabbatical with enough energy and pizzazz to catch the winds of Hurricane Andrew. His reputation for being student-centered, staying up on paperwork and representing the College at state levels is commonly recognized within Genesee Valley and beyond. I entered Bob's office and noted the neatly kept workplace, his computer keyboard covered with cotton wrap. His bookcases stacked high enough to require a stepladder, a desk lamp and a cleared work place greet this visitor. My attempt to probe into the world of Bob Seidel required no real effort on my part; his openness and ease with sharing ideology led to a relatively smooth interview and a deep appreciation of his labor of love .

Irene: So Bob, this is an "all about Bob" session. Tell me about Bob [laughter].

Bob: Well, where shall we start? Shall we start with the vision?

Irene: Yes, let's talk about vision.

Bob: Well, Bob got scared 20 years ago when he finished graduate school and his oldest son was getting ready for college. David was having trouble in high school in the sense that teachers said, "Oh my God, this kid isn't paying attention." I also couldn't find a teaching position. I had finished a Ph.D. I was in a post-doctoral program and wasn't going anywhere. I was depressed. I couldn't even apply for a job teaching school because I didn't have teacher certification. Ironic, huh?

I spent a year doing research in a program concerned with science and technology relating to economic development policies. I went to South America and studied in Peru and Colombia and Venezuela. This was after the Pinochet revolution against Allende in Chile -a terrible time -and that was more depressing. I wrote a little monograph that was very nicely received, but I didn't like doing that stuff. What was I going to do? Work for the US government? So I quit my job about June or so. I was going to spend the rest of the summer looking for a job.

Actually, it didn't work out that way. What happened was, about May I was coming out of the library at Cornell and a friend was entering as Betty and I were going home about 5 p.m. He said, "Hey, Bob, remember that place, Empire State, that was looking for people about two years ago? Well, they're hiring in

Buffalo." It was Friday. Monday morning I called Saratoga and John Jacobson got on the phone. He said, "Call Jim Garbarino." Jim said, "There's a faculty meeting tomorrow in Rochester where I am a part-time faculty member. Why don't you come?"

So I drove to Rochester that next day. I sat with the faculty and met people. Bill Laidlaw was the dean. He had been associate dean and took over after John Jacobson [had left to become academic vice president]. He asked me to come to his office. He said, "The faculty member who was doing history and politics here just went to Saratoga to be an assistant to John Jacobson. How about applying for his job?" "I only came to learn something about the College. I understand you are opening something in Buffalo," I replied. Bill said, "That's true, but I'd like you to apply here. Will you do that?" So I did.

Being a mentor for the first five or six years was something like stage fright. There is a degree to which you are always sort of antsy because you're not always sure you are doing the right thing. It's never quite predictable. I was trying to figure out how to be a mentor in a college that was still forming itself. But I determined that I would try to be a good citizen of the College and also be an advocate for it.

Irene: As we sat down, you started talking about your vision. You've described the vision that you had when you came to Empire State.

Bob: I said I had a vision. I'm not sure I really said it very clearly. I had a vision about working in a non-traditional educational setting that had integrity.

Irene: What do you think about that now, 19 years later?

Bob: I would say that hasn't changed. There's absolutely no reason why the original vision of the College, as I and many other people understand it, isn't just as viable as it's always been since the beginning of organized approaches to education. It's education that takes people from where they are, engages them in discussions about what is going on, and helps them to think. It provokes you to think about the method, the materials. You get outcomes, and some of these outcomes you put on paper. They confer credit, and some of them are other things. You are always in a constant conversation with adults who have had experiences.

Irene: One of the things that I have witnessed by being around you, and something that I have heard other mentors say about you is that you are "driven." What drives you?

Bob: Several things. The first is that I am bit of a compulsive person, sometimes destructively so. That's personal, you know; I have to live with it. But I was raised in a situation that taught me always to be compassionate and committed about fighting injustice. So I approach education not as a missionary against ignorance -that is not what I mean -but as a way of engaging in a passionate way about learning, which I take almost to be sacred. That drives me.

When people come in here with a desire, I am driven to try and find something to try to help them. I think that to a certain degree there is an injustice when people have not been able to get the kinds of things that they have been yearning for. Most people will say that there is something really intrinsic about education.

They will say, "I'm not fully human until I can use my mind better, and I feel so much better when I can use my mind this way."

Thanks comes in many forms. When I hear people so joyful with what they can do, I am elated. It frees me. So, the third thing is that I'm driven to overcome the little barriers that make it difficult to achieve those things that we want. You see "driven-ness" that I don't?

Irene: No. It appears to me that "driven" can be seen in a negative way. I see it as a very positive aspect of you. I think it's great and noble to be driven.

Bob: But I am impatient. It's cost me probably as much as anybody else. What it means is I won't wait for anyone else. Before, I would get impatient, perhaps with colleagues in requesting documents from them. I have learned to be more patient. I don't know if collaboration among mentors is better or worse now. However, it is easier for a mentor who is driven not to oppress another mentor with our present systems.

Irene: One of the questions that keeps occurring in my conversations with mentors here in Rochester as well as across the College is the concern over scholarship and staying current or feeling "expert." The role of mentor seems to require us to be out of our own frame of reference so often. Tell me what you think about this. How have you resolved this for yourself, if in fact you have?

Bob: I don't think I'll ever resolve this completely. However, I think that there are a number of sources to this tension. To begin with, we don't want to feel inferior. Academic people often feel less inferior if they can do the standard thing, like publishing an article or a book, or giving a paper, and so on. It means getting known among a circle of people who do that small specialty. By the way, it is not very good if you publish your one book and everybody says it's really crap and you don't have any self-respect the rest of your life. The majority of people who work at the College level do not publish a lot of stuff .

The second thing has to do with an approach, which is that we should consider what we do to be scholarly in the best way that we know how. It means being open with ourselves and with our students. We risk more than people in most other collegiate settings. That takes courage. Mentors don't stay long if they are not willing to do studies that are broad and diverse.

The issue then is how to rationalize doing that. I think the answer is that you have to have self-confidence. You have to talk to colleagues so that you feel some confidence that you can do studies in areas where you never took formal courses. But you feel comfortable because you have been forward enough to have conversations with others; you have developed insight and inquired about things. I think this is scholarly activity.

The third element, in our situation, is being as good a model as you can of scholarship. Don't write a contract that doesn't at least give a glimmer of scholarship. It should be fairly well crafted. It doesn't have to be elegant or long. It should suggest something about scholarship. It shouldn't be so high and mighty that it puts the student down. It should be a model. Students respond to that.

If there is a fourth dimension to scholarship, it is within our conversations with students. Never say to the student something that suggests you're the world's leading expert. They should know better anyway. Listen carefully to the student. Tell students they are in charge. This is my scholarship. Finally, as SUNY Chancellor Johnstone has argued, faculty should be as scholarly in their governance participation as they are in their academic endeavors.

The time spent with Bob Seidel on this beautiful autumn afternoon was as inspirational as the trees that surround 8 Prince Street.

ALL ABOUT

MENTORING

A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 2, Fall 1993

Seeing Mentoring: Little Voices, Little Pictures

Lee Herman , Central New York Center

"Authority," said John Jacobson, ESC's second academic VP, "rests in the dialogue." It's not in the teacher, not the student, but in the process of inquiry occurring between them, which both agree to begin, shape and end -the "learning contract." What an astonishing idea it was to me when I began to work at ESC, and a wonderment it remains. Philosophically, I loved it and love it still, but how hard it was and is to do! Taking my students' curiosity and abilities as seriously as I take my own? I'm the Ph.D.; they're not. How am I supposed to tell when authority is "rest[ing] in the dialogue" and when it's gone someplace else? I'm still learning to be a mentor. How does one do that?

How did you learn to be a mentor? Writing LCs, CEs, LCOs, DPs and CBEs? Spending some time with a colleague who was busier than you ever imagined an academic could be? When students asked you to "teach" subjects you knew almost nothing about, and your colleagues and dean expected you to do so? Did it happen the first time a student said something surprising, discomfiting and you, instead of gravely explaining it away, paused and let the direction of the conversation change?

For me, it's hard to recognize those moments for pausing, and then to reflect and maybe change my mind. (I'm busy, I'm proud and my students expect me to be certain.) I think it's a skill or an art. But how are its distinctive attributes identified and practiced?

At 15, I first encountered some of Plato's dialogues. There was Socrates, impishly claiming not to know anything and to help others only discover their own ignorance. I loved it. And I loved annoying my acquaintances and teachers by asking them confounding "Socratic" questions, the kind to which I already had answers or which revealed contradictions in my opponent's ideas. Later, as a teacher, I did the same thing to students-for their own good of course. But what if the teacher isn't supposed to be merely the expert? What if a really profound way to help students learn is for the teacher to be as genuinely inquiring as they are? How do we learn to help others learn by discovering our own ignorance? Who questions us?

Socrates had a "daimon," a "little voice" he sometimes called it, which gave him pause when he was about to go off the track while he was questioning people in the marketplace or at some other gathering. But most of the time, we work with our students in private. We're rarely, if ever , observed by colleagues. It wasn't too often that I heard a "little voice" (and if I had, or admitted I had, I would have thought about therapy, a long vacation or a career change). At ESC meetings I talked a lot about us learning to share our mentoring practices with each other, but, not knowing how we could do that, I wasn't very convincing.

Then, in 1991, Sylvain Nagler told some friends about an idea he'd had. Preparing for a presentation on the

differences between distance and "face to face" mentoring, he videotaped a session with a student. He realized how much he could learn from watching/hearing those conversations. What if colleagues did the same, he suggested, and shared their tapes with each other? So, that fall, Sylvain, Xenia Coulter, Judy Gerardi, Irene Rivera de Royston and I agreed to try. We began to videotape conversations with students and to meet regularly. We shared our tapes and discussed what we saw and heard.

Scary! The first time I taped, I was a lot more nervous (as far as I could tell) than the student was. Also the tenth time. Then there was the first time I saw and heard myself mentoring. I played the tape late at night, the house was dark, I was alone. And there was much in the little voices and pictures coming out of the TV to make me blush. There I was, scratching my nose, gesturing pompously, lecturing and asking trap-questions, showing the student that I knew more than he did. How was I helping this guy learn anything? How was I going to show this thing to colleagues, even if they were my friends?

But I did. All of us did, because we had agreed to be in the process together, "in the dialogue." We had to learn to talk with each other about what we heard and saw. We met every three months, at one another's houses and apartments. We served each other lots of goodies, we drank, we stayed overnight, we watched commercial movies as well as ourselves. We also kept detailed minutes of our discussions. We've been learning, more and more comfortably and methodically, how to recognize mentoring "moves" and issues: There are open and leading questions, fertile silences, stimulating and stifling explanations. When is "the personal" academically relevant? How do we criticize, ignore, support? When do we follow up, when do we let it be?

Though our membership has changed a little, the video mentors continue. We've shown some of our stuff to other mentors and presented at national conferences. I feel like I'm attending mentoring college.

What have we learned? Speaking for myself, when I work with students now, there's often a "little voice" and a "little picture" in my head, even when the camera's not on. I often wonder while I'm talking with a student, how I would behave, if a tape were running, if this conversation were observed and discussed with colleagues. I wonder if this is what I really want to be doing with this student. I notice how I feel and wonder what "moves" might be most helpful at this moment. I find that I'm more often able to pause, listen, reflect, make conscious choices.

I've also learned from watching my companions' tapes. I try to imitate some of their "moves": Sylvain's gentle but pointed questions, Irene's open-ended but persistent ones, Xenia's fascinated supplements to what her students say, Judy not competing with students even when they're pushing her. I know I'm changing, learning, because I can see and hear the signs on the tapes. I feel less certain but more thoughtful, more deliberate but less confused. I've got a "daimon" now, which "reminds" me with little pictures, little voices -and my colleagues. I no longer feel that mentoring is such a lonely, incomprehensible profession.

The two articles which follow, by Sylvain Nagler and Xenia Coulter, are about a presentation which the "video mentors" which gave in Atlanta at the 1993 conference of the International Mentoring Association.

ALL ABOUT
MENTORING
A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 2, Fall 1993

Dialoguing About Mentoring In Atlanta **Sylvain Nagler, Northeast Center**

"Diversity In Mentoring" was the conference name; Atlanta, the place. An ideal gathering it seemed to us to showcase the work of our mentoring study group. We had two presentations already under our belt: our first at a faculty retreat (a rehearsal in front of friends) and then at the ACE/ Alliance Conference in Evanston in the fall. Both featured using videotapes of actual mentor-student meetings. Despite limitations in the technical aspects of our presentation, our sessions received warm responses from both audiences, as did our general focus on highlighting the use of questioning as a mentoring tool. We all agreed that we had achieved our principal objectives; namely, informing others of our work while enabling us to learn from the exchanges with the attendees.

In many ways we looked forward to the nonacademic focus of the conference, anticipating that it would provide us with an unusual opportunity to compare notes with mentors in other settings. But I don't think that any of us anticipated the degree to which ESC's academic mentoring approach was seen as exceptional, as we were among the very few presenters who spoke of mentoring as an educational "delivery" (I so dislike that term) alternative. So, we were quite taken back when several questioners at our session inquired (in a somewhat challenging way) on what basis we call what they were witnessing on the videotapes as mentoring. And we thought we had already gained universal respectability! For most of them, mentoring meant something quite different: embracing a different set of goals and targeting a different population.

Like the proverbial stage performer, we had clearly misjudged the crowd. In retrospect, a different slant seemed called for, perhaps, one highlighting the ways in which our brand of individualization enables a whole range of students with very different interests, needs and talents to achieve their unique educational objectives. Without that sort of introduction to our craft, our presentation made us seem quite outside the legitimate mainstream to many in the audience. In fact, I think we seemed more different than we actually are.

While there was no single definition of mentoring that emerged at the conference, here's my sense of what a composite one might look like: Someone who shepherds, advises, counsels, supports and serves as a role model to populations at risk. The goal is to assist them to overcome historical exclusion and institutional barriers in the hope that with this assistance they will be able to match promise and reality. The keynote speaker, sociologist Charles Willie, argued forcefully that a mentor is much more than a teacher. Rather than confine their attention to the 3 R's, mentors need to embrace the 3 S's: suffering, sacrifice and service.

If the mission was broader than ours, the population of mentees certainly was as well. Professor Willie

described them as members of the "subdominant" power class in the society. And, to give meaning and substance to his proposed mentoring agenda, he recalled some moving moments from his own professional history and those of some other prominent African-American professionals he had surveyed. His message, it seemed to me, advocated seeing mentoring as more than an educational tool, more than a personal way of engaging others. It is, as well, a political instrument, a pursuit designed to assist mentees to negotiate successfully the uneven playing field they confront and, in the process, mentors can play a role in promoting progressive social change.

Listening to his talk proved to be no less provocative than inspirational. I felt challenged to rethink, still one more time, my role as ESC mentor and, this is crucial, the institutional mandate that circumscribes that definition. What would it take, for example, for us to move beyond our present boundary, to provide the same kind of personalized attention to our less successful students as we do to those whom we proudly celebrate at our yearly graduation ceremonies? The mentoring model we heard most enthusiastically advocated in Atlanta was one directed at assisting those least likely to succeed. In fact, our own attrition statistics would suggest that we have no scarcity of such students. Yet, we show no particular inclination to apply the mentoring model just described to retain them. Quite the contrary, in the rush to keep our heads above water and with the FTE "in the bank," we may even feel a sense of relief when we do not hear from an enrolled student, particularly one who has not demonstrated great enthusiasm or promise, realizing only after awhile that the end date of the learning contract has long passed. At least that is what the records would seem to suggest.

Occasionally the Northeast Center has launched various initiatives to keep in touch with entering students and to follow up on those who are not making adequate progress or who do not re-enroll. But, clearly our staffing and resource shortage now discourage such efforts. And, given current budget priorities, I see little hope that we will enjoy a reversal in this trend. Many of us wish it could be otherwise. In the meantime, we will have a ways to go to match the mission advocated by our new found colleagues in Atlanta.

A closing note: The informal discussions one has at gatherings such as these are typically time well spent. And so it was for me. The response from fellow academic faculty to my description of the individualized programming we do at ESC grabbed their attention and elicited words of envy. I raise that here because I think it is important to keep what we do in proper perspective, and going to such conferences certainly helps do that. The mentors I encountered at this, the 6th Annual International Mentoring Conference, had lots to teach me about how much further we can extend the mentoring we do. But at the same time I felt encouraged that we, too, have something important to contribute to the dialogue on mentoring. With this initiation under our belts I believe we can return to the 7th annual meeting next year and explain more effectively how we too belong in the family of mentors.

ALL ABOUT
MENTORING
A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 2, Fall 1993

Joining the Family of Mentors Xenia Coulter, Center for International Programs

In Margot Murray's book, *Beyond the Myths and Magic of Mentoring* (1991), mentoring is defined as:

a deliberate pairing of a more skilled or experienced person with a lesser skilled or experienced one, with the agreed-upon goal of having the lesser skilled person grow and develop specific competencies.

Kathy Kram in *Mentoring at Work* (1985) also sees mentoring as "a relationship that enhances career development" where an experienced individual guides, supports and/or counsels a less experienced person. And Tom Evans in *Mentors* (1992) defines us as "individuals who aid students individually or collectively," often teachers, "bringing an extra dimension to their job."

I mention these definitions to emphasize the fact that as mentors, we are part of a much larger family than just Empire State College. Just how large that family is (and how small we are) was recently brought home to me when I and three other colleagues attended the annual conference of the International Mentoring Association in Atlanta.

Given our complete identification with the above definitions, you can imagine our consternation when at the first presentation we attended, we were told that Empire State College mentors "don't count" because we "are unique." Although we tried to discount those statements as simply misguided opinions, we were not able to escape quite so easily: At our own presentation, an hour later, the first question we heard from the audience before we were even finished was something like -"how in the world is what you do mentoring?" Stunned but not bowed, we decided that the problem was in our presentation -that we had taken too much for granted or failed to be clear enough in explaining our work. As we moved on to other presentations reassuring ourselves with commonalties we saw between our practice and what was described by others, we felt deep regret that our identification with mentoring was not as evident to others as it was to ourselves.

After lunch Professor Charles Willie from Harvard gave a stirring speech about the importance of mentoring, particularly for "subdominant people of power." He made us proud to be mentors, although he cautioned us that mentoring is more than just a student-teacher relationship. It is not only the 3 A's that you represent, he said; you mustn't forget the 3 S's: namely, service, sacrifice and suffering. A little later we heard a second speech by sociologist Asa Hilliard that was, if possible, even more inspiring. In describing the mentors in his life and their critical role in his academic success, he made service, sacrifice and suffering particularly vivid and important. Wryly commenting about "mass-produced mentoring programs," he saw mentors as people undaunted by terrible odds who struggle heroically to help those who are in serious need. And indeed, his

vision was reinforced throughout the remainder of the conference as we listened to descriptions of mentoring programs where despite huge social, economic and political difficulties, mentors reached out to inner-city youths, women, managers-at-risk, and at-risk college students, particularly from diverse populations. Increasingly, we could not help but notice that for most people at the conference mentoring always seemed to occur within the context of great generosity of spirit and an intense sense of mission.

Do we really have an equivalent sense of calling, we began to ask ourselves. Do we have the same profound concern for the well-being of our students as we saw described again and again during the conference? Just how far are we really willing to go to find students for whom higher education would otherwise be an impossibility? How far are we willing to go to help these students make it through our system? Indeed, just how much service, sacrifice and suffering do we actually endure? While we did not lose our sense of identity as mentors, our confidence in ourselves as mentoring exemplars was certainly shaken.

Much discussion during the conference centered on one mentor function -that of role model. Hilliard described in moving terms the love of scholarship that he acquired from one of his first mentors. Although Willie and others cautioned that mentoring is not equivalent to role modeling, it emerged as a relevant concept in nearly every presentation. One of the clearest cases was the description of the Each One Teach One program connected to Hunter College. There, the professors themselves served as models of social responsibility for their college students, who in turn were required to serve as mentors and role models to inner-city youths.

As I heard about this project, I suddenly wondered why we weren't doing something similar at Empire State College. It dawned on me that we have a beautiful opportunity to serve as role models -not as scholars, for how many of our students are all that interested in the life of academe?- not just as socially responsible individuals, for in that role many of our students put us to shame -but as mentors, the one role that is uniquely ours in higher education. If we could but shift our focus ever so slightly away from our academic disciplines toward the very considerable skills and personal attributes demanded by our mentoring role, perhaps our students could be inspired by our example. Maybe as a result of being an Empire State College student, they might be moved to serve, sacrifice and suffer -in whatever area they feel competent -as mentors.

Perhaps we could go even further as mentoring role models. Why couldn't Empire State College take on a leadership role in the mentoring movement? Why couldn't the College commit itself to helping set up or to assist in already existing mentoring programs in each of our local communities or schools? Why couldn't it be college policy that we actively encourage our students to follow in our footsteps to become mentors themselves? Indeed, why couldn't we require our students to serve as mentors to those less fortunate than they -before we let them graduate?

Several years ago I gave a presentation at the All College meeting which I ended with the suggestion that we "require" all our students to undertake some kind of gender- related study. Much of the discussion that followed centered upon the issue of "requiring" anything in a student- centered college. Clearly, "requiring" a student to be a mentor is even more problematic. Yet if we, as faculty, could but stretch ourselves a little toward the vision of the ideal mentor, if we could accept that our role involves the 3 R's as well as the 3 S's, if we could encourage, not efficiencies, but ever increasing patience and tolerance with our students, surely they would notice.

Perhaps a collegewide mentoring requirement would be too difficult to implement, but on an individual basis, we could still go far toward inspiring our own students to serve as mentors. As we mentor them-that is, demonstrate a commitment toward going as far as we can in helping them meet their goals-how could they not want to similarly help those in our community who need guidance, counsel, support, advocacy,

modeling, protection, information, advice, and encouragement even more than they? If by such a program, whether it be individual or collegewide, we managed to graduate mentors as well as college-educated adults, I for one would feel a lot more deserving of belonging to the family of mentors than, in the wake of Atlanta, I do right now.

ALL ABOUT
MENTORING
A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 2, Fall 1993

Spirituality and Academic Work **Wendy Goulston , Long Island Center**

In June 1992, Rhoads Wald and I were awarded a small grant to call together a group at our Center to pursue issues and concerns about "the challenge of faith in the academy ." The latter theme framed the discussions at the 1992 Association for Religion and Intellectual Life (ARIL) consultation at Emory University, which Rhoads and I both found fascinating. We wished to pursue in our own community the ideas and feelings that the consultation had unleashed, as we considered how our Judaism and our students' religions and spirituality nourished and put into question our secular disciplinary knowledge, while the latter fed and challenged our religion. The focus and process we evolved became an ongoing challenge that developed our ties to and knowledge of each other. For me it created a hopeful shaft of light that began to illuminate dimensions of knowing that inform cognitive thought but are usually dark. It was wonderful to hear people explore the workings of their religion and spirituality in their academic and creative work.

As we approach the conclusion of our first year of monthly meetings, we feel pleased that a core group of 11 of us have explored together some aspects of our experience and thinking that is usually hidden, especially in academic settings. Talking about one's spirituality and religion can be as exposing as talking about sex and income, and as difficult to come to grips with intellectually and emotionally, particularly in a group of colleagues from mixed and no faiths. We have Protestants and Catholics (observant and non-observant), Jews (orthodox, conservative and reconstructivist), non-affiliated spiritualists, and non-religious intellectuals with an academic interest in religion. Our disciplines comprise education, literature, sociology, economics, community and human services, computers, linguistics, psychology, art, and religion. One member is an administrator, the rest faculty, students and support staff.

We spent several meetings grappling with what we each and as a group wanted to gain from our meetings. These were difficult and I thought exciting times, when we risked exposing our religious histories and values in an effort to name what would be useful. Inevitably we differed in our degree of comfort with personal talk and in our interest in abstraction. We had to find a balance between our wishes to learn more academically about religion and spirituality, our own and other's, and our willingness to explore and learn from our own experiences.

For the first few meetings Rhoads and I selected readings that we thought would help us clarify our own spiritual/intellectual journeys, and we used these readings as starting points for our discussions. We also agreed to begin each meeting with a go-around in which each person present would speak for a couple of minutes about some reaction to the reading or to the questions we were raising generally. Soon we added the idea of beginning with a ritual of some kind, using some non-verbal symbol we all responded to in turn. And we decided that before bringing in outside speakers, one or two of us each meeting would volunteer to

talk about ways our notions of religion/spirituality related to our work, circulate a short reading, and design and lead the opening ritual.

These meetings have been thought provoking, moving, sometimes exasperating for some of us, worthwhile. We have eaten bread together, and reflected aloud on what bread means to us in our lives, concretely and as metaphor; likewise with candlelight, grapes and brownies served on a grandmother's plate. We have seen and explored spiritual themes in an artist's work; in a prison-counselor/academic student's work; in a secular sociologist's thinking; and in a psychologist's valuing of ecologically significant new physics. We have spoken openly about our values, as we seek to live by them in our creative, domestic, intellectual and community lives. We have had to tolerate and respect differences between us that were not always comfortable.

I have learned a great deal from this openness about difference, expressed as it was, not in the usual predictably different views about ESC matters, but in more tender areas of thought and feeling that we usually keep private, even though they fuel and in some ways shape our teaching and thinking. I look forward to our final meeting with a heightened respect, even awe, for both the limits and the stretches of our personal and intellectual, conscious and unconscious knowledge. We have illuminated some pieces of the mysteries of our spiritual/religious/intellectual interconnections, surrounded all the while by larger mysteries that some call Divine. Let us know if you would like more information about ARIL and/or our LI group meetings.

ALL ABOUT
MENTORING
A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 2, Fall 1993

Shoshana's Journal: Charting Organizational Culture and Individual Emotions **David Starr-Glass, Jerusalem, Center for International Programs**

I have found journal keeping a valuable adjunct to experiential learning. In keeping a journal the student is encouraged to identify and record daily experiences, and to relate these experiences to the set of topics being explored in his/her current study. The student is helped to search out ideas discussed in the literature in his/her own world.

Concepts which may have been encountered by the student in a formal and distanced manner, often appear with a fresh familiarity and personalized relevance in the pages of his/her journal.

As Kolb (1984) indicates there are four phases in the process: the concrete experience, reflective observation, conceptualization and experimentation. Student and instructor alike must be prepared to see everyday life as the true theater for presented ideas. The learner must be encouraged to reflect on experience, and these reflections must be supported and sustained by the mentor. Further elaboration of these reflections around abstracted concepts and generalization of experience must likewise be encouraged and nurtured. The successful journal is rarely the work product of the student alone. Rather its true value is a direct function of the mentor's encouragement and involvement. The journal process often represents the tentative beginnings of an active communication between those engaged in the educational exchange.

In a large group setting, the journal is a valuable vehicle for capturing fragments of ideas and reflections. Communication is certainly there, but my own experience with class settings is that the communication remains fairly distanced. In the mentor setting, however, the dynamics of journal keeping change dramatically. It is the mentor who is probably in the best position to successfully employ the student journal technique. At the individual mentor and individual student level of interaction, it is easier to emphasize and develop what is for many the journal's most valuable feature -the capturing and the exploring of transitory emotions.

The journal technique has frequently been used to capture experiential learning components of management and organizational behavior studies (Sims and Lindhold, 1993). In these study areas it is easy for the student to opt for text-centered explorations. The student is often in search of packaged solutions to vaguely appreciated problems. Such solutions are invariably simplistic, highly structured, rational and cognitive. The underlying problems however tend to be much more complex, ill-defined, highly diffuse and emotive. Not surprisingly the problem/solution fit is likely to be an artifact with little real-world relevance.

By encouraging the student to capture experiences using the broadest range of the senses, it is often possible to investigate the emotive, rather than cognitive, dimensions of those experiences. In the beginning

students often tend to jump to a phase of abstraction without having really appreciated or processed the initial feelings and emotions which the incident evoked. Reflection is not the same as rationalization. I encourage students to set out journal observation in terms of snapshots - "Did you feel anger ?" "Were you embarrassed ?" "How did she look ?" "What do you think he really wanted ?" -rather than in terms of crafted portraits. A similar emphasis on reflecting emotional responses is reported by David Coghlan (1993), who uses a related ORJI (observation, reaction, judgment, intervention) model developed by Schein (1987).

Shoshana was not her real name, but that is the only detail which has been altered. She entered a study of organizational behavior bright and interested. She was in her late twenties and had been employed for several years in secretarial and administrative capacities with the same employer. Right from the outset there seemed to be a fair degree of tension and anxiety. Shoshana's husband was in professional school, and while they shared the tasks of keeping home and looking after their two young children, it was clear that the pressure to provide economic benefit was on her .

When Shoshana first started keeping her journal, it was descriptive and disjointed. She looked at her work environment in terms of the form and structure which she encountered in her readings. As we began to focus more on the interpersonal involvements which developed in her work setting, a new picture started to develop. Shoshana, who was articulate and sensitive in investigating the behavior of others, started to focus on her own behavior and emotional discomfort in the organization. We utilized her ongoing work experiences to chart the newer ideas which grew out of her readings - organizational culture, power, politics, leadership and conflict. But most interestingly, Shoshana, through her candid autobiographical record, began to tap the emotional level of her situation -the fear, the frustration, the anger, and occasionally the joy.

As our study progressed the issue which confronted us was not the description of an organizational culture, but rather the charting of the conflicts of one of its participants. Several times during the study Shoshana said that through the study of organizational behavior, and through the use of her journal, she was able to come to a clearer understanding of her personal history within her work organization. However, the picture which she constantly presented was not that of a smoothed and resolved past, but of a troubled and volatile present.

Shoshana was fired from her job just before our study ended. It was a traumatic incident, but not an improbable conclusion to the journal which she had kept. We extended the study to incorporate this event, and Shoshana slowly recovered some of her former confidence. The journal was helpful in allowing her to come to terms with the dismissal. It was not the result of one mistake; it was a result of organizational-participant mismatch. Shoshana is now re-employed and reports being cautiously happy in her new setting.

The experience of Shoshana was unique and personal. I was privileged that she agreed, and was able, to share these experiences and feelings with me. The use of the journal in a mentor setting seemed not only to initiate the communication process but also gave the student a clearer understanding of corporate culture and related organizational behavior notions. But more than that, the use of the journal in this setting permitted Shoshana to develop a clearer and more realistic appreciation of her own emotional strengths and weaknesses. She learned about herself, and not simply about her organizational matrix.

In the educational exchange all participants must gain something; it is not, as they say, a zero-sum game. In my experience the keeping of a journal enhances the degree of sensitivity which the student displays to both the cognitive and emotive domains of the study. The student benefits. But the mentor in actively entering into the world of the student may well benefit even more.

References

Coghlan, D. (1993). Learning From Emotions Through Journaling. *Journal of Management Education*, 17(1),

90-94.

Kolb, D. (1984). *Experiential Learning*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Schein, E.H. (1987). *Process Consultation: Vol. 2. Lessons for Managers and Consultants*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Sims, R.R., & Lindholm, J. (1993). Kolb's Experiential Learning model; A First Step in Learning How to Learn From Experience. *Journal of Management Education*, 17(1), 95-98.

ALL ABOUT
MENTORING
A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 2, Fall 1993

Interactions: What Would You Do? **Paula Silver, Long Island Center**

[Editors' Note: "Interactions" is a regular feature of *All About Mentoring*. In this "Interactions," Paula Silver presents a difficult situation, without its resolution, and she asks how you would handle it. E-mail your responses to LHerman or JGilbert, and we'll publish them in the next issue of AAM.]

Stu was in his final contract for his B.S. degree. He was one of two students in a group study who elected to prepare a paper on a focused topic as an alternative to preparing summaries of a packet of research based articles that I had supplied. I was pleased that he had identified a topic on his own and was taking the initiative in pursuing it. As I read the paper he submitted I couldn't help but be pleased. Stu had tackled a complicated topic and presented it with clarity, detail and specificity that were not characteristic of his work in his earlier contracts. I didn't feel troubled that he listed only two sources for the paper because he had obviously mastered the material in a comprehensive way.

I wrote a very positive evaluation of his work, commenting on how much it had improved. This evaluation was typed and sent to the associate dean for signature. I naturally thought that I was done with Stu and his contract. Alas, as the days passed I had a stronger and stronger nagging awareness that Stu could not have written the paper he submitted. I kept hoping that this awareness would just go away but it didn't. I realized that I would need to resolve this question in order to escape this sense of disquiet. I intercepted the contract evaluation before it was sent up to Saratoga and initiated a series of inquiries that often had a surreal feeling about them.

I began by phoning the student and asking him to send me the review article he listed as the main resource for his paper. When this article arrived it was no surprise to find that whole paragraphs of the student's paper had been lifted verbatim from this review. What was a surprise and a puzzle was that the title page of the reprint did not match the body of the article. The content of the article reported work that was done years after the date on the title page. When I asked the student about this, his position was that he didn't understand how this could be. This mystery was never solved but it's not hard to imagine scenarios that would lead to doctoring of the reprint. Instead of pressing this question I asked the student how he had originally located the article, expecting to hear about his library research. Instead, he told me that someone in the group study had given it to him. He was unable to identify his benefactor when I asked who the "someone" was. I also asked what other sources he had used, since a careful reading of his paper revealed information not contained in either of the sources listed. Stu took an evasive tack until told him that there was already evidence of plagiarism, a serious offense, and that I needed additional information to decide how to resolve the case .

At this point, Stu became extremely contrite. He continually apologized and insisted that he hadn't meant to "offend" me. He was now willing to do whatever I asked. He phoned group members until he identified the student who had given him the reprint. He sent me another document, a publication from a commercial laboratory from which other paragraphs of his paper had been lifted. By the time I compared his paper to these two publications, I could scarcely find a sentence that was his own.

Sometime in this series of inquiries I recalled that a year earlier when Stu's portfolio was evaluated, one of the evaluators determined that an essay was plagiarized and awarded no credit. This determination and the reasons for it were explained to Stu at the time. Now I asked Stu if he had understood at that time what plagiarism is and why it was unacceptable. He replied that he had. When I asked why he had resorted to plagiarism again, he replied, "It's so hard for me to do a paper on a technical subject."

Well, what would you do in this case?

ALL ABOUT
MENTORING
A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 2, Fall 1993

Innovations in Education

Arthur W. Chickering

[Editors' Note: The following excerpts from Arthur Chickering's speech at the 20th Anniversary All College meeting are reprinted from *Exchange* at the suggestion of Bob Rodgers. Arthur Chickering was ESC's first academic vice president.]

There were a few educational and organizational principles that were key to developing Empire State. They flowed from the initial charge from Ernest Boyer, who stated,

Empire State College was created by the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York in response to an urgent need to provide new and more flexible approaches to education for New York State. We are being asked to serve students of all ages, and therefore our educational programs must be expanded and focused on new ways in which education can be delivered to the people.

Meeting these needs is an ambitious undertaking. It will not be accomplished simply or overnight. Nevertheless, we must identify the most promising approaches and press ahead, keeping the individual student constantly in mind, and tailoring education to his [or her] requirements. To do this, we must find ways of acting on what we've long known -that learning is not bounded by place or time, and that it is a life-long process.

To educate diverse adults throughout New York State, that was our charge. The bedrock principle that followed from this charge was respect for each individual and recognition of the significance of individual differences. That educational principle was expressed through:

- Individualized degree programs pursued through individually designed learning contracts.
- The portfolio assessment process to recognize and validate the rich knowledge and competence students had developed through work, volunteer activities, community responsibilities and a vocational interests.
- Narrative transcripts which capture the particular quality of each student's plans and performance in rich fashion.
- Using ongoing responsibilities and activities of students as legitimate experiential contexts for observation, analysis, experimentation, and practice, related to academic concepts and skills.

-Reaching out to students where they live and work.

-Creating processes through which students could drop out or re-enter as the exigencies of the rest of their lives required.

The second key principle called for a strong mix of theory and practice, a heavy emphasis on "experiential learning." We know learning that lasts needs to involve a sound combination of concrete experiences, reflective activities, abstract concepts and active application.

The third principle called for broad content areas, capacious enough to accommodate a range of student purposes and interests without requiring that they fit into narrow, academically defined boxes.

A fourth principle was the rejection of "credits" and semester. We created a full-time or half-time enrollment basis (except for the then-named Labor School) , and the flexible contract lengths, to avoid arbitrary , meaningless, and often dysfunctional categories. We wanted to leave the way free for coherent and integrated learning contracts with large time units, where the purposes and substance drove the time definitions instead of the reverse, which characterizes most higher education.

The fifth educational principle was to place the relationship between student and faculty at the center of an educational process which involved joint planning, evaluation and inquiry. We were confident that once both experienced that interaction, they would be so enriched and nourished, stimulated and satisfied, that the program would hold, that the rest of the principles would be honored.

There were also three organizational principles that were key to implementing the educational principles.

First, we recognized the importance of creating the College in action with students, out of our experiences with them, instead of through a lengthy, detailed planning process. Beginning with students and working the program out with them was an organizational expression of the bedrock principle of respect for students.

The second key principle concerned unit size. We wanted units small enough that faculty members had to work together, know each other, share information about students, and experience a strong sense of community.

The third principle recognized the necessary tension between high levels of autonomy at the unit level, to respond to the particular needs of students and community context, and a reasonable degree of coherence and integrity across the institution. That's why we started with very little effort to control and constrain early degree programs and contracts, and also why the Office of Program Review and Assessment was later introduced.

Those were key organizers for creating this new College in response to the Chancellor's charge. I am gratified that they still seem, in large measure, to be expressed in the way the College functions.

I make so bold as to suggest a direction for ESC's future research and development. Educating in a multi-cultural society, with respect and effectiveness, is the most significant educational

challenge the world faces. New technologies can be harnessed in the service of this challenge, but they can only supplement and enrich the understandings we reach in our direct work with students. Empire State has the competence and experience to lead the world toward a similar approach.

I look forward to sharing the College's 30th anniversary and to the contributions it will have made.

ALL ABOUT

MENTORING

A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 2, Fall 1993

MI News

Collegewide Workshop on Mentoring -The Mentoring Institute will sponsor a collegewide workshop on mentoring that will be part of the next All College Meeting. We've been collecting ideas from the MI advisors and others, including general topics and volunteers for particular workshops. Below is a list of the general topics suggested so far. Please contact us (JGilbert, LHerman, MTatzel) with more suggestions and let us know if you want to lead a session.

- new directions in group work
- responding to student writing
- having fun with educational planning
- students' "stories" as part of educational planning
- assessment resources
- dialogues with students
- the video mentor project
- developing effective independent learning skills
- serving students with special needs
- workshops for (newer) mentors
- connecting electronically with learning resources
- international and cross-cultural mentoring

MI Advisors Meeting -The Mentoring Institute advisors and cochairs met in Albany, 9/30-10/1/93. There were rich discussions of faculty development at the individual, center and collegewide levels. The participants discussed their own faculty development ideas and practiced planning their own collaborative faculty development "learning contracts." They discussed the collective faculty development issues at their respective centers and collegewide. The role of the Mentoring Institute in supporting development at all three levels was further shaped. Strong endorsement was given to collaboration and to encouraging mentors with particular skills and interests to travel to other centers to share them. Also supported was a proposal to seek a grant to enhance the funding of the Mentoring Institute; the money would be used to support mentor development within ESC and a "summer institute" at which people from outside ESC could come to learn mentoring skills. A full set of "minutes" of the meeting can be obtained from your center's advisor to the MI.

Collaborators Wanted -In nearly every discussion of the MI, the cochairs have encountered the request that the MI provide training for newer mentors, both individually and in groups. We've begun arranging faculty development learning contracts for some newer mentors. But we don't have a systematic way of

identifying you or if you want help, nor have we yet planned how to do group activities for newer mentors.

SO: If you are a newer mentor and want to do an individual development contract, please contact your center's MI advisor and/or the MI cochairs. If you are an experienced ESC mentor and would be willing to help your newer colleagues learn mentoring through such a contract, also contact your center's MI advisor or the cochairs.

AND: If you are interested in facilitating a group learning experience for newer mentors, please let the advisors and cochairs know.

The Mentoring Institute Advisors:

Bob Carey -Metro
Jay Gilbert -Hudson Valley
Susan Hallgarth -Labor
Marjorie Lavin -Academic Affairs
Tim Lehmann -NCAL
Sylvain Nagler -Northeast
Susan Oaks -CDL
Irene Rivera de Royston -Genesee Valley
Bob Rodgers -Niagara Frontier
Chris Rounds -Central New York
Paula Silver -Long Island
Evelyn Ting -Corporate College

They and the MI cochairs can be collectively reached at @[maillist]miadvise.

Generic Contract Wanted for Learning Educational Planning and Assessment -At the collective meeting of Areas of Study and the Faculty Conference the proposal was made and warmly received that important learning topics for all newer mentors are doing educational planning with students and preparing them for the assessment process. Since these are collegewide activities and even somewhat uniform from center to center, the MI would be interested in sponsoring the development of a generic faculty development learning contract for newer mentors on educational planning and assessment. Working with veteran mentors, newer faculty would learn about purposes, issues, techniques, and resources for doing educational planning and about assessment policies, procedures and customs. If you are interested in collaboratively developing such a learning contract for newer mentors, please contact Trish Gannon (TGannon) and/or Lee Herman (LHerman).

"Work in Progress" Wanted for *All About Mentoring* - The articles in *All About Mentoring* don't have to be about the mentoring processes or experiences. A primary purpose of MM is to give people a place to share their creative and scholarly work-in-progress. If you're working on something, something which you might not be ready to send to a refereed publication but which you want your colleagues to know about and respond to, send it via email or on disk (as an ASCII file) to the AAM editors, Lee Herman and Miriam Tatzel (LHerman, MTatzel). We'll proudly publish it in AAM.

God put me on
earth to accomplish
a certain number of
things. Right now I
am so far behind, I
will never die.



*contributed by Xenia
Coulter*