EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Circle Members: Larry Baenik (Special Education); Jennifer Hammack (Government); Robin S. Lewis (OGSP); Rebecca McMullen (Special Education); Caitlin Powell (Psychology); Rosalie A. Richards (Chemistry) – co-chair; Doreen Sams (Business)– co-chair

The overarching goal of the academic year 2012-13 teaching circle was to build on successes realized through the professional development experiences in undergraduate research mentoring that a core group of nine (9) cross-disciplinary faculty initiated in 2011-12 (Sams, 2011; Richards et al., 2012). During that timeframe, circle members explored and applied best practice strategies for effective faculty-student mentoring in undergraduate research. Outcomes from the 2011-12 teaching circle included (a) rich discussion/reflections on the common text, Faculty Success through Mentoring (Bland et al., 2009); (b) presentations and workshop facilitation at local, statewide, and national workshops/conferences; (c) contributions to a proposed statewide undergraduate research conference at a USG workshop on Leading Undergraduate Research Programs (2012); and (d) participation as team leaders in the CETL-sponsored Undergraduate Scholarship Symposium & Follow-Up Sessions.

Towards developing faculty careers that include undergraduates as researchers, this teaching circle chose to continue enriching faculty (and tacitly, student) experiences by exploring, applying and disseminating best-practice strategies for effective faculty-student mentoring.

Noteworthy accomplishments by the circle included:

1. **A Research Study**: the implementation of an on-going study to examine the value (cost versus benefit) of mentoring in undergraduate research and creative endeavors (URACE) at GC

2. **Leadership in the GC URACE Symposium**: two circle members led the coordination and implementation of the symposium

3. **Invitation to conduct a Workshop**: the teaching circle was invited to conduct a mentoring workshop at the URACE Symposium: Mr. Miyagi Mentoring – Working with limited resources in a public liberal arts setting (Session V Workshop: GC; March 16, 2013)

4. **Student Nominations for Panel Presentation**: teaching circle members nominated research students to present a panel discussion at the URACE Symposium: Student Panel – URACE Experiences @ Georgia College (Session IV Workshop: GC; March 16, 2013)


6. **Handbook Development**: the circle completed the first draft of the Undergraduate Research Mentoring Handbook

7. **Manuscript of a Journal Article**: Mentorship: Competitive Advantage in a Global Marketplace; to be submitted to the International Journal on the Scholarship of Teaching & Learning (IJ-SOTL)

8. **Undergraduate Mentoring Research Course (MKTG-4999)**: this course was proposed and implemented in the College of Business (Sams 2011-2012).

9. **Updates to the Teaching Circle Blog**: http://undergraduateresearchmentoring.blogspot.com
INTRODUCTION AND GOALS
The overarching goal of the teaching circle was to enrich faculty (and tacitly, student) experiences in undergraduate research by exploring and applying best-practice strategies for effective faculty-student mentoring. Circle members spent the 2012-13 academic year exploring, examining, applying and sharing best practices across disciplines. The circle’s work was rooted in mentoring practices promoted by Shellito et al. (2001), Crowe and Brakke (2008), Wenger and others (2002), Handelsman and colleagues (2009), and Bland et al. (2009).

PROCESS
Recruitment: The composition of the circle was critical to continuing the project. Three first-year members did not continue into the second year. This was partly due to job relocation or that the circle’s focus was not of continued interest. We added one new member, Bacnik, who is personally and professionally interested in mentoring, especially to diverse populations. The new make-up of the circle has allowed us to delve further into our desire (1) to empower circle members to pursue conversations about undergraduate research mentoring in the respective departments; (2) to create ambassadors for undergraduate research in their respective departments; (3) to seed and stimulate cross-disciplinary dialogue; and (4) to form a core group of faculty mentor-leaders to support peers interested in or already conducting undergraduate research. The diversity of faculty in terms of discipline, race/ethnicity, gender, and place of origin also elevated an already rich dialogue.

Circle Activities: We met monthly from October 2012 through April 2013. Our first meeting was hosted at the new Center for Engaged Learning. Many of the other meetings were typically held at the Science Education Center (that is, on campus) since faculty schedules heavily conflicted. In several cases, a member or two was unable to meet during the times that most could meet.

During the Fall semester, we submitted a proposal to present at the 2013 Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SOTL) Commons Conference to be hosted in Savannah, GA. The proposal was accepted. We developed also a framework and questions for implementing a research study that we had discussed during the previous year, and submitted IRB materials for approval.

During the Spring semester, in addition to our monthly circle sessions, we participated in two full-day Saturday retreats (a) to meet as a full circle and provide both professional and personal progress updates; (b) to coordinate the materials for the Undergraduate Research Mentoring Handbook; (c) to prepare the workshop materials for the URACE Symposium; (d) to evaluate the preliminary research study data; and (e) to prepare materials for a roundtable discussion at the SOTL-Commons Conference. Between February and May, teams of circle members also worked both face-to-face and via electronic means to develop materials for all activities. In April, no formal circle session was held since March was spent on several circle functions. Instead, circle members met in early May for lunch at Lieu Peking’s to celebrate circle accomplishments, circle members’ individual professional and personal achievements, and Powell’s transition to a new position. A timeline of circle activities and a description of associated outcomes are described below in Table I.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>Teaching circle meeting</td>
<td>• circle members organized activities for the academic year • circle submitted a proposal for presentation at the SOTL-Commons Conference (goal III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>Teaching circle meeting</td>
<td>• members discussed framework for research study focused on outcomes of undergraduate research mentoring (see blog), created questions, determined interview protocols • articles for the handbook were identified for expanding the literature review (goal I) • (Dec) planned for Spring 2013; IRB was submitted and approved; SOTL proposal was accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Teaching circle meeting</td>
<td>• SOTL conference plans were solidified • handbook responsibilities were distributed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GC Undergraduate Scholarship Symposium</td>
<td>• this faculty event was hosted in March as the URACE Symposium; two circle members led the development and implementation of the symposium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>Teaching circle meeting</td>
<td>• SOTL conference plans were solidified (goal III) • initial preparations were made for Saturday retreats - to develop a one-hour mentoring workshop for the URACE Symposium; - to finalize presentation materials for the SOTL conference; and - to develop the handbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>Teaching circle meeting</td>
<td>• the circle committed two Saturday retreats to the development of an Undergraduate Research Mentoring Handbook (goal II) initiated during the previous year • the major portion of one retreat was dedicated to a “mentoring with few resources” workshop design for local dissemination at the URACE Symposium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOTL Conference</td>
<td>• members finalized the conference presentation • three members presented the roundtable discussion at a conference in Savannah, GA: Mar 27-29 (goal IV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>GC Student Research Conference</td>
<td>• student presentations were made by mentees of all circle faculty members at the conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Circle final report due</td>
<td>• end-of-year circle luncheon at Lieu Peking’s • the circle’s final report was initiated (this document) and will be submitted to CETL in June for local dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>Journal publication</td>
<td>• a manuscript to IJ-SOTL is in preparation (goal V)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GOALS MET AND FINAL PRODUCTS: As outlined in the executive summary, not only were the goals of the circle met, but we also realized several unanticipated outcomes of the year’s work.

- **Goal I - Expand the literature review on mentoring initiated in 2011**: The circle used the literature collected in 2011-12 to design a research study to examine the value (cost versus benefit) of mentoring in undergraduate research and creative endeavors. In addition to the study, the circle expanded the literature review to create an *Undergraduate Research Mentoring Handbook* for the sole purpose of professional development by faculty and administrator at liberal arts colleges. Members agreed that we had met this goal.

- **Goal II - Publish a Mentoring Handbook electronically**: Caitlin Powell led the charge of coordinating the development of the handbook. All circle members were allocated assignments and a team was responsible for putting the document together. A first draft, produced for presentation at the SOTL conference, is currently under revision. The Table of Contents is shown in Appendix I and the draft is available upon request. Our ambitious goal (TBD) was to use electronic technologies (e.g. *Apple Beyond the Textbook* software) to publish the product. Members agreed that we had met this goal as a draft is available but not published electronically.

- **Goal III – Submit a conference proposal**: Sams led the charge of developing a successful proposal for the SOTL Commons Conference. Members strongly agreed that this goal was met.

- **Goal IV - Present a workshop at the SOTL-Commons Conference**: Richards, Hammad and Sams conducted a roundtable discussion on mentoring in undergraduate research in Savannah at the SOTL-Commons Conference. Members strongly agreed that this goal was met.

- **Goal V - Prepare a publication to the International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (IJ-SoTL ISBN: 1931-4744)**: Circle members are currently developing a manuscript for an article initiated during the previous academic year for publication in IJ-SOTL. Members agreed that we had met this goal as a manuscript for publication is under preparation.

**FINAL THOUGHTS**

*Dishonesty/Theft of Intellectual Property/Breach of Confidentiality*

During the course of the academic year, circle members became aware of a research survey produced by a graduate research assistant of one of the circle members (Professor X) and co-authored by a faculty member outside the circle (Professor Y). Professor X shared the graduate student’s research hours with Professor Y. The survey, submitted for IRB approval on behalf of a Professor Y and the graduate research assistant, was almost identical to the Circle’s work; it tapped the same concepts, same scale points and scale descriptors, and very similar questions to assess the same sample population. To support the concern for faculty research protection, the circle provides the following pieces of data as evidence: (1) the graduate assistant had access to the circle’s work; (2) the graduate assistant was well aware of the research as she had asked many questions about the work of the circle; and (3) the graduate assistant pointedly asked questions about mentoring and the mentoring research. Fortunately, one of the circle’s members served on the IRB Committee and recognized the work. Had that not occurred, the situation would not have been arrested, and tacitly severe damage to
the current work could have ensued. It would have resulted in an extremely negative impact on nearly two year’s worth of work by the Circle (which is still ongoing), and the work would be for naught.

The circle attempted to impose some accountability by Professor Y and the research assistant. Yet, at the time of the writing of this report, only the following outcomes have been realized:

1. the behavior of the graduate research assistant does not fall under the student judiciary board, as determined by Student Affairs
2. the behavior of the graduate research assistant does not fall under the jurisdiction of Human Resources, as determined by the Georgia College legal department, and
3. there are no known repercussions for the graduate research assistant or for Professor Y as there are no confidentiality agreements required of graduate research assistants and verbal agreements cannot be proven.

**Responsible Conduct of Research: Policy, Education Requirement, Faculty and Student Misconduct Boards**

This incident highlighted the lack of resources at Georgia College to arrest these types of actions or provide recourse/remedies if they do occur. There is no formal Georgia College Responsible Conduct of Research Policy. In addition, a formal Responsible Conduct of Research education requirement does not exist. Implementing and enforcing such a requirement would ensure that both faculty and students recognize and understand Georgia College’s research conduct expectations. Likewise, associated Faculty and Student Research Misconduct Boards and appropriate processes to evaluate and issue sentences related to faculty or student research grievances are absent. In fact, the recourse for faculty or student with grievances is to solicit attorney assistance and bring suit to the university. Therefore, it is proposed that the university develop a *Responsible Conduct of Research Policy* that provides formal required training and the appropriate practices for research assistants and the faculty for whom they work.

**Results of Circle Evaluation**

Despite navigating the aforementioned research conduct activities this year, all members of the circle strongly agreed that their ideas and concerns were valued by other members and that participation as a circle member increased their understanding and confidence in mentoring others (faculty peer mentoring, undergraduates, graduate students, etc.). Members agreed that they had effectively disseminated or shared their mentoring work with faculty peers and/or helped others develop ideas about mentoring. Approximately one-third strongly agreed and about two-thirds of the circle agreed that they were recognized by their peers and others for work or expertise in mentorship.

All circle members indicated interested in continuing the circle’s work during academic year 2013-14. Top reasons included continued professional growth and a desire to see the handbook and academic journal article completed and disseminated. Members requested that the circle should maintain open/honest dialogue, keep the readings as they sustain/update circle members’ expertise and retain “strong leadership”. Circle members suggested a reduction in the number of emails while focusing key communications during common meeting times. Several members commented that they were proud to be a part of the circle and that the work product/outcomes were vast and meaningful.
EXPENSE REPORT
The budget request was for the full $500.00 and we were awarded $335 in Fall 2012. In April 2013, the circle made an additional funding request to CEL for support to offset the cost of travel to present at the SOTL Commons Conference. The CEL funding request was denied but a recommendation was made to solicit funding from CETL. CETL graciously provided year-end support of up to $1,000 and requested dissemination by the circle to the university community during academic year 2013-14.

Circle funding was used for the following:

i. SOTL-Commons Conference - registration fee (Sams) $ 325.00
ii. SOTL-Commons Conference - registration fee (Richards)* $ 325.00
   iii. Shared mileage and room charges* $ 656.89

* Supported by CETL year-end funds ($981.89)  
Total $1306.89
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