

## Final Program Evaluation Results for Scholar/Mentor Program (03-05)

### Directions: Section I

For questions #1-#10, please respond by typing a number 1-5 in the box below each question, where 1=Not at All; 2=Minimally; 3=Undecided; 4=Somewhat; 5=As Much as Could Be Expected.

- To what extent has participation in the program increased your awareness of your own time-management behaviors relevant to creating time for scholarly writing?  
4, 2, 5, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5  
Average-4.391304  
Standard Deviation =0.722315
- To what extent has participation in the program improved your time-management behaviors relevant to creating more time for scholarly writing?  
2, 3, 3, 3, 5, 5, 5, 5, 4, 2, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 5, 5  
Average-4.869565  
Standard Deviation =1.6866965
- To what extent has participation in the program increased your awareness of your scholarly writing habits?  
2, 3, 3, 5, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 5, 4, 4, 4, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5  
Average-4.347826  
Standard Deviation=0.831685
- To what extent has participation in the program improved your scholarly writing productivity?  
2, 3, 3, 4, 5, 4, 4, 5, 5, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5  
Average-4.26087  
Standard Deviation=0.810016
- To what extent has participation in the program helped you learn new strategies for assessing clarity and coherence of scholarly writing?  
2, 3, 3, 5, 4, 4, 4, 4, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 4  
Average-4.454545  
Standard Deviation=0.857864
- To what extent has participation in the program helped you improve the clarity and coherence of their scholarly writing?  
2, 5, 4, 4, 5, 5, 5, 5, 4, 5, 5, 5, 5, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 3, 3, 2, 2  
Average-4.047619  
Standard Deviation=1.07127
- To what extent has participation in the program increased your awareness of strategies and variables likely to influence the submission and publication process?  
2, 5, 4, 4, 5, 5, 4, 4, 4, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 2  
Average-4.217391  
Standard Deviation=0.850482
- To what extent has participation in the program increased or refined your awareness of the research being conducted by other faculty on campus?  
3, 5, 3, 4, 5, 4, 5, 5, 4, 5, 2, 5, 5, 5, 5, 4, 4, 4, 3, 3, 2, 2, 1  
Average-3.826087  
Standard Deviation=1.23038

9. To what extent has participation in the program increased the likelihood that you will collaborate on a research project with another faculty member from the campus?  
 1, 2, 4, 5, 3, 3, 2, 5, 3, 5, 2, 4, 4, 3, 3, 3, 2, 2, 2, 1, 1, 1      Average=2.782609  
 Standard Deviation=1.277658
10. To what extent has participation in the program increased your confidence in their abilities to publish your research?  
 2, 5, 5, 5, 3, 3, 5, 5, 4, 5, 3, 5, 5, 5, 5, 4, 4, 4, 4, 3, 3, 3, 1      Average=3.956522  
 Standard Deviation=1.14726
11. On a scale of "1" (one) to "10" (ten), with "1" representing "no value," and "10" representing "maximum possible value," how do you rate the overall value of this program relative to assisting you in your development as a scholar?  
 5, 8, 9, 8, 9, 5, 9, 8, 9, 8, 9, 10, 9, 9, 9, 9, 9, 8, 8, 8, 8, 8, 4      Average=8.086957  
 Standard Deviation=1.47442

**Directions: Section II**

*For questions #12-16, please type your responses in the space provided below each question.*

12. What are three things you learned about research, scholarly writing, the publication process, or about yourself that are/will be of value to you in your ongoing development as a scholar?
- I learned that I need to block off time and not worry about what other things may be happening
  - I need to set personal deadlines
  - I need additional instruction regarding the development of new research ideas
  - I need to be more assertive and concise with my writing
  - I learned what is appropriate to say in a cover letter to a journal editor
  - I learned how to pick apart a huge amount of writing (my dissertation) and relate it to different audiences
  - Don't worry about prejudging the project
  - I have things to say and good ideas about research questions that need addressing
  - I can write as well as my colleagues
  - Maintaining focus on research question
  - Strategies for conducting research
  - Understanding more about the publishing process
  - I need to stop "re-working" and just get stuff out the door
  - Details matter when it comes to making sure the pub is prepped for the journal-don't get rejected for stupid stuff
  - I need to be able to write in smaller bits of time
  - That it is very difficult
  - That, in spite of its difficulty, researching, writing and publishing can still be done
  - The value of a reader outside my field
  - Writing habits (from the Boice book-excellent)

- The possibilities of producing good work given the time limitations
- I did like Boice and found a variety of his exercises very helpful. There was, however, not real consensus in our group on pursuing the time-management and confidence building exercises the Boice promotes so discussion of Boice and the scholarly process took a back-seat to our actual work and work environment. In retrospect, I would have liked to have incorporated Boice into the discussion much more formally.
- I believe that members of our group were somewhat surprised by the high quality of research and writing pursued by peers. This was a great find and, to a degree, raised the bar for the level of criticism but also of sharing of ideas. This was, I believe, one of the most unexpected benefits of the group.
- The importance of planning schedules and goals and keeping to them
- The importance of keeping the internal censor under wraps while writing
- The key sentence method as a way to structure arguments
- Learning how to organize an argument and be willing to cut out passages that I had labored so hard to write, but that obscured the central ideas, was a helpful part of our discussions. Not only my case as a few of us had work that had evolved since our dissertations so some detritus from the past needed to be cut out and the discussions made it clear why this was so.
- The submission process-that is how to get something published-the mystery of publishing, targeting journals, etc.
- Thoughtful planning before starting to write-that is, having clear research questions and theory in mind before starting research and writing
- There are people who are really supportive on this campus-Jim Larson was such a positive motivator. People are positive in general-we are all in the same boat so to speak
- To have more confidence in myself as a researcher
- I learned to research more carefully publication possibilities
- I learned that the process of scholarly writing can be a "habit" when the time is available, and I learned that time can sometimes be available although in shorter increments

13. What activities or aspects of the program did you find to be of the most value? Are there changes or amendments to these activities or aspects that could further extend their value?

- I enjoyed having meeting time with my colleagues from outside the department
- I hoped that I would have had more step-by-step guidance through the publication process
- Perhaps more structure to the meetings might have made it seem more meaningful, i.e. by the next time we meet, I would like to see an outline of a new research idea, or I would like to see two pages of a lit review...or articles you found to support your ideas
- Having the other members of the group critically look at and give feedback on a work-in-progress was extremely valuable. This motivated me to look at the piece another way and finally submit it in for publication to a journal.
- I would make the sessions longer and less frequent-perhaps 1 ½ hours four times a semester
- Reading the work of others and getting to talk over ideas with an experienced person-both gave me confidence

- Participating in helping shape/form another's project; IMPROVEMENT: place more emphasis on getting work product out to colleagues for review, even the smallest fragment of work accomplished
- The journaling was helpful-but most helpful was the deadline-having to have a piece done and in the mail by a specific date-that was the single best part about this program. KEEP THIS AS A KEY PIECE!
- Without a question, the most valuable part of the program was the regular meetings (with writing deadlines) with colleagues. For me, the majority of the researching and writing process is getting motivated to actually sit down and do it. Not that I don't like doing it, but if the choice is between spending one hour finishing a lecture or spending one hour working on a paper that won't be done for months, I will spend the hour on the lecture. The other task simply seems too daunting. But when there are regular meetings, where there is someone "in charge" saying that they would like to have a look at my work in two weeks, I am more likely to set aside the time to get the work done. It is difficult to impose deadlines on yourself. It is much easier if they are imposed externally.
- My mentor's feedback was excellent. I really appreciated it.
- I like the Boice book and wish the group would have taken it more seriously. I got many good tips from it.
- The key sentence approach was a helpful exercise
- Mixing in criticism of work in progress and a general overview of the writing process is not as complementary a discussion as one would think. I would prefer a model that either split the time between the two discussions or alternated them. Both are valuable.
- I found the collegiality of my research group especially helpful in creating a productive communal learning environment
- Actually, I found the writing log real valuable-that my sound odd. And the fact that we were meeting forced us to keep writing and plugging away. I also like the mix of people from different areas of the university-this was less intimidating and also interesting. In fact, today I saw someone from our group and it was really neat to say hi and catch up. This type of training increases cohesion in the university setting.
- I think sitting around and discussing the research/scholarly writing process was valuable. Hearing others, and expressing my own ideas, helped me to feel less "alone" in the process
- My mentor's feedback was excellent. I really appreciated it.

14. What activities or aspects of the program did you find to be of the least value? Relatedly, what changes should be made to the program in future offerings?

- Although it is important for us as colleagues to have a chance to vent-there was a little too much of this going on. I appreciated the mentor's role as a facilitator, but would have liked a bit more structure each session
- It should be on going-one semester isn't long enough
- The friendly environment of our discussions felt comforting but at times encouraged letting time management slip. I am not sure how to address this. The demands of our jobs, i.e., the multiple commitments, make it difficult to be productive. I surely don't/would not value someone standing over me with a whip but do think more needs to be said about getting work produced.

- I think that the meetings were sometimes off topic-it is good to bond with the other members, but I would have liked to stay on target more in our limited time together
- It was all useful. I suppose it would be more useful if there were mentors from each department
- More effort to exchange work among the entire group and give feedback on each other's work-not just unilateral between mentor and student
- More participants from the social sciences-maybe if we met in Madison instead of Whitewater?
- Writing log found no supporters
- I cannot think of anything that needed changing
- To be honest, I really didn't care for the book. It seemed really negative. I came in with a relatively positive attitude, and the book seemed geared toward people that were generally too depressed to write. Also, I disagreed with the author's point of writing a little here and there. I tried this, and it didn't work too well. I do much better with LARGE blocks of time devoted to writing.
- Tough question. I think all of it had value. But perhaps if the participants had to read each others writing then more discussion could be generated that would lead to improved writing.

15. As a junior faculty member, what advice would you offer to future junior faculty participants that might aid in enhancing the value of their participation?

- Bring portions of your work and be direct about your needs
- Come in with an idea and/or work in progress for others to evaluate!
- Let yourself be supported-don't be too self conscious to trust those in the group
- Have the courage to risk putting your work out there for others to see. You are among friends!
- Beyond simply "participate in the program" I have not advice.
- Have a piece that is not too far along-it will force you to get it done-if it is "almost ready" you don't need the deadlines as much to get you motivated
- Have an open mind about the Boice book
- The book is useful even if it's advice sometimes seems almost too simple
- Be open to ideas from the lead instructor. Accept criticism as ways to improve, not perceived as negative based, but positive based.
- Be open to trying any new ideas or suggestions in the process of your writing.

16. What advice would you offer to research mentors that would aid them in performing their role?

- Create clear goals with your mentees at the beginning of the term
- Have one specific topic each time to review-even just for the first 15-20 minutes-i.e. advice on a specific aspect of writing. I felt that our mentor was a great untapped resource-we didn't get to hear enough from him
- Be gentle, open and available with, and to , insecure group members
- Keep the expectations out there for mentees to see, i.e., remind them: produce, don't think or get caught up in perfectionism...Just write!

- More information on how to research appropriate journals
- No particular advice here. Again, though, I think it would be great to have mentors from more departments. I think Sally did an excellent job, and her advice was fantastic. I guess I wish Sally were in my field, because it was clear that she knew her stuff and knew it well. Had she been in my field (or I in hers) I think the program would have been even more valuable. But, really, this is not a critique at all. I would gladly participate in the program again with the same scholars and the same mentor if the opportunity presented itself.
- You are giving several important kinds of feedback: on the article, on the process of submission, and on the writer's strategy as a career academic. All were crucial in my summer experience.
- Sometimes the best teaching goes on when participants collaborate together; you don't have to be the "sage on the stage" to help us along.
- We had discussed bringing in senior scholars to talk about how to make the transition from a dissertation to a book, successful strategies for grant writing, etc. I still like this idea. For this group there were few mysteries about writing articles but the larger writing challenges ahead could use some informed guidance.
- None
- I feel really lucky to have had Dr. Larson—he was open-minded and non-judgmental, and an excellent editor. I was happy that he took the time to explain the scholarly writing submission process, even though it might have been redundant for others in the group. I think everyone really enjoyed each other's work and discussions.
- All I can think of is that they shouldn't be afraid to "push" the scholars toward success. I was very satisfied with Jim Larson as my mentor. He was very well informed and had good insight into the scholarly writing process.