

Mentoring – An Instrument to Promote Equality at Universities:
Status Quo, New Developments, and Challenges



INSTITUT FÜR HÖHERE STUDIEN
INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDIES
Vienna

PLATTFORM DER EINRICHTUNGEN FÜR
FRAUENFÖRDERUNG UND GESCHLECHTERFORSCHUNG
AN DEN ÖSTERREICHISCHEN UNIVERSITÄTEN

Contact

Angela Wroblewski (Institute for Advanced Studies)

Mail: wroblews@ihs.ac.at

Phone: 0043/1/ 59991-135

Brigitte Ratzer (genderplattform.at)

Mail: brigitte.ratzer@tuwien.ac.at

Phone: +43 (0)1 - 588 01 - 43400

Venue

Institute for Advanced Studies (IHS), Lecture Room II (ground floor), Stumpergasse 56,
1060 Vienna

How to get there



8th May 2015

- 9.00 – 9.30 **Arrival / Registration / Coffee**
- 9.30 – 10.00 **Welcome**
Beate Littig (IHS, Head of Sociology Department)
Sylwia Bukowska (Gender Plattform, University of Vienna)
- 10.00 – 10.15 **From Gender Equality to Diversity: Current developments in Austrian higher education policy**
Roberta Schaller-Steidl (Federal Ministry of Science, Research and Economy, Gender and Diversity Management)
- 10.15 – 11.00 **Advances in Mentoring: Strategic approaches to mentoring and sponsorship for diverse target groups**
Jen de Vries (University of Melbourne)
- 11.00 – 11.15 **Coffee break**
- 11.15 – 11.30 **Questions / Discussion to Jen de Vries**
- 11.30 – 12.30 **Paper Session I – Examples of Good Practice from Universities**
- Mentoring as an instrument of structural change?**
Sandra Steinböck, Angelika Hoffer-Pober, Karin Gutiérrez-Lobos (Medical University Vienna)
- Mentoring – An instrument to Promote Equality at Universities: Status Quo, New developments, and Challenges**
Michaela Gindl, Doris Czepa, Julia Günther (Danube University Krems)
- 12.30 – 14.00 **Lunchtime – Buffet**
- 14.00 – 15.30 **Paper Session II – Views from Outside Academia**
- Experiences, considerations, and knowhow from different perspectives**
Sabine Prokop, Vienna
- Everlasting Postdocs?**
Gerlinde Mauerer (University of Vienna)
- Mentoring for female researchers in non-university research – similar or different to academia?**
Angela Wroblewski, Andrea Leitner (Institute for Advanced Studies)
- 15.30 – 15.45 **Coffee break**
- 15.45 – 17.45 **Working Session – From gender to diversity: starting points, chances and challenges**
- 17.45 – 18.00 **Closing**

Venue: Institute for Advanced Studies (IHS), Lecture Room II (ground floor),
Stumpergasse 56, 1060 Vienna

Jen de Vries
(University of Melbourne)

Dr Jennifer de Vries is a passionate advocate of mentoring, however she argues that many mentoring programs over-promise and under-deliver. Mentoring programs remain a popularly adopted organizational strategy, and it is critical that they incorporate the latest research as they adapt to expanding demand and diverse target groups. In this presentation Jen will draw on 15 years experience in the design and delivery of mentoring programs, and her own research as she weaves together theory and practice.

The presentation will focus on three main areas:

- Mentoring as an organizational change strategy. Jen will present what she calls a 'bifocal approach' to mentoring programs, positioning mentoring programs to focus on the development of the individual whilst simultaneously focusing on building more enabling workplaces. This enables mentoring programs to pursue the short-term goal of assisting mentees to thrive in the current workplace, while pursuing the long-term goal of building an organization where all can thrive. Mentoring, using the 'bifocal approach' focuses on developing the mentor and the mentee within a broader impetus for organisational inclusiveness, innovation and renewal.
- Mentoring or sponsorship? What's the difference and does it matter? Recent mentoring research in corporate contexts has highlighted the difference between mentoring and sponsorship. Jen will draw on her current research into sponsorship practices in higher education to tease out the differences and explore the implications of this for mentoring programs.
- Program design. Much of the work on mentoring is based on women's mentoring programs, most often relying solely on dyad (senior and junior partner) mentoring. Present day demands on mentoring programs require an expanded toolkit of mentoring approaches. How do we translate research and examples of good practice into diverse settings and with new target groups?

Relevant publications – copies on website <http://www.jendevries.com>

de Vries, J. (2011a). *Mentoring for Change*. Melbourne, Victoria: Universities Australia Executive Women & the LH Martin Institute for Higher Education Leadership and Management

de Vries, J. (2011b). Rethinking mentoring: Pursuing an organisational gender change agenda. In H. Fuger & D. Hoppel (Eds.), *Mentoring for change: A focus on mentors and their role in advancing gender equity* (pp. 12-25). Fribourg: eument-net.

de Vries, J. (2012). The 'Bifocal Approach': (Re)Positioning Women's Programs. Paper presented at the GEXcel Work in Progress report Volume X: Proceedings from the GEXcel Theme 11-12: Gender Paradoxes in Academic & Scientific Organisations, Örebro University, Sweden.

*Sandra Steinböck, Angelika Hoffer-Pober, Karin Gutiérrez-Lobos
(Medical University Vienna)*

Background

Mentoring programmes carried out as a component of equal opportunities initiatives often have two objectives. On the one hand, they aim at supporting women in their specific, individual careers, preventing career breaks that are regarded as a key cause for the leaky pipeline. On the other hand, mentoring programmes serve to sustainably change existing systems and structures in order to create conditions giving rise to gender equality in a viable way (de Vries, 2011).

The mentoring programme Women's Network Medicine has been designed based on the career-breaking points that are specific for Medical University Vienna (and also typical of women in science in general). So far, three rounds with slightly changing target groups were carried out (Hoffer-Pober, Kolodej, 2015). In the first two rounds, the selection criterion was a very broadly defined upcoming career step, while the third round focused on women at a fairly advanced stage in their career (post habilitation).

The participating mentees all benefited from the mentoring programme according to their personal judgment. The programme's goal to convey clarity to mentees with regard to their own aspirations and opportunities was largely met (Steinböck, Lydtin, 2015). However, only little is known about the extent to which the objective of a structural change has been fulfilled and how precisely it has been implemented. This aspect is hardly discussed in the evaluations.

Approaches

The specific practice of creating equal opportunities is mostly defined by the simultaneous pursuit of different and sometimes contradictory targets (van den Brink, Benschop, 2012). Participating women showed great reluctance when it came to self-reflection and questioning the dominating academic paradigm in their daily work. Despite the large number of scientific analyses on the construction and contingency of gender relations in the science system, the contexts of individual female researchers are still rarely considered (Krondorfer, 2010).

Research questions

How can the demand for a transformation of the system be pushed? How can the necessary reflection processes be integrated into programme design? How can evaluation be used as a space to initiate further reflection processes (of the participating female scientists)?

Implementation

Based on the specific experiences and results of Women's Network Medicine, Medical University Vienna's mentoring programme for female scientists, theoretical insights will be explored in light of their potential for change. The paper aims at highlighting interfaces and reference points in order to translate theoretical knowledge about mentoring as an instrument of structural change into practical implementation. The paper is thus conceived as a theory-inspired re-reading of the researchers' own work. The goal is to check the practicability of theoretical input by applying it to the mentoring programme at Medical University Vienna (programme descriptions, programme concepts, evaluation results). This focuses on embedding the ability to self-reflect and subsequently fostering awareness thereof (Martin, 2006).

The methods used include a re-reading of our own concepts, experiences and evaluations with regard to the reflection and problematisation processes of the area of gender and science. Especially ambivalences and ways to use them as opportunities will be analysed.

References

de Vries, Jennifer (2011). *Mentoring for Change*, Universities Australia Executive Women & the LH Martin Institute for Higher Education Leadership and Management, Melbourne, Victoria.

Genetti, Eva; Nöbauer, Herta; Schlögl, Waltraud (2003). *move on. Ergebnisse und Empfehlungen aus dem Wiener Mentoring-Projekt für Nachwuchswissenschaftlerinnen*. Wien.

Hoffer-Pober, Angelika; Steinböck, Sandra; Gutiérrez-Lobos, Karin (2015). *Mentoring in der Universitätsmedizin. 10 Jahre Mentoring an der MedUni Wien*. Wien.

Krondorfer, Birge (2010). Die Universität und ihre Frauen – eine unauflösbare Ambivalenz? In: Hey, Barbara; Rath, Anna; Wieser, Ilse (Hg.) *Qualität messen und sichern. Werkstattberichte aus zehn Jahren universitärer Frauenförderung in Graz*. Graz, 55-68.

Kurmeyer, Christine (2012). *Mentoring. Weibliche Professionalität im Aufbruch*. Wiesbaden.

Martin, Patricia Yancey (2006). *Practising Gender at Work: Further Thoughts on Reflexivity*. *Gender, Work and Organization*. Vol. 13 No. 3 May 2006

van den Brink, Marieke; Benschop, Yvonne (2012). *Slaying the Seven-Headed Dragon: The Quest for gender Change in Academia*. *Gender, Work and Organization*. Vol. 19 No. 1 January 2012.

van den Brink, Marieke; Stobbe, Lineke (2013). *The support paradox: Overcoming dilemmas in gender equality programs*. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*.

Mentoring – An instrument to Promote Equality at Universities: Status Quo, New developments, and Challenges

*Michaela Gindl, Doris Czepa, Julia Günther
(Danube University Krems)*

Title: “Mentoring III – the joint mentoring programme of the Universities Linz, Salzburg and Krems: Experiences and Future Challenges”

In 2011, the Universities of Linz, Salzburg and Krems started to implement a joint mentoring program for pre- and post-doc female academics (“Mentoring III”, currently in the second round, for details see www.donau-uni.ac.at/mentoring)¹. 18 mentees – 6 from each university – are offered a skilled one on one mentoring, accompanying workshops and coaching for the duration of one-and-a-half years. The most important characteristic of this program is that the mentoring relation explicitly focuses on the mentees’ research content, which means Mentoring III offers professional mentoring to mentees with the aim that they effectively benefit from the mentors networks, contacts and research resources. Mentors, who do not work at the mentees’ universities, introduce them to relevant communities and researchers. Furthermore, they provide useful information and ideally, mentee and mentor prepare a joint conference presentation or paper. Thus, sponsorship could be regarded as an integral part of Mentoring III. Additionally, strategic issues, such as giving advice on how to pursue one’s individual academic career and how to understand the “rules of the game” in academia better, are given. Networking among mentees as a peer group beyond the limitations of disciplines and status is highly emphasised as well. Mentees are also accompanied by career specific workshops and coaching. Finally, the cooperation between the three universities offers a wide range of synergies.

The presentation introduces these characteristics of “Mentoring III” and discusses the potentials of this specific program and its experiences in “combining” mentoring and sponsorship (understood as a special kind of relationship in which the mentor goes beyond giving advice and feedback, see de Vries 2011: 6).² Moreover, the future challenges will be highlighted, e.g. upcoming problems in recruiting a sufficient number of suitable mentees and warranting their commitment throughout the entire duration of the program. The authors assume that the reason could be identified in the demanding working conditions of academia and in the kind of objection towards measures for the promotion of women. Concluding, the potential future development of “Mentoring III”, considering evaluation and experiences made so far, will be outlined.

¹ We want to point out that the entire Mentoring III Program was developed, implemented, and advanced in a teamwork consisting of Ingrid Schmutzhart (University of Salzburg), Margit Waid and Irmgard Wörtl (University of Linz), and the authors.

² de Vries, Jen (2011), Mentoring for Change, Universities Australia Executive Women & the LH Martin Institute for Higher Education Leadership and Management, Melbourne, Victoria.

Sabine Prokop, Vienna

This presentation is based on my broad practical experience as mentor, mentee, trainer in mentoring projects, and counselling of (other) mentoring projects, all combined with a background in communication sciences as well as systemic consultancy of organizations. Above all, all these approaches should inspire vivid discussions.

To start with the moment when I was asked to be a mentor, I remember that I was a little bit concerned: What can especially I do as mentor?? (In my case in genderize! a project for the promotion of young women in Austria and another located in Lower Austria.) But soon I appreciated to be asked and became rather curious. Who will be my mentee? What will be her goals? How will our mentoring relationship work? When I myself was mentee at University of Vienna, I did not reach my personal goal. But I attended a lot of helpful workshops and got in touch with interesting women.

As consultant and trainer (partly in a network of trainers) I collected a broad range of experiences in mentoring projects for the promotion of women at universities as well as in mentoring projects for enterprises (e.g. food chains, public enterprises, building centres, and small private enterprises) which focused on additional diversity elements like disability. Some aspects could be transferred from one sector to another, others seem not so applicable – maybe only at first sight.

What are the advantages of group-coaching over twosome mentoring relations? What might be the benefit of even two mentors for one mentee? What are the challenges and traps of matching? Which are the possible and also surprising methods for this crucial point of every mentoring program and relationship? Is it sufficient, if an mentoring program brings mentor and mentee in contact per nothing but email? What about the praised networking effect of (only) final presentations? How far can be acted on the assumption that mentor and mentee are able to communicate in a sensitive way and can give appreciative feedback? What is the benefit for mentors – apart from one more item in their CV and some new contacts? How can mentoring ensure success and pleasure for all parties involved? ...last but not least the participants of this venue?

*Gerlinde Mauerer
(University of Vienna)*

I start my presentation with reflections on the first Mentoring programme for female scientists at the University of Vienna (2001-2003). Based on these reflections, I focus on the specific situation of postdoc scientists. Whereas there are tenure track positions for junior Postdocs and funds for students in doctoral studies, especially the financial situation of (senior) Postdocs in science and their future perspectives (e.g. to gain retirement provisions) is precarious.

The situation of Postdoc scientists in Mentoring programmes includes ambiguous feelings: on one hand being located in a competition related to "survival of the fittest"-targets and on the other hand being accepted as one who needs specific coaching to gain scientific recognition.

Additionally, after starting to participate in scientific research and funding with special funding, for instance gender programme integration with limited contracts, women scientists in feminist studies and gender studies are hardly integrated in the main research and teaching canon of male conducted teams and disciplines. Thus their research tracks often remain „second best“ expressed in objectified terms within publicity driven and market orientated research and science.

In the near past, at several universities there have been limited teaching contracts to absorb the precarious scientific integration of Postdoc scientists. Presently, caused by the implementation of the Bologna system in all studies programmes, there have been enormous restrictions in financing external teaching, with negative effects on the volume of gender and feminist studies especially in the master programme: The amount of students in the master programme is directly linked to seminar offerings, which were reduced since the classical diploma studies have been replaced by BA and MA studies.

Moreover, I focus on (inter)national research perspectives especially for female Postdoc scientists in women's and gender studies. The public benefit of our findings mainly is not capable in profitable business figures in comparison to profit-orientated patents e.g. in natural or technical sciences. Thus, a public-private divide is an additional burden in social and cultural studies, as well as for women scientists in feminist and gender studies.

References

Mauerer, Gerlinde (2005): In Bewegung bleiben. Mentoring-Erfahrungen 2001-2003. (Staying in motion. Mentoring experiences 2001-2003). In: Nöbauer, Herta/ Genetti, Evi/ Schlögl, Waltraud (Eds.): Mentoring für Wissenschaftlerinnen. Im Spannungsfeld universitärer Kultur- und Strukturveränderung. Mentoring for Women Academics and Scientists: Questioning Structural and Cultural Change in Academia, Bm:bwk, Materialien zur Förderung von Frauen in der Wissenschaft - Band 20, Wien: 158-169.

Mauerer, Gerlinde (2013): "Everlasting post-docs? – Critical potentials, limited integration in the institutional setting and canon building"; Atgender Spring Conference 2013: "Learning and Teaching in Gender, Women's and Feminist Studies", (General Assembly), April 28th-30th 2013, Gothenburg, Sweden.

Angela Wroblewski, Andrea Leitner
(Institute for Advanced Studies)

Mentoring is integral part of equality policies in most universities and has become especially important in STEM disciplines since the turn of the century. Several mentoring programmes for female scientists have been evaluated (e.g. Genetti et al. 2003; Nöbauer, Genetti 2008; Gerhardter, Grasenick 2009; Rath 2013) and undergone further development based on that evidence. Within non-university research fewer equality policies take place compared to academia (Tiefenthaler, Good 2011). Furthermore state programmes to support equality policies in non-university research focus on STEM disciplines (e.g. the state funded programmes “Talente”, “w-fforte”, and “FEMtech Karriere”)¹.

However, it is assumed that mentoring would be an adequate instrument for non-university research too. Nevertheless, non-university research provides different conditions for female researcher compared to universities. Differences are to be found in the following areas:

- Organisational structures: universities and non-university research institutions have a different legal framework (fall under different equality laws), are of different size and follow a different organisational logic.
- Established career paths: while in universities established careers from assistant level to professoriate exist, non-university research is characterised by flat hierarchies and a career goal of becoming an expert
- Funding: although success in acquisition of third party funding has become part of qualification profile of excellent researchers for university positions, third party funding is much more essential for non-university researchers.
- Competition: consequently non-university research is characterised by specific forms of competition while the university sector is characterised by patriarchal/hierarchical relationships.

These differences have to be considered when developing mentoring programmes for non-university research based on experiences with existing mentoring programmes established at universities. The presentation describes these differences and discusses their consequences for the design of a specific mentoring programme for a non-university research institution.

References

Genetti, Evi; Nöbauer, Herta; Schlögl, Waltraud (Hg.) (2003), *move on. Ergebnisse und Empfehlungen aus dem Wiener Mentoring-Projekt für Nachwuchswissenschaftlerinnen*. Projektzentrum Frauenförderung der Universität Wien, Wien.

Gerhardter, Gabriele; Grasenick, Karin (2009), *Follow-up Evaluierung des Mentoring-Programms für Nachwuchswissenschaftlerinnen an der Universität Wien*, Studie im Auftrag des Referats Frauenförderung und Gleichstellung, Dienstleistungseinrichtung Personalwesen und Frauenförderung der Universität Wien, Graz.

Nöbauer, Herta; Genetti, Evi (Eds.) (2008), *Establishing Mentoring in Europe. Strategies for the promotion of women academics and researchers*. A guideline manual edited by eument-net. Fribourg: eument-net.

¹ <https://www.ffg.at/talente>; <http://www.w-fforte.at/>; <https://www.ffg.at/femtech-karriere>

Rath, Anna (2013), *Wenn Frau wissen schaffen will. Universitäre gleichstellungsorientierte Weiterbildung zur Karriereförderung von Wissenschaftlerinnen*, Masterarbeit am Institut für Erziehungs- und Bildungswissenschaften der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz.

Tiefenthaler, Brigitte; Good, Barbara (2011), *Genderpolitik in österreichischen Wissenschafts- und Forschungsinstitutionen. Synthesebericht zum Status quo an österreichischen Universitäten, Fachhochschulen, Privatuniversitäten und außeruniversitären Forschungseinrichtungen sowie Einrichtungen der Forschungsförderung*, Studie im Auftrag des BMWF, Wien.