APPE RISE℠

ASSOCIATION FOR PRACTICAL AND PROFESSIONAL ETHICS
Research Integrity Scholars and Educators

APPE-RISE PRE-CONFERENCE WORKSHOP ON MENTORING

AGENDA/ABSTRACTS

8:30 – 9 a.m.   Coffee and Breakfast

9 – 9:10 a.m.   Introduction to Session & Invited Panelists

9:10 – 9:50 a.m.   Trisha Phillips & Michael Loui

Aligning Expectations Using Mentoring Compacts

Effective mentorship is important in the academy, as evidence shows mentorship can improve persistence, productivity, and career satisfaction. Importantly, it can also strengthen a mentee's sense of identity, sense of belonging, and sense of self-efficacy. Research and practice have identified a number of core competencies for effective mentoring, including: (1) Aligning expectations; (2) Maintaining effective communication; (3) Promoting professional development; (4) Assessing understanding; and (5) Fostering independence. This presentation will focus on aligning expectations by providing an overview, strategies, tools, and a sample activity using a mentoring compact to help mentors and mentees develop and strengthen their ability to align expectations in mentoring.

9:50 – 10:30 a.m.   Dena Plemmons

Mentoring for RCR in the Research Environment

Efforts to teach the responsible conduct of research (RCR) have traditionally relied on online modules and/or classroom-based instruction. However, much of the day-to-day work of recognizing and navigating the ethical dimensions of research takes place within labs and research teams. In this session, I'll present a mentor-engaged approach to RCR that supports meaningful ethics conversations within active research environments, and positions mentors as facilitators of ongoing ethical reflection and dialogue within their research groups.

During the workshop, I'll introduce practical tools that help integrate RCR discussions into routine research activities without requiring significant additional instructional time. I'll also highlight a strategy that uses disciplinary codes of ethics to prompt discussion about professional norms, shared responsibilities, and ways to approach ethical challenges that arise in research settings.

10:30 – 10:40 a.m. Break

10:40 – 11:20 a.m. Lisa Rasmussen

Workshopping CIMER's "Fostering Independent Researchers" Mentor Training Module

The module "Fostering Independent Researchers" in [CIMER's](#) training curriculum helps attendees think about preparing their mentees for their next steps. It focuses on considering what independence looks like for mentees; how that changes over the course of a mentoring relationship; and how to build mentees' confidence and independence. In this presentation, I'll focus on a two-step activity that helps mentors think about what independence targets to aim for and when. We will practice an accelerated version of this together

during the workshop, and I will conclude with some tips and cautions based on our 8 years of offering CIMER training at UNC Charlotte.

11:20 a.m. – 12 p.m.   Alison Antes

Assessing Mentoring in Research Institutions

Assessment identifies strengths and areas for improvement to provide feedback and guide development, while evaluation makes judgments about the quality or effectiveness of performance based on assessment data. Together, these processes offer insights and inform decisions. To manageably assess mentorship at research institutions, it's important to ensure the process feels achievable and does not cause undue stress. Assessment should focus on feedback, growth, and continuous improvement—this principle should be clearly communicated from the start. Neglecting the assessment of valued areas is not a sustainable strategy. By prioritizing assessment, institutions can better align their efforts with their core values and goals.

12 – 1 p.m.   Lunch

1 – 1:20 p.m.   J. Brooke Hamilton, University of Louisiana at Lafayette
                    Reese Benoit, EthicsOps

How Mentors Can Train Their Mentees to Use Five Checklists for Recognizing Ethics Issues in Research

Broadening the mentors' understanding of what ethics is and providing them a set of checklists that prompt recognition of ethics issues would greatly strengthen their ability to teach their mentees to recognize ethics issues in research.

The approach broadens both mentors' and mentees' understanding by training the mentors who train their mentees to remember a definition of the purpose of ethics, and to recognize the quick/automatic and slow/deliberate processes and their standards that our minds use to identify ethics issues, make ethics judgments, decide how to act on those judgments, and to look back to confirm or revise their processes or standards based on the outcomes of their actions. A visual map of ethics processes and standards would be provided and posted in the workplace.

Researchers would be trained to describe the purpose and activities of the research and the possible outcomes for those affected, then scan the description using five different ethics checklists to identify research activities or outcomes that violate the ethics standards in those checklists. The checklists are drawn mostly from the ethics processes and standards listed above and shown on the map

For example, would the research activities or outcomes violate a general purpose of ethics to allow us to live together in complex societies? Would the research involve any of the patterns that trigger quick/automatic intuitive judgments, patterns such as harm, unfairness, disloyalty, or threats to security? Does any aspect of the research spark emotions such as repulsion, disgust or shame? Would it violate any slow/deliberate generally recognized ethics tests such as the Grandmother test, the Everybody test, the Choices test, the Best Outcomes test, the Rights test, or the Justice test? Would any aspect violate the advice or example of respected people? And/or would any aspect violate applicable ethics code provisions of the researcher's profession or organization?

1:20 – 1:40 p.m.   C.K. Gunsalus, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Lessons Learned: Practical, Foundational Mentoring Skills Even Cranky Academics Will Tolerate

Promoting the professional growth of another—mentoring—is not a one size fits all endeavor. Individual mentors and mentees have distinct needs and goals. Still, most mentors and mentees benefit from a set of core concepts for working effectively with each other, as an effective relationship is most successful when the participants share clearly communicated understandings and expectations. In this presentation, we will share lessons learned about skills that we have found to be foundational in a continuum of mentoring knowledge.

Whether it's early career faculty mentoring graduate students, or senior faculty mentoring colleagues for tenure or promotion through the ranks, we have learned that there are some simple, practical tools that provide opportunities for reflection and concrete steps for improvement even among those who think they don't need them. These core issues revolve around self knowledge, an ability to listen to and understand the goals of the mentee, and working explicitly to align mentor and mentee expectations.

Using a range of range of evidence-based tools and practical skills to improve mentoring relationships, we use approaches that include self-reflection, practice exercises, and video case studies. In synchronous workshops tailored for senior and early-career faculty, evaluations report appreciation for the practicality of the tools, and report (some expressing surprise) finding value in articulating and clarifying expectations for the mentoring relationship. We have also created a pilot online program that contains a time-efficient introduction to concepts and is designed to produce a tailored mentoring plan to meet NSF requirements. Evaluations of that delivery format are still underway.

Whatever the media, the skills we foster are relentlessly practical; we believe it is not enough to know what should be done—faculty and leaders must have the practice, skill, and confidence to implement concepts and tools, especially when facing difficult personalities, conversations, or situations.

1:40 – 2 p.m.   Katy Shorey, Northeastern University

The Low-Prep/High-Impact Pedagogy Working Group

A practical template for a pedagogy workshop. My goal is to share simple steps for organizing and sustaining a low-prep/high-impact pedagogy working group, one that you and your colleagues will look forward to attending! My colleagues and I have developed several simple tools and strategies we are eager to share, particularly with a focus on mentoring graduate students and junior faculty.

2 – 2:10 p.m.   Break

2:10 – 2:45 p.m.   Workshopping in Breakout Groups

2:45 – 3:15 p.m.   Report Backs

Wrap Up