**Personal Examples**

Faculty mentor uses personal examples or experiences from outside of the team that apply to the current topic being discussed.

The example must be of relevance and applied to the current topic at hand. Example can be both positive or negative, however, the application of the example must be in an attempt to motivate team members to learn from it. If the example is NOT relevant, or if the example is not applied to current topics being discussed, then the personal example is assumed to not be an attempt at mentoring and will not be marked.

This item relies on the assumption that personal connections and examples are both successful mentoring strategies

E.g.

* If the team focuses scholarly activities on research activities, and is currently discussing disseminating studies, an experience shared about previous conference presentations or published articles could be shared.
* If the team focuses scholarly activities on the arts, and is currently discussing recitals or shows, then personal examples shared about previous activities is acceptable.

**Use of names**

Faculty mentor addresses mentees by name rather than general pronouns (he, she, you)

The application of mentees names reaffirms the relationship of trust and respect between the two. If the name must first be identified before applied by the faculty mentor, the behavior will not be marked (e.g. while checking attendance, the mentor checks a list of names to remind them of certain names). If the mentor must ask mentees for names, the use of that name within that interaction will not be marked, however, future applications (any use of the name after two minutes\* of asking the name) of that name will be marked.

This item relies on the assumption that learning and applying names strengthens the mentor-mentee relationship.

\*Subjective time limit preventing memory reliant upon working memory (Saults, J. S., & Cowan, N., 2007).

**Use of "our" or "we"**

Faculty mentor refers to team activities or projects with possessive pronouns such as "we", “us” and "our". This language presents a relaxed relationship between supervisor and students with “blurred boundaries between social categories” (Harju & Akerblom, 2017). By blurring these lines, the mentor puts themselves on more equal footing with the mentees which encourages students to act independently when presented within a strong pedagogical relationship. Language that includes both mentor and mentee should be assessed by frequency.

This item relies on the assumption that blurred boundaries between social categories promotes student independence and strengthens pedagogical relationships.
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**Asks open-ended questions**

Faculty mentor asks questions that encourages students to participate.

Open-ended questions should be asked with the intent of encouraging students to critically think about related topics. Questions should be in collaboration with the upper three tiers of Bloom’s taxonomy, inviting students to analyze, evaluate, and create (for a more detailed explanation of Bloom’s taxonomy, click [here](https://cft.vanderbilt.edu/guides-sub-pages/blooms-taxonomy/)). Questions that will not be marked include the following: questions that can be answered with a yes or no, questions that can be answered without critically thinking (e.g. questions regarding current time, date, locations of events, schedule issues, etc.), or questions that fall in the lower tiers of Bloom’s taxonomy.

This item is adapted from the four communication techniques found in Motivational Interviewing (Miller & Rollnick, 2002) (Observation Framework Handbook). It relies on the assumption that open-ended questions facilitate critical thinking skills and self-development.

**Affirmations**

According to the NITOP 2019 Observation Framework Handout, affirmations involve focusing on strengths, not weaknesses, of the individual being observed. Baker observed that verbal immediacy, or “those communication behaviors that reduce perceived distance between people,” have a direct correlation with student learning (Baker, 2004). Therefore, any positive verbal affirmation will be counted. Examples of verbal affirmations, from the NITOP 2019 Handout, include, but are not limited to:

* “You are clearly a very resourceful person.”
* “You handled yourself really well in that situation.”
* “That’s a good suggestion.”
* “If I were in your shoes, I don’t know if I could have managed nearly so well” (HRC, 2007).

Nonverbal affirmations, such as head nodding or smiling, will not be counted as affirmations as they could prove too difficult to affectively measure based off camera angles or conflicting with other items on the rubric.

**Reflections**

Faculty mentor responds to team members’ questions or statements in a reflective manner.

A reflective response must include some form of the original statement or question posed within the faculty mentor’s response in order for the item to be marked. Item will not be marked if questions are answered or statements are addressed without reflection.

Some examples of reflective responses include, but are not limited to:

* “From what I understood, you are saying/asking…”
* “It sounds like you are saying/asking…”

This item is adapted from the four communication techniques found in Motivational Interviewing (Miller & Rollnick, 2002) (Observation Framework Handbook). It relies on the assumption that reflecting statements or questions reinforces to the individual that they have been heard and respected.

**Smiling**

Faculty mentor smiles, regardless if directed at general audience or towards specific team members. Smile must last a minimum duration of 2 seconds. Any smile lasting less than the minimum duration time will not be marked. The duration time prevents false recordings of word pronunciations or mouth movements as smiles.

The item relies on the assumption that an immediacy, such as smiling, encourages more effective learning/working environments (Baker, 2004).

**Body Posture**

According to *Body Language Pocketbook*, by Max A. Eggert, interpreting body language relies on understanding the seven principles of body language (See notes below). These principles rely heavily on context and knowledge of one’s normal body postures, making accurate measurements of body language unreliable in a 30-60 minute observation time span.

Seven Basic Principles of Body Language:

1. Body speaks louder than words:
   1. Useless, but interesting…
2. Context is everything:
   1. Folded arms can have environmental, physical, or a cultural meaning:
      1. I am cold
      2. I am comfortable like this as my chair has no arms to rest on
      3. I am experiencing indigestion
      4. I want to show off my biceps/slender arms
      5. I think this is the right way to sit in a formal situation
      6. I wish to show off my jewelry
   2. This reliance upon context can make this very difficult to operationalize and accurately/reliably measure
3. Look for clusters:
   1. “Need at least three indications, but preferably five, before we might be right”
      1. In other words, in order for looking away to indicate lying it would have to be clustered with at least three other correlated body movements:
         1. Answering a different question
         2. Biting the lower lip
         3. Increase in blinking
         4. Body lifting out of chair
         5. Brows clinching
         6. Change in voice volume
         7. Dilated pupils
         8. Etc.
4. Recognize individual consistency
   1. In order to recognize abnormal body postures, one must first learn the normal body postures of an individual.
      1. This could prove difficult with only a 30-60 minute exposure time.
5. Abrupt changes are significant
6. Body language always precede speech
7. Beware Contamination:
   1. Body language is mirrored so abrupt changes could be triggered by the individual observing the body posture.