CUNY Faculty Affairs Advisory Board

Meeting Minutes

April 3, 2017

205 East 42nd Street, Rooms 818/819 (8th floor)

2:00 – 4:00 pm

In Attendance: Julissa Alvarez-Diaz, CCNY; Kathleen Barker, Medgar Evers; Stefan Becker, Lehman; James Berg, BMCC; Avrom Caplan, OAA/Research; Kay Conway, BMCC/UFS; Angela Crossman, John Jay; Madeline Ford, Hostos; Christopher Jerry, Lehman, Michael Guy, OAA; Mark Hauber, OAA/Research, Karen Hubbard, CCNY, Julia Jordon, City Tech; Karen Kaplowitz, John Jay; Eric Koch, CCNY, Sharona Levy, Brooklyn, Matthew Moore, Brooklyn; Annemarie Nicols-Grinenko, OAA; Ralf Peetz, CSI; Vita Rabinowitz, OAA; Albert Robinson, BCC; Dennis Slavin, Baruch; Cheryl Smith, Baruch; Jim Stimpson, SPH; Zun Tang, OAA/IR; Alexandra Tarasko, QCC; Greet Van Belle, York; Alyssa Vine, OAA

1) Approval of Minutes of meeting of February 10, 2017
   • The minutes were approved.

2) Announcements
   • Three new RFPs related to CUNY’s new strategic framework – Connected CUNY – were announced. The RFPs, which address experiential learning, academic momentum and globalizing the curriculum, were posted on the Faculty Affairs website. Proposals are due April 19, 2017.
   • Annemarie reminded the Board that the Faculty Affairs website can be used to honor faculty accomplishments in teaching, scholarship and service and asked that the Board send their own accomplishments for posting – and encourage their colleagues to do the same.
   • Next year’s meeting schedule will be sent out by the end of May. The group agreed that one Monday and one Friday each semester works well.

3) Research Support at CUNY
   • Mark Hauber, Interim University Vice Provost for Research talked to the Board about the support for research provided by his office, including
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- **internal funding**, which includes new programs to support a) faculty who write books, b) faculty in the fine and performing arts, c) faculty who write grants during the summer, d) Associate Professor travel, and e) a new focus on global challenges that affect urban populations for the Interdisciplinary Research Grant program.

- **research compliance, undergraduate research, resources for postdocs** and **innovation and entrepreneurship**

- Group discussion followed the IUPV’s presentation and addressed issues including the PSC CUNY grant program, IDEATE (the program used for HRPP protocols), the new Office of Award Pre-Proposal Support at the Research Foundation, customer service at the Research Foundation and the need for a CUNY faculty expertise database.

4) **Discussion: What issues should the FAAB address next year?**

- Follow-up on this year’s topics, including
  - **Support for adjuncts**: Over the summer, Annemarie will work on an adjunct support page on the Faculty Affairs website and will poll the Board for volunteers for a subcommittee to advise her on this task.
  - **Mentoring**: Identifying and disseminating best practices.

- Other suggestions included diversifying the faculty and faculty input in the Research Foundation

- Due to time constraints, the discussion of this topic was cut short. Annemarie will poll board members via email for more suggested topics for the FAAB in 2017-18.

5) **Discussion: Ideas for honoring excellent in teaching at the university level**

- This topic was addressed at a recent meeting of the CUNY Board of Trustees and is under discussion at the central office. We seek advice from the Board about whether this is a good idea and how a university-wide teaching award might be structured.

- Due to time constraints, the discussion of this topic was cut short. Annemarie will poll board members via email about their ideas on this topic.

6) **Discussion: COACHE follow-up – Support for mentoring**

- Kay Conway, *Chair of the UFS and Professor at BMCC*, distributed and discussed the results of the mentoring survey she conducted earlier this year (see Appendix A).
  - Across CUNY colleges, there is a fair amount of variability in mentoring programs for faculty
  - The FAAB could identify and share best practices.
  - CityTech has established a well-received faculty-led program that is supported by the administration, which was discussed in more detail.

- Group discussion revealed that due to differences in the way that “mentoring” was interpreted, the results of the survey (see Appendix A) do not adequately represent the full range of mentoring activities taking place across the university.
• Julia Jordan, *Professor at City Tech*, summarized their program as one that helps raise awareness of expectations and then helps faculty meet those expectations (see Appendix B for more information).
  o The Provost sends an invitation to all new faculty inviting them to participate in the year-long seminar that addresses the faculty’s roles as educator, scholar, and member of the academic community.
  o To date, 36 new faculty have gone through the program (100% participation rate).
  o There is ongoing evaluation and feedback that leads to programmatic revisions and improvements.

• Group discussion addressed issues surrounding different mentoring models, problems inherent in some models (e.g., “toxic” mentors in one-on-one mentoring relationships) and issues for faculty of color and women.
Appendix A

Mentoring at CUNY

Results from the COACHE survey suggest that while faculty find fulfillment being a mentor and believe that mentoring is effective, they are less satisfied with support for faculty to be good mentors. What form of support is needed is less clear.

The CUNY Manual of General Policy makes clear that mentoring is essential and that it is in the purview of the faculty:

_The Board of Trustees urges the faculties of the City University of New York to work together within disciplinary, inter-disciplinary, and professional groupings, to identify ways in which each field can be strengthened across the University in areas such as curriculum, program development, faculty hiring and mentoring, and faculty development. (BTM.1993.06-28.005_A):_

We queried members of the Faculty Affairs Advisory Board about faculty mentoring across their campuses. The existence and quality of mentoring varied widely. At some campuses it doesn’t exist, at others it is organized in response to a faculty member’s need for help and guidance in the promotion and reappointment process, at other campuses it is focused on improving teaching, and in the rare exception it is well organized, thorough and begins at the onset of a faculty member’s career at CUNY.

Where mentoring works on campuses, it is a partnership between the faculty who devise the mentoring program and the administration who support it. One of the most comprehensive programs appears to be the one at NYCCT and includes a series of seminars, assigned mentors, and includes subsequent evaluation of the program. The NYCCT materials are attached.

Several campuses have expressed a desire to initiate a formal mentoring program and some are in the planning stages. Given the effort that went into the creation of the NYCCT program, it might be worthwhile to have faculty and administration from other campuses examine the NYCCT program to determine if it is a viable option and if it is scalable for campuses with much larger numbers of new faculty. As part of the exploration, faculty participants in the program, both mentors and mentees should be interviewed.
Responses to Survey

How does your college ensure that junior faculty (pre tenure) benefit from mentoring?

Baruch – Not clear that college does ensure. Any mentoring relationships are developed by departments.

BCC - While there do exist opportunities for formal mentoring to take place these are not mandatory; therefore, the campus does not require that all junior faculty benefit from a mentoring relationship. All incoming faculty do participate in a year-long New Faculty Seminar which has some aspects of mentoring embedded in the process, but this is not necessarily 1 to 1.

BMCC - Many departments set up mentoring relationships for their incoming new faculty. Across the college, the Teaching Academy is a mentoring program for around 16 new faculty each year. Teaching Fellows are matched with a Master Teacher for a four-semester relationship. Each Master Teacher works with three Teaching Fellows.

Brooklyn - As a result of the COACHE survey and other concerns, the Associate Provost for Faculty and Administration has spent the past year surveying the departments and is now looking at developing a more unified and systematic mentoring program.

City – There is no mentoring process

CSI – With the exception of the CUNY Pivot Mentoring program, junior faculty at CSI does not have a formal mentoring program in which to participate. However, a proposal for a formal mentoring program is being developed as an outcome of the Faculty Strategic Diversity Plan, 2013 – 2018.

Hostos - Support for our junior faculty comes from our year-long orientation for new faculty and programming offered by the Center for Teaching and Learning designed to address junior faculty needs. For examples, CTL offerings have included sessions on portfolio design, grant writing and leadership development.

Hunter – Doesn’t happen initially. When problems arise, during third, fourth and continuous reappointment procedures, department chairs are asked to look for a mentor in their departments to mentor a junior faculty candidate. Sometimes also outside the department.

JJ - John Jay does not ensure this, and this is a problem. In my new role as Associate to the Provost for Faculty I am trying to start a mentoring program, and applied for a Diversity Grant to be able to pay mentors, but I did not get the money. We will still try to do this, targeting our minority junior faculty while also supporting any junior faculty who want to participate.

A number of years ago JJ had an informal mentoring program, which the Senate initiated and ran. Faculty were invited to sign up to be mentors or to be mentees in any of the following areas: (a) teaching (b) service (c) research/publishing (d) how to navigate JJ (general guidance). Volunteers were matched by the Senate Chair using the Senate’s philosophy that for our program, faculty were better served if they were from different departments.
LaGCC - Mentoring of faculty at LaGuardia Community College takes places in multiple venues, both formally and informally. The overarching mentoring program is a college-wide initiative which consists of a year-long New Faculty Colloquium, operating under the aegis of the LaGuardia Center for Teaching and Learning. The participants meet at least once a month. This academic year they are discussing the chapters in the book *How Learning Works: Seven Research-Based Principles for Smart Teaching*, edited by Susan A. Ambrose et al. (Jossey-Bass, 2010). The chapters are:

1. How does students’ prior knowledge affect their learning?
2. How does the way students organize knowledge affect their learning?
3. What factors motivate students to learn?
4. How do students develop mastery?
5. What kinds of practice and feedback enhance learning?
6. Why do student development and course climate matter for student learning?
7. How do students become self-directed learners?

This seminar covers pedagogy and classroom practice as well as information that new faculty need to pursue a successful career. They are also presented with information specific to LaGuardia’s culture.

Lehman – Pre-tenure faculty participate in a series of orientation/induction activities during their first year at Lehman.

Department chairs are encouraged to assign each new faculty member a mentor within the department. In many cases, the chair serves as a mentor to untenured faculty.

During 2016-2017, we launched a School-based effort to involve deans and associate deans in the mentoring process. Deans were asked to hold monthly “book club” meetings and associate deans were asked to invite early career faculty to participate in inquiry groups.

ME – Through the CTLE and the PSC one or two workshops per academic year are devoted specifically to the process of tenure and promotion. These sessions have proven very informative for junior faculty.

NYCCT - Professional Development Advisory Council (PDAC) developed a New Faculty Orientation Committee, now it its 5th year. The 6 member team volunteered to work together with directors of CTL (prof. development) and OFSR (staff relations) directors to develop a program that could support faculty in navigating the 3-legged stool at City Tech.

QC – No mentoring programs. Our provost is sponsoring a retreat with all tenure-track faculty in May, along with senior colleagues, where the subject of mentoring will be front and center. We’re also involved in Arlene Torres’s Mellon mentoring project. There six junior faculty are working with a senior mentor on developing a publication plan.

QCC - Has a faculty mentoring program. All new faculty are assigned a faculty member to guide them through the first year but hopefully maintain a relationship throughout their tenure at the college.
York - All untenured faculty are asked to create a professional development plan that includes listing mentors. Faculty are encouraged to have more than one mentor, and that mentors need not be at York.

************************************

Is the mentoring process formal or informal?

Baruch – Informal at dept. level. And only out in place when a faculty member needs assistance with publication.

BCC - There are examples of both.

BMCC - Informal at the department level; formal for the Teaching Academy.

Brooklyn- In general, mentoring at Brooklyn College varies greatly from department to department. Some is done on an ad hoc basis and some have very organized multi-year programs.

Hostos – Not formal

Hunter – See programs described below.

JJ - For the past 15 years it has been informal at John Jay. Spring 2017 will mark an attempt at a formal mentoring relationship.

LaGCC – Both. See above, for formal program. Mentoring also happens within each academic department. In some, it is formalized within the culture of the department. Each new faculty member is assigned to a more senior faculty member who will help them navigate through the LaGuardia “culture.” In other departments, mentoring is more informal: new faculty will simply ask other faculty members about how things are done at the departmental level and at the college level. In still other departments, both of these methods work in tandem. One faculty member explained that the department has a “faculty support board” which organizes workshops twice a year around documents and activities needed for junior faculty to achieve tenure. In another department, one faculty member is assigned the task of organizing monthly brown bags with a different theme every month.

Faculty Council, which, at LaGuardia, is not the College Senate, organizes a yearly Tenure & Promotion Forum, featuring a panel consisting of the Provost, a department chair, a newly promoted full professor, the head of Human Resources, and the PSC grievance officer. After a short presentation, the floor is opened to questions from the audience. This forum is a very useful event which raises different issues every year.

Lehman – The mentoring process at Lehman has generally been quite informal. However, all chairs take on a mentoring role when they work with new faculty on a plan to use the 21 hours of reassigned time prior to tenure. Another regular source of feedback from more experienced colleagues is the debriefing after a peer observation.
ME – Formal but in some cases department chairs have informal mentoring arrangements.

NYCCT - The mentoring process is formal.

QCC- This is a formal relationship in the first year, with outreach to the new faculty and meetings between mentor and mentee. Becomes more informal afterwards.

York - This depends .... Certainly, arranging formal meetings is encouraged, but it is important for mentors to be available when questions/situations arise. Informal or off-the-cuff meetings serve this purpose.

******************************************************************************

If your campus has a formal mentoring program please describe:

BCC - Not sure how to answer this. The formal mentoring is around learning a certain skill, such as on-line teaching and so forth.

BMCC - The Teaching Academy.

Brooklyn – The Center for Teaching had two faculty mentoring programs, both of which are currently moribund:
1. The Teaching Portfolio project: about 10-15 faculty members took part in a one-week training that resulted in a personal teaching portfolio
   - Originally faculty got a small stipend for taking part in it, but later only the 2 faculty members running the workshop were paid.
2. Faculty mentoring program: 5 award-winning teaching faculty (one from each of our Schools) each took on 2 junior faculty members who were recommended by their chairpersons as very good teachers who with this help could become great teachers. (This was not a “remedial” program. The mentees were expected as a result of this mentoring to be able to be candidates in a year or so for teaching awards.)
   - The mentors were paid stipends.

Hunter – Boot camps organized by the Provost’s Office at Hunter could be considered Mentoring. They are addressed to faculty considering promotion. The issue is that administrators, sometimes faculty who have recently been offered an acting administering position, run these bootcamps. This can lead to a kind of reversed order of how promotions should happen. Many faculty consider this a way to take authority away from departments. The Hunter Charter for example is very adamant stating that the consideration of promotion has to start in the department.

There was another initiative, maybe two years ago, where a Dean and a faculty member - a chair of a big department - ran a workshop for faculty to get their work published.

LaGCC – See above, New Faculty Colloquium

Lehman – We intend to launch a full-scale mentoring program next year. Stefan Becker, Vice Provost for Academic Programs, is currently soliciting the names of faculty who will serve as mentors. We plan to offer a mentor training workshop facilitated by a newly tenured faculty
member who has a background in educational leadership and supervision. The training workshop will be followed by monthly “touching base” meetings.

**ME** – Using the Nine Points of the PSC/CUNY contract, each point is explained by those who will judge the portfolio. Pointers are given to assure participants that their selections of documents are organized and presented in the most favorable light.

**NYCCT** - It is a fall seminar centers around “What is your role in the reappointment process?” Faculty are introduced to and work with mentors on published guidelines/formats:
- Plan – 7 year targets for teaching refinement / scholarly achievement / service contributions
- Annual / cumulative self-evaluation and listing of accomplishments in T/ Sch /Se
- January seminar includes:
  - Peer review of PDP and PARSE drafts
  - Faculty panel --- advise from tenure track faculty in developing their plans
  - Lunch mixer with seasoned faculty who teach interdisciplinary courses
  - Faculty panel discussing college wide initiatives and how they can participate and lead
If more information is needed, I can provide agendas / reflections / survey instruments

**QCC** – see above

**York** - There are multiple Professional Development opportunities that serve the function of mentoring. All new faculty attend our Prof 101 year-long series; mid-level faculty with tenure are invited to participate in the Prof 201 series. Chair and Adjunct professional development workshops are held at the start of each semester. For the adjunct workshops, part-time faculty attend sessions run by the Office of Academic Affairs regarding college-wide issues and then there are breakout sessions in the departments for local concerns.

**************************

**Is the mentoring program assessed, and if so, how?**

**BCC** – not sure

**BMCC** - The Teaching Academy has an evaluation program, including surveys every semester of the Teaching Fellows and the Master Teachers.

**Lehman** – Not applicable, just formulating program now.

**ME** – Qualitative surveys are collected after the sessions for feedback. A collection of document is kept in the CTLE files.

**NYCCT** - Yes, pre- and post- survey and feedback survey of the seminar

**QCC** - There is no formal assessment process but a meeting is held by academic affairs and mentors to discuss mentoring and issues that may arise. Nursing Department does formal surveys as part of data for accreditation.

**York** - Currently, these programs listed above have been tracked using descriptive statistics related to variables such as retention, tenure, promotion, grant success, and other factors.
Have you explored the relationship between mentoring and... turn-over? ...promotion? ...scholarship? ...student evaluations? ...grants applied for/funded?...increased cross-disciplinary work?

BCC - Not formally, but it does seem like a good idea.

BMCC – No.

Lehman – Informally, campus faculty leaders have noted the relationship between faculty success and careful mentoring. During deliberations, T & P Committee members struggle with files when it becomes apparent that an individual has not received sufficient guidance.

ME – Yes through the CTLE we have launched a special program for ’16-17 academic year call Multiple Mentoring Exchanges that include in four different kinds of arrangements: 1) senior to junior faculty; 2) full time faculty to adjuncts; 3) faculty to student; and 4) student to student.

NYCCT - No, though there has been some discussion about asking faculty how useful the orientation seminar is 2 years and 3 years and 4 years later.

QCC - Not explored formally, but these discussions may come up in the mentoring process.

York - Yes, each of these relationships have been explored to varying degrees. Retention, scholarship, teaching effectiveness have been looked at the most closely.

How are faculty selected to be mentors?

BCC - Typically, faculty who have been identified as an expert in a certain area (usually by the administration or an ad hoc committee called to supervise a certain area or function) they are invited to serve. Sometimes calls are made to general faculty.

BMCC - The Department Chair selects them at the department level. Master Teachers are selected from applications reviewed by a committee.

Lehman – We will request volunteers.

ME – Through their own choices and suggestions from other faculty members or the Direction of the CTLE.

NYCCT - Faculty were recommended by CTL and OFSR to develop the initiative because of their poor and excellent personal experiences in their own departments during their first years

QCC - Department chairs select mentors, usually those who teach in the same discipline.
York - The faculty member in need of a mentor will approach the potential mentor in the case of scholarship interests; for the pragmatic side of academic life, mentors may be assigned.

****************************

Do faculty mentors receive training? If so, please describe:

BCC - I am not sure, but if so, it is not extensive.

BMCC - I don’t know about departments. Master Teachers do get training on giving non-judgmental feedback on observations of classroom teaching.

Lehman – We plan to provide monthly training sessions for mentors.

ME – The CTLE plans to initiate a formal mentorship program during the academic year. Plans were to have it up and in order by the end of fall ’16 but this did not occur. We are now aiming for spring ’17.

NYCCT - Training in form of group discussions about what, how, when, why, and how to frame the seminar; and annual review; more recently, selected pages of a text: The Mentor’s Guide, Lois J. Zachary (2012) for developing short term contract with new faculty member

QCC - There is a workshop for new faculty mentors, describing their role.

York - No

****************************

Is there a mentor handbook or any materials provided for guidance?

BCC – Not sure

BMCC – No

Lehman – No

ME – Yes

NYCCT - There is a PARSE tab on the Faculty Commons website that includes examples of faculty work in teaching / scholarly work / service  http://facultycommons.citytech.cuny.edu/

QCC - No handbook specifically for mentoring but faculty handbooks are distributed and discussed.

York - No

****************************
What is the expected term of the mentoring relationship?

**BCC** - Depends on the program or the outcome expectations.

**BMCC** – One year for departments; four semesters for Master Teachers.

**Lehman** – We plan on one year.

**ME** - One year minimum but longer is suggested.

**NYCCT** - Formally for the fall and early spring of the first year. Offered, though not required:
Formal 3-day workshop in development of Teaching Portfolio
Follow up in 2nd year with PARSE workshops
Follow up in 3rd year with Dean’s Review process discussion
Follow up in 6th year with 2-part workshop, development of cumulative self-evaluation
Annual discussion with Provost around promotion process
Annual discussion with Department Appointment Committee: role in reappointment

**QCC** - Formally for a year, then informal.

**York** - There is no expectation since needs change as faculty progress in their ranks and in their research pursuits.

*****************************************

Are faculty permitted to request another mentor?

**BMCC** – Yes

**ME** – Yes

**NYCCT** - Yes, we just added a one-to-one component in fall 2016; so far we have been lucky.

**QCC** - Yes but that is uncommon.

**York** - Yes

*****************************************

Do faculty mentors receive compensation? (pay, reassigned time etc.)

**BCC** - For certain areas they may receive release time or a stipend.

**BMCC** – Master Teachers have been getting stipends; as of Spring 2017 they will get one course release per year.
Lehman - Do not plan to.

ME - No

NYCCT - No, it is part of their college service through PDAC

QCC - There is no monetary compensation.

York - No

Do faculty mentors receive other acknowledgement?

BCC - Not sure

Lehman - Plan to acknowledge on web site and in Edigest

ME - Other than accolade from the mentee, no

NYCCT - Yes, they present results to the Department Chairs Colloquium annually and report to the PDAC; they have been presenters in national mentoring conferences

QCC - Faculty participating as mentors are acknowledged at a reception. Faculty (mentors and mentees) have expressed positive experiences which gave them a sense of more job satisfaction. It is also acknowledged as service to the department for promotion.

York - Faculty who serve as mentors are acknowledged for their service and this is included on their annual evaluations.

Are you aware of any mentoring programs that exist across institutions (perhaps offered by discipline related groups)?

BCC - No

BMCC - No

ME - No

NYCCT - No
Multidisciplinary: CUNY Faculty Publication Program
CUNY Undergraduate Research Forums
CUNY OAA, pilot encouraging Associate Profs. to apply for promotion

QCC - We are aware of other programs and are working to improve ours.

York - Yes, and York faculty have been encouraged to participate in CUNY-wide programs.
### Survey Respondents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Department</th>
<th>College/Institute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td>Baruch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Berg</td>
<td></td>
<td>Borough of Manhattan Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Walker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bronx Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharona Levy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brooklyn College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Brass</td>
<td></td>
<td>City College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralf Peetz</td>
<td></td>
<td>College of Staten Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amaris Matos</td>
<td>Director of Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Hostos Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elke Nicolai</td>
<td>Assoc. to the Provost for Faculty &amp; Professor of English</td>
<td>Hunter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison Pease</td>
<td></td>
<td>John Jay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francine Eggers</td>
<td></td>
<td>LaGuardia Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Abreu</td>
<td>Office of the Provost</td>
<td>Lehman College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses Phillips</td>
<td></td>
<td>Medgar Evers College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Jordan</td>
<td></td>
<td>New York City College of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa Her</td>
<td></td>
<td>Queens College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Wolfe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Queensborough Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandra Tarasko</td>
<td></td>
<td>Queensborough Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Palmer</td>
<td></td>
<td>York College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greet Van Belle</td>
<td>Director, Center for Teaching, Learning and Educational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technologies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
June 7, 2016

Dear Prof.:

On behalf of the Professional Development Advisory Council Orientation Committee, as well as the administration and faculty, it gives me great pleasure to welcome you to the faculty of New York City College of Technology. You are joining a dynamic group of over four hundred full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty members who teach and mentor our students. We are pleased to be working with you.

Knowing that the beginning of any new academic position may be challenging, the committee has tried to design a meaningful, well-planned orientation to ensure that new faculty have a smooth transition to City Tech. I am writing to let you know about several orientation events.

Welcome Seminar
Plan to join us as President Hotzler and I, along with Vice Presidents Cairo and Armoza, and our deans and directors, welcome you to City Tech on Thursday, August 18, 2016, from 9:00am – 1:00pm in the Atrium 6th floor Faculty and Staff Lounge (A632). A light breakfast and luncheon will be provided so that you can meet each other and some of our returning faculty.

Introduction to Blackboard 9.1
The CUNY colleges, including City Tech, use BlackBoard 9.1 as their primary course management system. Blackboard has robust testing capabilities and will be introducing the Turnitin feature this year. We have scheduled hands-on training sessions for new faculty on Thursday, August 18th from 1:30 – 2:30pm in room G604. Please RSVP to itec@citytech.cuny.edu if you plan to attend.

Employee Benefits
Human Resources will conduct an orientation session on August 18 at 3:00pm where your employee benefits will be explained. Please RSVP to Tonya Solivan at tsolivan@citytech.cuny.edu if you plan to attend and she will be in touch when the location is finalized.
Seminar
In fall 2016 and spring 2017, the Orientation Committee has planned a multi-part seminar starting early in September that focuses on your roles as educator, scholar, and member of the academic community.

We believe that engaging faculty within and across disciplines early in the first year promotes a better understanding of the college culture, including its processes and expectations. How you fit in matters to us.

We look forward to meeting you at the Welcome Seminar, which will serve to introduce you to our City Tech culture, streamline processes, and provide an opportunity to answer your questions. In the meantime, for some information that you may find helpful about teaching at City Tech please visit the website at http://facultycommons.citytech.cuny.edu/teachingguide/.

To register for the Welcome Seminar on August 18, please call or email Ms. Kim Cardascia at (718) 260-5723 or kcardascia@citytech.cuny.edu no later than August 10, 2016.

Sincerely,

Bonne August

Professional Development Advisory Council Committee
Nadia Benakli, Mathematics
Aida Egues, Nursing
Pa Her, Social Science
Louise Hoffman, Hospitality Management
Zory Marantz, Electrical/Telecommunications Engineering Technology
John McCullough, Entertainment Technology

cc: President Russell Hotzler
    Vice President Marcela Katz Armoza
    Vice President Miguel Cairo
    Associate Provost Pamela Brown
    Interim Dean Justin Vázquez-Poritz
    Dean David Smith
    Dean Kevin Hom
    Dean Carol Sonnenblick
    Director Sandra Gordon
    Department Chairs
Use the text as a reference in setting up a mentoring relationship with two new faculty.

Aida Egues suggested that we consider using three parts of the text. Aida Egues, Zory Marantz, Pa Her, and fellow members of the Undergraduate Research Committee have successfully used these techniques to engage faculty who serve as mentors.

P 2 Using this case study as an “ice breaker” in introducing yourself and thinking together what your mentoring relationship will look like (tailored to each mentee).

Note: our role is to support faculty in pointing out “source documents” and providing up to date information; we do not replicate the work of the department faculty.

P 129 Setting boundaries in establishing a reciprocal agreement .... It is a good reference

P 152 Using this process form as a way of approaching SMART goal setting ... how to develop a plan over time based on interests / obligations ... and how that translates into a PDP draft
Approximate Dates for Participation and Deliverables

Year 1
Fall 2016
August 18, 2016
Welcome Orientation

September 2016
Learning Principles and Teaching Practice Study Group

October 2016
Assigned Orientation Committee Mentor

October/November
Part 1 and 2 of 3 Part Seminar:
Your Role in the Reappointment Process
Work with mentor
Meet with your department chair; discussion/draft PDP

Spring 2017
January 26, 2017
9am-3pm
Deliverable: Draft of PDP including 24 hour RT

Deliverable: PARSE with Fall 2016 accomplishments included
Part 3 of Seminar

February
Deliverable: Present PDP and PARSE to department Chair
Department Appointments Committee (DAC) meets to evaluate

March
Department Chair presents candidates for reappointment-Yr 2
Deliverable: Meeting with School Dean and Chair to discuss PDP

April
Meeting with dept. chair or DAC for annual evaluative process
How have you contributed as teacher/scholar/in service to date?

May/June 1

Year 2
Fall 2017
August 25, 2017
Deliverable: PARSE completed and delivered by hand to OFSR

Follow Annual Evaluative Cycle of the College/CUNY
Reappointment for Year 3 in early fall; letter by December 1st

New York City College of Technology
PDAC Orientation Committee
Seminar for Full-Time Tenure Track Faculty in Year 1

Goal: to provide an overview of the key elements of a structured process of development and evaluation during the years leading to tenure.

1:30pm  Welcome and Introductions and Overview and Objectives

Pre-assessment Questionnaire

Focus today:
   a. Understanding Your Role in the Reappointment Cycle Process
   b. Developing Your Teaching Practice annually and continuously

2:00pm  ‘Breakout’ Activity and ‘Share Out’
   How to ‘map’ CV to City Tech format: PARSE

2:30pm  Annual Evaluation Cycle
   Evidence based accomplishments in Teaching, Scholarly Work, Service

2:45pm  ‘Breakout’ Activity and ‘Share Out’
   How to ‘map’ Teaching/Learning Reflective Practice to City Tech format: PDP/TP

3:15pm  Why? An assigned Mentor from PDAC Orientation Committee
   To Navigate and Support: Vocabulary, Resources, Expectations, Initiatives, Due Dates

Summary and Next Session Focused Questions
   How do you identify, shape, and produce your scholarly work? 24 hr/RT
   Discuss with your department chair to use time productively PDP
   What interests and obligations shape your academic service overtime?

3:25pm  Written Reflection

Seminar:
Part 1  October 21st  Your Role in the Reappointment Process:  PDP/PARSE
  Teaching Practice as progressive refinement

Part 2  November 4th  Scholarly and Professional Growth  24RT
  Service: Interests and Obligations

Part 3  January 26, 2017  Reappointment Plan for Spring 2017:
  PDP – PARSED – Annual Evaluation – Class Obsv – SET – FYE
  UGR – ID – GENEDGE – OER – Accreditation – Assessment – WI

* “New faculty members at City Tech participate in a structured process of development and evaluation during the years leading to tenure. Key elements in the process are:
   • the Professional Development Plan (PDP)
   • the Professional Activity Report and Self-Evaluation (PARSE),
   • and the Annual Evaluation.  .... “ (Faculty Professional Development Plan, 22 April 2010)

PDAC: Orientation Committee  Faculty Seminar: Year 1  Fall 2016
New York City College of Technology

Vocabulary / Abbreviations used at City Tech

Office of Faculty and Staff Relations (OFSR)
Your File
PARSE
PDP
Guidelines or “big chunky document”
Instructional Staff Calendar

Written Resources:
- Guidelines for Faculty Personnel Process ("big chunky document")
- OFSR Calendar – Faculty Obligations / due dates
- Cover page for PARSE submission (label for disk packet)

e-Resources:
  Office of Faculty/Staff Relations (OFSR)
  Faculty Commons
  CUNY: HR
  Research
  PSC CUNY Collective Bargaining Agreement

OFSR
  a. What is your file?
  b. What is in my file as of today?
  c. What will be in my file by the end of each academic (contractual) year

Templates: PLAN / ACCOMPLISHMENTS and WORKS IN PROGRESS / ANNUAL CYCLE
- Faculty Professional Development Plan (PDP)
- Professional Activity Report and Self-Evaluation (PARSE)
Reflective Exercise: think – pair – share

- What excites you about your teaching practice?

- How do you intend to progress in your teaching practice over time?

- How do you document that progress? Annually and cumulatively?

Teaching Portfolio is the mechanism faculty use to demonstrate progressive refinement

- How is the Teaching Portfolio part of the annual evaluative cycle?

- State in your PDP
  List creation of Teaching Portfolio
  List annual update of teaching accomplishments/ professional development / works in progress / further goals /

- Submit as part of PARSE
  Include TP as evidence for #17 in PARSE and PDP annual goal
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SEMINAR FOR FACULTY NEW TO CITY TECH: WORKSHOP REFLECTION

Purpose: to reflect on this workshop and tell us what worked and what needs improvement. Your input is valuable to us as we plan future workshops. Please be candid in your remarks.

1. What aspects of the workshop were the most valuable for you? And why?

2. Least valuable and Why?

Lingering Questions:

I met with my Orientation Committee Mentor and agreed on the kinds of support that may be of use. Yes No Not yet.

Comments:

Name:

New York City College of Technology, CUNY

PDAC Orientation Committee 2016
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NEW FACULTY
Thursday, Jan
9am – 3pm
The ABC's of Reappointment: Multiple Perspectives from Faculty Across Disciplines

9:00 am  Welcome
Julia Jordan, Faculty Commons

9:05 am  Professional Development Plan and 24 Hours:
Round-robin Approach to Feedback

11:00 am  Seminar Series Feedback

11:30 am  Panel Discussion
Moderated by John McCullough, Entertainment Technology
Jose Reyes Alamo, Department of Computer Engineering Technology
Gretta Fernandes, Department of Health and Human Services
Kate Poirier, Department of Mathematics
Adam Wilson, Department of Entertainment Technology

12:30 pm  Luncheon

Synergies:
Scholarship • Teaching • Service
1:15 pm  Panel Discussion
Moderated by Pamela Br:
Monica Berger, Chair of:
Jean Hillstrom, Vice Chair
Roman Kezerashvili, Res:
Sean MacDonald, Interim
Hamidreza Norouzi, Dire

2:15 pm  Next Steps

2:45 pm  Closing Remarks
Professional Development Seminar Series for New Faculty Evaluation Questionnaire

Purpose: Please reflect on this seminar and let us know what worked and what needs improvement. Your input is valuable to us as we plan future seminars. Please be candid in your remarks.

1. Indicate to which extent do you agree that the following goals of the seminar were met:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Tend to Disagree</th>
<th>Tend to Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The seminar program engaged me in active learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe the following goals of the seminar as stated were met:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1: Orient faculty to the Reappointment Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2: Give overview of PDP development with regard to Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 3: Give overview of PDP development with regard to Scholarly and Professional Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 4: Give overview of PDP development with regard to Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Please comment on any of your ratings, particularly if you rated any "Tend to Disagree" or "Disagree".

3. Rate the qualities of the seminar:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of the seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content of the seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar pace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your engagement with colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation of the seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Please comment on any of your ratings, particularly if you rated any "Low" or "Very Low".

Please turn the page over and complete the other side =>
5. What aspects of the seminar were the most valuable for you? And why?


6. Least valuable? And why?


7. How has this seminar informed your thinking about teaching, scholarship and/or service?


8. Reflecting on your interactions at this seminar, are there people with whom you plan to be in contact in another capacity? Such as:

   - Mentoring
   - Research collaboration
   - Developing an Interdisciplinary course
   - Teaching together

   [ ] Yes  [ ] Maybe  [ ] No

   Other


9. Additional comments about the seminar:


In their fifth year, the New Faculty Orientation Committee, convened by Julia Jordan, planned and facilitated several activities to support the new faculty in sharing available resources, and providing an overview of the key elements of a structured process of development and evaluation during the years leading to tenure. Twelve new full time faculty members joined City Tech on tenure track in Fall 2016.

**Committee Accomplishments**

New this academic year, each new faculty member was assigned a member from the orientation committee as his/her mentor to enhance the in-department mentoring programs and to point to PARSE tab and OFSR Guidelines. The committee planned a 3-part seminar, the first two during the fall semester, the third one during the winter break.

Two cohorts met in the Faculty Commons to participate in the seminar-series during the times below:
- Cohort 1 (n=12): F 10/21, 11/04, 10:30 am – 12:30 pm.
- Cohort 2 (n=12): F 10/21, 11/04, 1:30 pm – 3:30 pm.

### Fall 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part 1</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Your Role in the Reappointment Process: PDP/PARSE Teaching Practice as progressive refinement</td>
<td>Nadia Benakli Aida Egues Pa Her, Louise Hoffman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Part 2 | Scholarly and Professional Growth/ use of 24RT Service: Interests and Obligations | Aida Egues, Louise Hoffman Zory Marantz, John McCullough |

### Winter 2017

"New Faculty Seminar", Thursday, January 26th, 9am–3pm, room A632. There were three components to the day. **Morning activity**: new faculty members were asked to bring a draft of their PDP document. Each member* of the New Faculty Orientation Committee sat with his/her two mentees, and facilitated the sharing of the PDP and the exchange of feedback. Julia Jordan discussed the essential difference between reappointment and promotion, and the process for reappointment to year 2 and beyond. **Panel Discussion**, moderated by John McCullough. Invited speakers** from different disciplines and at different stages along their tenure track, shared their experiences with the PDP and PARSE, as well as their personal journeys and perspectives of teaching, scholarship and service. **Afternoon activity**: Synergies: Scholarship-Teaching-Service. A panel discussion, moderated by Associate Provost Brown. Speakers*** discussed resources and opportunities with a focus on the impact of teaching and service on research at City Tech.

** Jose Reyes Alamo (Computer Engineering Technology), Gretta Fernandes (Health and Human Services), Kate Poirier (Mathematics), Adam Wilson (Entertainment Technology)  
*** Monica Berger (Scholarly Communications Committee), Jean Hillstrom (CUNY Integrated IRB), Roman Kezerashvili (Research Integrity), Sean MacDonald (Interdisciplinary Committee), Hamidreza Norouzi (Undergraduate Research)  

### Spring 2017

Presentations and Feedback
- Chairs Colloquium—Thursday, March 23.
- PDAC meeting---tbd

INFO PDAC Committee Members: Nadia Benakli (Mathematics), Aida Egues (Nursing), Pa Her (Psychology), Louise Hoffman (Hospitality Management), Zory Marantz (Electrical and Telecommunications Engineering Technology) and John McCullough (Entertainment Technology). **Convener**: Julia Jordan (Faculty Commons).
Quantitative Results

Pre- and Post-Seminar
A pre-seminar survey was administered to new faculty (n=12 Pretest; n=9 Post) assessing their understanding and process for tenure and promotion, as well as knowledge of the resources available. On average faculty were significantly more likely to agree with understanding both the criteria and process for tenure and promotion, and reported greater knowledge about the availability of resources after their participation in the seminar (p < .01).

Table 1. Faculty Knowledge

![Graph showing pre- and post-seminar faculty knowledge]

Faculty Attitudes towards Managing Career Goals, Teaching, Scholarship and Service
Four questions were also administered regarding new faculty’s ability to have a plan for their career goal, including managing their teaching, scholarship and service. Faculty were significantly more likely to agree to the statement “Managing my service in ways that are personally meaningful” after post-administration.

Exploratory analyses revealed significant relations between faculty understanding of tenure and promotion to their self-reported attitudes shown in Table 3. Faculty who reported greater understanding of tenure was significantly more likely to also report “I have a strategic plan for achieving my career goals”. In turn, having a strategic plan was positive correlated to their professional development, scholarship and service.

Attitude items:
- I have a strategic plan for achieving my career goals.
- Managing my professional development in teaching is largely under my control.
- Managing the direction of my scholarship is largely under my control.
- Managing my service in ways that are personally meaningful is largely under my control.

INFO PDAC Committee Members: Nadia Benakli (Mathematics), Aida Egues (Nursing), Pa Her (Psychology), Louise Hoffman (Hospitality Management), Zory Marantz (Electrical and Telecommunications Engineering Technology) and John McCullough (Entertainment Technology). Convener: Julia Jordan (Faculty Commons).
Table 2. Faculty Attitudes

![Graph showing Faculty Attitudes](image)

*(p < .05) **(p < .01)

Scale: 1-Disagree to 5-Agree

Last, participants were also asked to reflect on their interactions in the seminar and report if there are people with whom they would plan to be in contact in another capacity.

Table 4. Future Interactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n= 8</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing an Interdisciplinary course</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching together</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Tenure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Promotion</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Goals</td>
<td>.79*</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Prof.Dev</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.70*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Scholarship</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Service</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.79*</td>
<td>.89**</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INFO PDAC Committee Members: Nadia Benakli (Mathematics), Aida Eguis (Nursing), Pa Her (Psychology), Louise Hoffman (Hospitality Management), Zory Marantz (Electrical and Telecommunications Engineering Technology) and John McCullough (Entertainment Technology). Convener: Julia Jordan (Faculty Commons).
Analysis on Open-Ended Questions

1. What aspects of the seminar were valuable?
   - Hearing about their experiences
   - Learning Strategies
   - My one-on-one mentor was invaluable
   - Feel more confident writing my PARSE and PDP
   - Being paired with wonderful mentor; one-on-one session super helpful
   - Feedback from other people on PDP
   - Experiences of faculty
   - The panel of scholarship was most helpful and will inform by work as a researcher
   - Research and IRB
   - Learning overall process
   - Working with my mentor
   - Most valuable was the whole day workshop on reappointment and tenure/panel discussion

2. How has this seminar informed your thinking about teaching, scholarship and service?
   - By clarifying aspects which before were hidden areas for me.
   - Now I am aware of some new topics and there are resources to solve them
   - Taking advantage of existing opportunities that already exist and how to reach out new ones
   - Developing my skills and interests toward tenure
   - Allowed me to understand how all three are related and gave me strategies to help being overwhelmed
   - Different aspects of this job can be integrated
   - Knowing the process better for teaching, scholarship and service
   - Teaching – more teaching strategies to work with our students; Research – be active and productive; Service: More impacts

3. General Comments?
   - Really valuable to have this seminar
   - Amazing job! Thanks Julia. This was the best seminar so far. Well done all around.
   - This last one “Full day” was by far the best and most valuable!
   - Maybe mentees give a copy of their PDP to mentors in advance – It might improve the mentoring of PDP experience.
   - Very good seminar series
   - Hopefully invite more people sharing their experience of obtaining “big” external funding.

*INFO* PDAC Committee Members: Nadia Benakli (Mathematics), Aida Egues (Nursing), Pa Her (Psychology), Louise Hoffman (Hospitality Management), Zory Marantz (Electrical and Telecommunications Engineering Technology) and John McCullough (Entertainment Technology). Convener: Julia Jordan (Faculty Commons).
Professional Development Seminar Series for New Faculty
Pre-Assessment Questionnaire

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements. We will keep your responses confidential.
Please be candid in your remarks.

1. Tenure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Tend to disagree</th>
<th>Tend to Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I understand the **process** for reaching tenure.
I understand the **criteria** for reaching tenure.
I know where to find resources to help me understand the process and criteria for reaching tenure.

2. Promotion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Tend to disagree</th>
<th>Tend to Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I understand the **process** for reaching promotion.
I understand the **criteria** for reaching promotion.
I know where to find resources to help me understand the process and criteria for reaching promotion.

3. Goals and Strategies for Teaching, Scholarship and Service:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Tend to disagree</th>
<th>Tend to Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have a strategic plan for achieving my career goals.
Managing my professional development in teaching is largely under my control.
Managing the direction of my scholarship is largely under my control.
Managing my service in ways that are personally meaningful is largely under my control.

Thank you for completing the questionnaire!
Professional Development Seminar Series for New Faculty
Post-Assessment Questionnaire

After your completion of the seminar, please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements. We will keep your responses confidential.
Please be candid in your remarks.

1. Tenure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Tend to disagree</th>
<th>Tend to Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I understand the <strong>process</strong> for reaching tenure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand the <strong>criteria</strong> for reaching tenure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know where to find resources to help me understand the process and criteria for reaching tenure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Promotion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Tend to disagree</th>
<th>Tend to Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I understand the <strong>process</strong> for reaching promotion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand the <strong>criteria</strong> for reaching promotion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know where to find resources to help me understand the process and criteria for reaching promotion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Goals and Strategies for Teaching, Scholarship and Service:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Tend to disagree</th>
<th>Tend to Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have a strategic plan for achieving my career goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing my professional development in teaching is largely under my control.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing the direction of my scholarship is largely under my control.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing my service in ways that are personally meaningful is largely under my control.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for completing the questionnaire!
Professional Development Seminar Series for New Faculty
Evaluation Questionnaire

Purpose: Please reflect on this seminar and let us know what worked and what needs improvement. Your input is valuable to us as we plan future seminars. Please be candid in your remarks.

1. Indicate to which extent do you agree that the following goals of the seminar were met:

   The seminar program engaged me in active learning.  N/A  Disagree  Tend to Disagree  Tend to Agree  Agree

   I believe the following goals of the seminar as stated were met:
   
   Goal 1: Orient faculty to the Reappointment Process
   N/A  Disagree  Tend to Disagree  Tend to Agree  Agree

   Goal 2: Give overview of PDP development with regard to Teaching
   N/A  Disagree  Tend to Disagree  Tend to Agree  Agree

   Goal 3: Give overview of PDP development with regard to Scholarly and Professional Growth
   N/A  Disagree  Tend to Disagree  Tend to Agree  Agree

   Goal 4: Give overview of PDP development with regard to Service
   N/A  Disagree  Tend to Disagree  Tend to Agree  Agree

2. Please comment on any of your ratings, particularly if you rated any "Tend to Disagree" or "Disagree".

   ____________________________

3. Rate the qualities of the seminar:

   Overall quality of the seminar  N/A  Very Low  Low  Neutral  High  Very High
   Content of the seminar
   Seminar pace
   Your engagement with colleagues
   Facilitation of the seminar
   Overall satisfaction

4. Please comment on any of your ratings, particularly if you rated any "Low" or "Very Low".

   ____________________________

Please turn the page over and complete the other side =:  

NYCCT
5. What aspects of the seminar were the most valuable for you? And why?

6. Least valuable? And why?

7. How has this seminar informed your thinking about teaching, scholarship and/or service?

8. Reflecting on your interactions at this seminar, are there people with whom you plan to be in contact in another capacity? Such as:
   - Mentoring
   - Research collaboration
   - Developing an Interdisciplinary course
   - Teaching together
   - Other

9. Additional comments about the seminar: