COE PROMOTION AND TENURE MENTORING PROGRAM OUTLINE

In Spring 2003, the COE began a program to assist faculty in obtaining successful promotion and tenure decisions at the department, college, and university level. The program met biweekly for 1.5 hours during lunch time from January 29 through April 30.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1/29   | 14        | Introductions  
|        |           | Program Mission and Goals  
|        |           | Program Handouts  
|        |           | Complimentary Pizza |
| 2/12   | 10        | 2001 COE P/T Policy with P/T Rubric  
|        |           | Tenure Tip Sheet  
|        |           | Samples of Journals for Publication  
|        |           | Cabell’s Directory of Publishing Opportunities in Education  
|        |           | Henson’s Writing for Publication Samples  
|        |           | Complimentary Snacks |
| 2/26   | 11        | Teaching Category  
|        |           | IDEA  
|        |           | Teaching and Learning Center, Peer Review Resource  
|        |           | Karen Carey, Director of Institutional Resource |
| 3/12   | 20        | *Technological Achievements-Scholarship Category  
|        |           | Ed Richard, COE Director of Technology  
|        |           | Fred Kolloff, Division of Media Resources Director  
|        |           | Gene Kleppinger, Coordinator of Online Learning  
|        |           | Jaleh Rezaie, Chair of Computer Science |
| 4/2    | 8         | Dean Q&A  
|        |           | Service Category  
|        |           | Complimentary Snacks |
| 4/16   | 10        | *Grants-Scholarship Category  
|        |           | Beth Brickley, COE Grant Specialist  
|        |           | Trisha Davis, Grant Writer, Center on Deafness  
|        |           | Complimentary Snacks |
| 4/30   |           | Closure  
|        |           | IEP for P/T Discussion  
|        |           | Program Evaluation  
|        |           | Complimentary Pizza |

*Monthly group initiated to assist and support faculty in this area
Please send your comments or suggestions about the program by campus mail to: Sue Strong, COE P/T Mentoring Program Facilitator, 420 Combs, FAX 622.5061, or email attachment (Sue.Strong@eku.edu). Feel free to comment on some or all sessions since attendance varied.

Each of the comments below has a place to circle the degree of your agreement or disagreement with the statement using the following scale:
(1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = do not know; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree)

**January 29-Meeting 1**

1. Sharing stories and getting to know other faculty better who were also on tenure track and seeking promotion and/or tenure was helpful.
   (1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = do not know; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree)

2. The P/T Mentoring Program mission and goals were clearly defined in emails or during the group meetings.
   (1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = do not know; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree)

3. Handouts provided during the program were helpful.
   (1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = do not know; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree)

**Additional comments on Meeting 1:**

**February 12-Meeting 2**

1. The samples of journals, books on publishing opportunities, and samples of how to mine an area for multiple publications was helpful.
   (1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = do not know; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree)

2. The discussion on publication tips was helpful.
   (1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = do not know; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree)

**Additional comments on Meeting 2:**
February 26-Meeting 3
1. Karen Carey’s (Director of Institutional Research) presentation on the IDEA instructor evaluation system was helpful.
(1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = do not know; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree)

2. Going over samples of the IDEA evaluation form and comparison data by department, college, and university was helpful.
(1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = do not know; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree)

Additional comments on Meeting 3:

March 12-Meeting 4
1. The Panel Discussion on Technological Achievements as related to the P/T process with Ed Richard, Fred Kolloff, Gene Kleppinger, and Jaleh Rezaie was helpful.
(1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = do not know; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree)

2. Establishing a monthly group focused on Technological Achievements in Teaching is/will be helpful.
(1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = do not know; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree)

3. Beginning to clarify criteria for the Technological Achievement area was helpful.
(1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = do not know; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree)

Additional comments on Meeting 4:

April 2-Meeting 5
1. The Q&A session with the Dean Sexton was helpful.
(1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = do not know; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree)

2. The discussion of the Service components of the P/T process was helpful.
(1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = do not know; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree)
Additional comments on Meeting 5:

April 16-Meeting 6
1. Beth Brickley and Trisha Davis’ presentation on grants as related to the P/T process was helpful
(1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = do not know; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree)

2. Connie Callahan and Joanne Guilfoil’s demonstration on how to organize your documentation and application for P/T was helpful.
(1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = do not know; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree)

3. Establishing a monthly group focused on the grant search, writing, and management process is/will be helpful.
(1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = do not know; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree)

Additional comments on Meeting 6:

April 30-Meeting 7
1. The program helped me further develop my individualized plan for P/T and my mentor selection process.
(1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = do not know; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree)

2. The program gave me more confidence about my future success in the P/T process.
(1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = do not know; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree)

3. Overall the program is/will be a very helpful resource for the COE.
(1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = do not know; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree)

Additional comments on Meeting 7:
Open Response Comments:

What aspect(s) of the program were the most helpful:

What would you add, delete, or modify about the program:

Any additional comments: