COACHE Governance Results

I. Introduction

Committee: Hollis Glaser (Chair), Sharon Avni, Sangeeta Bishop, Soniya Munshi, Phyllis Niles.

This document may be difficult to read. The charge to this committee was to discover why the results of the COACHE survey on Governance were so low. Therefore, we asked the faculty their opinions on the low scores. They necessarily talked about problems they perceive at BMCC. However, the faculty who answered our call to participate in the focus groups did not necessarily do so out of a desire to complain. Their participation can also be interpreted as wanting to improve the college, as having optimism that things can change for the better. Our committee sees this process and this document as a positive step in righting some of the wrongs the faculty speak of. We would like to commend the administration for taking this important step toward a more self-reflective organization, where the different sectors learn from one another.

It speaks well to the administration that they wanted to further investigate the low ratings that BMCC received in the COACHE survey. That faculty were in charge of this investigation is to be commended as this report begins to address some of the concerns delineated in this document, i.e. that faculty perceive there is a centralized power structure in the college and a lack of responsiveness to their concerns. This committee would like to thank the administration for asking us to be part of this important process and urges a continuous effort to address these pressing issues.

We can imagine that this document, along with those from the other COACHE Committees, might be overwhelming. It is imperative that these recommendations be taken seriously by the administration, especially as one of the main issues faculty have with working at BMCC is that they feel the administration does not care about nor respond to faculty concerns.

Throughout this report, the committee offers a number of specific recommendations; however, there are four major recommendations that cut across all of the categories outlined in this report and address many issues at the same time.

1) Institute a wider evaluation system (upward and across units).
2) Increase reassigned time for scholarship and committee work.
3) Widely distribute the entire budget through College Council and College P & B.
4) Create an ombudsman position so there is a process and a neutral party to resolve conflicts.

The committee also encourages BMCC faculty and administration to find out what other CUNY colleges are doing that received higher scores and to research best practices of award winning (best places to work) community colleges across the country.
We suggest that you divide the recommendations into three categories.

1) The first category should be those recommendations that you agree should and can be done. Along with the governing bodies, start instituting those changes and announce to everyone that you are doing so.

2) The second category include those recommendations which are more confusing. Perhaps you don’t perceive them to be problems, or it is not obvious how to address them. These recommendations need more research or explanation. Again, along with the governing bodies, institute some task forces to decide how to move forward on these recommendations.

3) Finally, there is a third category of recommendations which the administration does not agree with or does not want to do. These are the most difficult issues. These are the ones where faculty do not understand administrative direction or policies and the administration does not understand how the faculty has such a different perspective. These are the recommendations for which we have public forums where faculty and administrators can speak directly to one another, listen, ask questions and try to understand the others’ perspective.

II. Methodology

The committee’s charge was to look more closely at the COACHE survey responses on governance and to figure out how to understand these results. The committee focused on those items which received below 3.0 on a 5-point scale, 5 being the most positive answer:

COACHE Governance items below 3.0

Public recognition of progress.
Faculty and administration have an open system of communication.
Faculty and administration discuss difficult issues in good faith.
Important decisions are not made until there is consensus.
Administration ensures sufficient time for faculty input.
Faculty and administration respectfully consider the others’ view.
Administration communicate rationale for important decisions.
Faculty and administration have equal say in decisions.
Faculty and administration define decision criteria together.
Shared governance holds up in unusual circumstances.
Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance.
Institution cultivates faculty leaders.
The President’s pace of decision making.
The President’s stated priorities.
The President’s Communication of priorities.
Dean: support in adapting to change.

The survey was quantitative, expressing the breadth of faculty perceptions. In order to more fully understand these scores, our follow-up research was designed to gather qualitative data,
information that delves more deeply into the survey results. After studying the results, the committee concluded that we could summarize them into two basic issues BMCC was rated low on: Communication and Decision-Making. We wanted to make sure we talked to those faculty who had the most experience at BMCC and were most involved with governance. We asked faculty to participate in focus groups that were deliberately structured with open-ended questions.

The faculty participating in the focus groups were provided a copy of the results and were asked the following questions:

**Focus Group Protocol**

**Question 1:** What occurs to you as you look at these results?

**Question 2:** One main result of this survey is that faculty seem concerned about the quality of communication with administration.
   a. What are your thoughts about this?
   b. Can you give some examples?
   c. What recommendations do you have?

**Question 3:** Another main result of this survey is that faculty do not feel included in major decision-making.
   a. What are your thoughts about this?
   b. Can you give some examples?
   c. What recommendations do you have?

These questions allowed the participants to speak both broadly and specifically about their response to the COACHE survey.

We did eight focus groups lasting approximately an hour each. In order to ensure we had experienced faculty participating, we conducted one focus group for chairs only and one for the Academic Senate Executive Committee. The focus group for chairs had 14 participants and the focus group conducted especially for the Academic Senate Executive Committee had seven participants (including two members of this committee).

The other focus groups had 25 participants in all. In addition, there were five one-on-one interviews conducted by one of the committee members. Invitations were put out for faculty (twice) to email committee members in response to the questions and eight faculty sent in their thoughts via email, but of these eight, two had already participated in focus groups and hence they are not counted in the final numbers.

In total we had 57 participants with representation across all departments. Forty-one participants were female and 16 were male.
A note about these findings: The following is a report on faculty perception. Some of what they claim may not be factually true. However, what is relevant and what we are trying to discover is how faculty experience working at BMCC. Perception affects feelings and although faculty may be mistaken about certain details, these mistakes may also indicate larger issues regarding misinformation or miscommunication.

The results are organized into three categories: 1) Governance, 2) Organizational Structures and Procedures and 3) Organizational Culture. These categories overlap both conceptually and experientially. For instance, a structural issue—how faculty get reimbursed for travel, is also a governance issue and is indicative of the wider organizational culture. Perhaps more significant, faculty do not necessarily experience their work in these neat categories; in the course of the faculty’s work day, they are often indistinguishable. When, for instance, faculty members go to a College Council meeting, they are participating in the governance of the college, but also seeing how the college is structured and experiencing its culture.

III. Governance

Introduction. This category refers to the very specific and literal governance of the college, the Academic Senate and the College Council.

A. How faculty experience Governance.

The overall perception of the participants is that BMCC administration does not respect or abide by the spirit and rule of shared governance. Faculty feel that College Council is ineffective, information is not shared with the faculty and the administration ignores the Academic Senate. Three main examples illustrate this perception.

First, faculty noted how brief the College Council meetings are and that the committees rarely have reports. Furthermore, College Council Committee minutes are not posted on the website, so it is not clear whether or not they have even met. As College Council is chaired by the President and all of the committees are chaired by high-level administrators, many faculty see this as a deliberate and clear violation of shared governance.

Second, faculty noted that the budget report is unclear and the full budget is not shared. The issue of the opaqueness of the budget came up consistently and with a decent amount of concern. Many faculty claimed that they have asked the administration for the full budget to understand how discretionary funds are allocated, and have never received it. The College Personnel and Budget Committee has a standing sub-committee that is charged with looking at matters relating to the college’s budget. They also have not seen the entire budget. It was noted that we have a number of faculty who are trained to understand budgets (i.e. the Accounting faculty, some Business faculty) and that they could parse it for the wider faculty.

Finally, there is also a perception that the administration does not respect the Academic Senate. Many people noted that the President does not attend Academic Senate, although he is a
member, and that Senate resolutions are often ignored with no explanation from the President. For example, there has been no discussion in Academic Senate about the President’s plan to build a multi-story hi-rise on top of 199 Chambers St. Another example is the President establishing the Enrollment Management Committee without including a faculty member. Some faculty are still upset that it took two years for the Academic Senate to stop The Office of Student Affairs from collecting student complaints about faculty.

There is a sense that the administration does what it wants and ignores what the faculty wants. There is still resentment about Pathways: that the administration moved it forward despite widespread and vehement faculty opposition. Some participants expressed that the administration does an “end-run” around the Senate, often through ad-hoc committees. For example, ASAP and CUNYstart are curriculum initiatives that should be the purview of faculty, but that administration controls.

Another example of perceived disrespect for Academic Senate is that the faculty has little time to properly do its job. First, because of the bi-cameral structure, College Council eats into the Academic Senate meeting. Second, there are only three hours of reassigned time offered to the Senate secretary and none for the Senate Chair, which makes it difficult for them to focus on Academic Senate issues in the course of their week. This is in spite of an Academic Senate recommendation to increase reassigned time for Academic Senate leadership.

B. Recommendations.

The recommendations offered by faculty respond to their perception that the administration does not take Academic Senate seriously. These recommendations give more power to Academic Senate leadership and ways to change how governance operates.

1) The President should stay for Academic Senate as he is a member.
2) Academic Senate Chair should sit in on the Cabinet meetings (as a non-voting member).
3) There should be more reassigned time for Governance leadership.
4) The roles of Academic Senate and College Council should be explained at Faculty Orientation.
5) College Council needs to expand its committee membership to include non-Senate faculty who could ensure that the committees fulfill their charges and the committees should be chaired by faculty. The committees should have agendas and notes published on the BMCC website.
6) The Governance Plan needs to be re-written. This could address a wide array of issues, including more faculty representation (as faculty have grown), the time crunch created by the bi-cameral, and the lack of activity from the College Council.

IV. Organizational Structures and Procedures
A. Introduction.

This category refers to how the college’s personnel is organized, their assigned roles, the various duties of departments, units and divisions, the rules that faculty must abide by, as well as informal rules (i.e. those not written down but are followed because of habit or tradition), and the way communication flows through the organization.

B. How faculty experience structures and procedures.

In sum, the faculty experience BMCC as having a very centralized power structure that does not respond to their concerns, that changes rules arbitrarily and that lacks accountability. There is a sense of being in a Kafkaesque world (literary allusion brought up more than once) where faculty are stumbling through an irrational bureaucracy that gives them little direction or answers to their questions.

Centralized power structure:

Faculty experience centralized power in a variety of ways. Some faculty feel that the administration makes the rules and then expect faculty to follow, that it simply wants compliance from faculty, that faculty are not driving the direction of the school. For example, there are many curricular and pedagogical programs that the administration initiated and then expects faculty to maintain such as, Life Experience Credits, Pathways, Assessment, Gateway Initiative, and Freshman Learning Academy. E-learning, on the other hand, was run by faculty and then was taken away and given to administrators.

Another example is the perceived amount of power department chairs have. Many faculty noted that they are on the College Personnel and Budget Committee as well as the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee. Much of the communication between faculty and the administration must funnel through this relatively narrow channel, a process which some faculty consider to be particularly “corporate.” In addition, chairs must sign off on forms for research which gives the chair the power to deny progress on faculty’s research agenda.

A third example is the control of key resources—information, funds and space. Faculty do not know how the budget works and have no real input. Some faculty noted that at other colleges (i.e., QCC) control of travel and FTE funds are distributed throughout the college and are in the hands of the departments. The administration also controls the way instructional space is allocated; whereas it would be helpful to have department classrooms near the departments’ administrative offices departments are not allowed to make this decision. Further, the administration seems to prioritize non-pedagogical space over classrooms. For example, the Health Education Department has been denied exclusive use of their lab (the gym) for instructional purposes. Similarly, the Theatre program cannot use needed classrooms because they are being used for storage.
Although many faculty perceived the chairs to have too much power, the chairs, for their part, do not feel that they have much control. Like the rest of the faculty, the chairs also do not have an understanding or control of funds and space. As mentioned above, chairs are not able to decide which classrooms they can use, nor do many of them understand how the number of classrooms allocated to them are determined. The department Personnel and Budget Committees cannot rank order their candidates for professoriate lines and do not understand why they must send three candidates for every opening. Many chairs also resent that students complain to administration about faculty, and then a note is sent to the chairs from a dean to find out what is going on and a directive to report back. Some chairs believe their roles are often undercut in the College Personnel and Budget Committee. It was noted that this committee is advisory to the President and his evaluation of a profile that is before the committee influences the discussion and the subsequent vote. In addition, this committee is not notified of the president’s personnel decisions.

Recommendations

These recommendations offer ways to distribute power more widely.

1) There should be evaluations of department chairs by faculty.
2) There should be evaluations of Administrators by faculty they interact with.
3) There should be more budgetary transparency and authority throughout the college.
4) The College Personnel and Budget Committee should know the final decision on split votes.
5) Faculty should be engaged in resource allocation by identifying faculty with the appropriate interest and skill set.

Lack of responsiveness:

This issue came up consistently and with emotion that ranged from frustration to wonder to disgust. Almost everyone experienced administrators across many department simply not responding to their e-mails, working on projects that never go anywhere, and of course, the ubiquitous issues with travel funds (see the next section for a fuller explanation). Faculty have consistently experienced initiatives and programs that either seemed to have “disappeared into the ether” or that don’t work properly.

For example, there was a similar survey of faculty conducted by the University Faculty Senate called the “Faculty Experience Survey.” It produced very similar results to this COACHE survey yet there was no follow-up. Similarly, faculty are unsure if their small group meetings with the Provost will result in any changes and are very skeptical about the results of this COACHE survey having any consequences. Faculty also spoke of the lack of responsiveness from the Help Desk and do not understand the on-going issues with the elevators at Murray. Faculty also reported being extremely embarrassed about having difficulty getting guest speakers reimbursed. More generally, faculty perceive that there are no consequences for incompetent administrators.
Perhaps most alarming is that many faculty do not feel safe at BMCC. They brought up a number of situations that indicate to them the administration is not responding to their concerns. Many faculty complain about the lack of responsiveness from Security and BART and they feel like they are on their own to solve their own safety and security issues. Faculty referred to a meeting with administrators who came to their department to talk about problem students. They described the talks as being disorganized, where the administrators seemed to be talking off the top of their heads, had cavalier attitudes, and did not answer faculty questions.

Two faculty members talked about harassment within their department. One felt she was sexually harassed by a senior member of the department during her peer observation, who was also a member of the department’s P & B. She was told to keep quiet.

A second faculty said, “...in the past two years I have raised concerns about bullying, workplace violence and harassment within my department, reaching out to several administrators to only be disregarded and left fighting for my job.” This person then described being passed around from Security to HR to AA back to HR. “It has been a never ending circle with no one helping out the situation that has resulted in a few full-time faculty resigning and a few not being reappointed.”

Another example of faculty not feeling safe is the lack of a protocol for an active shooter on campus. A number of faculty brought up this concern and noted that the administration’s response has been slow and inadequate, despite this concern coming up in a variety of venues including College Council. The President has been requested by faculty in writing since spring 2013 to conduct a “Lock-Down” practice drill, but has not done so to date.

Recommendations

These recommendations create feedback loops within the college and address on-going concerns about safety.

1) Administrators should have 360 degree evaluations.
2) Staff should be trained to address the above issues, especially safety concerns.
3) A safety task force should be created to address the variety of ways faculty feel in danger.
4) Administration should explain how faculty feedback fits into decision-making.

Arbitrary and confusing rules and priorities:

In general, faculty do not have a clear sense of how BMCC operates, what the proper procedures are or what its priorities and goals are. People noted a lack of transparency, unspoken rules, and that they have to learn through trial and error. Many faculty do not understand the duties of the President nor the roles of the various Deans. By far, the most consistent complaints from the faculty are not being able to get travel funds easily and the lack of college-wide Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure guidelines.

The issues with travel funds has been well-documented in a report to the Provost dated December 7, 2015. The faculty in the focus groups did not reiterate these problems, but did mention them as being well-known and pervasive. These problems include unspoken rules about
travel documentation which the faculty learn about after submitting, having to submit documents multiple times, complaints about dealing with an unpleasant administrator, and never getting reimbursed. Many others (including chairs) have simply given up on applying because the process is too burdensome and not worth the $450.00.

Faculty mentioned a variety of basic rules and procedures that are confusing or change every semester. Those mentioned include policy changes at the help desk, registration procedures that have to be figured out every semester, scheduling rules that are not clear and office hour rules that do not make sense. For example, faculty identity cards stopped working and yet there was no prior notification of this. Another example is the confusion about office hour rules. Some faculty feel that office hour rules are not conducive to meeting with students and do not take into account the time that faculty spend online communicating with their students. Many faculty teach only in Fiterman and it would be easier to meet students there, but there is a rule about holding hours in their office which is often in Chambers and having office hours on multiple days. Similarly, people don’t understand the three-day on campus rule which some feel is punitive and based on the assumption that faculty will take advantage of a more flexible policy. Nor does this rule offer exceptions for faculty who conduct research or are teaching online or heavily involved in committee work.

Some faculty also noted inconsistent policies across departments and lack of clarity about who makes these rules and how they can be appealed. Scheduling rules are not clear. One faculty member told of being caught between the chair and administrator where each was sending that person to the other for approval for a schedule request which lasted until a week before the semester started leaving the faculty little time to prepare for the class. Faculty also mentioned a lack of justification for changes in policy. For example, they are confused why sabbatical is now called something else. They do not understand how course caps are decided on nor the number of sections allowed per course. They noted that there are long waits lists and do not understand why new sections cannot be opened up, nor why they have no input in this decision. Many faculty, especially those who have strong research agendas, are upset that they cannot update software on their computers.

Second, faculty were confused about larger college-wide rules and priorities. For example, faculty perceive that the college is focused on increasing enrollment instead of retention, graduation and curriculum. This emphasis on higher numbers comes at the same time that faculty are receiving the clear message that space is at a premium, so they do not understand how the college balances these priorities. Another example is that while faculty do not have enough office and meeting space in Fiterman and Murray, they see that Year Up received a substantial amount of space for their program.

Finally, faculty are confused about those priorities most applicable to their careers, namely how much emphasis they should place on each of the three legs of teaching, research and service. They do not perceive an actual prioritization, but that all areas are high priority. Faculty believe that this lack of prioritization sets up impossible standards. However, faculty do not agree on which areas should be prioritized. Some resent pressure to publish over teaching and service. They feel the scholarship pressures are too heavy, that this is a teaching college and promotion
should not be tied to publication, that the workload makes it impossible to be a researcher. On the other hand, others resent the heavy teaching load while also being required to and **wanting** to publish. One participant talked about how she started to teach online to make more time for research because research was a priority. Then she was told she had to teach face to face because teaching was a priority. Another faculty member believes there is too much pressure to serve on a wide variety of committees. The only agreement among faculty is their unhappiness about having to excel at all areas.

**C. Recommendations.**

These recommendations create clear and transparent guidelines and procedures.

1) Create college-wide Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure guidelines.
2) Assign travel fund duties to a different administrator who will simplify and streamline the process.
3) File information about rules and procedures online, available to everyone.
4) Create a flow chart or other transparent visual information about process and procedures for decision-making at all levels, as well as job descriptions for Deans.

**V. Organizational Culture**

**A. Introduction.**

This category is the most nebulous of the three. It is a term that resonates widely in corporate America and helps describe the way employees experience their work. As defined by one of the leaders in the field, Edgar Schein, a social psychologist who made his mark in organizational development, organizational culture is the “basic assumptions and beliefs” (which may be unconscious and not visible) shared by members of an organization and is reflected by artifacts (physical structures, documents, spaces, rituals…), espoused beliefs and values (those that are written down or spoken aloud in formal venues, stories, surveys…), and norms and rules (ways of operating and communicating) (Schein, 1986). When people describe their organizational culture, they are referring to the values and beliefs that are transmitted through the organization, either formally or informally, consciously or unconsciously.

In other words, everything that has been described above—the governance structure, the way power is distributed, the way communication flows, the rules, procedures and priorities all create the culture of BMCC. This category of organizational culture encompasses the previous two categories. The examples mentioned above all work as examples here, too. Just like the way culture operates in the wider world, there is a dominant culture. There are certain values that everyone experiences and espouses, that education is important, for instance. There are also micro-cultures; everyone in the organization does not have identical experiences. But, sub-sets of the population, in this case the faculty, will have commonalities in how they perceive their work.
B. How faculty experience organizational culture

Faculty described the culture of BMCC as being punitive where faculty are infantilized or punished or policed, where they are not respected by the administration and where there is a lack of mutual trust between faculty and administrators. These seemingly different elements—perception of being policed, lack of trust and respect—are intimately entwined. When people lose autonomy, they also lose face; limiting another person’s power is a clear sign of mistrust and disrespect. Some faculty spoke about a “punitive culture” or a “culture of disrespect,” and could point to specific events or procedures that created this culture. Other faculty, however, talked more about attitudes they detected and “a lot of little things” that created this environment. Therefore, this section is divided into two areas: 1) procedures and events and 2) perceived attitudes.

Procedures and Events

Many of the policies and procedures described above are perceived as being punitive by the faculty. For instance, the control of funds, the rigid scheduling and office hours are interpreted as being deliberately punishing toward the faculty. One faculty member believes that policies are set up with the assumption that faculty are going to abuse them and therefore they are extremely rigid and often counterproductive. Ignoring Academic Senate, e-mails not being answered, not responding to safety issues and creating arbitrary rules all send a message to faculty that they are not valued.

By far, the two most common organizational structures that faculty identified as creating a negative environment were that of a heavy workload and the on-going issues with travel funds. The workload is, of course, the main determinant of faculties’ lives and they do not understand why there is not more reassigned time. Many believe that other CUNY community colleges do have more liberal rules about giving reassigned time. For the faculty who do want to research and are active scholars, besides dealing with the heavy teaching load, the difficulty and unpleasantness they experience in receiving travel reimbursement is particularly infuriating. While the college is requiring that they publish, on the one hand, it is also making it difficult for them to remain active, on the other hand.

There are many other areas in which the faculty feel disrespected. One prominent example is when the administration deliberately discouraged faculty from applying for the Associate Dean of Faculty position by adding “Dean experience preferred” to the call. In the context of a college that regularly promotes administrators to increasingly higher positions, blocking faculty to an associate dean position was especially insulting. Faculty also feel disrespected when administration “takes over” faculty initiatives, i.e. the Department Grants Committee in the English department was disbanded and taken over.

Finally, the perceived lack of concern on the part of the administration for faculty safety deserves another mention. One faculty member talked about feeling unsupported when dealing with a student stalker. Another felt BMCC did not respond well to a student masturbator. The Harrison
entrance with its lack of turnstiles was mentioned. All of these issues with safety are interpreted by faculty that the administration does not care about them.

Perceived Attitudes

This section reports faculty perceptions of attitudes within the college. There were basically three different dynamics at work: perception of administrator attitudes; perception of backlash from administration; and faculty not trusting the administration.

First, faculty have experienced insults from administrators, as well as a general attitude of “sneering condescension.” There is a fear of dealing with certain administrators and departments where faculty are made to feel as though they have done something wrong. One person described going to a particular department is “like going to a welfare office.” Faculty believe that some administrators promote the stereotype that faculty do not work hard enough, that we are in “la-la land” that “faculty cannot be trusted to do their jobs.” They feel the current Provost does trust and value them. However, in general, there is a perception that the administration thinks faculty do not want to work hard.

Second, some faculty believe that there will be “backlash” if they ask hard questions. One new faculty member expressed reluctance to speak up for fear of being seen as a “squeaky wheel” and that it could hurt her progress toward promotion and tenure. There was a perception that many faculty did not participate in the survey or the focus groups because they did not believe there would be a response from the administration. Others believe that the administration would punish them for negative scores and comments. Faculty feel that there is retaliation if they voice their opinions.

Finally, many faculty reported that they simply do not trust the administration. They believe the administration is not really interested in any meaningful input and does lots of “interactions” for “face validity” reasons “but are not really interested in what we have to say.” Faculty do not trust the President and many people heard that others did not do the COACHE survey because they thought they could be identified and that nothing would happen from it. We heard that there was no confidence that these focus groups would matter and that they would be a waste of time. However, it is important to note, that many people did come to the focus groups because they are hopeful that the administration will work with the faculty to make BMCC a better place.

C. Recommendations

Organizational culture is very difficult to change. Although no one person is completely responsible for it, those with the most power do shape it the most. Edgar Schein believes that leadership and culture are two sides of the same coin. In order to change an institution’s culture, there must be commitment and change from the top and there must be consistent and system-wide efforts. Because the entirety of the rules and procedures create the culture of the college, instituting changes suggested above will also help change the culture. However, there are also
recommendations that speak directly to building trust and respect between faculty and administration.

1) More faculty should be involved in administration, so that relationships are built between faculty and administrators.
2) BMCC should have town hall meetings.
3) There should be more meetings with the President.
4) Administrators at all levels should be vetted and trained.
5) Faculty accomplishments should be praised.
6) There should be recognition of hard work by increasing reassigned time, including partial reassigned time that can be accumulated across semesters.

VI. Conclusion

We recognize that this document creates a rather grim picture of BMCC and how faculty perceive the administration and their workplace. However, it is important to also report that many faculty felt the new Provost does value the faculty and is creating a more open and transparent college.

The Committee thanks the administration for trusting us to do this important work and for investigating more deeply into the COACHE survey. We understand this is difficult information but starting this process will make BMCC a stronger college and will ultimately help everyone: the faculty, the staff and the students.