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The most recent Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) survey was administered to full-time faculty across CUNY in the spring of 2015. Provost Jane Bowers, Faculty Senate President Karen Kaplowitz, and Chair of the Council of Chairs Jay Hamilton, functioning as a steering committee, developed and implemented a plan for the dissemination and discussion of the results of the survey administered to John Jay College faculty.

The steering committee then formed a Working Group on the Faculty (Working Group) that included two faculty members from each full-time faculty category: Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Full Professor, and Lecturer/Instructor and two administrative liaison members. The responsibilities of the Working Group were:

- study the COACHE data
- talk with individuals about the findings (including members of the faculty, OIR, and representatives from other CUNY campuses)
- make recommendations to the College community
- plan and take appropriate action in response to the results and additional faculty feedback
- track progress in the implementation of its recommendations, perhaps meeting once a semester to maintain accountability

This was the first COACHE survey at John Jay to be followed by a faculty-driven Working Group. This report provides background on the COACHE program and the Working Group’s methods, and details the findings and recommendations of the Working Group to the John Jay administration and faculty.

Background: COACHE and the History of Its Administration at John Jay

The Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) is a “research-practice partnership,” begun ten years ago at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. While COACHE administers faculty satisfaction surveys, the COACHE organization also pursues extensive research on faculty careers – based in part on the survey results they observe – and creates ongoing partnerships with the 230 institutions it has served. The relationship begins with a two-day, pre-survey meeting in Cambridge for provosts and other administrative staff from participating institutions and continues with individual consultations for faculty and administration following the release of the results to each campus. One of the goals of the COACHE enterprise is to align faculty and administration on the need for institutional change in the name of faculty success and workplace vitality.

COACHE results are benchmarked against a small group of similar higher education institutions, and there are comparisons among sub-groups on campus. The survey’s ability to explore faculty views by gender, academic rank, race, or tenure status enables participants to understand the workplace from multiple perspectives and to conduct focused follow-up research.
John Jay has participated in the COACHE survey on three occasions: 2009-2010 for pre-tenure faculty; 2011-12 for tenured faculty; and 2014-2015 for all full-time faculty. CUNY is expected to continue on a three-year cycle of survey administrations.

The COACHE survey was distributed to all full-time faculty members at John Jay during the spring of 2015. Of 354 faculty invited to participate, responses from 242 full-time faculty members were included in the analysis from COACHE – an impressive 68% response rate that was particularly high overall and within CUNY. The findings from the COACHE survey were circulated by Provost Bowers and were posted on the John Jay intranet: the Provost Report, the Governance results, internal analysis by the Office of Institutional Research, and the raw data, as well as white papers on best practices by COACHE. This degree of community access to the findings was comparatively unique across CUNY.

The current report details the work completed by the Working Group, following the release of the 2015 COACHE findings, to better understand those findings and make recommendations to the community in response. The Working Group will periodically monitor progress based on the recommendations in this report and looks forward to seeing positive results reflected in the next COACHE survey, based in part on the College enacting these recommendations.

**Working Group Methods**

**Meetings, Planning and Discussions**

The Working Group met regularly during the fall 2015 and spring 2016 semesters to brainstorm, plan, set our focus and analyze data. We began our work by establishing baseline understanding of the task, the COACHE survey and the John Jay data. We spoke via conference call and in person at CUNY Central with Todd Benson, Associate Director of Surveys and Analysis at COACHE. He answered questions and engaged in a lengthy and candid discussion with Working Group members about best practices, John Jay’s findings and process, and next steps for the group. The group also met with Ric Anzaldua, Director of Institutional Research at John Jay, to discuss the John Jay COACHE data, additional institutional data available, options for additional analyses, and the College’s internal summary and supplementary analyses (OIR 15-09). Subsequent to that meeting, Mr. Anzaldua supplied additional tables with item and benchmark means for different groups (e.g., by gender, by racial/minority group, by whether one came to John Jay from a prior tenure-track position; by salary or teaching load satisfaction). We met with members of the College’s Strategic Planning Group for Goal 2 (Faculty Support) as well to discuss the latter group’s findings and recommendations from their work, which was near completion. Finally, we worked with colleagues across CUNY to share and compare COACHE findings and participated in CUNY’s new Faculty Advisory Board initiated by CUNY Provost Rabinowitz.

1 Information was posted at this location on the John Jay intranet: http://inside.jjay.cuny.edu/apps/coache/coache_survey.php
3 OIR 15-09 was disseminated via email by Provost Bowers to full-time faculty, 9/23/15.
Early in the fall, the Working Group began its analysis of the John Jay COACHE data. We sought to isolate and focus on a few of the most salient issues from the results, as the survey addressed a wide variety of issues and topic areas. Discussions highlighted eight issues or areas that seemed most salient, as reflected by the greatest degree of relative dissatisfaction among respondents and highlighted as “areas of concern” by COACHE (Provost’s Report, pp. 15, 17). They were: promotion; tenure issues; compensation and teaching load; service/research support; health care/benefits/child care; value/weight of service; subgroups (associate professors, faculty of color, women); and leadership priorities. However, the Working Group decided to focus most closely on three areas that showed the strongest negative responses and covered many of the other issues – at least tangentially. They were: Tenure/Promotion, Subgroups (Associate Professors, Faculty of Color (FOC), Women), and Workload (which encompassed consideration of service, compensation/benefits, and work-life balance issues). We also introduced a discussion of leadership priorities in our follow-up survey and focus group discussions.

Once the main focal areas were identified, subcommittees were formed to analyze and report on key findings and concerns in each of these domains. Findings in each area drove and informed focus group and survey questions written to probe and better understand the nature of the COACHE responses. During the fall, the Working Group met often to discuss these results and strategize for next steps, which included setting up a COACHE email address, sending out a community email on our progress, planning to host Focus Groups on Faculty Development Day (and beyond) and creating qualitative surveys (for faculty and chairs) probing COACHE findings.

To plan for the initial focus group during Faculty Development Day, the Working Group met several times during winter break. During these meetings, committee members wrote and refined the focus group questions and planning for the day’s organization, including inclusion of adjunct faculty members. These same questions were used during subsequent focus groups. The Working Group met several more times during the spring to plan, organize and draft this report.

**Focus Group Data Collection by the Working Group**

To speak with individual faculty members about their concerns, focus groups were scheduled during the spring semester, moderated by the faculty members of the Working Group. The first was held at Faculty Development Day. This group included simultaneous discussions of the three focal areas highlighted by the committee, as well as a concurrent discussion with Adjunct Faculty members. This was followed by two general, lightly attended sessions. Additional focus groups were targeted with specific topics that matched the Working Group’s foci: promotion for assistant and associate professors; FOC and women; and workload, roadblocks and general issues. The sessions on FOC and women were the most heavily attended of all sessions, with the exception of the session held on Faculty Development Day.

**Additional Surveys and Data Collection and Supplemental Analyses**

---

4 That is, according to the Provost Report (see FN1 for link), these were domains in which John Jay faculty scored below most or all of our selected peers, in the bottom 30% of institutions, and/or showed medium to large sized group differences across items.
During the spring 2016 semester, the Working Group launched two additional surveys – one for faculty in general and one for department chairs. A total of 81 individuals began the faculty survey; 67 completed it. A total of 5 department chairs completed the department chair survey.

Also, CUNY-wide comparisons of the COACHE data were created and distributed by the University Faculty Senate and shared with John Jay and our committee.\(^5\) Campus-specific findings were highlighted for ease of comparison in the document. Finally, during the spring 2016 semester, the College released three years of John Jay results on the independently administered Chronicle of Higher Education “Great Colleges to Work For” survey, which assesses employees’ perspectives on the quality of the workplace.\(^6\)

**Findings and Recommendations**

Members of the faculty expressed many positive feelings and opinions about the College and their work lives; pockets of optimism were evident in focus group discussions. Some individuals expressed their dedication to our mission, to our students and to public education as important and meaningful. Some indicated that they feel inspired by these aspects of the College.

On the COACHE survey, John Jay faculty rated the quality of their colleagues as one of the best aspects of working at the College. Perhaps relatedly, faculty rated opportunities for collaboration and interdisciplinary work comparatively well. In addition, leadership in departments received high marks as one of the best aspects of working at John Jay – high in comparison to other CUNY campuses. Also, compared to other CUNY campuses, John Jay faculty rated the following benchmarks well: departmental leadership, departmental quality, and facilities and work resources. Academic freedom, a critical component of any academic institution, was rated as one of the best aspects of working at John Jay, as was our geographic location. Finally, faculty rated their sense of “fit” at the College as one of the best aspects of their jobs.

Given these strengths, the report now focuses on our weaknesses, as identified through the COACHE survey. The Working Group offers the recommendations below as attainable means of improving and enhancing our collective work lives (see Appendix for a Task List with recommendations, goals, and measurable outcomes). They are organized according to the themes and suggestions that emerged through all means of data collection.

1. **Reduce Faculty Workload: Teaching Load**

The most consistent and unequivocal finding across all surveys, analyses and comparisons is that John Jay faculty report our teaching load is too high. This was true even in comparison with all CUNY campuses, which share the same contract; John Jay ratings of teaching load were at the bottom of CUNY ratings for nearly every item.\(^7\) This is not surprising; this finding has been

---

\(^5\) Corrected findings across CUNY were disseminated by Karen Kaplowitz via email, 5/15/16.

\(^6\) Also called the ModernThink Higher Education Insight Survey, John Jay findings from the 2013, 2014, and 2015 administrations can be found at: http://inside.jjay.cuny.edu/apps/modernthink/index.php.

\(^7\) John Jay ranked lowest or nearly lowest among senior colleges on the benchmark: Nature Work: Teaching, as well as the following items: time spent on teaching; number of courses
consistent (and worsened) across multiple COACHE surveys and has been communicated by the Faculty Senate to the College administration repeatedly over time.

Addressing this issue is especially important because it has a significant impact on faculty satisfaction and morale. Dissatisfaction with the teaching load impacts perceptions and ratings of all other aspects of the faculty experience. According to the Office of Institutional Research Summary Report (OIR 15-09, p. 15), “[d]issatisfaction with the Number of Courses Taught produced statistically significant lower means for 13 of the 19 benchmarks. Dissatisfaction with Salary produced statistically significant lower means for 17 of the 19 benchmarks. …It is safe to say, faculty who were dissatisfied with either Teaching Load or Salary were very dissatisfied with everything” (OIR 15-09, p. 15).

Other CUNY campuses have structured means of financing de facto teaching load reductions. The Working Group recommends that the College analyze its finances with an eye toward creative solutions and commit to an across the board reduction in teaching load. Faculty members spend far too much time strategizing and worrying about teaching load (as do administrators and staff forced to count hours). Associate Professors, upon whom heavy service loads often fall (as evidenced by within campus mean differences; Provost’s Report, p. 21), are particularly vulnerable, as they no longer have junior faculty releases. Reducing the burden would alleviate stress and some workload.

It is important to note that, in every group comparison provided by the OIR, the worst aspect of working at John Jay was the teaching load.

2. Reduce Faculty Workload: Service

In discussions with faculty members, it seemed that some individuals conceptualize teaching load and service under the ‘workload’ umbrella, while research/scholarship fell under a different label. That is, they described workload as being teaching and service.

As with teaching, faculty members indicate being overwhelmed by service. The College this year made an effort to quantify the large number of committees and extent of committee membership; hence this is also not a surprising finding.

Note that faculty members routinely engage in extensive amounts of service. They reported on our survey and in focus groups a willingness to engage in meaningful service, but also indicated frustration with:

- overly long meetings (> 1 hour) that are poorly chaired, moderated and documented
- committees that are inconsequential
- redundancy of meetings and of different committees
- proliferation of ad hoc committees (again, with redundancy of function)
- impossibility of balancing teaching load with heavy service commitments and research taught; level of courses taught; number of students in classes taught; equitability of distribution of teaching load; quality of grad students to support teaching; time spent on outreach; time spent on administrative tasks; and ability to balance teaching/research/service. The College did not rank the lowest on discretion over course content and quality of students taught.
lack of clarity regarding the value of committee work (particularly in the tenure and promotion processes)

**Faculty comments:**

🔗 “The adage going around is that you meet the same 50 people everywhere. That’s about right. It’s the same people at Research Week as on College Committees as turning up for Open House as do Advising as run majors and programs. There is plenty of work for everyone: and it is the WORKLOAD that must be evenly distributed.”

Faculty members discussed several important issues that arise out of the heavy service workload.

(a) **Committee work is not evenly distributed as a function of department size.** Service and committee work is overwhelming in small departments. They have fewer faculty members available to serve on the same numbers of committees populated by much larger departments, which can more readily spread the burden. They also do not have access to the same resources available to support larger departments. This is a structural issue that should be weighed during any future consideration of our shared governance processes.

(b) **Service work is not evenly distributed as a function of subgroups.** Both nationally and at John Jay, faculty of color and women report shouldering heavier service burdens than other groups. For faculty of color, individuals noted that “everything race related gets directed to FOCs.” Inherently, this makes “race related work” the responsibility of FOC, rather than reflecting a comprehensive institutional responsibility for diversity issues. Such initiatives should be led and supported by a diverse group of faculty leaders and members to signal the importance of “race related work” to our entire community.

In addition, FOC often provide extensive “hidden” service as mentors and advisors, sought out by students of color wanting guidance and support. Associate professors and women often shoulder a disproportionate amount of service burden within departments as well. This can undermine promotion success in the personnel process.

(c) **What is the value of service work?** There are implications of dedication to service work for the personnel process. Many faculty members noted that it seems as though only scholarship is valued, both by the senior administration and in the personnel process. Unfortunately, faculty members can get conflicting information about the implications of their service work for the personnel process – many in our survey indicated they get their information from chairs, from colleagues and from the “rumor mill.” Hence, the College should be clearer in communicating the value placed on service in the personnel process – *early in the pre-tenure process.*

To give one example, there is inconsistency in how different *types* of faculty service are valued and weighed in the personnel process. Specifically, service that is compensated (with release time) seems to be weighed less than uncompensated service. This creates enormous confusion among faculty members in how to assess service opportunities, how to dedicate their time and energy, and how those choices will affect tenure/promotion. One suggestion was to quantify service work in the same manner in which faculty research productivity is quantified for CUNY.
This issue is especially important given the recent history of the College. We have undergone tremendous change in the past decade – change that required dedicated service by faculty members to create new programs, curricula and courses. The College must be very clear, early in the personnel process, about the impact and value of such service for faculty members. As noted below, next year discussions should address how we value, evaluate and weigh the different forms of work faculty accomplish at the College.

3. Reduce Faculty Workload: Support Student Learning and Success

An important strength of our faculty is their dedication to our students and to the mission of the College. They love teaching our students and want to do it well so that our students graduate with the skills required to succeed. However, it is clear that classwork alone is not sufficient to bring students to the place we want them to reach by the time they graduate. In addition, although causality is unknown, faculty satisfied with their teaching were much more likely to rate the quality of undergraduate students as among the best aspects of working at the College, while those unsatisfied with teaching rated students lower.

For our students to succeed, the College must invest in support services that support student learning and success (and facilitate faculty teaching). Specifically, faculty in focus groups and on our survey suggested that John Jay should truly invest in the following:

- **The Writing Center** – to enhance its ability to serve students and reinforce faculty in their efforts to help students improve this critical skill
- **The Center for the Advancement of Teaching** – faculty members at all levels need accessible support for teaching by a robust teaching and learning center. The successful PATT program illustrates ways in which faculty helping faculty can be productive and highly effective. The Center has been moribund and needs to be revitalized.
- **The Office of Undergraduate Research** – given the degree to which student engagement is enhanced through research, a form of experiential learning, the College must invest in the OUR. We have an incredible opportunity to provide a pipeline for our diverse student body to explore and eventually pursue graduate education – and supporting their research in a centralized way, through the OUR, is critical to that effort. It can provide critical support for faculty and student research – facilitating productivity and reducing the challenges and difficulties faculty sometimes face trying to mentor students in research. It can also provide community for faculty members, an additional form of support.

In addition, we recommend that the College engage in a comprehensive review of all student support services to ensure that important student support programs are appropriately funded.

4. Reduce Faculty Workload: Address Faculty Work-Life Balance in Meaningful Ways

As with our students, John Jay faculty members face numerous challenges that create impediments to their success and increase workload as a result. They work in a city where housing is prohibitively expensive. CUNY does not have a fully developed housing program for faculty. John Jay does not have a spousal hiring program, making it more challenging to find employment for both partners. Some faculty members commute long distances to work at John Jay. Faculty do not have on-site childcare for older children, only recently gaining access for younger children. They may be caring for children, and also caring for aging parents, with
minimal support available. Faculty members do not have tuition remission or reduction for their children, despite having it for themselves (i.e., those who have reached the highest degrees possible in their fields already). All of these challenges are made more difficult due to CUNY’s non-competitive, stagnant salaries, the result of having no labor contract for the past six years.

While the College is not responsible for the contract and salary negotiations, there are creative ways in which the College could facilitate greater work-life balance for faculty (including alleviating some of the burdens due to salary stagnation). This is another area in which John Jay ratings fall at or near the bottom in comparison to the other CUNY Colleges, suggesting room for improvement despite existing constraints.

- In the personnel process, recognize the reality of expecting extensive scholarship in the face of heavy service requirements and heavy teaching loads. They are not always compatible, particularly when personal concerns weigh as well (e.g., lengthy commutes).
- Given the major shifts that have occurred over time in hiring, starting salaries, and workloads, the College should engage in a salary compression analysis. It is very likely that there are inequities that should be addressed, perhaps before additional merit-based allocations are made (which might possibly be further perpetuating inequities that could be related to date of hire).
- Consider additional use of summer salary as a means of alleviating salary discrepancies or stagnation.
- John Jay ratings were lowest for questions regarding housing benefits, family medical/parental leave, phased retirement options and right balance between professional/personal lives. Given the same policies and benefits, this suggests need for proactive dissemination at John Jay about CUNY policies and benefits that are available to faculty members. In particular, there is a lack of clarity regarding parental leave and the tenure clock.
- Create informal and formal opportunities for building relationships among faculty members, staff and senior administrators (e.g., Friday afternoon gatherings in our under-used Faculty Dining Room) to create opportunities for information sharing, for social support, and for more openness among various constituencies. Individuals could build informal networks and could increase collegiality across disciplines, domains and positions. In addition, faculty members could have greater access to the Provost and the President and other ‘power brokers’ through informal means.
- Emphasize the importance of departments and programs working with faculty members to make balancing their work lives more manageable. This can include consolidated teaching schedules, online teaching opportunities, teleconferencing for meetings, virtual office hours, etc.
- Consider creating a formal spousal hiring policy.
- Either offer (or advocate that CUNY contractually offer) tuition remission (or reduction) for children of CUNY faculty.
- College leadership should consider suggesting or advocating for CUNY-wide initiatives that might benefit faculty overall – such as a housing program.

5. Increase Transparency of Personnel Process

The personnel process at CUNY is a challenge for faculty – it is opaque and anxiety provoking. Although John Jay faculty fell in the bottom third to half of CUNY campuses, not the bottom of
COACHE responses, there are nevertheless numerous means by which these processes could be significantly more transparent and supportive for faculty.

Transparency

There should be greater transparency in the Faculty Personnel process. Below are several specific recommendations to accomplish this.

- The Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC) should have a website that includes all available policies, information, dates/deadlines, and a flow chart of processes and steps. Make all deadlines the SAME every year – this would reduce the burden of updating website information. (This will help candidates and department chairs.)
- The Provost’s office (or departments) should make Model Form C’s (different fields, levels and self-evaluation strategies) available for candidates to reference.
- The Provost’s office should publish clear timelines – in particular, faculty noted lack of clarity on what the timeline is for seeking promotion to full professor and what the standards are for evaluation.
- The FPC should separate and clarify information/guidelines on tenure, promotion to associate, and promotion to full professor.
- The Provost’s office should host regular information sessions for faculty approaching personnel actions.
- The FPC (or Provost’s office) should publish annual statistical reports of FPC actions. Information should not be detailed enough to identify individuals, but should communicate to candidates the tendency over time of candidates to be tenured and/or promoted.
- The FPC (or Provost’s office) should hold open consultation with faculty prior to any changes to the personnel guidelines.
- The FPC (or Provost’s office) should publish and disseminate personnel guidelines prior to candidates submitting materials for a particular year’s personnel actions – particularly if any changes occurred.

Standards

- Initiate a college conversation on pathways to tenure/promotion and on how to value and evaluate teaching, service and research in the personnel process. For instance, should there be domains of excellence for promotion (e.g., promotion to full professor based on excellence in teaching)? How would such domains of excellence be evaluated? Should the College move away from a one-size fits all means of assessing faculty for promotion?

Support Prior to Tenure/Promotion

- Appoint a faculty member to address faculty affairs and development (support for tenure/promotion; career development at all levels) – and/or create a position for a resource person independent of the Office of Academic Affairs (e.g., ombudsperson)
- Provide faculty members with early and regular feedback on their progress, perhaps from both within and outside their departments. Ideally, this feedback would identify areas of general concern and help faculty members to address any deficiencies. The Center for the Advancement of Teaching could support this effort.
- Academic Affairs should provide department chairs with guidance/best practices for how to support faculty in their roles as faculty mentors and advisors in the personnel process.
- When the College undergoes change (e.g., structural changes), the Administration must respond to evolving needs in departments that require meaningful support of faculty undergoing transition. Provide that support to ensure faculty success under the novel circumstances. For instance, changes to departmental structures or missions should be supported to facilitate transition to the new structure/mission.
- Create an equitable, transparent and intentional system for bringing faculty to promotion through full professor. For example, the Provost’s office should periodically contact faculty post-tenure to initiate and maintain conversations about promotion.

**Faculty suggestions:**

- Provide a “package” for newly tenured/promoted faculty members to support continued success (e.g., enhanced travel funds, funds for professional affiliation, release time for professional service, a mentor etc.) – not unlike a start-up package.

**Support Following Tenure**

- Actively provide material support toward promotion (e.g., travel funds). It is troubling that any faculty member would report, as they did in our survey, “I don’t expect to ever be promoted to full.” Ensure that faculty members have the support they need to reach their career goals, to the extent possible.

6. Support Subgroups: Women, Faculty of Color and Associate Professors

John Jay’s diversity was noted as one of the best aspects of working at the College by a sizeable minority of faculty members (16% overall; 23% among FOC) – suggesting an area of relative strength (Provost’s Report, p. 40). Nevertheless, there are numerous ways the College can support subgroups of faculty, as well as additional issues of concern, many of which arose through focus groups and surveys.

- Initiate ongoing campus conversations about race, recognizing that this is a shared community responsibility of faculty, staff, students and administration, as noted above.
  - Identify what specific initiatives will be pursued and timeline for outcomes.
  - Host annual, day-long events on diversity at John Jay, including LGBTQ issues which have yet to be addressed in COACHE.
  - Build broad coalitions to support faculty – for instance, provide training for department chairs and other leaders to facilitate their role as advocates, mindful actors aware of subtle biases and micro-aggressions, to protect faculty members from feeling the need to be ‘race police’ (or gender police) for their departments. All faculty members need allies and support from power positions and more FOC/women in power positions.
- Recognize and reward the “hidden” work of faculty of color and women in the personnel process. FOC feel isolated and burdened/responsible for our students of color. In addition, provide guidance and mentorship around this additional service.
- Prioritize and emphasize the importance and benefits of hiring more diverse faculty and plan for more effective recruitment of diverse faculty.
  o Spend money to recruit minority applicants. Use formal and informal networks to recruit. Seek out minority candidates; do not expect them to come to us.
- Strategic plan for FOC, including intersectional faculty, to focus on retention of FOC.
  o Need to better support FOC – because differential success isn’t about ability or preparation; it’s about opportunities and what people are told (or are not told).

Faculty comments:

“FOC are expected to contribute more, but it is not acknowledged.”

FOC and women reported feeling (or experiencing) the need to be better than others to be judged equal – consistent underestimation.

- The College is a Hispanic-serving and Minority-serving institution. Resources are needed to support this responsibility, if these designations are part of the mission of the College. This could include diversity in faculty, staff and administrative hiring, but also programs and advising targeted to our diverse students.
- Provide both formal and informal mechanisms for supporting faculty success for subgroups in particular.
  o Sponsor formal mentoring opportunities for faculty members including training for mentors, possibly through the faculty senate.
  o Provide informal opportunities for building relationships and support among faculty (e.g., writing groups for interested faculty)
  o Make existing programs through the OAR better known to faculty members and department chairs. Perhaps the OAR programs can be advertised directly to faculty in the tenure/promotion pipeline.
  o Fund faculty travel sufficiently to support success.
- The next COACHE survey should include questions regarding LGBTQ and adjunct faculty experiences.

7. Increase Administrative Transparency and Collaboration

In addition to FPC transparency, faculty indicated additional areas for administrative transparency and need for greater collaboration.

- The College needs greater transparency on the budget. For instance, the Faculty Senate repeatedly advocated for additional workload mitigation, and the response was that the budget would not allow it. However, without any greater elaboration or reflection on the budget or even consultation, the decision was made to move forward on mitigation. Collaboration will be more beneficial than stratification and an “us-them” ethos. Openness and communication (transparency) are important means of dispelling suspicion to enhance collaboration.
- The College should prioritize the central academic mission of the College in its budgetary decisions and show how College funds are being allocated.
- Adhere to existing governance processes and engage faculty in meaningful discussion before making decisions. Faculty expressed frustration at serving on committees which rubber stamp an administrative decision that did not truly reflect shared governance.
- Work with faculty as partners in the success of the College, not as obstacles to success. The relationship between faculty, staff and administrators is strained at best. Greater collaboration is required.

**Faculty comments:**

- Lack of transparency contributes to the perception that, although the Administration means well, they have developed a corporate, autocratic model and the faculty are simply factory-like employees.
- Nothing is more demoralizing to faculty than feeling that their efforts are not valued, that their commitment to the College is not respected, and that their contributions are not recognized.

8. **What Is Our Identity – And What Do We Value?**

One of broadest issues raised by the COACHE findings is the question of the identity of John Jay and its implications. In our internal survey, 79% of respondents indicated that the College is primarily a teaching institution. However, 40% indicated that our primary identity is that of a research institution (32% indicated “other” and 26% indicated “service institution” – multiple responses were possible). One telling response was, “There is no way for anyone to truly identify the primary identity of the college, because the institution cannot make up its own mind.” The College community needs to critically examine who we are, decide who we as a community are going to be – and the College must support and value the work we do to get there. And we must be clear and frank in communicating what we will value.

The history of CUNY and John Jay are relevant here. First, different cohorts of faculty were hired into dramatically different contexts. Some faculty members were hired with zero workload reduction, zero start-up funding, minimal and poorly functioning research infrastructure – and they were hired to teach at a comprehensive college. More recent hires received higher starting salaries, received workload reductions, got start-up funds, and were hired into a senior college that had both research resources and infrastructure to support them (e.g., functional IRB, sponsored programs and OAR offices). These are dramatic differences that impact satisfaction. Moreover, many faculty members hired between these “eras” engaged in extensive service work to transform the College from what it was to what it is now, which may have had implications for their scholarship and career success.

Over time, many faculty members perceived that the emphasis of the College shifted away from teaching toward research and only research. This is combined with a feeling that teaching is not valued. While teaching and service might be rewarded in some ways – faculty noted that it appears as though the only work that is valued is mission-specific research. This work brings attention, financial support, course releases and benefits to faculty in the personnel process. However, strength in other domains is not similarly valued.

If the College is to be a research institution, then teaching loads must be reduced further and
funds must be channeled to research support. However, if it is to be a teaching institution that values research and service, the College community must have frank conversations about how to quantify, evaluate and weigh that which we value. Should there be greater flexibility in the tenure/promotion process to allow faculty members to excel in different areas, but still succeed? For instance, should the College promote based on excellence in teaching, or based on excellence in scholarship? Should the subsequent workload vary to support faculty members working in their areas of strength?

Regardless of the outcome – it seems clear from the multiple discussions and surveys that faculty feel like the institution currently has unrealistic, shifting, and vague expectations. Day-to-day faculty experiences must be reflected in the College’s expectations and in resource allocations. We are an institution striving toward maturity. We must ensure that we are all on the same team and striving for the same outcome. Our community must have a clear and shared vision for the future of the College, earned through community debate and discourse. We must direct resources to support that vision, and value ALL the work contributed by our faculty to achieve that vision.

Conclusions and Next Steps

As noted above, the charge to the Working Group was to study the COACHE data, talk with our colleagues, make recommendations to the community and monitor implementation and progress to increase accountability.

The Working Group was gratified to see that the College has begun to address two of our recommendations: teaching load reductions and the creation of a faculty-held position to address Faculty Affairs. The teaching load mitigation in particular will likely have a dramatic impact on faculty morale among affected faculty members. However, members of the faculty expressed a number of significant concerns and low morale, with comments such as “I can’t wait to leave,” “I just don’t see a future here,” “I will kill my career if I stay,” or “The future’s bleak.” Overall, 58% of respondents said that, in the past five years, the institution’s priorities have changed in ways that negatively affect their work.

At the same time, John Jay faculty consistently rated their departments higher than most other CUNY colleges and afforded them high marks for providing opportunities for interdisciplinary and collaborative work. They lauded the quality of their colleagues and the academic freedom they experience at John Jay. Moreover, our faculty is deeply committed to the College’s mission and its students. Our “sense of ‘fit’ here” was one of the four best aspects of working at John Jay, as was its geographic location. Finally, approximately 55% of faculty indicated they would again choose to work at John Jay if they had it to do over. These are strong foundations for moving forward toward a shared vision for the College. Critical in this process will be decisions about what that vision should be, how to reach it collaboratively, and how we will fund or support it.

Next steps will be critical to continue to enhance the work-life satisfaction of colleagues (see Appendix for a Task List with recommendations, goals, and measurable outcomes). Going forward, the Working Group will attempt to facilitate implementation of the recommendations and to monitor their progress and success.
## APPENDIX: TASK LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Who needs to be involved</th>
<th>Short term goal</th>
<th>Medium/Long term goal</th>
<th>Measurable outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Reduce Faculty Workload: Teaching Load</td>
<td>Provost’s Office Faculty Senate PSC</td>
<td>Reduce teaching load</td>
<td>CUNY contract changes to formally reduce teaching load across university</td>
<td>Increased faculty satisfaction on nearly all ratings in the next COACHE survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reduce Faculty Workload: Service</td>
<td>Provost’s Office Faculty Senate Council of Chairs FPC</td>
<td>Finalize and analyze results of faculty committee service survey; streamline faculty service; Distribute service evenly among faculty at all levels (department and College); Identify and reward “hidden” service</td>
<td>Structure the service workload so that small departments are not disadvantaged; Place a clear definition and value of service in the tenure and promotion process</td>
<td>Increased faculty satisfaction with service in the next COACHE survey; More explicit recognition of “hidden” service in personnel process; More robust participation in service commitments; More diverse representation of faculty on committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Reduce Faculty Workload: Support Student Learning and Success</td>
<td>Provost’s Office Student Affairs Faculty Senate Office of Undergraduate Studies Office of Graduate Studies</td>
<td>Provide more resources to student support services so as to use faculty time more efficiently</td>
<td>Engage in a comprehensive review of all student support services to ensure that important student support programs are appropriately funded</td>
<td>Increased faculty satisfaction with teaching in the next COACHE survey; Increase in students accessing services; Gradual improvement of student skills and success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reduce Faculty Workload: Address Work-Life Balance in Meaningful Ways</td>
<td>Provost’s Office Human Resources Faculty Senate Council of Chairs FPC PSC</td>
<td>Proactive dissemination of human resource policies; Create informal and formal opportunities for building relationships among faculty, staff and senior administrators; Encourage departments to assist faculty in managing work-life balance</td>
<td>Engage in a salary compression analysis; Revisit FPC guidelines to allow for better work-life balance; Advocate for CUNY-wide benefits such as: a spousal hiring policy, tuition remission or reduction for faculty children, and a housing program</td>
<td>Increased faculty satisfaction with work-life balance on next COACHE survey; Increased faculty retention, as engaged and satisfied faculty remain over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Who needs to be involved</td>
<td>Short term goal</td>
<td>Medium/Long term goal</td>
<td>Measurable outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Increase Transparency of Personnel Process</td>
<td>Provost’s Office FPC Faculty Senate Center for Advancement of Teaching</td>
<td>Create an FPC website with all policies, deadlines and flowchart; Recruit and select model form Cs for dissemination; Host regular information sessions for faculty approaching personnel actions; Hold open consultation prior to any personnel guidelines change; Disseminate guidelines before yearly submission deadlines; Create and appoint faculty affairs and development position; Offer more feedback to candidates earlier in the personnel process; Teach department chairs “best practices” in supporting faculty; Support faculty in transitioning departments</td>
<td>Make all deadlines the same, year to year; Separate and clarify information/guidelines/timelines on tenure, promotion to associate and promotion to full professor; Publish annual statistical reports of FPC actions; Provide a “package” for newly tenured/promoted faculty; Consider establishing domains of excellence for promotion</td>
<td>Fewer queries to Provost’s Office; Fewer appeals; More frequent success in applications for Full professor; Greater faculty satisfaction on next COACHE survey with the personnel process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Support Subgroups: Women, Faculty of Color and Associate Professors</td>
<td>Provost’s Office Office of Compliance and Diversity Faculty Senate OAR</td>
<td>Initiate ongoing campus conversations about race, with specific initiatives and timelines; Recognize, reward and guide “hidden service”; Operationalize and proactively develop our identity as an HSI and MSI; Provide increased mentoring, travel, and OAR opportunities to all</td>
<td>Strategically plan to recruit and retain FOC; Include questions regarding LGBTQ and adjunct faculty experiences on the next COACHE survey</td>
<td>Increased satisfaction by these subgroups in the next COACHE survey; Increased hiring and retention of FOC; Inclusion of questions on LGBTQ and adjunct faculty experiences on next COACHE survey; Higher retention and graduation rates for Hispanic and Minority students as HSI and MSI initiatives gain traction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Who needs to be involved</td>
<td>Short term goal</td>
<td>Medium/Long term goal</td>
<td>Measurable outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Increase Administrative Transparency</td>
<td>Provost’s Office Faculty Senate Office of Budget and Planning</td>
<td>Provide greater budgetary transparency</td>
<td>Align the College budget to our mission</td>
<td>Greater perceptions of administrative transparency on the next COACHE survey; Broader participation of more faculty members in budgetary consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. What is our Identity – And What do we Value?</td>
<td>President’s Office Provost’s Office Faculty Senate, College Council</td>
<td>Include discussions of college identity in all ongoing discussions on college governance;</td>
<td>Identify a shared vision for the future of the College through community debate and discourse; Align college policies, decisions and funding with college identity</td>
<td>Increased consistency in faculty perceptions of college identity and institutional goals; Greater perceptions of shared College community vision for College future on the next COACHE survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>