

# COACHE: Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (2023)



**LaGUARDIA**  
COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Instructional Staff Meeting  
November 1, 2023

## COACHE TEAM COMMITTEE MEMBERS

- hara bastas, Former Faculty Council President, Social Science Department,
  - Cristina Bruns, Senate Chair, English Department
  - Tara Coleman, Faculty Council Secretary, English Department
  - Dianne Gordon Conyers, Co-Chair of the Senate Committee of Faculty, Library
  - Rochell Isaac, President of Faculty Council, English Department
  - Nava Lerer, Dean of Institutional Effectiveness
  - Billie Gastic Rosado, Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs
- 
- Members of all college COACHE Task Forces will be posted on the [CUNY COACHE webpage](#)

## **Benchmarks & Thematic Breakouts**

- COACHE defines an area of strength as any Benchmark where LaGuardia scores first or second among our comparison group in the top 30%. An area of concern is where faculty rating of a Benchmark is 5th or 6<sup>th</sup> among our peers and on the bottom 30%.
- Each survey theme is identified as a Benchmark (the mean of several 5-point Likert scale survey questions). The Benchmark score gives us a sense of how faculty feel about some aspect of work/life at LaGuardia. The 25 COACHE benchmarks were collapsed to 7 themes.

## **Cohorts and Peers**

- The Cohort is all 8 community colleges participating in COACHE in 2022/23 while our peers are 5 selected comparison institutions chosen by us.
- "Underrepresented minorities" (URM) are individuals who identify as neither White, non-Hispanic nor Asian/Asian-American.
- Faculty of Color are those individuals not categorized as White, non-Hispanic. Asians were counted as Faculty of Color but also reported separately.
- Please note that unless the responses in the related items provided particularly important insights, we only used the benchmark items.

# Understanding the COACHE Data

## Peer Institutions (2023)

- Borough Of Manhattan Community College, CUNY (2023)
- Bronx Community College, CUNY (2023)
- Hostos Community College, CUNY (2023)
- Kingsborough Community College, CUNY (2023)
- Queensborough Community College, CUNY (2023)

# Cohort Institutions

- Amarillo College (2022)
- CUNY - Borough of Manhattan Community College (2023)
- CUNY - Bronx Community College (2023)
- CUNY - Guttman Community College (2023)
- CUNY - Hostos Community College (2023)
- CUNY - Kingsborough Community College (2023)
- CUNY - Queensborough Community College (2023)
- Perimeter College at Georgia State University (2023)

*\*As only 8 community colleges participated in the COACHE Survey, the five comparable CUNY community colleges are already included as peers. Therefore, the cohort data are not useful.*

# COACHE 2023 Response Rates

Response Rates												
		overall	tenured	pre-tenure	full	assoc	men	women	white	FOC	Asian	URM
LaGuardia	population	336	287	48	176	106	143	185	177	155	67	88
	responders	185	153	31	106	57	62	115	108	73	35	38
	response rate	55%	53%	65%	60%	54%	43%	62%	61%	47%	52%	43%
Selected Comparison Institutions	population	1557	1280	266	433	527	733	795	859	659	212	447
	responders	669	528	130	199	235	285	357	348	287	82	205
	response rate	43%	41%	49%	46%	45%	39%	45%	41%	44%	39%	46%
Cohort Comparison Institutions	population	2134	1594	432	528	714	967	1122	1268	825	244	581
	responders	1025	720	240	261	353	415	569	607	382	102	280
	response rate	48%	45%	56%	49%	49%	43%	51%	48%	46%	42%	48%

# List of Themes and Benchmarks

Themes	Benchmarks
Nature of Work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Research</li><li>• Service</li><li>• Teaching</li></ul>
Resources and Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Facilities and work resources</li><li>• Personal and family policies</li><li>• Health and retirement benefits</li></ul>
Cross-Silo Work and Mentorship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Interdisciplinary work</li><li>• Collaboration</li><li>• Mentoring</li></ul>
Tenure and Promotion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Tenure policies</li><li>• Tenure expectations</li><li>• Promotion to full</li></ul>
Institutional Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Senior Leadership</li><li>• Divisional (School/College) Leadership</li><li>• Departmental Leadership</li><li>• Faculty Leadership</li></ul>
Shared Governance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Trust</li><li>• Shared sense of purpose</li><li>• Understanding the issue at hand</li><li>• Adaptability</li><li>• Productivity</li></ul>
The Department	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Engagement</li><li>• Quality</li><li>• Collegiality</li></ul>
Appreciation and Recognition	Has no benchmarks
Retention and Negotiation	Has no benchmarks



## Areas of Strength (All Faculty Combined)

- Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose
- Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand
- Interdisciplinary Work
- Tenure Expectations: Clarity





## Areas of Concern (All Faculty Combined)

- Departmental Collegiality
- Health and Retirement Benefits
- Leadership: Departmental
- Mentoring
- Nature of Work: Research
- Nature of Work: Service
- Nature of Work: Teaching
- Personal and Family Policies

# Themes and Benchmarks I

Theme	Benchmark	2023	2019	All CUNY Peers	Observations
Nature of Work	Teaching	3.59	3.57	3.68	<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discretion over course content and teaching schedules</li> </ul> <p>Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for teaching online/hybrid courses</li> <li>• Time Spent on administrative tasks</li> <li>• Ability to balance teaching/research/service</li> </ul>
	Service	3.19	3.10	3.32	<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discretion to choose committees</li> </ul> <p>Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for faculty in leadership roles</li> <li>• Support for being a good advisor</li> </ul>
	Research	2.80	2.99	3.03	<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Influence over focus of research</li> </ul> <p>Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for travel to present/conduct research</li> <li>• Availability of course release for research</li> </ul>

# Themes and Benchmarks II

Theme	Benchmark	2023	2019	All CUNY Peers	Observations
<b>Resources and Support</b>	Health and Retirement Benefits	3.5	3.6	3.7	This benchmark was flagged as an area of concern by COACHE, when compared to peers. The benchmark and the health benefits items are especially negative for URM faculty.
	Facilities and Work Resources	3.3	3.4	3.3	Strengths: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Library Resources</li> <li>• Offices</li> </ul> Concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Laboratory, research, studio space</li> <li>• Equipment</li> </ul>
	Personal and Family Policies	2.9	3.0	3.2	Strengths: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stop the Clock Policies</li> <li>• Family medical/parental leave</li> </ul> Concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing Benefits/Eldercare/Childcare</li> </ul>

# Themes and Benchmarks III

Theme	Benchmark	2023	2019	All CUNY Peers	Observations
<b>Cross-Silo Work and Mentorship</b>	Collaboration	3.6	3.6	3.5	Strengths: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunities for collaboration within and outside the dept</li> </ul>
	Mentoring	3.3	3.4	3.3	Strengths: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effectiveness of mentoring within departments</li> <li>• Effectiveness of mentoring outside departments</li> </ul> Concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for faculty to be good mentors</li> <li>• Mentoring of tenured associate faculty in departments</li> </ul>
	Interdisciplinary Work	2.9	2.9	2.7	Strengths: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interdisciplinary work is rewarded in tenure and promotion</li> </ul> Concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budgets encourage interdisciplinary work</li> <li>• Facilities conducive to interdisciplinary work</li> </ul>

# Themes and Benchmarks IV

Theme	Benchmark	2023	2019	All CUNY Peers	Observations
Tenure and Promotion	Clarity	4.1	3.5	3.7	Strengths: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarity of Expectations</li> </ul>
	Tenure Policies	3.7	3.3	3.7	Strengths: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarity of tenure process and Criteria</li> <li>Consistency of messages about tenure</li> </ul> Concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarity of body of evidence for deciding tenure</li> <li>Clarity of whether I will receive tenure</li> </ul>
	Promotion to Full	3.6	3.6	3.6	Strengths: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dept. culture encourages promotion</li> <li>Clarity of promotion process and criteria</li> <li>Clarity of time frame for promotion</li> </ul> Concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarity of whether I will be promoted</li> </ul>

# Themes and Benchmarks V

Theme	Benchmark	2023	2019	All CUNY Peers	Observations
Institutional Leadership	Leadership: Departmental	3.7	3.5	3.8	Strengths: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Head/Chair: Ensuring faculty input</li> <li>Head/Chair: Fairness in evaluating work</li> </ul> Concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tenured faculty gave lower scores to all items</li> </ul>
	Leadership: Faculty	3.6	3.4	3.4	This benchmark does not include individual items, but should be considered as a strength (it is higher than peers and improved since 2019)
	Leadership: Senior	3.2	3.3	3.1	Strengths: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CAO: Pace of decision making</li> <li>CAO: Stated priorities and communication of priorities</li> </ul>
	Related Items (Consists of 4 items that are notably different than the benchmarks)	3.9	3.7	4.0	Strength: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Visible leadership for the support of diversity</li> </ul> Concerns:
		2.7	3.1	2.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Priorities are acted on consistently</li> </ul>
		2.7	2.7	2.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changed priorities negatively impact my work</li> </ul>
		2.8	3.1	3.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Priorities are stated consistently</li> </ul>

# Themes and Benchmarks VI

Theme	Benchmark	2023	2019	All CUNY Peers	Observations
<b>Shared Governance</b>	Governance: Productivity	3.4	3.2	3.2	Strengths: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall effectiveness of shared governance</li> <li>• Committees make measurable progress towards goals</li> <li>• Public recognition of progress</li> </ul>
	Governance: Trust	3.2	3.0	3.0	Strengths: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty and admin follow rules of engagement</li> <li>• I understand how to voice opinions about policies</li> <li>• Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith</li> </ul> Concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration</li> </ul>
	Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand	3.2	3.0	2.9	Strengths: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input</li> <li>• Faculty and admin define decision criteria together</li> </ul>
	Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose	3.1	3.0	2.9	Strengths: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility</li> <li>• Faculty and admin respectfully consider the other's view</li> </ul> Concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Important decisions are not made until there is consensus</li> </ul>
	Governance: Adaptability	3.1	3.0	2.9	Strength: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shared governance holds up in unusual circumstances</li> </ul>

# Themes and Benchmarks VII

Theme	Benchmark	2023	2019	All CUNY Peers	Observations
<b>The Department</b>  <b>The Department themes and benchmarks are rated negatively compared to LaGuardia Peers. Most ratings dropped slightly compared to 2019</b>	Departmental Collegiality	3.8	3.9	4.0	Strengths: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Colleagues committed to diversity/inclusion</li> <li>• Department is collegial</li> </ul> Concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amount of personal interaction with pre-tenure faculty</li> <li>• Colleagues pitch in when needed</li> <li>• Colleagues support work/life balance</li> </ul>
	Departmental Engagement	3.7	3.8	3.8	Strengths: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussions of undergrad student learning and effective teaching practices, were rated higher than other items in the benchmark, but lower than 2019.</li> </ul> Concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussions of current research methods</li> </ul>
	Departmental Quality	3.6	3.8	3.7	Strengths: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty</li> <li>• Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty</li> </ul> Concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dept. addresses sub-standard performance</li> </ul>



# Themes and Benchmarks VII. 2

Theme	Benchmark	2023	2019	All CUNY Peers	Observations
The Department	Related Items	3.7	3.7	3.8	Strengths:
		3.7	3.7	3.7	
		2.9	3.2	2.9	Concerns:
		2.8	2.9	3.0	

## Strengths:

- Intellectual vitality of non-tenured faculty
- Teaching effectiveness of non-tenured faculty

## Concerns:

- Recruiting part-time faculty
- Managing part-time faculty

# Best Aspects of Working at LaGuardia

- Quality of Colleagues
  - Quality of Students
  - Support of Colleagues (Asian Faculty)
  - Geographic Location
- 
- FOC identified diversity as a best aspect (URM and Asian included) as did full and pre-tenured faculty
  - Women identified Academic Freedom as a best aspect as did White faculty

## Top Best Aspects

- All Faculty selected quality of Colleagues as one of the two top best aspects
- Quality of undergraduate students was second for most groups (and very close for full professors and men)
- Support of colleagues was top for Asian faculty by far

	Best Aspects of Working at LaGuardia - top five items for all groups										
	All Faculty	Tenure	Pre-tenure	Full Prof	Associate	Men	Women	White	FOC	Asian	URM
Quality of colleagues	33%	34%	29%	38%	29%	32%	34%	34%	33%	24%	42%
Quality of undergraduate students	23%	21%	29%	19%	25%	20%	24%	24%	22%	12%	32%
Support of colleagues	19%	18%	19%	21%	11%	21%	17%	19%	19%	29%	11%
Geographic location	19%	19%	16%	18%	20%	18%	19%	20%	18%	24%	13%
Academic freedom	18%	18%	16%	19%	16%	12%	21%	22%	14%	12%	16%
Diversity	17%	16%	19%	20%	11%	12%	19%	14%	21%	21%	21%
My sense of "fit" here	12%	10%	19%	10%	13%	20%	9%	14%	10%	9%	11%
Opportunities to collaborate with colleagues	10%	10%	6%	9%	9%	7%	11%	6%	15%	21%	11%

# Worst Aspects of Working At LaGuardia

- Teaching Load
- Service (too much)
- Lack of Support for Research (Full Professor)
- Cost of Living, Compensation, Commute and Quality of Facilities were also worst aspects but on a lesser scale.

## Top Worst Aspects

- Faculty selected teaching load and too much service as the top two worst aspects
- Men were the only group that did not select teaching load as a top aspect
- A considerably higher proportion of Asian faculty selected too much service

	Worst Aspects of Working at LaGuardia										
	All Faculty	Tenure	Pre-tenure	Full Prof	Associate	Men	Women	White	FOC	Asian	URM
Teaching load	29%	29%	26%	32%	31%	14%	34%	28%	31%	26%	34%
Too much service/too many assignments	28%	27%	32%	29%	29%	25%	29%	25%	32%	41%	24%
Lack of support for research/creative work	15%	18%	3%	19%	13%	14%	17%	17%	12%	9%	16%
Compensation	13%	13%	10%	10%	11%	14%	12%	13%	14%	12%	16%
Commute	13%	15%	6%	17%	11%	18%	11%	16%	11%	15%	8%
Quality of facilities	12%	10%	23%	9%	13%	16%	11%	14%	11%	9%	13%
Cost of living	12%	13%	10%	15%	5%	18%	10%	16%	8%	9%	8%
Tenure/promotion clarity or requirements	6%	4%	13%	2%	15%	4%	7%	3%	8%	12%	5%

### Best and worst Aspects compared to CUNY Peers

	Top 4 best aspects			Top 4 worst aspects	
	LaGuardia Faculty	CUNY Peers Rank*		LaGuardia Faculty	CUNY Peers Rank*
Quality of colleagues	33%	5	Teaching load	29%	2
Quality of undergraduate students	23%	4	Too much service/too many assignments	28%	2
Support of colleagues	19%	4	Lack of support for research/creative work	15%	3
Geographic location	19%	4	Compensation	13%	4
Academic freedom	18%	2	Commute	13%	1
Diversity	17%	1	Quality of facilities	12%	4
			Cost of living	12%	4
			Quality of undergraduate students	7%	1

\* The total number of times an item appeared as a top four item amongst any of your five peer institutions



### Best and Worst Aspects Compared to Peers



The top Best Aspects are similar for LaGuardia and CUNY peers unlike the top Worst aspects which are dissimilar



LaGuardia Faculty selected teaching load and too much service as the two worst aspects, while they were selected as top by 2 of the 5 peers



Compensation, quality of facilities, and cost of living were selected by 4 CUNY peers as the top worst aspects, but as 4<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> at LaGuardia

# LaGuardia Custom questions (% strongly agree and somewhat agree)

Faculty of color are mentored to assume roles with increasing leadership responsibilities — 32%

The input of faculty of color is solicited on a regular basis — 42%

I have been discounted or ignored after expressing my ideas or sharing my comments because of my race/ethnicity — 14%

I have been discounted or ignored after expressing my ideas or sharing my comments because of my gender — 22%

My department has been instrumental in assisting me with maintaining a balance between career and personal/family obligations — 40%

## 2023 to 2019 Comparison

- There is a considerable improvement for leadership mentoring and soliciting input from faculty of color, and for the department assisting in maintaining work/life balance
- Being discounted because of race/color remained similar hovering around 17%-19%
- Being discounted because of gender declined by 4%: Women (11%), Associate professors (5%), tenured (10%)

## A Summary of the five LaGuardia Custom Questions

<b>Strongly agree/ agree responses</b>	<b>2023</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>2023 - 2019</b>
<b>At LaGuardia Community College, faculty of color are mentored to assume roles with increasing leadership responsibilities.</b>	39.9%	30.0%	9.9%
<b>At LaGuardia Community College, the input of faculty of color is solicited on a regular basis.</b>	49.7%	36.8%	12.9%
<b>At LaGuardia Community College, I have been discounted or ignored after expressing my ideas or sharing my comments because of my race/ethnicity.</b>	17.2%	18.6%	-1.4%
<b>At LaGuardia Community College, I have been discounted or ignored after expressing my ideas or sharing my comments because of my gender.</b>	24.1%	28.5%	-4.4%
<b>My department has been instrumental in assisting me with maintaining a balance between career and personal/family obligations.</b>	42.9%	31.5%	11.5%
Declined to answer and not applicable are excluded from the base			



## College Action from COACHE 2015 Data

### To address Workload, Budget and Support concerns

- Reassigned time instituted for 6th-year faculty to support research/creative work when contractual released time expired
- Travel funding was increased (registration fee from 40% to 75% for 2<sup>nd</sup> conference)
- Increased reassigned time for Program Directors and new formula to ensure equity among programs
- Expanded what counted as contributions in the annual evaluation categories leading to reductions in college service requirements
- Academic Budget Working Group created to improve consultation with governance relating to the Academic Affairs Budget (Fall 2018)
- Former Provost, Paul Arcario, launched the Provost Spotlight web radio focused on acknowledging and celebration faculty work (Spring 2018)

# College Action from COACHE 2015 Data

To address Tenure and Promotion Issues

A re-assessment of the teaching annual evaluation via the Provost Learning Space to include stronger faculty voice

Joint workshops offered for the first time to all department P&B committees to ensure consistent information was being shared, Spring 2018.



## College Action from COACHE 2015 Data

### To address matters of equity

- Outside consultants were hired to conduct faculty roundtables to assess gender and racial equity issues
- SURJ (Showing Up for Racial Justice) campus chapter was created
- Faculty & Staff of Color Collective was launched
- Faculty & Staff of Color Collective survey administered
- Consultant hired as Support Liaison for faculty/staff in Fall 2018
- A survey comparable to COACHE was developed and launched
- Workshop conducted for Academic Chairs and Deans

## College Action from COACHE 2019 Data

- Executive Director of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) position created and filled
  - Survey comparable to COACHE. The Employee Engagement Survey, developed and administered for staff
  - New survey instrument designed and implemented for student evaluation, SET, (formally SIRS) for more holistic perspective and to address bias against women and faculty of color
  - The leadership criteria for promotion to full was expanded from simply “College-wide” to include leadership in Teaching, Departmental, Student Guidance and Scholarly Work.
- 
- Important to not that the College’s Response to 2019 data stalled due to the pandemic along with the search for a new provost.

# CUNY Task Force Response to COACHE 2019 Data



What is the one  
thing your  
institution could  
do to improve  
the workplace  
for faculty?

2023	2019
<b>Nature of work: Teaching--23%</b>	Nature of Work: Teaching-33%
<b>Facilities and resources for work--20%</b>	Nature of Work: General-25%
<b>Nature of Work (general)--17%</b>	Nature of Work: Service-18%
<b>Culture--16%</b>	Facilities and resources for work-17%
<b>Leadership (general)-14%</b>	Nature of Work: Research-15%

## In The Words of Faculty

- Not clear how people get into and get credited for "leadership" which seems an important criteria for promotion. I feel that I have engaged in "leadership" and that I have been passed over some opportunities that would have been a good match based on my qualifications, experiences, background (e.g. global learning, international studies).
- Demonstrate a deeper commitment to diversity, equity and inclusion and remove the bullies that appear invested in as leaders. We need to stop performative acts such as creating job titles that have no legs. People cannot be placed in roles and not given the resources/infrastructure to get the job done. We may be diverse, but not so much inclusive and equitable.
- Recognize that faculty need work/life balance and full travel funding for one conference per year.
- Be more transparent about decisions and not let tenured faculty who have been at LaGuardia for 20+ years have all the power automatically (this is what is done in my department).

## In The Words of Faculty II

- Be less restrictive about online teaching -- many students want it and many faculty want it. Yes, we need to ensure students know what they are signing up for with online classes, and true, we should still have a robust offering of in-person classes, but restricting highly competent faculty to just one online class per semester (and then allowing less well qualified faculty to pick up the others) while watching in-person sections get cancelled due to low registration is just infuriating.
- Provide an opportunity for colleagues to meet and greet, such as a social, that is outside of a business meeting like opening and closing sessions. this would allow colleagues to get to know each other, promote collaboration, and potentially improve engagement across campus. a welcoming environment is more than smiling faces, it's a sense of belonging, not feeling on the outside of already formed silos.
- Provide checks and balances for department chairs. Currently, department chairs at my institution make decisions with impunity and no need be given for reasons behind any decisions. Release time and other resources and funds are awarded as a reward or to friends and is removed as a punishment for perceived slights...
- Prioritize student learning above all else. This includes realizing that many of our policies are not helping students achieve the learning objectives of our courses. Faculty have been reducing the amount of reading, writing, and difficulty of assignments for years now but performance is at an all time low. But the amount of time we are asked to spend in meetings and on administrative work that \*has absolutely zero positive effect\* on student performance is astounding... Instead, the college should study the unique conditions under which our students and faculty thrive. Studying these conditions might also involve understanding the type of community college we have been (the co-op model was once LaGuardia's defining feature--is there a way to update that model for 2023 and beyond?) and then creating a clearer vision for the kind of institution we want to be going forward.



# Take the Poll

- Based on the COACHE data, which two “areas of concern” need to be given priority?
- Consider your own concerns as a LaGuardia faculty member, what issues remain that were not showcased in the COACHE data?
- <https://forms.office.com/r/Ed6cPKvk5k>

COACHE Response Poll



An hourglass with white sand is positioned on the left side of the slide. In the background, a calendar is visible with dates 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 29, 30, and 31. A large red rectangular box is overlaid on the center-left, containing the title text.

# COACHE TIMELINE 2023-24!

- March/April 2023 :Faculty Survey Administered
- September 2023: COACHE reports/data shared with faculty
- November 2023-February 2024 (COACHE on every Department's Agenda)
- February 2024- Department Recommendations submitted to Faculty Council Reps
- Fall 2023: Faculty Council and the COACHE committee facilitate:
  - (1) **Instructional Staff Presentation**, November 1<sup>st</sup>
  - (2) **Yammer/ Viva Engage** on Friday, November 3<sup>rd</sup>, 11-2pm
  - (3) **3 in- person focus groups:**
    - Faculty of Color: Thursday, November 16 at 11am
    - Pre-tenured Faculty: Thursday, December 7 at 11am
    - Tenured Faculty: Thursday, December 7<sup>th</sup> at 2:30pm

# Benchmark Comparisons, Part 1

	CUNY Overall		Senior Colleges		Community Colleges		Specialized Programs	
	2015-2019	2019-2023	2015-2019	2019-2023	2015-2019	2019-2023	2015-2019	2019-2023
Nature of Work - Service							0.12	-0.11
Nature of Work - Teaching	0.15		0.14		0.18			-0.34
Nature of Work - Research						-0.14		-0.14
Facilities And Work Resources								
Personal And Family Benefits	0.10				0.10		0.11	0.11
Health And Retirement Benefits	0.17		0.17		0.15		0.37	
Interdisciplinary Work								
Collaboration							0.11	
Mentoring								-0.13
Tenure Policies	0.11	0.12	0.10		0.14	0.23		
Tenure Clarity		0.12				0.21		
Promotion							0.11	

Legend:	
Blank cell	No difference
Green cell	Small to Moderate difference (eff size .1 - .5) 2019>2015 or 2023>2019
Red cell	Small to Moderate difference (eff size .1 - .5) 2019<2015 or 2023<2019
Grey	Insufficient data or NA

# Benchmark Comparisons, Part 2

	CUNY Overall		Senior Colleges		Community Colleges		Specialized Programs	
	2015-2019	2019-2023	2015-2019	2019-2023	2015-2019	2019-2023	2015-2019	2019-2023
Senior Leadership	0.11	-0.22	0.12	-0.21		-0.26		-0.11
Division Leadership		0.13		0.14			0.22	-0.30
Departmental Leadership						0.11	0.26	
Faculty Leadership	0.12		0.11				0.33	-0.32
Departmental Engagement							-0.11	
Departmental Quality					0.15		0.14	
Departmental Collegiality							0.17	-0.17
Appreciation And Recognition								-0.22
Governance Trust		-0.16		-0.19		-0.11	0.24	-0.16
Governance Purpose	0.11	-0.22	0.12	-0.23		-0.21	0.20	-0.11
Governance Understanding	0.11	-0.17	0.10	-0.19	0.10	-0.14	0.22	-0.13
Governance Adaptability	0.11	-0.15		-0.13	0.14	-0.17	0.24	-0.41
Governance Productivity	0.12	-0.15	0.11	-0.15		-0.14	0.35	-0.36

Legend:	
Blank cell	No difference
Green cell	Small to Moderate difference (eff size .1 - .5) 2019>2015 or 2023>2019
Red cell	Small to Moderate difference (eff size .1 - .5) 2019<2015 or 2023<2019
Grey	Insufficient data or NA

The background features a series of concentric circles in light gray, some solid and some dashed, creating a ripple effect. A large, solid red oval is positioned in the center-right of the frame. A dark gray, curved shape, resembling a thick comma or a stylized 'C', is located to the left of the red oval, partially overlapping it.

Thank you!