COACHE Service Subcommitee Report Submitted

May 13, 2024 by:

Loren Cohen, Business Management

Daniel H. Katz, Ph.D., Director, Office of Diplomatic Engagement and Training, Center for Continuing Education and Workforce Development

Shamira Malekar, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Business Management

Brenda K. Vollman, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Social Sciences, Human Services and *Criminal Justice*

Contents

Key suggestions for improvement

- There should be training and compensation for the service work and integrated into requirements for promotions and tenure.

- A lot more reassigned time for service and service requirements should be commensurate with departmental size, teaching load and in line with transparent criteria.

- Recognition for excellence in service can create additional motivation in faculty with an Outstanding Service/ Engagement Award or an Excellence in Advising Award.
- Remote meetings and service are more effective, achieve greater outcomes and have positive experiences for faculty and students.
- Clarify the student centric purpose of service and align the wider team towards standardized expectations.
- BMCC and departments should explore additional meaningful service opportunities to better engage and reward contributions.
- Department chairs should clearly and transparently communicate service expectations to faculty that promotes departmental culture.
- Publish a list of college-wide service opportunities to encourage involvement and generate interest.

Key observations from qualitative data

High workload and lack of recognition
- There is no recognition for excellence in service.
- Given the increase in administrative work, faculty believe there is not enough time to serve on committees.
- Service expectations are not adjusted for teaching load.
- Administrative and academic departments need to shoulder similar service expectations.
- Service does not count towards promotions, tenure or compensation and detracts from core academic accountability.

Effectiveness of outcomes
- Some faculty members advise and mentor students outside of their discipline and feel advice is better handled by the Advisement Office.
- Remote meetings are effective and ensure wider coverage.
- In some cases, there is less concern for service and committees are not aligned to a common purpose.
- There is too much focus on service that has no value added outcome.
- Service requirements are not standardized and clarity is needed to improve appropriate assignment of service.

Gender related
- View that male faculty are more recognized for committee membership, which may be less work than student advising and more valid service work.
- Belief that women of color received heavier service responsibilities than men and white faculty.
- Questioning the comparative amount and variety of service can produce marginalization, exclusion, microaggressions, blatant hostility, discrimination, and inequitable treatment.
- Belief that women do the majority of service work, specifically student advising and non-committee service, which is more valid and challenging.

Key observations from Quantitative data

OVERALL SERVICE MEASURE:
This first section is an analysis, on the Overall measures of satisfaction with Service responsibilities at BMCC (listed below with mean scores., from lowest to highest). The *order* of low scores by demographic group has changed slightly since 2019. Associates are still least satisfied, and Non-Tenure Track are still most satisfied. This (Table 1) is the ranking from least to most on the overall measure of service in 2019 and (Parentheses = 2023 group).

TABLE 1.Demographic Group ranking changes 2019 – 2023, least satisfied to most.					
2019	(2023)	2019	(2023)	2019	(2023)
1. Assoc	(Assoc)	5. Pre	(URM +1)	9. Men	(Pre +4)
2. Women	(Whites -1)	6. Tenured	(Men -3)	10. Asian	(Asian)
3. Whites	(Tenured -3)	7. FOC	(Full -1)	11. NTT	(NTT)
4. URM	(Women +2)	8. Full	(FOC +1)		

Seen in Table 1, men have dropped (-3), followed by tenured (-2) then full and whites (-1). Pre-tenured (+4), Women (+2) and Faculty of Color (+1) have increased. I think these are actually changes in the right direction, in that women and FOC can often have service dumped on them without support, as well as Pre-tenure. The fact that men and whites are lower

on the ranking of satisfaction with service is not necessarily a problem. Nor is it a problem that Full professors may be balancing the weight of service. It may mean that service is becoming more equitable regardless of demographic groups.

That said, *overall scores are low*, hovering around midpoint on the scale of 1 (least satisfied) – 5 (most satisfied). *All but one* group has decreased (Pre-Tenure) since 2019. All but two groups (Pre-Tenure and Non-Tenure track) present lower scores than the overall for peers. (Table 2) It is most notable that Faculty of Color are least changed (-.03) scores since 2019, followed by Asians (-.04), Underrepresented Minorities (URM) (-.06) and women (-.07). Compared to peers, URM (-.03) followed by Full Professors (-.05), Asians (-.06), and women (-.07) are least different from peers overall. (Table 2)

TABLE 2. Overall Measure of Satisfaction (2023): Lowest to Highest, with score changes from 2019 & (compared to peers)
Scale 1 (least satisfied) - 5 (most satisfied) on 11 measures
BMCC Overall (3.19) Mean scores -.11 than the previous study (2019) and lower than peers currently (−.13)
1. (2.84) Associate Professors are -.24 since 2019. This is -.22 compared to the demographic category (whites) and are the most dramatically lower (-.41) than peers.
2. (3.06) Whites have a notable decrease -.18 since 2019 within BMCC as well as compared to peers (-.26)
3. (3.12) Tenured professors have same decrease -.18 as Whites since 2019, and are also less satisfied than peers (-.15)
4. (3.16) Women have decreased only slightly, -.07, and are slightly less satisfied that peers (-.07)
5. (3.23) Underrepresented Minorities scored -.06 compared to 2019, similar to Asians & FOC, and are only slightly less satisfied than peers (-.03)
6. (3.24) Men [median]are -.22, since 2019 (similar to Associates) are less satisfied than peers. (-.26) (equally to whites)
7. (3.30) Full Professors are -.15 since 2019, similarly to whites & tenured professors, & like women, only -.05 compared to peers.
8. (3.36) Faculty of color change is close to zero (-.03) and nominally beter than peers (.+.02)
9. (3.41) Pre-Tenure track is the most positively changed since 2019 **(+.14)** and relative to peers **+.04**
10. (3.45) Asian change is small (-.04,) like POC, compared to 2019, & they are only slightly less satisfied than peers (-.06)
11. (3.82) Non-Tenure Track change , down notably -.15 since 2019, yet has highest + mean difference compared to peers **(+.06)**

Table 3 shows us that we are most likely to lose Associates to other institutions, followed by men and whites. This seems reiterated in the dramatic changes in overall satisfaction since 2019.

Table 3. Order of Most Notable decreases since 2019 and lower score differences from peers (less satisfied):	
Decreases since 2019:	Lower score differences from peers (less
1. Associate (-.24)	1. Associate (-.41)
2. Men (-.22)	2. Men AND Whites (-.26)
3. Whites & Women (-.18)	3. Tenured (-.15)
4. Full Professors & Nontenure Track (-.15)	

SPECIFIC SERVICE MEASURES:

This next section is an analysis of three specific questions with the lowest mean scores. They are both down from 2019 and less satisfaction than peers. Faculty are **not satisfied with support for faculty on leadership positions** (Table 4), **being a good advisor** (Tabe 5); and **equitability of committee assignments**(Table 6)**.** Scale 1 – 5 (least to most satisfied).

Table 4 shows that, on average, BMCC faculty are ***not satisfied with support for faculty in leadership roles*** (less satisfied than in 2019 and notably less satisfied than current peer institutions (-.3). *The only note of improvement since 2019, pre-tenured faculty (+.20)*

Associate professors are least satisfied with support for faculty in leadership roles at -.53 from the mean. Continuing the analysis noting other groups measuring below the dissatisfied mean at BMCC on this measure, we see whites (-.26), Tenured professors (-.16) and women (-.13) and Full Professors (-.6). Those who are slightly more satisfied on this measure. From most to least are Asians (+.51) and pre-tenured faculty (+.50), Faculty of Color (+.33), Other Underrepresented Minorites (+.26) and Men (+.21).

Table 4 _Support for faculty in leadership roles (Q55B)_		
Score = 2.52; (-.17) from 2019 (-.3) comp to peers (51.8% answered [SW+SD]) Scale 1 (least) - 5 (most)		
Mean (+ since 2019) Group		% of sample responding SomeWhat+Strongly Disagree
1.99	Assoc	(69.2%)
2.26	White	(59.1%)
2.36	Tenured	(57.6%)
2.39	Women	(55.4%)
2.46	Full Prof	(56.7%)
2.73	Men	(46.3%)
2.78	URM	(44.7%)
2.85	FOC	(42.1%)
3.02 ***+.20	pre-ten	(35.3%)
3.03	Asian	(35.5%)
NTT = N<5 NA		

Table 5 shows, on average, that BMCC faculty are **_not satisfied with support for being good advisor_** (again, less satisfied than in 2019 and compared to current peer institutions). _The only note of improvement since 2019 is for Asian faculty (+.15)._

Associate professors are again least satisfied at -.28 from the mean. We see a similar order of groups below the mean, as above. Again whites (-.17), Tenured and women (-.05) are less satisfied than other groups. Those who are slightly more satisfied on this measure shift order compared to the previous question. Identified from more satisfied to less satisfied but still above the mean on this question, are Asians (+.49), with a notable distance to the next group, FOC (+.23), pre-tenured faculty (+.15) and URM (+.12), Men (+.10),and Full Professors (+.6).

Table 5. _Support for being a good advisor (Q60H)_		
Score = 2.68; (-.10) from 2019 (-.11) comp to peers; (43.3% D+VD) & (27.7% Neither)		
Mean (+ since 2019) Group		% of sample responding Dissatisfied + Very Dissatisfied
2.40	Assoc	(55.0%)
2.51	White	(51.5%)
2.63	Tenured	(45.8%)
2.63	Women	(45.3%)
2.74	Full Prof	(41.9%)
2.78	Men	(41.5%)
2.80	URM	(36.8%)
2.83	pre-ten	(39.2%)

2.91		FOC	(33.9%)
3.17	***+.15	Asian	(26.6%)
NTT = N<5 NA			

In Table 6, we see that, on average, BMCC faculty are **_not satisfied with equitability of committee assignments_** (again, less satisfied than in 2019 and compared to current peer institutions). Associate professors are again least satisfied, being -.33 from the mean. Again whites (-.19), women (-.11) and tenured faculty (-.12) are less satisfied than other groups and fall below the dissatisfied mean on this measure. Those who are slightly more satisfied on this, order from more satisfied to less satisfied, but still above the mean on this question, are FOC and Underrepresented Minorities (+.27), pre-tenured faculty (+.26) Asians (+.25), Full Professors (+.21) and Men (+.15). I would argue that, while the measures are not stellar, the fact that there were improvements for several groups on this measure since 2019 means we may need to continue some practices.

Table 6 Equitability of committee assignments (Q60D)			
Scale 1 (least satisfied) - 5 (most satisfied)			
Score = 2.92 (-.13) since 2019 [SD high] (-.16) comp all peers; (37.8% D+VD) & (25.2% Neither)			
Mean (+ since 2019)		Group	% of sample responding Dissatisfied + Very Dissatisfied
2.59		Assoc	(46.2%)
2.73		White	(44.0%)
2.81		Women	(41.0%)
2.82		Tenured	(38.4%)
3.07		Men	(34.1%)
3.08		Non-Tenure	(0.0%)
3.13		Full Prof	(28.4%)
3.17	***+.23	Asian	(30.0%)
3.18	***+.20	pre-ten	(39.2%)
3.19	***+.12	URM	(30.2%)
3.19	***+.16	FOC	(30.2%)

Key observations from Qualitative data

Here we present a few sample quotes from the

High workload and lack of recognition

Faculty reported that there is no recognition for excellence in service. In particular, they frequently described how service is not counted towards promotion, and how teaching load is not adjusted for service workload. Overall, faculty described being overworked and undercompensated (e.g., in the form of RT) for service responsibilities.

"There are constant new initiatives starting, and faculty are asked to be involved. However, we are not compensated monetarily or in the form of reassigned time. None of this work can be done effectively because faculty are overworked. It

seems like everything is to be done for free and this is not a good model of success. Our class sizes are huge. We teach too many classes. If these initiatives are to work, the institution has to start valuing faculty and allow reassigned time for service. I would like it for research as well, but the fact that much of the service we do at [institution] is a paid position at other institutions across the country should be addressed."

"Our promotion and tenure criteria are set on the basis of PUBLICATIONS, but the everyday emphasis is on teaching and retention of students through SERVICE. Yet, there is no recognition of teaching excellence AT ALL, and there is no RT for those who engage in service. This in my view is a totally incoherent approach to treating faculty that sends a very negative message that the administration just doesn't care about the faculty."

"The college has asked faculty to take part/help with college-wide initiatives that should be the responsibilities of specific offices and/or people who should be hired for these tasks. In turn, faculty are receiving mediocre training and are also asked to train other faculty to perform these responsibilities."

Effectiveness of outcomes

Faculty reported that remote meetings are effective and ensure wider coverage. Faculty described a lack of clarity of the purpose of committees, including what service requirements are for promotion. But in particular, they noted that there is too much focus on service that has no value added outcome.

"I think most meetings (departmental included) can be on zoom. Making people come in person doesn't get lazy people to do anything but get on a train, and those of us who pitch in could be there more for our families."

"Reduce the teaching load, reduce the enrollment cap in sections, and reduce the amount of service work and administrative tasks - especially the latter, since virtually all of it serves no tangible purpose and doesn't result in anything worthwhile. We are busy enough without adding more tasks just for the sake of looking busy."

Gender related

Faculty often expressed the view that service work is not equitably distributed, and that male faculty are more recognized for their service work. Faculty described women doing the majority of service work, and especially the most time-consuming work such as student advising.

"Women still end up doing the majority of service work! Men seem to be recognized for doing very little, while women do the majority of the actually work (not just sitting on committees) as well as the majority of student advising."

"It is noticeable that the brunt of the department service work is handled by people who identify as women."