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About our audience

- Shared governance
- Autonomy
- Consumers of data

About our environment

It takes a network

- Build a flexible team
- Layered transparency
- Share data and convene

Using data with faculty

- Process matters
- Use existing structures
- Pull, not push
- Sense-making, not report-writing
- Developmental conversations
- Pedestal, not the pillory

Making meaning, not more data:
FSSE: Faculty Survey of Student Engagement

- Designed to complement the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
- Gives a snapshot of
  - Faculty perceptions of how often students engage in different activities
  - The importance faculty place on various areas of learning and development
  - The nature and frequency of student-faculty interactions
  - How faculty organize their time in and out of class
- 2014: 143 institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Engagement</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Low                | • Is this activity not aligned with institutional mission, educational goals, etc.  
|                    | • Should this change?                     |
| High               | • Are faculty values not aligned with institutional mission/goals? 
|                    | • Do faculty values need to be examined or changed?  
|                    | • What is driving this?                    |
|                    | • Are there institutional barriers (curricular, monetary, etc.) preventing students from participating?  
|                    | • Are students prepared for, aware of, or capable of participating in the activity?  
|                    | • Is there more work to be done here?  
|                    | • Is this sustainable?  
|                    | • How can we maintain?                     |

General Examples of FSSE Use

- Accreditation self-studies
- Assessment and improvement
- Curricular reform
- Faculty development programs
- Faculty workshops and retreats
- Grand proposals, applications, and progress reports
- Institutional research
- Scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) initiatives

Examples of Institutional Use

- **Quinnipiac University**: NSSE-FSSE, curricular reform, student learning plans
- **Fisk University**: annual institutional effectiveness planning, department review, FSSE-course evaluations
- **Luther College**: NSSE-FSSE subpopulation reports, Faculty Assessment Committee
- **Viterbo University**: general education study, Higher Learning Commission/North Central Association Comprehensive self-study report

New York City College of Technology

COACHE Comparison 2008-09 and 2011-12

Evolution of City Tech since 2004

- Full time faculty increased from below 300 to over 420
- College is more baccalaureate-focused
- Progress toward improvement of facilities and equipment
**Goals of COACHE Survey Administration**

- Probe results
- Gain faculty input about how to extend positive directions
- Find remedies for persistent problems

**COACHE @City Tech**

- Administered three COACHE Surveys
- Under auspices of ADVANCE grant
  - Spring 2009 untenured faculty
  - Spring 2009 tenured faculty
- Under auspices of CUNY
  - Spring 2012 tenured faculty

**COACHE provides data for the following Key Domains/Themes**

- Tenure and Promotion
  - Clear expectations, reasonable expectations

- Nature of Your Work
  - Time
  - Teaching load
  - Quality of support

- Policies and Practices
  - Support for work (e.g., mentoring, grant assistance)
  - Work/life balance

**COACHE provides data for the following Key Domains/Themes**

- Climate, Culture, and Collegiality
  - Colleagues
  - Departmental
  - Institutional

- Global Satisfaction
  - Department
  - Institution

**COACHE Respondents**

- 2008-2009
  - Pre-tenured
    - Population: 62 (31 Females; 31 Males)
    - Responders: 34 (21 Females; 13 Males)
    - Response Rate: 54.8%
  - Tenured
    - Population: 200 (77 Females; 123 Males)
    - Responders: 99 (43 Females; 56 Males)
    - Response Rate: 49.5%

- 2011-2012
  - Tenured
    - Population: 205 (90 Females; 115 males)
    - Responders: 97 (46 Females; 51 males)
    - Response Rate: 47.3%

**Recommendations from 2009 Findings**

- Committee for the Retention and Advancement and of Faculty
  - Working committee that reviews survey data and conducts focus group activities
  - Provides recommendations regarding areas of concern to the Provost and President
Recommendations from 2009 Findings

• Reduce Teaching load
  – Current Status in 2011-12
    • Average for tenured faculty is 3.92 out of 5
    • Women (3.86) and Men (3.96) were similar in their ratings
    • This area was identified as a “worst” aspect at the college (29%)
  – ACTION in 2013-14
    • Teaching load reduced

Recommendations from 2009 Findings

• More time/appreciation for research
  – Current Status in 2011-12
    • This area is still a concern for tenured faculty (2.82 out of 5)
    • Women are less satisfied (2.50) than men (3.11)
  – ACTION 2013-14
    • Performance Measurement Process places greater emphasis on research grants
    • Faculty publications in refereed journals has increased from 69 to 138
    • Faculty book chapters have increased from 5 to 34
    • Faculty conference presentations, published as proceedings has increased from 42 to 71

Recommendations from 2009 Findings

• Decrease committee work
  – Current Status in 2011-12
    • This is no longer a weakness when compared to our peers
    • Average for tenured faculty is 3.33 out of 5
    • Women are less satisfied (3.15) than men (3.49)
• Improve office space
  – Current Status in 2011-12
    • This area is still a concern among tenured faculty
    • Average for tenured faculty is 2.53 out of 5
    • Women are less satisfied (2.33) than men (2.72)

Recommendations from 2009 Findings

• Clarify tenure/promotion process
  – Current Status in 2011-12
    • This is not an area of concern when compared to our peers for the promotion process
    • Average for tenured faculty is 3.71 out of 5
    • Women (3.76) and Men (3.68) were similar in their ratings
  – ACTION since 2012-13
    • New Faculty Handbook created
    • New Faculty Orientation designed and implemented
    • New PARSE (Professional Activity Report and Self-Evaluation)
    • Workshops

Recommendations from 2009 Findings

• Faculty Commons
  – Sponsored Programs
  – Assessment and Institutional Research
  – Center for Teaching and Learning
The New School
• Urban
• Design, social science and the arts
• High use of PT faculty
• Tenure recent

Why A Faculty Survey?
• MSCHE Chapter Working Group
• Faculty Senate
  • Perception of much change so quickly
  • Perceived disparities between divisions

Why COACHE?
• Understand our effectiveness at recruiting, retaining and supporting faculty
• Understand campus climate and satisfaction
• Understand our faculty perceptions vis-à-vis our peers

Anticipated Use of Results
• MSCHE faculty chapter
• Aid in setting PO agenda for continued faculty affairs policy development

Actual Use of Results
• MSCHE chapter
• Workload
• Mentoring
• Faculty development

Actual Use of Results
• COACHE revealed the areas of dissatisfaction
• PO, OIRE used (and will use) additional data to understand the issue(s)
Actual Use of Results

Green Paper / White Paper

- Posted on faculty channel
- Senate interactive platform to collect comments
- Divisional committee to collect feedback
- PO revises
- Deans Council and Faculty Senate approve
- Becomes policy

Reflections & Next Steps

- Participation rates
- Connect survey data to actions
- Search for peers
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Questions...