

## **Executive Summary: CAS COACHE survey recommendations**

### **OVERVIEW**

In November 2020 members of the Equity, Engagement, and Mentoring working group, reviewed the COACHE survey data compiled in Spring 2020 from College of Arts & Sciences faculty. Over the last several months they reviewed these data. Initially, they identified dominant areas of concern identified in the survey, and they developed some preliminary recommendations. Subsequently, they invited feedback from faculty on the dominant areas of concern, specifically requesting suggestions for action. CAS faculty provided input via Chairs Council, Undergraduate Council, the College Executive Committee, a dedicated Coffee with the Dean event (open to all CAS faculty), and a college-wide Qualtrics survey. In addition, the working group reviewed recommendations made by the GSU Task Force for Racial Equality ([dei.gsu.edu/about/task-force/](http://dei.gsu.edu/about/task-force/)), particularly recommendations in the areas of Faculty Affairs and Institutional Change. In light of our own analysis and feedback from our colleague, the working group presented an extensive series of recommendations for possible action to the Dean's Office. In moving forward as described below, college leadership will draw on those specific recommendations.

### **AREAS FOR ACTION IN ARTS & SCIENCES**

The COACHE survey brought to light three major areas of concern:

1. Underrepresented Minority (URM) faculty: recruitment, hiring, retention, development, and leadership development. Faculty do not feel that GSU prioritizes the hiring, retention, promotion, and leadership development of URM faculty. In addition, they believe that URM colleagues face personal and professional challenges that are not recognized, let alone addressed, by the institution. As a result, they believe we lose the URM faculty we hire, we fail to provide role models and personal guidance for our students, and our research mission is impoverished. The recommendations below are designed not only to increase the numbers of URM faculty, but also to generate an inclusive climate that enriches our educational, research, and community outreach missions.
2. Equitable distribution of service: CAS faculty express several concerns about service. First, they believe there is no meaningful reward for extraordinary service and there are no meaningful consequences for not fulfilling department- and college-level service assignments. As a result, some faculty simply do not engage in service, while others take on the lion's share. Second, mid-career faculty (especially associate professors and senior lecturers) are disproportionately shouldering department and college level service responsibilities, to the detriment of their own career progression. This disproportionately affects women and URM faculty. In addition, extraordinary service is not compensated financially or in structured/promotion reviews. Data collected by the college indicates that those who take on too much service are slowed in their progression to senior ranks (e.g., professor, principal senior lecturer). This results in less diversity in the most senior faculty ranks and administrative leadership.

3. Access to key decision-making positions, committees: CAS faculty believe that NTT faculty are regularly excluded from key decision-making positions at the departmental level. Data indicates that departments vary widely in their appointment/election of NTT faculty to important roles (e.g., department executive committee, senate). Since NTT ranks include a higher percentage of women and URM faculty than in TT ranks, this practice disproportionately marginalizes female and URM faculty members more than others. In addition, NTT faculty members overall feel less valued than their TT colleagues, even though they frequently take the lead in curriculum design, innovation, and implementation.

## **SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION**

In 2020-21, the Dean's Office will work with the college Executive Committee; department chairs; the Equity, Engagement, and Mentoring working group; Graduate Council; and a Dean's Task Force to prioritize next steps among the many suggestions brought forward by the faculty. This work will set the stage for efforts to come in subsequent years.

### **Area 1: URM faculty: recruitment, hiring, retention, development, and leadership development**

As part of its strategic plan, for the last several years the college has been implementing several strategies focused on URM faculty recruitment and hiring. Specifically, the college compiled data about faculty composition (focused on race/ethnicity, gender), applicant pools (NSF current data on PhD pipeline by discipline), and faculty progression to senior ranks. In addition, the college has established a required training program for search committee chairs and a small number of trained search advocates available to serve on search committees. Finally, the college regularly posts faculty positions in venues likely to attract URM candidates (e.g., Black Doctoral Network).

In response to the CAS COACHE survey data feedback, the college will expand its search committee training, requiring it of all search committee members (not just the committee chairs), to further improve recruitment and hiring processes. In addition, the college will prioritize its efforts in the areas of URM faculty retention and leadership development. Specifically, a Dean's Task Force will review and prioritize 2-3 strategies suggested by faculty. In particular, we anticipate reviewing the development of cluster hire proposals to enhance hiring; establishing year-long mentors for URM faculty upon hire and upon promotion, per recommendations from higher education experts; and providing equity training for college leadership and department chairs. Finally, the college executive committee will be asked to begin a review of college bylaws and P&T manuals with an eye toward equity.

It became clear through the faculty conversations that efforts the college has made in advancing equity and diversity (e.g., mentoring programs, search trainings, referencing NSF PhD pipeline data in reviewing applicant pools) are not widely known across the college. The Dean's Office will work to communicate ongoing and new efforts.

### **Area 1: Distribution of service**

The college is currently in the midst of a staff reorganization, which is designed in part to reduce the administrative tasks of chairs and faculty throughout the college. Currently, service responsibilities are reviewed individually as part of structured and promotion reviews.

In response to the CAS COACHE survey data feedback, the college will focus on working with departments to develop department-wide standards for faculty service within GSU. Specifically, the departments will develop plans for rotating service and assigning service in a regularized, transparent way to assure that service is distributed equitably, recognizing that senior faculty will be expected to offer greater service than junior colleagues, and that URM faculty are often providing informal student support that should be factored into their service responsibilities. In addition, the college will expand its current means of recognizing extraordinary service (e.g., increase number and prominence of college awards, review role of service in merit raise consideration). Finally, the college will partner with chairs to develop concrete, consistent plans for addressing faculty who do not provide the service they are assigned.

### **Area 3: Equity for NTT faculty**

The college has already taken significant steps to equip and recognize its NTT faculty. NTT faculty serve on the college Executive Committee and participate in Dean's Office academic leadership programs, and new NTT faculty members are assigned mentors just as TT faculty are. In addition, Arts & Sciences established the first Dean's Office NTT Faculty Associate position, contributing to faculty and policy development.

The CAS COACHE survey data feedback indicated that NTT faculty members' experiences differ widely from one department to another. In response to the CAS COACHE survey data feedback, department-level practices will be reviewed, with an eye toward standardizing NTT access to leadership and key decision-making positions across the departments.

In addition, the CAS COACHE survey data made it clear that NTT faculty feel under-resourced in many ways, and particularly when compared with their TT faculty. This is of concern in part because the college strategic plan prioritizes improving career progression rates for senior lecturers. This is also a concern because URM and women faculty are disproportionately represented in NTT faculty ranks. Keeping in mind the different position expectations of regular faculty at different ranks, the college leadership will review the numerous suggestions made by faculty and identify 1-2 strategies for implementation (e.g., establishing equity in professional development/travel funds). We will also seek ways to recognize NTT faculty more prominently and more widely than we have done to date.